

Androula Yiakoumetti (ed.)

Harnessing Linguistic Variation to Improve Education



PETER LANG

Oxford · Bern · Berlin · Bruxelles · Frankfurt am Main · New York · Wien

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data:

Harnessing linguistic variation to improve education / Androula Yiakoumetti.

p. cm. -- (Rethinking education; 5)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-0343-0726-0 (alk. paper)

1. Language and languages--Variation. 2. Linguistic change. 3. Linguistic minorities. 4. Multilingualism. 5. Multicultural education. 6. Education, Bilingual. 7. Language and education. I. Yiakoumetti, Androula, 1976-

P120.V37H37 2012

306.44'6--dc23

2012011043

ISSN 1662-9949

ISBN 978-3-0343-0726-0

© Peter Lang AG, International Academic Publishers, Bern 2012
Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland
info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

Printed in Germany

Contents

ANDROULA YIAKOUMETTI

- 1 Rethinking Linguistic Diversity in Education I

STEPHEN MAY

- 2 Educational Approaches to Minorities:
Context, Contest and Opportunities II

OFELIA GARCÍA, NELSON FLORES AND
HEATHER HOMONOFF WOODLEY

- 3 Transgressing Monolingualism and Bilingual Dualities:
Translanguaging Pedagogies 45

SURESH CANAGARAJAH, MADHAV KAFLE AND YUMI MATSUMOTO

- 4 World Englishes in Local Classrooms 77

SANDRA LEE MCKAY

- 5 English as an International Language, Multilingualism and
Language Planning 97

LINDA TSUNG

- 6 Rethinking Multilingual Education for Minority Students
in China II5

PETER GARRETT, JOSEP M. COTS, DAVID LASAGABASTER AND
ENRIC LLURDA

- 7 Internationalization and the Place of Minority Languages
in Universities in Three European Bilingual Contexts:
A Comparison of Student Perspectives in the
Basque Country, Catalonia and Wales 139

NKONKO M. KAMWANGAMALU

- 8 The Medium-of-Instruction Conundrum and
'Minority' Language Development in Africa 167

JESSICA BALL AND BARBARA MAY HANFORD BERNHARDT

- 9 Standard English as a Second Dialect:
A Canadian Perspective 189

IAN G. MALCOLM AND ADRIANO TRUSCOTT

- 10 English Without Shame:
Two-Way Aboriginal Classrooms in Australia 227

JEFF SIEGEL

- 11 Educational Approaches for Speakers of Pidgin and
Creole Languages 259

ANDROULA YIAKOUMETTI

- 12 The Dangers of Dialects:
Debunking (or Substantiating) the Myths 293

Notes on Contributors 313

Index 321

SURESH CANAGARAJAH, MADHAV KAFLE AND
YUMI MATSUMOTO

4 World Englishes in Local Classrooms

Introduction

In the context of globalization and late-modernity, scholars have started asking how education can prepare students for transnational communication. English is touted as the global language par excellence, and claimed to guarantee communicative success in today's social and economic relationships. There is a stampede to acquire a good knowledge of English, and many countries are giving English teaching priority in their educational policies. However, it is often ignored that the global status of English comes with a price. English has also been appropriated by local communities for their own interests and purposes, and it has now become a heterogeneous language. 'Native-speaker' varieties, such as standard British or American English, have lost their status as the universal norm for proficiency. Multilingual people are negotiating their own varieties of English in their own terms to conduct business. Some linguists contend that English has diversified to such an extent that it is not one language, but 'a family of languages' (Crystal, 2004: 40). We use the term 'World Englishes' (WE, hereafter) broadly to capture this plurality of English language. As people are required to shuttle between communities and languages, proficiency in one's own variety of English is insufficient. One has to develop the competence to engage with diverse varieties of English worldwide. Such a perspective calls for a paradigm shift on thinking about the nature of English and ways of teaching it. In this article, we survey the attempts to address the plurality of English in classrooms worldwide through the burgeoning literature on WE.

It must be noted at the outset that studies on ways of teaching WE are fairly limited, as scholars are still preoccupied with modeling the changes English is going through and describing its varieties. Some are diffident to propose pedagogical practices because they feel that the changes of English have to be researched and described better before we proceed to teaching practice. In many excellent publications that track the global flow of English, such as Pennycook (2007) and Higgins (2009), the pedagogical implications are shoved to a final chapter. Such publications offer cursory reflections rather than robust findings from pedagogies that have been researched in a disciplined and systematic manner. Our survey of the literature on WE shows that the educational implications of the diversity of English need to be urgently addressed in our fields.

Theoretical foundations

Before we offer a perspective on teaching WE in diverse classrooms worldwide, we must review the ongoing debates on ways to theorize global English. Scholars are locked in heated polemics on how to model the changing nature of English language. Though we use WE in this article as an umbrella term to capture different ways of modeling English language, 'World Englishes' was coined to specifically label one of the earliest schools to theorize the diversity of English. Associated with the Indian linguist Braj Kachru (1984, 1985), this school is known for a tripartite model of the spread and diversity of English. Inner circle constituted the traditional owners of the language and they were called 'norm providing', as their norms were considered the reference point for others. Outer circle constituted the postcolonial communities such as India, Nigeria and Jamaica, where English was developing local norms, as it was actively used as a second language within those communities. They were called 'norm developing'. Expanding circle constituted communities which use English as a foreign language and, therefore, were presumed to adopt the norms of inner circle communities. Such communities as China, Brazil and Germany were called

'norm dependent'. Though the linguistic reality of these circles has now been questioned (see Canagarajah, 2006c), we will use this terminology to distinguish between different contexts of teaching English below.

Deviating from Kachru's model is the school of English as an International language (EIL). As Aya Matsuda clarifies, EIL is 'not a linguistic distinction, but it is rather a functional one' (2006: 160). Scholars who belong to this school perceive WE varieties as deriving from the same grammatical system. For them, English simply takes functional variations in different geographical contexts, the same ways registers and discourses of English are different in institutional, social and textual contexts. However, as Kachru's coining of the term 'Englishes' suggests, other scholars may consider the differences to go beyond mere functional variation.

Scholars of the ELF (English as a lingua franca) school believe that multilingual speakers have developed a grammar of English that differs from the norms of 'native' speakers (Jenkins, 2006a; Seidlhofer, 2004). These scholars are now attempting to describe the lingua franca core (LFC) that captures this emergent grammar of multilinguals who use English as a contact language for their transnational communication. ELF primarily relates to the usage of speakers in expanding circle communities. While Kachru's school perceives these communities as dependent on inner circle norms, it is significant that the ELF school perceives these communities as developing their own norms. ELF also takes the discussion of English beyond the fairly homogeneous national boundaries (and circles) of an English variety studied by Kachru's camp as it considers the use of English in transnational contact zones as more significant.

However, the search for a homogeneous and stable LFC is considered by some other scholars as misleading (see Pennycook, 2007; Canagarajah, 2007a; House, 2003a). Though they agree with the ELF camp that English usage beyond national borders varies from native speaker usage and that its variation needs to be given importance, they consider the norms in these interactions as fluid and hybrid. More importantly, they consider the norms as negotiated and evolving situationally in each specific interaction. Rather than looking for the core grammar of lingua franca English therefore, they attempt to study the strategies people adopt to negotiate the diverse norms multilinguals bring to the communication. Since these

scholars look at lingua franca English as not a single variety, but a form of practice that negotiates diverse local varieties, they have labeled themselves the LFE (Lingua Franca English) school. Pennycook (2010) argues that the term English *as* a lingua franca gives the impression that this is a monolithic variety. LFE scholars also go beyond Kachru's camp in saying that English is more diverse than the listing and numbering of them as Indian English, Singaporean English and Nigerian English. For them, English is a form of local practice that is always creative and emergent, evolving in the context of the local values and interests of the people who use it worldwide for their purposes. The ability to communicate in this hybrid English does not depend on shared norms, but mutually recognized and reciprocated practices. The LFE school also goes beyond other models to argue that such negotiation is not limited to situations of English as a foreign language in the expanding circle. In the context of late-modern globalization, no community is self-enclosed. Apart from all communities having to negotiate language beyond their borders, the local is itself interpenetrated by the global. Therefore, those in the outer or inner circle cannot also rely upon their own national norms for communication in English. All of us have to adopt effective strategies to negotiate ever-present linguistic difference in global communication.

Pedagogical approaches

As we can imagine, the ways to teach WE would of course depend on the models scholars adhere to. Teaching is further complicated by the geographical setting (i.e., inner, outer, expanding circle, or the contact zones between all these communities), skill addressed (i.e., reading, writing, listening or speaking), and language competence aimed at (i.e., grammar, phonology, vocabulary, pragmatics, text features or discourse conventions). We discuss the pedagogical approaches in general below, while noting the distinguishing features related to specific geographical, skill and linguistic domains where relevant.

Promoting local English

At the most basic level, some teachers in local communities are focusing on developing a competence in the local varieties of English. Scholars in this school, mainly from the Kachruvian tradition, consider it important not to impose exonormative norms to develop and assess the English proficiency of their students. They recognize that their students learn English not necessarily to interact with native speakers in far away inner circle communities, but primarily to communicate in their own local contexts. This pedagogy works well for outer circle communities where there are recognizable local varieties (with a long history of usage) and institutionalized uses of English in local community. Teaching has focused on grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and discourse conventions to make students competent in the local variety.

For example, Hino (2009) proposes teaching a de-Anglo-Americanized English as a means of expressing indigenous values in international communication. He adopts such teaching practices at one of the top national universities (Osaka University) in Japan. He encourages students to speak English with a Japanese mindset and exposes them to varieties of English and examples of nonnative speaker interactions in his course. His major teaching goal is to give confidence to Japanese learners by demonstrating that Japanese English is internationally functional. Thus he promotes this type of English as capable of expressing indigenous values while maintaining international intelligibility.

In the field of phonology, scholars like Levis (2005) are promoting the idea that pronunciation is connected to people's identities and relationships. Therefore, they are moving away from imposing a native speaker norm, and exploring ways of accommodating the accents and pronunciations diverse communities are comfortable with. A practical way to introduce local norms is discussed by Bruthiaux (2010). He argues that the teaching of English should remain based on one of the dominant models serving as a convenient starting point, with the localization of pronunciation supplied by teachers and the introduction of wider variation depending on students' proficiency. Given inadequate teaching materials featuring local norms and descriptions of local rules, many teachers would rather start

with the dominant models and move on to localization at a later point. The danger is that this approach would treat WE as an add-on, marginalizing local norms and simplifying the profound issues of ownership that motivate the WE pedagogical paradigm shift.

The limitations in teaching materials and descriptions of local varieties of English are motivating others to combine research with teaching. Tsuzuki and Nakamura (2007) try to identify which phonological errors of Japanese student researchers in science majors might lead to miscommunication. Thereafter they fashion pedagogical implications that help learners notice which phonological features should be avoided in order to prevent communication failure. They have found out three types of mispronunciations which seriously impede intelligibility: 1) consonants such as plosives and l/r distinctions; 2) vowel length contrasts; 3) misplaced or lack of stress on words or phrases. These features are considered as phonological core features of Japanese influenced English, which may be the highest priority to teach in terms of pronunciation. They conclude that English curricula in Japanese school systems need to provide prioritized pronunciation education that is tailored to the needs of their local students.

The limitation of the above approach is that students cannot be satisfied with competence in local varieties in order to function as global citizens. Even communication in local communities involves interacting with international agencies and diverse ethnic groups who bring other varieties of English. An approach that addresses this limitation is intercultural sensitivity.

Intercultural awareness

Such pedagogical approaches sensitize students to the diversity of English worldwide. One might consider this approach a sensitivity training. The approach would help students develop positive attitudes towards their own varieties of English and develop tolerance towards other varieties. Such attitudes would increase their willingness and capacity to negotiate language diversity in their interactions. Morrison and White (2005) focus on nurturing their students as 'global listeners'. They describe a course offered

in the World Englishes department at Chukyo University, Nagoya, Japan. The structure of the course is so designed that the students get real experience of interacting with English speakers around the world. To accomplish such goal students are taken to other countries to experience other WE varieties. Following a term-long class at Chukyo, groups of students travel to Singapore during school breaks in August, February or March. Part of the curriculum includes a three-week study tour at the Language Teaching Institute (LTI) at the Regional Language Center (RELC) in Singapore. The following academic year, all second year students are required to participate in a three-week course in one of the following destinations: Surrey, England; Boston, Massachusetts; or Sydney, Australia. Though this somewhat hands-on experience with WE is constructive, it requires considerable resources of time and money to make it succeed.

However, a limitation of sensitivity training is that knowing about WE is not the same thing as having competence in WE. It is important to consider ways of developing communicative competence through engagement with the language and through speech activities.

Intercultural competence

Such pedagogies address sociolinguistic sensitivity while also developing some competencies in negotiating diversity in intercultural communication. They situate English in specific cultures to consider how language use in these communities is shaped by local values and practices. Even in the case that there might be similarities in syntax structure or vocabulary, students can expect to experience differences in tone, thought patterns, idea development and conversational rules as they are shaped by the cultures concerned. Pedagogies informed by intercultural communication would develop the competence to negotiate these cultural differences in English communication. Alptekin (2002) argues for a pedagogy that introduces the local cultural situations in which students use English so that they develop the intercultural sensitivity to negotiate the different cultures informing the use of English in the context of globalization.

Teaching core grammars

Scholars informed by the ELF orientation would argue that one does not have to stop with an understanding of cultural values, but teach grammatical and phonological commonalities that characterize multilingual communication in English. Considering the intercultural approach as too open ended and process-oriented, they would advocate the teaching of LFC rules of grammar and phonology as more product-oriented and direct. Jenkins (2000, 2002, 2006a, 2006b) convincingly proposes a pedagogy based on LFC to fulfill a pluricentric approach to the teaching and use of English, and addresses the dual needs of international mutual intelligibility and local identity of ELF users. LFC provides empirically established phonological norms and classroom pronunciation models for teaching English as an international language rather than imposing Received Pronunciation or General American pronunciation on multilingual students. More specifically, Jenkins (2000) presents a five-phase accent addition programme. Note how her strategy differs from the traditional *accent reduction* programmes. She proposes:

1. Addition of core items to the learner's productive and receptive repertoire. This way, they can ensure intelligibility in diverse contexts.
2. Addition of a range of L₂ (i.e., second language) English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire. In this manner, they can at least understand speakers who deviate from the LFC.
3. Addition of accommodation skills. This would enable speakers to fashion their speech in consideration of the norms their interlocutors bring with them.
4. Addition of non-core items to the learner's receptive repertoire. This too would help students to negotiate the speech of those who deviate from LFC.
5. Addition of a range of L₁ (i.e., first language) English accents to the learner's receptive repertoire. This would enable them to communicate with native speakers who are often not adept at multilingual norms.

Jenkins thus proposes considering only core item deviation as error, and non-core item deviation as regional variation. In addition, she emphasizes the importance of developing learners' accommodation skills and language awareness so that they can engage with diverse groups of speakers.

Like Jenkins, many ELF scholars believe that the norms and practices of global English speakers have to be empirically studied in order to develop a suitable pedagogy. Seidlhofer (2001, 2004) introduces the corpus named VOICE (Vienna–Oxford International Corpus of English) and presents emerging ELF lexicogrammar characteristics which arise from this corpus to develop teaching practices. She focuses on ELF lexicogrammar among ELF users and analyses which items are used systematically and frequently without causing communication problems. She finds that typical grammatical errors are generally unproblematic among ELF interactions and pose no obstacle to communicative success. Therefore, deviations from native speaker norms do not necessarily cause communication problems among multilinguals.

Pragmatics

The limitation of the ELF approach is that students would rely too easily on commonalities and ignore the fact that English is changing and evolving in diverse local interactions. Furthermore, this approach may not allow multilinguals to negotiate with native speakers who would come armed with their traditional norms for communication. Students have to be prepared to negotiate any deviation from the norms they are trained to expect. To prepare students for such negotiation of difference, LFE scholars develop pedagogical approaches that focus on pragmatics. They feel that a focus on form fails to develop the competencies required to deal with the diversity of forms one would encounter in transnational encounters. Since it is impractical to expect that we can teach all the varieties of English under the sun, a more reasonable approach is to go beyond individual varieties to develop the competencies students need to deal with the difference in all possible encounters. To address this challenge, LFE scholars propose developing competencies such as the following:

Language awareness: this way, students do not focus only on learning single varieties but learn how all varieties are constituted. This awareness enables them to negotiate the different varieties their interlocutors bring to communication by decoding them and framing their own language to suit the interlocutor's expectations.

Interactional strategies: Rather than focusing on individual varieties, these strategies too would enable students to negotiate any variety speakers bring to an interaction. Scholarship such as accommodation theory (see Giles, 1984) has enlightened how interlocutors make adjustments to each other's difference in communication. Teaching accommodation strategies would help students tailor their speech to the norms of their interlocutors. Other strategies are emerging from ongoing research on lingua franca encounters, and are illustrated below.

House (2003b) shows how to develop pragmatic fluency in lingua franca English in the classroom based on intercultural research and her own multilingual subjects' interactional data. She provides the following detailed suggestions for developing pragmatic competence and fluency in WE: 1) Instruction should focus on training learners in using a variegated repertoire of interpretation and negotiation strategies; 2) The yardstick for measuring competence is the stable bilingual/multilingual speaker under comparable social, cultural, historical conditions of language use with comparable goals for interaction in different discourse domains and hybrid procedures in the teaching and learning of LFE; 3) Particular attention should be paid to LFE users' strategic competence and to training communication strategies such as code-switching and borrowing from other languages that the LFE users speak; 4) English language classrooms should empower learners to keep their own personalities and social persona, and linguistic and pragmatic knowledge for performance should be given primary importance in order to improve learners' pragmatic competence and pragmatic fluency; 5) It is important to stress the interactional usefulness of relevant routines in LFE; 6) Collaborative talk (discourse production) in LFE interactions should be capitalized in the teaching of pragmatic fluency; 7) For developing pragmatic fluency, it is essential to intensify the teaching of interactional phenomena in order to enable learners to manage smooth turn taking through sensitizing them to points

of transitional relevance and to the lubricating and modificatory function of a rich repertoire of gambits and discourse strategies. In order to further increase metapragmatic awareness, House proposes that it is important to combine both research and teaching in pragmatics.

Others propose a teaching approach that recognizes the different pragmatic rules available in different communicative contexts. McKay (2005) proposes a pedagogy of pragmatics that recognizes the different conventions governing different WE circles. She argues that multilingual students should recognize the existence of native speaker norms in the inner circle, equally well established indigenous norms in the outer circle, and the co-construction of norms to negotiate a plurality of pragmatic norms in the expanding circle. She would be happy if students at least develop receptive competence in the conventions of other communities so that they can make themselves intelligible in intercultural communication. McKay outlines her pedagogy of pragmatics in the following manner:

1. Explicit attention should be given to introducing and practising repair strategies, such as asking for clarification, repetition and rephrasing, and allowing for wait time.
2. A variety of conversational gambits should be introduced and practised, including such items as managing turn-taking, back channeling and initiating topics of conversation.
3. Attention should be given to developing negotiation strategies that involve such features as suggesting alternatives arguing for a particular approach, and seeking consensus. (2009: 239)

Multilingual negotiation

Some in the LFE school go beyond English to advocate a negotiation with other languages for global communication. They are interested in constructing a multilingual pedagogy as they recognize that English co-exists with other languages in global communication. Higgins (2009), for example, advocates that we should teach students different kinds of code switching and hybrid communicative practices. She is critical of the current

educational policy that stipulates that languages should be taught one at a time, separated from each other. In making this proposal, such scholars are motivated by everyday communicative practices in multilingual environments, where hybrid codes are common. Many scholars are in fact making the claim that pedagogy should be shaped around the creative multilingual practices of youth in popular culture, Internet and other new media environments. In this regard, the work of Pennycook (2007) on hip-hop communication is valuable. He criticizes the antipathy to popular culture in educational circles. Therefore, he proposes a pedagogy of 'teaching with the flow' – i.e., adopting the global flows of popular cultural forms. This form of pedagogy is not only multilingual, but also multimodal. Pennycook advocates teaching how to exploit the resources of media, music, the body and other semiotic resources to communicate in global English.

A pedagogy of appropriation

Though the teaching approaches above will help students be functional in contemporary contexts of global communication, some critical practitioners insist that we have to go beyond functional competence and develop the ability to appropriate English for students' own purposes according to their own values and interests. For this purpose, scholars are interested in developing a pedagogy of appropriation (Canagarajah, 2006a; Lin et al., 2005). It is arguable whether anyone can learn or use a language without appropriation. To speak is to people the language with one's own intentions, according to Bakhtin's well known theorization. Anything less than that is not to have voice in that language but to mimic it. Such appropriational pedagogical approaches have been developed in the teaching of writing much better rather than in speaking. Canagarajah (2006a, b) has argued that it is possible to teach students how to merge their own discourse patterns and codes with the dominant conventions of academic writing to construct hybrid texts. He has also shown how multilingual students lean towards such strategies of writing even without teacher intervention (Canagarajah, 1997, 2009). Though such writing strategy is rhetorically very demanding (i.e., students should know the dominant codes, their own

codes, and appropriate ways to merge them), Canagarajah argues that multilingual students have developed such strategies through social practice in their own communicative environments. Appropriation is a well-practised communicative strategy in post-colonial contact zones (see Pratt, 1991). The task for teachers is to develop a reflective and critical attitude towards such practice so that students can develop their competence further.

A pedagogy of choices

Many scholars consider such an appropriation approach too idealistic and demanding. More importantly, they think that students will be penalized for deviating from dominant conventions. Short of teaching appropriation, they would teach students the range of options available to them and leave it to them to choose what is appropriate for their different communicative contexts. Matsuda and Matsuda (2010) propose a pedagogy for writing that involves the following options: i.e., teach the dominant language forms and functions; teach the nondominant language forms and functions; teach the boundary between what works and what does not; teach the principles and strategies for discourse negotiation; and teach the risks involved in using deviational features. Presumably, students will be able to adopt the strategies that are comfortable for them, with a full awareness of the risks and limitations of the different orientation towards established varieties of English.

It is clear that we have moved far from the traditional approach of developing universal expertise in the native speaker varieties of British or American standard, under the assumption that those norms are the ones that matter in international communication. The evolving pedagogical alternatives recognize that English has become deterritorialized and found new homes in diverse local contexts in the world. The global speakers of English are claiming ownership over the language and developing their own norms quite independently of native speakers. To be a global citizen in late-modernity involves the capacity to negotiate creatively and critically the plurality of norms characterizing English language.

Further research and educational development

Though scholars are expanding their work on constructing effective pedagogical approaches, students' attitudes towards local varieties of English remain negative. Without positive or at least enlightened attitudes towards the diversity of English, pedagogical intervention may not pay off. A few scholars who have studied the attitudes of students in local communities observe that students still give more value to native speaker varieties as the desirable target for learning. Others find that students are also confused about the differences between varieties of English. Though they feel that native speaker norms are preferable, they cannot recognize the distinction between varieties of English. Matsuda analyses the attitudes of the students in Japan towards WE. She found that questions about varieties of English confused students. They often replied, 'I don't know' and 'I'm not sure' (2002a: 437) while answering questions about nonnative varieties. But the students clearly expressed that American and Britain English were the only standard varieties and they wanted to acquire these rather than outer circle varieties such as Singapore English. The study suggests that there is a need for pedagogical intervention to work hand in hand with language awareness, sociolinguistic sensitivity and ideological clarity. It is important for teachers and researchers to consider if pedagogical intervention is resulting in positive attitudes towards WE. If not, teachers have to pay equal attention to developing the type of attitudes that will help their students cope with the diversity of English.

Along with working on positive attitudes among students, we have to also empower nonnative teachers of English. It is well known that multilingual teachers have a high sense of linguistic anxiety and insecurity. Bolton (2002) discusses the dominant discourses and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. His findings from questionnaires show that there is still a preference for native standard varieties in formal communication, and English language teachers conceive Hong Kong English as inappropriate. Other scholars are working on creating a positive view of the skills and knowledge brought by multilingual teachers for the teaching of English

(see Kirkpatrick, 2007). Though multilingual teachers do bring certain competencies that are useful for English teaching, they need guidance and clarity. McKay (2002) provides a useful manual for teachers on adopting the proper attitude towards WE, understanding the motivations for the paradigm shift, and devising creative strategies for teaching WE.

Furthermore, though it is now commonly accepted that inner circle communities also need the ability to negotiate WE, efforts to teach native speaker students WE are inadequate. As many scholars have noted, the inability to negotiate the diversity of English can result in inner circle students being disadvantaged in the new global job market (see Horner and Trimbur, 2002). A pilot project by Kubota is exemplary in this regard. She aims at raising American high-school students' awareness of issues on WE and assisting them in exploring ways to better communicate with WE speakers (2001: 59). Her goals for her high school class in rural North Carolina were the following: (1) to help understand that there are many varieties of English used in the United States and in the world; (2) to provide a brief history of English; (3) to demonstrate the difficulty of acquiring native-like proficiency in a second language; (4) to explore ways to communicate effectively with WE speakers; and (5) to critically investigate implications of global spread of English (Kubota, 2001: 50–51). The project was conducted for eight sessions each of fifty-five minutes. Though Kubota states there are positive outcomes, she lists the following as the pedagogical and educational challenges of teaching WE in the inner circle that need to be addressed in the future: (1) the difficulty of critically examining the global spread of English; (2) the need for creating classroom interaction that is conducive to critical examination of the issue; (3) the need to use more experiential approaches when exploring cross-cultural communication strategies; (4) the need for earlier interventions for promoting cultural/linguistic diversities; and (5) the need for more emphasis on cross-cultural/linguistic awareness in foreign language learning (Kubota, 2001: 60).

In terms of skills developed, teaching of WE in reading instruction seems to be inadequate. This is intriguing as postcolonial literary writers have been using local varieties of English in their writing for a long time, and students and scholars of English literature have been exposed to many diverse varieties through the writings of Achebe, Soyinka, Walcott and Raja

Rao. It is possible that language teachers have failed to address reading as they have reserved this task to scholars in literature. It is also the case that reading specialists focus on expository and academic texts as coming under their purview, and treat these texts as still written in standard British or American English. From this perspective, they may consider their task as teaching the decoding of texts using traditional norms, and thus continue business as usual. In this regard, it is useful to merge the pedagogies of literature and multimodal communication with those of expository/academic texts to develop a richer literacy pedagogy.

Furthermore, while teaching strategies have developed well, researchers and scholars have not paid enough attention to teaching materials. This is a challenging area for intervention as textbook publishing is highly commercialized. Publishers would prefer to publish materials that can be marketed worldwide to diverse communities. Materials that are tailored to specific local communities require a lot of resources to research, write and produce. Materials in inner circle (traditional) norms are easier to produce. Adopting a pragmatic attitude, commercial publishers may also argue that it is the prestige varieties that are universally demanded by parents and students, and that they would sell more profitably. As a result, teachers are compelled to produce their own self-made materials for their classes.

However, even locally produced textbooks sometime fail to go far in accommodating local norms and culture. In her analysis of seventh-grade ministry-approved text books in Japan, Matsuda (2002b) found an inner circle emphasis in the textbooks' representation of users and uses of English. Of the 74 characters shown in the textbooks, most characters were from Japan (34), followed by inner circle country speakers (30). The remaining were from outer and expanding circle countries (10). However, there was a dissonance between the number of characters and their actual speech production. Despite being most in number, the Japanese speakers produced minimal utterances. In general, outer and expanding circle speakers produced nominal utterances. It is the inner circle speakers who dominate the conversation, denying the possibility of presenting the norms of other communities. The diversification of characters and situations, though welcome, fails to do much to provide a deeper vision of plural English. Perhaps based on this limited progress, Matsuda (2003, 2006)

goes on to consider other ways of introducing diverse WE varieties in classrooms. She proposes using guest speakers from WE communities, student exchange programmes, Internet sites and multimedia resources to expose students to language diversity.

A final area for further research and development is testing. Though creative teaching practices are being devised in local classrooms, testing instruments are still traditional. They measure competence according to traditional native speaker norms. Such tests thus have the washback effect of shaping teaching and curriculum, setting back the advances made in teaching plural norms. The commercialization of the international testing industry creates constraints on the extent to which tests can be made open to plural Englishes. Tests like TOEFL and IELTS are held worldwide, and it is difficult for them to create different tests for different communities. Though there are a few examples of specialized tests for specific communities – such as the test for Indonesian teachers that focuses on local situations and language norms (Brown and Lumley, 1998) – we have to adopt more creative testing formats to assess if speakers can negotiate the diverse varieties they would encounter in transnational relations. For this, we have to move beyond the product-oriented and discrete-item tests to adopt more process-oriented and interactive instruments (see Canagarajah, 2006b). Proficiency today is not mastery of a single variety of English, but one's ability to negotiate the new and emerging norms one encounters in interactions.

Conclusion

As we have argued in this chapter, educational settings have to develop a plurilingual model that transcends the teaching of single varieties or monolithic grammars. The communicative context of late modernity compels us to develop language awareness among students and make them capable of negotiating the diverse varieties they will encounter in their everyday

life in transnational settings. We have to therefore shift the pedagogical focus from individual varieties to repertoire building; product to process; mastery to negotiation; and grammar to pragmatics.

References

- Alprekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56, 57–64.
- Bolton, K. (2002). *Hong Kong English: Autonomy and creativity*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Brown, A. and Lumley, T. (1998). Linguistic and cultural norms in language testing: A case study. *Melbourne Papers in Language Testing*, 7(1), 80–96.
- Bruthiaux, P. (2010). World Englishes and the classroom: an EFL perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 365–369.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1997). Safe houses in the contact zone: Coping strategies of African-American students in the academy. *College Composition and Communication*, 48(2), 173–196.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006a). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57, 586–619.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006b). Changing communicative needs, revised assessment objectives: Testing English as an International language. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 3, 229–242.
- Canagarajah, A. Suresh (2006c). TESOL at Forty: What are the Issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40/1: 9–34.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007a). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923–939.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007b). After disinvention: Possibilities for communication, community and competence. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (eds), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*, 233–239. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Canagarajah, S. (2009). Multilingual Strategies of Negotiating English: From Conversation to Writing. *Journal of Advanced Composition* 29, 17–48.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The language revolution*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giles, H. (ed). (1984). The dynamics of speech accommodation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46. (Special topic issue.)

- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Hino, N. (2009). The teaching of English as an international language in Japan: An answer to the dilemma of indigenous values and global needs in the expanding circle. *ALLA Review*, 22, 103–119.
- Horner, B. and Trimbur, J. (2002). English Only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53, 594–630.
- House, J. (2003a). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7/4, 556–578.
- House, J. (2003b). Teaching and learning pragmatic fluency in a foreign language: The case of English as a lingua franca. In A. Martinez Flor, E. Usó Juan and A. Fernandez Guerra (eds), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching*, 133–159. Castello de la Plana, Spain: Publications de la Universitat Jaume I.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language: New models, new goals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2002). A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language. *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 83–103.
- Jenkins, J. (2006a). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 157–181.
- Jenkins, J. (2006b). Global intelligibility and local diversity: Possibility or Paradox? In R. Rubdy and M. Saraceni (eds), *English in the world: Global rules, global roles*, 32–39. London: Continuum.
- Kachru, B.B. (1984). World Englishes and the teaching of English to non-native speakers: contexts, attitudes, and concerns. *TESOL Newsletter*, 18(5), 25–26.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985). The English language in a global context. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds), *English in the world*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native speakers of English in the USA. *World Englishes*, 20, 47–64.
- Levis, J. (2005). Changing contexts and shifting paradigms in pronunciation teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 369–377.
- Lin, A., et al. (2005). International TESOL professionals and teaching English for globalized communication (TEGCOM). In Canagarajah, S. (ed.), *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*, 197–222. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Matsuda, A. and Matsuda, P.K. (2010). World Englishes and the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 369–374.

- Matsuda, A. (2002a). 'International understanding' through teaching World Englishes. *World Englishes*, 21(3), 436–440.
- Matsuda, A. (2002b). Representation of users and uses of English in beginning Japanese EFL textbooks. *JALT Journal*, 24(2), 182–200.
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating World Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 719–729.
- Matsuda, A. (2006). Negotiating ELT assumptions in EIL classrooms. In J. Edge (ed.) (Re)Locating TESOL in an age of empire, pp. 158–170. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mckay, L.S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mckay, L.S. (2005). Teaching the pragmatics of English as an international language. *Guidelines*, 27, 3–9.
- Mckay, L.S. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In F. Sharifian. (Ed.), *English as an international language: perspectives and pedagogical issues*, 227–241. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Morrison, R. and White, M. (2005). Nurturing global listeners: Increasing familiarity and appreciation for world Englishes. *World Englishes*, 24, 361–370.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pratt, M.L. (1991). Arts of the contact zone. *Profession*, 33–40.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133–158.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239.
- Tsuzuki, M. and Nakamura, S. (2007). Intelligibility assessment of Japanese accents: A phonological study of science major students' speech. In T. Hoffmann and L. Siebers (eds), *World Englishes – Problems, properties and prospects*, 239–261. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.