

Challenges and Opportunities in Using Local Online Materials for Education 3.0 Localized EFL Practices

Kamaludin Yusra

English Department, Mataram University
Mataram, NTB, Indonesia
kamaludin@unram.ac.id

Abstract—This paper explores online local cultural materials written in English that local teachers and students can use for Education 3.0 EFL learning. This paper firstly discusses the internet sources that local English teachers can use as resources for English learning materials. These materials can be in the form of cultural texts (e.g. legends, stories, recipes, etc) and cultural practices (e.g. ceremonies, games, etc). It then elaborates on the nature of these texts and practice as well as the challenges and the opportunities for using them in 'glocalised' EFL classes, which are 'global' in orientation but 'local' in pedagogic practices. These challenges and opportunities will also be seen from the perspectives of Education 3.0 where, firstly, learners actively make use of the online materials for their own independent learning and shared in the classroom for the learning of others, and, secondly, teachers facilitate students for intra- and inter-individual learning. The study focuses on materials from major cultural groups in Indonesia (i.e. Balinese, Banjarese, Buginese & Makassar, Javanese, Minang, Sundanese, Sasak, Samawa and Mbojo). Data were collected by downloading online materials and analysed using content analyses to identify the nature of texts and practices and to examine the nature of the challenges and the opportunities from both perspectives. The paper shows the nature of texts and practices, and the contents as well as the challenges and the opportunities in using the materials for localized Education3.0 English classes.

Keywords— EFL, text, practice, active learning, Education 3.0

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last ten years, Indonesia, as well as other ASEAN countries, is experiencing a paradigm shift in the management of English education. It has abandoned its traditional system where of teachers are the sole source of knowledge and skills and opted for a more constructivist approach to education where students are the creators, correctors and managers of their own learning. Although teachers still have to be in classes at particular time periods, their roles have shifted to facilitating the students with tasks and topics that are not only motivating to them but also relevant with their career orientation. Unlike the traditional classes where students become passive listeners learning only through listening to authoritarian teachers, the modern approach enables the students to totally participate in classes by engaging in face to face communication, and by sharing learning responsibilities.

At the same time, the way teachers view English has shifted from a single and Anglo-American variety to a multiple localized variety of English. According to Davies, Hamp-Lyons, and Kemp¹, (2003), various varieties of English

recently co-present as a result of socio-political vitality of the language and its speakers both in the colonial and the post-colonial era (Kubota, 2001). To Kachru (1992), the spread of English is concentrated in its traditional, inner circle territories (UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand), in the former British colonies referred to as the outer circle countries (Ghana, Bangladesh, India, Singapore and Malaysia) and in the countries where English use has expanded into social life resulting from rapid advancement in economy and technology of various countries such as Egypt, China, Israel, Japan, Rusia, Brazi, Korea, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, and Indonesia (see Kachru, 1992). The variety used in the inner circles provides norms of language and use for the outer and the expanding circles. In the outer circles, however, the use of English, which has been learnt formally at schools and used formally in governmental institutions, has shifted away from its exo-norms to those of the endo-norms associated with those of the inner circles (see Kachru, 1997). The expanding circles, likewise, has shifted away from foreign status into the exo-normative situations in which the local varieties of English has become more frequently used both in formal and informal settings. The younger speakers in both circles, as Higgins (2003) has convincingly noted, acquired these varieties endonormatively and they grow as native speakers of the varieties. Consequently, numerous varieties of English co-present in numerous communities of practice and in such situations the norms cannot possibly be based on the inner circle varieties alone. As Schneider (2007) has rightly argued, the norms used in each circle itself should be equally treated as acceptable norms of English.

Besides, in some non-English speaking countries, technology and economic growth has also brought about changes in the way English has been used. As Bruthiax (2002) has shown, in these countries like China, Brazil, Thailand, Maroko, and non-English speaking European union members the economy has grown to a level where internationally standardized education has become affordable and native-speaker teachers of English have been widely employed. Rather than being dependent upon the inner circle norms of English use, they can, to a certain extent, confidently develop their own norms and varieties of English. In this way, they can become members of the outer circle. In China, as Kirkpartick, (2007), has shown, English has become a lingua franca in business and with this status this variety of English can

increase from norm-dependent to norm-developing. In Japan, as Hino (2012) has revealed, English has been used in international communication as a means of representing Japanese values.

For a similarly increasing status, the speakers of English in the expanding circle countries have to take up the experience above as a model for promoting English learning (Rajagopalan, 2011). This could be the model for Indonesia and other EFL countries. Note, however, that the native-speaker variety of English cannot be the only acceptable norm of English usage. The increasing number of speakers and the intensity of contacts within and between the outer and the expanding circles have raised the status of their varieties of English to be recognized as essential varieties of English for international communication. With this in mind, as Kachru (1992), and Hamid (2014) have projected, these varieties should be essential repertoires of English. Consequently, the native-speaker ownership of English is mutually shared and, thus, non-inner circle norms are acceptable (Higgins, 2003; Kachru, 1997).

This view has brought about a pedagogical shift from conforming to the norms of the so-called native speakers and inner circle countries to those of the localized speakers of English. As a result, local teachers of English can acceptably make use local materials that they themselves or others have produced. As McKay (2002) has mentioned, as an international language, the learners and the users of it should make use of the norms of the countries in the outer and expanding circles and should not be dependent upon the norms of the inner circle. For effective international communication, the speakers and the learners of English from the outer and the expanding circles can make use of local identities, cultures and moral values for learning and, by the same token, the speakers of the inner circle should also learn such values. Additionally, the adoption of the local norms, following Kirkpatrick (2007a), can, on the one hand, escape the unwanted English-related values and, on the other, promote the local varieties within the struggle for recognition in the locality.

Other studies have also shown that the use of local norms and varieties has increased the quality of English that the students produced and the quality of education services provided by the teachers and the institution. Studies on ELT classroom talks in American contexts (see Au & Jordan, 1981; Erikson & Mohatt, 1981) have indicated that the use of local styles and patterns of interaction pedagogically adjusted to those in English can be effectively used in local ELT classes and such practices have increased not only the participation for the students in learning but also in the ability to communicate in English.

With the advancement of internet technology, such materials and practices can now readily available and their use has been widely encouraged. As Sinas and Lin's (2014) study has experimented, the use of internet reading materials has increased the students' motivation to learn English because the internet offers numerous materials and the students are self-motivated to have access to the materials of their own choice and interests. This study has also shown that the intensive use

of internet materials has increased the students' reading performance. Molchanova (2015) has similarly shown that the use of internet materials for extensive listening activities has increased learning motivation up to 85%. Other studies (see Shyamlee & Phil, 2012; Aydin, 2007) have shown that while using the internet the teachers and the students might face challenges, they can gain the following benefits: it can provide contexts for learning, expand students' interest, maximize teacher-student interaction, increase the impact of learning, and create flexibility in course contents. These studies have encouraged students, teachers, parents, and education managers to maintain the use of internet materials as the main sources of English language learning.

While the use of internet materials is not at all new in English language learning, it is, however, quite challenging in some contexts. In Indonesian contexts, it is true that internet access is no longer an issue as schools, urban or rural, are provided with internet access. But, there is no one can guarantee that the materials therein are available and appropriate to classroom needs. With the current development of the technology, internet, as an intelligent web, has opened up the promises for free and open resources for flexible learning activities enabling wired teacher and learners to remotely work together at their own time and space (see Alison and Kendrick, 2012), but such resources need to be provided and uploaded by expert users of English before the learners of English can have access to them.

With respect to the global cultures of English speakers for international students of English, such materials might be abundant. But, with respect to Indonesian and local cultures for Indonesian and local students of English, it is still unclear whether such materials are available or not. This is the merit of this paper as it investigates the internet sources, the materials, and the teaching procedures that the teachers and the students use as well as the challenges and opportunities that they encounter.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As the paper discusses challenges and opportunities facing local students and teachers in using local online materials in local English classrooms and how these practices enable them to endeavor into Education 3.0 principles, the notions of World Englishes, online materials and Education 3.0 need careful scrutiny.

A. *World Englishes*

The term "World Englishes", according to Davis, Hamp-Lyons, and Kemp (2003), has been used to refer to the numerous varieties of English contemporarily in use due to, following Kubota (2001), the wide spread of English in the colonial era and in the post-colonial technological advancement and economic growth. It is currently associated with three stratified uses of English (Kachru, 1992, p.356): the inner circle, the outer circle and the expanding circle.

The Inner Circle refers to the traditional territories of English (i.e. UK, USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) where English is spoken as the first language. The inner circle speakers traditionally lived in the United Kingdom (i.e.

England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland) and during the colonial time they massively migrated to USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Transmitting them from generation to generation, they maintain the language and the cultures endo-normatively and their norms of language and language use have been used as standard norms for English education and planning in other areas (Bruthiaux, 2002; Kachru, 1992).

The Outer Circle has been identified as the territories known as British colonies where English has been learned as a second language and used as a means of communication in government institutions. Countries such as India, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Ghana, and Singapore fall into this category (Jenkins, 2005) and people here learned the language formally at schools, used it formally in offices, but added with some local innovations. Used over time from generations to generations, these institutionalised varieties of English develop their own norms which are exo-normative to the inner circle norms. With rapid advancement in international transportation, communication, and business, the norms have gradually shifted away from the traditional exonormative to native-speaker endonormative (see Kachru, 1997). Younger generations of speakers in the outer circle countries acquired these varieties endonormatively and, thus, using them as native speakers of the English varieties (see Higgins, 2003). As argued above, these varieties of English can rightly contribute endo-normative norms of English as an international language (see Schneider, 2007).

The Expanding Circle is concerned with the use of English as a means of science, technology, and business communication in countries with rapid technological advancement and economic growth. As Kachru (1992) has mentioned, in countries like China, Egypt, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Brazil, Italy and other European nations, English has been learned as an EFL and used as performance varieties with linguistic and cultural norms exo-normative from that of both the inner and the outer circles (Bruthiaux, 2002; Kachru, 1992).

With the economic growth and technological advancement, the expanding countries, however, can have access to native-speaker teachers of English or trained their teachers to near native-like competence in English. Bruthiaux (2002), for example, has argued that some countries with remarkable economic development have reached the points where contact with inner and outer speakers of English has been intensified that the communicative capacity of the extending speakers is close to that of the outer speakers. Thus, instead of being 'norm dependent' the extended speakers can reach the level of norm developing and their norms have significantly contributed to the international norms of English. In China, Japan, and non-English speaking European countries, for example, the local varieties of English have been used as business lingua franca in business and the speakers' capacity, as Kirkpatrick (2007) has shown, is close to that of the outer speakers. As the use of localized varieties of English has been institutionalized in science, technology and business encounters, a similar use by non-native speakers of English in internet encounters is also legitimized. Besides, as means of

international communication, English is mutually owned by its speakers in all circles and all norms are endo-normative to all of them (McKay, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 2007a; Bruthiaux, 2010) in fact, some studies have explicated that the local varieties of English can equally be used both as a medium and as the content of instruction (see Au & Jordan, 1981; Erikson & Mohatt, 1981; Cazen & Legget, 1981; Erickson & Mohatt, 1981) and, just like the inner circle varieties, the local varieties can be equally taught at schools. Not only are these practices useful for learning, they would also provide room for the local norms of English to get recognized.

B. Local Varieties, Local Cultures and Online Materials

Internet has been widely used in both developed and developing countries. The International Telecommunication Union, a specialized agency of the United Nations responsible for issues on and technologies for information and communication has predicted that the use of the internet will continue to grow and this is driven by the massive amounts of online information, knowledge, entertainment, commerce and social networks on the internet (see Aun, 2007). As Coffman and Odlyzko (1998) has correctly shown, in the 1990s, the traffic on the public use of the internet grew annually by 100 percent and the growth in the number of internet users each year was between 20% and 50%. In 2011, as Aun (2007) has suggested, Brazil, Russia, India and China were the world's leading users of the internet. In 2017, it was estimated that internet users 48% of the world population (i.e. 7.4 billion), 81% and 41.3% of which were respectively attributable to developed and developing countries. This indicates that the use of internet in non-English speaking countries is less dominant and, by the same token, the contribution of online materials from these countries is also less prevailing.

Contribution and access to internet materials by inner circle speakers of English is comparable to that of the outer and the expanding circle speakers. The International Telecommunication Union has reported that 90 to 100% of inner circle speakers in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland have access to internet, but, it is similarly true to the developed countries in expanding circles such as the members of European unions and Japan. In other inner circle countries like USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the use of internet materials cover 80 to 90% of the population. But, a similar phenomenon is also found in the outer circle countries such as Malaysia and Singapore and in the expanding circle countries such as Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Eastern European countries. In Indonesia, in 2012, access to internet is limited only to 20 to 30% of the population. Broadband and mobile subscriptions are respectively 5% and 20% of the total population. All these indicate that, though limited, contribution of online materials from non-English speaking countries is not negligible and, thus, the presence of local varieties in online materials is also significant.

Online materials from non-English speaking countries can be cultural and exists in numerous forms. As Sarangi (2009) has mentioned, such materials should contain the followings: survival (food, clothing, defense, and shelter), education, transportation, communication, economy, technology, social

structure, beliefs and tradition, rules and regulation, as well as arts and recreation.

Several studies have actually made use of online materials for instruction. Alison and Kendrick (2015), for example, have explicated how the development of the network machines has led to new directions of teaching and learning. In the beginning, the internet emerged out of the need for computation, networking and storage of information. The interconnection was only limited to networked system and the information was uploaded and filtered by technology professionals. The access was in read-only mode. Reiser (2001) argued that, with read-only modality, the access to the technology is in essence one-way and this has been characterized as Web 1.0. Motivated by high demand and enabled by the development in network-based computational and storage technologies, Web 1.0 was transitioned to Web 2.0. With this technology, the users can read and write (McManus, 2005) and the technology was also as the read-write web. The users were then capable of sending to the cloud the knowledge that they had just created. Unlike its predecessor, Web 2.0, according to Cormode (2008), Web 2.0 became the main tool for social software data and in this way the internet and the construction of knowledge and intelligence it has helped create is no longer one-way but rather multiple ways as its citizens can mutually contribute to the collective intelligence of the communities.

Nonetheless, more and bigger data were used in social networking and, thus, accessing them has become time-consuming. Berner-Lee et al (2001) introduced the semantic web in order to organize the unorganized data in the social media and Web 3.0, as the most efficient way of finding information is introduced. This technology makes use of direct pathways of accessing information and increases the machines capacity to gather information. Software agents as human proxies can help students gather information that they need for learning and, consequently, they can save more time for more focused learning. In this way, individual students can independently focus on materials of interest or assigned tasks and, when required, they can share online or face-to-face what they have learnt with other students. Web 3.0 has indeed enabled learners to learn independently and to share learning virtually with the teachers and other students. The principle of independent but mutually shared learning has become the core of the contemporary philosophy in education practice or Education 3.0.

C. Education 3.0

The move to Education 3.0 is indispensable from its predecessors Education 1.0 and Education 2.0.

In Education 1.0, according to Keats and Schmidt (2007), education is mainly based on existing curriculum developed based on traditional school subjects. Teachers perform teaching tasks based on what is dictated in the curriculum and they are the only sources of knowledge. The classrooms are teacher-oriented and the class focus is on test scores as a means of assessing achievement. Learners passively sitting in rows of massive classes serve as receptacles of knowledge in that they receive, respond and regurgitate knowledge from the

teachers. In the age of standardization, most schools, if not all, are functioning within this model. Such practices resemble that of Web 1.0 in that it is one-way process where teachers are producers and controllers of knowledge and the students are consumers.

In Education 2.0, according to Keats and Schmidt (2007), teachers function as facilitators and orchestrators of learning while the learners are collaborators in learning. Teachers assign individual, group or classical projects for the students and they collaboratively and interactively inquire into their learning by making use of various online resources available such as wikipedia, blogs, google documents, and other educational materials. In this way, learners can access global, rather than local teacher-based, knowledge, skills and expertise. The learning projects are then shared through social networks for further learning. Such learning practice is in nature and made possible by the advancement in Web 2.0 technology.

Education 3.0, according to Watson, Watson and Reigeluth (2015), is constructivist and heutagogical in its approach to teaching and learning. Teachers, learners, networks, connections, media, resources, and learning tools can become potential resources to meet individual and societal needs of the learners and educators and, as a result, it shifts away from teacher-centered approach to a more constructivist in its approach to learning. Knowledge is seen as free, open, contextual, applied and reinvented commodity and teachers' main responsibility in this model is to guide students to information resources. Learners can access, co-construct, create, and share learning in their own space and time through social media. Thus, learners can collect information from experts, internet and diverse networks in order to complete learning projects at hand as well as correcting others. Learning is, therefore, life-long and takes place in borderless contexts. This has been enabled by the invention of Web 3.0.

III. METHODS

The study is descriptive qualitative in nature as it explores online cultural materials written in English that teachers and students can use in learning. Major (i.e. Balinese, Banjarese, Buginese, Javanese, Minang, and Sundanese) and minor/local ethno-cultural groups (i.e. Sasak, Samawa, and Mbojo) were selected as samples. Data on online materials were collected by downloading and then analyzed using content analyses. Data on challenges and opportunities were collected by observing and interviewing 6 schools, 6 headmasters, 12 English teachers, and 60 students. Additionally, focused-group discussion involving headmaster, teachers, and school supervisors and questionnaire to students were also used.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Internet Sources

Using key words such as culture, folklore, food, sports, marriage, and other cultural aspects with names of the national and local cultural groups above, I was able to download 1624 instances of cultural materials attributed to cultural referents as shown in Table I.

TABLE I. LOCAL CULTURAL MATERIALS ON THE INTERNET

No	Cultural Referents		f	%
1	National Culture	Indonesia	391	24.1
2	Major Ethno-Cultural Groups	Balinese	388	23.9
3		Javanese	365	22.5
4		Banjarese	231	14.2
5		Bugis & Makassar	124	7.64
6		Minang	66	4.06
7	Local Ethno-Cultural Groups	Sasak	40	2.46
8		Samawa	12	0.74
9		Mbojo	7	0.43
	Total		1624	100

The table indicates that the presence of materials from national culture and from the large ethnic groups of Indonesia is dominant (97%) while that of the local minority group is limitedly less than 3%.

B. Types of Materials

The types of materials on the internet can be authentic materials that are produced and published for real-life purposes and this covers 83% of the data. Pedagogic materials are those created for instructional purposes and this covers 17% of the materials. As shown in Table II, these materials are attributable to different types of texts and practices.

TABLE II. TYPES OF MATERIALS, TEXTS AND PRACTICES

No	Texts & Practices	Materials		f	%
		Authentic	Instructional		
1	Descriptive	465	137	602	37.1
2	Narrative	256	29	285	17.5
3	Recount	152	58	210	12.9
4	Procedure	143	45	188	11.6
5	Argument	157	0	157	9.67
6	Exposition	137	0	137	8.44
7	Others	23	0	23	1.42
8	Hortatory	22	0	22	1.35
	Total	1355	269	1624	
		83.44	16.6		

C. Texts and Practices

Types of texts and practices are dominantly in the forms of texts describing places, historical and experiential events, and procedures for performing cultural events and making of cultural food. Other forms of texts and practices such as arguments as well as analytical and hortatory expositions were found to be limited.

D. Cultural Texts and Practices for Education 3.0

Cultural texts and practices useful for Education 3.0 practices, as shown in Table III, were dominantly about arts and recreations, belief systems and traditions and survival materials such as food, cultural sports, houses, and local cultural defense systems. Texts and practices related with education, transportation, economy and technology were rather limited.

TABLE III. CULTURAL TEXTS AND MATERIALS

No	Texts and Practices	f	%
1	Arts & Recreation	230	14.16
2	Beliefs & Traditions	198	12.19
3	Survival	197	12.13
4	Social structure	162	9.975
5	Education	158	9.729
6	Communication	156	9.606
7	Transportation	149	9.175
8	Rules & Regulations	146	8.99
9	Economy	137	8.436
10	Technology	91	5.603
	TOTAL	1624	100

E. Challenges and Opportunities

Seen from the perspectives of education administrators, teachers and students, the challenges in using local online materials have something to do with curricular and instructional accountability. The majority (88%) of teacher respondent in the study were concerned with the minimum coverage per semester as required in the national curriculum which to them requires more teaching time. Although the majority (98%) of the students reported having use local online materials and considered such materials was fun, interactive and enjoyable, the teachers and educators were concerned with the accountability of what students had learned and how they might help them pass the national examination. Other challenges come from the limited numbers of materials from the students' cultural groups, as shown in Table 1 above, and such materials should be created more and uploaded. Besides, the majority of materials, as shown in Table 2, were not made for instructional purposes and they thus should be adapted to instructional purposes. The distribution of materials across text types and practices, as shown in Table 3, was not even and the text types with limited appearance should also be produced.

Though met with challenges, the use of online materials offers great opportunities. None of the respondents in the study were concerned with internet access and internet access was no longer an issue with the schools, teachers and students. The majority (78%) of educators, teachers and students were no longer concerned with the management of online learning materials and technological expertise in accessing them. Some

of the teachers and the students were in need of training for speedy access of materials.

V. CONCLUSION

Analyses show that while the nature and the quantity of the texts and practices are numerous and various, the contents can cover all curricular needs. The materials were mostly authentic, but teachers and students can always find ways of using them for interactive pedagogic purposes as required in Education 3.0. Modification of the texts and the practices for pedagogic procedures were recommended.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aghaei, Sareh, Mohammad Ali Nematbakhsh and Hadi Khosravi Farsani. 2012. Evolution Of The World Wide Web: From Web 1.0 To Web 4.0. *International Journal of Web & Semantic Technology (IJWesT)* Vol.3, No.1, January 2012 DOI : 10.5121/ijwest.2012.3101 1
- [2] Alison, M and Kendrick, L.M. (2015): Constructivism Reconsidered In The Age Of Social Media. *New Directions For Teaching And Learning*, No. 144, Winter 2015, DOI: 10.1002/tl.20167
- [3] Au, K., and Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, & K. H. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- [4] Aun, Fred. 2007. Brazil, Russia, India and China to Lead Internet Growth Through 2011. *Clitz*, oct 4, 2008. <https://web.archive.org/web/20081004000237/http://www.clickz.com/showPage.html?page=3626274>. Accessed on 10 November 2018 at 4.00 p.m. central Indonesian time
- [5] Aydin, Selami. 2007. The use of the Internet in ESL learning: Problems, advantages and disadvantages. Researchgate.
- [6] Benito-Osorio, D., Peris-Ortiz, M., Armengot, C.R., & Colino, A. (2013). Web 5.0: the future of emotional competences in higher education. *Global Business Perspectives*, 1(3), 274-287. doi: 10.1007/s40196-013-0016-5
- [7] Berners-Lee, T., Hendler, J., Lassila, O. (2001). The semantic web. *Scientific American Magazine*, 21(3): 119-132
- [8] Bruthiaux, P. (2002). Predicting challenges to English as a global language in the 21st century. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 26(2), 129-157.
- [9] Coffman, K. G; Odlyzko, A. M. (2 October 1998). "The size and growth rate of the Internet" (PDF). AT&T Labs. *Archived* (PDF) from the original on 14 June 2007. Retrieved 21 May 2007.
- [10] Davies, A., Hamp-lyons, L., & Kemp, C. (2003). Whose Norms? International Proficiency Test in English. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 571-584. Doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00324.x
- [11] Downes, S. (2016). The 2016 look at the future of online learning. <http://www.downes.ca/post/65113>
- [12] EPN. (2008). Evolution Web 1.0, Web 2.0 to Web 3.0. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bsNcjya56v8>
- [13] Erickson, F. & Mohatt, G. (1981). Cultural organization of participation structures in two classrooms of Indian students. In G. Spindler (Ed.), *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action* (pp. 132-174). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [14] Hamid, M.O. 2014. World Englishes in international proficiency tests. *World Englishes*, 33 (2), 263–277. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- [15] Higgins, C. (2003). "Ownership" of English in the Outer Circle: An Alternative to the NS-NNS Dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 615-644
- [16] Hino, N. (2012). Negotiating indigenous values with Anglo-American cultures in elt in Japan: A case study of EIL philosophy in the expanding circle. In A. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English as an International Language in Asia Implications for Language Education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- [17] Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- [18] Kubota, Ryko. (2001). Teaching World English to Native Speakers of English in USA. *World Englishes*, 20 (1): 47-64.
- [19] Kachru, B.B. (1992). World Englishes: approaches, issues, and resources. *Language Teaching*, 25 (1), 1-14. Doi: 10.1017/S0261444800006583.
- [20] Kachru, B.B. (1997). World Englishes 2000. Resources for research and teaching. *Literary Studies*, 14, 209-251.
- [21] Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Language Teaching*, 44 (2), 212-224. doi: 10.1017/S0261444810000145.
- [22] McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an International language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [23] McManus, R. 2005. Web 2.0 Is Not About Version Numbers or Betas. *Read/WriteWeb*, August 6. http://readwrite.com/2005/08/06/web_20_is_not_a.
- [24] Molchanova, Igorevna Irma. 2015. Influence of the Internet on Studying English. *International Education Studies*; Vol. 8, No. 1; 2015. doi:10.5539/ies.v8n1p133
- [25] Pedro Isaias, Dirk Ifenthaler, Kinshuk, Demetrios G. Sampson, and J. Michael Spector (Eds). 2012. Towards Learning and Instruction in Web 3.0: Advances in Cognitive and Educational Psychology. New York: Springer,
- [26] Rajagopalan, K. (2011). The 'Outer Circle' as a role model for the 'Expanding Circle'. *English Today*, 27(04), 58-63.
- [27] Reiser, R. A. 2001. "A History of Instructional Design and Technology. Part I: A History of Instructional Media." *Educational Technology Research and Development* 49 (1):53–64.
- [28] Sarangi, S. (2009). Culture. Östman, J. S., and Gunter Verschueren, J. (Eds) *Culture and Language Use*: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 81-119.
- [29] Sinas, S., and Lin, S. N. P, 2014. Usage of English Materials from the Internet to Improve Students' Language Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Volume 134*, 15 May 2014, Pages 193-200.
- [30] Schneider, Edgar W. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Solanki D. Shyamlee, and M Phil. 2012. Use of Technology in English Language Teaching and Learning: an Analysis. 2012 International Conference on Language, Medias and Culture. IPEDR Vol 33 (2012). IACSIT Press, Singapore.
- [32] Shyamlee, S. D., and Phil, M. (2012). Use of Technology in English Language Teaching and Learning: An Analysis. International Conference on Language, Medias and Culture IPEDR vol. 33 (pp. 150-156). Retrieved from <http://www.ipedr.com/vol33/030-ICLMC2012-L10042.pdf>.
- [33] Watson, William R.,Sunnie Lee Watson and Charles M. Reigeluth. 2015. Education 3.0: breaking the old with technology Interactive Learning Environments, 2015 Vol. 23, No. 3, 332–343, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2013.764322>