

Throwing down the gauntlet: the challenge represented by current research in the fields of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca

“Language is very powerful. Language does not just describe reality. Language creates the reality it describes.” Desmond Tutu

“An Englishman’s way of talking absolutely classifies him. The moment he talks, he makes some other Englishman despise him!” My Fair Lady

This paper is based on insights gained at the International Association of World Englishes (IAWE) conferences which I had the privilege of attending in Vancouver and Melbourne in 2010 and 2011 and on research that I have conducted since 2010 in what was then a new field of study for me. The expression "throwing down the gauntlet" takes us back to a time when a knight would challenge an opponent to a duel by tossing one of his gauntlets (armoured gloves) onto the ground. If the opponent picked up the gauntlet, it meant that the challenge had been accepted. This paper employs this central metaphorical image and argues research in World Englishes (WE) and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) offer challenges to which practitioners in TESOL (Teaching of English to Students of Other Languages) should respond. Metaphorically speaking, a challenge has been issued and a response is required.

World Englishes

An essential starting point involves outlining the intellectual territory occupied by fields of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. WE ‘establishes a conceptual framework for investigating the spread and functions of English in global contexts’ (Coetzee-Van Rooy 2010: 8) which includes research into the cultural, socio-linguistic and educational attributes of developing and established varieties of English. The use of the plural ‘Englishes’ indicates the inclusivity and pluricentricity at the heart of the discipline. WE contests the possibility of a monolithic English and acknowledges the linguistic rights of divergent and emerging varieties of the English language. It asserts that varieties of English cannot be viewed simply as deviations from an acknowledged standard from traditionally native-speaking countries, such as the United Kingdom and America. WE is multi-disciplinary in that it draws on theoretical perspectives from fields as divergent as Applied Language studies, Didactics, English studies, Literature, Cultural Studies and Identity Theory. Its underpinnings are deeply political, embedded in the

historical forces which led to the development of varieties of English in divergent local contexts. It also does not shy away from the present consequences of brutal colonial heritages. It represents an acknowledgement of the local in an increasingly global world, hence the coining of the term 'glocal' (Coetzee-Van Rooy 2010: 8), which is a combination of the terms global and local. At heart WE is a field that recognises the reality of multilingualism and, as such, it has a deep relevance for South Africa, a country whose identity is founded on its multilingual character, evident in its language policy, its national anthem and even in the now clichéd metaphor of the rainbow nation. On a personal level, WE speaks to my three main research areas: history, literature and TESOL. My background in Applied Linguistics and passion for teaching has led to my involvement being in the didactic implications of WE. The IAWE is the international academic association representing the field and its journal is entitled *World Englishes*. Other academic journals in the field include *Asian Englishes Today*, *English Today* and *English World-Wide*.

English as Lingua Franca

ELF is also known as *English as a medium of intercultural communication*, *Global English in use* and as *English as an international language*, although the term ELF is the preferred label to describe situations where English is chosen 'as the means of communication among people from *different* language backgrounds, across linguacultural backgrounds' (Seidlhofer 2005:339). Ehrenreich (2011) has described ELF as a communicative tool which aims at achieving common ground where none can be assumed. ELF acknowledges the fact that mother tongue speakers are minority stakeholders in the English language business with the overwhelming majority comprising non-native speakers of English. ELF asserts its independence from traditional English lingua-cultural roots and acknowledges the authority of the dynamic, interactive, international, communicative contexts in which English is employed. It also contests ownership of English by mother-tongue speakers. Most interactions in English are based on intercultural communication in which native-speaker norms are no longer the primary point of reference. In these contexts power is not linguistically determined but is related to the stature the participant has in the context in which the exchange is taking place (Ehrenreich 2011). There is a rejection of the view that ELF speakers are in any sense deficient and speakers assert their status as users rather than primarily as learners of the variety. Mutual intelligibility is placed above accuracy as

the key concern and participants acknowledge and rely unapologetically on their multilingual resources. In these contexts strategic competence is a valuable asset and competence is defined as the ability to interact with those who don't necessarily have a shared linguistic or cultural code (Mahboob 2011). ELF communicative exchanges are flexible. ELF is a vibrant field in its own right, no longer prepared to be relegated to a mere 'contact language' or 'trade language' (Kirkpatrick 2007:30). ELF corpora have been developed to promote linguistic description and these include the English as a lingua-franca in Academic settings (ELFA) and the general Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) (Seidlhofer 2005: 340). The paradox represented by ELF is that English is now being shaped as much by its multilingual users as it is by its native speakers, it is an additional or foreign language for most of its users, most exchanges in English no longer involve a native speaker, and yet 'there is still a tendency for native speakers to be regarded as custodians over what is acceptable usage' (Seidlhofer 2005: 339).

The spread of English: awareness sheet

The spread and hegemony or dominance of English in the opening years of the 21st century can be demonstrated by means of the following awareness sheet, adapted from Matsuda (2012:202-203), compiled by Paul Tanner and based on data he obtained from Crystal (2010), Graddol (2006) and Davis (2004).

1. English language is the official or semi-official language of at least (60) countries.
2. An estimated (1.2 / 1.4) billion people are believed to speak English as a second or foreign language
3. More than 2/3 (fraction) of the world's scientists read and write in English.
4. 52% of international university students are taught in English.
5. More than 50% of the world's print newspapers are published in English. *
6. 80% of the world's electronically stored information is in English. *
7. The English language accounts for 28.2% of world GDP (Gross Domestic Product) *
8. English language users comprise 30.5% of all Internet users worldwide. *
9. In 2010, about how many people in the world are learning English at schools, colleges, and as independent adults? 2 billion (*= numbers estimated to be decreasing)

With respect to the areas indicated by means of an asterisk, the hegemony or dominance of English appears to be on the decline. The power associated with English varieties in countries such as China has been underestimated. Kirkpatrick claims that ‘the number of people learning English in China is now greater than the combined populations of countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia’ (2007:30). Not only are students learning English in these contexts, but they are frequently using English as a medium of instruction and in cross-cultural contexts as the lingua franca of choice in communication with other non-native speakers of English. The growing power of Chinese English as a variety is implicit in the title of Andy Kirkpatrick’s keynote address in Melbourne in 2011: ‘From expanding circle to dominant variety: a prediction for Chinese English’. In his words: ‘The so-called postcolonial stage is being replaced by a post-anglophone phase in which Asian varieties will become increasingly independent of inner-circle norms and in which the Chinese variety may become the most influential’ (Kirkpatrick 2011). One irony is that ‘American and Western values will be contested as never before. It is highly likely that they will be contested through the medium of English’ (Kirkpatrick 2007:37) by speakers who claim as much of a right to the language as native speakers do.

A step back in time: Uncritical acceptance of a dominant variety and the associated stature of a monomodel

During the colonial era a monomodel conception of Standard English was uncritically accepted. The view was that a single variety, namely Standard British English, reigned supreme, along with the British empire upon which, it was asserted, the sun never set. This world view can be illustrated in the persona of Professor Henry Higgins from George Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion*, adapted for film in 1964 as *My Fair Lady*. Higgins’s contempt of all but the Queen’s English is apparent in his appalled assertion that ‘there even are places where English completely disappears; in America they haven’t used it for years’.ⁱⁱ

Higgins’s project involved training (in the form of phonetic correction) of Eliza Doolittle, a speaker of a Cockney variety of the language, with the goal of passing her off as a ‘lady’. In his words: ‘Eliza, you are to stay here for the next six months learning to speak beautifully, like a lady in a florist’s shop. If you work hard and do as you’re told, you shall sleep in a proper

bedroom, have lots to eat, and money to buy chocolates and go for rides in taxis. But if you are naughty and idle, you shall sleep in the back kitchen amongst the black beetles, and be wolloped by Mrs. Pearce with a broomstick.' His is an able expression of the link between language and class, mastery of the dominant discourse and social advancement: 'You see this creature with her curbstome English. The English that will keep her in the gutter till the end of her days'.

Higgins's arrogance and unquestioned, elitist assumptions are evident in the lyric:

Look at her, a prisoner of the gutters
Condemned by every syllable she utters
By right she should be taken out and hung,
For the cold-blooded murder of the English tongue...
This is what the British population
Calls an elementary education...
It's 'ow' and 'garn' that keep her in her place,
Not her wretched clothes and dirty face.

Mastery of Received Pronunciation and standard grammar were the unquestioned keys to acceptance and material prosperity. The deficit pedagogy is implicit in the assumption that the only fitting punishment for linguistic infringements is death by hanging! Eliza's transformation naturally involved accent 'correction':

Professor Henry Higgins: All right, Eliza, say it again.

Eliza Doolittle: The rine in spine sties minely in the pline.

Professor Henry Higgins: [*sighs*] The 'rain' in 'Spain' stays 'mainly' in the 'plain'.

Eliza Doolittle: Didn't ah sy that?

Professor Henry Higgins: No, Eliza, you didn't "sy" that, you didn't even "say" that. Now every night before you get into bed, where you used to say your prayers, I want you to say "The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain" fifty times. You'll get much further with the Lord if you learn not to offend His ears.

While the monomodel view (together with Higgins's rote learning pedagogy) has been challenged in the years since Shaw wrote his play, discrimination based on accent remains and

has been well researched and documented (Maum 2002:3). The monomodel paradigm is alive and well in TESOL. Vavrus (1991: 181) concluded, after examining 10 US TESOL programmes, that 'a monomodel paradigm based on native-speaker norms remains firmly entrenched'. The degree to which a monomodel has been adopted on the African continent can be demonstrated by the recommendations of the Commonwealth Conference held at Makerere in Uganda in 1961, which was called to decide on policies for ELT in the newly independent African countries. The key tenets that emerged from the conference, described in detail in Phillipson (1992:181-222), are as follows:

English is best taught monolingually.

The ideal teacher of English is a native speaker.

The earlier English is taught, the better the results.

The more English is taught, the better the results.

If other languages are used much, standards of English will drop. (Phillipson 1992:185)

These criteria characterize the monomodel approach.

Challenge to Monomodel approach by World Englishes

Kachru's concentric circles model

The monomodel view of English was first challenged by Kachru in 1985) who used three concentric circles to illustrate "the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages". His *Inner Circle* consists of countries such as the United Kingdom and America where English is the primary native language (ENL). From here the language is spread, mainly as a result of colonialist policies, to the *Outer Circle* where English serves as an additional or second language (ESL). The third circle is the *Expanding Circle*, which includes countries such as China where English is primarily a foreign language (EFL). Here the classroom context is vital because of the limited number of native speakers of the language. In Kachru's terms (1985) the *Inner Circle* countries are *norm providing*, the *Outer Circle* countries can be viewed as *norm developing* and the *Expanding Circle* countries as *norm dependent*.

In a revolutionary and almost magical conceptual leap, English was made plural so that one English became multiple Englishes. Kachru was the first to posit the then-revolutionary notion that no single ‘variety is superior, linguistically speaking, to any other’ (Kirkpatrick 2007:28). Emerging varieties of English are thus, not merely translocations, but new languages with unique histories and individual socio-cultural underpinnings.

Kachru acknowledges that the ENL/ESL/EFL labels have become increasingly problematic:

The traditional dichotomy between native and non-native is functionally un insightful and linguistically questionable, particularly when discussing the functions of English in multilingual societies. The earlier distinction of English as a native language (ENL), second (ESL) and foreign (EFL) has come under attack for reasons other than sociolinguistic. (1992:3)

Globalisation and urbanisation, for example, have resulted in the division between ESL and EFL becoming a ‘distinction [that increasingly] appears to be more valid when applied to the contrast between city and countryside’ (Kirkpatrick 2007: 28) in that in the more the well-resourced, multicultural environment of the city English serves a lingua franca while in isolated, rural contexts there is so much less use of English that it could almost be viewed as a foreign language. In terms of ‘native language’, the implication that all members of ENL countries have English as their native language, silences the large, originally-migrant populations of both countries for whom English is not necessarily still a mother tongue. Also inherent in the label ENL is the underlying assumption that the variety used is uniform and standardised and that class distinctions do not exist. This leads to the conception that ENL is innately superior and consequently the ideal model of English ESL or EFL countries (Kirkpatrick 2007:28). This assumption privileges speakers and varieties spoken in inner circle countries.

The ENL/ESL/EFL distinctions no longer accurately reflect the linguistic complexity of multilingual countries and the increasingly diverse linguistic heritages of peoples. Matsuda’s *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language* (2012), can be used to exemplify the current complexity relating to both the linguistic labelling of people and the assumed directional flow of expertise from the Inner Circle outwards. Despite the authors’ Outer

Circle heritage, the publication originated from the Arizona State University, where Professor Matsuda now teaches. It contains a chapter on activities to promote English as an International Language in traditional language classrooms which is compiled from lessons submitted electronically in response to an invitation sent to all participants at the Vancouver IAWE conference. The result was contributions from countries from all three circles: the United States, Canada, Australia, Malaysia, South Africa and Japan. The bibliographical details of the participants show the challenge in labeling in terms of Kachru's model. One would have expected an inner to expanding circle flow of expertise as exemplified by the following contributor: 'Currently based at Osaka University, Fergus O'Dwyer's interests include cultural conceptualizations, Dublin and Irish English, the European Language Portfolio, and the pedagogy of introducing WE in the classroom' (Matsuda 2012:210). Note the range of the following entry: 'Robert J. Baumgardner ... Professor of Applied Linguistics in the Department of Literature and Languages, Texas A&M University-Commerce. He has taught English in Germany, France, Iran, Mexico, Morocco, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, and the United States' (Matsuda and Duran 2012:227). However, contributors to this Inner Circle publication also come from Outer and Expanding Circle countries as diverse as Japan, Malaysia and South Africa.

Schneider's *Dynamic Model of Postcolonial Englishes*

English is not so much distributed as it is spread and this is a vital distinction as: 'Distribution implies adoption and conformity [while] spread implies adaptation and non-conformity' (Kirkpatrick 1997:141). Schneider's *Dynamic Model of Postcolonial Englishes* (2003, 2009) explains this distribution. The model is an advanced, coherent and influential explanation of the complex linguistic and identity shifts which occur as a variety of English becomes established in a post-colonial society. Schneider's phases towards the development of a new variety of English begin with the initial contact foundation phase and moving through the phases of exonormative stabilization, nativization, endonormative stabilization and finally, but not necessarily, differentiation. These stages are seen 'as functions of socio-politically-driven identity reconstructions of all the parties involved' (Schneider 2003, 271). In the process the new variety of English becomes independent of its colonial origins to a point where codification and acceptance of the new variety of English can occur.ⁱⁱⁱ

South African English (SAE) has not yet reached the point of differentiation which would give it the level of recognition that Australian English has, for example. In terms of Gill's model (1999), SAE can be regarded as being at a stage beyond the exonormative phase in the 'liberation and expansion' phase but prior to endonormative stabilization (Van der Walt and van Rooy 2002). Both exonormative and endonormative phases are relatively stable stages, the primary difference depending on whether the language used as the norm comes from the ex-colonial power or from the new variety. The core challenge in terms of SAE is that its assessment tests operate in Schneider's second phase of exonormative stabilization (based on Standard British English) while the variety itself has progressed beyond this point. There are proportionately few native speakers in South Africa and the majority of teachers are speakers of SAE who reinforce the norms of the variety. The problem is compounded in that any variety that is in the 'liberation and expansion stage' of development is unstable, and testing requires the identification of stable norms against which the candidate can be tested.

TESOL's challenge

The core pedagogy in TESOL still retains the categories of ENL, ESL and EFL. This divisiveness flows from the theoretical underpinning to materials development and proceeds to create the classroom reality in its image. Teachers crave stable norms and are thus attracted to a monomodel despite the fact that a polymodel more accurately reflects the internal variations of students' variety of English. The result is a deficit pedagogy, which can be reflected in words taken from Browning's *My Last Duchess*: "Just this / Or that in you disgusts me; here you miss / Or there exceed the mark"^{iv} In terms of deficit pedagogy the learner always falls short of the elusive standards prescribed. Deficit pedagogy eventually results in students internalising the limitations to which they are exposed and eventually even endorsing them themselves. This concept is termed structural violence and it can be illustrated in the following analogy: 'a ewe does not run through the open gate when her entire world consists of the pen in which she lives. Once such a creature has memorized the fence of thorns, she will not cross that marker, not even after it's torn down, for it still rules the boundaries of her vision and her life' (Hoffman 2011:305). Is this what we want for our students?

TESOL programmes have not yet fully come to terms with the challenge represented by WE and ELF. It is my contention that the underlying tenets at the Makerere conference remain despite their having been debunked as the monolingual fallacy, the native speaker fallacy, the early start fallacy, the maximum exposure fallacy, and the subtractive fallacy (Phillipson 1992: 185). Due to time constraints only the native speaker fallacy will be discussed in this paper. The native speaker fallacy is described by Ehrenreich (2011) as a powerful myth but a myth nonetheless.

Linguistic imperialism and the native speaker fallacy in TESOL

In terms of Phillipson's (1992) concept of linguistic imperialism, when a variety is elevated to the position of standard, this is followed by uneven resource allocation with the privileging of the preferred variety and, by implication, the speakers of that variety. This is the theoretical heart of the native speaker fallacy which privileges the native speaker. While it is true that English native speakers have the advantage of innate skills in the language, these do not automatically make them more effective teachers. Non-native English Speaking Teachers (NNESTs) have the advantage of local cultural knowledge. They provide sound learning models because they have learnt English as an additional language and should thus be more aware of their students' linguistic difficulties and cultural needs. They also would be more familiar with the grammatical rules underpinning the language as they have learned rather than acquired the language. This learning experience should increase their empathy and they are also able to adopt a multilingual approach as they and the learners frequently have a shared L1 (Maum 2002:1; Medgyes 1994).

Despite NNESTs' strengths as teachers, discrimination remains and this is reflected – where it hurts most - in hiring policies. Research cited in Maum (2002:1) shows that Native English speakers without teaching qualifications are more likely to be hired as ESL teachers than qualified and experienced non-native teachers. This was a conclusion endorsed by the research in Oman conducted by McLean (2011). Ruth Golden's presentation at the 2011 IAWE conference, entitled *Teaching Job Advertisements: A Case Study of Two Regions*, dealt with the continued discrimination against NNESTs in the TESOL industry. The research was based on 103 advertisements from the Middle East and Asia. Her findings echo those of Mahboob et al. (2004) who concluded that there is a distinction between NESTs and NNESTs, a preference for the former, that Nativeness was the most common requirement for employment and that

Nativeness remains associated with Inner Circle Englishes. The titles of two of the research papers Golden cites in her presentation speak volumes about continued discrimination in the hiring practices in the TESOL industry world-wide: *All Teachers Are Equal, But Some Teachers Are More Equal Than Others* (Selvi 2010) and *Children of a Lesser English: Status of Non-native English Speakers at College-Level English as a Second Language Teachers in the United States* (Muboob et al 2004).

Taking up the gauntlet: How could TESOL respond?

In terms of linguistic competence ...

Seidelhofer challenges the use of a centrifugal view on the grounds that Standard English is hard to define and that there is confusion and disagreement about what Standard English is. 'In WE the position is advanced that deviations (defined as innovations, appropriate to a specific, indigenised context) should not be classified as errors' (Van Rooy 2010). How could the teaching industry respond to this? My answer is that consciousness raising is needed. A shift towards descriptive grammar away from deficit pedagogy (difference, deviation) would also be aided if there were an increased awareness of features of emerging varieties of English which differ from this 'standard'. Van Rooy (2010) explains that there is a fundamental distinction between innovation (individual selection – interference, creativity, extension of existing forms, speech performance) and selection (social process that happens through interaction). A variety can thus be viewed as 'the total sum of selections' associated with a community (Van Rooy 2010). Research in the field takes the place of acceptability ratings, corpus research and eye tracking (Van Rooy 2010) Such studies have identified entrenched linguistic features of BSAE (Addendum 1) and the debate needs to be raised relating to the value of sustained correction of these 'deviations' given that these represent the communal choices of an emerging variety. I would like to refer the audience to the research of Mesthrie and Van Rooy for further information on emerging features of BSAE.

Data from ELF research, such as Seidlhofer's corpus (VOICE), has identified items that do not cause communication breakdown although they are used systematically but differently from L1 speakers by expert ELF speakers from a wide range of L1s. These items are listed in Addendum 2. To what degree should features that are entrenched in BSAE, but which do not impede

communication, be penalised in the testing context? The answer would differ depending on the course as one would anticipate varied levels of linguistic competence from student teachers of English as opposed to students registered for a Business Communication module, for example.

In terms of sociolinguistic competence ...

In contrast to items that do not interfere with communication, Jenkins states that communicative difficulties relate mainly to unilateral idiomaticity, in the form of idiom, phrase or metaphor unknown to listener (2006:170). In a multicultural teaching context, these culturally-specific idioms represent a fruitful area of exploration. In his paper at the 2011 IAWWE entitled *Cultural linguistics and World Englishes*, Sharifan explained that language is the play of verbal symbols that are based in imagery that is culturally constructed. Such metaphorical awareness increases sensitivity to and tolerance of metaphorical expressions originating from speakers of other cultures (Sarifan 2011). Sarifan cited the example of the Western concept of time as a commodity reflected in terms such as ‘save time’, ‘spend time’ and ‘time is money’, which invites comparison with the concept of ‘Africa time’, for example. Sharifan showed how divergent world views can be expressed linguistically. Consider, for example, the conceptual chasm between ‘This land is mine’ (Australian English) and ‘This land is me’ (Aboriginal English) (Sarifan 2011). A debate around such divergent perceptions is vital for cross-cultural understanding. The discrepancy in terms of the land issue can be represented in the South African context in the response of local inhabitants to the Xolobeni Heavy Minerals Sands Project, which will impact an area on the Wild Coast known as Mgungunluvu. There is ‘a distinct awareness amongst respondents that their survival is integrally dependent on the land, which reinforces their identities’ (Bennie 2011: 50) as the following quotations reveal:

- ‘The land is forever; but the money will disappear’
- ‘The mining will go but the land is here forever’
- ‘and to make sure our children, they have land to build their own houses’
- ‘The land is part of me. Everything I am using is from the land ... If you destroy this land, you destroy yourself’ (Bennie 2011: 49-50)

The value of multilingualism ...

The cognitive benefits of multilingualism and multiculturalism have been acknowledged (Coetzee-vanRooy 2010) but these need to be implemented fully. One initiative is being undertaken by Joseph Mwelwa in his doctoral research. He is developing a bilingual teaching resource based on traditional narratives translated from Bemba into English to ensure that local, cultural values are able to permeate into the teaching of English. The University of the North-West has taken the issue of multilingualism to heart and offer simultaneous translation of lectures in three languages.

In terms of testing ...

The 'most pressing problem will be to find a way of incorporating a WES-ESL perspective into testing ... [because] until examination boards acknowledge the importance of new competencies, teachers and curriculum planners will not do so ...for fear of jeopardising their students' exam prospects' (in Jenkins 2006:175). This is our challenge. The time for divisive labels is over. Teachers should be evaluated on their training, proficiency and effectiveness rather than on the basis of outdated, linguistic labels. This development should be celebrated.

Thank you for your time.

Bibliography

- Bamgbose, A. 1998. Torn between norms: innovations in World Englishes. *World Englishes*. 17 (1) 1-14.
- Bennie, A. 2011. Questions for labour on land, livelihoods and jobs: a case of the proposed mining at Xolobeni, Wild Coast. *South African Review of Sociology*. 42 (3): 43-59.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Coetzee-Van Rooy, S. 2010. *The importance of being multilingual*. North-West University: Vaal Triangle Occasional Papers: Inaugural lecture 6/2010.
- Crystal (2010) Crystal, D. (2010) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, third edition. Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, 1994. The interlanguage metaphor and language assessment. *World Englishes* 13 (3) 377-386.
- Davies, A. 1991. *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Davis, M. (2004) GDP by Language. Unicode Technical Note #13. Retrieved on 9 February, 2012 from <http://www.unicode.org/notes/tn13/tn13-1.html>

De Klerk, V. and Gough, D. 2002. Black South African English. In Mestrie, R. (Ed. Second Edition), 2002. *Language in Social History*, Cape Town, David Philip, 356-378.

Ehrenreich, S, 2011. Describing the pragmatics of English as a business lingua franca: an emic perspective *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Golden, R. 2011. Teaching Job Advertisements A Case Study of Two Regions. *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Graddol, D. (2006) *English Next*. London: The British Council.

He, D. & Zhang, Q. 2010. Native speaker norms and China English: From perspectives of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly* 44 (4): 769-789.

Hoffman, A. 2011. *The Dovekeepers*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Jenkins, J. 2006. Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly* 40: 1: 157-181.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. 2011. From expanding circle to dominant variety: a prediction for Chinese English. *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Kachru, B.B. 1992. World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching* 25: 1-14.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2006. TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1): 59-81.

Lui, M. & Zhang, L. 2007. Student perceptions of native and non-native English teachers' attitudes, teaching skills assessment and performance. *Asian EFL Journal* 9 (4): 10.

Mahboob, A. 2011. World Englishes in Education. *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K., & Hartford, B.S. (2004). Children of a Lesser English: Status of Nonnative English Speakers as College-Level English as a Second Language Teachers in the United States. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience:*

Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals (pp. 100-120). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Matsuda, A. (ed.). 2012. *Principles and Practices of Teaching English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Maum, R. 2002. Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in the English Teaching Profession. *JPCS Adult and Continuing Education*. [Online]

Available: <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0209maum.html> [Accessed: 2011, 1 Aug.]

McLean, A. C. 2011. *Particularity, practicality and possibility: An investigation into the awareness and use of Communicative Language Teaching methodology in a College of Higher Education in Oman*. Unpublished Master's dissertation. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Medgyes, P. (no date) *When the teacher is a non-native speaker*. [Online]

Available: <http://teachingpronunciation.pbworks.com/f/When+the+teacher+is+a+non-native+speaker.PDF> [Accessed: 2010, 19 Aug.]

Mestrie, R. (Ed. Second Edition). 2002. *Language in Social History*, Cape Town, David Philip, 356-378.

My Fair Lady <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0058385/quotes> [3 February 2012]

My Fair Lady <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0058385/quotes> [3 February 2012]

Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schneider, E.W. 2003. The dynamics of New Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 79 (2):233-281.

Schneider, E.W. 2009. *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, B. 2005. English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*. 59 (4): 339-341.

Selvi, A. F. (2010). All Teachers Are Equal, But Some Teachers Are More Equal Than Others: Trend Analysis of Job Advertisements in English Language Teaching. WATESOL NNEST Caucus Annual Review, Vol 1.

Sharifan, F. 2011. Cultural linguistics and World Englishes. *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Spencer, B. 2011a. 'International sporting events in South Africa, identity re-alignment, and Schneider's EVENT X'. *African Identities*. 9 (3): 267-278

Spencer, B. 2011b. Linguistic penetration at Schneider's Phase 4: Acceptability ratings of entrenched features of Black South African English by South Africans outside the originating culture of the variety. *Journal for Language Teaching*. 45 (2) 133-149.

Spencer, B. 2011c. International sporting events: can they function as an Event X in terms of their impact? *Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Melbourne: 23-25 November 2011.

Van der Walt, J. L. and Van Rooy, B. 2002. Towards a norm in South African Englishes. *World Englishes* 21 (1) 113-128.

Van Rooy 2010. Psycholinguistic evidence for a distinction between error and innovation. *Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the International Association for World Englishes*. Vancouver: 25-27 July 2010.

Vavrus, F. K. 1991. When paradigms clash: the role of institutionalized varieties in language teacher education. *World Englishes* 10 (2): 181-195.

Widdowson, H. 1978. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Widdowson, H. (1992). ELT and ELT teachers: Matters arising. *ELT Journal* 46 (4): 333-339.

Addendum 1

Entrenched features of BSAE

- 1 Non-count as count nouns: You must put more *efforts* into your work.
- 2 Omission of article: He was * good man.
3. Excessive use of resumptive pronouns: The man who I saw *him* wearing a big hat.
- 4 Gender conflation in pronouns: He said (when it is she)
- 5 Noun phrases [sic] not always marked for number: We did all our subject in English
- 6 Extension of the progressive: Even racism is still existing
- 7 No singular or third person indicative present: The survival of a person depend on education
- 8 Idiosyncratic patterns of complementation: The thing that made me *to know* God
- 9 Simplification of tenses: We * supposed to stay in our homes
- 10 Past tense not always marked: The 2005 boycotts starts
- 11 New prepositional verb forms: He *explained about* the situation.
- 12 Structures of comparison: She was beautiful than all other women

13 Use of too and very much as intensifiers: She is too beautiful (very). Hatred is very much in common

14 Use of *in order that* in purpose clause: She went there *in order that* he sees her

15 Generalization of being as a participial: He left *being* thirsty

16 New pronoun forms: She was very happy *of which* it was clear to see.

17 Question order retained in indirect questions: I asked him *why did he go*.

18 Use of subordinators: *Although* she loved him *but* she did not marry him

19 Invariant ne in tag questions (Afrikaans): You start again by pushing the button, ne.

20 New quantifier forms: *Others* were drinking, *others* were eating.

21 The most thing for the thing I <verb> most: The most thing I like is apples.

22 X's first time for 'the first time that X': This is my first time to go on a journey.

23 *Can be able to* as a modal verb phrase: I can be able to go.

List and examples taken from De Klerk and Gough in Mestrie 2002

Addendum 2

Features from ELF research that do not impede communication:

- Interchangeable use who and which
- Non use 3rd person present tense
- Article omissions or insertions
- All purpose tag: *isn't it or no?*
- Increased redundancy: add prepositions '*discuss about*'
- Increased explicitness '*black colour*'
- Heavy reliance on verbs with semantic generality - *do have make*
- Pluralisation of uncountable nouns 'staffs'
- Use of that clauses (not infinitives) *I want that we discuss about*

ⁱ The quotation was taken from [http /www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/5943.Desmond_Tutu](http://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/5943.Desmond_Tutu) [accessed 15 February 2012]

ⁱⁱ All quotations from the film have been taken from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0058385/quotes> and <http://www.filmsite.org/myfa.html> [accessed 3 February 2012] and these have not been referenced after individual quotations.

ⁱⁱⁱ At the 2011 IAWE conference Schneider's model was critiqued (Sharifan 2011) on the grounds of its theoretical link to nationhood as the model suggests that a national status is a necessary pre-requisite for the recognition of a variety.

^{iv} The line was quoted from a source found on: <http://barney.gonzaga.edu/~jdavis6/poem.html> [3 February 2012]