



GLOBAL ENGLISH HEGEMONY AND THE QUESTION OF CULTURE IN THE
PALESTENIAN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

A Thesis Written By:

Raja' Majed Barghouthi

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Ismael Nashef -- Thesis Advisor

Dr. Fateen Mas'ad -- Committee Member

Dr. Abdul-Rahim Al-Shaikh -- Committee Member

Birzeit, Palestine
May, 2008

GLOBAL ENGLISH HEGEMONY AND THE QUESTION OF CULTURE IN THE
PALESTENIAN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree in
Education from Birzeit University

Signatures of Committee Members:

Dr. Ismael Nashef.....Thesis Advisor
Dr. Fateen Mas'ad.....Committee Member
Dr. Abdul-Rahim Al-Shaikh..... Committee Member

Birzeit, Palestine
May, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iv
DEDICATION	vi
ENGLISH ABSTRACT	1
ARABIC ABSTRACT	3
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	4
I. Teaching English in Palestine: Critical historical review	4
II. Importance and need of the study	12
III. Problem statement & research questions	13
IV. Limitations of the study	14
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
I. Introduction	16
II. The concept of global English	17
III. Gramsci's notion of hegemony	22
IV. Americanizing the world through global English	25
V. Relationship between globalization, language and culture	30
VI. Culture dissemination through language	33
VII. Concluding notes	41
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	43
I. Introduction	43
II. Sampling and sampling characteristics	44
III. Data collection procedures	47
IV. Instrument structure	51
i. Standardized open-ended interview	51
ii. Open-ended focus group	53
II. Instrument validity procedures	54
III. Data analysis procedures	56
i. Analysis in the exploratory phase	57
ii. Analysis in the specification phase	57

iii.	Analysis in the reduction phase	58
	CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND STUDY RESULTS	59
	1. Main results and themes	59
	Summary of results (table 1)	60
	i. Mixed perceptions of global English hegemony over first language and culture	65
	ii. Global English as legacy of U.K and U.S.A colonization	73
	iii. Spread of English as the language of advanced science	81
	iv. Fascination of English as an attractive language	88
	v. Successive occupations and other local agents promote English hegemony and Arabic blending	95
	vi. Cultural hegemony and relevance of English curriculum to learners' cultural and national identity	107
	II. Chapter summary	125
	CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS	127
	I. Introduction	127
	II. General discussion of the results	127
	i. Intuitive interpretations of English hegemony	131
	ii. Marginalization of national education and symptoms of cultural alienation	133
	iii. Cultural alienation and cultural hegemony	134
	iv. Absence of collective educational vision for EFL in Palestine	141
	III. Conclusion and recommendations	152
	List of references	156
	Appendix A	160
	Appendix B	161

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I am so grateful to all revolutionary voices that have always taught me, inspired me, and directed my steps towards believing in, and writing for, a future, which is free from colonization, and free from domination. To

my supervisor, Dr. Ismael Nashef, his deep reading and stimulating comments have certainly encouraged me to be more critical in my attempt to achieve this research. To the committee members, Dr. Fateen Mas'ad, and Dr. Abdul-Rahim Al-Shaikh, who have read, re-read, and discussed this thesis. To my professors at Birzeit University, especially in departments of Philosophy, English and Education, their many inspiring lectures, discussions and feedback have undeniably helped to shape my mind into thinking.

My deep gratitude goes to the English language educationalists, students, and all research participants, who sacrificed their time and rest, to sit for long interviews, and engage in difficult discussions and questions about global English. By means of their sacrifices this research has been achieved.

I am so grateful to my dearest husband, Dr. Ibrahim Makkawi, who helped me a lot throughout his worthy comments and involvement in discussing the details in this thesis, only through his endless love, caring and encouragement, this hard work is made possible. To my kids, Fayruz and Amr, who gave me the chance to feel what it means to be a mother and a student at the same time. They taught me to value each and every moment to be able to succeed academically.

My eternal love and appreciation to my family, my parents, sisters and brothers, with their support and trust in my abilities, I arrived at this moment. My special thanks should also go to my cousin, Dr. Wedad Barghouthi, whose first gift to me, while still in the childhood, a book entitled: "Uncle's Tom Cottage", which became the earliest that opened my eyes on the oppressed of the world. To the expatriate, my best friend

and soul mate, Hanada Kharma, she is always a great source of inspiration and encouragement to me.

DEDICATION

To my people, the Palestinian people, to the English language curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students, to foreign language educationalists in general, to future generations, to my kids Fauruz and Amr,

“To the oppressed and to those who suffer with them and fight at their side”. Paulo Freire

*I dedicate this work and I hope to be able at least to open a
.discussion*

ENGLISH ABSTRACT

English language globalization does not reflect a linguistic change only, but also and more prominently, it leaves significant socio-cultural implications on communities in general, and on presently colonized communities, such as Palestine, in particular. This thesis is intended to explore the perceptions of English language experts and students regarding the actual challenges that global English poses to the Arab Palestinians' first language and national culture.

Furthermore, it is intended to investigate, critically, the nature of the cultural context embedded in the new Palestinian English language curriculum, as perceived by English language experts and students. Throughout the study, I argue that, teaching and learning English in Palestine, had started and continued to develop, not only as an educational necessity, but most importantly, as a dominant linguistic reality that has been imposed through culture of colonization and culture of globalization.

Qualitative research tools and techniques have been utilized in the implementation of this study. Fifty-five English language expert and student were selected for in-depth interviews and focus groups. Among the prevailing findings of this study, it was established that there are mixed perceptions of global English hegemony in its relationship to learners' first language and national culture. English hegemony is promoted through successive occupations, formal role of the educational institution and other local agents,

such as, non-governmental organizations. Although English is perceived as an attractive and advanced language, however, crossbreeding and drawback of the Arabic language and culture were observed as direct results of global English hegemony. Cultural hegemony, moreover, is revealed within the English curriculum superficial relatedness to learners' cultural and national identity.

Thus, this study reflects on some of the socio-linguistic and socio-cultural implications of global English hegemony in the Palestinian educational context.

ملخص الدراسة

إن عولمة اللغة الإنجليزية لاتعكس ظاهرة لغوية فقط، بل إنها أيضاً، وبشكل أكثر أهمية، تترك تبعات ثقافية وإجتماعية على المجتمعات بشكل عام، وعلى المجتمعات والبلدان التي مازالت محتلة، كما هي الحال في فلسطين، بشكل خاص. تهدف هذه الدراسة، إلى إستكشاف كيف يعي خبراء ومعلموا وطلاب اللغة الإنجليزية، في السياق التربوي الفلسطيني، التحديات الحقيقية التي تفرضها عليهم عولمة اللغة الإنجليزية، وعلاقتها بلغتهم الأولى وثقافتهم الوطنية والقومية.

بالإضافة الى ذلك، تهدف هذه الدراسة، الى الكشف، وبشكل نقدي، عن طبيعة المحتوى الثقافي الموجود في منهاج اللغة الإنجليزية، كما يدركه ويعيه خبراء ومعلمي وطلاب اللغة الإنجليزية. أجادل في هذه الدراسة، بأن تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية في السياق التربوي الفلسطيني، لم يبدأ كضرورة وحاجة تربوية فقط، بل كهيمنة لغوية فرضتها ثقافة الإستعمار، وعززتها متطلبات العولمة الثقافية والإقتصادية. للإجابة على الأسئلة المطروحة في هذا البحث، إستخدمت منهجية وأدوات البحث. شملت عينة الدراسة خمسة وخمسين من خبراء وطلاب اللغة الإنجليزية في فلسطين، بحيث أحررت معهم مقابلات معمقة فردية، وضمن مجموعات بؤرية.

توصلت الدراسة الى مجموعة من النتائج، من ضمنها، أن هناك فهماً مختلطاً لظاهرة عولمة اللغة الإنجليزية، وتأثيرها على اللغة والثقافة الأولى للمتعلمين. وضحت الدراسة أن هيمنة اللغة الإنجليزية، في السياق الفلسطيني، تم تعزيزها من خلال الإحتلال المتواصل والمتعاقب لفلسطين، ومن خلال الدور الرسمي للمؤسسة التعليمية الفلسطينية، بالإضافة الى مؤسسات محلية أخرى، مثل الجامعات، المدارس الخاصة، والمنظمات غير الحكومية. وضحت الدراسة أيضاً، أثر الهيمنة الثقافية، وعلاقتها بارتباط منهاج اللغة الإنجليزية بهوية المتعلمين الثقافية والوطنية. من جهة أخرى، بينت نتائج الدراسة بأنه وبالرغم من أن اللغة الإنجليزية وصفت من قبل المشاركين باللغة الجذابة ولغة العلوم المتطورة، إلا أن ضعف وتهمين اللغة والثقافة العربية، فُهمت كنتائج مباشرة لهيمنة اللغة الإنجليزية في السياق الفلسطيني.

بالجمل، فإن هذه الدراسة تعكس بعض الأبعاد الإجتماعية والثقافية لهيمنة وعولمة اللغة الإنجليزية في السياق التربوي الفلسطيني.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

I. Teaching English in Palestine: Critical historical review

Teaching English as a foreign language in Palestine refers back to the colonial era of the British mandate over Palestine (1917-1948). The mandate's educational administration imposed teaching English for the first time on Palestinian students in the lower primary grade levels, including students within the age category seven to twelve. Since then, the English language was planned to be taught to the primary stage graders starting from the fourth grade and up (Sabri, 2003). Thus, from the very beginning, English is considered as the language of occupation and of the colonizing authorities. Put differently, it is the language of the Palestinian people's oppressor. By imposing English on the native people, the British colonialist authorities aimed at creating an atmosphere which enables them to control not only the country and the geography, but also, the minds, the souls and the cultural development of the indigenous people, through communicating their own colonial agendas, priorities and culture. Furthermore, educational policies that have been adopted by the British mandate including the imposition of English language on Palestinian students, were designed to eradicate the legacy it had inherited from the Ottoman educational system which was dominant prior to that and had in turn enforced teaching through its' own Turkish language instead of the learners' native Arabic language. Therefore, the colonial hegemony of English language was imposed over a people whose first language was already marginalized and weakened through consecutive colonial policies. This reality of successive colonialism had facilitated the British mandate's efforts to continue the destruction to native language

educational policies including imposition of the English language with less resistance from the Arab Palestinians who did not have a chance to catch their breath and reconstruct their cultural identity after the end of the Ottoman colonial period.

The subsequent colonial eras, including the Jordanian rule in the West Bank, the Egyptian in Gaza Strip and lately the Israeli occupation all over Palestine, have continued to strengthen and to emphasize policies of imposition on different political, social, economic and cultural levels. The curriculum that was and is operating inside Palestine during these colonial eras has been created and developed to ensure imprisonment of people's economical and spiritual development. It has been dedicated to create a generation that is totally alienated and deprived from basic human rights, such as the right to live and choose freely.

Building on that, it is obvious, through reading the previous historical decades, that learning and teaching either English or other foreign languages in Palestine, such as the Hebrew language, does not reflect an educational choice only, but it mirrors the colonizers' compulsion policies in the first place. This fact of language imposition through recent history adds a lot to say about the reality of teaching foreign languages within the Palestinian educational context. It influences directly the very intrinsic nature of the field of teaching foreign languages in Palestine. For example, it raises important questions about the political and the cultural content of the target language and its' relationship with learners' national and cultural identity. These types of questions become dramatically important when, furthermore, one or more of the colonialist foreign languages developed into a global hegemonic language, such as in the case of the English language.

Since the Palestinian Ministry of Education (MOE) had assumed responsibility over education in the West Bank and Gaza Strip in 1995 in accordance with the Oslo agreement, it was pre-occupied with the idea of not only enhancing the teaching of English language, but also with its infusion through the first grade. This unexpected shift in English education is noteworthy in light of the fact that English had been taught in the fifth grade just prior to the arrival of the Palestinian National Authority (PNA). One can only interpret this new policy of the MOE in light of the fact that English has been grown into global and international language, and more importantly, under the pressure of global powers and global market demands to heavily integrate English and technology into the third world consumption sack. Teaching English to first graders has raised hot discussion among Palestinian educationalists; some stood for its integration and many stood against it. One of the objectives of the current study is to investigate how English language experts and learners do think about the issue.

Generally speaking, and similar to the rest of the Palestinian national curriculum, the political and social umbrella under which the “new English for Palestine” has been developed is the Oslo agreement. The Oslo agreement is a political agreement which has been signed in 1993 between Israel and the leadership of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). The agreement is viewed by many devoted Palestinians as a tool for capitulation and dissolution of the Palestinian national cause. For instance, Samara (1999) argues that the agreement is a tool to re-settle more than four and half million Palestinian refugees and to deprive them from their natural right to return to their homeland. It has been viewed as an instrument to destroy the Palestinian people’s resistance and end their aspirations for independence and self- determination.

According to the Oslo agreement, the Palestinians were to develop a “neutral and objective” educational curriculum, which in fact would serve the interests and agendas of Israel and its supporters. To be neutral curriculum, it should not include discussions about serious national problems, such as, Palestinian refugees, borders, water, settlements or any other problem that might sound political and critical of the Israel occupation and its colonialist practices. To be neutral, the Palestinian national curriculum should not include any material that might be interpreted as instigative or provocative against the occupation. The Zionist occupation has exerted equivalent effort inside the 1948 occupied Palestine to re-create a curriculum which is described by number of researchers as: “...aimed at producing a personality which is vague and formless, neither Israeli nor pure Arab, but a personality which surrenders to and justifies the existing political situation” (Hayder, 1997, p.79). This description can be also accurate in terms of the expected objectives behind Palestinian education within the framework of the Oslo agreement.

Constrained by the limitations of the political agreement, Palestinian curriculum developers were allowed a very narrow space of operation within which they were expected to develop the new “English for Palestine” curriculum. The new "English for Palestine" came to substitute the old versions of the Jordanian and Egyptian English curriculum which were operating within Palestinian schools in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The previous Jordanian and Egyptian curriculum, including the English curriculum, came under tremendous criticism for their lack of cultural relevance to the Palestinian needs and context. Central pedagogical themes in that curriculum were restricted to issues and problems relevant to Jordan, Egypt and some other foreign countries such as

Britain, whereas Palestine was totally absent from the content. Within these culturally peculiar educational contexts, the Palestinians were aspiring for a new Palestinian curriculum which would be more relevant to their national dreams and daily life problems. Rather than serving as a step in this liberating direction, there is mounting evidence that the new “English for Palestine” curriculum, simply replaced an old curriculum dominated with foreign cultural hegemony by a new one.

It is a major challenge for Palestinian educators to be able to develop a culturally relevant national curriculum while still under occupation, let alone the pressure of overstated age of globalization and global English hegemony. I argue that, under a political agreement between two parties with asymmetrical power relations; the needs, goals and strategic interests of the more powerful party will dominate the outcomes of such an agreement. Under these circumstances, it follows that, the new Palestinian curriculum would be anything but an authentic national curriculum serving the Palestinians aspiration for nation building and self determination. It is a curriculum serving the goals of the more powerful party in the agreement.

Globalization as a concept and as a historical reality has generated a wide range of intellectual controversy and debate. Within this reality, English has emerged as the global and hegemonic language. It is the language of the most dominant nation during this era of history. For small and newly liberated nations, not to mention nations that are still under occupation, such as the Palestinians, the development of national English curriculum becomes an overwhelmingly complicated and challenging task. Global English raises massive social and cultural concerns that require serious discussion of educational and political autonomy of the nation at question. These concerns deserve to be discussed

seriously on the national level, for instance, the long term consequences of global English on people's national and cultural identity.

I have noticed, through my experience as English language student, that locally, teaching and learning English as foreign language almost always engages learners in discussions that frequently appraise the fruits and benefits of learning and teaching the English language, particularly on the personal level. English language is always valued as dynamic and effective tool for successful and full engagement with the world's intellectual activities. Admittedly, this is true, but the argument supporting English as an asset for the individual is not sufficient and it is often judged out of the macro or collective context. Benefitting from global English on the individual level cannot be detached from the negative consequences of its cultural hegemony on the collective level. It is important, for example, that learners know about the cultural domination that might be embedded in the powerful language, learners should be able to consider seriously what language hegemony and language globalization could bring to them and to their societies.

Socio-linguists and other social scientists have already begun warning educationalists from global English hegemony on different social and cultural levels among developing nations cross the globe. Thus, I believe that it is very important to investigate perception of Palestinian English language educationalists and students on issues relevant to the English language hegemony, especially within the context of their occupied homeland and dominated education. This assumption is grounded in the preliminary finding of a pilot study which I have conducted with Palestinian educationalist. The pilot study helped clarifying my research problem and led to more

focused direction of the current research project, in which I explored in depth the perceptions of English language hegemony among Palestinian educators and students.

The pilot study, entitled: "Global English and indications of national & cultural identity in the Palestinian English curriculum", utilized qualitative research methodology. The pilot study aimed at exploring perceptions of global English among Palestinian educationalists and investigating the manifestation of Arab-Palestinian national and cultural issues within the content of the English language curriculum. The study involved three in-depth interviews with three data-rich cases including two faculty members and one graduate student, in addition to qualitative content analysis of the textbooks used in 10th and 11th grades.

The main argument in the pilot study was that the deep concepts of contextualization, meaning making and relatedness as being observed in the field of foreign and second language teaching and learning are very intensely connected to learners' national and cultural identity and challenged by global English. National and cultural identities are key components in the social and political context of the learners. As indicated in the preface of the "English for Palestine" textbook for the tenth grade, published in 2004, it is evident that the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) has clearly announced its' commitment to produce "a national curriculum which meets the needs and aspirations of the Palestinian society, and which fosters Palestinian values and traditions".

In addition to the three in depth qualitative interviews, the pilot study has also analyzed the national and cultural content of the tenth and eleventh grade textbook in terms of names, titles, subjects of discussion, intended objectives, pictures and images.

The results showed that information which is closely and directly relevant to the Palestinian national and cultural identity is very limited. Subjects which are discussed in the textbooks include: 1) technology & communication, 2) health, 3) business, 4) education, 5) personal activities, 6) climate issues, and 7) international activities. The stories about Palestine, Arabs and national culture are very brief and incomplete. The general impression of the reader is that the context through which such stories are mentioned is still with a foreign flavor. For example, when the textbook teaches learners about Jerusalem as the capital of Palestine (11 grade, p.6), it is not introduced within a separate and specifically designated piece of information which focuses on Palestine, but within the frame of the world map in general and with no special focus.

A simple calculation of names mentioned in both textbooks has showed that approximately 72% of the total names are foreign names, not Arabic. Curriculum designers have portrayed foreign people as more active and more involved in life activities. For instance, foreign characters are the ones who write letters, who travel, and who respond to actions. On the other hand, characters of Arabs and Palestinians come into view as passive and weak actors. It is my conclusion that such view might leave learners with stereotyped images about themselves and their nation, especially when it is presented without critical perspective. Furthermore, there are no evidences in the textbooks that Palestine is an occupied country, economically destroyed, or politically fragmented. Palestine instead, is portrayed as beautiful, geographically imparted and open country. People are presented as if they can freely move in and out, attend conferences and ready to join the global market. On the level of global English perception, the pilot study showed that English is a dominant language inside the

Palestinian context and negatively impacts the national and cultural identity of the learners. The Arabic language became feeble, unproductive and passive recipient. The study showed also that educationally, global English re-creates new categories of learners with new literacy, and new teaching approaches. On the level of socio-economic implications of global English in the Palestinian context, the study showed that global English has re-established new social group of elitists who are more advantageous than the rest of the population in terms of access to job opportunities and international involvement.

II. Importance and Need of the Study

The central objective of the current research project is to explore critically a number of issues that are relevant to global English hegemony and their implications on the local Palestinian education. The research has the potential to contribute to the development of the existing critical and progressive trend in teaching English as a foreign language. This progressive trend has been initiated originally by intellectuals and writers from the most oppressed and dominated third world and minority groups. Basically, the challenge to this trend is to alternate the presented traditional and racist movements and teaching approaches of English language, such as, the "English only movement" and the "contrastive analysis approach" whom defenders try to inflict exclusively a mono-linguistic and monoculture reality through the English language hegemony. Thus, in this attempt, the research encourages Palestinian English teachers and learners to engage in deep discussion about the implications of global English

hegemony within their own national context. This research investigates existing debates, discussions and perception of some very conflicting issues in the field of teaching English as a second or foreign language. One of these issues is how to help learners acquire effectively the English language while at the same time protect their cultural identity against the foreign language cultural hegemony. The issues under investigation pertain to thinking critically about both advantages and disadvantages of teaching EFL on the national level. The premise of the study hinges on the idea that the obtained findings, discussions and points of view on global English can be very useful in determining where the Palestinian educationalists do stand with regard to these issues. This would hopefully help clarify their roles as the intellectual elite in resisting or maybe facilitating this conflictive process of cultural hegemony.

III. Problem Statement and Research Questions

The main question in this research project pertains to the diverse ways and the terms by which English language teachers' and learners' understand the concept "global English" and its' different consequences on the learners' national culture and native language. The research intends to explore the different manifestations of the English language hegemony within the Palestinian educational system, through in depth examination of the thoughts and perceptions of the English language educationalists and students. More specifically, the study attempts essentially to answer the following two questions:

(1) How do English language specialists (i.e. curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers) and students comprehend the concept "global English" and its' effect on the

national English language curriculum (i.e. dissemination through curriculum structure, theories, teaching approaches... etc).

(2) How do English language specialists and students view the relationship between English as a dominant language on one hand, and their national culture and native language, Arabic, on the other? (Look at Appendix B to see the detailed questions).

In order to explore and shed light on the above research questions, qualitative research design was used. The research design included a number of individual open-ended qualitative interviews, as well as focus group interviews, and an exploratory qualitative observation to gather necessary data from the targeted population. The targeted population included the educationalists who work closely in the English language curriculum, such as the curriculum designers, supervisors, and teachers. Students were also included in the study in order to be able to reflect on the raised questions not only from the teachers' perspective, but also from learners' perspective. More information about the research methodology with detailed description of the targeted population is presented in the "methodology chapter".

IV. Limitations of the Study

It is significant to remind that the nature of this specific research design and the targeted research curriculum and participants' positioned in hierarchy cause unsurprisingly some limitations that might hinder the research's full potentiality to achieve the best possible results in terms of answering the research's questions. For instance, the experience of working with the new "English for Palestine" does not

exceed ten years, which is relatively short period of time to test the effect of such a newly developed curriculum. The English curriculum, after these years, is still considered as trial edition. Although its content is quite clear and it can be fully evaluated, however, the experts' perceptions and their working experience with the content of the curriculum might not be mature enough yet, especially because the curriculum has been developed within discrete stages and some stages, such as the ninth grade are still using the old Jordanian version "PETRA".

On the other hand, the targeted research participants are positioned in a hierarchal order. Hierarchal structures are normally represented with less number of employees in their higher levels. For instance, the total number of English language curriculum designers is less than that of supervisors, the number of supervisors is less than that of teachers, and the number of teachers is less than that of students. Thus, the available number of designers and supervisors, for example, who represent higher level of decision making, is limited by default. To reduce the impact of this limitation, the researcher, for instance, had to select all the available number of supervisors for interviews.

Utilization of only the qualitative methodology and tools, as the best that can explore the raised topic and issues in this research, is another limitation. For this reason, the study recommended deeper exploration of the same issues through other quantitative techniques or mixed methodology.

Other limitations are objectively connected with the political situation in Palestine. Due to movement difficulties and the Israeli military checkpoints inside Palestine, the researcher chose to interview participants from the middle districts of the

West Bank only. A purposive sample has been selected from number of educational institutions in Ramallah, Jerusalem and their surrounding villages and camps. However, some of the selected educationalists and students who teach and learn in Ramallah and Jerusalem have come originally from the Northern and Southern parts of the West Bank.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

I. Introduction

Prior to delving into the academic work and literature about language, it is essential to point out that the different articles and texts reviewed herein, present and discuss the concept of “global English” and the relationship between English language hegemony and local cultures and languages from different paradigmatic perspectives and schools of thought; namely liberal as well as socialist perspectives. Furthermore, the concept of “globalization” itself has been in the core of a wide variety of research and political debates tackling almost every level of its divergent political, economic and social implications.

The body of literature which is presented in this review explores a new level of globalization which is language globalization. The thread connecting this review pertains to such an issue when one language such as the English language becomes a global language and what type of ramifications this phenomenon holds in terms of national and international consequences. The light is shed also on the dialectical relationship between social changes and linguistic changes, and on the way by which different technological, economical, political and other social developments could facilitate and guide the linguistic changes that are marked by global English.

One common concurrence among authors of the studies and articles tackling the issue from both liberal and socialist traditions reviewed herein, is the fundamental assumption that global English is an American English. The term American English is used interchangeably with the term global English as a description of the dominant nature of American hegemony through the use of global English. This issue, I argue,

deserves a serious critical discussion on the level of the Palestinian educational context, primarily because, the antagonist history of the USA imperialism towards the Palestinian people and their national cause. This long history of imperialism should have already taught the Palestinian people to examine cautiously and critically anything which is American before they accept it, and especially, when we talk on the linguistic, cultural and national identity level of domination.

II. The Concept of Global English

In order to understand the concept “global English”, it is important to place it within the context of the wider definition of the concept of “globalization”. For example, Block (2000), maintains that globalization, in its different forms, intensifies worldwide social relations and bond together distant localities in a way that local happenings can be directly affected and shaped by international events that are occurring many miles away from them.

Global English, in Block’s (2000) argument, and also in the work of a wide variety of scholars discussed in this review like (Crystal 2002, Wallace 2002, Kushner 2003 and Canagarajah 2005), is viewed as one level of the whole globalization; it is a linguistic level of the globalization. Globalization in general, lays the ground for hegemony and domination through it’s intervention and impact on distant localities. The intended act of globalization, from the vantage point of the dominant power, is to re-shape the structure of world power and the center - periphery relationships. This has been found to increase the conflicts between poles, such as international versus national, center versus periphery, and more importantly for the purpose of the current

research project, dominant language and culture versus dominated language and culture (Cangarajah, 2005) .

The implication of Block's (2000) definition of globalization on the level of language would mean that English as global language will probably be found to occupy the center of the world languages, while the other native and national languages would be found to play marginal roles. Becoming global language means that, in addition to other things, English functions as the lingua franca of the world, and manages to occupy the world's cultural, social and economical domains. Practically speaking, the overwhelmingly spread of English means that the number of speakers of this language grows up to one and a half billion speaker around the world, a number which no other language had arrived at in the moment (Crystal, 2002, p.5). Crystal's (2002) quantification of the phenomenon of English globalization includes astonishing sets of numbers and statistics. Following are some examples: more than 50% of the world academic papers are written in English, three quarter of the world's mail is written in English, about 80% of the world electronically stored information is in English.

Consequential to the different examples of English globalization presented by Crystal (2002), I argue that English is a world wide dominant language to the point that nobody nowadays can escape learning it if they want to function productively in this era of globalization. In order to keep updated with the latest information and thinking in a specific subject matter, to be able to use the new technology and many other things people have to learn English. Global English, therefore, can be very threatening to many people who don't know the language, even if they don't directly use it inside their

workplaces or with their families. Global English creates a new world order which classifies people who are not fluent in the use of English as illiterate.

But before we continue to discuss the threats embedded in global English, it is crucial that we tackle the question of “why English” is the global language and not any other language? Reflecting on this question will help us to understand in more details the diverse sides and threats of global English. People might ask the question: why English has happened to be global English? Why it is not any other language, such as Arabic, or French? This is an important question that requires to be asked and, its clarification will help set the context for the premise of the current research.

Some socio-linguists who had similarly raised the same question have presented number of interpretations that try to explain why English exclusively has become the global language of the world. To give an example of the evolution of English as a global language, Wallace (2002) has stated that:

There is nothing inherent in English as a language which makes it more suitable than any other language for this role, it is rather that English has developed extensive resources as a result of its' dominance across many domains of use (p.106).

In her interpretation of the phenomenon of global English, Wallace suggests that the high functionality of the English language in important life aspects as, science, agriculture, research, trading, economic, industry...etc, is what makes the English language a dominant language, rather than the innate nature of the language. Wallace's interpretation, I argue, can represent a good answer for the writers who try to sell people English as naturally superior language. But again, the question remains: why English is the highly functional language in different life domains? What about other

languages such as Arabic, French, Spanish etc.? The answer to this question should lead us to factors of hegemony and domination behind the English language wide functionality and spread. The clarification presented by Crystal (2002) takes us undoubtedly into analyzing capital states hegemony behind global English. Crystal (2002) argues that the turning point when the English language assumed very successful position is when it had existed in the right place and at the right time. By saying that, Crystal pinpoints the fact that English was the language of Britain during the seventeenth and into the nineteenth century when Britain was a giant colonial nation and the leader of the industrial revolution. Then, English was and still the language of the U.S.A during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, when the U.S.A became a leading economic and military power in the world. These factors played chief role in the widespread and globalization of the English language as a language of imperialistic and authoritative states.

Considering the argument set forth by Crystal (2002), we can easily conclude that the notion of colonialism is a key component in understanding the English language globalization. The other descriptions used by Crystal such as “the leader of the industrial revolution” or a “leading economic power” might give a positive impression about capitalist states such as Britain and the U.S.A. It is important to remember that nobody has elected them to be the leaders of the world. Rather, it is the acts of colonialism, domination, hegemony and suppression of other nations which characterized their assumed leadership over the rest of the world. This forced “leadership” was what helped them to control and to spread their own language on the

expenses of other world languages. For instance, the British had imposed teaching English inside the colonies they control such as Palestine and India.

In the same sense, Block and Debrah (2002) have talked about the political power and its' relationship to language development. The political supremacy of one state, they believe, will in turn lead to the empowerment of its' own language so the language can grow into what they call “linguistic imperialism”. Thus, the problem is when one language grows into a “linguistic imperialism”, the extension of this language will be realized on the expenses of the remaining languages of the world. Furthermore, the culture of the dominant language will be further enhanced and empowered along with the use of its' own language, something which can only be achieved on the expenses of the other native and national cultures of the world. The marginalization of one language in the global context is directly linked to the marginalization of its culture, exactly in the same manner that the domination of one language leads to the domination of its culture.

The world-wide spread of English language, and consequently, the spread of its culture, has been viewed by many thinkers a cultural invasion of the west through the process of westernization and, more particularly, Americanization of the world. As the most dominant among the Western nations, American culture and way of life, assumes a “leading” role in the Western domination of the world. This domination is first and foremost facilitated by the U.S.A being politically and economically the most powerful state in the world. Thus, to reiterate, language globalization, when one language assumes hegemony over others, creates cultural hegemony and domination. What does hegemony mean and how can it be crystallized through language globalization? The

concept “hegemony” is defined by McLaren (1994, p.182) as “a cultural encasement of meaning, a prison – house of language and ideas, that is "freely" entered into by both dominators and dominated”. In the following section, I will discuss Bates’s (1975) interpretation of the Gramscian conceptualization of “hegemony”. The discussion of the concept will help us to comprehend more deeply the point made by McLaren; that is why dominated people enter “freely” into the cultural prison of the dominant language.

III. Gramsci’s Notion of Hegemony

Language hegemony in light of Gramsci’s notion of hegemony re-creates an “ideological unity of a whole social bloc” (Bates, 1975). The unity of ideology can stand behind successfulness and survival of world different cultures and civilizations. It can also stand behind stability of governments and ruling systems and classes. For example, spreading the capitalist ideology can maintain permanence of ruling capitalist class inside Britain, U.S.A and other capitalist ruling systems.

Gramsci has introduced the concept “hegemony” to explain how human beings can be ruled not only by force, but also, by ideas. Language bears, in addition to other things, ideas. From Gramscian viewpoint, the economic power or military force alone are not enough for the ruling class in order to rule the world or the dominated classes. Ruling others requires the dominant class to spread and popularize its’ own ideology and its’ own viewpoint in order to gain the consent and the approval of the dominated classes. Consequently, Gramsci has uncovered the role of the intellectuals in societies. He breaks down the superstructure of a state into two main components, the “political

society” which represents the military state versus the “civil society” which includes the rest of the private institutions, such as, schools, churches, clubs, and journals. Civil society, in particular, exists as the “market place of ideas, where intellectuals enter as salesmen of contending cultures” (Bate, 1975, p.353). Therefore, for Gramsci, civil society is the sphere of cultural organizations and of the “organic intellectuals” to create hegemony through extending the rulers viewpoint to the ruled, and subsequently to create, inside the ruled class, a “false consciousness”, which mixes their priorities and confuses their real goals and interests. Gramsci coined the concept “organic intellectuals” which includes professionals, leaders, economists and state employees who owe allegiance to the capitalists and work with them very closely to produce a new culture.

In my understanding, originally, the real revolutionary organic intellectuals stick to their own country’s national interests, defend it and mobilize ordinary people around it. The rule of the hired “organic intellectuals”, I understand, is to try to convince the ordinary people in the targeted countries with the agenda embedded in the new hegemonic ideology. The so called intellectuals do, in most cases, benefit from their attachment to the new hegemonic ideology and hegemonic powers. They might be given additional motivations, higher positions or higher salaries...etc, so as to keep them strongly tied to and interested in the new hegemonic structure. Thus, they start immediately and willingly to diffuse and justify the actions of the dominators. Generation after generation, when the educational system, the media and cultural organizations are totally converted and changed in accordance with the dominators agenda, we might find some of miss-led professors, students or even political and

social activists who start to repeat and teach the new ideology of the colonizer without having any direct benefits from doing so. They might become, unintentionally, self-destructive to their own national interests.

Practically speaking, I strongly believe, that Gramsci's analysis is very applicable in today's world. For instance, the imperialist ruling system inside the U.S.A is relentlessly involved in the creation and support of some of the intellectuals in third world countries into a group of mercenaries whose role is to try to convince their poor nations, that the capitalist system in the U.S is democratic and stands for the protection of human rights. We watch on a daily basis many of those "intellectuals" on satellite channels while they endeavor not only to defend the U.S.A massacres in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also to explain it as sacrifices for the U.S.A promised democracy and justice.

Applying Gramsci's notion of "organic intellectuals" to global English would mean that the English language hegemony does not realize its' domination automatically. It requires organic intellectuals or agents to adopt and defend the language. It needs cultural organizations, schools, language clubs and centers that are directed by the organic intellectuals who absolutely believe in the language and who believe in the language native culture and native speakers' ideology. Put simply, it needs to build "false consciousness" about other languages and cultures as well. For example, to motivate a group of university professors, students or other professionals to merge English into their Arabic while speaking to Arabs, or to push them to use complete English sentences and terminology, whether the conversational context requires that or not, the targeted group should feel the superiority of the English language first. They

should be convinced that talking in English, for instance, can be more impressive than talking in their first language and so on. This theme was among the emerging findings of the current research, and more details will be discussed in latter sections. What is important here is to notice that without some “organic intellectuals” who could spread the English language, talk about its magical benefits over and over again, administer some centers to teach the language for people or include it heavily into the school curriculum, it would become near impossible for English to emerge as a dominant language. In other words, without “internal agents” whose main role is to facilitate the hegemonic domination of English as an invading language, or any other invading language for that matter, this domination would have been extremely difficult if not impossible.

IV. Americanizing the World through Global English

At the outset, it is important to clarify that what is intended by the concept “Americanization”, is spreading American culture and values throughout the world, so as to facilitate American global hegemony and domination, rather than making people American as such. Many studies have observed the planned tendency to westernize and more specifically to Americanize the world through the spread of global English. The issue of westernizing and Americanizing the world through global English has received different reactions amongst language researchers. Some wrote to defend trend and others wrote to argue against it. For instance, Crystal (2002) and Wallace (2002) have observed that global English sounds vividly American English, while the U.S.A is not the only country who is native speaker of the language, and so they concluded the existing of

American hegemony through language and cultural domination. Other writers, such as Haneline (2001) or even before him Anderson (1982), have defended the idea of Americanizing the world through spreading American globalized English.

Haneline (2001), for example, has strongly defended the idea of diffusing and teaching an edited version of the American English. According to him, teachers who fail to teach an edited American English are not doing their jobs. Haneline (2001), at the same time, refused to read invitation to “whiteness” and “American” domination in his request. He stated that (2001, p.669) “English is not a white language anymore; it is used throughout the world by those in every race and culture”. In contrast to Crystal’s (2002) viewpoint, Haneline has denied the fact that English widespread is a result of past and current colonization, business and technological dominance of world powers. He believes, unlike Wallace (2002), that English is dominant, comparing to other languages, because it is easy to learn, it is relatively uninflected, has a large vocabulary, and has a history of welcoming foreign terms. Wallace (2002), just to remind readers, does not believe in the innate nature of English as a reasonable justification behind its’ widespread, but she thinks that the high functionality of the language as a language of politically and economically successful powers is what makes English a dominant language.

The idea of Haneline (2001) that Americans do not control the English language and that it simply belongs to its’ users, sounds paradoxical with his invitation to all English teachers everywhere to teach an edited American English and not any other version of English. He states that: “In an edited American English, we have a versatile tool we can give them, our hesitating to do so will not change the global shift toward

English, nor will it benefit our students-of any race, ethnic group or nationality” (p. 670).

In his invitation, Haneline (2001) sounds as extreme as the other defenders of the “English only movement” whose members call for teaching only English inside mixed classes in the United States. The proponents of this movement believe that it is educationally better for learners from different ethnic and language minority groups to learn English and to learn in English, and it is not necessary to teach their first languages besides English. Advocates of the “English only movement” think that teaching learners’ first languages will weaken the English language. Haneline in the same sense asks for teaching exclusively the American English and not any other edition of English. In his invitation, he denies not only national cultures and first languages spoken by people around the world, but also the rest of English speaking countries such Britain and Australia.

Contrary to this, Block & Cameron (2002) who argue against Americanization of global English think that Americanization of global English is further materialized through the pioneering role of the U.S.A in developing and marketing the electronic hardware and software. Furthermore, the internet plays a central role in the domination of American English compared to other forms of English, since 64% of its use was found in the U.S.A and only 12.7% where found in other English speaking countries. Thus, for those language researchers, Haneline’s additional invitation for globalizing the American version of English seems needless, because, the economical and technological superiority of America over the rest of world countries is enough to

globalize the American English. But again, Haneline (2001) could be understood, using Gramscian's terminology, as one of the American "organic intellectuals" who works to educate other people about the American capitalist ideology and culture through spreading the American English.

Centering most current educational reforms among non-English speaking nations on the integration of English into national curriculum is another important issue that deserves a special attention and discussion. Literature review showed that most educational reforms, particularly in the third world and Arab countries, are dedicated to integrate teaching English into the curriculum on the expenses of other social and human sciences (Judy, 1999). Furthermore, these educational reforms have been found to be imposed by an international body or agency. They are heavily funded, pre-planned, and have very little, if at all, to do with the countries' educational needs and requirements. What is incredibly noticeable in such educational reforms is the consistent insertion of the English language proposal which is firmly included in each and every submitted educational restructuring. This proposal, as described by some writers like Anderson (1982), Judy (1999) and Hadley (1999) has nothing to do with the educational needs of the indigenous people. As a substitute, it aims at English language globalization. Perilously, these educational reforms were observed in their progress towards more adaptation with the market's needs and consumption values (Judy, 1999). These values of open market and consumerism resonate well with the trend of Americanization discussed earlier.

Language researchers, such as Anderson (1982) or more recently Haneline (2001) have seen that such educational reforms are dedicated not only to integrate the English

language into national curriculum of third world and poor countries, but also to Americanize education in the world. For instance, the question of “why American education should be globalized?” parallels the question of “why should we die?” and sounded a silly question to be asked for Anderson (1982, p.55). He explained that the English language hegemony was and continues to be a very integral part in the intensifying efforts to globalize American education and cultural values which started in 1970s, after the decline of the British hegemony. Thus, efforts to upgrade foreign language instruction and cross-cultural education were in the heart of globalizing the American educational project.

Consequently, Anderson (1982) and Haneline (2001) have confirmed Gramsci’s analysis of hegemony. That is, to unite the world under one ideology, the U.S.A needs to globalize its’ own culture and its’ own education. In order to able to do so they have to enforce foreign language integration in the world’s educational systems, as a way to globalize and to integrate their English language. Of course, changing educational curriculum to look more American in its entire content, approaches, theories and strategies can be the most successful key to change the way people think into their future. By doing so, the U.S.A presents itself as a model for other nations to follow. More precisely, it presents the capitalist system as a model for the other countries to follow.

However, I think, it is very insightful to us, the third world people, who suffer from the U.S.A multiple forms of hegemony and domination to take seriously Anderson’s confession (1982, p.159) that declining U.S.A hegemony will "reduce the level of world cultural homogeneity". My critique against Anderson's claim is that culture is not and can never become a universal homogenous entity. Culture is heterogenous; it is one of the

distinctive features in the identity of every nation and even sometimes within the borders of some nation-states where we have distinctive ethnic minorities. Making culture a worldwide homogeneous existence, I believe, requires suppression and control over the world's diverse cultural traditions. For example, domination of global English in Palestine enforces people to forget about their own language and to start immediately to learn English. The common requirement in most job announcements in the local Palestinian context includes the English language competency. Job interviewees are required to be competent in English even when the nature of the proposed job does not really need such proficiency. People at the present live under the pressure to learn English or otherwise they will lose important things such as job vacancies or participating in international activities.

Saying this, it is important to remember that suppression and control of the world's spiritual and cultural heritage are only some characteristics of the global capitalism. Global capitalism which is led by the U.S.A attempts to utilize the world's different resources so as to increase its' own capital and power. Marketing one language which is the English language and one culture which is the American western culture on the expenses of other world languages and cultures, in addition to its' role in spreading the capitalist ideology, can also transform language and culture into profitable investment for the capitalists. In the coming pages, I will elaborate more on the strong relationship between global English and global capitalism and on the idea of materializing and marketing spiritual entities, such as culture and language, for the sake of accumulating profit and capital.

V. The Relationship between Globalization, Language and Culture

The attempt towards the re-creation of culture beyond the borders of nation-states is one of the major characteristics of globalization. For instance, Jay (2001, p.32) suggests that globalization, regardless of whether modern or postmodern phenomenon, has reformulated culture to include not only national interests, "but also shared set of global interests". Jay's (2001) notion of "global interests" suggests that the educational institutions as cultural institutions are no longer linked only to the development and needs of nation states. His argument proposes also that literary studies, especially English literature, are now post-national phenomenon rather than a national one. The world is exchanging, through literature, not only systems of commodity, but also sets of symbols, language and culture. Thus, cultural forms like for example literary narratives, cinema, and films are dealt with as commodities, that can be bought, sold and exchanged. Cultural forms are no longer encountered as aesthetic or spiritual forms that have nothing to do with reality.

The capitalist system, as mentioned earlier, will make use of art and culture as commodities to increase its' own profits, on one hand. The "artistic form" which is produced for profit's sake lacks authenticity, spontaneity and creation which are naturally found in the true art. On the other hand, these types of artistic and cultural form are created to serve the interests of the imperial and capital powers that produced them, and thus, the resisting artistic spirit of the oppressed and poor people in the third world can only be and is meant to be spoiled by this production. Marx (1977) for instance, has believed that the different cultural and art forms that have been produced under the control of the capitalist system are idealistic, metaphysical, unconnected to lives of poor

people, and are created to serve only the interests of the wealthy and rich class. The cultural and art forms, from Marxist viewpoint, should be able to mirror the real life problems of the masses and should help them to change the oppressive economic and social conditions they live under capitalism to a better being.

Jay (2001) has viewed globalization as another synonym for westernization and Americanization, and that global literature is exclusively English literature. As a result, he called upon the writers of the world to develop a "transnational approach to English that avoids colonizing literature of others" (p. 34). Transnational English is expected, from Jay's viewpoint, to help writers all over the world to express their voices equally as a substitute to American and British writers' domination. Therefore, the main problem for Jay is for the people of the world to be extensively introduced to British and American literature and the solution is to develop transnational English which belongs to all people.

However, the point that merits reemphasis from my viewpoint, is that the rest of the world's writers who write in English can not freely and equally compete with the British and American writers, who not only write in their mother tongue, but who also write under the umbrella of their politically and economically dominating states. They will continue to control, using Jay's terminology, the world exchange of symbols. I argue that, English literature intensifies possibilities for homogenization and colonization of weak country's cultures and languages. Thus, the symbolic exchange, which is accelerated by globalization and global English literature, is tied to stand for the west, the Americans and the British, as agents for modernity, innovation, democracy, human rights and justice, while the rest of world's nations are breathless trying to follow up with the presented role model. Thus, even though, Jay's attempt to free English literature from

the British and American control through “transnational English” is a legible dream, but I think, this conflict can not be completely resolved on the level of literary studies alone without winning the economic and political war against capital world powers. Literature is only one component, albeit very important component, which materializes the capital system colonization and hegemony over the rest of the world.

Critically and frankly speaking, I find myself in a strong disagreement with Jay’s (2001) “transnational English” as a fundamental solution for globalizing equally the English literary studies which are developed by non-native writers. From cultural and language-based perspective, I believe that defending the right of the world authors to think and write in their native languages, while protecting their equal chances to internationally compete and globalize their own literary studies should become the natural solution which respect the world’s diverse cultures and languages. Moreover, it is the natural solution which guarantees genuine creation in different arts including literary studies. World languages, I assume, should have the same access not only as languages that have the right to compete with English, but also, and more importantly, as holders of cultures. Otherwise, it will be impossible to escape the ramifications of the project which aims to homogenize cultures through killing the spirit in diversity among the world’s cultures. Translation of literature as one possible solution for transcending the borders of languages is a very challenging practice, especially on the cultural level, since “the real challenge partly stems from the fact that literary translation is not solely a linguistic enterprise, but a cultural and moral one as well” (Jabr, 2000, p.1).

Therefore, literary creation in the writer’s foreign or second language can never reach the level of creation in his or her first language. From this point alone, it is not

difficult to imagine the roots of inequality that could be embedded in the transnational English. In the coming pages of this literature review, the focus will be more on importance of culture in learning and teaching foreign languages.

VI. Culture Dissemination through Language

Language literature, in addition to what has been mentioned so far, has raised other interesting questions and issues related to the concept of culture and its' relationship to the educational process of language teaching and learning. Hence, this part of the literature review will explore the question why culture is one of the most important yet controversial issues, specifically, in teaching and learning foreign languages.

The main question which is raised in this part is: what kind of culture educationalists should integrate in teaching foreign languages, and if cultural integration into foreign languages can add anything in terms of the learners' educational needs' fulfillment and more prominently, their potential to acquire the targeted language?. Many studies have been dedicated to study the conflicting issue that boundaries between language and culture insistently create inside teaching foreign languages. The dilemma is whether to teach a foreign language within its' own cultural context, or else, to teach it within the cultural and national context of the native learners. To start tackling this question would lead to the acute need to develop a culturally-based content which is relevant to the national culture of the learners' themselves, as opposed to, importing a pre-prepared cultural content which is taken from the context of the instructional foreign language. The question, for example, becomes whether to teach English to Arabs within

the context of the Arab culture or within the context of the American or British culture?

What is the cultural heritage to be transmitted with the English language itself?

Language researchers have reacted differently to this important question, most of them, whether representatives of traditional psychological models or progressive social theories, have agreed on the importance of the contextualized activities in learning and cognitive development. The cultural context of the learner is one source through which any educational activity can be contextualized. For instance, Alptekin (1993) has believed that the cultural context is very central for learners to access what he called the “schematic data”. To explain what he means by that, he actually divided the educational input into two types of knowledge. The first one is the systematic knowledge, which refers to the formal properties of language itself, such as, the semantic and syntactic aspects of the language. The second one is the schematic knowledge which is the socially acquired knowledge. When learners are exposed to language, if they can at least relate to the context, they will certainly learn major parts of the input they are exposed to.

However, if it is very hard for learners to access the schematic data, then, it would be very hard to expect them to learn the systematic data. Language readers constantly make use of cultural-specific schemas in relating input to what they already know. This means that culture, especially, learners' national and native culture, can help learners to access and to understand the targeted language's schematic knowledge through contextualizing the linguistic aspect of the language being taught. Language researches, for example, have showed that teaching students verb tense as an isolated linguistic part, is harder to understand comparing to teaching the verb tense within a culturally contextualized text which communicate a relevant events to learners from his or her real life.

As a prominent representative of the social cognition learning model, Vygotsky (1978) has strongly believed in the role of cultural context, social environment and social interaction as important sources in the child's cognitive development. His model of learning has emphasized culture as the major source for cognitive development. Culture provides children with the content of their thinking and also with tools and ways on how to think. This content or knowledge, in other words, provided by culture is conveyed through language. Adults' intervention within the Vygotskian "zone of proximal development" which suggested adults' guidance and peer collaboration in helping children to perform tasks that could not be achieved alone, can be achieved through the tools of written and spoken language and conversation with children. Thus, culture as a source of knowledge and language as a tool to transmit this knowledge from adults to children are interconnected factors in children cognitive development.

I infer therefore, that such theories, in addition to their contribution to explaining the relationship between culture and language which is reflected in the contextualized knowledge, also invite us, even indirectly, to think deeply about the conflicting relationship which exists between the content that might be found inside global hegemonic languages on one hand and the content that is there inside national cultures on the other hand. English language teachers and curriculum designers in the Arab world for example, should become interested in asking the question: how can we develop nationally and culturally-based contextualized knowledge to be integrated in teaching English as a foreign language in our countries? This question is mainly a question about culture in particular. What kind of culture should learners be exposed to in teaching and learning English as a foreign language? Do we teach the foreign culture of the targeted

language or the national culture of the learners? Culture is important because, I suppose, it establishes people's context of behavior and identity. It shapes their thinking, perspectives, background knowledge, cognition, conscious, and social awareness. If teaching English as a foreign language in Palestine has to be carried on within a curriculum which is developed by native speakers of English, this means that we have to teach not only the language as such, but also, the views, values, beliefs, attitudes and theories that native writers have transmitted into their own language. In other words, we teach the language and its' own culture, with little regard to the students' native culture. Curriculum designers might find some voices that defend this choice. Guest (2002), for example, has believed that it is impossible to teach the target language within any specific culture other than its' own. This voice of Guest (2002) has been strongly refuted long time ago and powerful argument to the contrary can be found in the above mentioned theories of Vygotsky (1978), Alptekin (1993), and Freire (1994) Judy (1999). These are only some examples of intellectuals whose works had emphasized the success of teaching and learning processes that consider learners' social and cultural context. In the coming pages, I present more detailed discussion about the applications of Freire (1994), Judy (1999) and other similar voices.

In all cases, I assume that creating balance between teaching a foreign language and meanwhile focusing on national culture of the learner is in itself a very challenging task. This task becomes even more complicated when we consider the fact that the specific native culture has already been exposed to subjugation and marginalization, and especially, if this culture has to be taught within a global language, such as, the English language. More succinctly, how can we transmit Arab-Palestinian culture to Palestinian

students through the instruction of English as a foreign language when it is the hegemonic language of imperialism during this historical juncture of globalization? This is a real educational, linguistic, cultural and political challenge to all educational cadres in general and to curriculum planners in particular. I believe that the voices, such as Guest (2002) who argues against integrating learners' national and cultural context in teaching foreign language, should be considered cautiously. Locally, the choice should be encouraged towards what is in the interests of the learners and towards building culturally and nationally-based educational English curriculum. This is important for two main reasons. First of all, the contextualized knowledge which is rooted in the learners' social and cultural background has been found to help learners acquire more easily the targeted foreign language. Second, by doing so, we keep teaching and educating learners about themselves and their relationship to the targeted language. But again, the reason why I present conflicting voices such as Guest (2002) and Vygotsky (1978) or Alptekin (1993) is to say that the researchers in the field of teaching English as a second or foreign language (TESFL) did not agree on one straightforward answer to the issue of culture and language. Also it is important to help developing a choice, which is strongly informed by the different conflicting views. English language curriculum designers might read confusing voices, such as Bax (2003) which I will explain in the coming pages, therefore, they should be very eclectic in the choice they include as teaching approach to English.

Despite the fact that Alptekin (1993) and Bax (2003) might seem comparable in valuing "the contextualized knowledge" in teaching foreign languages, however, their perceptions are immensely conflicting. Alptekin (1993), for instance, refers directly and

clearly to learners' cultural and local context as content for the contextualized knowledge, whereas Bax (2003) leaves the context undefined and vague. He, furthermore, uses expressions such as "language without culture" and presents them as balanced approaches to teaching foreign languages. Bax (2003) asserts that educators should teach foreign languages in a context, which is a value free context. He means context with no specific cultural or political references that might influence learners' perceptions or lead them into specific political or moral directions. Although, Bax stresses highly the contextualized knowledge in teaching languages, but he wants this context to be objective and not biased in any way. Principally, two concepts, the "context" and the "communication" were compared in Bax's (2003) study. He asked the question: which is more important to language learning and teaching, the methodology of teaching or the framework within which this methodology has to take place, which is the "context"? In his answer to the question he values framework over methodology or context over communication. Context for Bax (2003, p.283) is "a crucial determiner of success or failure for language learners". He criticize the Communicative Teaching Language (CLT) as a teaching approach to foreign languages, mainly for it's attempt to prioritize communication, regardless of what the communicational context is. Bax does not believe that CLT is the best approach to teaching and learning languages. For him, the CLT can only waste learners' time in meaningless communications which are initiated for the sake of communication only.

I suppose that Bax's (2003) implicit objectivity might leave the door open to culture of domination and culture of hegemony, chiefly, if learners are taught to be unresponsive, indifferent, and inexpressive towards moral values or other social and

political contexts in their language curriculum. Educators should have to be very precise regarding the content that deserves to be taught to learners through foreign languages. If the proclaimed “context” is left vague and undefined, as Bax contends, the risk which is said to be embedded in the intensive focus on communication on expenses of context is going to be equal. Both are hazy and they can be exploited differently. In addition to that, I find it difficult to argue for the existence of a “context” which is totally free from value and judgment. It is quite obvious that each formal educational institution has its own values, moral and political agenda that they desire to transmit through education. I observed that, realization of English language hegemony can find fertile soil and enough empty space to un-competitively live within the borders of Bax's "context".

Accordingly, the focus should be directed towards advancing Bax's (2003) “context” by asking about the specific content that should be adopted as defined context in teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). I recommend full integration of learners’ national culture as a relevant and accessible social context for teaching and learning foreign languages. What is fundamentally required is to substitute Bax's undefined and culture-free context with a culture-based context which considers complete integration of learners’ national and cultural identity. The cultural context can, in addition to that, provide cultural-based information and illustrations to a wide variety of issues that might encounter foreign language education. For example, it engages learners dialectically in thinking about language and identity. When, for example, Arab teachers present example from the structure of the Arabic language to compare it with the structure of the foreign language, it can help learners further to imagine what the teacher talks about. But, for instance, the rigid position that the use of Arabic language is completely

forbidden during English language classes can deprive learners from important source of knowledge, which is the native language as a tool for comparison and contrast with the targeted language.

Thus, culture-based approaches to teaching foreign language are valued as more indicative and even more protective of speakers. Tan (2005) for example, has intelligibly viewed the role of cultural approaches to teaching languages as more able than any other approach to provide realistic explanation to the nature of language learner production. The traditional tool of error analysis which is the "contrastive analysis" used to refer to some productions which are culturally-rooted productions that emerge from the learners' first language as "learners' errors". For example, when an Arab learner who learns English pronounces the letter "b" instead of "p" in a word such as "people", the contrastive analysis would classify it as an "error" which is transferred from the Arabic language. The production of "b" instead of "p" would be furthermore classified as unauthentic and unnatural error. But culturally speaking, "b" is not an error; it reflects the cultural background, the roots and the identity of the speaker. The specific dialect, for example, marks the original homeland of the speaker, it could also indicate the social class that he or she belongs to. Thus, it is very difficult to produce native-like speakers without omitting parts of their unique identities. The main reason behind classifying such cultural errors as language errors is said to be the failure to re-produce indifference, sameness and native-like pronunciation. This point spells out one of the most powerful cultural implications of global English hegemony. For this reason, we find people like Tan (2005), who argues strongly against the fault claims behind the conservative, racist

and behaviorist approaches, such as, the authentic language–based approach or the contrastive analysis approach. Authentic language should be able to reflect people's internal culture and local environment, if not; we should become very cautious about calling it authentic.

VII. Concluding Notes

The previous discussions have raised many key issues and questions to be deeply considered. English is observed as global and hegemonic language which dominates other world languages. This fact necessitates thinking critically about teaching English as a foreign language or a second language. The interaction between the foreign dominant language and the national language of learners is going to subjugate the later if balance is not created between both, at least in local and national curriculum. Languages that are already subjugated as a result of past and or present colonization will be more cruelly damaged by the hegemonic language. English language hegemony also raises central questions about cultures, dominant and dominated cultures. The dominant language is found to generate dominant culture, a matter which threatens learners' cultural identity. Therefore, this calls upon language teachers and curriculum planners to question the nature of the language content. The political and economic power of one state leads to its language and cultural hegemony. Consequently, the current global English marks the power of the U.S.A and intends to Americanize the world through the hegemony of English.

Findings of previous studies have assured that the language content which is culturally relevant to learners' can enhance the targeted language acquisition. On the

other hand, even defenders of global English have recognized that access to world intellectual and global involvement is not possible within the frame of extremely westernized and Americanized version of global English.

Radical researches have vigorously invited us to oppose and resist global English. Global English is viewed as a device to spread hegemonic ideology which intends to re-shape learners' self consciousness so as to become imitators for the language's native speakers. Global English is a device to marginalize learners' national language and culture. Implementation of integrative approaches, which do not overlook learners' first language and culture, into teaching English as a foreign language, is strongly recommended. Learners' national culture and language should be fully incorporated into foreign language curriculum to form a relevant context for learners. This will enhance learners' aptitudes and motivation to learn the language.

The above mentioned observations and findings of previous research on global English require us, in the Arab and Palestinian context, to deeply think about the context of teaching English as a foreign language in our countries. We are invited to think deeply in terms of: Who is responsible for developing the English language curriculum? What are the different considerations they take into account when they develop the curriculum? What is the relationship between the Arabic language and global English? What is the relationship between the Arab national culture and the culture embedded in global English and the American culture specifically? And finally, is it possible to create an English curriculum which is culturally and nationally relevant to our context? The theoretical framework which is shaped by the answers of these questions will be locally

investigated in the coming chapters through interviewing group of interested and involved Palestinian curriculum designers, teachers, supervisors and students.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

I. Introduction

This is an exploratory critical ethnographic study using qualitative methodology to investigate the complex relationship between global English and its international use on one hand, and Arab-Palestinian national identity, first language and culture on the other. The study focuses more specifically on the interplay between these two issues within the educational context of English language curriculum, including curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students.

The study uses “grounded theory” techniques (Gasser & Strauss, 1967) in order to explain the perceptions of the interface between global English and first language and culture among the Palestinian English language experts and students. Consequently, it aims to explore the degree of content relevance within the English language curriculum and find out the obstacles that face successful integration of relevant cultural content into the local English curriculum. The study intends to accomplish this purpose through studying perceptions, thinking patterns, meaning making, and attitudes of the English language experts and students in the Palestinian educational context.

The main qualitative research tools and techniques used in this study include in-depth, open-ended interviews and focus groups. Individual interviews were conducted with curriculum planners, supervisors and English teachers, whereas focus group interviews were used with students. My choice of the qualitative research methodology was directed by the reason that the central problem under investigation and main research questions around it could be more powerfully spelled out through the qualitative

techniques. Rather than formulating preset research questions and hypothesis to be tested deductively, the current research problem is better served by the utilization of inductive exploratory research process moving from the specific data into the generation of new hypothesis and theoretical notions about the use of global English hegemony within the evolving Palestinian educational context. The researcher is more likely looking at probable explanations and not absolute cause-effect relationships. Contextual data and narrative description through words, sentences, fully and meaningfully expressed language rather than numbers can be more capable, I believe, to explore the complex issues and problems embedded in teaching global English in the Palestinian educational context. Many researchers studying similar social context have used qualitative methodologies in their investigations. For example Hadley (1999), studied innovative curricula in ELT as a Japanese case study and Kushner (2003) explored English as global language both using qualitative research methodologies.

II. Sampling and Sampling Characteristics

The identified research sites and participants were selected in accordance with the technique of maximum variation sampling and purposive selection of a wide set of “data-rich cases” (Johnson & Christensen, 2000, p.180). The settings and participants include those who are involved in teaching and learning English as a foreign language within the Palestinian educational system. This entails that English language experts and learners would be divided in four sub-groups (curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students). The maximum variation of participants was obtained on all three different levels of the professions and the students: (i.e. curriculum designer, supervisors, teacher, and students). These four groups form a hierarchy on top of which we find the curriculum

designers, moving thorough the supervisors and teachers, and ending with the students as the target population and the learners of this curriculum.

The total number of participants in this research project was fifty five. Twenty three were males and thirty two were females. Thirteen of the total participants were selected for individual interviews including (curriculum designers, supervisors and teachers) and forty two were selected to participate in focus groups (students).

Geographically, the participants were selected from the middle districts of the West Bank; namely Ramallah, Jerusalem and their surroundings. Educationally, the three types of educational institutions working in Palestine (governmental, UNRWA and private schools) were included in the study. The specific number and characteristics of each group encompass the following:

Three curriculum designers participated in the study. They include one participant serving as the coordinator of the curriculum development team and coordinator of the national committee of the English language curriculum. He also serves as the head of the English language department in the curriculum center. The second participant is the head of the team which is in charge to develop the secondary stage (10- 12 grade) curriculum. The third participant is a member of the team who developed the primary stage (1 – 6 grades) curriculum. All three curriculum planners in the study have had long teaching and supervising experience ranging from 15 – 35 years. This group includes holders of Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in the field of teaching English as a foreign language.

There were four English language supervisors who took part in the study. They supervise teachers in grades one to twelve; two of them are holders of M.A. degree in teaching English as a foreign language, the rest are holders of B.A. in English language

and literature, with diploma in teaching and psychology. Their teaching experiences range from 10 – 19 years and their supervising experiences range from 6 – 11 years. One of them has worked as vice principal of school for three years. They supervise English in governmental, UNRWA and private schools. All of them had the chance to supervise the old “PETRA” (the Jordanian English language curriculum which was and parts of it still function in the West Bank) and the new "English for Palestine" versions of the English language curriculum.

Six English language teachers were interviewed as participants in the current study. Four teachers are holders of B.A. in English language, some of them are with diploma in teaching, and the rest are with diploma in translation. Two are holders of M.A. in "TEFL". They teach English to different grades in primary (1- 10 grade) and secondary (11 and 12 grade) stages. They teach in governmental, UNRWA and private schools. There was one teacher who works with the largest UNRWA school in the West Bank. Another has participated eleven times in developing the questions for the English language national exam (Tawjihi), he also has, in addition to schools, the chance to teach English in four-year colleges. Teaching experiences of selected teachers range from 8 – 32 years. All of them had the chance to teach in the two versions of the old Jordanian English "PETRA", and the new "English for Palestine" as well.

There were forty-two students, divided into five different focus groups with a maximum of eight participants in each group. The sample purposefully included students with very good academic records (80% and up) who were selected from grades eleven and twelve. These grade levels have been purposefully selected because students' ages at these grades are seventeen and eighteen, which means, according to the Piaget’s theory of

cognitive development; they are at their formal operational phase. In this phase, children can engage in logical thinking and abstract propositions, and they also become concerned with hypothetical problems. Thus, the concern in this research was to include students who were cognitively mature enough to interact meaningfully, and to be able to reflect on abstract concepts and difficult social, political and linguistic issues such as global English, hegemony, culture, relevant context and teaching approach. Selection of academically competent students aims at increasing the possibility of getting meaningful, rich, informed, and logical responses. In addition to the above mentioned characteristics, the group of students included students from governmental, UNRWA and private schools, males and females, residents in villages, camps and cities.

III. Data Collection Procedures

Following the official approval of the research proposal by the Department of Education and Psychology at Birzeit University, a formal letter to that effect issued by the Department, was presented by the researcher to the Palestinian Ministry of Education and Higher Education, the administration office of UNRWA schools, and the administration office of each of the private schools included in the study. The letter introduced mainly the researcher, the research purpose, and asked to provide her with assistance to meet with the listed individuals and schools. The three administrative offices of the governmental, UNRWA and private schools that were in charge have replied positively and sent approval letters to the Department to pass on to the researcher with copies to the assigned schools and officials under their supervision. This formal process of research approval was necessary in order for the researcher to gain access to the site of the study and conduct the interviews with the different research participant.

Without this formality, research participants would have been reluctant to participate and share their views and perceptions.

Demographic data about the study participants and schools was collected from the official documents and websites of governmental, UNRWA and private educational institutions. A complete list which includes full information, addresses, and phone numbers of the selected participants was established and attached to the submitted thesis proposal along with the detailed interview questions. Following the approval letters, the researcher contacted the school principals in five schools to select 8 to 10 students from eleventh and twelfth grades for focus group interviews within the above mentioned characteristics of the student group. The involved curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students were contacted to get their fully informed consent. The participants were explicitly informed about the nature and the purpose of the study, and were fully informed about the procedures, timing and instruments of the research. They were also informed about their rights, such as, their right to freely participate or withdraw without penalty. Then, specific dates and places were appointed for meetings with the different participants.

Field work and data collection lasted for about one month and eighteen days; the first meeting interview was conducted on January 24, 2007 and the last meeting conducted on March 12, 2007. Arranging meetings with curriculum designers and supervisors was relatively easier than with teachers and students. Teachers and students had to cancel some classes in order to meet with the researcher during the school day. It is against the school policy that students remain “unattended” in the school after the school time is over. Thus, I was trying hard with the school principal to arrange meetings

during the periods of less demanding subjects or subjects that can be easily covered by other arrangements. School principals have suggested conducting meetings during the times scheduled for subjects, such as, physical education and art. I had to accept meeting with students during the time of these classes despite the fact that these subjects might be the most exciting activities for students during the school day.

Basically, English language curriculum designers, supervisors and teachers were assigned to individual interviews and the rest of students were assigned to focus groups. The interviews with the designers and supervisors took place in their own offices, and the interviews with teachers and students took place inside their schools. The list of schools and dates of the focus group interviews with students include the following: Koubar secondary school (mixed) on January 24, 2007; Abu-sheikdom secondary school (mixed) February 25, 2007; Bitonia secondary school for girls on February 28, 2007; Al Am'ari girls' school on March 4, 2007; and Al Room Alarthothox secondary school (mixed) on March 12, 2007.

In preparation for each interview, required equipment, like tape recorder, tapes, the interview questions and other necessary equipment were checked before their use. The locations of the interviews and the focus groups were selected based on the "comfort zone" of the participants and in a place which would allow for the recording to take place. Each interview was started by an introduction by the researcher and an informal conversation intended to build trustful, comfortable and friendly environment that help to relax participants and to encourage their active and effective involvement. For example, the researcher after she introduced her self and her research has encouraged the participants to ask her any question they like just to get them involved. The participants

in each group were asked to speak freely, in Arabic or English as they like, standard or colloquial Arabic. The researcher told them not to hesitate to express any idea or any question, whether they think it is important or not. The jokes and comments that the students usually make against each others were received positively by the researcher and she tried to use them to encourage conversations.

Data collection began from the top of the hierarchy, namely with the group of curriculum designers. Three curriculum designers were interviewed for a total of six hours. This arrangement of starting data collection from the highest position has provided me with a good opportunity to add, omit and re-consider revising some of the interview questions based on the impressions and themes that emerged from the interviews with the designers and the feedback provided by them. Then, I moved down the hierarchy to collect data from the English language supervisors, teachers and finally students. Each participant in the individual interviews was interviewed for about one and half hour. The tape recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim and submitted for qualitative analysis using “grounded theory” techniques.

The top-down order in gathering data has helped the researcher in re-formulating her questions and focusing on other important issues that have been uncovered by curriculum designers. For example, I was not aware of the existence of a formal document which summarizes the whole view of the Palestinian English curriculum until I met with the curriculum designers. Therefore, I added a new question to my interview questions which asks the rest of the teachers and supervisors about this document and if they had the chance to participate in its development. Furthermore, the top down order of

data collection gave me the chance to feel more concretely the effect of hierarchy in terms of the participants' reactions to different questions.

IV. Instrument Structure

This research utilized two sets of qualitative interviews to gather information from the different groups of research participants. As mentioned earlier, open-ended individual interviews were conducted with the participants from the three groups of the profession, whereas, focus group interviews were conducted with the students. Following is a brief description of the two qualitative instruments of data collection.

a. Standardized Open- Ended Interview

Field interviews are strong techniques of qualitative research. Field interviews have many types and can be conducted differently. This research has utilized what Patton (2002, p.339) refers to as the “standardized open-ended in-depth interview”. Using this type of interview, the researcher has conducted individual interviews with the selected English curriculum designers, supervisors and teachers. The researcher has approached the individuals who were selected for interviews from these groups with structured, focused, and well prepared number of interview questions, but at the same time allowed a certain degree of flexibility where participants had the chance to respond openly and to express freely their own thinking and ideas. This level of flexibility was observed with the general framework of the specified interview questions and topics. The concept of “in-depth” means to allow deep reflection on participants' long experience, so as to arrive at each and every detail that might contribute to the research findings. The researcher has considered the fact that open and spontaneous responses guarantee feeling of security and readiness by the participants to talk during the interviewee. When participants are limited

to strict interview structure which requires them, for example, to answer in order, or to speak in a certain style such as formal language, genuine ideas and deep reflections on their personal experience may have become difficult to achieve. These and similar inflexible arrangements might make the participants feel under stress and push them to feel that the situation is so formal. This feeling could prevent the free flow of ideas which we usually feel when we are free from stress.

In addition, the main strength of the open-ended standardized interview includes using the same order of questions, which are developed in advance, with the different interviewees. Furthermore, all the interviewees were asked the same basic interview questions and almost in the same order. Order of questions is regarded as actual strength in the standardized open-ended interview, because when each participant answers the same questions and in the same order, the possibility to compare data and analyze results is widely enriched and increased. In order to decrease the effect of the major weakness in this instrument, which is the tendency to limit the interviewee's natural responses due to inflexible order of the questions, a certain degree of flexibility was provided so that research participants were allowed each time to respond freely, but were asked to keep the discussion around the basic interview questions. With some interviewees, such as curriculum designers and supervisors, it was not difficult to get free responses and to follow the given order of the questions at the same time. The main difficulty was with the students in the focus groups, thus, the researcher had to make sure that at least the main questions were covered during the group session.

The duration of each individual interview lasted from one hour and thirty minutes to two hours. All the interviews are tape-recorded, transcribed and then submitted to the

data analysis. For further details of the interview questions, see appendix (A) for the pilot study questions and appendix (B) for the more advanced questions which were developed based on the pilot study results.

b. Open -Ended Focus Group Interviews

The focus group as a trustworthy and reliable technique for qualitative data collection has been also employed in this study. A focus group, in principle, is a type of interview in which a moderator leads a discussion with a small group of individuals with similar experience and shared background (Johnson & Christensen, 2000, p.125). Focus groups aim mainly at explicitly examining how the group members feel and think about an issue that is relevant to all group members. A focus group is called as such because it intends to keep the members in the groups focused on the topic which is being discussed. In comparison to individual interviews in qualitative research, the focus group interview, allows for a process of interaction among participants where more in-depth insight into the topic under discussion can be obtained.

Students in this research were assigned to focus groups. The group members were asked to respond to a number of open-ended questions. Each group was composed of eight to ten student participants who were in terms of their academic achievement homogenously selected from the same classroom, the same school, and with attention to gender and school type representation. It is generally accepted that "homogenous groups are less likely than heterogonous groups to result in information of cliques and coalitions" (Johnson & Christensen, 2000, p.146). The researcher has conducted all the focus group interviews and facilitated the discussion. Each group was interviewed for approximately

two to four hours. In sum, there were five focus group sessions with students; all were tape-recorded and transcribed, and the transcripts were submitted for qualitative analysis.

V. Instrument validity

Validity which is relevant to qualitative research consists of descriptive validity, interpretive validity and theoretical validity (Patton, 2002, p.20). Descriptive validity refers to the degree of factuality of what is reported to be happened, does it truly happened or not. To maintain descriptive validity within this research, tape record and data transcription have been utilized. The researcher, instead of depending on memory or taking short notes to recall events, she precisely retrieved the information from tape records. The standardized open-ended interview, moreover, has the potential to ensure descriptive validity. The main questions have been asked to all participants and the answers are taped. Inclusiveness of data record which consequently enhances descriptive validity and reliability has been insured. Furthermore, the researcher kept always taking additional notes when she felt that something was happening and it was difficult to capture it on tape, such as the very important body language, gesture, body movement, face expressions and other non-verbal and non conversational modalities. Thus, the descriptive validity is believed to be maintained in the study.

Interpretive validity refers to the ability to interpret and to understand accurately the meaning which is conveyed by the research participants. In general, two strategies are effective to guarantee interpretive validity. First, taking into consideration the participants' feedback, or what is known in qualitative research as “member check” (Patton, 2002). Second, applying low-inference descriptors that depend more on what the participants really say and do, for example, verbatim quotation of the participants. To

guarantee interpretive validity in this research, the participants' feedback is highly considered through the phase of data analysis and discussion. The researcher has referred much to participants' direct quotations, direct speech; own words and sentences and she built inferences based on participants' feedback and not by going far beyond the actual events and points of view expressed in the interviews.

Theoretical validity refers to the degree to which conceptualization and theoretical explanations are compatible with the collected data (Johnson & Christensen, 2000). A number of strategies can help researchers to achieve theoretical validity, such as extended field work, theory triangulation; pattern matching and peer review (Patton, 2002). To ensure theoretical validity in the implementation of this research, a pilot study which ensures extended field work was carried out during the preparatory phase of the study. In the pilot study three participants who represent “data - rich cases” were selected for three different interviews. The pilot study has helped to re-formulate the study’s theoretical framework and the interview questions based on the analysis of the collected data. For more details on pilot study questions see appendix (A). To ensure theoretical validity, the researcher, moreover, utilized the technique of “inter-rater reliability” (Patton, 2002) where the input of two experts in qualitative research methodology was used for matters of triangulation. The process of data transcription and the different levels of data analysis were discussed. Then both experts compared the final themes and the theoretical framework resulted in comparison with data in its different levels of analysis. Comments and feedback were considered and integrated to avoid possible overlooking or mis-theorizing that might result from a single viewpoint. Thus, solid connection of grounded

theory was intergraded in conjunction with the data analysis so as to ensure high theoretical validity and internal cohesion.

VI. Data Analysis Procedures

Data has been analyzed in accordance with the “grounded theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p.223) and with close reference to the relevant contributions of Wester (1996) and Patton (2002). In the process of transforming data into findings, the researcher, following the steps of the grounded theory methodology, has to consider the main patterns and themes that are running through the collected data. Patton (2002, p.432) has maintained that "transmutation, conversion, synthesis, whole from parts, sense-making ... such metaphors run through qualitative analysis like golden threads in a royal garment". Qualitative analysis is believed to leave the space for the artistic creativity and for the strong analytical capacity of the researcher to come out. Data analysis is realized when patterns take shape and possible themes spring to mind. In this research, data analysis has been realized after passing into three different phases of analysis (detailed discussion will follow). That is when the general ideas and principles have been established through collecting, comparing, contrasting and analyzing the data. The researcher has looked at the main concepts, indicators, variables, categories and classifications within each level of data analysis. A great deal of attention has been paid to the meaning made by the interviewed individuals while they speak out and freely reflect on their own experiences. There were three distinctive phases of data analysis utilized in this study: a) the exploratory phase, b) the specification phase, and c) the reduction phase (Wester, 1996). Following is a brief description for each phase:

a. Analysis in the Exploratory Phase

In this phase, participants' answers and responses in different individual interviews and focus groups have been collected and transcribed fully and accurately. The researcher has applied three separate notebooks. In this phase of data analysis, the first book which was given the title "first level analysis" has been applied. Transcripts of the interviews of each category of participants have been collected together (i.e., curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students). At this phase each of the individual interviews and focus groups has been analyzed separately. A number of techniques have been used to allow deep reading of the transcripts of each group separately. The researcher has applied focused reading, which means to read again and again with high attention and high focus into the lines and between the lines of each transcript. So, important ideas and themes have been summarized in each individual interview or focus group. A large number (not less than thirty) of smaller themes and ideas resulted from analysis of data at this phase. However, within this huge number of initial categories, the researcher was able to notice the possibility of more clustering some themes under similar and wider themes. In other words, many of these themes were like branches or twigs of the same tree. So, there was a need to move up into the coming phase of more specification of analysis.

b. Analysis in the Specification Phase

In this phase, the researcher re-read again into the intensive and summarized ideas which have resulted from each single interview and focus group in the previous phase. Different colors were applied to signal repetitive, similar and important ideas in responses across distinctive groups (curriculum designers, supervisor, teachers, and

student, each group together). For example, the red color was used to mark all the ideas state that: language crossbreeding weakens first language in the answers of curriculum designers. The notebook of the "second level analysis" was used in this phase to cluster together, label and name distinct concepts and similar ideas and to translate them into wider and more distinctive themes. Thus, primer conceptual or theoretical frame which include ten to eight main themes under each sub – group has resulted from further and deeper lessening and intensification of the previously resulted thirty themes and ideas.

c. Analysis in the Reduction Phase

Through application of a "third level analysis" notebook, main themes and big ideas were compared and contrasted across different groups (curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers, and students). The number of main constructs which were obtained in the second phase was reduced into less number of constructs. The researcher did so through re-chunking similar concepts and themes into bigger categories and then, re-connecting the complete theoretical frame that is grounded from the data analysis into the whole study's theory and integrate all the parts together. The researcher concluded with a thematic frame which consists of six major themes. In the coming chapter of data analysis, these emerging themes will be presented and discussed in some details.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

Six major themes capturing the perceptions of the students and educational specialists regarding the main reasons behind English globalization and hegemony have emerged from the qualitative data analysis. These themes reveal the dialectical interaction between global factors and local factors embedded in the Palestinian context which have led to materialize English language hegemony on the level of the Palestinian educational context. The themes were labeled in a way that indicate the essence of each of them, and were classified for each category of the research participants (i.e. curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students) in a manner that facilitates their simple comparison. Before the detailed discussion of each theme separately, it is worthwhile to present all six themes in a chart which summarizes the research results. The qualitative results of the study in the form of six dominant themes are summarized and presented in table 1.

Following this succinct presentation of the findings, in the remaining of this chapter, each theme will be presented and discussed in further details.

1.Mixed Perceptions of Global English Hegemony over First Language and Culture

The four different sub-categories of research participants (curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students) have responded to specific set of questions that explore their conceptualization of the notion "global English" in its relationship to first language and native culture. The ideas and perceptions of the four groups are compared and contrasted in order to highlight the controversy about global English and its hegemony over the Palestinian educational curriculum. The purpose is not to comment on every detail of the responses, but rather, to highlight the most important divisive issues. For example, the fact that the participants were fond of the French language in addition to English does not constitute a major finding unless it adds something to the explanation of the language hegemony issue, which is the core premise of this study. The discussion is focused on highlighting the controversial views between the different groups of respondents with particular emphasis on the fact that they form a hierarchy with regard to power and influence over the educational process. On the peak of this hierarchy we find the curriculum planners whereas students as the targeted population form the base of the hierarchy.

English language curriculum designers, similar to the viewpoints of some supervisors and teachers, believe that Arab local culture and first language are well established, protected, and strong enough to defy English language hegemony.

Furthermore, the designers strongly believe that the teaching load allocated to the Arabic language in the Palestinian governmental schools (four to six weekly classes), in addition to the use of Arabic as the language of instruction in most subjects, as well as the Arab social context of schools, can not be seriously influenced by very limited number of English classes (three to five hours weekly), at least inside governmental schools. They did not point out any grave damages that could result from English globalization over first language or native culture. The general coordinator of the English curriculum national team explained that: "We should not be scared of English globalization; our value system can shelter our students". He strongly believes that Arab society morals and values form a safety valve to face the immoral defects of globalization. It seems that there is an exaggerated confidence that English, even if it carries with it antagonistic ethical, social, and religious Western values; the Arab value system is deep-rooted enough to protect our students against such shortcomings of a foreign language. For this reason, one of the curriculum designers has indicated that some units of the English curriculum were designed specifically to deepen the integration of Arab value system. They were designed to raise students' awareness, particularly, against the consequences of western open sexual relationships. To clarify this point, another designer added: "When we teach our students about the problem of Aids and they discover that our society is free from it, they will thank Arab and Palestinian Islamic values".

It is apparent that the value system forms a very important and central component of any culture. However, it is also observable that curriculum designers were not aware of the kind of value system which is intended to be integrated within the English language curriculum, and the way by which it synchronizes with or contradicts the students'

cultural value system outside the school. In other words, curriculum designers are throwing the responsibility on the students' home culture to be able to balance the impact of globalization and not for the very specific English curriculum which they design to serve that same objective. Another curriculum designer relies heavily on the Arabic language teaching load to protect Arabic language and culture against English language domination. A female curriculum designer, who is at the same time English language supervisor, has stated that: "In all cases, foreign language's number of weekly classes should be less than what is assigned to the first language". By doing this, she supposes that the Palestinian educationalists can prevent English language domination over the Arabic language.

The fact that English language books are available to parents and everybody else who may want to check their content, made curriculum designers feel more committed to produce high-quality English curriculum. Curriculum designers, in addition to Palestinian parents and students, have presented themselves and the Palestinian Ministry of Education, as nationalist controllers over content. For instance, they claimed that they work cooperatively to guarantee the development of an English curriculum which is vividly devoted to the Palestinian people's collective needs and faithful to the Palestinian cause. One designer, who coordinates the work of the English curriculum's national team, has declared that: "We have to defend our Palestinian cause, without the English language the Palestinian students can not tell others about our real situation". Curriculum designers clarified that the English curriculum national team was representative and open to broad participation. Unfortunately, supervisors and teachers who were interviewed about the same issues in the study did not concur with this information. One supervisor

with nineteen years of teaching experience, six-year supervision experience, and M.A. in teaching English as a foreign language has affirmed that: "Only some supervisors and some university professors had the chance to join the national team of English language, and they have been selected based on personal interests and relations". The idea of biased selection of the members of the national team was repeated by other supervisors and teachers as well. An English language teacher who teaches in the UNRWA schools has confirmed: "Historically, university professors are always in charge of curriculum design, teachers have nothing to do with it". Teachers, as a professional group expected to carry out the curriculum, are considered closer than university professors to schools' reality, and consequently, they feel themselves more qualified to participate in developing the school curriculum in their subject matter. This notion of teacher involvement in the curriculum development was articulated by one teacher, who teaches English to grades 11 and 12 at one of the government schools. He had this to say: "English curriculum developers are mostly university professors. University professors are not aware of schools' needs and requirements. Teachers didn't have the chance to participate in English curriculum development". Most of the interviewed supervisors and teachers have assured that their participation in English language curriculum development was very limited among supervisors, and nil among the teachers. Wide and representative participation of professionals in the curriculum development is supposed to protect the national and cultural content which is presented inside the English curriculum, but obviously, number of teachers and supervisors did not believe that this condition is properly met.

The contrary perspective of the impact of global English on the native language and culture was expressed by the rest of English language supervisors and teachers, as well as the students. They believe that global English brutally impacts their first language and native culture. One supervisor with seven years work experience, asserted that: "Using English as the language of instruction in some universities affects negatively our students' academic achievement and weakens their Arabic language". This group of interviewees believes that teaching some very difficult and demanding subjects, such as chemistry, physics and math in English can be more compatible with the market's demands than teaching them in Arabic. However, they also believe that this educational strategy decreases the students' abilities to comprehend the most important parts in these difficult subject matters, and consequently, it lowers their chances to succeed or specialize in their desired fields of education. For instance, prospect teachers who graduate from the universities where they have studied these subject matters in English and go back to teach them in the schools in Arabic find it hard for them to re-phrase key concepts and main themes in Arabic, and they find themselves speechless during lessons. Clearly, teaching important subjects such as the hard sciences in English is one example of English domination inside the Palestinian educational system. Another example is the schools' national exam "*Tawjihi*". Students, who do not pass the English exam within the "*Tawjihi*", will not be able to continue their higher education, regardless of their remarkable achievement in other subject.

On another level of English hegemony within the Palestinian educational context, one supervisor who is also a university professor has argued against the possible domination of the inner English language structure over the Arabic language structure.

To clarify his point, he has provided this example: "We are not supposed to say in Arabic 'he wrote and read the lesson', the particular structure where we have one object for two successive verbs, came from English". According to this supervisor, there are many other examples which originally came from the English language and include shifting positions of names and pronouns, or advance pronouns before names. Such changes in Arabic language inner structure have resulted from mis-importing from English. Besides changes on language structure, another teacher has talked about: "The invasion of new concepts, words and expressions which are sometimes meaningless in Arabic". For instance, the concept "*Tagthiya raje'a*" is a literal translation of the English concept "feedback". The difference is, she clarified, "in Arabic it does not convey the same specific meaning that it gives in English. It conveys the meaning 'vomit'". Regardless of this fact, people continue to use it in Arabic in the same sense that it is used in English. According to this teacher's viewpoint, people speak their language without sense of the meaning in their words. Improper translation is explained to result from the pressure Palestinian organizations and students feel to follow up with the latest updates in scientific fields which are mostly in English. Their needs have pushed them to "cheaper, unprofessional and faster translation" that ends up with such "destruction on their first language" said one of the supervisors in the study.

Block (2002) has showed us the way by which globalization works to re-shape local happenings. In this sense, the examples, which are presented by teachers and supervisors, illustrate global English impact on first language sentence-structure and sense making. Furthermore, it is critical to pose the question of how does the future of the Palestinian students, who in fact live many miles a way from the English language

homeland, has been re-shaped by global English domination into their localities. This cultural domination reflects the incident of re-formation of the center–periphery relationship, which requires re-shaping the image of the periphery to fit into the image of the center. In this asymmetric relationship, domination of the English language structure as the structure of super language (or language of the center) weakens the Arabic language structure, as a structure of a periphery language.

The students as a group were in sharp contradiction with the position advanced by the curriculum designers. They were united in feeling the detrimental consequences of global English over their first language and local culture. Noticeable amongst the students' perceptions, is the absence of controversy in deciding that global English weakens national language and culture. To illustrate this point, consider an example given by a 12th grader, male student, attending one of the governmental schools, who made clear that: "Globalization is culturally harmful; it marginalizes national culture and language and values one dominant culture and one dominant language over the rest". The interviewed students were thinking critically about the humankind dream of a common language. They realized that this dream might come true on the expenses of humankind cultural and linguistic heritage. Consider another 11th grader, female student, who suggested that: "Why don't people create an artificial language that does not belong to any particular nation and use it for world communication?". Evidently, while not compromising the importance of international communication among people of the world, this speaker was concerned about the idea of domination of one language and one culture over the rest of world languages and cultures. To imagine the possibility of developing an artificial and “culturally neutral” language has allowed her also to imagine

people from different parts of the world standing on an equal distance from this language that is used by all. Nobody is closer to the language than the rest, and no owners or imposers of their culture through the use of this language.

I observed that the concept "globalization" for students is another synonym for "sameness" and "identicalness". One of the students said, "Diversity is something positive in life, however, globalization abandons diversity". Diversity from students' perspective, celebrates the existence of different languages and different cultures. Globalization, on the other hand, imposes one single language and definitely one single culture over the other languages and cultures. They said that life becomes one boring color as substitute to multi-colored life.

Palestinian students in this study are not alone in their perceptions and feeling regarding the threat of homogeneity that globalization and global English can create into the world. Actually, there are number of language researchers who support these students' feeling and justify their fears. For example, Kushner (2003, p.21), in an article tackling global English hazardous consequences, has cited a study by Worldwatch institute which concluded that 50% of the world's languages may soon vanish. The languages which are spoken by some thousands of people will be the most vulnerable. The Worldwatch sounded this alarm mainly because "losing languages mean losing cultures" (p.21). Kushner (2003), with reference to another Canadian scholar's article entitled: "we need a forest of tongues", suggests that people should discover other useful modes of interaction, "rather than let, by default English language become a means of political domination" (p. 21). So accordingly, the students in this study have sounded too attentive to the deep relationship between language and culture, they are willing to dismantle barriers between

humankind and create new tools for communication. However, they refuse the end of homogenizing cultures and languages which leads to, using Kushner's term, "cultural impoverishment" (p. 22).

The contrast between the views presented by the curriculum designers and those of the students in regard to this issue should not predicate that students' might be more knowledgeable to discover darker sides of globalization. It could be the official position assumed by curriculum designers which challenges them to speak formally and to be more confident in their own production. Students on the other hand, are free from the limitations of the official position and expected to hold more radical and liberation prone views than educational officials including their own teachers. It might be concluded that the behavior of the curriculum designers, as part of the middle class "hypocrite behavior", might push them, more than regular students, to defend official governmental educational policies in teaching global English. Due to this fact, for instance, history presents us with many evidences and stories where students' have assumed roles as revolutionary agents for social change; the French revolution is only one example. Students are viewed to face less conflict of interests than do teachers and supervisors employed by official authorities. Thus, they can be more ready to criticize educational, cultural, political or any other aspect of life. This could be one explanation behind their open, critical and less formal positions.

To summarize the main outcome in this theme, the interviewees' perceptions were mixed concerning English language hegemony over national language and culture. The expressed attitudes were expected to be affected by the participants' job description or the formal positions they assumed (for example, curriculum designers speak more

formally than teachers). The English language curriculum designers and most supervisors and teachers have ignored the threats of global English on national language and culture. Instead, they believe in the society's inner structure (family structure, value system...etc) and the existing focus on the Arabic language inside schools to protect the local culture from English globalization. On the contrary, some of the interviewed supervisors, teachers and all students have strongly criticized the harmful consequences of global English on first language and culture and they did not believe that native language and culture are protected against the English language hegemony. The interviewees in this group have provided many examples which confirm these harmful consequences.

11. Global English as the Legacy of U.K. and U.S.A. Colonialism

Interviewees in the different sub-categories (curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students), were asked to respond to number of questions that investigate reasons behind English language globalization. English by and in itself, is only one language among thousands of world languages. The main question is what are the various political, social, and economical circumstances or reasons that elevate English as global language over the rest of world languages?_

Curriculum designers have focused their responses on the pragmatic motivations and communicational interests behind teaching and learning English language around the world. A male curriculum designer, who supervised the secondary-stage curriculum design team said: "English is a pioneer language that introduces other cultures to us. It is the language of science, technology, and information". Curriculum designers have articulated the experience of the Palestinian Ministry of Education and how it was advised to learn from the private schools' experience and to initiate teaching English to

first graders, instead of starting from the fifth graders. Another female curriculum designer who has participated in the primary stage curriculum development has added: "We are guided by the private schools' success in teaching English in first graders in addition to teaching most subjects in English. Through English, students of the private school are extensively exposed to different cultures and information". It is worth mentioning that some private schools in Palestine, such as the Friends School, has started to teach English to its' students since at least 160 years ago. More details on private schools' experience in teaching English will follow in the coming theme when we discuss the roles of some local agents in accelerating English language globalization in Palestine. Thus, curriculum designers have observed that teaching English in general and teaching it to first graders in particular will decrease the students' withdrawal from governmental schools to private schools. In addition, they believe that competency in English can increase the rate of students' employability after graduation.

Curriculum designers, in analyzing the reasons behind English language globalization, have restricted their thinking straightly to the down-to-earth and pragmatic explanation. Wallace (2002), conforming the designers' opinions, has exceedingly emphasized the notion of the English language elevated functionality in important life aspects, such as science, technology, research, trading, economy, and industry. However, Crystal (2002) has added another important dimension to Wallace's interpretation of English language functionality which is the political dimension. For Crystal, English is a mother tongue for two colonial states, first for Britain when Britain was the leader of the industrial revolution, and then for U.S.A. when the latter is currently the leading economic power of the world. Crystal's idea that English existed "in the right place, at the

right time", seems to provide more logical explanation behind English language globalization.

On the same level of analysis, I have observed that curriculum designers' have hesitated to discuss and explore political factors that may stand behind English language globalization. They instead, have persisted on the pragmatic use of the English language. From their viewpoint, no political pressure was exercised against their free-will as Palestinian curriculum developers while developing the English language curriculum, or when they have adopted teaching English to first graders. One curriculum planner, who is also faculty member at one of the Palestinian universities, has admitted: "Despite the fact that usually political, religious or economic motives stand behind teaching world languages, however, teaching English in Palestine is tied to pragmatic, rather than, political, social or religious causes".

In explaining what exactly the types of pragmatic reasons which stand behind teaching English in Palestine, curriculum designers have referred to a number of justifications. They have talked about the strategic geographical location of Palestine in the center of the world which turned the country into a junction for foreigners and investors. Their discussion entailed also the issue of the high rate of unemployment in Palestine and, as a result, the youngsters' migration to look for job opportunities outside Palestine. The high rate of unemployment has increased the need to learn the English language which would be probably used more overseas. Palestine's sanctity dimension was, moreover, presented as another pragmatic reason behind teaching and learning English in the country. Existing as a holly place that attracts thousands of tourists and religious men and women every year, provided that, most tourists speak English, require

from the designers' viewpoint, to teach the English language. However, it is important to mention here that due to the Zionist occupation, the Palestinian people have no control over most of their historical and religious tourist sights, and thus, Israel benefits more on this level.

Crystals' hypothesis that the U.K. and U.S.A. political and economic hegemony stands behind English language globalization is re-emphasized by the interviewed supervisors, teacher and students. In addition to the pragmatic justifications which were mentioned by the curriculum designers, the interviewed English language supervisors, teachers and students have mentioned two interrelated factors to explain English language hegemony. First, English hegemony is due to the U.K. and U.S.A domination over the world countries. Second, the competitions between local agents in the Palestinian context, which are affiliated with the U.K and U.S.A., have promoted English hegemony as well. To shed more light on this point, a male supervisor with nineteen years of teaching experience, has marked: "The English language is broadly extended due to the political supremacy and scientific development of its' possessors." Another female teacher, a holder of M.A. in teaching English as a foreign language has similarly declared: "English language widespread is realized through British and American colonialism." In her speech, one reference is made to the British mandate over Palestine which took place during the period of 1917-1948. As has been mentioned earlier, teaching English in Palestine on a massive scale has started with the British mandate.

Students were aware of the consequences of the First World War, and how, since then, Britain has imposed English on the Arab countries which were directly under its occupation. Students understand the fact that English language is endorsed through the

political and economic power of both Britain and America. A female student, 12th grader said: "Britain was the most powerful country in the world and English is its' language, now America is the most powerful country and English is its' language". In the same theoretical argument which supports the students' interpretations of the spread of global English, Block and Debrah (2002) have described the relationship between political power and language development. Empowering a certain language to grow into "linguistic imperialism" or "linguistic capital" in their view, is what lead to this language hegemony over the rest of world languages. They also connect between language and culture; the fact that language and culture are inseparable components means that hegemony of one language entails also hegemony of this language's culture.

Some supervisors and teachers have pointed out creatively to the relationship between two factors that produced English hegemony; that is not only U.K. and U.S.A. hegemony, but also, the competition between them in the local context. To be more specific, they were talking about the competition between some American agents, such as, the AMIDEAST and other British agents, such as, the British Council. It is well known that both types of offices (AMIDEAST and British Council) are spread everywhere in the world. They work hard to extend English language inside the countries where they operate. More importantly, these two agents have helped to spread two diverse western cultures inside the targeted countries in which they operate around the globe. A supervisor, with B.A. in English and minor education said: "America and Britain are badly competing to spread their English and cultures, in Palestine we have some private schools sponsored by U.S.A., and others sponsored by Britain".

It could be useful to point out that, in Palestine, the AMIDEAST and the British Council conduct hundreds of English language training courses every year. The courses teach English to beginners, middle and advanced learners. They also offer different study scholarships to Britain and U.S.A. Most people might look at this situation as profitable and advantageous opportunity. But, the existing of some private schools that are funded by Britain and others that are funded by U.S.A. has meant, according to the previously mentioned supervisor, the creation of two culturally fragmented sub-groups inside Palestine. The first group will be more loyal to the British culture including songs, accent, traditions, and projects, whilst, the other group will grow to be closer to the American way of life and culture. Sometimes, new situations which mix both cultures together appear in Palestine. The competition between the American and the British cultures in Palestine does occur inside schools' curriculum as well. The teacher who raised this issue, teaches English for the 9th to 11th graders, he also has 14-years of teaching experience, he said:

The new “English for Palestine” curriculum joins together the American and the British syllabus. For example, it concentrates on grammar, the way the British do. However, it replicates the American and focuses on communication. Sometimes, it integrates both ways in one exercise. For instance, learners can find the American utterance "to hearing"; Americans do not subject themselves strictly to the language grammar as the British do. At the same time, we teach students that the verb “hear” does not take "ing" copying the British form. It confuses our students a lot.

As an educational approach, it is crucial to explain that the new-fangled "English for Palestine" is based, mostly, on the communicative teaching approach. Actually, the fundamental brainwave behind the emergence of the communication – based approach in learning and teaching foreign languages refers back to the beginning of the seventies of the past century (Savignon, 1991). Linguists like Hymes (1972, 1974) and Savignon

(1983, 1991), are among other prominent scholars who have contributed to the development of this approach. Their main concern was that language teachers focus more on teaching grammar and phonology than on promoting communicative competence in their students. Since then, notions such as communicative teaching approach (CTA), communicative language teaching (CLT), and communicative competence (CC) were developed. It was intended to be modern multidisciplinary approach that views language in its relationship to both social and linguistic contexts. Meaning making and communication competence (Savignon, 1983) is a result of collaboration and interaction between the four active skills (speaking, writing, listening and reading. It is also important to notice that emergence of the socio-linguistic factors (Hymes, 1974) into teaching foreign languages has helped to view language teaching not only as an educational issue, but also as a political one.

What is also of great importance to our research is that defenders of communicative-based approaches have suggested that difficulties in communication competence might refer to the notion of cultural interference (Hyme, 1972). This reflects the differences between cultures and students' tendency to use patterns of interaction from their own first language when communicating in a second language, considering that, communicative competence is not the same in all cultures, but each culture has its' own conversational patterns.

Results of this study have showed that the application of the CLT into “English for Palestine”, which requires equivalent focus on grammar and communication, constitutes a major challenge to most Palestinian teachers. Palestinian teachers have used for long years, through the past versions of English language curriculum, to focus on

discrete skills and to pay more attention to grammar. Now, because the Americans have created this new approach, our teachers were expected to apply it to their teaching immediately even without enough training and preparation. Yet, Palestinian teachers are not the only group to feel the challenges created by CLT. Savignon, (1991) has demonstrated that, many teachers around the world have felt similar restlessness dealing with such approaches. Teachers differ in the way they react to CLT, some feel frustration, and others feel happy and satisfied. She clarifies that reasons behind frustration include uncertainty on how to evaluate learners due to the ambiguity of CLT terminology, like, context, purpose, or meaning negotiation.

Nevertheless, in spite of its' progression, in comparison with other old-fashion teaching approaches, the communicative teaching approach has received serious criticism. It has been described as an “imperial approach”. When we discuss curriculum and culture in the next themes of this study, readers will find additional details about other reactions of the research interviewees toward the CLT teaching approach.

To summarize the main argument presented in this theme, in explaining the reasons behind English globalization and hegemony, it is reasonable to conclude that curriculum designers have focused on the pragmatic dimensions of the language. The stated pragmatic dimensions and motivations recount the English language high functionality in different life domains and explain the need to learn English as a practical language for everyday use and scientific advancement. Curriculum designers have ignored the political motives behind English hegemony. However, English language supervisors, teachers and students have included, in addition to the pragmatic explanations, the U.K. and U.S.A. colonialism and hegemony as a direct reason behind

English language hegemony. They have also considered the competition between the two hegemonic political powers of the U.K. and U.S.A as another reason behind the English language hegemony in the Palestinian educational context.

111. Spread of English as the Language of Advanced Science

All interviewees in the four sub-categories, curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students have agreed on the idea that English high serviceability and functionality, as a language of technology and advanced science, is another imperative reason behind the language's global hegemony.

One of the curriculum designers has stated that: "English is the language of development, of new-discoveries and of scientific concepts". He sees that loosing historical glory of Arabs stands behind the Arabic language subside and decline, and if Arabs develop as an international power once more as in the past, the Arabic language will re-gain its' own magnificence. But for the time being, English is the glorious and most functional language. Another curriculum designer who approved this observation has added: "English is the language of science, of computer, of communication and of technology". Actually, the intensive integration of the English language into most countries' educational curricula and the fact that, currently, it is difficult to find any single English-free educational system around the globe, confirm evidently English language high functionality. I have found, for example, that the educational reform which took place in Japan during the period (1991 -1997) is an obvious case that reflects not only English language high functionality, but also its domination in different educational reforms. I would like to elaborate on what some researchers have said about the Japanese

educational reform because it shows some aspects of the English language hegemony in the world of education.

One of the researchers, Hadley (1999, p.92), has pointed out that the most notable aspect in the 1991 educational reform in Japan is the "increase in the number of universities developing innovative EFL-English as foreign language – curricula". The big aim behind the educational reform was declared to be: “further internationalization of Japanese society” (p: 98). The curriculum reform is mainly language reform which has been, similar to what happened in Palestine, inspired with the experience of private education. This reform, has particularly taken place inside a number of national Japanese universities including Keio University, Asia University and Tokyo Christian University. The Japanese have integrated into their language education new programs called "language immersion programmes" which focused on English as the only spoken language inside classrooms. In this situation, English native speakers, more than others, were allowed to work full-time. Students are placed in “ability grouping” classes according to their scores on the university's English aptitude test, and they must all take one year of intensive English language classes. Japanese students have to live on campus with American roommates. Some universities, such as, Tokyo Christian University, has developed eighteen elective units of content courses ranging from western philosophy to contemporary theology, all to be taught in English and by native speakers. Like in Niigata University, the department of general education was downgraded to the school of Liberal Arts, language teachers from the old department were put in charge of the EFL courses. New courses labeled as English for Specific Purpose (ESP) were developed. The number of language teachers, either full time or part time has incredibly increased.

In Japan, similar to what happens in most Palestinian universities and educational institutions; the top-down planning policy has limited the feedback that could come from field teachers in general and from short-time and part-time teachers in particular. As a result, the answer for the question on how innovations should be implemented was partial and inadequate. Most Japanese people have discovered that the expression "internationalization of Japanese society" is difficult to define and its meaning is too vague to be translated into practical plans. The Japanese discovered that the real objectives behind this educational reform were also not clear to them (Hadley, 1999).

What could be also valuable to learn about the Japanese educational reform is the internal grave critique that it faced which indicates its inefficiency. For instance, the reform did not consider seriously the cultural implications of the intensive integration of English into the Japanese educational system. Japanese were uncertain about why to equate English speaking with creativity and economic-rebirth. Hadley (1999) has concluded that, "Japan is blissfully happy to continue as monolingual society" (p.96). He showed that little has changed as a result of the English language intensive integration into the Japanese educational system.

One comparative aspect between the Japanese' educational reform and the Palestinian English curriculum development is the scope of participation and representation in the process. Lack of involvement of qualified educationalists and other local community members are the same in the two experiences. Also we can notice that the same top-down policy has been activated in both cases. Hadley (1999, p. 98) has concluded that part of the educational reform breakdown derives from the traditional Japanese concept of top-down relationships, a belief which acknowledges that some

people are more important than others in an organization. Japanese students and teachers, as a result of this top-down policy, were not able to explain the real objectives behind their innovations or to know why they were being carried out.

Similar to that, the current research has revealed participants' lack of knowledge on the level of EFL strategic objectives in the Palestinian educational context. To give an example, it showed that Palestinian teachers don't discuss the English language strategic objectives with their students. Nonetheless, they care a great deal about the daily and short-term objectives of every individual lesson they teach. Teachers develop daily teaching plans on these bases. This point will be expanded more when we will discuss the curriculum itself.

Thus, it seems that policy makers who believed in heavy integration of English into national educational systems do not pay enough attention to factors such as local community involvement in curriculum development or level of knowledge of strategic and national objectives behind EFL. They only care about English high functionality and necessity to integrate it into their national educational systems.

Palestinian students see that part of English high functionality as language of science and of educational reforms incorporates its' aptitude to serve up youngsters' daily and modern life requirements. A male student, 12th grader has affirmed that: "English serves teenagers' needs and attracts their minds more than Arabic does, because for example, internet, email, password are all in English, teenagers must know English and they don't need Arabic". Students feel that their first language, especially in fields of science and technology, has converted to derivative, unproductive and secondary language when compared to English. This feeling of inferiority accounts also for the fact

that Arabic language is not as dominant and formal as English language on the level of international integration and academic connections. A young female student, 12th grader has also commented: "They use English in worldwide academic conferences, but they don't use Arabic".

However, it is noteworthy at this point to remember that regardless of their official status, many languages, not only Arabic, have been disqualified and excluded on the level of translation inside academic global conferences. For instance, Kushner (2003) has mentioned that the council of Europe Language Policy has adopted translation into French and German besides English. However, for economic reasons, the council attempted to exclude both languages and to translate into English only. Just after protests by French and German ministers, translation into all three languages has been recommended by the council.

Participants in the four sub categories have considered the fact that in order to succeed, people must publish in English. Only publishing in English can guarantee spread desalination of results all the way through the world. But, from the participants' viewpoint, this fact does not justify teaching scientific subjects in English inside Palestinians universities and other educational institutions. For them, teaching in English reflects a stage of backwardness and underdevelopment. A female supervisor who is also one of the curriculum designers has clarified: "Teaching science subjects in English inside our universities unveils weakness of our Arabic language".

Some Palestinian universities, such as Birzeit University, has decided since the time of it's' establishment, to teach important disciplines in English. Colleges of Science, Engineering, Commerce, Law and other graduate programmes regularly use English

textbooks, despite the fact that the university had moved back to using Arabic as the language of instruction. Teaching in English in this context means that the teaching materials, textbooks and assigned articles are in English, while the language of instruction continues to be in Arabic. Most research papers, reports, presentations and tests; especially in colleges of science and engineering are done in English. Lectures and discussions are kind of mixture between Arabic and English. But, students in general are encouraged to write, think and speak in English.

One of the participants, who is an English language teacher and graduate student at Birzeit University, enrolled in the Education program has said: "Doing my master in Education, I have noticed that all required readings and articles are in English, the presented researches and theories are all developed by foreigners. I think the programmes should assign some, even if very slight Arabic stuff, something to make us, as Arabs feel that we exist and have a voice". In addition to what this graduate student has mentioned, other students who complain from domination of English in their academic life have talked about high financial costs of translation and the difficulties they face to find professional and accurate translation. To make a connection again with the Japanese experience in their application of the "English Immersion Programs", some universities, such as Tokyo Christian University, even if it aims from the very beginning at developing English communication skills for international encounters, yet, they followed something called "modified sheltered approach" (Hadley, 1999, p.94). This approach means that the content courses, which are delivered in English, have interpreters on hand to explain the most difficult part of lectures in Japanese. Despite the fact that the main part of the lectures at Birzeit University are implemented in Arabic or in mixed language in some

cases, students still face difficulties in translating the material on their own. So, it might be more helpful to students, although more expensive to universities, if they re-evaluate the Japanese experience in this part at least, and hire professional and expert translators or do something similar. The argument that “most knowledge exists in English” can be counterbalanced by a national campaign of professional translation into Arabic of the most important theories and textbooks believed to contain the essence of the subject matter under discussion.

From the viewpoints of some English curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and even some students, the experience of teaching science in Arabic under the umbrella of worldwide English language hegemony would be helpless to the local context. The discussion entails the Syrian and Iraqi episode in teaching some disciplines in Arabic, particularly medicine, pharmacy, and other sciences. The interviewees think that the real problems will occur following students' graduation. It will occur, when the graduates stand face to face with the daily details such as career advancement, technology, publications and other requirements that can never be achieved without mastering the English language. I quoted one of the curriculum designers who affirmed: "Syrian post-graduates, above all, in the field of medication do not know how to write a therapeutic recipe". Another teacher, who graduated from Ukraine, was aware that struggling with the English language is not a dilemma for students who only study science in Arabic or graduated from Syria and Iraq. He believes that the situation is challenging to other students who studied in different less competitive world languages, such as the Russian or the Spanish. He mentioned that:

Graduates from the former Soviet Union face major troubles in dealing with English and computer, at the beginning of the nineties and while I was student,

the former Soviet Union was not introduced to the culture of English language and computer yet, despite the fact that it was expanded to most countries including Palestine. When I came back from Ukraine to Palestine, I went through many problems, it required me to re-educate my self”.

Most participants think that Palestinian universities and other academic institutions should start and try to encourage intellectual production in the Arabic language. English is not the solution for science development. In this regard, Palestinians might find it useful to study experiences of EFL in other countries and see what they are doing in this regard. For example, French-speaking researchers (Kushner, 2003, p.20) are encouraged to publish in their own language and funds are expended to develop scientific journals in French.

To summarize this theme, as a language for advanced science, the hegemonic English language is heavily integrated into different world educational reforms, such as the cases in Palestine and Japan. The two Japanese and Palestinian experiences in integrating the English language are comparable on different levels. Both, to different extents, did not fully consider the national and cultural interests in the EFL programs. Local universities were drowned in the English language. Students have faced serious challenges as a result. The intensive integration of English has failed thus far to produce the promised scientific development.

IV. Fascination of English as an Attractive Language

Contrary to expectations, the participants in the different sub-group, curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students have repeated the idea that English is an effortless, graceful, and attractive language. A female curriculum designer has shared with us her experience while she was a student enrolled in the scientific stream, and the

reason why she changed her field of study, she said: “I was originally enrolled in the scientific stream, I wanted to continue in math, and then I decided to move to the English department, because I felt that English will be easier to me than math”. In corroboration with the personal experience of this participant, I have observed, whilst analyzing the quotes gathered from different interviews and listening to the interviewees stories and stories of other people they know and shared with me, that visible number of English specialists were formerly registered in the scientific stream.

In order to clarify the structure of the different academic streams operating within the Palestinian educational system, it is important to point out that by the end of the primary stage which includes grades one to ten; students have to choose to continue their higher education in one of two streams. They chose either the academic stream which focuses mainly on arts, social sciences and languages or enroll in the scientific stream which focuses on the natural sciences, like chemistry, biology and physics. By the end of the 10th grade, students’ selection of one of the two streams is not “free choice” based on their interest but depends strongly on their individual academic abilities and on their average in the different subjects.

To support this point, I myself graduated from high school majoring in scientific stream, and then I changed to major in English during college. What is relevant to our discussion here is not the relationship between the two disciplines (i.e., science and arts); but the fact that there should be some common abilities between students of languages, especially foreign languages, and students of science to be accepted in what is known in Palestine as “difficult programs”. Consequently, there is a noticeable decrease of the number of students enrolled in the scientific stream. The Palestinian people can easily

notice the transfer from different disciplines, especially science, to English, and the fact that the scientific stream is gradually losing much of its candidates to the departments of English language. Economic reasons and employability might stand behind this phenomenon. In fact, English specialists in Palestine can be more employable than, for instance, physics specialists. In addition, Palestine is a small occupied country deprived from the right to develop genuine complicated labs or heavy industries. A great number of outstanding specialists in physics and chemistry, reluctantly, take up a teaching position because of the total absence of industrial and scientific infrastructure to offer them appropriate employment in their fields of specialization.

Bringing the discussion back to the curriculum developer cited above, it is safe to conclude that she felt that English is more attractive as a subject matter because it is easier academically and opens more doors for employment than sciences. The idea of English language attractiveness was also revealed in the speech of another male, supervisor: "I became interested in English during my childhood; I loved the subject very much, it is easy and attractive language". The perception of English as an easy and attractive language among the different groups of participants could mean, that the participants have no problem with English as a language. On the contrary, they loved the language. Students, for example, who expressed their extreme fascination with English, seem to have a problem with English when it marginalizes or weakens their first language and national culture, not the difficulty of English by and in itself. Thus, I conclude that the real problem transpires with the nature of the cultural hegemony and domination entrenched within surrounding the English language. As an example on how students react not only positively, but also romantically towards the English language, a private

school teacher, with 32 years of teaching experience, has told me that he noticed: "the students, especially at the private schools like to express their feelings of love in English". It is quite possible that this situation of romantic expression in English could have different interpretations, and the one we point out is only one explanation.

It could be also possible that students feel themselves more romantic and may be more attractive to their girlfriends or boyfriends when they express their love and emotions in English. The tendency to communicate in English has certainly other social dimensions that would be discussed in details in the coming theme when we discuss the issue of language hybridity. For instance, many interviewees were talking about the social values related to speaking in English. However, it was astonishing to discover that some people might feel a foreign language is not only more attractive but also easier than their first language. It was intriguing to explore more deeply this feeling inside the interviewees. I have listened attentively to another teacher who teaches grades 9 to 12 in governmental schools, holds a B.A. English and has 14-years of teaching experience when he clarified that: "It could be that people here in Palestine use English a lot and hybridize it with their first language because it is easier for understanding". It might be interesting to language experts to discover that some people, who are not bilingual, can comprehend easier when they are exposed to a foreign language than when they are exposed to their first language. However, this finding could be another indicator which shows the extent of English language domination and consumption inside the Palestinian context. Even though English is supposed to be taught as a foreign language in Palestine, still, it is extensively employed inside local universities, private schools, and non-governmental organizations. Thus, it is quite possible that the widespread consumption

and use of English inside those and other local organizations has helped to create a communicational atmosphere which heavily borrows lexis and terms from English. Consequently, and with time, it becomes easier to understand some words, expressions, or concepts in English. To further clarify this point, one of the supervisors has provided this example:

When chemistry students like to discuss a relevant issue, one of them might mention the concept "titration", they can understand easier when they both use the concept in English, the way they learn it at the university, if one of them would like to Arabize the concept and use "*Mo'ayera*" instead of "titration", a communicative slip back is going to occur between the speakers, it is hard for the other student to understand what his classmate means, because he or she is not familiar with the Arabic translation.

The above mentioned example, I believe, mirrors some situations by which a foreign language becomes more comprehensible than the first language. One such context is prevalent in the local universities when students are taught in a foreign language and then try to communicate in their first language. The example also elucidates some of the reasons behind the fact that English is perceived by most participants as "the easiest, the shortest, the most attractive language", as one of the teachers said. In the coming theme, the participants have elaborated more on the relationship between English language hegemony in Palestine and the role of some local institutions, such as, the non-governmental organization or private schools that promote its hegemony.

The description of English as "the easiest, the shortest, the most attractive language", moreover, assumes that, compared to their first language, the participants envision English to be shorter, easier and more attractive. Even though, they are Arabs, the interviewees have perceived the Arabic language to be one of the most difficult existing languages in the world. In fact, compared to English, the Arabic language is

older and more “complicated” language, which was originated in pre-Islamic times. According to number of historians, the first evidence of Arabic as a written language dates to 328 C.E. (DeYoung, 1999). In addition to the complexity of its' semantic and syntactic structure, language historians think that students might also find it difficult because it exists in three varieties. These include classical, modern standard and colloquial Arabic. Classical Arabic is said to be the Qur'an's language. Arab people usually if they want to formally communicate or write they use modern standard Arabic which is valued as the perfect form of written Arabic. Also, to deal with the different colloquial Arab dialects, the modern standard Arabic is the type that can be understood by all Arabs. Arab colloquial dialects are the everyday spoken languages amongst Arabs. They use it in their daily interactions and local contexts. Standard Arabic, on the other hand, is more or less the same throughout the Arab World, while there are wide differences between the various colloquial dialects.

From my personal experience as a student in the Palestinian formal educational system, I observed that students grow up using colloquial Arabic, and when they go to school, they start to learn another more official type, which is the modern standard Arabic. They also engage, while learning the Islamic religion, in a more stylistic and classical language of the Qur'an. Exposure to different versions of Arabic can be very challenging to the school age children. The Arabic language, in addition to that, has a unique style of decoration in writing. It has number of different although beautiful and tapestry scripts, syntax and language rules. Consequently, subsistence of such intricacies needs more focus inside schools in teaching this arty language. It needs more weekly classes, and very qualified teachers who can show the beauty of this language. The

educational policy inside the schools which gives more attention to the English language on the expenses of the Arabic language has created this feeling among Arab-Palestinian learners that English is easier in comparison to their first language.

Some writers, such as Anderson (1982) and Haneline (2001), argue for a connection between English language attractiveness and easiness, especially the American English on one hand, and between English globalization on the other. Those writers, when analyzing global English, they clearly see and analyze the component of "Americanization" besides ignoring other components, such as, "whiteness" and "westernization". They think that the attractiveness of especially the American English is one reason behind the language widespread. Clearly, the widespread fascination here is not with any type of English, but particularly with the American English. Findings of the current research have showed similar indications. Some of the participants, especially students, consistency with pervious findings, are captivated with the American accent. For example, a ninth grader, female student, studying in one of the UNRWA schools had this to say: "English is my favorite subject, I love it very much, and the terminology is very easy, especially when we use the American accent". Contrary to this, we can find more logical interpretation of this phenomenon in Gramscian and Freirian theories or more elaboration provided by Wallace (2002), Crystal (2002), Block & Debra (2002) and others who prefer to read political and cultural hegemony behind English globalization rather than language attractiveness or special inherited features inside some English accents or dialects. Political and cultural hegemony of the native English countries, specifically the U.S.A. and Britain, are what makes English grows into a global language. Referring to the above mentioned literature, English could be an

attractive and musical language, but this is not a sufficient reason to facilitate the language's attainment of such hegemonic position around the world.

Thus far, English language has been perceived amongst the research participants as an easy, attractive and romantic language. Participants in the different groups of the study have expressed the idea that comparing to their first language, English is easier and more attractive language. English as a field of study is valued over sciences and other subject matters. The results in this theme have also revealed that there is fascination with particularly the American English. The mainstream and neoliberal language literature justifies English globalization based on the language's easiness and attractiveness; however, the critical theorists believe that cultural and political hegemony of the U.S.A. and Britain stand behind the language hegemony rather than the internal or natural structure of the language itself.

V. Successive Occupations and other Local Agents Promote English Hegemony and Arabic Hybridity

Participants in the four sub-groups have talked about local agents inside the Palestinian society, (i.e. universities, NGOs and private schools), who form a network operating, purposively or otherwise, towards the realization of English language hegemony. Through their intensive integration of the English language, this network of organizations, contribute to the phenomenon of crossbreeding of their first language, the Arabic language. The participants have noticed that first language hybridity inside the Palestinian society became an observable and common reality. Language hybridity results in a strange mixture, people like to call it “*Arabizi*”, which means a mixture of Arabic and English together. It is well known that people who live in bilingual or

multilingual societies are bilingual and multilingual speakers. They can fluently switch code from one language to another when the conversational context requires that. For example, bilingual Canadians switch codes between English and French fluently and this could be natural result of exposure to both languages. Dissimilar to bilingual societies, participants were speaking about a destructive crossbreeding and hybridizing of the people's first language. Palestinians in West Bank and Gaza strip as part of the historical Palestine, for instance, are monolingual communities. People in these territories of historical Palestine are expected to speak Arabic. They also learn other languages such as English, French, and German as foreign languages. In the past few years, we started to notice an intensive mixing of English words, expressions or concepts into the Arabic sentence structure. It becomes common to hear the concept "*Arabizi*" to mean the language that mixes Arabic and English together in the same sentence structure. The result is deformed and distorted Arabic language. Language breeding, the way Sabbagh (2005, p.27) defines it, is: "the tendency of some educated and middle class people to speak or write in hybrid, strange language, part of it is Arabic and with foreign structure". It is when people, consciously or unconsciously use some foreign concepts and mix them with a spoken or a written Arabic text. I have asked my participants to describe similar occurrences within the Palestinian context, and if they think that some social groups, classes, literate or illiterate tend to hybrid more than the rest; and in general, how they view this new style of communication. With only few exceptions, most participants have expressed negative reactions towards the phenomenon of language crossbreeding. Curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students have indicated that the speakers who incorporate some foreign English words or expressions into their first language feel

some kind of supremacy and superiority over other fellow Palestinians. A female curriculum designer said: "people mix up English into Arabic to show themselves as superior than others, this is common between Palestinians". Research participants attribute language half-hybrid, as a common fashion among Palestinians, to social, economic and psychological justifications. On the economic level, one of the curriculum designers has mentioned that, "in professional job interviews, if people don't know how to mix some English words inside their Arabic, they will surely lose the job opportunity". Employers, generally speaking, encourage language crossbreeding through job interviews and inside the workplace. Participants have also talked about first language hybridity as a tool to attain better social prestige for speakers or writers who speak and write in hybrid language. This justification might be classified as social or even psychological explanation which stands behind the occurrence of first language hybridity.

Another important issue that deserves special attention and which has been raised by participants, is the speaker's feeling and thinking of Arabic as the first language and culture as inferior and subordinate in comparison to English language and culture. A supervisor with six-years of supervision experience thinks and argues that "the idea of improving a person's social reputation through language crossbreeding means that the speaker believes that his first Arabic language and culture is secondary to the English language". This idea of superiority versus inferiority has been repeated vividly amongst the group of teachers and students. For example, a female student, 12th grader, said: "I like to combine Arabic and English together, I feel myself privileged when I attach some English words to my Arabic speech."

Speakers' feeling of first language inferiority can be interpreted in the light of what critical theorists such as Freire (1994) and Fanon (1963) have said about this phenomenon among the oppressed and colonized people. Both theorists believe that living for a prolonged period of time under oppression, colonization and marginalization, some of the oppressed people will end up, consciously or unconsciously, internalizing feelings of inferiority and subordination towards the oppressor. The oppressed, in order to run away from such inferior feeling, try to make themselves different from the rest of the oppressed through adapting to patterns of behavior (i.e. eating, speaking, clothing) that could look exactly like the ones of their oppressors.

One of the research participants, an English language supervisor, with 19-years of teaching experience has illustrated that: "We have to remember that English is not a mere foreign language in Palestine, it is the language of colonization and the language of the powerful states". This participant points to the fact that English was the language of the British Mandate over Palestine since 16 May, 1916 for about thirty years. This cultural colonization did not vanish overnight once the British have departed and turned Palestine over to Zionist settlers to establish a Jewish state on the ruins of the Palestinian people. It is also important to remember that Britain, during its' entire mandate period over Palestine, has worked relentlessly to alienate national education, and to fragment the national and cultural identity of the Palestinian people, in order to rule them more easily (Al-As'ad et. al, unknown date). As an example about the British systematic policy in mandatory Palestine, one of the written educational goals that they develop was to "create new educational cadres who can assist the mandate's administration to exploit the country's natural resources" (P.6).

Based on that, the English language and the way it was introduced to the Palestinian context can be better classified, according to Freire and Fanon, as the language of the oppressor or the language of the colonizer. Being historically the language of the oppressors and of colonizers, the cultural content embedded in English is meant to build what Freire refers to as "false consciousness" among the oppressed. This places the whole cultural, economic, social, and even value system of the oppressor in a superior position in relation to that of the oppressed. It shoves the oppressed to feel themselves and every component of their entire social and cultural identity inferior to that of the oppressor. The oppressed are encouraged to internalize an image identical to the oppressors' social consciousness with no hope to truly own or live in the oppressors' real world. The oppressors, among other things, works hard to marginalize the whole heritage of the oppressed people's national language and culture in order to open the way to their language and culture domination inside the oppressed educational, and other social structures.

Relevant to that, Sabbagh (2005), by uncovering the story of a "1948 Palestinian" citizen, who named his small shop "super mini market" to differentiate it from the other mini shops which belong to the rest of his people, has attempted to describe the behavior of "the oppressed" Palestinians, who crossbreed their first language to fallaciously differentiate themselves from the rest of their oppressed people. It is possible, I observe, that speaking English and not Arabic or even the distorted mixing of some English terms and expressions into the first language might create inside the speakers some kind of distinctiveness. At the same time, it leads to identification with their oppressors' image of communication.

On another level of the discussion, some teachers and supervisors have mentioned that they, indeliberately, mix English into Arabic or speak English outside their classes. A female teacher, who teaches 7th and 8th graders, has stated that: "As an English teacher, I, unintentionally, mix up Arabic and English together influenced by the long hours of teaching and repeating English lessons". Thus, they, as English experts and professionals, justify their tendency to mix languages together. However, language experts expect this situation to weaken and marginalize their first language.

The most important question remains: how do ordinary people are encouraged to hybrid their first language and how can they use it in this way of communication?. Local agents operating in the Palestinian context are said to directly contribute to the phenomenon of first language hybridity. With the existence of some local agents who encourage language hybridity, it becomes easier to explain vibrantly why and how do local cultures and languages in far-away countries and peripheries are affected by global English to such huge extent. Evidently, globalization, as Block (2000) identifies it, could intensify worldwide social relations and link together distant localities in ways that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away. The research participants, have ensure that nothing could happen in side-lines and weak world margins, no matter how strong the center is, without some local agents who can devotedly cooperate with the head of power. To clarify this point, a male English teacher with fourteen- years of teaching experience at governmental schools said:

Some reasons behind first language blending in Palestine include occupation, and non-governmental organization (NGOs), for example, when a kid falls down on the ground we say to him "up", this "up" came to us from the British mandate, the word "mahsoom" came to us from the Hebrew language, it means checkpoint. The NGOs administrations, to solicit money from foreign sponsors, need to

communicate in English, they write their proposals in English and mix a lot of English utterances inside their Arabic.

In addition to occupation and non-governmental organization, Palestinian universities and private schools were mentioned as another two types of local organizations who encourage first language hybridity and English hegemony within the Palestinian educational context. A supervisor has regretted to say that: "Palestinian universities and private schools play a superlative role in actualizing English language domination, they impose it compellingly on us; they oblige all students to learn English, instead, I suggest that we, as Arabs, should work hard to arabize our education".

Besides the role which successive occupations as the British, and the Israelis have played in crossbreeding and deforming the Arabic language in the Palestinian context, the research participants have identified a number of local institutions who work to hearten English language hegemony in Palestine. The participants believe that it becomes extremely risky when local agents are not mere individuals, but entire educational and cultural institutions who are supposed to play vital role in protecting the people's national and cultural identity. They believe it is terrifying when certain social organizations work to promote domination of global products, like the English language, within specifically irrelevant and improper cultural content that might fragment people's national and cultural identity. The participants were talking about the role of the foreign fund as a major motivator for the three previously named types of social organization (local universities, private schools and non-governmental organization), which push them to promote English language hegemony on the expense of the Arab Palestinians' first language and culture.

In addition to, and in corroboration with what the participants have mentioned, Jarbawi (1986), in an analytical study, has talked about the fragile foundation of the local universities. He explains that the Palestinian higher education institutes and universities were created without much thinking about their deep content and philosophy. The main reason behind the establishment of Palestinian local universities, he argues, was to respond to the emergent situations that have been developed towards the end of the British Mandate and beginning of the Zionist military occupation over Palestine, in the period (1922-1948). Following the 1967 occupation over the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the pressing issue was how to enable hundreds of Palestinian young people to continue their higher education, giving that their country is occupied and isolated from the rest of the Arab world countries (p.30). According to Jarbawi (1986), the Palestinians, as a result, were forced to establish local universities so quickly, without having the time to think carefully of a nationally committed educational philosophy to stand behind higher education in Palestine. The expansion of Palestinian universities was quantitative and only to fulfill the rising educational needs of the isolated young Palestinians and to help them to follow up with their higher education (p.32).

It seems also that local universities did not have much time and resources to teach English within a relevant national and cultural context, or to develop coherent philosophy that could explain and answer reasonably questions like: why and how English should be selected as a separate field of study, why do they want to teach science in English, or other relevant questions. Inside local universities, English is valued as an outlet into the world intellectual sphere and as a tool to enhance the quality of Palestinian higher education. For example, I have heard stories about university professors who studied,

for example, in the U.S.A. or Britain, who are accredited over the others who completed their graduate studies in the Arab universities. As a student enrolled in the Education Department at Birzeit University, I have noticed, for instance, that more than 95% of the Department faculty are U.S.A. graduates. At this university also, the students take a placement test that determine their level of English and based on a number of English courses as a foreign language regardless of their intended field of specialization.

Many participants think that, more than others, both Birzeit University and Bethlehem University, are working hard to spread the culture of teaching and learning in English. They think also that it is noticeable to see faculty members, students and other administration employees inside these universities, mix English into Arabic while communicating formally or informally. A male teacher explained that: "It is impossible that one day the universities of Birzeit and Bethlehem might make Arabic as a first and basic language for teaching, because both are connected with Latin and European churches which directly interfere in their polices". It is noteworthy that the Bethlehem University by definition is a Christian institution exactly in the same manner that Al-Azhar University in Gaza is an Islamic institution. Birzeit is a national institution that promotes liberal education, but has no official religious affiliation. The idea that local administrations of Christian educational institutions could be interested in spreading English more than Arabic, has been repeated amongst the research participants, especially teachers, in at least two occasions. The first one was when they were speaking about the relationship between English language hegemony and local universities, the previous quotation was actually taken from that context, and second, when they were discussing the role of private schools in promoting English domination. In agreement

with this conclusion, I have noticed that some participants, particularly Muslim students reiterate the idea that they prefer Arabic and not English because Arabic is the language of their Islamic religion and the language of their holy book the "Qur'an". For instance, one of the female Muslim students was very proud to say: "I love Arabic because it is my religion's language". It is beyond scope of the current research objectives to infer how do Christian students think about Arabic as a language for Islam, but it is obvious that Muslims are committed to the language based on connection to their religion. Thus, I might recommend future research to explore more deeply the relationship between national language and religion. Therefore, it is critical that we need education which can motivate Arab students, either Muslims or Christian, to engage with their first language as a national language regardless of whether it is the language of their religion or not. Religion in this case, is expected to positively enhance their engagement with their first language. Otherwise, how could Christian students be motivated towards the Arabic language, giving that, most of them are enrolled in private schools which are said to value English over Arabic?

Furthermore, the non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have been described as a third type of local agents who operate to promote English language hegemony. Talking about the role of the NGOs in promoting English language domination in Palestine, one of the research participants who is a teacher has stated that: "The language of communication between the different NGOs and foreign sponsors is usually English, they don't communicate in Arabic because the foreign sponsors will not understand them."

Ironically enough, it is important to notice that the history of the NGOs in Palestine has started when these organizations were first established to serve as civil,

national, and charitable community organizations, to contribute to the movement of their country's national liberation from occupation (Samara, 2003). The vision was to depend heavily on self-funding, committed and voluntary work of their wide masses. Since 1988, foreign sponsors (including American, British, European, and Israeli sponsors) were working hard to hijack these national organizations and to turn them into NGOs which are totally dependent on foreign fund. Since then, the NGOs have been described, by many critical and national writers and researchers as anti-national and anti-liberation organizations. To give an example, one of the findings in a research study which has been conducted by Bisan Center (2002), have showed that 94% of the non-governmental organizations do not contribute to the Palestinian national liberation movement. On the contrary, Samara (2003, p.28) argues that, non-governmental organizations are only new tools for globalization and they are created to spread capitalists ideology through fragmenting national and social consciousness of poor classes and destroying their national liberating movements.

One of the female research participants, teaching 12th grade in a governmental school has noticed: “The intensive application of English language concepts inside the NGOs, and the important skills that attracted the NGOs’ directors during job interviews is the individual’s competency in the English language”. From this teacher’s viewpoint, competency in English language is very necessary for fund – raising activities, and especially to recruit funds from foreign organizations who mainly speak English. Thus, individuals who especially wish to lead an NGO or even to work in an NGO might become preoccupied with the idea of mastering the English language. On the other hand, foreign sponsors are found to exploit the hard life conditions of the Palestinian people in

order to impose their political, economic and cultural agendas on them. The aim is to recruit Palestinian national activists, not only to neutralize and co-opt them, but also, to alternate their national priorities with other international or more extremely anti-national agendas (Samara, 2003).

In addition to the role played by the above mentioned social organizations and local agents (i.e., local universities, private schools and NGOs), research participants have noticed that also individuals, mostly students and educated people, do, consciously or unconsciously hybrid first language. They mix Arabic with English or code switch completely to English even when they are communicating in an Arabic context. They, sometimes, find it irresistible to imagine themselves as English native speakers who make an effort to find the Arabic equivalent of some English words. For instance, a twelfth grader, female student has uncovered the evidence that she sometimes: "Need a certain word and can not find it in my Arabic language, so I borrow it from English to complete the sentence, sometimes, it is easier for me to find a word in English".

Modern technology and especially the wide spread use of the internet seem also to encourage individuals, students and teenagers to hybrid their first language. A student, 12th grader, has made clear that: "The activity of chatting with friends through the internet encourage first language hybridity". Students were talking about their experiences in chatting especially with German and French friends. But because English is the lingua franca for most world speakers, they would probably use it in their communication through the internet. Another student, 11th grader, has told us about his experience in chatting with one of the German students, and he said: "In most cases, me and my German friend use English in chatting together, and when we face a problem expressing

some expressions, we just borrow it from our mother tongues and made new language, a mixture between our first language and English, we are used to it and we understand each others without problems". Surely, this technique of communication, in addition to languages' hybridity, can serve as a very useful tool in making up for any possible break down in conversations between the two friends. I think, what can be inferred from the experience of chatting and internet conversations shows not only how do world languages are crossbred, but also, it shows the domination of English over the rest of the world languages.

Research participants were all in agreement on the idea that mixing English into Arabic affects negatively their first language. They believe that this blending can weaken and deform their first language's entire structural system. Paradoxically, some students still can not escape mixing English into their first language. They do it as a device to practice the English language. A female student said: "I mix English with Arabic to practice the English that I have learned inside school". Those students seek mainly to succeed in the courses of English language, and so, they search hardly to find a context where they can practice it. It is also noticeable that educated people and school students are encouraging each others and endeavor to create a kind of context that can help them to practice English. The fact that they are not equally fluent in both Arabic and English languages, they are not bilinguals for instance, would probably lead them to combine English words and expressions into Arabic and end up hybridizing their Arabic language.

To summarize this theme, successive occupations over Palestine in addition to other local agents have been found to deeply contribute to the realization of English language hegemony and national language hybridity in Palestine. Local agents include

social and educational organizations, such as, non-governmental organizations, private schools and universities. Realization of English hegemony and crossbreeding of first language are accompanied with feelings of inferiority towards speakers' first language and culture. The results within this theme have indicated lack of engagement in Arabic as a national language; instead, other factors as religion are valued over the national language. Modern technology and especially the heavy use of the internet are also found to facilitate first language hybridity.

VI. Cultural hegemony and English Curriculum Relevance to Learners'

Cultural and National Identity

Research participants have responded to a number of interview questions which investigate their perception of the English language curriculum relevance to their cultural and national identity as Arab-Palestinians. Their reactions to the questions vary from very positive evaluation expressed particularly by curriculum designers at the top of the pyramid's of participants, to disagreement in attitudes between the groups of supervisors and teachers located in the middle of the pyramid, to quite negative appraisal attained from students at the pyramid's base.

Curriculum designers believe that the new "English for Palestine" relates strongly to students' national and cultural identity. A male designer has confidently declared that: "We did our best to make the English language curriculum culturally and nationally relevant to our Palestinian context and we did it successfully despite all the difficulties". Although their reaction to the question about the cultural and national relevance of the English language curriculum came to be, during the interviews, more defensive than was expected, however, it can be justifiable that they wanted to start by insisting on the

perfection of their job as curriculum designers. Designers insisted on the fact that the curriculum is completely and purely Palestinian- made. A female curriculum planner who has participated in designing the fifth grade syllabus said: "The English national curriculum was under our total control, nothing was imposed on us, names, places and pictures are all from our context". The designers have talked about some exceptions where they did utilize foreign names and pictures. It is unusual to them, for example, to insert Arab names and pictures when the subject is about "inviting some foreign visitors to Palestine".

The distinctiveness in the current curriculum design, they think, that it has been developed within a cross-cultural vision. This includes that the English language curriculum teaches Palestinian students about their culture and at the same time introduces them to other foreign cultures. Despite the fact that I have asked all the interviewed designers if they had a vision about what space should be given to the local national culture and to other world cultures, however, no preference to national culture over the rest of world cultures can be observed from their responses. For them, what is important in the curriculum is the ability to reflect the cross-cultural vision. One of the planners who took part in developing the secondary stage curriculum has better expressed the idea in his sentence: "our culture should not dominate over other cultures; the aim is the cross cultural interaction."

The above statement shows that it would be paradoxical, in the designers' understanding, to teach English from a cross-cultural perspective and at the same time to focus on national and cultural identity of learners. To focus on the students' national culture and at the same time to show the diversity among the world's cultures seemed to

the designers as contradictory educational practice. Also, the value of national culture integration into teaching and learning foreign languages did not seem to take much of their attention. National culture and other cultures are pondered on the same scale with no preference of one over another. They understand that Palestinian students should be exposed to learning about different cultures. But, this specific understanding seems to refute their evaluation that the English curriculum relates strongly to Palestinian national and cultural identity. In addition, one of the designers has explained that they were working without a formal written objective which directs planning towards integration of national culture. He said:

The curriculum formal document [Developed by the national team for curriculum planning] which outlines the main headings and objectives behind the entire English language curriculum in Palestine contains no direct aim which invites the integration of Palestinians' national and cultural identity into English the language curriculum.

The idea of national culture integration into teaching and learning foreign languages, which is a central theme in the field of TEFL, has been evidently confused with the idea of teaching a language within its' own cultural context. A university professor, who is a member in the curriculum planning team has expressed the controversy over language and culture in this way: "I can't change the language and give it flavor and taste from my own culture, as a matter of fact, anything that relates to the language's own culture can help students to acquire the language easier and quicker".

Research into the field of teaching and learning foreign languages has proved the opposite to what most interviewed curriculum designers think about the consequences of national culture integration into the English language curriculum. For example, the findings of Alptekin (1993), Bax (2003), regardless of my critique of them, or Tan (2005)

have obviously persisted on the significance of relating to understandable "schematic input", "context", and "cultural identity". Tan (2005), for instance, has concluded that the type of authentic teaching of foreign languages should genuinely consider linking to learner's local culture and local context. Otherwise, it should not be labeled as authentic.

Supervisors and teachers, in their different argumentations and discussions on the issue of English curriculum relevance to national and culture identity, were divided into two groups. The first group was more satisfied and less critical when it comes to the quantity and quality of the cultural and national content inside the new "English for Palestine" curricula. The second group was not satisfied about the content and the members in this group were observed to be more critical of the curricula.

Some of the perceptions expressed by the first group include a male supervisor, who supervises English teachers inside the UNRWA schools. He argues that:

The English language curriculum is culturally unique, selective and it fulfills Palestinian students' needs. It is enough to name it "English for Palestine", the name reflects its identity, the curriculum is huge achievement for Palestinians, look at the cover pictures, for example, you see Hisham palace in Jericho, Al-Aqsa mosque, the dome of the rock, etc. The cultural content is mostly Arab and Palestinian, and there are also parts about other cultures.

Other teachers and supervisors, who basically support this orientation, have added that the English curriculum leads to discussions concerning, for example, nature in Palestine; it teaches, for instance, about birds and other animals. The curriculum, moreover, introduces students to some very famous Palestinian and Arab national writers and poets. It teaches students about Palestinian traditional life, such as, Palestinian national tapestry. Furthermore, the curriculum teaches about other international issues such as storms, diseases and earthquakes.

Despite the feeling of satisfaction amongst supervisors and teachers in this group, they have indirectly acknowledged the fact that local and national culture stories were left unfinished or partially addressed in most pages. However, the dilemma for them is solved in believing that it is not the role of English curriculum to fully address or finish such stories. For example, when I asked if they think is it enough to insert a picture of some ruins of a Palestinian village without giving any important details about it, or if the curriculum talks about the Dome of the Rock without mentioning the difficulties Palestinians face to get to there because of the Israeli occupation's practices and so on. The answers obtained from the members in this group included that it is not the role of the English language curriculum to engage in discussing issues of politics. To explain this point further, a female teacher has clarified that:

The English language curriculum does not discuss political issues, such as, Oslo agreement, occupation, martyrs or Israeli checkpoints. It involves only talking about superficial stuff, when I want to elucidate some lessons, I need to add other details and information from me to connect it with what is going on outside the class; one day we were talking about the Israeli declaration of war against Lebanon.

Some other voices within this group believe that the curriculum is not allowed to engage directly in political issues. However, they believe that it is the role of teachers to complete the unfinished political story, such as, checkpoints to Al-Aqsa mosque or similar stories. One of the supervisors has stated that: "It is the role of teacher to help students sense their own national and cultural problems and know it well". In agreement with this statement, another male teacher has affirmed that:

It is the role of teacher to protect his or her people's cultural heritage. Even if the formal curriculum intentionally omits this part, we should understand that curriculum designers, especially in Palestine, might face political pressure from Israel, for instance, in order to change the national content inside the curriculum.

New content might be imposed on them in accordance with political agreements such as the Oslo agreement or the Road's Map, but if teachers themselves don't exert enough effort to introduce their students to cities such as Haifa and Al-Ramla, which are omitted from the Palestinian curriculum, they better die.

The teachers who were interviewed also believe that it is their role to complete the unfinished stories and nationalist content, especially the political ones. They understand the fact that their curriculum is not free enough to complete stories with deep national and cultural relevance to Palestinians life. However, this belief seems to be in contradiction with other teachers' complains about the overloaded English syllabus, which leaves no time for any extra activities or explanations. Even though, the number of English language weekly classes in the new curriculum has been increased, in comparison with the old version; three classes for grade one to four, four classes for grades five to seven and five classes for grades eight to twelve; yet, teachers still teach under high pressure to finish the assigned materials. This includes the pressure of exams, especially the *Tawjihi* national exam, and the obligation to finish the designed material. For each grade, the English language curriculum consists of twelve units. Teachers have to finish six units in each semester which lasts for three months. They believe that six units for each semester are intensive content to be covered. One teacher, who teaches English for 11th and 12th graders, sounded very angry when he said: "We have to finish on time, regardless if the students understood or not, we don't have time to prepare extra activities or readings". Added to that, the low motivation teachers feel as a result of their low salaries, continuous school closures by Israeli occupation, and other national strikes and holidays, which all cause extra difficulties for them.

So far, to finalize the viewpoint of the culturally satisfied group of supervisors and teachers, they, without reservation, feel that the new "English for Palestine" curriculum relates strongly to Palestinian students' local environment. It relates strongly to their national and cultural identity, even if, it is limited when it comes to direct discussion of issues of political nature. For them this limitation is justifiable because it does not affect the curriculum very deep relatedness to learners' local reality. Moreover, for them it is natural that teachers can compensate for that deficiency inside the "English for Palestine".

However, the challenge remains for teachers to perform the tasks of completing unfinished cultural and national stories inside the curriculum and to assign extra readings and activities or connecting curriculum content with learners' life. How can they meet such expectations within the teaching conditions and the very limited time they have to finish an overloaded curriculum? Some extreme viewpoints inside this group have totally ignored the role of the English curriculum in teaching about learners' cultural and national identity. For them, the existing relevance of content to learners' national and cultural context in the English curriculum is more than enough. The English language should not bother teaching about cultural and national identity as a principle. To illustrate this point, a male teacher who teaches seventh graders in one of the boys' governmental school has accepted that:

I don't think that English language curriculum should relate to the Palestinian context and reality. Instead, foreign language should teach the culture of its own people. In other words, I think it should be connected to its real cultural context. It is better for us to learn English from the language's homeland and own people. I don't see pig problem if we, inside our 'English for Palestine', use the foreign name 'John' instead of the Arab name 'Sami'.

The main problem in the above stated opinion of this teacher is his total ignorance of the value of relating foreign language teaching to learners' cultural and national context. Connection with learners' context, according to his belief, makes no difference in terms of acquiring the target language. Consequently, his belief is in sharp contradiction with results of most recent research in the field of teaching and learning foreign languages which emphasize the fact that content relatedness to learners' life, within the context of teaching and learning foreign language can facilitate acquisition of the target language and also enhance awareness of learners' identity (Vygotsky 1978, Alptekin 1993, Tan 2005, Canagarajah 2005)

The second group of supervisors and teachers who expressed less satisfaction with the cultural content of the new "English for Palestine" believes that the English curriculum relates, but superficially, to the Arab and Palestinian national and cultural identity. To illustrate this point, a male supervisor who was describing the size of information relevant to the Palestinian national culture inside the new English curriculum said: "The space where the English curriculum refers to information relevant to the Palestinian students' national and cultural identity is very limited; I can say 2% of the whole content". He believes that, in addition to the limited space which has been given to the discussion of Palestinian national and cultural identity, the curriculum designates a wider space to discuss other worldwide problems, such as, globalization, pollution, and the internet.

Both supervisors and teachers, who criticize tawdriness and superficiality of cultural and national content inside the English curriculum, have provided number of justifications to explain their negative attitudes. They believe that the topics of discussion

inside the curriculum are unrealistic and do not raise serious issues and problems that concern the Palestinian people. Characters inside the English language text books communicate for the purpose of mere communication. One of the teachers has described it in this way:

It is difficult to teach students how to write skillfully if the syllabus keeps asking them to write letters on imaginary subjects, instead of picking something real from their lives to write about it. For example, instead of asking the student to imagine that he or she has a friend in London and to write a letter to this friend, why we don't ask the student to write a letter to his father or brother in the prison, this kind of letter can be more realistic and it can really motivate the student to write more creatively.

The attitudes of some supervisors and teachers who felt that the English curriculum over employs communication mistakenly in less important subjects, have met with Bax's (2003) general critique against the tendency of the communicational approach to engage learners in a process of communication for the sake of communication. One of Bax's concerns is the attempt of the communicational approach to prioritize communication over anything else and regardless of the subject of discussion. This penchant in communication can very often lead to waste learners' time in worthless interactions. Thus, I argue that it is important to teach students the skills of communication, because this is what teaching and learning languages are all about, but at the same time, it is equally important to pay attention to the subject of communication and to choose topics and subjects which are closely relate to learners concerns and needs.

Moreover, some teachers have assumed that partnership between the planners of English curriculum design on one hand, and the British and American curriculum companies and expertise on the other hand, is an additional reason behind the existing poor relatedness of the topics inside the new "English for Palestine" to Palestinian

cultural and national identity. For instance, a male teacher who teaches in one of the governmental schools and who also performs as the school's vice principal, did not understand why, "the Palestinian planners have to exert any effort to produce a national English curriculum, whilst the Macmillan company had from the very beginning a pre-planned version of English curriculum to be offered to them".

Subsequently, some teachers and supervisors think that the largest part of the curriculum content is pre-designed by the British Macmillan company and pre-agreed on by the Americans. In addition to that, their limited participation in the different procedures of curriculum development seems to create inside them deeper feeling of alienation about the whole process of curriculum development. The process of curriculum planning, as they understand it, was not inclusive and it did not open doors in front of teachers, supervisors, parents or other active community members to participate. On the contrary, it was planned to include only very limited number of university professors, some supervisors and other members from the curriculum center. Some teachers from this group were found to feel very frustrated, because they did not have the chance to participate in the process of curriculum development. One of the teachers has complained that:

School teachers did not participate in curriculum planning; only some university professors did. University professors don't have enough information about schools and teachers' different needs. They have no idea about the difficulties teachers face in teaching English and what they want from the curriculum.

This contradictory information and understanding of the curriculum development process indicates the existence of struggle and controversy among experts in different Palestinian educational levels. Although, the interviewed curriculum designers have

claimed that the teachers' different needs were assessed prior to the planning process, yet, most teachers and supervisors in both groups have denied the existence of any studies of need assessment. All of the teachers affirmed that they have no idea about such study and that nobody has investigated their needs. Unfortunately, I have observed, during the different interviews, that the few supervisors and other curriculum designers who had the opportunity to participate in the process of curriculum planning were intolerant towards comments from those who were excluded from the curriculum process. Some of these comments were attributed to jealousy feelings of those who were excluded. As a case in point, one of the supervisors has declared that: "The ones who attempt to criticize the English curriculum are doing so because they didn't have the chance to participate in its' development".

Intolerance to hear comments from non-participants might be explained by curriculum observers as indirect announcement for English language experts to set aside their aptitude for criticism and to accept the English curriculum as it is. It is possible also to conclude how such perception pre-assumes contradiction between participation and criticism. For them, it is either to participate or to criticize; critics are labeled as non-participants. If my voice is excused to speak at this point, I would say that it sounds as linear thinking, which does not mix white and black together. People have to decide either to participate or to criticize, as if both cannot be achieved together. Linearity in thinking can be observed through analyzing other quotations as well. To avoid labeling any specific participant as "linear thinker" because at the end this is not the purpose of this study, I would like to give examples from other quotations, but without mentioning the speaker this time. I quoted a participant who was describing the relationship between

Arabic and English when he said: "Let's say that English is one side and Arabic is another side". From the viewpoint of this speaker, both languages stand on different sides as if no relationship can be found between them. Other participants also have uttered expressions like "English against Arabic", "Arabic opposite to English". Contradictory to higher cognitive thinking, linear and dualistic thinking have been proved to character thinking patterns more obviously in situations of domination and hegemony. For instance, Flavell (1985) has started to explore the higher cognitive and metacognitive learning strategies by the beginning of the twentieth century. In addition, recent critical pedagogical theorists like Freire's "education for critical consciousness", or Giroux's (1997), "dialectical and critical thinking patterns" have argued strongly against teaching linear and dualistic thinking patterns. Linear and dualistic thinking indicate low cognitive thinking abilities that might influence destructively learners' abilities to analyze information and to think critically.

Many quotations which were taken from different participants in the different four groups can indicate various degrees of dualistic thinking. Dualistic thinking, as defined by Perry (1997, p.79), means "division of meaning into two realms-good versus bad, right versus wrong, we versus they, all that is not success is failure, right answers exists somewhere for every problem and authorities know them". The stage of dualistic thinking in Perry's (1997) scheme of cognitive and ethical development, for example, is structured as first and less matured phase of thinking development, while the other two more complicated phases of cognitive thinking include the second and third phases of relativism and commitment respectively.

Consequently, and despite the fact that Perry (1997) was investigating development in college students' thinking, when he first established his scheme of cognitive development, but unfortunately, it is possible to find and observe dualistic thinking within the other groups of the interviewed Palestinian educationalists as well. For example, teachers believe in the curriculum designers to know everything about curriculum and to develop a nationally committed curriculum, such as in this statement "We trust the curriculum designers to know everything about curriculum development". This is one justification some teachers, for instance, have used to explain why they gave up their right in participating in and criticizing the English language curriculum. According to Perry (1997), dualism in this and other similar examples is characterized by the position which believes in the authorities' absolute knowledge. This position is classified as the simplest and more naive first stage within the dualistic thinking stage which develops from position one into position four.

Another interpretation of dualistic thinking include Giroux (1997) in his effort to establish the "theoretical foundations for critical pedagogy", has creatively connected between the concepts of objectivity and neutrality as part of the uncritical positivist thinking view of world and between actualization of hegemony. He concluded, in the same source, that undermining the value of building historical consciousness which has been always the mark of the positivist mode of rationality inside schooling systems is intended to achieve three objectives which are:

First, it fosters an un-dialectical and one-dimensional view of the world, second, it denies the world politics and lacks a vision of the future and third, it denies the

possibility that human beings can constitute their own reality and alter and change that reality in the face of domination (p.13).

I conclude that, dividing the world into dichotomies of Arabic and English, white and black, participate or criticize, or good and evil and the like, is a strong indication of linear and dualistic thinking which will finally lead people not to notice the dialectical and more complicated relationships between the world's existing objects. When, for example curriculum designers, supervisors, teachers and students look at the Arabic as a language which stands far from English and do not notice the interaction between the two languages, it is expected to become even harder for them to notice if one language dominates the other or not, or if one culture dominates the other culture or not. In this sense, I think, we can understand Freire's and Giroux's conclusion that linear and dualistic thinking can lead more easily than critical thinking to internalization of hegemony and domination.

Back to the critique leveled by the second group against the cultural and national content of the English curriculum, we notice that members of this group think that in the very few places where the curriculum teaches students about some important national characters and symbols, it teaches about persons who are still alive, such as Mahmood Darwish or the Lebanese singer Fayruz. Although, most participants have expressed their high appreciation to these national Palestinian poet and Arab singer, still they do not think that it is a good idea to teach students about people who are still alive, mainly because, living people are vulnerable to change in their beliefs and guiding principles.

In addition, reservation regarding teaching about political issues was observed in participants' speech and in both disputing groups of teachers and supervisors. Either

teachers or supervisors, who support the cultural content of the curriculum, or those who are against it, both of them have answered with reservation when they were asked about the role of the English language curriculum in teaching about political issues which directly relate to students' life. Some of them have adopted very rigid position against the whole subject of including politics inside the English curriculum; their answers were an absolute no to the whole subject. The rest have turned around the question in a very diplomatic way and they gave no clear answer. Only one voice of a supervisor was heard to call for the adoption of liberating education. This supervisor had strongly supported the idea of “teaching every issue, whether political or social, that might contribute to building students' deep awareness towards their national and cultural identity”.

Similar to what curriculum designers believe, supervisors and teachers in both disputing groups think that it is better to teach English, especially literature, within its' own cultural context. Supervisors and teachers who criticize the superficiality of the relevant national and cultural content inside the English curriculum did not explain the contradiction in their views about relevant English curriculum and at the same time teaching English within its' own cultural context. What can be inferred from their responses regarding this issue is their wish to have both, culturally relevant curriculum, but not on the expenses of the English language's own context and culture, which, they believe, can help learner to understand the target language well.

Turning to the students' perspective, all participants from the students group in different schools have believed that the cultural and national content inside the new "English for Palestine" relates very superficially to their cultural heritage and everyday

life environment. They admitted that the curriculum does not go deeply into serious cultural and national issues. To give an example, a female student has affirmed that:

I am not satisfied about the cultural content of the English language curriculum; our local culture should be addressed more strongly. Also, the curriculum does not teach us anything about occupation, it is only full with imaginary, fanciful or sometimes real stories but have nothing to do with, for example, the political situation that we live.

The students have explained that the curriculum teaches them superficially about some of the Palestinian cities, and selectively about some national symbols or leaders such as Yaser Arafat, Abd Al-hameed Shoman and Mahmood Darwish. Some students have also complained about the omission of the 1948 occupied Palestine from the curriculum altogether. Another female student, 12th grader, from one of the UNRWA schools has sighed deeply and said: "The English language curriculum teaches us things about Palestine, but very shallow, they include names of some cities, but nothing deep. The curriculum talks only about some 1967 cities, nothing about 1948 occupied Palestine".

Excluding the 1948 occupied Palestine from the curriculum, for instance, is not by chance, but it is systematic and planned policy of both Israeli occupation and the resulting Oslo agreement. Teaching about Arab cultural and national identity inside textbooks is meant to be shallow and ineffective if any. This intended educational policy of imprisoning development of Palestinian learners' national and cultural identity does not exist inside the new "English for Palestine" only, but it is one of the results of a long organized policy that has been adopted by different consecutive occupations over Palestine. For instance, Othman, Al-Asa'ad and others (n.d.), have talked about the British mandate and the Israeli policy towards actualization of Palestinian educational

and cultural dependency on occupation and consequently effacement of their distinctive identity as Arabs and Palestinians. Part of this policy is to "focus on students learning about the history of the world more than their own history" (p.6). The same source has also counted names of number of books and textbooks which were prohibited to enter Palestinian schools. The list includes "voice of Palestine", "our country Palestine", "unity and case of Palestine", "from and to Palestine", "geography of the Arab world", which indicates the colonialists' systematic effort to erase national consciousness among Palestinian students.

The students, in addition, have viewed "English for Palestine" as a variety of scientific, medical, sport, social, local and international collection of topics. Within these topics, students feel that they learn about international subjects more than their own national problems. Students said that focus on Arab and Palestinians own identity and life is prohibited not only inside the written curriculum, but also in the other extra curriculum activities, especially inside the UNRWA and the private schools. A student who studies in the UNRWA schools has stated that: "We are not allowed even to hang the Palestine's flag or martyrs pictures inside our classes, if we did, foreign directors of UNRWA will be upset and they will penalize our teachers and the school's principal."

Furthermore and similar to what some curriculum designers have expressed, teachers and supervisors believe, a number of students also think, that it is not one of the English curriculum's strategic objectives to raise students' awareness towards their national and cultural identity. Most students assume that it is only the role of the Arabic language to relate strongly to their cultural and national identity. For them, the existing curriculum of English language relates superficially to their national identity, but as a

foreign language, they do not expect English to do more in this regard. By default, they expect the English language to teach them about other foreign cultures, especially the British and American culture. A female student from one of the governmental schools has concluded that: "English should introduce me to foreign cultures of other people; I should study my own culture in other subjects, such as, Arabic". Students longing to know about other cultures might be attributed to the isolation imposed on them by the Israeli occupation.

Relatively speaking, students feel more satisfied with the cultural content in the "English for Palestine", especially when they compare it to the former Jordanian English curriculum PETRA. They said that the main focus of PETRA was on Jordan and Britain, while Palestine has found no place inside it, and thus, comparing to PETRA, the new "English for Palestine" is a step forward according to them. Sometimes, students who are now in their final schooling stages regret their loss; primarily because, they did not have the opportunity to study from the very beginning in a curriculum which is purely Palestinian as they said. For some of them, even if the curriculum relates strongly, and as they wish to their national and cultural identity, it is, as one student has described it: "Too late for 12th graders to learn about Palestine, we are the harvest of eight years studying about Jordan and Britain".

Students have also expressed their concerns about economic and political challenges that are increased and rooted intentionally through occupations and other interfering foreign policies. They think that such challenges can block developing real liberating Palestinian education, an education, which can truly contribute to the development of their cultural and national awareness. Foreign fund was counted by

students as one of the challenges which obstacles development of culturally and nationally relevant and committed education. Also, the existing overloaded English curriculum, from their viewpoints, does not leave any free space for them to contribute to the enrichment of the cultural and national content through extra curriculum activities. One of the male students said: “The curriculum does not even give us the chance to compensate for the superficial cultural content through extra curriculum activities; we can bring relevant topics from our local environment and every day life if they give us some space”.

To summarize this theme, English curriculum relevancy to learners’ cultural and national identity has been viewed controversially amongst the different groups of participants. Curriculum designers believe it relates strongly to learners national and cultural identity and they relayed some examples which confirm their perceptive. Disagreement in opinions has occurred inside the groups of supervisors and teachers. Some supervisors and teachers think that it relates strongly to learners cultural and national identity, and thus, they were satisfied with it. Others said that it relates, but contractedly to learners national and cultural identity. Examples and issues were raised in both sides to defend their viewpoints. Students tended to criticize the superficiality of the relevant cultural and national content inside the English curriculum. In comparison with the Jordanian English curriculum PETRA, most participants were satisfied about the cultural and national content inside “English for Palestine”. Furthermore, within all groups, whether proponents or critics of the content, some very contradictory views were observed, particularly, about teaching a foreign language within a context which is relevant to learners cultural background or else teaching it within its’ own cultural

context. Some participants were observed to defend both situations at the same time without noticing the contradiction that may exist between them.

Chapter Summary

Six main themes, as the major findings of the study, were discussed and elaborated through out this chapter. These themes were labeled: First, mixed perceptions of global English hegemony over first language and culture, second, global English as the legacy of U.K. and U.S.A colonialism, third, spread of English as the language of advanced science, fourth, fascination of English as an attractive language, fifth, successive occupations and other local agents promote English hegemony and Arabic hybridity, and sixth, cultural hegemony and English curriculum relevance to learners' cultural and national identity

The main findings discussed within these themes indicate that threats of global English on national language and culture were not seriously considered yet, especially, on the highest levels of decision making inside the Palestinian educational context. On the level of curriculum planning, the arguments about teaching English as a foreign language are still centered on the language's pragmatics and the language as a tool for joining the global market without bothering with the questions about learners' national and cultural identity. Political hegemony of capital powers, particularly U.K and U.S.A, which led to English hegemony, is tended to be ignored. The English hegemony which marks the American English hegemony is not discussed by participants in levels of decision making. Also, the new "English for Palestine" is highly valued for its' very strong relevance to Palestinian learners cultural and national context.

Despite the spread of some romantic ideas about global English attractiveness and easiness amongst groups from lower levels of the pyramid of participants, criticism against global English hegemony is heard from voices at these levels including some supervisors, teachers and most students. The lower levels sounded less satisfied about the whole process of developing “English for Palestine” which superficially relate to their cultural and national identity. Global English is perceived as a direct product of colonization and political hegemony of the capitalist powers. However, the possibility that these more critical voices can lead changes in term of global English perception or on the level of the curriculum itself is very limited. Besides the Oslo agreement, which controls the content inside the Palestinian curriculum, the critical voices are silenced through the bureaucratic, exclusive, un-participatory policies and approaches to curriculum planning and development in the Palestinian educational context.

More organized effort is being executed by local agents including non governmental organizations, local universities and private schools to globalize English and its culture within the Palestinian educational context. Hybridity and weakness of national language and culture, internalization of inferiority towards key components in learners’ national and cultural identity, and lack of engagement with Arabic as a national language are observed to be increased through English globalization.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Introduction

In this concluding chapter, it is worthwhile to reiterate that the main objective behind the implementation of this research project was to investigate the perceptions of English language experts and student about the concept "global English" and its' relationship to national culture and context within the English language curriculum in Palestine.

Reading into the qualitative findings presented in the previous chapter, in light of the main theoretical arguments discussed in literature review, it becomes evident that a substantial gap can be observed between theory on global English hegemony in one hand and practices and perceptions of most participants concerning this issue on the other. Consistently with the nature of "grounded theory" investigation which was employed in this study, it is quite possible and expected that the data and themes uncovered in the study would not fit precisely into existing theory and prior research. In this chapter I will discuss in further details the different results including the participants' perceptions and practices, while attempting to enlighten the linguistic, social and political explanation that might stand behind these perceptions. Furthermore, I will discuss more deeply the expected long term educational implications that might be concluded based on the results of this study and the wide variety of perceptions and practices expressed by the different groups of research participants.

II. General Discussion of the Results

Generally speaking, the most dominant assertion that can be concluded from the details discussed within each of the six themes of the study is the fact that most

curriculum designers, supervisors and teachers are less worried about the consequences of global English hegemony and cultural domination throughout the Palestinian society at large and within the Palestinian educational system in particular. On the contrary to that, most students are observed to be more concerned with the possibility that global English might lead to the marginalization of their own national language and culture.

Regardless of their low expectations from foreign languages as means for the facilitation of national education, or education for national consciousness, students exemplify strong rejection of the existing hegemonic symbols inside the English language curriculum, such as, giving wider space in the curriculum to the discussion of foreign cultures on the expenses of their own national culture. Diversity in opinions, argumentations and debates regarding the extent of English language hegemony characterize the attitudes of supervisors and teachers. They were divided between views expressed by the students on one hand and those expressed by curriculum designers on the other. Moving up in the hierarchy to curriculum planners, I observed expressions that reflect deep satisfaction with and acceptance of the whole subject of teaching English as a foreign language in Palestine and refutation of global English negative consequences on first language and national culture. They simply see no negative effect of global English on native Arab Palestinian language and culture.

These variations in attitudes towards English language hegemony, I conclude, is for the most part attributed to the formal position one holds in the educational hierarchical system. Thus, it might be possible to obtain different responses from participants in other informal conversations where each group can put aside feelings of apprehension and hesitation that could result from their official responsibilities. This

situation of “formal position effect”, for instance, is reflected in the tendency which was found to be prevalent among curriculum planners who unlimitedly defend the curriculum they have developed. It is further reflected in their vehement defense of teaching English to first grade, something which was not the case during the use of the Jordanian curriculum. Let alone its teaching to grade one, such as, in the Palestinian case, in other countries like Vietnam, the dispute was about whether to start teaching English in grade three or not. Sinh (2006), who studied teaching EFL in Vietnam, has concluded that English instruction there, after hot discussion, has shifted from grade one to grade three and was enriched with continuous development of children’s first language. The concerns behind that shift were about “the negative effects of early bilingualism imposed on children” (p.111).

Curriculum designers were reluctant to raise any critical issue against early bilingualism or the cultural content inside the English language curriculum. Consequently, they were expected, not to formally allow or lay the ground inside classrooms or among teachers and supervisors to freely and openly criticize the cultural and national content in the "English for Palestine" curriculum. Accordingly, research results showed that teachers and students did not comment or try to suggest changes into the content of the curriculum. While this passive stance among teachers and students corroborates with the curriculum designers’ perspectives, it may as well be attributed to a wide range of factors operating within the Palestinian educational context at large. Teachers' comments are limited to grammatical and spelling mistakes. Freire (1970), for instance, would analyze the behavior by which a group of people are denied their right to comment and criticize as a "form of dehumanization", and more than that; it may be

defined as a “form of violence”. This form of dehumanization and violence, is particularly alarming when we have a situation in which a group of individuals, who have authority and power such as the Ministry of Education, curriculum designers or supervisors, prevent others from their right to engage in the process of inquiry and reflective dialogue about the very foundations of their educational process.

I have also observed existence of un-informed debate about what is currently considered central educational issue in language literature, such as, the importance of integrating the learner's national culture in teaching and learning foreign languages. Moving up to curriculum designers, I noticed based on the results, that the attitudes become more formal, and accordingly less critical of the content of the English language curriculum and its relevance to Palestinian students cultural background.

Individualistic interpretations rather than collective educational vision are observed behind the participants' perceptions of issues, such as, the meaning and the impact of global English on national education, or the importance of integrating the students' native culture into the English language curriculum. Lack of involvement and lack of control over the cultural content inside the English language curriculum, especially among teachers and students, can be explained as strong indication of cultural alienation. I can safely conclude based on the research results, that the participants' perceptions reveal different degrees of cultural alienation. Cultural alienation, through re-creation of indifference and lack of interest inside the alienated individuals, might lead in turn to the internalization of different types of cultural hegemony. If they are culturally alienated, unquestionably educational cadres can and are expected to allow the development of an educational atmosphere which is vulnerable and conducive to cultural

hegemony. In such peculiar educational situations of colonized nations, protection against different types of cultural hegemony which might come within the content of not only the local English language curriculum, but also within the content of global English as a whole can be hardly guaranteed.

Individualism, cultural alienation and subsequently cultural hegemony are three interdependent and intertwined factors and educational implications that can be inducted from the different research results. Therefore, in the coming pages, I would like to discuss research results with close focus on these implications to Palestinian education. I intend to demonstrate how I inferred such implications from the research results, and educationally what does it mean to be captive by such a complex educational context. But before we get into this discussion and interpretation, it is very important to note that threats of cultural alienation and cultural hegemony that might be resulted from teaching foreign language in general and global English in particular, have preoccupied the minds of policy makers in many countries around the world. Bulgaria represents one example of a country that in its attempt, to counter cultural hegemony that usually comes with global English has developed an EFL curriculum for the public schools which is based on children's local culture. In this culturally sensitive education, "learning is immersed in children's culture: games, songs, sport, and fun that children of the same age share". (Savova, 2006, p.128).

III. Intuitive Interpretations of English Hegemony

Research results, especially as revealed in the first theme, indicated that perceptions about global English hegemony and its diverse threats against national language and culture, especially amongst curriculum designers and most supervisors and

teachers, are less informed and not well-versed in scientific research. When, for instance, they discuss important issues like teaching English to first graders, or relationship between relevant context and foreign language acquisition, they rarely connect to language literature or scientific findings of research. Lets consider once again some of their expressions: "we are protected enough", "our value system is strong enough", "global English does not threaten us", according to these expressed viewpoints, there is no need to take further steps or develop any plans to face global English.

Consequently, this means that when Palestinians develop their own national English curriculum, global English does not necessitate any specific considerations to be taken by curriculum designers or other responsible professionals in the field of education. Listening to curriculum designers' discussions about global English leaves one with the impression that we are fine and face no threats, and somehow it is immature and exaggerated to elevate such worries about global English.

The few supervisors and teachers who think differently and believe that global English can severely threaten their national language and culture, stop short from asking for the development of the local English curriculum in a different way so that it promotes national and cultural identity among students. Instead, they expected other subjects in the local curriculum, such as, the Arabic language and the history to perform this role. Although students do clearly criticize superficiality of the cultural content inside the English language curriculum, still they continue to think that the Arabic language and history, other than English, are the subjects that should be dedicated to national and cultural education. In their minds, it is difficult to connect a foreign language with a national education and native culture of the learners.

IV. Marginalization of National Education and Cultural Alienation

A study investigating, among other things, the role the new Palestinian curriculum in teaching about national values, has found that the curriculum in general is not devoted to focus on the national and Islamic dimensions of the Palestinian learners' identity. The study also found that supervisors, more than school principles and more than teachers have stood to defend the curriculum's loyalty to these values (Sabri, 2003, p.26-27).

The other observation in Sabri's (2003) study, that can shed more light on the conclusion regarding the issues of "cultural alienation" which has been revealed in the current study, is the direct written objective of the "English for Palestine" curriculum, which is concisely articulated as: "to raise positive awareness towards the foreign culture" (p.8). Accordingly, to develop an English curriculum which does not integrate national culture and which purposively works to change learners' attitudes to be more positive towards the culture of the hegemonic, imperial and capitalist powers of U.S.A and U.K can undoubtedly produce learners who are not only culturally alienated, but also learners with internalized "false consciousness" particularly about the foreign and hegemonic culture of U.S.A and U.K.

To further clarify this point, I have observed through the different interviews that most research participants including students were never able to start one single sentence about what kind of national culture they learn through the English language curriculum, without ending this sentence with what they also have learned or should

learn about foreign cultures as well. There is a wide range of sentences that resemble this point: "the text which addresses our Arab culture is good, but let us also learn about other foreign cultures", " I want the English curriculum to teach me language not culture or at least to teach me about both Arab and foreign cultures", and " I think from its' name "English" has to teach us about other cultures not only about our own culture". Examining such expressions leads to the realization that speakers expect the English curriculum to teach them about foreign cultures more than about their own national culture. Aside from the emphasis on what culture should be more conveyed through the English curriculum, I have also noticed that speakers feel indifference when they talk about their own national culture and about other foreign cultures. The value they attached to both cultures sounds the same.

If the curriculum, as made clear in the above explained objective, continues to put the emphasis on fulfilling unrealistic fascination with the foreign culture on the expense of the learners' national culture, as the curriculum's objective would be achieved with time, the sameness our learners feel currently about their own and foreign cultures should be expected to grow in the future into more fascination with the foreign culture and more ignorance of learners' national culture. In addition, this situation, by which national language and culture is being undervalued inside our English curriculum, would lead learners to misperceive ideas such as "cross-cultural", "international", "foreign cultures", "global", and "others" as something which is achieved on expenses of their own national education.

Cultural alienation is also reflected in the difficulty participants face to refer to major cultural elements or key components in their own culture. Except for a few participants, who refer to “Islam” as a major component in their own culture, the rest of the participants were hardly able to classify some historical names and places as symbols for national culture. They have, for instance, named some of the Palestinian cities which were occupied in 1967, some historical ruins in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, or names of some national characters such as the poet Mahmood Darwish.

Scholars who discussed the structure of the Arab culture, Khairy (2006) is an example, have named at least four key components in this culture which include: Arabic language, Islamic religion, national traditions and customs, and other sub-cultures such as the Kurdish sub-culture. In general, readers can find other broader definitions of the concept "culture" such as the one by Johnson & Christensen (2000, p.321): "A system of shared beliefs, values, practices, perspectives, folk knowledge, language, norms and rituals that members of a group use in understanding their world and their relating to other cultures". However, the participants in the current research were hardly able to name cultural components, such as, “national language”, “values”, “perspective”, “folk knowledge”, “ritual” or any other clear cultural element that they consider as cultural component and try to protect it against English language cultural hegemony. However, participants were talking generally about their fears from western values that might threaten their own traditions without providing specific example to such threats. They were referring to western values, indirectly, as “immoral”, in comparison with their “moral” values. Without being able to discuss it directly, in between the lines of the participants’ expressions, the observer can understand their fears specifically from the

threat of the western open sexual relationships. For example, they have expressed their fears of western values invasion through their talking about satellite channels, foreign films with naked actors, kisses, and sexual relationships. The following statement by one of the students from the UNRWA schools may clarify the point: "Western societies differ from our Arab societies, why do we need to learn their moral values; our singers have already started to imitate their naked style in singing".

The value system is very important component in the structure of the any culture. For example, the researcher Jasor (1998) has concluded that all scholars who have tackled the subject of culture have identified four main elements in any culture, one of which is the value system. Furthermore, the conflict between the Arab and western value systems which has been expressed by the previous speaker constitutes a real conflict which is repeatedly discussed among Arab speakers.

It might be safely concluded, based on the previous analysis, that the English language curriculum has a vague contribution, through its' cultural content, to teaching Palestinian students about the different components of their cultural identity. Thus, I conclude, it becomes harder for learners to speak about or criticize their own culture when, I would risk calling it, "unknown object" to them. In this case, I expect cultural hegemony that is assumed to accompany global English to become also a trend that is harder to resist. The task of the global powers that attempt to destroy the Arab cultural and national identity and to fragment it into smaller ethnic, religious and tribal sub-identities becomes easier. In addition, participants' fascinations with easiness, cuteness and attractiveness of English language and of the American accent in particular, can even make the situation further vulnerable and conducive to cultural hegemony.

Based on the above picture, a strong indication of cultural alienation has been observed among the various groups of research participants. The concept of "cultural alienation" in Khairy's (2006) view, accounts for giving up one's right in criticizing and developing his or her own culture to some other agent. Participants' mixed perceptions about global English hegemony and its' impact on their national and cultural identity can not help them to avoid "cultural alienation". An alienated person is characterized by random behavior and thinking and has little, if any, connection to and control over the outcomes of his or her behavior (Friere, 1970). The culturally alienated and oppressed people live in the world rather than make and interpret the world.

Compatible with that, the research results have showed that those participants, whether teachers or students, have given up their right to ask questions, to criticize or to raise comments against the cultural content of the English curriculum. It is noteworthy, that language education which is relevant to learners' culture and environment is expected not only to encourage learners' and teachers' motivation to engage in and criticize, but also to open up the possibilities for change. For instance, Tomlinson (2006, p.143) stated that "students and teachers are especially willing to accommodate change if the new approaches mirror features in their social culture". The adopted internal policies and procedures of the Palestinian Ministry of Education do not encourage the teaching staff and students' aptitude to criticize and intellectually engage with the curriculum content. On the contrary, teachers and students are expected to teach and learn, or simply transfer to one another, the knowledge which has been defined for them by others in authority. This result was clear in the different quotations that we analyzed and

documented. Teachers were allowed only to observe and share their opinion about grammar and spelling mistakes, but not to comment on the cultural content of the curriculum. It was also evident in the results that students are not motivated, neither internally nor externally, to ask questions or to raise issues concerning the cultural content of the English language curriculum. Students end up believing that nobody will listen to their questions or comments. They believed that their teachers, even if they listen to them, have no authority to change the content and therefore they gave up.

Thus, the attempt of the U.S.A educational institutions to export to us a teaching approach, such as the communicative approach, which was basically developed to encourage student-centered and active learning educational environment (Hyme, 1972, 1974, Savignon, 1991, Savignon, 2005), while politically conspire with Israel and support its controlling of the development of Palestinian education is paradoxical and makes little sense beyond imposing hegemony on every aspect of Palestinian lives. Curricular innovations within the framework of the communicative language teaching, as for instance, Savignon (2005) has clarified “is best advanced by the development of local materials”, (p.639). Thus, the situation of teaching with CLT in Palestine and within an imposed English language instruction seems ironically paradoxical. Such educational atmosphere, where the ability and right of teachers and students to question the cultural content of the English language curriculum are eradicated by the formal procedures of the educational institution, in addition to, the limited and vague knowledge the English curriculum teaches them about key cultural components, is expected to result in cultural alienation of both teachers and their students.

V. Cultural Alienation and Cultural Hegemony

Cultural alienation, I argue, lays the ground for cultural hegemony and practices of political and social control. Participants have expressed a deeply entrenched level of dependency on curriculum designers to protect them from global English and its' cultural hegemony. This hope among participants was articulated in many expressions such as: "We are not afraid of cultural invasion, because we have a national team of curriculum planners; this national team is dedicated to the national, regional, Arab, Islamic and international goals". On another level of discussion, research results, especially in the second theme have showed us that curriculum designers' analysis and understanding of English globalization did not consider seriously concepts such as hegemony, globalization, cultural invasion, or competition between weak local languages and strong international languages. Frankly speaking, I have concluded that curriculum designers are tranquil and serene more than they expected to be in regard to issues like global English hegemony.

Participants' reservations against cultural hegemony account only for very limited moral part of their cultural identity, which were often expressed in their general statements like: "our traditions are not like the western traditions". Cultural traditions are often perceived as static and predefined entities beyond the possibility of cultural change and development. Persons, myself included, who belong to the Arab-Islamic culture, can read between the participants' lines their fear from the western value system, their morals and specifically their open sexual relationships. As was mentioned before, participants, especially students, have expressed symptoms of existing cultural hegemony on this level.

Undoubtedly, the value system composes very central part in any cultural identity (Jasor, 1998). The value system can also become a very attractive target to the hegemonic powers because the moment they change people' value system, everything else will be susceptible to changes. However, I assert, that focusing exclusively on morals as the only sphere for cultural hegemony would leave other important aspects in the structure of the Arab national identity, such as, the rest of their political, economic, social characteristics vulnerable to cultural hegemony which is attached to global English. Clearly, cultural hegemony by western capitalist powers is not an ultimate objective by and in itself if not accompanied by economic domination and exploitation of the targeted nation and its natural resources.

Compatible with the Participants' concerns about morals and values, Freire's (1994, p.160) definition of the concept "cultural invasion" has re-emphasized the threats enclosed in the invaders' ideology including their value system. For him, cultural invasion entails that "the actors draw the thematic content of their action from their own values and ideology". The reference here is made to any cultural action which aims to serve hegemony and domination through treating people and their realities as objects. The intended critical education which relates to learners' culture and avoids "cultural alienation" and "cultural invasion" (Freire, 1994, McLaren 1994, Giroux 1997, Tomlinson 2006) should help to transform the existing dominant social structure, and to liberate learners through helping them to critically analyze and understand their reality. Freire (1994), for instance, has suggested substituting "cultural invasion" with another revolutionary existence of "cultural synthesis". In "cultural synthesis", the existing

hegemonic patterns of education can be alternated with a new liberating education “with no invaders, no top-down relationships, and no dealing with people as objects” (p.162).

VI. Absence of Collective Educational Vision for Teaching English in Palestine.

Vulnerability to cultural hegemony can be indirectly and unconsciously promoted through the absence of a collective educational vision of a nationally and culturally committed English curriculum, and through the existing of individualistic interpretations towards TEFL in Palestine. Research results indicate strong existence of un-informed individualistic interpretations, rather than, collective scientific and research- based understanding of TEFL different dimensions. Collective and scientific understanding of TEFL in Palestine, I suggest, can be gained through adoption of a notional plan and also through exposure to academic education which highlights teaching English as a foreign language within learners’ cultural context. At the moment, the basic requirements for teaching and supervising English in Palestinian schools include holding a B.A or an Educational Diploma in English language literature and grammar, in addition, to some teaching experience. The existing Educational Diploma and B.A programs in Palestine, do not usually elaborate on issues related to the core question of teaching and learning foreign languages, namely the cultural relevance of teaching foreign languages. This kind of questions can be more adequately handled on higher levels of language education programs, such as, the M.A. or Ph.D. in teaching foreign languages. I have observed through conducting the current research interviews that participants' knowledge about different sides of interactions between national language and culture in one hand, and

foreign language on the other, is strongly connected with their academic level in language education and the kind of educational programs they have enrolled in.

The few participants, who are holders of M.A degrees in teaching English as a foreign language, were more reflective on issues and questions like the meaning of English globalization, the relationship between first and foreign language, how is education being helped or hindered by the interaction of both languages, what does it mean to integrate learners' culture into foreign language education, and what does context mean in terms of teaching foreign language, as well as many other similar questions. They were also observed to be more knowledgeable and more reflective in the sense that their answers were closer to and consistent with the scientific interoperations provided by referred research on foreign language education. For example, their understanding and their criticism against "the communicative approach" as the teaching approach adopted by the English language curriculum are informed by recent writings on this approach.

Individualistic interpretations of English hegemony were also revealed in some contradictory views of participants in different sub-categories and within the same category as well. For instance, curriculum designers were contradicting themselves when they claimed at one point, that learners' national culture can be protected inside the English curriculum through opening the doors in front of content criticism. At the same time, participation of supervisors, teachers, students, parents and other local society activists has been restricted to its' narrowest limits, such as retracting teachers' and supervisors' participation to editing, and observing for grammatical mistakes. The curriculum planners may indeed believe that the margin they allow for punctuation and grammatical feedback from teachers and supervisors, all what is needed in the process of

developing an “English for Palestine” curriculum. This peculiar practice of allowing feedback from recipients of knowledge is also prevalent in the classroom itself where teachers allow the expression of their student’s opinion in a rigidly controlled fashion where the students are not allowed to question the authority of knowledge, (i.e., the teachers and the textbook). Contradictory beliefs in this research have been found to reflect individualistic rather than collective coherent decision. It could be true also that the observed contradictions stem from the influence of other factors which are exterior to the curriculum itself. For instance, the whole authoritative political system can stand behind some or most of these contradictions. The central role that politics plays in language policy and planning (Baldauf, 2005) is widely recognized.

Individualism was also clear in the participants' talking about what they are doing and what they should do as individuals, rather than as an educational institution, facing larger socio–linguistic questions such as global English implications. I have noticed that different participants, supervisors, teachers or students believe deeply in their own individualistic strength and internal resistance to face consequences of global English, globalization or cultural hegemony. When they were asked about what should be done to protect teachers' and learners' cultural identity, their answers never arrived at a point where they think of a national plans, curriculum designers' responsibilities, educational policies or the Ministry’s of Education role. Rather than tackling the issue on the collective level, they were talking about their own faith, their individualistic commitment, and their internal strengths which can help them not to be influenced by foreign culture invasion. I have documented many statements that sound like this one: "we don't fear English language domination, if learners are mindful, they can choose positive and useful things

from the cultural content that they exposed to". Responding to questions about what should be done, the participants were observed to talk about not even the teachers, the supervisors, the learners, as a group, but rather, about the role of everyone as an individual. Based on this observation, I have sensed tendency to personalize responses to educational problems, and therefore, to personalize responsibility to find solutions. Again, it is the individual student and his or her personal strengths that account for resisting cultural hegemony rather than the collective system of Palestinian education and society at large.

The above argument is not intended to minimize the role of individuals facing language domination and cultural hegemony and to deem it less important. However, to personalize and individualize responses to political and socio-linguistic problems, such as, global English hegemony may reflect the existing un-collective, un-participatory and elitist language planning process in the Palestinian educational context. This tendency to individualize responsibility can hardly help to vision the multi-dimensional effects of the phenomenon on the national level. It does not help to think of who is responsible in the first place, or to think of a national plan to overcome the problem. It does not sound logical, for example, to exclude individuals' cultural choices through limiting their participation, to present them with a pre-planned cultural content, and then to ask them to bear the responsibility for cultural identity protection.

Individualistic and less representative actions are enhanced through limiting the participation in the process of English curriculum development. Exclusion from the curriculum planning process was not only limited to English language experts, like supervisors and teachers. However, local society's participation was also denied

according to responses expressed by research participants. Curriculum development experts, such as, Sa'adi and Ibrahim (2004), have suggested that the process of curriculum development should be characterized as participatory and cooperative process between different organizations, educationalists and activists from school and society. According to this inclusive and participatory perspective, there should be at least two main levels of decision making in any process of curriculum development. The first level determines general educational polices and regulations. The second level determines curriculum implementation planning. The authors suggest also that educationalists can not exclude participation of local society organizations, groups and individuals in the first level of decision making. The level of general educational policies and regulations entail finding solutions to different social and educational problems, which affect local society's national interests, and thus, require their fully involvement.

Participants' responses regarding participation in the curriculum development procedures indicate strong centralization of the process. Exclusion of even teachers and supervisors from the process of curriculum development also indicates weak attempts toward local society involvement. Highly centralized educational process is expected to be more vulnerable to foreign language and cultural hegemony, mainly because the elitists who control the whole process of curriculum development can be more willing than ordinary and poor teachers and students to compromise national interests (Samara, 1988, 2003, Harb, 1998). At best, they can be characterized as cooped intellectual elite who are restricted by political agreements and arrangements that are not in the best interest of the society for whom they are developing an educational curriculum.

Highly centralized processes of curriculum planning typify education not only in Arab and third world countries, but also in other western countries, such as France. Education in France and since the middle Ages was a first responsibility of the government and the minister of education (see The'venon, E. (2004) www.unesco.org/education/efa). Clark (1967, p.2) has provided strong evidences for the highly centralized educational system in France, indicating that: "the minister of education in Paris was able to post that he could at any particular moment know what every pupil in France was doing". French students and teachers organizations have started early to demonstrate against the highly centralized system and to call for de-centralization of education.

Highly centralized systems of education have faced mounting criticism even inside advanced communities, such as France. Centralization of education, I would emphasize, especially in occupied countries like Palestine is damaging to national interests because it places education as an instrumental element of national liberation in the hands of an elitist group who historically proved to be more ready to scarify national interests for the sake of their own personal and class interests. Unsettled and underdeveloped countries suffer more from foreign intervention in their internal affairs, as they are also subjected to conditional foreign fund which lays the ground for further imposition and intervention. For instance, the Palestinian curriculum was originally developed in accordance with a political agreement known as "Oslo Accords" which has been signed between the leadership of the P.L.O. and Israel. It is widely known that this agreement, and whatever development evolve from it, has been viewed by many radical politicians and writers, both Arabs and non Arabs, to be in favor of Israel and on the

expenses of Palestinian people's national interests. To give an example, Brown (2001) in his analysis of the foreign competition over the Palestinian curriculum has stated that the Palestinian curriculum is unable to discuss important national issues such as the right of return for Palestinian refugees, settlements, camps, and military checkpoints.

Once again, the point made here is to clarify that the Palestinian process of curriculum development in general is highly centralized, but not in the same meaning as in France or other independent powerful countries. In our case, the Palestinian Authority does not have full authority to control the whole educational process, local society and popular participation is restricted, while it is kept open to the Israeli government and other world powers, such as, U.S.A to impose their agendas and reservations on the Palestinian curriculum. This situation might explain why some research participants; observe the English curriculum as to superficially relate to their real life and problems. It might also explain the weak contribution of the curriculum in national and cultural identity promotion among the students.

At this point, it is important to provide some evidence that the English language curriculum is not the only curriculum which is superficially relevant to students' reality. In addition to Brown's (2001) previous conclusion, other analytical studies on the Palestinian curriculum have arrived to similar outcomes. For example, Sabri (2003), in her assessment study of the Palestinian curriculum, has found that the social sciences curriculum is not relevant to the Palestinian society. Thus, the only meaning by which the process is made highly centralized in Palestine is through restriction of public participation. For this reason, I observe that the curriculum is produced with fragile relevancy to local context. In this sense, highly centralized educational process within the

Palestinian society can make the situation more vulnerable to cultural invasion and hegemony. In addition to high centralization of the Palestinian curriculum, individualistic actions and interpretations were observed to mark the English language curriculum and consequently increase chances for cultural alienations, cultural hegemony and global language hegemony. The research results have also showed other indications which might lead to the same cultural consequences. For example, the participants' feelings of first language and culture as inferior to English, spread of Arabic language cross-breeding with English, and the evidence of local agents who encourage first language hybridity, can further spread global English and culture hegemony within the Palestinian educational context.

Adding to that, the process of developing the new English for Palestine within discrete stages did not help much in providing the English language experts, supervisors, teachers and even students with holistic connected picture that can be clearly viewed, analyzed, and criticized. The first syllabus of grade one and six of the new “English for Palestine” curriculum were started to be developed by the beginning of 1996, then they continued to develop curriculum for some grades and skipping others. Until the time of conducting this research project, the eighth and the ninth graders were still studying in the Jordanian English PETRA. The Ministry of Education has planned to finish the development of the whole English curriculum to all grades by the school year 2008, and so, teachers and students have to wait for the new curriculum. The already developed parts were issued as trial version to be re-printed after three years of teaching and collecting comments on them. Eleven years have passed since the first trial edition, and the interviewees have assured that none of the versions has been changed to this date. It

was also noticeable that none of the interviewees was able to provide an explanation behind production the English curriculum in disconnected stages.

Regardless of the stated or unstated rationale behind this process of curriculum development, the un-connected process has increased participants' confusion concerning the strategic goals of teaching English in Palestine. They were hardly able to evaluate the discrete parts of the English curriculum. Moreover, the curriculum has a strange mixture, within the same pages, between the British English and the American English. Teachers and supervisors were not able to even understand the reason behind this mixture. This point was discussed in details in the data analysis chapter. Here, I would like to clarify that different circumstances and issues interact and pose questions about the philosophy, processes, teaching approaches, and objectives behind teaching English in Palestine. Vagueness and lack of clarity are still surrounding many details, and thus English teachers, supervisors and students, were left with many unanswered questions regarding English curriculum and the teaching and learning processes. The educational justifications behind introducing English to first graders were not fully discussed with English language supervisors and teachers. In this regard, teachers and supervisors would be satisfied if curriculum designers and other professionals understand the logic behind such a practice and provide some explanation to these issues. In Khairy's (2006) description, this problem would be classified as another symptom of cultural alienation experienced by English language experts in Palestine. To different degrees teachers, supervisors and students have been deprived from their right to receive accurate, scientific and educational explanations about important issues of teaching English as a foreign language in Palestine. They, in turn, have surrendered to the belief that it is

enough if curriculum designers and other officials in higher positions know what they are doing.

Finally, I would like to conclude by summarizing the discussion through pinpointing major deficiencies which have been observed to characterize the whole process of teaching and learning English as a foreign language and which, accordingly, might help to increase global English and cultural hegemony inside the Palestinian educational context. The shortcomings include lack of national critical vision and framework by which English language learners and teachers can understand the very deep philosophy, objectives and intended national interests behind teaching and learning English in Palestine. Participation and involvement of teachers, supervisors, students, parents and other local community activists in the different levels of curriculum development is limited. The newly adapted “communicative approach” as the main teaching approach in the new “English for Palestine” is not fully explained to its’ users. Perceptions of different social, economic, political, cultural, and ethical consequences of global English hegemony over first language and national culture are mixed and confused. Except for students and few teachers and supervisors, the rest of the participants, including curriculum designers, have denied possible negative impacts of global English hegemony over first language and national culture. In addition to the previous shortcomings, the observed individualistic interpretations and authoritative behavior can severely lead to cultural alienation and encourage readiness and speediness to internalize cultural hegemony

It is worth asserting once again that the whole field of teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) has witnessed, since the beginning of 1990s,

massive shift towards fighting against systems of “banking education”, empowering learners through equipping them with critical thinking which can lead them to be politically, economically and socially empowered. Education in foreign language encourages directions into helping learners to re-create the world through involvement in social movements and enable them to take control over their lives (Brown, 1990).

The field of teaching English as foreign language, more importantly, has witnessed more intensive focus on socio-political issues. Sociopolitical dimensions of English language should consider interaction between local social and cultural aspect and the foreign language. Globalization of English has been observed to impose new changes on curriculum design and classroom activities. It has also increased the need to value and respect native cultures and languages inside English classrooms. The communicative teaching approach should help to question opportunities through which students can utilize language learning to accomplish their own individual and national interests and needs (Hyme, 1972, 1974; Savignon, 2005, Canagarajah, 2005; Sovova, 2006).

In order to defy global English hegemony, “English for Palestine” curriculum needs to re-teach the language as a tool for resistance, and not a tool for American hegemony. In order to do so, it might be more realistic and more helping if, through the English language, we teach our learners about the real challenges and difficulties which face their society development and their future. Giroux (2000) has concluded that when we teach people truly about who they are and what is their real history, we liberate them; the idea of liberation and freedom that can come from being strongly and truly educated.

VII. Conclusion and Recommendations

To face global English and cultural hegemony, the whole framework of teaching English as a foreign language in Palestine requires to be re-evaluated from a deeper, committed and more participatory national perspective. Evaluation should profoundly and thoughtfully consider questions about philosophy, national objectives and interests, and relationship with first language and native culture. Also, the framework needs to be fully explained to English language supervisors, teachers and students. Despite the fact that inside official documents, English is intended to be taught as a foreign language in Palestine, but in reality, there is a vast confusion with teaching English as a second language, and more extremely, as a first language in some private schools. This confusion has been reflected in experts' attitudes and the educational load which has been given to the foreign language on the expense of the students' first language. Thus, we need to re-define the limits of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in Palestine, and to make clear, for language experts, distinction between the different directions of EFL and ESL, for example, in terms of national objectives and teaching policies.

There is no need to re-emphasize the fact that within the framework of learning and teaching foreign languages, questions that relate to national and cultural identity become even more critical, especially if the target language is global and dominant language as English. Commitment to national language and culture, which has been weakened under global English hegemony, need to be re-improved through developing more promising curriculum of "English for Palestine". Promising curriculum can be achieved by deeply re-thinking the space and content that are specified to connect foreign language with learners' national and cultural identity. Critical and intellectual

revolutionary voices of students and some other committed teachers and supervisors that are silenced through policies of ignorance and exclusion needed to be heard and considered again.

This research has posed, in addition to the results discussed throughout, another number of important questions with close relevance to issues of relationship between global English, national culture and learners' social context. Within the limitation of the current study, it was very difficult to find answers for these questions. However, I think that conducting further research about them is fundamental to carry on where the current study has left. Furthermore, because qualitative research, such as this one, uses mostly purposive sample, using qualitative and quantitative tools in future research, might reveal other interesting issues. Thus, I recommend future research, both qualitative and quantitative, to explore mainly the following issues:

First, research should explore the attentiveness of English language experts, particularly teachers and supervisors, in regard to relationship between foreign language and national culture, and particularly, their knowledge and awareness about teaching foreign languages within the learners' social and political context.

Second, the results of the current study revealed lack of commitment to Arabic as a national language. Muslim students, for example, value Arabic as the language of Qur'an and Islam, which is a very important component in their identity. However, the question remains, what if Arabic is not the language of religion? Do they still have reasons to re-engage with it, and how do they perceive it? Also what about other Christian students, do they belong to Arabic as their national language regardless of other sub-identities? Reflection on this issue would be very important in terms of measuring

Arabic language strengths, as national language in facing English language hegemony. It could also figure out the impact of the national language within the structure of the whole national identity.

Third, in addition to English language curriculum, what is the role of the rest of the disciplines? Do they focus on teaching about key components in the Arab national and cultural identity? The results of the current study have showed that students can hardly refer to specific key components in their national and cultural identity. It also concluded that the "English for Palestine" contributes superficially to teaching about students' cultural and national identity.

Fourth, in the introduction of this study, I have referred to a pilot study (using content analysis of grades ten and eleven English curriculum), which I had conducted with a purpose to comprehend indications of national and cultural identity inside the mentioned textbook. The pilot study has led me to conducting the current study. However, another research which continues in the same direction of the pilot study by analyzing the content of the rest of the English textbooks would complete my attempt in the current study, and give more detailed picture on the issue.

Finally, although the current study has shed some light on the role of the whole Palestinian political system in producing the current English curriculum, by referring to political factors, such as, OSLO agreement, the highly centralized, un-participatory educational processes, written documents and pre-planned curriculum, but it was beyond the scope of this study to examine the impact of the whole formal political system (i.e. the PNA and the Palestinian ministry of education policies and procedures) on the

production of English curriculum. The current study started from the level of curriculum designers and moved down to English language supervisors, teachers and students, but with full awareness that the present English curriculum is an outcome of the existing political system represented in the overall structure of the PNA. A study which investigates the curriculum within this broader political and social context is strongly recommended.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aljarbawi, A. (1986). *Palestinian university between reality and expectations: analytical critical study* (in Arabic). Jerusalem: Arab Studies Society.
- Alptekin, C. (1993). Target language culture in EFL materials. *ELT Journal*, 42(2), 136-143.
- Anderson, F. (1982). Why should American education be globalized? It's a nonsensical question. *Theory into practice*, 21(3), 155-161.
- Bates, R. (1975). Gramsci and the theory of hegemony. *Journal of the history of ideas*, 36(2), 351 -366.
- Baldauf, R. (2005). *Planning and policy Research: an overview*. In E. Hinkel. research in second language teaching and learning London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: a context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 278- 287.
- Bisan Center (2002). *Role of NGOs in building civil society* (in Arabic). Rammlah: Bisan Center.
- Block, D., & Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and language teaching*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Brown, D. (1990). TESOL at twenty –five: what are the issue?. *TESOL Qtr*, 10(25)16-31.
- Brown, J. (2001). *Democracy, history and the contest over the Palestinian curriculum*: prepared for Adam institute.
- Canagarajah, S. (2005). Dilemmas in planning English: vernacular relations in post – colonial countries. *Journal of Sociolinguistic*, 9(3), 418 – 447.
- Clark, M. (1967). *Teachers and politics in France*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University press.
- Crystal, D. (2002). *English as global language*. U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- DeYoung (1999) www.historyofarabiclanguage.com
- Eid, I. (2001). Arab cultural identity in changeable world (in Arabic) . *Altofolah wa al tanmeyah* 3(1),109-125.

- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Flavell, H. (1985). *Cognitive development (2nd)*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc
- Freire, P. (1970), *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.. Reprinted in 1994.
- Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: theory, culture and schooling*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Glaser, G. & Straus, L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyer.
- Guest, M.(2002). A critical checkbook for culture teaching and learning. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 154 -161.
- Hadley, S. (1999). Innovative curricula in tertiary ELT: A Japanese case study. *ELT journal* 53(2), 92-96
- Harb, A. (1998). Elitists' illusions or critique of the intellect (in Arabic). Lebanon: Arab cultural center.
- Haneline, D. (2001). A comment on reading whiteness in English studies. *College English*, 63(5),669 -670.
- Harris. et al.(2002). *Globalization, Diaspora and language education in England*. In D. Block, D. Cameron. *Globalization and language teaching*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundation of sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania,.
- Jasor (1998.) *Arab nation and the fragmentation projects* (in Arabic). Jordan: Alahleya llinasher wa atawzee',
- Jawdat, S., & Abed Alla, I. (2004). *Modern school curriculum* (in Arabic). Jordan: Dar alfeker llinasher wa atawzee'.
- Jay, P.(2001). Beyond discipline? Globalization and the future of English. *Globalizing Literary Studies* 116 (1), 34-47.
- Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Judy, A.(1999). Some notes on the status of global English in Tunisia. *Boundary 2*, 26(2), 3 – 44.

Kheiry, H. (2005). *Cultural alienation of Arabs* (in Arabic). Cairo: Dar Al'alam Althaleth.

Kushner, E. (2003). English as Global Language: problems, dangers, opportunities. *Diogenes* 50(2), 17-23.

Mchlaren, P.(1994). *Life in schools: an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Los Angeles: University of California.

Othamn, A., Al Asaad, A., & others. (n.d), *Educational Curriculum under occupation: documentary study* (in Arabic). Dar Al kateb.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3ed). U.S.A: Sage publication, Inc.

Sabbaq, Z. (2005). Crossbreeding of Arabic Language (in Arabic). *Heritage and community* (42),27-45.

Sabri, K. (2003) *Assessment of modern curriculum in Palestine* (in Arabic). Ramallah:Muntada Abhath Alceyassat Alejtame'yeh wa aleqtesadieh.

Samarh, A. (2003). *Non- governmental organizations or bases for the other* (in Arabic). Ramallah:Markez Almashrek Alamel.

Samarah, A. (2003). *Intellectuals in the service of the other* (in Arabic). Ramallah: Markez Almashrek Alamel.

Savignon, J. (1983). *Communicative competence: theory and classroom practice*. Addison-Wesley: Reading , MA .

Savignon, J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of art. *TESOL Qtr.* 25(2), 261-277

Savignon, J. (2005). *Communicative language teaching: Strategies and goals*. In E, Hinkel. *Research in second language teaching and learning* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sovova, L. (2006). *A local approach to global English: A Bulgarian EFL model based on international children's culture..* In M, McCloskey, J, Orr & M, Dolitsky. *Teaching English as a foreign language in primary schools*. U.S.A: *TESOL Qtr.*

Sinh, H. (2006). *Is grade 3 too early to teach EFL in Vietnam. Teaching English as a foreign language in primary schools*. In M, McCloskey, J, Orr & M, Dolitsky. Teaching English as a foreign language in primary schools. U.S.A: *TESOL Qtr*

Tomlinson (2006). *English as a foreign language: matching procedures to the context of learning*. In M, McCloskey, J, Orr & M, Dolitsky. Teaching English as a foreign language in primary schools. U.S.A: *TESOL Qtr*

Tan, M.(2005). Authentic language or language errors? Lessons from a learner corpus. *ELT Journal*, 59(2), 126 -134.

The'venon, E. (2004). The French school outside France,,: published in Arabic in *Label France*. [http: www.unesco.org/education/efa](http://www.unesco.org/education/efa).

Wallace, C.(2002). Local literacies and global literacies. In D. Block, D. Cameron). *Globalization and language teaching*. New York: Routledge Press.

Wester, F., & Maso, I.(1996). *The deliberate dialogue: qualitative perspectives on the interviews*. New York.: VUB Press.

William, P.(1997). *Cognitive and ethical growth: the making of meaning*. London: Garland Publishing, ING.

APPENDIX A

THE PILOT STUDY QUESTIONS

- 1) Could you please introduce yourself, what is your job and your educational background?
- 2) Did you face any problem with teaching and learning the English language, what kind of problem, could you share it with us?
- 3) From your educational experience and in your intensive daily interaction with the educational materials, do you think that English is a dominant language in the Palestinian educational context (for example: in the teaching approaches, methodologies, space, size, and content of our educational system) or does it occupy only the same space as the original and other world languages?
- 4) Do you expect any existing or potential conflict between English as a dominant world language and Arabic as vernacular local language?
 - 5) In which domains in the Palestinian context do you notice English language dominance more?
- 6) Is there any relationship between language, culture and identity in one side, and global English on the other?
- 7) Do you think that global English threatens in any way our national language and cultural identity?

APPENDIX B

ADVANCED QUESTIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

Personal Information

- 1) Could you please introduce yourself, your name?
- 2) Gender
- 3) Place of residency, city, village, camp?
- 4) In which school do you teach? Governmental, private, UNRWA?
- 5) What is your educational background, academic certificates?
- 6) What is your job description? Curriculum designer, supervisor, teacher, student, other (please specify)
- 7) Which classes do you teach, supervise, or design curriculum, if you are student, in which class are you?
- 8) Which aspects of the English language do you teach? (i.e. literature, grammar, methods... etc)

Conception of language globalization and hegemony

- 9) What does language hegemony means to you?
- 10) Do you think that English is a global or dominant language? Why? What are the reasons?
- 11) What does concepts such as global English means to you?
- 12) Are you involved in developing the English language curriculum? How? if not, Why?
- 13) Why do we need to teach and learn English in Palestine? Do you personally have any private or personal objectives, interests behind teaching or learning English?
- 14) In which domains in the Palestinian context do you notice English language domination more? (For example: in education, in business, in the medical sector...etc?)
- 15) Which version of English do we teach and use more, the American, the British, the Australian or what? Why?

Relationship between culture and language

- 16) What does culture means to you?

17) Is there any relationship between culture and language? If yes, what can you say about this relationship?

18) Do you learn or teach culture through English language textbooks, lessons, activities? Which culture, give examples?

19) Does global English threaten in any way your cultural identity? *How?*

20) Based on your educational experience, which approach do you think more effective for language acquisition, to teach the English language through its own culture (for example through the American or British culture or through the local culture, the Arab Palestinian culture?). Why, can you give examples from your own experience?

21) Do you face difficulties in teaching or learning the English language? What kind of difficulties?

22) Did you attend any training sessions, discussions or received any instructional materials concerning the relationship between language and culture, when, where, from who, please specify?

23) Do you have a guide book which shows you how to teach the English language? Is there anything specific in this guide about language and culture? Specify?

24) Do you think that the cultural context can enhance students' achievement in the English language or not, can you elaborate on this question, give examples from your experience?

25) If you have the chance, do you ask to integrate local culture in teaching English language or not? Why or why not?

26) Is it theoretically and practically possible to integrate local Arab and Palestinian culture in the English language education?

27) Do you think that the new English for Palestine curriculum is closer culturally to the Palestinian students than the old versions of the Jordanian, Israeli or Egyptian English curriculum or not? How?

28) Do you think that the English curriculum empowers or restrains Palestinian students' national and cultural consciousness? How?

Table 1: Summery of Main Results and Themes

Theme	English Curriculum Designers	English Supervisors	English Teachers	Students
I. Mixed perceptions of global English hegemony over first language and culture	<p>Global English does not affect first language or national culture.</p> <p>Weak Arab countries can't resist global English consequences.</p> <p>First language still can compete with global English.</p> <p>Global English helps people of the world to communicate more effectively</p>	<p>Controversial opinions pro and against global English impact on L1 and national culture</p> <p>Defenders of global English have no clear vision on how does global English positively affect us.</p> <p>Teaching English to first grade is for pragmatic reasons, not English globalization</p> <p>Global English helps people of the world to communicate more effectively</p>	<p>Disagreement: Global English leads to marginalization of national culture & language.</p> <p>Global English does not affect native culture and language.</p> <p>Global language helps people of the world to communicate more effectively</p>	<p>Global English weakens national languages and cultures</p> <p>Global English helps people of the world to communicate together, but opportunities of communication are decreased as political conflicts increased.</p> <p>We need to create a global language which does not belong to one dominant country.</p> <p>While learning global languages people need to protect their own languages and cultures</p>
II. Global English as the legacy of U.K and U.S.A colonialism	<p>Pragmatic but not political reasons stand behind TEFL in Palestine.</p> <p>Teaching English to first grade is for pragmatic reasons, not English globalization</p>	<p>U.S.A. hegemony has led to English globalization</p> <p>Competition between U.S.A and Britain has played central role in English globalization</p>	<p>British and American economic Power is the main reason behind English domination.</p> <p>Palestinian curriculum is dominated by Britain & U.S.A</p>	<p>U.S.A. & Britain military, political, economic domination behind English globalization</p> <p>Arabs as mere consumers of western products.</p>

Global English hegemony and the question of culture in the Palestinian educational context

Raja' Majed Barghouthi

<p>III. Spread of English as the language of advanced science</p>	<p>English is the language of science, technology, modernity, computer, and the internet.</p>	<p>English is the language of science, technology, modernity, computer, and the internet.</p>	<p>English is the language of science, technology, modernity, computer, and the internet.</p>	<p>Technological and scientific advancement of U.S.A. and Britain led to global English</p> <p>Progression helps to create new set of language terminology</p>
<p>IV. Fascination of English as an attractive language.</p>	<p>English is easy language</p>	<p>English is easy and attractive language</p>	<p>English is the easiest, shortest, and more scientific language.</p>	<p>English is easier, more attractive and more interesting language</p>
<p>V. Successive occupations and other local agents promote English hegemony and Arabic hybridity</p>	<p>Language crossbreeding weakens L1.</p> <p>Social reasons stand behind first language crossbreeding</p> <p>First language crossbreeding is a widespread phenomenon in Palestine</p>	<p>Language crossbreeding weakens L1.</p> <p>Persons who hybrid first language feel higher than others.</p> <p>Private schools Local offices of Amid East, British council NGOs Universities encourage L1 crossbreeding and English domination</p> <p>First language crossbreeding is a widespread phenomenon in Palestine</p>	<p>Language crossbreeding weakens L1.</p> <p>Persons who hybrid first language feel better, higher, richer than others.</p> <p>First language hybridity indicates lack in L1 mastery</p> <p>Private schools Universities NGOs encourage L1 crossbreeding and English domination</p> <p>First language crossbreeding is a widespread phenomenon in Palestine</p>	<p>Language crossbreeding weakens L1.</p> <p>Persons who hybrid first language feel higher than the rest</p> <p>It indicates speaker's weakness in his or her first language.</p> <p>Foreign fund policy. NGO universities encourage L1 crossbreeding and English domination</p> <p>First language crossbreeding is a widespread negative phenomenon in Palestine.</p>

Global English hegemony and the question of culture in the Palestinian educational context

Raja' Majed Barghouthi

			Scientific concepts can be expressed more precisely in English	
				Code –Switching helps to practice English.
VI. Cultural hegemony and English curriculum relevance to learners' cultural and national identity	“English for Palestine” relates strongly to students' national and cultural identity.	Disagreement in opinions: "English for Palestine" relates to students' cultural and national identity vs. contradicts strongly with students cultural and national identity	Disagreement in opinions: “English for Palestine" relates strongly to students' national and cultural identity vs. relates superficially to students' national and cultural identity	The new "English for Palestine" relates superficially to students' national and cultural identity.
	It is cross-cultural curriculum.	It is cross-cultural curriculum.	It is cross-cultural curriculum.	It is cross-cultural curriculum.
	Curriculum design reflects wide and representative participation	Limited participation from supervisors	Total exclusion of teachers.	No idea about curriculum design members.
	English to first grade doesn't influence the child's national language	Controversial opinions on teaching English to first grade.		
	It is preferable to teach English within its' own real cultural context.	It is preferable to teach English within its' own real cultural context.	Relevancy to students' cultural context does not make big difference in teaching foreign languages.	Culturally relevant curriculum helps more in learning foreign languages.

Global English hegemony and the question of culture in the Palestinian educational context

Raja' Majed Barghouthi

	<p>The teaching approach in the new English curriculum is progressive and modern</p>	<p>The cultural content is satisfactory</p> <p>Controversial opinions in evaluating the teaching approach in the new English curriculum.</p> <p>Passing over some grades in English curriculum planning is problematic.</p> <p>Teaching politics through English language is not tolerated by majority. Only one view was sharply against this idea.</p> <p>It is overloaded and intensive curriculum</p> <p>Teachers can look for grammatical, knowledge or spelling mistakes</p>	<p>Comparing to the Jordanian English curriculum, teachers are satisfied with the cultural content in English for Palestine</p> <p>The teaching approach is, more participatory and involvement</p> <p>Passing over some grades in English curriculum planning creates real gap and difficulty in English teaching.</p> <p>Students are less critical to the cultural content in the new English curriculum.</p> <p>English curriculum is not political</p> <p>The curriculum is heavy and overloaded.</p> <p>Teachers' evaluation is limited to grammatical, spelling or knowledge mistakes.</p>	<p>Comparing to the Jordanian English curriculum, the students are satisfied with the cultural content in English for Palestine.</p> <p>The teaching approach required less focus on memorization, grammar and more on communication.</p> <p>Students' rarely comment on the cultural content in the new English curriculum</p> <p>English curriculum avoids mentioning political subjects.</p> <p>Very intensive, full of information and has no time for extra –curricular activities.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Global English hegemony and the question of culture in the Palestinian educational context

Raja' Majed Barghouthi

		<p>Promoting students' national and cultural identity is not a written direct objective of the English curriculum.</p> <p>Teachers need to know how to enrich curriculum and teach indirect messages</p>	<p>Teachers do not negotiate strategic or big aims behind teaching English in Palestine.</p> <p>No time left for further enrichment or elaboration</p>	<p>Students are eager to know about other foreign and international cultures</p> <p>English seems more important than Arabic.</p>
--	--	--	--	---