



Minnesota State University, Mankato

Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly  
and Creative Works for Minnesota  
State University, Mankato

---

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other  
Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other  
Capstone Projects

---

2011

## The World Englishes Paradigm and its Implications for International Students' Acquisition of Standard American English for University-Level Studies in the United States

Karen Applequist Clement  
*Minnesota State University - Mankato*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Clement, K. A. (2011). The World Englishes Paradigm and its Implications for International Students' Acquisition of Standard American English for University-Level Studies in the United States [Master's alternative plan paper, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/2011/>

This APP is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

The World Englishes paradigm and its implications for international students' acquisition of  
Standard American English for university-level studies in the United States

By

Karen Clement

An Alternate Plan Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

In

Teaching English as a Second Language

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

May 2011

The World Englishes paradigm and its implications for international students' acquisition of Standard American English for university-level studies in the United States

Karen Clement

This alternate plan paper has been examined and approved by the following members of the APP committee.

Dr. Stephen Stoyhoff, Advisor

Dr. Harry Solo

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction .....	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	8
Defining the Phenomenon.....	8
Diversity in English. ....	8
Kachru’s three circles. ....	9
The Inner Circle. ....	9
The Outer Circle. ....	9
The Expanding Circle. ....	10
World Englishes (WEs). ....	10
Standards.....	11
Traditional standard English (SE).....	11
Other standardized WEs. ....	12
Unity within English. ....	12
English as a lingua franca (ELF). ....	12
IE, ISE and WSE.....	13
English as an international language (EIL).....	13
Non-Standard Grammatical Features of World Englishes.....	16
Zero-marking of 3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular verbs.....	17
Other verbs.....	18
Pronouns. ....	18
Articles and nouns.....	19
Phrases. ....	19
Implications for the Education Community.....	21
Bias or fairness in English proficiency tests. ....	21
Modifications to English language teaching.....	22
Teaching a standard versus teaching varieties. ....	23
Teaching English as an international language.....	24
Teaching English as a lingua franca. ....	26
Teaching English as an intercultural language. ....	27
Teaching standard American or British English. ....	28
Teaching standard English as a standard dialect.....	29
Language awareness through a comparative approach.....	32
Modifications to teacher training.....	36
Chapter Summary .....	36
Chapter 3: Implications and Application .....	38
Implications for the ELT Classroom.....	38
Benefits of a comparative, polymodel approach.....	38
Implications for SAE-focused classrooms.....	39
Conscious identification of differences. ....	40
Attitude and identity .....	41
Contexts for the polymodel approach.....	42
Outer Circle context.....	42
Expanding Circle context.....	43
Inner Circle context.....	44

Putting the Approach into Action – An Example .....	44
Step one: exposure .....	45
Step two: classification .....	45
Step three: transference.....	46
Step four: production .....	46
Limitations of the Approach .....	47
Implications for TESOL Programs .....	48
Chapter Summary .....	49
Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	50
Appendix.....	55
References.....	56

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

In a world where globalization is the trend – a global economy, a global internet, global warming, global businesses – it should not be surprising to learn that there is now also an undisputed global language, namely English. Because English today is used in a plethora of contexts around the world, as the native language of millions, the official language of numerous nations, and a lingua franca in a multitude of international dealings, more users of English than ever before either feel some ownership in the language through their national dialect or some resentment towards the Western cultural norms that tend to come embedded with the language. These citizens of English as an international language feel that changes need to be made: in how the language is viewed in general, in attitudes towards varieties of English, in the construct of English proficiency tests, and in methods of teaching English.

This paper addresses one specific problem relating to world Englishes, the fact that many students of English throughout the world are exposed, not to one of the traditional native speaker Englishes, as spoken in the United States or United Kingdom, but rather to an indigenized official language variety or an international lingua franca. In many cases, these other varieties exhibit grammatical, phonological or lexical features which differ enough from native speaker English conventions that it is difficult for these students to perform well on major international tests of English proficiency, based as they are on native speaker varieties, no matter how proficient they are in their particular variety of English. This does not seem fair to observers who see these other varieties of English as equally valid languages. Nor does it seem fair to those who worry that there is too much American or British culture embedded in the language itself, in the methods promoted for teaching it, and in the tests that assess it, and therefore advocate the adoption of a de-nationalized version of English for use internationally.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to discover what might be done to help international students to improve their chances of success specifically in the American university system; for purposes of simplification, it will focus solely on grammatical differences that occur in the English varieties of these students. To accomplish this goal, the paper first turns to the literature. Here, background information on the global phenomenon of English is provided, non-standard grammatical features of world Englishes are examined, the results of studies on bias in English tests of proficiency are summarized, and suggestions for best teaching practices enlightened by a new understanding of English are detailed, including the promotion of including such enlightenment in the curricula of MA TESOL candidates. Because many of the teaching modifications suggested in the literature promote an approach in which students are introduced to multiple varieties of English to produce greater language awareness, an empirical study on a bidialectal Greek language teaching situation in Cyprus is included, as it, too, investigates the benefits of precisely this kind of a multiple-variety, comparative approach in teaching the standard Greek dialect.

The discussion section of this paper then highlights the literature findings relevant to the particular language learning situation described above and discusses how those suggestions might benefit the students' mastery of Standard American English. Parallels are drawn between the use of a non-standard dialect as a comparative device for learning a standard dialect and the use of a non-standard world English as a comparative device for learning Standard American English. The discussion covers three contexts in which international students might learn Standard American English in preparation for taking a standardized test, offers activity suggestions through a sample lesson, and discusses the limitations of such an approach. Finally, the inclusion of graduate-level instruction on the issue of world Englishes is addressed as a

beneficial step in promoting new attitudes and awareness among English language teachers about the effect that globalization has had on the reality of English and the changes that should come about in their own teaching methods as a result of this paradigm shift.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

The following review begins by examining issues created by the growing status of English as the predominant international language currently in use, focusing not only on the wealth of varieties, both standard and non-standard, but also on the promotion of an international standard divorced of association with any one nation or cultural ideology. To gain a better understanding of the challenges that today's English language learners face if they choose to study in the United States, the paper next looks at several specific examples of non-standard grammatical features shared by diverse varieties of English. Finally, after touching on the efforts of language assessment scholars to judge the fairness of major international tests of English proficiency, the review fastens its attention on a more promising and immediate solution to this changed, and ever-changing, context of English usage, specifically, that literature which proposes adaptations to traditional English language teaching methods as well as a proposal to add world English awareness to teacher education curricula.

### Defining the Phenomenon

Once isolated to a small corner of Europe, English has become a prominent feature in today's world. According to McArthur (2002), at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it was estimated that users of English numbered over one billion, although less than a fourth of those used it as their native language (p. 2). The following section discusses this expansion and defines several of the terms associated with this recent global phenomenon. For ease of reference, these definitions have also been compiled in Table 2.1.

**Diversity in English.** English is used throughout the world in a multiplicity of contexts, and the following terms were coined to reflect that diversity. The definitions for the following

terms are taken from a variety of sources and, for the most part, other authors follow these conventions. Where there is disagreement, note will be made of this fact and preferences for their use in this paper delineated.

***Kachru's three circles.*** The expansion of English followed closely with the settling of colonies and formation of territories by Great Britain. To describe the contexts of English usage among these far-flung former colonies and the rest of the world, Kachru (1992) coined the terms Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle (p. 356).

*The Inner Circle.* Those territories in which English became the native language are referred to alternately as native speaker (NS) or Inner Circle countries. Examples include Australia, most of Canada, New Zealand, parts of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. In these nations, the varieties of English spoken are referred to as English as a native language (ENL), NS English, or mother tongue (MT) English. Inner Circle varieties hold a position of prestige in the world, however wrongly, and have been described as “norm-providing” (Kachru, 1986, cited in McKay, 2002, p. 54).

*The Outer Circle.* The Outer Circle comprises those countries that once had strong commerce or colonial ties with Great Britain and now use English as a second language (ESL), usually as the official language. Examples include India, Kenya, Nigeria, Singapore, and parts of South Africa. Described as “norm-developing” (Kachru, 1986, cited in McKay, 2002, p. 54), these so-called New Englishes (McArthur, 2001, p. 9) came about through years of contact with the L1 languages of their users and have adopted their own conventions which are now considered acceptable indigenized norms of valid English varieties. According to Bamgbose (1998, cited in McKay, 2002, p. 54), an innovation is considered a norm based on the number of people who use it, the extent of its use within a nation, the identity of its users, in what

publications or situations its use is sanctioned, and the opinions of both users and non-users regarding its usage. In many cases, it is these non-standard norms which give users a sense of identity. Asserts de Klerk (2003) in the context of users of Xhosa English and Black South African English (BSAE), “part of establishing ones identity as a black South African entails using English in order to sound like a black South African, and deliberately not using the norms of MT speakers” (p. 479).

*The Expanding Circle.* In comparison to the aforementioned circles, the third circle is a more recent phenomenon which led to a “growth spurt in the language” beginning in the late 1950’s according to Crystal (1995, quoted by McArthur, 2002, p. 446). In this circle, English continues to expand in usage as the preferred lingua franca in international business, political, and academic arenas, hence the term Expanding Circle. It is in these contexts, described by Kachru (1986, cited in McKay, 2002, p. 54) as “norm-dependant” because they have traditionally looked to Inner Circle varieties of English for models, that English is used as a foreign language (EFL). They include most European, Middle Eastern, South American, Francophone African, and Asian countries. However, a blurring of boundaries between Outer and Expanding Circle varieties has begun to occur. According to Lowenberg (2002), as greater numbers of EFL students from the Expanding Circle have been studying English in the Outer Circle, they have internalized some indigenized Outer Circle norms and carried them back to their own countries, thereby resulting in Expanding Circle Englishes with features more characteristic of New Englishes than of Inner Circle varieties as spoken by non-native speakers (NNSs).

*World Englishes (WEs).* The term world Englishes (WEs) is used to refer to the myriad varieties of English in use today (McArthur, 2002, p. 44; Davies et al. 2003, p. 572). The

spectrum of varieties represented by the term WEs is so wide that McArthur (2001) asserts it is now “possible to be multilingual within world English” (p. 16). Along these lines, the WEs viewpoint on ELT and assessment issues is one which values the richness in diversity of English and affirms the validity of every variety (Davies et al., 2003).

***Standards.*** Under the umbrella of world Englishes exist both standard and non-standard varieties. Because a standard language is considered the prestige variety, the variety established by the social elite, used in educational institutions, heard in the media, and preserved in the literature of a nation, its mere existence can effectively marginalize those who use non-standard varieties of the language. Non-standard varieties may vary from the standard in terms of phonology, lexis, or grammar, but in her discussion on language standards, McKay (2002) notes that there is less tolerance for grammatical innovation than for lexical innovation because grammar expresses a social identity. She cites Widdowson (1994, p. 381) as follows: “The mastery of a particular grammatical system, especially perhaps those features which are redundant, marks you as a member of the community which has developed that system for its own social purpose” (McKay, 2002, p. 69).

***Traditional standard English (SE).*** For many years, the only standard for properly spoken and written English was Standard British English (SBE), also known as Received Pronunciation (RP) in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Today, Standard American English (SAE) enjoys similar prestige on the world stage thanks to the growth of the United States’ prominence as a global power and, with the advent of the computer age, the fact that word processing software has nudged standards towards SAE conventions (McArthur, 2001, p. 6). However, increasingly the question is being asked: who really has the right to decide what is “standard” for a language with hundreds of millions of users around the world (McArthur, 2001, p. 1)? At this time, standard

English (SE), seen as a dual standard of U.S. and U.K. conventions, still seems to be the goal of language learning programs around the world, especially when the high-stakes international tests of English proficiency are normed to one of those two standards.

*Other standardized WEs.* In the case of world Englishes, several other varieties besides SBE and SAE are also considered standard. Standardization can be defined both by the existence of dictionaries and grammar books for a particular variety or by the production of publications in that variety. In this way, Australian English (AusE), Canadian English (CanE), New Zealand English (NSE), Philippine English (PhIE), White South African English (WSAE), Indian English (IndE), Irish English (IrE) and Singaporean English (SgE), among others, are also considered standard varieties (McArthur, 2002, pp. 443-444; Kortmann et al., 2004, pp. xv-xvii).

**Unity within English.** While great diversity exists in English, scholars also acknowledge the commonalities that unite the language. For communication to occur across cultures through the use of English, speakers of diverse varieties of English must draw upon the features of English they have in common in order to make themselves understood. As Widdowson (1997) points out, “Even if we allow diversification for local communities, we must surely deny it in the interests of global communication” (p. 143). The following terms reflect the unifying forces at work within the dynamics of global English.

*English as a lingua franca (ELF).* Lingua francas have been traditionally seen as languages used by speakers of different L1s whose main goal in using them is mutual comprehension, not form (McArthur, 2002, p. 2). Furthermore, as Seidlhofer puts it, “a lingua franca has no native speakers” (2004, p. 211). At one time this might have meant the use of a pidgin or “broken” English, as perhaps used in global business dealings (McArthur, 2001, p.1). Now, however, English as a lingua franca (ELF) has come to be seen as a term referring to a

standard form of English that NNSs use when communicating with each other. Other interpretations of ELF exist as follows: English used in contexts where at least some of the interlocutors are NNSs, English used in contexts where all the interlocutors are NNSs from the same L1, and English as a “new code,” not standard English, but based on it (Elder & Davies, 2006, p. 284). For the purposes of this paper, ELF will be seen as a variety, standard or otherwise, used by NNSs of different L1s.

*IE, ISE and WSE.* Because of intelligibility concerns across WEs, interest has grown in the establishment of a single, non-territorial standard English for the entire world (McArthur, 2001, p. 10). This monolith is referred to in the literature by four names: International English (IE), International Standard English (ISE), World Standard English (WSE), and world English (WE), each with slightly different shades of meaning (McArthur, 2002, p. 446). For simplicity, WE in the singular will not be used in this sense at all to avoid confusing it with the “WEs” view mentioned above. In addition, this paper will treat IE, ISE and WSE as synonymous ideas, deferring to IE in most cases, however nebulous this concept may be in reality. Crystal is of the opinion that such an IE already exists, based on what can be read in international English-language newspapers or heard in English-language broadcasts around the globe (1995, p. 111 as cited in McArthur, 2002, p. 446), and heavily favors SAE and SBE conventions. For the purposes of this paper, the term IE (including ISE and WSE) will be used to refer to any standard variety of English commonly used in venues for international communication, between NSs and/or NNSs, and an IE viewpoint one which focuses on the importance of maintaining worldwide standards for English to remain viable in the global context.

*English as an international language (EIL).* The term international English is often used interchangeably with the term English as an international language (EIL); however,

Seidlhofer (2004) makes a slight distinction between the two. Whereas IE refers to one “clearly distinguishable, codified, and unitary variety,” EIL refers to the situations of English usage internationally, whether in Expanding Circle, Outer Circle or Inner Circle contexts (p. 210). In this way, EIL can be seen as relating to ELF in that both refer to the context in which the language is used as well as to the actual code itself. This paper will reflect Seidlhofer’s understanding of the term EIL.

Table 2.1 *Definitions of English Relating to International Usage*

Term	Abr.	Definitions	Synonyms	Source
Inner Circle		countries where English is a native language	native speaker English, mother tongue English	Kachru, 1992 de Klerk, 2003
Outer Circle		countries where English is a second language	New Englishes	Kachru, 1992
Expanding Circle		countries where English is a foreign language		Kachru, 1992
World Englishes	WEs	English as used in specific national contexts	e.g., SAE, Nigerian English, China English, etc.	McArthur, 2001 Davies et al., 2003
Standard English	SE	the prestige variety of English	e.g., SBE, SAE, CanE, WSAE	McArthur, 2002
English as a lingua franca	ELF	·English as used between NNSs of different L1s* <sup>†</sup>	·IE, EIL	*McArthur, 2002 <sup>†</sup> Elder & Davies, 2006
		·English as used between NNSs and NSs <sup>†</sup>	·IE, EIL	
		·English as used between NNSs from the same L1 <sup>†</sup>	·IE, EIL	
		·English as a “new code,” based on SE <sup>†</sup>	·WSE, IE, ISE	
International English	IE	single, non-territorial standard English for the entire world	IE, WSE, ISE	McArthur, 2002
World Standard English	WSE			
International Standard English	ISE			
English as an International Language	EIL	all uses of English internationally	IE (for some)	Seidlhofer, 2004

## **Non-Standard Grammatical Features of World Englishes**

Having provided some background into the study of world Englishes, this section of the review examines some of the specific ways in which non-standard Englishes differ from SAE. Understanding what these differences are will facilitate the discussion in the following section concerning issues of standardized testing and English language teaching. Corpora have been compiled for many world Englishes as well as instances of ELF, and after analyzing them, patterns of non-standard features have been reported in the domains of pronunciation, lexicogrammar, and pragmatics. (Kortmann, Burridge, Mesthrie, Schneider, & Upton, 2004; McArthur, 2002; De Klerk, 2003; Shim, 1999; Seidlhofer, 2004; and Breiteneder, 2005, 2009) This paper focuses on non-standard grammatical features, in particular those which are observed to recur across varieties. Table 2.2 is a compilation of those features as they became apparent during the research for this paper. It is by no means an exhaustive summary of non-standard grammatical features observed by linguists. In addition to reporting on specific individual varieties, Kortmann et al. (2004) provides information on groups of varieties, including African Englishes [Ghanaian English, Cameroon English, East African English, Indian South African English, BSAE, Ghanaian Pidgin, Cameroon Pidgin, Nigerian Pidgin, and White South African English (p. 1181)], Asian Englishes [Butler English, Pakistani English, Singaporean English and Malaysian English (p. 1178)], and New Englishes [Chicano English, Gullah, Suriname Creoles, Belizean Creole, Tobagonian/Trinidadian Creole, Bahamian English, Jamaican Creole Fiji English, Butler English (India), Pakistani English, Singapore English, Malaysian English, Bislama, Solomon Islands Pidgin, Tok Pisin, Hawaiian Creole, Aboriginal English (Australia), Australian Creoles, Standard Ghanaian English, Ghanaian Pidgin, Cameroon English and Pidgin, Nigerian Pidgin, East African English, Indian South African English, Black South African

English (p. 1184)].

**Zero-marking of 3rd person singular verbs.** In terms of present tense verb inflections, SE is an anomaly among languages as there is very little marking of present tense verbs, except in the irregular verbs *be* and *have*, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular inflection of regular verbs. Making this 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular marking even more unusual is the fact that it is a redundant feature; because SE is a non-pro-drop language, the marking of the verb as 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular through the addition of an *-s* is unnecessary. Thus, it stands to reason that ELLs would find this feature of standard English troublesome, if not downright illogical. Breiteneder (2009) cites the online version of Kortmann and Schneider's *Varieties of English Multimedia Reference Tool* which shows that out of 46 varieties they pooled, 26 of them exhibited this feature (p. 257) [e.g., *So he show up and say... He don't like me.*]. Among NSs, the 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular *-s* has acquired the status of one of the "markers of in-group membership" (Seidlhofer, 2000, cited in Breiteneder, 2005, p. 5). Surprisingly, however, in a corpus of 50,000 spoken words compiled from "group discussions between representatives of the EU government and national agencies of higher education" (pp. 6-7), Breiteneder (2009) did not find a large incidence of 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular -  $\emptyset$ . In only about 21% of the cases where 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular was used was the *-s* left off. Perhaps, reasons Breiteneder, this is because all the speakers in the study had received formal schooling in a SE, but if so, then why was the *-s* used in some cases and not in others? Breiteneder posits that in some instances the interlocutors may have been purposely leaving off the *-s* for social reasons (2009, p. 262).

This non-standard feature has been noted in other WEs as well. It has been attested in seven of the other English varieties and groups listed: BSAE (sometimes), NigE (sometimes), Singlish, Outer Circle Asian Englishes, and New Englishes.

**Other verbs.** The use of the present progressive for stative verbs [e.g., *I'm liking this. What are you wanting?*], which, it should be noted here, is becoming accepted even among SAE speakers [e.g., McDonald's ad: *I'm lovin' it.*], were observed in five of the varieties: BSAE, NigE, African Englishes, IndE, and Asian Englishes. The leveling of the distinction between the present perfect and the simple past [e.g., *Were you ever in London? Some of us have been to New York years ago.*] was noted in the following four varieties: African Englishes, IndE (the PP is preferred where SAE would use the SP), Asian Englishes, and Korean English (where leveling of the present / present progressive and the past perfect / simple past distinctions have also been observed). As for the use of uninflected verbs for the simple past tense [e.g., *I walk for I walked.*], five varieties have exhibited this trait: BSAE (which exhibits an overuse of *did* in place of inflection), NigE (sometimes), Singlish, Asian Englishes, and New Englishes in general. Two varieties demonstrate omission of the verb *be* [e.g., *She smart.*]: Asian Englishes and New Englishes.

**Pronouns.** The use of resumptive pronouns [e.g., *This is the house which I painted it yesterday.*] has been attested in five of the varieties: BSAE, NigE, African Englishes, Asian Englishes, and New Englishes. BSAE, NigE, African Englishes, and Singlish all have demonstrated the usage of anaphoric pronouns which follow the noun phrase [e.g., *The guests whom I invited them have arrived.* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 818)]. IndE and Singlish have both been observed to drop subject and object pronouns, hence the term pro-drop [e.g., *Is he in his office? Sorry, Ø left just now only.*]. Similarly, the null subject feature is noted in China English (Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002, p. 271). Regarding non-standard use of reflexive pronouns, BSAE, African Englishes and New Englishes exhibit the characteristic in which a plural pronoun may go with *-self*, while a singular pronoun may be put with *-selves*, while in NigE the word

*themselves* is taken to mean *each other*.

**Articles and nouns.** A non-standard usage of articles [e.g., *I had nice garden. I had the toothache.*] is reported in all of the varieties except the Asian and New Englishes, and in Singlish, articles tend to be omitted altogether [e.g., *I don't have ticket.* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 1061)]. This non-standard usage of articles is likely related to variation in the use of count / non-count noun distinctions [e.g., *staffs, a luggage, machineries* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 971)] as all of those varieties except ELF also show that characteristic, with Singlish also tending to leave off the plural *-s* on count nouns unless the noun is preceded by a number [e.g., *She queue up very long to buy ticket for us.* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 1061)].

**Phrases.** The use of simplified comparatives, where half of the comparative phrase *more... than, the most... that, or rather... than* is omitted [e.g., *... my school was one of the radical schools that you can ever find.*], has been observed in both BSAE and NigE. The feature of invariant, non-concord tag questions [e.g., *You are going home soon, isn't it?* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 1021)] shows up in six of the varieties: NigE, African Englishes, IndE, Singlish, New Englishes and ELF. Finally, four of the varieties, NigE, African Englishes, IndE and Singlish have been observed to frequently use double adjectives and adverbs for emphasis [e.g., *Tell Mr. Bello to come now-now.* (Kortmann et al. 2004, p. 825)].

Table 2.2: Non-Standard Features of World Englishes

Circle	Variety	Source	3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular - $\emptyset$	Stative verbs in present progressive	Leveling difference between Pr Perfect and S Past	Past tense uninflected	<i>be</i> deleted	Indirect questions uninverted	Direct <i>wh</i> -questions uninverted or no auxiliary	<i>yes/no</i> questions uninverted	Answering negative questions (yes = no, no = yes)	Resumptive pronouns	Anaphoric pronoun subjects after NP	Pro-drop	Plural + <i>self</i> , singular + <i>selves</i>	Articles (use of $\emptyset$ , <i>a</i> or <i>the</i> )	Count / non-count noun variation	Simplified comparatives	Invariant non-concord tag questions	Doubled adjectives or adverbs	
Outer Circle	Black South African English	Kortmann, 2004, pp 962-973	sometimes	yes				yes			yes	sometimes				sometimes	yes	yes			
		de Klerk, 2003, pp 467-477		yes		yes <sup>1</sup>							yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes		
	Nigerian English	Kortmann, 2004, pp 813-827	sometimes	yes			sometimes					yes	yes	yes		see notes <sup>2</sup>	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
		McArthur, 2002, pp 279														see notes <sup>2</sup>	yes	yes			
	Africa	Kortmann, 2004, p 1182		yes	yes						yes		yes			yes	yes			yes	
		McArthur, 2002, pp 269												yes				yes			yes
	Indian English	Kortmann, 2004, pp 1016-1030		yes					yes	yes		yes			yes		sometimes	yes		yes	yes
		McArthur, 2002, pp 321-322		yes	yes <sup>3</sup>					yes							yes			yes	yes
	Colloquial Singapore English	Kortmann, 2004, pp 1058-1072		yes			yes								yes		yes ( $\emptyset$ )	yes		yes	yes <sup>4</sup>
		McArthur, 2002, pp 340-341		yes										yes			yes ( $\emptyset$ )	yes <sup>5</sup>			
	Asia	Kortmann, 2004, p 1179		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes								
	New Englishes	Kortmann, 2004, p 1192		yes			yes	yes		yes			yes			yes				yes	
Expanding Circle	Korean English	Shim, 1999, pp 252-254			yes <sup>6</sup>									yes <sup>7</sup>		yes	yes				
	ELF core features	Seidlhofer, 2004, p 220	yes <sup>8</sup>													yes			yes		

<sup>1</sup> Overuse of *did* in place of inflection. <sup>2</sup> Use of *themselves* = *each other*. <sup>3</sup> PP preferred where SP would be used. <sup>4</sup> Also comparative adjectives. <sup>5</sup> Lack of -s in count nouns. <sup>6</sup> Also leveling of present and present progressive, past perfect and simple past. <sup>7</sup>  $\emptyset$ -subject in China English Kirkpatrick & Xu, 2002, p. 271). <sup>8</sup> Variable in EELF (Breiteneder, 2005, pp 8-9).

## **Implications for the Education Community**

The growing acceptance of such non-standard grammatical features in contexts of world Englishes as noted in the previous section indicates a shift in the acceptable norms of the language. A major shift in language leads inevitably to necessary shifts both in the way the language is tested and in the way it is taught. A great deal of recent literature in English language journals (Davidson, 2006; Davies, 2009; Davies et al., 2003; Elder & Davies, 2006; Hamp-Lyons & Davies, 2008; Lowenberg, 2002) has investigated allegations of bias in such international English tests as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC), the Michigan English Language Assessment Battery (MELAB), and the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), which have been accused by some scholars of privileging those who have been exposed to Inner Circle Englishes and marginalizing those who have primarily had access to Outer Circle and Expanding Circle varieties. In addition, much has been written about the need for changes in English language teaching methodology to reflect the new dynamics within the usage of English internationally (Adger, 1997; Brown, 2006; Kachru, 1992; 1991; McKay, 2002, 2003; Quirk, 1991; Seidlhofer, 2004; Sifakis, 2004; Snow et al., 2006; Widdowson, 1997). This section looks briefly at the issues of test bias and test adaptations before turning to the more immediate area of adjustments to English teaching methodology.

**Bias or fairness in English proficiency tests.** Due to the current worldwide “ownership” and diversity of English, Davies, A., Hamp-Lyons, L., and Kemp, C. (2003) ask in their study whose norms should be followed in designing tests of English proficiency. They question whether it is fair that the major international tests of English proficiency available to test-takers today are normed either to SAE, as in the case of the TOEFL, TOEIC, and MELAB,

or to SBE, as in the case of the IELTS, varieties to which only a fraction of ELLs worldwide have access on a daily basis. In an informal study of several Outer Circle national tests of English, as well as the American-based TOEFL and British-based IELTS, Davies et al. (2003) concluded that no matter which test was being considered, the number of questions which covered material that might be considered either non-standard by IE standards or discriminatory against WEs test-takers was negligible. A later quantitative study by Hamp-Lyons and Davies (2008) comparing the effects of using raters from different countries was inconclusive as to the existence of bias and declared the need for more empirical research to answer this question. Furthermore, in studying the issue of fairness in the context of Expanding Circle countries, Lowenberg (2002) noted that to be able to evaluate English proficiency in the context of global communication, test designers and raters alike must have a better understanding of what constitutes a “deficiency” in language acquisition and what merely reflects a “varietal difference”(p. 433). Not only has an IE not yet been codified in such a way that assessing proficiency in it would even be possible, he opines, but the research has so far not been extensive enough to demonstrate unfairness in test results of the existing assessments. Furthermore, Elder and Davies (2006), in exploring the possibility of adapting existing assessments to meet the needs of WEs users, arrive at the conclusion that to do so would run the risk of changing test methods to the point of corrupting test construct, and hence test validity. So while accusations of test bias abound, Davidson, F. (2006) warns that testing companies will do nothing about solving the problem until faced with “cold, hard numbers” (p. 714).

**Modifications to English language teaching.** Given the difficulties inherent in determining bias in assessments, much less redesigning them, a more immediate and productive approach may be to implement some changes in the way English is taught around the world. It is

hoped that these changes would be of benefit to the English language learner whether the goal is to learn an international standard form of English less embedded with American or British cultural attributes or to become better prepared for success in the SAE environment of formal education in the United States. This section looks at some of the literature on the subject of improving English language teaching (ELT) practices, and is organized according to ELL contexts. Table 2.3 is provided as a summary of these ideas.

*Teaching a standard versus teaching varieties.* There are conflicting viewpoints on whether it is of greater benefit to students of English to be taught a standard English as the ultimate goal or to teach an awareness of, and respect for, the great diversity of English varieties. According to Quirk (1991), teaching students anything other than a standard Inner Circle variety of English does them a gross disservice. In his opinion, "...if I were a foreign student paying good money in Tokyo or Madrid to be taught English, I would feel cheated by such a tolerant pluralism. My goal would be to acquire English precisely because of its power as an instrument of international communication" (p. 174).

In a similar vein, Widdowson (1997) asserts that, even accepting the diversity of English varieties, if the world is to find a global English, it must be a standard form, "for if this linguistic centre cannot hold, things do indeed fall apart" (p. 142). His suggestion for promoting an international English, rather than teaching national varieties, is to focus on the teaching of subject-specific registers which would cut across national boundaries and naturally lend cohesiveness to the language. Predicts Widdowson, "...registers will regulate themselves in the interests of global communication. There is no need of native-speaker custodians" (p. 144).

Taking a pluralist approach, Kachru (1992) writes the following concerning this topic: "The implications of the internationalization of English have yet to be reflected in the curricula

of teacher training programs, in the methodology of teaching, in understanding the sociolinguistic profile of the language, and in cross-cultural awareness” (p. 355). He points to “six fallacies about users and uses of English.” The first of these is the notion that people in the Outer and Expanding Circles learn English primarily in order to interact with native speakers (NSs). In fact, in most cases where English is used, neither interlocutor is a NS and to follow SAE or SBE conventions in such contexts would be considered “not only irrelevant” but “inappropriate” as well (1992, p. 357). The second fallacy is the idea that one of the goals for learning English is to understand American or British culture. Third, ELLs only want to learn one of the standard models of English. Fourth, world Englishes are in fact “interlanguages” that are working towards standardization of features. Fifth, NSs provide the majority of the input in determining the course of English teaching around the globe. Finally, variety in the language is evidence of “linguistic decay” and the goal of language teachers is to reverse that process (pp. 357-358). In order to rectify what he sees as misdirected teaching method, based as they have been on these fallacies, Kachru advocates several changes that could be implemented in the EL classroom, depending on the goals of the class. Among the suggestions he makes are that teachers choose several major varieties and allow the students to explore how they are used and how they differ from each other. He also suggests allowing students to examine both standard and non-standard varieties. He stresses the importance of keeping a non-biased attitude throughout this process, so while focusing in class on a certain variety, the teacher should build student awareness of all varieties and their “functional validity” (p. 361).

***Teaching English as an international language.*** McKay (2002) echoes the ideas of Kachru in her theories of teaching EIL and asserts that a new ELT pedagogy is needed which will “take into account the cross-cultural values of the use of English in multilingual

communities, the questioning of native-speaker models, and the recognition of the equality of the varieties of English that have resulted from the global spread of the language” (cited in Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 225). Suggestions for the ELT classroom in this context include a focus on intelligibility rather than accuracy, a new sensitivity to whose cultures are represented in the content materials, and “respect for the local culture of learning” (p. 226). In terms of content, McKay (2003) refers to some national policy shifts in two specific countries, Morocco and Chile, concerning the cultural content incorporated into textbooks. Both nations have implemented the creation of textbooks featuring the national culture as opposed to an Inner Circle target culture. Even more promising could be the use of international target culture content, which could demonstrate to learners the morphosyntactic, lexical, phonological and pragmatic variation seen in English. (2003, p. 11). McKay also highlights the cultures-of-learning issue by pointing out that while children in Western classrooms respond well to communicative language teaching, which encourages classroom participation, children in Chinese classrooms consider such behavior disrespectful and boastful (2003, p. 13).

Supporting this move to pull away from NS English as an appropriate model, Snow et al. (2006) report on projects for the improvement of English language teaching in Egypt and Uzbekistan as part of an effort to challenge the notion that “nativeness” in English is to be equated with proficiency (p. 262). As a result of this study, they advocate several steps that EL teachers can take to improve their own teaching, and by extension their students’ results. While some of the suggestions correlate with standards for ELT already in place, others reflect the unique challenges of teaching English as an international rather than American or British product. One of these proposes that teachers as well as students need to gain exposure to varieties beyond NS English. Doing so will help to dispel the myth among educators in

Expanding Circle countries that it is the native speaker who “owns” English. Another is to help learners and teachers alike to see that the NS proficiency does not need to be their goal, that there is value in the way speakers from their own contexts use English in intercultural settings. The promotion of local methodologies and patterns of teacher behavior that are valued within the culture was also found by this study to be important in matching students’ needs and interests.

*Teaching English as a lingua franca.* Closely related to the field of teaching English as an international language is the teaching of English as a lingua franca. Seidlhofer (2004, p. 211) highlights the importance of examining ELF interactions more closely to learn how they differ from NS/NS or NS/NNS interactions, and thus to better inform pedagogy for teaching English in contexts where the goal is to be able to use ELF. Melchers and Shaw (2003, p. 195 cited in Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 212) note that since such interactions tend to occur between users who don’t “control standard grammar,” the trend being observed in English usage internationally could be described as a “process of internationalization and de-standardization.” Due to this shift in the needs of the ELL, Seidlhofer (2004) agrees with Kachru, McKay, and Snow above in calling for a complete “re-conceptualization of ELF” (p 214) in which teachers shift away from the priority of mastering NS norms.

One of the main hurdles to accomplishing this goal is the construction of a clear description of the ELF code. Work has begun on this through the efforts of the Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE). Key to an understanding of what constitutes ELF is knowledge of which features of English are considered by the majority of ELF users to be necessary for intelligibility. These features would then make up the “lingua franca core (LFC)” (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 216). In examining the core features, certain non-standard features continually show up as not creating issues of intelligibility (see Table 2.3, ELF), and thus are

seen as valid for inclusion in the core.

*Teaching English as an intercultural language.* Sifakis (2004) argues that the goal of teaching EIL in polymodel rather than monomodel fashion will not necessarily prepare learners for communication in the international community. Rather, he insists that the bulk of English communication that occurs around the world requires interlocutors not simply to be familiar with a number of varieties of English, but to have at their disposal the skills needed to make themselves comprehensible and inoffensive in a variety of cross-cultural situations. To differentiate it from EIL, he calls this approach “English as an intercultural language (EiCL)” (p. 242). As he claims, for learners to become successful communicators through EiCL,

Learners should be exposed to and become actively aware of as many and diverse samples of NNS discourse as possible and acquire training in making themselves comprehensible in as many different communicative situations and with as many different types of NNSs as possible (p. 242).

He speaks of the traditional “N-bound syllabus,” which focuses on mastery of norms, as being most appropriate in cases where the learner’s goal is to pass an exam, whereas a “C-bound syllabus,” which focuses on communication, comprehensibility, and culture, as used in an EiCL classroom, would be most important when the learner’s goal is to be able to communicate with people from diverse countries and cultural backgrounds. He advocates the use of term-initial surveys to assess student goals and needs, yet goes on to assert that even if one’s students favor the N-bound approach, the teacher could still “raise learners’ awareness of (a) the relationship between EIL and EiCL and (b) the ‘reality’ of EIL and EiCL in all communications that involve NNSs” (p. 246). Thus, the goal is not only to provide exposure to many varieties of English, but also to situations in which interlocutors from various English backgrounds must use

communication skills such as “making repairs, asking questions, shortening utterances, and changing the tempo of their speech output” (p. 243) to bring about true communication.

***Teaching standard American or British English.*** As noted above, a key consideration to be made in designing any English curriculum is to consider the goals of the learner. While many learners reject any form of standard English that smacks of American or British hegemony, others, perhaps because they plan on living in the United States or United Kingdom or hope to further their education there, desire proficiency in SAE or SBE specifically, just as Quirk (1991) suggested above. A project which could be of benefit to such learners of English is the creation of the International Corpus of Learner English through the Centre for English Corpus Linguistics in Louvan, Belgium. The objective of this project, as related by Seidlhofer (2004) is to “facilitate comparisons between... foreign-language productions and those of native speakers, and so to highlight the difficulties specific L1 groups have with native English in order to make it easier for learners to conform to ENL *if they so wish* [emphasis mine]” (p. 224). Although learner English as an inter-language cannot be considered a true variety, once again a comparative analysis of two “varieties” of English is being advocated here as a method for teaching the target variety, NS English in this case.

Baumgardner and Brown (2003) posit the effectiveness of a comparative approach even in classrooms dedicated to preparing students specifically for the TOEFL, their reasoning being that this practice will help the students become more aware of the differences between WEs. Baumgardner adds the following comment about the Pakistani TOEFL-preparatory classroom in which he used this approach:

This was not popular with other US government agencies or even with some local teachers who still adhered to Inner Circle exonormative models of English and

viewed their own varieties as deficient. However, I felt that the pluricentricity of English should be part of my students' linguistic knowledge, and they should know when to use one variety versus the other (Baumgardner & Brown, 2003, p. 248).

*Teaching standard English as a standard dialect.* Ironically, this issue of the status of world Englishes versus a standard such as SAE has become a domestic issue in the American public education system, swelling on a large influx of immigrants from Outer Circle countries. Adger (1997) discusses the issue of dialect awareness among US educators in public schools, and the impact that school policy favoring SAE production has on students from Outer Circle countries. These students, while they speak their own indigenized varieties of English fluently, are being placed into ESL classrooms with regular ELLs, to the disgust and frustration of their parents, and thus, different methods should be used for helping these students master SAE.

Adger does point out that while achieving proficiency in SAE can make a big impact on one's future career, not all students will need or benefit from proficiency in it. Despite this fact, she feels that no matter what a student's career goals may be, the answer both to boosting their feelings of cultural identity as well as improving their understanding of the features of SAE is to be found in the discipline of language awareness. In this methodology, students become aware of the ways in which their own dialects compare to the standard dialect, in the hopes that they can become adept at switching back and forth between the two depending on their context. Thus, rather than replacing their variety of English, the goal is to add a new one to their repertoire. Adger suggests that a three-pronged approach used by Wolfram, Detwyler, and Adger (1992, cited in Adger, 1997) in bidialectal learning situations in Baltimore would be applicable here. One aspect of this approach involves promotion of the scientific method, in

which students discover for themselves the rules of dialects by studying samples of different dialects, including their own, and comparing them with each other. The second aspect takes a socio-historical perspective by teaching students about the forces involved in language development, especially in relation to their own dialects. Finally, the humanistic approach is used to encourage students to come to terms with society's attitudes towards dialects, including their own. Student attitudes are key to the success of second dialect acquisition, as shown by a study of African American teenagers done by Fordham in 1996 (cited by Adger, 1997) which found that they purposely did not use SAE in order to avoid sounding "white." Ultimately, the goal in such language awareness programs is to eliminate prejudice, on the part of the students themselves as well as educators, to the point that it does not interfere with students' ability to gain proficiency in SAE, should they so desire.

Brandon, Baszile, and Berry (2009) also support this policy of using students' own dialects in education to help them acquire the standard. They claim that, "Countless researchers hold that successful learning experiences for bilingual and bidialectal students connect school to students' home language, culture and community and as such use current knowledge to build future learning experiences" (p. 48). Studies they cite which were found to support this position include those carried out by Delpit in 1995, by Ladson-Billings in 1994, by Nieto in 2004, and by Perry and Delpit in 1998.

Table 2.3 *Teaching Approaches Advocated as a Result of the New World English Paradigm*

<b>Context</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Approach Advocated</b>	<b>Benefits</b>
ESL/EFL	Quirk, 1991	Monomodel, NS English	NS Englishes are the varieties with the most power to promote international communication
ESL/EFL	Widdowson, 1997	Monomodel, subject-specific registers within IE	Language of registers cuts across national boundaries, lending cohesiveness to IE
ESL/EFL	Kachru, 1992	Polymodel	Students become aware of other varieties and their “functional validity”
EIL	McKay, 2002, 2003	De-nationalized monomodel: non-NS variety, culturally apt content and methods	Cross-cultural sensitivity among ELT professionals, classroom practices inoffensive to students
EIL	Snow et al., 2006	Polymodel, de-emphasizes goal of NS proficiency, use of local teaching methods	Exposure to other WEs, others besides NSs “own” English, NNS English has value
ELF	Seidlhofer, 2004	De-nationalized monomodel based on NNS interactions in English, not NS norms	Student goal-oriented, continual gathering of corpus data to better understand ELF interactions
EiCL	Sifakis, 2004	Poly-model and –context; C-bound approach: culture, communication, and comprehensibility	Learners exposed to many situations of IE use, learn to negotiate meaning in cross-culturally appropriate ways
SAE/SBE	Seidlhofer, 2004	Polymodel, comparison between target variety and learner English using ICLE	Pinpoints specific problem areas depending on L1, students learn by comparing
SAE	Baumgardner and Brown, 2003	Polymodel, comparison between the local WE and SAE for TOEFL prep	Increases students linguistic knowledge, students learn when appropriate to use each variety
ESD	Adger, 1997	Polymodel, comparison between D1 and SAE; to add a variety to repertoire, not to replace one with another	Students increase language awareness by discovering differences, studying history of dialects, and discussing attitudes
ESD	Brandon et al., 2009	Polymodel, comparison between D1 and SAE	Connects school learning to home language and culture, builds new knowledge on existing knowledge

**Language awareness through a comparative approach.** As the literature highlighted in the previous chapter attests, there are many scholarly proponents to adopting a comparative polymodel approach to teaching English, whether in Outer Circle ESL contexts, Expanding Circle EFL, ELF or EIL contexts, or Inner Circle ESD contexts. However, the question with which this paper is attempting to come to terms is whether a WEs perspective, in which the validity of more than one variety is acknowledged, can be of any benefit to those students who have set as their goal proficiency in one of the very Inner Circle standard varieties which the WEs perspective wishes to dissuade ELLs from idolizing. Specifically, for students seeking mastery in SAE in order to excel on the TOEFL or MELAB and succeed in the United States' tertiary education system, is there any evidence that a pedagogical approach in which the target variety is presented in comparison to another WE variety produces higher levels of proficiency in that target variety than if it were presented as the only variety worth learning?

To answer that question, this review temporarily leaves the domain of English to examine an empirical study on language awareness reported on in Yiakoumetti et al. (2005) and Yiakoumetti (2006, 2007) involving Standard Modern Greek (SMG) and the Cypriot Dialect (CD) on the island of Cyprus. Yiakoumetti et al. explain that the situation in the Cypriot school system is a bidialectal one in which CD is the mother tongue of the students, and SMG the prestige variety used in the schools. Since the two varieties are related closely, this is not a second language situation, but the bidialectal students do need to acquire some new linguistic features if they are to gain proficiency in the target variety. Those involved in the educational system on Cyprus agree that this bidialectism has a negative affect on students' attitudes and abilities in SMG, resulting in considerable first dialect interference when using SMG at school (2005, p. 255). In fact, the schools on Cyprus do not officially recognize the Cypriot dialect, but

treat the students as if SMG were their mother tongue. Yiakoumetti (2007) credits Valdés with pointing out that a major hurdle with learning a second dialect (D2) is that students often are not even aware how the D1 and D2 differ specifically (p. 53). Yiakoumetti et al. (2005), thus, proposed a language awareness program in which this non-standard first dialect (D1) of the students was used as a “comparative/contrastive tool” (p. 255). Yiakoumetti draws on other scholars in the field of bidialectal education to inform this study. He refers to James (1992) who attests to “the benefits that can be drawn from juxtaposing or confronting D1 and D2 and helping the learner to notice the differences between them” (cited in 2007, p. 54). He also cites Harris-Wright (1999) who performed a study called the DeKalb Bidialectal Communication Program on the use of a contrastive approach to help American students see the differences between African-American English and SAE, and who discovered improvements both in reading and oral proficiency (cited in 2007, p. 54).

Yiakoumetti’s study involved 92 students in their final year of primary school, 53 urban and 39 rural (2005, p. 256), as the experimental group, and 90 students in the same grade and the same two schools as the control group (2006, p. 301). The D1 of both urban and rural students is CD, not SMG. During half of each daily language period for three months, the experimental students did lessons from a textbook designed for the program, while the control group had their regular language lessons. The first part of their textbook covered information on “languages of the world, differences between languages and dialects, Greek dialects, domains of usage of SMG and the CD on the island of Cyprus, and the linguistic differences between SMG and the CD” (Yiakoumetti, 2005, p. 256). The second part contained activities that “trained students to identify the differences between the two varieties, to classify them and finally to transfer production from the local variety... to the standard” (Yiakoumetti, 2005, p. 256). The key to this

approach was that having the students work from both parts of the textbook “ensured that social and sociolinguistic information was provided alongside grammatical exercises” (Yiakoumetti, 2005, p. 256). Yiakoumetti (2007) delineates the following four steps through which lessons progressed: (1) “Exposure to D1 and D2,” in which classes were introduced to the two varieties and tasked with finding differences between the two; (2) “Classification of D1/D2 differences,” in which students grouped differences as having to do with pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary in order to more easily identify patterns in each language; (3) “Transference from D1 to D2,” in which learners modified oral and written material from the non-standard variety to the standard; and (4) “Oral and written production of D2,” in which students described pictures using only the target variety (pp. 300-301). Except for the testing of student attitudes towards CD and SMG which was administered only pre- and post-study, the students were evaluated on their oral and written proficiency in SMG four times: before the study began, mid-way through it, at its completion, and three months later.

In Yiakoumetti et al. (2005), the article focuses on the effect of the language awareness program on students’ attitudes and oral production in terms of their geographic location and gender, while Yiakoumetti (2007) is concerned with its effect on students’ writing skills, also with respect to location and student gender, and Yiakoumetti (2006) focuses on a comparison between the experimental and control group. Students’ attitudes were measured through the use of a questionnaire in which students expressed agreement or disagreement with various statements about the CD and SMG. The study found that before the program began, both rural and urban students held somewhat negative views about CD, but that after the program they were overwhelmingly positive (Yiakoumetti et al., 2005, p. 258). To test the students’ oral improvement, interviewers listened for and counted instances of D1 interference, whether

morphological, syntactical phonological or lexical. The study reports that the D1 features were “significantly reduced” (Yiakoumetti et al., 2005, p. 257) in all four categories, and that the rural students showed the greatest amount of improvement, even though they had started out with the greatest influence from the D1. Finally, to test the students’ writing ability essays were elicited in geography and in language class, without the students’ knowledge that they were being tested as part of the language awareness program, and errors deemed a result of interference from the D1 were recorded. Once again, noticeable improvements were observed among both the rural and urban children, allowing Yiakoumetti (2007) to conclude:

The current study empirically demonstrated that, prior to any intervention, the choice to exclude the dialect from the classroom in line with the current educational policy in Cyprus has resulted in ‘negative transfer’ of dialectal features to learners’ production of the standard... The study also revealed that the choice to include the dialect in the classroom alongside the standard variety does not result in dialectal interference. On the contrary, dialectal interference is reduced and the two codes are better separated. This is evidence that, once children were made aware of the features that are SMG and are not SMG, they applied their knowledge to increase the appropriateness of their usage (p. 62).

Furthermore, in Yiakoumetti (2006), the study discovered a striking improvement in SMG proficiency among the experimental group over the control group, both in oral and written production. As a result, Yiakoumetti (2006) asserts that the implicit knowledge the students gained through explicit discovery of differences between the two dialects “was especially useful because it was founded in terms of the relation of the two varieties, rather than in their isolation” (p. 311), and most importantly for this paper, that his study “confirmed that the ability to

consciously identify differences between two varieties enhances performance in the variety which is targeted for improvement” (p. 312).

**Modifications to teacher training.** The same paradigm shift in the state of English which has testers and teachers taking a fresh look at their methods has forced teacher educators to also re-examine the content of MA TESOL programs in the United States. Brown (2002) argues “that pre-service teachers need not only to be familiar with what others have termed the ‘Kachruvian paradigm’ (Pakir, 2000; Smith and Sridhar, 2001), but to be able to place this paradigm and others within an epistemological continuum” (p. 445). Doing so will not only foster better relationships with ELT colleagues from around the world who are also coming to terms with new notions of who owns English, but also to disseminate critical information about the multitude of WE contexts which necessitate a paradigm shift in teaching methods. Brown and Peterson (1997) report on a study carried out on forty MA TESOL students comparing the effects of a four-hour WE workshop versus a 34-hour, four-credit graduate-level WEs course on the thinking of graduate students. They found that “simply infusing a brief introduction of WE issues into teacher preparatory programs is unlikely to bring about the kind of paradigm shift called for by Kachru throughout his scholarship. Instead, more extensive curricular revisions are necessary” (p. 44). Brown and Peterson (1997) conclude that “until such time as an introductory world Englishes class becomes a mandatory part of the core linguistics classes in TESOL MA programs, many of the conceptual and attitudinal changes which WE authors have been calling for are unlikely to happen” (p. 45).

## **Chapter Summary**

This review of the literature has provided some background into the complexities of policy-making in regards to English usage in the world today. As the literature has shown, the

English language is rich in variety, and many speakers of WEs feel that the imposing of Inner Circle norms neutralizes their identities or cultural values. However, these traditional standard Englishes are also seen by ELLs as a goal to work towards and a doorway to higher learner or careers within international corporations. Due to the inconclusive nature of studies which have sought to establish bias in English proficiency tests based on SAE or SBE, and the difficulties inherent in adapting such tests, this review turned its focus to adjusting English teaching practices, especially in light of the acceptability of some non-standard English features in WEs contexts nowadays. A common theme among the scholars of ELT methods became apparent as many of them advocated approaches in which more than one version of English could serve as a classroom model, not just Inner Circle English as traditionally held. The study of more than one dialect was also suggested as a method for increasing language awareness by allowing the students to compare and contrast features of the various dialects. In the next chapter, this paper will discuss what relevance these suggestions could have for a classroom of ELLs with the goal of doing well on their TOEFL or MELAB tests and going on to succeed in the American university system.

### **Chapter 3: Implications and Application**

From the review of the literature it can be seen that not only are there a wide variety of dialects falling under the designation of world Englishes, there are also widely differing viewpoints on how this variation should be approached from the standpoint of ELT. As mentioned in the introduction, the focus of this paper will be how the explosion in contexts for using English worldwide could and should impact the way teachers teach English to ELLs, and specifically, what effect this paradigm shift should have on methods for preparing students from other countries to succeed in the SAE environment of United States colleges and universities.

#### **Implications for the ELT Classroom**

This discussion will begin by summarizing the recommendations provided by various experts in the field of ELT as it relates to WEs. It will then turn to an examination of which recommendations might logically have an application to contexts in which ELLs are learning SAE for the purpose of studying at American universities.

**Benefits of a comparative, polymodel approach.** The overwhelming majority of scholars, whether considering a traditional EFL context, an ELF context, an EIL context, or an SESD context, advocate the benefits of an approach in which the students are exposed to more than one variety of English, affirming the legitimacy of each variety while becoming aware of the differences between them. This has been called a polymodel approach, versus the monomodel approach where one variety is learned in isolation, and also a comparative approach, due to the comparison of one variety to another, as in dialect awareness. In this way, students learn to see accuracy in light of contexts of usage, not as deficiencies of a “worse” variety as compared to a “better” variety, and to consider successful communication a more important

outcome of learning English. One benefit of this approach is that it promotes students' sense of self-worth as members of specific socio-cultural groups in that it validates the language with which they identify. Another benefit is that it promotes the use of culturally appropriate content and pedagogical methods. Furthermore, it helps students see that there are many more NNSs than NSs of English and, for that reason, users of English do not need to produce English like NSs to be considered proficient in the language. Finally, for most contexts in which English is used internationally, communication which is appropriate is the goal over communication which is accurate; thus, the goal of ELT for students heading into the world of international relations should focus less on form and more on communication.

**Implications for SAE-focused classrooms.** That last comment brings this discussion to one of the more salient points of the literature review, namely, that the goals and preferences of the students themselves should be central to the planning of EL curricula. Since this paper is concerned primarily with teaching those students who plan to study at the college level in the United States, it is to that context which this discussion now turns. As Sifakis (2004) noted, these are the students who are likely to desire the traditional N-bound approach to teaching over a C-bound approach, and who will need to focus on one variety, SAE in this case, in order to get high scores on the TOEFL or MELAB, a first step in gaining access to the American higher education system. One may wonder, and logically so, whether it would be of any use to such students to expose them to a wide variety of world Englishes. As noted above, it stands to reason that all students would benefit psychologically from an approach which validates their previous English exposure and affirms the ability of NNSs to produce noteworthy contributions to the English language and English language learning. Moreover, to reiterate Baumgardner and Brown (2003)'s comments noted earlier, it is beneficial to all learners of English to acquire

pragmatic knowledge about which contexts are appropriate for the various dialects of English they may pick up along the way, even those who are focusing primarily on obtaining high TOEFL or MELAB scores. Furthermore, whatever the context, a comparative polymodel approach would validate culturally appropriate teaching methods and content, instead of forcing Western teaching methods or cultural content on students who may be offended by such practices. However, superseding the afore-mentioned benefits of this approach, the most important result of teaching this particular group of students will be how well it prepares them to achieve their goal of succeeding on their standardized English test as well as in college. The salient question in this case is whether a comparative, polymodel approach is better for helping students master the grammatical, lexical, and phonological features of SAE than simply studying SAE in isolation.

**Conscious identification of differences.** According to the results of Yiakoumetti's study (2005, 2006, 2007), a comparative approach was indeed found to produce striking improvements in the ability to use the standard dialect when the non-standard dialect was juxtaposed with it in the language classroom, especially when compared with control groups which were only exposed to the standard dialect in language class. Rather than causing greater interference from the D1, encouraging the students to consciously identify differences between the D1 and D2 resulted in less grammatical, lexical and phonological interference of the D1 on the D2 by the students in the experimental group than those in the control group as well as a greater awareness as to when certain features are appropriate and when they are not. From this result, it could be predicted that learning SAE in comparison to a WE would help students recognize and keep straight which features belong to WE contexts and which are appropriate for SAE contexts.

It is important to note, however, that the non-standard variety used for comparison to the standard variety in the Cypriot situation was the students' own mother tongue, whereas in most ESL/EFL classrooms, the non-standard variety would be the students' world English, in almost all cases an L2 at the very least, if not an L3 or L4. Could the results of the Cypriot study have similar implications for a situation in which the students are likely to lack the same intimate familiarity with the non-standard variety as they would with their mother tongue? Just as Brandon et al. (2009) assert that in the area of bilingualism and bidialectism new knowledge is built on current knowledge, it would seem reasonable to assume that even an L2- or L3-level of familiarity with one variety of English should provide some current knowledge on which to base a comparison with a standard English, and that greater improvement in target language proficiency would occur. Furthermore, there would still be the benefit of an increase in learning gained through the technique of consciously noticing differences between varieties. Thus, while the benefits of a comparative, polymodel approach may not be as striking in the WE to SAE context as they were in the Cyprus study's MT to D2 context, it seems rational to expect that some improvement over a strictly monomodel approach would be observed.

**Attitude and identity.** While conscious identification of differences is undoubtedly a strong factor in the success of a comparative polymodel approach, learner attitude towards their WE must also play a significant role in its effectiveness. The Cypriot dialect was viewed by the students and their teachers as inferior to the standard variety heading into Yiakoumetti's (2005, 2006, 2007) study, yet it gave the students on Cyprus their sense of identity. The same is likely true of users of non-standard WE varieties.

As mentioned previously, McKay (2002) asserted that grammar expresses a social identity. This proved true for de Klerk (2003) who pointed out that Xhosa people in South

Africa may choose to use Xhosa English over the standard White South African English, particularly in speaking, as a means of identifying with that particular group. Adger (1997) echoed the same point of view in mentioning black American students who gave as their reason for resisting SAE in their speech that they didn't want to sound "white." Similarly, Breiteneder (2009) attributed social factors as an explanation for why European businessmen, who know to add an -s to third person singular verbs would sometimes do so, yet leave it off when talking amongst other NNSs. Finally, Kachru (1992) asserted that, contrary to one of the great fallacies about the use of English, in most cases where English is used, neither interlocutor is a NS and to follow the conventions of one of the Inner Circle standard varieties in such contexts would be inappropriate, if not downright ostentatious. Thus, while NNSs of English may not have the same emotional attachment to their second language WE as mother tongue speakers of a non-standard dialect do towards their variety, there is undoubtedly a level of identity-association that could serve as a motivational factor if their non-standard WE variety, long viewed as being inappropriate for use in schools, were suddenly given prominence as a comparative tool in the ELT classroom.

**Contexts for the polymodel approach.** The discussion has so far considered the benefits to using a comparative, polymodel approach in a TOEFL preparation course. Such a situation could take place in any of three contexts: an ESL classroom in an Outer Circle country, an EFL classroom in an Expanding Circle country, or an ESL classroom in the United States.

**Outer Circle context.** In an Outer Circle English language classroom, the teacher would be likely to have students who, though they may or may not have the same L1s, at least identify with similar Outer Circle varieties of English. For example, in a South African EL classroom, some of the students might be conversant in BSAE, while others with its sub-variety Xhosa

English. Such students would have been exposed to their WE in listening to popular personalities and singers on the radio and television, as well as in casual conversations with others from different L1 backgrounds. In school as well as in the newspapers and news reports, they would also have been exposed to the standard English, known as White South African English, which could benefit them as an intermediate step en route to mastering SAE. In such a classroom context, evidence from Yiakoumetti (2005, 2006, 2007) and de Klerk (2003) suggests that students would derive the greatest benefit if the teacher used examples of the WE variety in which they had the greatest current knowledge base and sense of identity, namely BSAE or Xhosa English, for comparison purposes.

*Expanding Circle context.* In the Expanding Circle, on the other hand, where indigenized English varieties have only recently begun to take hold (Lowenberg, 2002), students are less likely to have formed an identity in connection with any particular WE, though they may have been exposed to a regional version of ELF and will also have learned in school an Inner Circle standard English flavored by the culture, accents, and understandings of their country's teachers. In these contexts, classrooms focused on preparing students for the American college system would likely be comprised of students who are users of a single or related L1s. Teachers could provide examples of the regional ELF, if available, or of learner English corpora as suggested by Seidlhofer (2004) for comparing to the target variety. Although the Expanding Circle students would not have the same emotional attachment to the comparison variety as the Outer Circle students, they would still have the current knowledge gained from studying English language in school and might notice features in common between their own usage of English to-date and that of the ELF or learner English varieties, even as they notice differences between those varieties and the target language.

***Inner Circle context.*** Finally, in the context of the Inner Circle, a teacher could easily be faced with a classroom of students from multiple backgrounds, some Outer Circle and some Expanding Circle. While it would be impossible to choose one variety that all students could relate to for comparing to the target variety, the teacher could choose a neutral variety not represented by any of the students in the class, or again, texts from the learner English corpora. In this way, no one student's variety would be given prominence in the classroom comparison, yet each of the students could be considering whether the non-standard features they discover in the chosen variety are present in the WEs they are familiar with. The emotional distance from the comparison variety would likely be further than that in the Expanding Circle context, but the students would still have the benefits of adding new knowledge to current knowledge and explicit learning of features through noticing. An additional activity to better bring the learning home for the students in such a classroom, and thus close that emotional gap somewhat, could be to have them find examples of English published in their own countries, either in print or on the internet, and share with their classmates what they notice about these samples.

### **Putting the Approach into Action – An Example**

To illustrate how a comparative, polymodel approach might look in the Inner Circle context noted above, we turn to Table 2.2 and notice that a wide-spread non-standard feature among WEs is the zero-marking of 3<sup>rd</sup>-person present tense verbs. It would make sense then, to focus explicit attention on this feature of the language, helping the students to notice instances of it in written publications, transcripts of spoken conversations, or excerpts from video. A logical variety to focus on for comparative purposes would be African American Vernacular English (AAVE) because the 3<sup>rd</sup>-person *-s* is dropped in this WE as well. In addition, none of the students in the class would have had exposure to it as their own WE and thus have an unfair

advantage over others in the class, and resources showcasing this variety are readily available in the United States.

**Step one: exposure.** First, following a progression similar to the four steps described by Yiakoumetti (2006), the teacher could begin by introducing the students to some background information on the demographics of AAVE users, their geographical locations, and the variations that occur within AAVE according to location. The discussion should also include the fact that AAVE has long held a position of low esteem among varieties of English in the United States, especially in education contexts, and ask students to share similar knowledge about low-prestige dialects of English in their own countries. The teacher would then present the class with samples of authentic text or audio from SAE as well as from AAVE.

**Step two: classification.** Second, in keeping with Yiakoumetti's (2006) second step as well as Kachru's (1992) advice to treat each variety as a valid, rule-governed language in its own right, students would be asked to notice differences in grammar from the two samples, and to classify these according to the prescriptive SAE grammar rules from which the AAVE text deviates. Limiting this exercise to items of grammar would certainly not be advised in an actual college-preparatory English class as mastery of pronunciation and appropriate vocabulary are also critical to students' success on the TOEFL and MELAB tests. However, as this paper's focus is the non-standard grammatical features of WEs, this discussion of a sample lesson will limit itself to the domain of grammar. The Appendix provides samples of AAVE and SAE narrative writing in worksheet format, including space for students to write down the differences they notice. In choosing representative samples of each variety, a special effort was made to find an SAE text which exhibited the SAE version of the same grammar points that would be noticed in the AAVE text. Thus, in the AAVE text, the students should notice, in addition to the absence

of *be* verb inflection provided as an example, one instance of the absence of the auxiliary *be* in the present progressive, one omission of the definite article, and numerous instances of zero-marking of 3<sup>rd</sup>-person singular verbs. Similarly, upon examination of the SAE text, they will be able to find examples of the presence of *be* verb inflection, the presence of auxiliary *be* in the present progressive, instances of the use of the definite article, and numerous examples of *s*-marked 3<sup>rd</sup>-person singular verbs.

**Step three: transference.** As in the third step of Yiakoumetti's (2006) language awareness program, in which students made a transfer of knowledge from their D1 to their D2, students of this class would next be instructed to make SAE modifications, not "corrections," to the AAVE text so that it followed SAE conventions. Granted, some of the students in a mixed-WE class may not have had issues with zero-marking of 3<sup>rd</sup>-person singular verbs in their own WE exposure; however, this activity could still be a good awareness-building exercise for them as well. A further component that could be added to this step of the lesson would be to give students the homework assignment of finding a sample of English writing from their own countries. These could be examined among their classmates for examples of adherence or non-adherence to SAE present tense verb inflections, and if necessary, modified to comply with SAE conventions.

**Step four: production.** The final step in Yiakoumetti's (2006) awareness process is to elicit the production of target-language features. While this was done in the Cyprus study through the use of pictures to be described by the students, in the current scenario, students could be given a prompt to begin a present-tense narrative, following the example of the two excerpts. The teacher should draw students' attention to the fact that most of the description in this kind of narrative is accomplished using the simple present tense, and that the present progressive is only

used to describe occurrences of a more temporary nature as part of the narrative. An example of a possible prompt might be: “It is morning in my hometown, and as I walk down the street... (*describe what you see*).” Such a topic should give the students adequate material as it would be familiar to them, and the prompt sets the tone for the tense of the writing. First drafts could be revised by peers and final drafts shared with the entire class as part of a meaningful sharing of cultural backgrounds.

### **Limitations of the Approach**

It has been suggested by the scholars discussed in Chapter 2 that a comparative, polymodel approach to ELT could be of great benefit to any level of English language learner by creating greater awareness of and tolerance toward the variety seen in English today. By drawing parallels to a study of bidialectal education in Cyprus schools, it has been proposed that such an approach could also improve the acquisition of SAE features by advanced students of English preparing for their American university experience. However, in the context of beginning English students who are coming straight from zero English exposure to an SAE environment, such a polymodel approach might only serve to confuse them. In situations where the entire classroom of newcomers represents the same L1, it is possible that the language of comparison could be their actual L1 as opposed to a non-standard variety of English. This would only be possible, however, if their teacher or a bilingual classroom helper were proficient in the L1. Furthermore, once the newcomers had a good grasp of SAE, the language awareness built up through comparing it with their L1 could be extended to other dialects, especially varieties that they may encounter outside the American classroom environment. Until that time, however, it does not seem prudent to suggest that the comparative, polymodel approach would be helpful to non-English-speaking newcomers to the American education system.

## **Implications for TESOL Programs**

Before bringing this discussion to a close, it should be pointed out that it makes little sense for the paradigm shift in our view of the English language to effect a shift in teaching methods unless it also effects a shift in the educating of ESL/EFL teachers. Baumgardner (2006) lists only eight universities in the United States which offer courses in world Englishes (p. 663). Brown and Peterson's (1997) research on the effects of a four-credit graduate-level course on the epistemology of MA TESOL students revealed that to truly change pre-service teachers' thinking on world Englishes issues, a full-semester course was necessary. It is undeniable that a world-Englishes viewpoint will have not just a positive effect on the learning that occurs in EL classrooms but also on the attitudes of students and teachers towards the acceptance of non-standard dialects of English. If nothing else, a world-Englishes viewpoint will foster harmonious international relationships as greater cross-cultural sensitivity occurs along with it. However, a substantial gap exists between a four-hour workshop on world Englishes, which led to almost no new understanding by the students, and a 34-hour semester-long course. Some universities might find it difficult to alter their MA TESOL curricula to the point of requiring an entire additional course in world Englishes. Thus, it is suggested here that a half-semester emphasis on world Englishes, perhaps embedded in a course on sociolinguistics, would still create much greater understanding than a brief workshop, while being easier to work into the MA TESOL curriculum than adding a whole new course.

## Chapter Summary

There are many scholars who feel that the new status of English as an international language makes it imperative that changes occur in the way English is taught throughout the world. This chapter has examined their ideas to determine whether they have any validity in terms of the specific situation of students wishing to further their education at the tertiary level in the United States. A comparative, polymodel approach which seems to be a common denominator among most of them has been found to be successful in helping bidialectal learners in Cyprus (Yiakoumetti, 2005, 2006, 2007) to master features of the standard dialect, their D2. Of the three Kachruvian contexts enumerated, that of Outer Circle students studying SAE in their own countries most closely resembles the situation of the Cypriot students, given the familiarity the students have with an indigenized Outer Circle variety, and thus is mostly likely to see similar positive results. Nevertheless, this discussion has also put forward reasons that English students in the Expanding and Inner Circle contexts could expect to benefit from such an approach, namely that its increased cultural sensitivity both in terms of teaching methods and content would create a more favorable environment for learning to occur, and that the exercise of consciously noticing differences produces enhanced proficiency in the target language. An example of a possible lesson was provided, following the same four-step procedure used in Yiakoumetti's (2006) awareness program, and comments were made regarding the limitations of this approach as well as the necessity of making pre-service English language teachers aware of the new world English view of teaching English.

## Chapter 4: Conclusion

That English has become the international language of choice today cannot be denied. As this paper has shown, this relatively recent development has caused a major shift in the way that the language is perceived currently as compared to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. This so-called paradigm shift in the reality of English has, of necessity, affected the way the language is assessed as well as taught. Thus it is observed that this new reality for English has elicited accusations of bias in tests which assess English proficiency, allegations that tests such as the TOEFL or MELAB, for example, which are based on SAE conventions, privilege those who have been exposed to that particular variety of English and marginalize those who have been exposed to and mastered other equally valid WEs. Likewise, instead of having one or two Inner Circle models to choose from in teaching ELLs, there are now hundreds of varieties, both standard and non-standard, which scholars in the polymodel camp believe should receive equal air-time in the EL classroom.

This paper has focused on how these new world English issues impact international students who are preparing to study in American colleges and universities. Thus, after defining the broader issue of world Englishes as reported in scholarly works, it has explored the literature for specific ways that non-standard WE grammars deviate from SAE, and hence which features of SAE might be problematic for students from those particular dialect backgrounds.

To determine how such students' situation could be made more equitable in terms of English proficiency tests, this paper then looked at studies which attempted to find evidence of bias in several major tests of English, specifically the TOEFL, TOEIC, MELAB, and IELTS. While scholars posit that to make the testing more equitable the tests should either be modified according to students' WE background or adapted so as to assess only the very core features of

English varieties, the aforementioned studies were not able to establish the existence of significant bias, even when the international tests were compared to national tests of English proficiency, meaning that such an overhaul to the test construction would not be worth the time and expense at this point in time.

Because the domain of assessment modification did not offer much in the way of opportunities to improve the likelihood of international students' test-taking success in the midst of a changed English paradigm, this paper turned to an examination of the literature in terms of new ideas for ELT. As the review showed, there are widely varying opinions concerning how English should be taught in light of the WE reality. Some scholars advocate focusing exclusively on one standard English, while others insist that a pluricentric approach would better prepare students for the reality of a world of English varieties and multiple contexts for using them. Contexts for teaching English ranged from traditional ESL/EFL situations to EIL, ELF, and EIL classrooms, from contexts where the students' goal is to learn SAE or SBE to bidialectal situations where the students seek to add a standard dialect of English to their repertoire. Suggestions that had relevance in particular to this paper's question of how best to serve international students preparing for a successful career in the American tertiary system included the following: the use of a polymodel approach which increases students' awareness of English varieties and their value as real languages, the use of culturally appropriate content and teaching methods to better reach one's students, and the use of a comparative approach between one variety and the target variety to elicit the skill of noticing differences, highlight attitudes about dialects, and use existing knowledge of one variety to build new knowledge about the target variety.

While these suggestions were helpful in formulating a possible classroom scenario for

United States-bound college students, there remained the question as to whether a polymodel approach in keeping with the WE viewpoint could actually enhance the mastery of SAE conventions, and grammar features in particular. To answer this question, the literature review turned to Yiakoumetti's (2005, 2006, 2007) study of students in a bidialectal educational situation on the island of Cyprus. In this bidialectal language awareness study, Yiakoumetti found that not only did the use of D1 as a comparative tool in the classroom not detract from the learning of the standard target variety, the D2, it in fact enhanced the students' ability to master it as demonstrated by a significant reduction in the incidences of D1 interference on the D2. Found to produce even greater improvement in the speech and writing of rural students who had had less exposure to the standard features of the D1 than urban students, this approach has promising implications for the case of international students who have been exposed primarily to a WE variety other than SAE.

An important factor differentiating the Cyprus context, as well as other bidialectal situations, from the context of WE speakers focusing on SAE is that in the former context the Cyprus school children's comparison language was their own mother tongue, while in the latter context the comparison language would be at least a second language to the students. However, it was seen that dialect attitude and user identity play a significant role in language use at both the mother-tongue (e.g., African American Vernacular English) and L2-level (e.g., European ELF, BSAE, or Xhosa English). Furthermore, in both situations, students would learn by discovering differences and building new knowledge on a current knowledge base, all the while increasing their awareness of language in general. Therefore, there are enough similarities between the two situations to warrant optimism that Baumgardner and Brown's (2003) method of using variety comparison in TOEFL-preparatory classrooms, as done in Pakistan, really can

result in better TOEFL scores while still affirming the value of the students' WE and culture.

It was in this hopeful light that the discussion next examined three possible contexts in which a comparative, polymodel approach could take place. Because students in Outer Circle EFL classrooms would be likely to have the most intimate knowledge of, and attitudinal attachment to, the comparison WE, it was argued that this context would be likely to produce the most striking improvements in test scores. Nevertheless, due to the techniques of creating a respectful atmosphere towards all dialects, learning through noticing differences, and building new knowledge on existing knowledge, which are inherent to this approach, it was felt that even in the Expanding Circle and Inner Circle contexts, students could gain greater language awareness, leading in turn to an improvement in proficiency and, thus, test scores. Which WE to use for a comparison variety might be less obvious in these contexts; however, a regional ELF or a corpus of learner English would be possibilities in the Expanding Circle, while any neutral WE could serve the purpose in a multi-WE Inner Circle ESL classroom. One example lesson was provided to illustrate how this scenario might operate in an Inner Circle classroom, following the four-step process propounded by Yiakoumetti (2006) which comprises exposure, classification, transference and production. The WE used in this example was AAVE as the context was considered to be an American ESL classroom of college-bound students, thus few, if any, students would have formed an attachment to this particular dialect.

In discussing the question of how a shift in the English paradigm has changed the way non-standard features of the language are perceived, how major international assessments of English should be adjusted to accommodate this shift, and how teaching methods should be modified to match the current reality of English as an international language, there was yet one more aspect of the discussion that needed mentioning, namely, teacher education. While Brown

(2002) proposed, based on her study (Peterson & Brown, 1997) of MA TESOL graduate students, that to increase pre-service teachers' sensitivity to the issues surrounding the new English paradigm a full-semester course in world Englishes should be included as part of every MA TESOL program in the United States. While this is a worthy goal given the controversial nature of the testing and teaching of English worldwide, it was noted in the discussion that perhaps a more attainable goal for many TESOL programs, and one still likely to improve teachers' understanding of the issues, would be to include a half-semester emphasis on world Englishes as part of a one-semester course such as sociolinguistics.

There is no doubt that international students who have been exposed to non-standard varieties of English and are intent on continuing their education at American universities are at a disadvantage compared to those who, perhaps by virtue of the fact that they live in urban areas, have been exposed to a standard variety more closely related to Standard American English. It is the conclusion of this paper that these students can best be helped to achieve their goals at the current time if WE-sensitized English language teachers will consider the specific non-standard features of their students' dialects and focus on these in a polymodel approach which non-judgmentally compares a WE to the standard target variety. Not only is it predicted that this will result in better test results and a successful college career, but that students will come to see themselves as part of a large and diverse community of people who share a common bond in their use of the English language.

**Appendix – Worksheet for Sample Lesson**

**African American Vernacular English compared to Standard American English**

Circle examples of grammar in this AAVE text which differ from SAE grammar. Fill in the chart below according to the kinds of grammar features you notice. One example is provided.

**Excerpt from *His Own Where*, by June Jordan—**

First time they come, he simply say, “Come on.” He tell her they are going not too far away. She go along not worrying about the heelstrap pinching at her skin, but worrying about the conversation. Long walks take some talking. Otherwise it be embarrassing just side by side embarrassing.

Buddy stay quiet, walking pretty fast, but every step right next to her. They trip together like a natural sliding down the street.

Block after block after block begin to bother her. Nothing familiar is left. The neighborhood is changing. Strangers watch them from the windows.

Angela looking at Buddy, look at his shoes and wish for summertime and beaches when his body, ankle, toes will shock the ocean, yelling loud and laughing hard and wasting no sand.

Buddy think about time and the slowspeed of her eyes that leave him hungry, nervous, big and quick. Slide by the closedup drugstore, cross under the train, run the redlight, circle past two women leaning on two wire carts, and reach the avenue of showrooms. Green, blue, yellow, orange cars driving through, cars at the the curb, cars behind the glass, cars where houses used to stand, cars where people standing now, and tree to tree electric lights.

Grammar feature:	<i>“be” verb form</i>			
Examples found:	<i>it be</i>			

Now examine the SAE text below. Circle examples of the features you noticed above that show how they are used in SAE.

**Excerpt from *Cross Creek*, by Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings—**

The road goes west out of the village, past open pine woods and gallberry flats. An eagle’s nest is a ragged cluster of sticks in a tall tree, and one of the eagles is usually black and silver against the sky. The other perches near the nest, hunched and proud, like a griffon. There is no magic here except the eagles. Yet the four miles to the Creek are stirring, like the bleak, portentous beginning of a good tale. The road curves sharply, the vegetation thickens, and around the bend masses into dense hammock. The hammock breaks, is pushed back on either side of the road, and set down in its brooding heart is the orange grove.

Any grove or any wood is a fine thing to see. But the magic here, strangely, is not apparent from the road. It is necessary to leave the impersonal highway, to step inside the rusty gate and close it behind.

## References

- Adger, C. (1997). Issues and implications of English dialects for teaching English as a second language. *TESOL Professional Papers #3*. Retrieved from [http://www.tesol.org/s\\_tesol/sec\\_document.asp?CID=403&DID=1061](http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp?CID=403&DID=1061)
- Baumgardner, R. & Brown, K. (2003). World Englishes: Ethics and pedagogy. *World Englishes*, 22, 245-251.
- Baumgardner, R. (2006). Teaching world Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The world handbook of Englishes* (pp. 661-668). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Brandon, L., Baszile, D., & Berry, T. (2009). Linguistic moments: language, teaching and teacher education in the U.S. *Educational Foundations (Winter-Spring)*, 47-66.
- Breiteneder, A. (2005). The naturalness of English as a European lingua franca: the case of the 'third person -s'. *Vienna English Working Papers*, 14, 3-26. Retrieved from <http://www.univie.ac.at/Anglistik/Views0502ALL.pdf>
- Breiteneder, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca in Europe: An empirical perspective. *World Englishes*, 28, 256-269.
- Brown, K. (2002). Ideology and context: World Englishes and EFL teacher training. *World Englishes*, 21, pp. 445-448.
- Brown, K. (2006). Models, methods, and curriculum for ELT preparation. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The world handbook of Englishes* (pp. 680-693). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Davidson, F. (2006). World Englishes and test construction. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The world handbook of Englishes* (pp. 709-717). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Davies, A., Hamp-Lyons, L., & Kemp, C. (2003). Whose norms? International proficiency tests in English. *World Englishes*, 22, 571-584.
- Davies, A. (2009). Assessing world Englishes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29, 80-89.
- De Klerk, V. (2003). Towards a norm in South African Englishes: The case for Xhosa English. *World Englishes*, 22, 463-481.
- Elder, C. & Davies, A. (2006). Assessing English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 282-301.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. & Davies, A. (2008). The Englishes of English tests: Bias revisited. *World Englishes*, 27, 26-39.

- Jordan, J. (2010). *His own where* (pp. 2-3). New York: Feminist Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. & Xu, Z. (2002). Chinese pragmatic norms and 'China English.' *World Englishes*, 21, 269-279.
- Kachru, B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue* (pp. 355-365). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kortmann, B., Burridge, K., Mesthrie, R., Schneider, E. & Upton, C. (2004). *A handbook of varieties of English* (Vol. 2: morphology and syntax). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lowenberg, P. (2002). Assessing English proficiency in the expanding circle. *World Englishes*, 21, 431-435.
- McArthur, T. (2001). World English and world Englishes: Trends, tensions, varieties, and standards. *Language Teaching*, 34, 1-20.
- McArthur, T. (2002). *The Oxford guide to world Englishes*. England: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. England: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 1-22. DOI: 10.1111/1473-4192.00035.
- Quirk, R. (1991). Language varieties and standard language. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *Languages and standards: Issues, attitudes, case studies* (pp. 165-177). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Rawlings, M. (1983). *Cross Creek* (p. 6). St. Simons Island, GA: Mockingbird Books.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Shim, R. (1999). Codified Korean English: Process, characteristics and consequence. *World Englishes*, 18, 247-258.
- Sifakis, N. (2004). Teaching EIL – teaching international or intercultural English? What teachers should know. *System*, 32, 237-250.
- Snow, M., Kamhi-Stein, L., & Brinton, D. (2006). Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 261-281.
- Widdowson, H. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 16, 135-146.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2005). Language awareness in a bidialectal setting: The oral performance and language attitudes of urban and rural students in Cyprus. *Language Awareness, 17*, 254-260.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2006). A bidialectal programme for the learning of Standard Modern Greek in Cyprus. *Applied Linguistics, 27*, 295-317.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2007). Choice of classroom language in bidialectal communities: To include or to exclude the dialect? *Cambridge Journal of Education, 37*(1), 51-66. DOI: 10.1080/03057640601179046.