Kirkpatrick, Andy. "Teaching (About) World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca." *Research Developments in World Englishes*. Ed. Alexander Onysko. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 251–270. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167087.ch-012>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:32 UTC.

Copyright © Alexander Onysko and Contributors 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Teaching (About) World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca

Andy Kirkpatrick

1. Introduction

The understanding that English comprises a range of varieties is of long standing. Some sixty-five years ago Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens pointed out that:

English is no longer the possession of the British, or even the British and the Americans . . . In West Africa, the West Indies and in Pakistan and India . . . it is no longer accepted by the majority that the English of England with RP as its accent, are [*sic*] the only possible models of English . . . English exists in an increasingly large number of varieties.

1964: 293, cited in Bolton 2012: 14

More than twenty-five years ago, Kachru (1992: 357 ff.), the scholar who can be considered the founder of the discipline of World Englishes (WE), presented his six fallacies associated with English and English language teaching. By way of introduction, I shall repeat these here to underline that many of the current perspectives associated with the teaching of World Englishes (WE) and English as an international language (EIL) have their inspiration in rebutting these six fallacies. The six fallacies were:

Fallacy 1

That in outer and expanding circles English is essentially learned to interact with NS.

Fallacy 2

That English is necessarily learned as a tool to understand and teach American or British cultural values, or what is generally termed the Judeo-Christian traditions.

Fallacy 3

That the goal of learning English is to adopt the native models of English.

Fallacy 4

That the international non-native varieties of English are essentially “interlanguage” striving to achieve “native-like” character.

Fallacy 5

That the native speakers of English as teachers, academic administrators and materials developers provide a serious input in the global teaching of English, in policy formation, and in determining the channels for the spread of the language.

Fallacy 6

That the diversity and variation in English is necessarily an indicator of linguistic decay and that restricting the decay is the responsibility of the native scholars of English and ESL programs.

I return to respond to these later in the chapter, but here note that World Englishes scholars and those who have argued for the adoption of an EIL, Global Englishes or ELF-approach to the teaching and learning of English would readily agree that these six points contain fallacious arguments. Nevertheless, as will be seen below, these WE and ELF approaches have proved remarkably difficult to introduce in many English language classes throughout the world. The idea that English is best represented by a native speaker variety and that this is the variety that should be the classroom model has proved remarkably resilient. In this chapter I want to explore possible reasons for this resilience and to suggest ways in which it might be overcome. To do this, I shall review recent research into the adoption of a World Englishes perspective and a lingua franca approach to the teaching of English. I am making a distinction between a World Englishes perspective—which recognizes that English does not comprise a single or solely native speaker varieties, but rather recognizes the existence and legitimacy of Outer Circle and other varieties of English which typically develop among people who share linguistic and cultural backgrounds—and an English as a lingua franca approach to English language teaching, which sees English function as a shared medium of communication, typically between people who come from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Before proceeding, I need to explain the terms (WE and ELF) I am using. Other terms that are in current use include English as an International Language (EIL) (e.g., Matsuda 2019) and Global Englishes (GE) (e.g., Rose and Galloway 2019). In this chapter I shall use World Englishes as a cover all term for WEs, EIL and GE, distinguishing these from an ELF-approach to the teaching of English (e.g., Kirkpatrick 2014, 2018a, b; Sifakis and Tsantila 2018)

I also want to make a distinction between teaching world Englishes and adopting an English as a lingua franca approach and teaching *about* World Englishes and an English as a lingua franca approach. Teaching world Englishes and adopting an ELF approach would mean either teaching a specific variety of English as a classroom model or teaching English in a way that recognizes its function as a lingua franca. The students in such cases would be learners of English and the teachers English language teachers. In contrast, teaching *about* World Englishes and about an ELF-approach would mean introducing these concepts either to pre-service students training to become English

language teachers or to in-service English language teachers in some form of professional development course such as a Diploma or MA in TESOL. I shall argue that, while teaching about World Englishes and about an ELF approach is becoming common in professional development courses for teachers, there remains little transfer from these teacher education programs into the English language classrooms. In other words, despite professional development courses introducing trainee and trained teachers to the concepts of World Englishes and ELF, very few of these teachers actually implement these ideas in their own classroom teaching. There is a significant gap, therefore, between theory and practice. The question is why? In this chapter I also want to explore the possible reasons for this.

2. Teaching About WEs and About an ELF-Approach

Scholars proposing that World Englishes and/or an ELF approach should be part of the curricula of professional development courses agree on the underlying philosophy that should shape such courses. Here I summarize how a selection of scholars have expressed this philosophy. In a recent state of the art article for the journal *Language Teaching*, Rose et al. (2020) use the term “Global Englishes” as a cover term for World Englishes, English as an international language, English as a lingua franca. They explain that Global Englishes “... is an inclusive paradigm that aims to consolidate the work of WE, ELF, and EIL to explore the linguistic, sociolinguistic and sociocultural diversity and fluidity of English use and the implications of this diversity of English on multifaceted aspects of society, including TESOL curricula and English language teaching practices” (2020: 2). They note that scholars recognize the need for a paradigm shift in TESOL curricula to address the mismatch between what is taught in classrooms and how English functions outside of the classroom” (2020: 2). They summarize their philosophy in six Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) proposals:

1. Increasing World Englishes and ELF exposure in language curricula
2. Emphasizing respect for multilingualism in ELT
3. Raising awareness of Global Englishes in ELT
4. Raising awareness of ELF strategies in language curricula
5. Emphasizing respect for diverse cultures and identity in ELT
6. Changing English teacher-hiring practices in the ELT industry

In an earlier article, Dewey (2012) proposed what he called the post-normative approach to curriculum change, an approach that, in many ways, foreshadows these GELT proposals. This approach proposed the following strategies:

Investigate and highlight the particular environment and sociocultural context in which English(es) will be used
Increase exposure to the diverse ways in which English is used globally; presenting alternative variants as appropriate whenever highlighting linguistic form

Engage in critical classroom discussion about the globalization and growing diversity of English

Spend proportionately less time on ENL forms, especially if these are not widely used in other varieties; and thus choose not to penalize non-native-led innovative forms that are intelligible

Focus(more) on communicative strategies

Dewey 2012: 163–4

Another scholar of WEs, Marlina, has summarized the philosophy for the teaching of EIL in the following way:

Teaching EIL or EIL pedagogy means the act of professionally guiding students from all Kachruvian circles to: (i) gain knowledge and awareness of the pluricentricity of English and the plurilingual nature of today's communication; (ii) inspire students to give equal and legitimate recognition to all varieties of English; and (iii) develop the ability to negotiate and communicate respectfully across cultures and Englishes in today's communicative settings that are international, intercultural and multilingual in nature.

Marlina 2014: 7

He then acknowledges that these views do not always meet with approval from teachers. Using the acronym PESTs (2014: 9) he lists their concerns over the practicality of such a course, its efficiency, as teachers feel that time could be better spent, standards in that students want a standard English, and simplicity, as teachers feel that such an EIL course would confuse their students.

Taking Asia as their context, Widodo and Fang (2019) argue that "Global Englishes (GE) is an ecological approach that recognizes the use of language in different social and cultural domains in which different languages and cultures coexist" (2019: 194). GE perspectives should be taken into account when language teachers and teacher educators design and enact English language education (ELE). It is crucial that teaching materials reflect: (i) GE as guiding theory; (ii) authenticity of English use in the 3 circles; (iii) GE-related topics; (iv) GE knowledge and language awareness; (v) GE-oriented assessment in various contexts; and (vi) GE-awareness raising tasks and activities (2019: 197). Tellingly, however, they acknowledge that the GE philosophy has been slow to influence the field of language pedagogy and assessment with assessment being in their view, the trickiest issue. Like, Marlina above, therefore, they recognize that these ideas are not being universally embraced.

I myself (Kirkpatrick 2012, 2014, 2018a, b) have proposed an ELF-approach to English language teaching, designed primarily for the East and Southeast Asian / ASEAN context. This originally comprised six principles later reduced to these five. More detailed descriptions can be found in Kirkpatrick (2018a).

Principle 1

The native speaker of English is not the linguistic target. Mutual intelligibility is the goal. The role of English as a lingua franca in ASEAN means that English is

primarily used between multilinguals whose first languages comprise a variety of Asian languages and who have learned English as an additional language. There is no need for people to approximate native speaker norms. What is important is that these users of English are able to communicate successfully with each other. Strategies for negotiating meaning are more important than adherence to native speaker norms.

Principle 2

The native speaker's culture is not the cultural target. Intercultural competence in relevant cultures is the goal.

A curriculum that adopts an ELF-approach can provide information about the cultures of the people the learners are most likely to be interacting with. In the ASEAN/Asian context, this means including information about Asian cultures and religions. Most importantly, the curriculum should show learners how to talk about their own cultures and values.

Principle 3

ELF speakers make appropriate ELF teachers.

This principal was originally formulated as "Multilinguals who are suitably trained provide the most appropriate English language teachers."

As the language learning goal is not to approximate native speaker norms, but to be able to interact successfully with fellow ELF users, it follows that a multilingual who is proficient in English and who has the relevant qualifications represents an appropriate teacher. Successful users of ELF are likely to be better equipped to adopt an ELF-approach

Principle 4

Lingua franca environments provide excellent learning environments for lingua franca speakers.

Rather than sending students whose primary goal for learning English is to communicate with fellow Asian multilinguals to Inner Circle countries such as Great Britain or the United States, consideration should be given to sending them to places where English is naturally used as a lingua franca. Within Asia, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei and the Philippines provide examples of sites where English is regularly used as a lingua franca and as a language of inter-ethnic communication. The great advantage of such sites for Asian learners of English is, paradoxically, that the native speaker is absent. Instead, English is being *naturally* used as a lingua franca between Asian multilinguals. Students will find the linguistic environment less threatening and will feel more comfortable using English

Principle 5

Assessment must be relevant to the (ASEAN) context.

In the context of ASEAN, there is an overwhelming need for an overall ASEAN approach to these issues, particularly regarding the issues of teacher and student assessment (Dudzik and Nguyen 2015). They call for ASEAN-wide proficiency

benchmarks and ELT competency frameworks to be developed, which would include creating a “common regional proficiency assessment framework” (61) and “regional English teacher competency assessment tools” (62). They also call for the development of relevant curricula (such as SE Asian cultures) and teach English “no longer by teaching and assessing only NS varieties of English but also by introducing those spoken in neighboring countries and by other regional multilingual speakers such as Singaporeans and Malaysians” (60).

Kobayashi (2017) refined or softened these principles in order for them to become relevant for wider contexts. He reduced them to 4, namely:

Principle 1

The native speaker of English is not the only linguistic target. Mutual intelligibility is nothing less than a goal.

Principle 2

The native speaker’s culture is not the only cultural target. Intercultural competence in relevant cultures is nothing less than a goal.

Principle 3

Local multilinguals who are suitably trained provide more appropriate English language teachers than English teachers lacking teacher training and empathy with English learners.

Principle 4

Lingua franca environments provide excellent learning environments for international English learners.

The philosophy and principles outlined above may all sound very sensible and useful components for a pre- or in-service English language teacher education course, but how might they be implemented in actual language classroom contexts given that their adoption seems slow? A recent volume edited by Sifakis and Tsantila (2018) includes a number of chapters which offer practical advice, and here I review the chapter by Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt. The authors provide lesson plans on how to adopt an ELF-aware approach to teaching and say that a major aim of their chapter is to allow its readers to be then able to develop for themselves “a teacher education model underlain by ELF-awareness” (2018: 159). They suggest that teachers go through three phases on their way to be able to deliver ELF-informed classrooms. The first phase is a theoretical phase when teachers become engaged with ELF- and WE-related theory and research literature. The second phase is the application phase when teachers develop lesson plans that exemplify their understanding of ELF; these lessons should be designed to raise their students’ awareness of ELF-related issues. The third phase is the evaluation phase when teachers evaluate the lessons taught. The authors note that, operating in this way, gives teachers autonomy. This is no doubt true, but it assumes teaching contexts where teachers have the autonomy to design their own materials and courses.

This, however, is often not the case, especially in Asia, where the curriculum may be set in stone and teachers required to teach it faithfully. This is a point to which I return later in the chapter.

Hino (2018) offers an interesting take on how EIL education might flourish in the Expanding Circle, using Japan as a case study. He argues that the recent dramatic increase in the number of English Medium of Instruction (EMI) courses being taught in Asia (e.g., Fenton-Smith, Humphreys and Walkinshaw 2017) provide ideal contexts for combining an EIL approach within EMI classes. For this to be successful, Hino (2018: 130–1) lists three administrative principles and six pedagogical principles which need to be observed. The three administrative principles are:

- (i) Collaboration between content teachers and EIL teachers (unless the EMI class is taught by an EIL expert)
- (ii) Ready access to EMI classes for both local and international students
- (iii) No discrimination against NNS in the employment or assignment of EMI teachers

It is essential, in Hino's view, that EMI classes contain both local and international students for this provides a natural context for the use of ELF and EIL. In his experience, asking Japanese students to use English with each other in the classroom when Japanese students are the only students present is not only unnatural but also leads to the development of a type of Japanese English that is likely to be unintelligible to others. Only the presence of international students allows for the creation of an authentic EIL context in which the users of English will have to negotiate meaning when interacting with each other.

The six pedagogical principles are (2018: 131–3):

- (i) activities to utilize authentic EIL environments in EMI classes;
- (ii) refraining from identifying EMI pedagogy with Anglo-American pedagogy;
- (iii) intercultural negotiation for appropriate pedagogy in EMI classes—an intercultural pedagogy;
- (iv) consideration of pedagogical tradition in each disciplinary field;
- (v) care for international students when the local language is additionally used in an EMI class;
- (vi) EMI teachers as role models of EIL users.

The third and fourth pedagogical principles above are worthy of further comment. Hino believes that it is important that an “intercultural pedagogy” be negotiated with students if they come from different traditions. For example, when the class contains American, Chinese and Japanese students (as many of his classes do) an intercultural pedagogy would seek “reconciliation between East Asian beliefs in harmony and American values in argumentation” (2018: 132). The fourth pedagogical principle recognizes that different disciplines may have different pedagogies and these must be respected in these EMI-EIL classes. I agree that taking into account cultural differences surrounding pedagogy is crucial. The fact that these might not have been taken into

account may be a reason for teachers being hesitant in adopting a WE/EIL philosophy and/or an EFL-approach. This also bears on the amount of autonomy English language teachers may or may not have.

I shall close this section of the chapter with one more example from Asia—Musthafa, Hamied and Zein's recommendations for the adoption of an ELF-approach in Indonesia. Their four recommendations are (2018: 177–87):

- (i) objectives of English Language Education in Indonesia be re-oriented from Inner Circle varieties to regional varieties and ELF;
- (ii) empower teachers and students as users of ELF. To ensure this they stress that “Pre-service teacher education must prepare teachers through exposure to the varieties of English used in the ASEAN context, and show that communication can be accomplished without adherence to native speaker norms” (2018: 180);
- (iii) a policy on teachers' proficiency needs to be developed;
- (iv) policy innovations to support teacher education need to be developed for which they recommend the setting up of an inter-ministerial group which would harmonise teacher education throughout Indonesia.

In this section, I have reviewed several scholars' views on the need to adopt a WE philosophy and/or an ELF-approach to the teaching of English and shown that many of these scholars share similar views. As Matsuda points out “the variation and diversity in English is . . . a reality that we work with in order to help our students better” (2019: 150). Matsuda envisions that the understanding of WE perspectives will become so widespread “that they become part of the shared knowledge and assumptions of the field that everyone takes for granted” (2019: 150).

The problem seems to be that, while the need to adopt WE/EIL perspectives is widespread among scholars of the field and is increasingly common in professional development courses for English language teachers, their actual implementation and adoption in English language classrooms remains relatively rare. In the next section of the chapter I want to explore why this might be the case.

3. Teaching WEs and Adopting an ELF-Approach

In this section of the chapter I shall review recent studies which have examined the effect of introducing the WE philosophy and/or ELF-approach into professional development programs and classrooms. I must here signal my indebtedness to the work of Rose et al. (2020) as their state-of-the-art article in the journal *Language Teaching* reviews many of the studies covered here. They used strict criteria for selecting which articles to review. These were that the studies:

- must contain empirical research;
- must have been published between 2010–2019;
- must be about English language teaching or teacher education;

must be about one or more of our key constructs (Global Englishes, World Englishes, EIL or ELF).

They first reviewed seven studies of innovation in language teacher education. I shall not review each of these here in detail but simply summarize Rose et al.'s findings. Three of these studies were conducted in Inner Circle countries (one in the United Kingdom and two in the United States) and four in Expanding Circle countries, namely Israel, Turkey, South Korea, and Italy. Two of the studies reported on one-off interventions such as a two-hour workshop while the other five reported on longer term interventions, such as in semester-long courses; the one conducted in Italy took place over two-years and investigated the extent to which, if at all, the implementation of a WE/ELF-aware module influenced the teaching practices of pre-service teachers (Vettorel and Corrizato 2016). Rose et al. make the following general comments about these studies. First the relatively low number of them suggests that this type of action research is not yet being conducted in any great numbers. Second, they note that while some of these studies showed excellent pedagogical innovations, the lack of rigor in the methodology of some of these studies meant there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate the heightened awareness claimed (2020). With regard to the longer-term Vettorel and Corrizato study, they say that, while the participants appeared positive about the curriculum innovations, "conclusions that such innovations can broaden perspectives of English language teaching are questionable" (2020: 11). They call for more longitudinal studies which include both pre- and post-course data and which investigate if and whether the ideas presented in these courses are implemented in the teachers' own classrooms.

The second set of studies they reviewed involved curriculum innovation within classrooms. Using the same criteria outlined above they selected fourteen studies. Four of these looked at classroom activities and, here again, Rose et al. are critical in that these studies typically comprise "one-shot" explorations of impact and that "there are no measures to directly capture students' beliefs before and after the tasks, and thus there is a lack of evidence to demonstrate change" (2020: 17). Their review included a subset of these studies. The six which focused on teaching WEs and EIL and which are therefore of most relevance to this chapter are reviewed in more detail below.

Fang and Ren (2018) reported that a course teaching world Englishes to English language students over the course of two terms suggested that students did develop a tolerance of diversity and, thus, to their own English. There was, however, no follow-up study to see to what extent these attitudes were maintained.

Chang (2014) looked at how the introduction of the idea of a WE-informed English language course influenced the Taiwanese students taking the course. It was perhaps not surprising that the students, in their writing about the WE topic, indicated that they had understood more about the varieties of English, but again, there was no follow up study.

Teixeira and Pozzi (2014) showed how a WE course influenced the students, all of whom were from different language backgrounds. Again, not surprisingly, the course enabled students to recognize different varieties of English, but the small number involved (7) and the lack of any follow up study means that it is impossible to see if the course influenced the students in any long-term way.

In a small case study that involved only three students who took an EIL course at an Australian university, Marlina (2013) found that, on the one hand, the students developed a greater understanding of variation in English(es), but, on the other, found it hard to see how this knowledge might connect with the worlds in which they worked. For example, despite growing to realize that their own variety of English was appropriate, their own teaching and learning contexts presented the native speaker standard as the correct model. This potential contradiction between what they were learning and what they were expected to teach may well be a major reason why courses in WE and ELF do not necessarily result in these approaches being adopted by teachers in their own classrooms. I shall return to this issue, which is connected to teacher autonomy, below.

Ali (2015) collected data during a series of five EIL workshops given to postgraduate students of linguistics in Pakistan. Findings showed that the workshops challenged the students' position about standard English but did not alter their views that their own English was deficient. Ali suggested that this might be because the notion of a standard English as being the only correct English continued to be believed in this postcolonial context.

The final study of this subset of six was conducted by Galloway (2013). Using a control and experimental group, she investigated how Japanese learners of English were influenced by taking a Global Englishes course. Again, not surprisingly, she found that those students who had taken the Global Englishes course had a greater understanding of non-native varieties of English and a greater confidence in their own English.

In their summary of their review of these six studies, Rose et al. conclude that they "provide powerful pedagogical evidence from the language classroom of the positive benefits of innovations based on Global Englishes, World Englishes, ELF and EIL proposals for change" (2020: 22). But they also note that most of the studies did not adopt a "concrete research design" and lacked any longitudinal component, rendering their results open to question.

Rose et al. also reviewed eight articles that investigated students' and teachers' attitudes to curriculum innovation in the context of WEs and an ELF approach. Most of these studies found that participants felt more comfortable with a consistent model of English than with WEs. While students and teachers were generally open to introducing students to different varieties of English, teachers had practical concerns about how they could best be taught in the classroom.

A study that did have a longitudinal component and which had a sound methodology is the replication study of English learners' attitudes to native English teachers (NESTs) and local English teachers (LETs) in Thailand (Watson Todd and Pojanapunya 2020). Their 2020 study was a replication of their 2009 study. Eliciting data using an Implicit Association Test and questionnaires, they sought answers to the following four research questions:

what are Thai university students' explicit attitudes towards NESTs and LETs?;

what are Thai university students' implicit attitudes towards NESTs and LETs?;

is there a relationship between explicit and implicit attitudes towards NESTs and LETs?;

is there a relationship between previous learning experiences with NESTs and attitudes towards NESTs and LETs?

The replication study added an additional research question, namely: “How do these findings differ from the 2009 findings?” The only other difference between the two studies was the number of participants. The 2009 study surveyed 261 undergraduates at a well-known Thai University. The 2020 study surveyed 439 undergraduates from the same university. In both cases, the majority of the participants were engineering students.

The researchers’ hypothesis was that the students’ attitudes in 2020 towards NESTs and LETS would have shifted to a more favorable attitude to local teachers and to a less favorable one to native English speaking teachers. They suggested two reasons for this hypothesis: first, the significant increase in tourism in Thailand since 2009 might be expected to make students far more familiar with non-native varieties of English and the use of English as a lingua franca, especially as tourists from inner circle countries comprised less than 10 percent of the total; the second reason was connected with the implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) in 2016. This allowed for skilled worker mobility, meaning that Thai workers would be mixing with workers from other ASEAN countries where English as a lingua franca would be the most likely medium of communication.

The results of the replication study did not support the hypothesis, however, with students indicating a greater preference for NESTs and a lower preference for LETs than the students in the 2009 study. The researchers also suggested two reasons for these unexpected findings: first, there has been a significant increase in the numbers of NESTs employed in Thailand with the result that the great majority of Thai students have now studied with a NEST; second, while the implementation of the AEC gave Thais a strong motivation to improve their English, “the social discourse around the AEC focused purely on improved English, not on who English would be used with” (2020: 9). The authors conclude that the belief in the native speaker model of English and NESTs as ideal teachers remains dominant in Thailand. As they point out, “[f]or ELF advocates, such a situation is worrying” (2020: 9). They argue that ELF advocates need to broaden their audience from a purely academic one to include wider society.

Similarly worrying results for advocates of a WE philosophy to the teaching of English were obtained by Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2019). They surveyed 56 English teachers in Australia. 32 were first language speakers of English. The remainder were L2 speakers with a wide variety of first languages. Out of those surveyed, 87 percent had also taught English outside Australia. Their results found that, while more than 50 percent of those surveyed viewed WEs as relevant to their English language teaching in Australia, this was limited to their *awareness* of WEs rather than seeing them as fundamental to the teaching of English. Opponents of the idea of including WEs in the classroom felt students had come to learn Australian English and that they would feel short-changed if taught other varieties. They also felt that the inclusion of WEs would

confuse learners. Based on these results, the researchers note that, despite so many studies arguing against teaching English as a single variety, and proposals for EIL/ELF approaches “research studies in different contexts have shown that teachers are still teaching English as a monolithic language” (2019: 254). They conclude that, to enable teachers to teach EIL, the teaching curriculum should reflect the multi-varietal nature of English and educators should not rely on the native speaker-based publishing industry and native speaker-based international tests. This sounds a little despairing, as scholars have been urging these types of curriculum changes for decades, but without, it would seem, much effect.

4. Where Does This Leave Us?

So far, this chapter has shown how several scholars—the author included—have advocated the adoption of a World Englishes philosophy and/or an ELF approach to the teaching of English. These scholars have put forward these proposals in light of the way English has developed internationally over the past few decades. The world has seen the development of new varieties of English in many Outer Circle countries so that there is now a large family of Englishes stretching from the Indian sub-continent and across much of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. Perhaps more unexpectedly has been the fast-paced development of the role of English as a lingua franca in many Expanding Circle countries. English has become the main international lingua franca. In the context of Asia, Bolton and Bacon-Shone note:

Since the era of European de-colonisation in Asia, which largely took place from the late 1940s to the 1960s, there has been a massive expansion in the spread of English throughout the whole of the region, in both Outer Circle and Expanding Circle societies.

2020: 49

Tables 12.1 and 12.2 show the estimated number of English speakers in Asia's Expanding and Outer Circle countries. These tables are adapted from Bolton and Bacon-Shone 2020. They arrived at these figures using data from government censuses and language surveys.

The tables indicate both the percentages and total number of the population that speaks English.

Taken together, the numbers of Tables 12.1 and 12.2 show that there are some 800 million users of English in Asia alone. This is significantly more than the number of native speakers of English. There are even more speakers of Outer Circle varieties of English in Asia than there are native speakers of it world-wide. So the question arises as to why the belief in a native speaker model and the NEST as the ideal English teacher remains so resilient?

In Kirkpatrick (2006), I argued that the resilience of the native speaker model rested on a number of factors. These included the very powerful testing and publishing industries which had an obvious vested interest in promoting a native speaker model

Table 12.1 Knowledge of English in Expanding Circle Asian Societies

Society	Current estimates (%)	Approx. total of English speakers (million)
Nepal	30	8.5
Macau	28	0.2
China	20	276.0
Myanmar (Burma)	10	5.2
Japan	10	12.5
South Korea	10	5.1
Taiwan	10	2.4
Thailand	10	6.5
Vietnam	10	4.6
Cambodia	5	0.8
Indonesia	5	13.0
Laos	5	0.3
Total		335.1

Table 12.2 Knowledge of English in Outer Circle Asian societies

Society	Current estimates (%)	Approx. total of English speakers (million)
Singapore	80	3.1
Philippines	65	66.7
Brunei	60	0.2
Hong Kong	53	3.9
Malaysia	50	15.5
Pakistan	25	50.9
Sri Lanka	25	5.3
Bangladesh	20	32.6
India	20	260.0
Total		438.2

and the idea that the native English speaker represented the ideal English teacher, despite so many scholars showing how fallacious this argument was. I also noted that educational bureaucrats and politicians were likely to favor native speaker models. Politicians from Inner Circle countries would favor an inner circle variety for financial reasons. In 2008, then Prime Minister of Britain, Gordon Brown, before departing on a trade mission to China said “So today I want Britain to make a new gift to the world: a commitment to help anyone—however impoverished and however far away—to access the tools they need to learn English” (<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2008/jan/17/gordonbrown.labour>; accessed March 17, 2020). The “gift” would not be free.

I also argued that a further reason why a native speaker model was favored was because these had been codified. There are grammars and dictionaries of these varieties against which the learner of English can be evaluated. It is worth underlining that this evaluation always sees the learner’s goal as approximating the native speaker model. This codification allows these models to be presented as standard models and this is another

reason they are favored by politicians and educational bureaucrats. By insisting on a native speaker model for the classroom, they feel reassured they are offering their students a standard model, one that is universally accepted. This is linked to the notion of familiarity. People are more comfortable with the familiar than with the unfamiliar. However fuzzy the notion of a native speaker might be (Davies 1991), it is, nevertheless, a concept with which all language teachers and, importantly, language learners, are familiar. However much we, as academics, might critique the notion of the native speaker (e.g., Braine 1999), learners and teachers accept aiming for native speaker models as self-evident. Those of us advocating the adoption of a WE philosophy or an ELF approach do not yet have slogans as catchy or attractive as “Learn to speak like a native speaker.” Slogans along the lines of “Add English to your multilingual repertoire” or “Learn to be a successful user of English as a *lingua franca*” do not have quite the same cachet at present.

A further reason that the target of the native speaker model remains resilient is that such models are associated with power and prestige—and, of course, this allows them to be promoted by the governments and institutions where these Inner Circle varieties are spoken. These varieties also have what might be called “historical authority.” The United Kingdom can call itself the “true home” of “real” English and market the language as such.

These arguments for the native speaker teacher and model all ignore the sociolinguistic reality of language use and change. It is as though Kachru’s six fallacies are still believed. Here I repeat them, but present counter-arguments.

Fallacy 1

That in outer and expanding circles English is essentially learned to interact with NS.

This is demonstrably not the case. As the percentages and numbers of speakers of English noted in Tables 12.1 and 12.2 above show, there are far more so-called non-native speakers of English than native speakers of it. The majority of these speakers use English with each other more than with native speakers. An example of this is that the ten nations that comprise the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have adopted English as the sole working language of the group. English is the officially designated *lingua franca* of ASEAN.

Fallacy 2

That English is necessarily learned as a tool to understand and teach American or British cultural values, or what is generally termed the Judeo-Christian traditions.

This is also demonstrably not the case. English has been adopted by its new users to reflect and represent their own cultural values and customs. A striking example of this is the use of “English for Islamic Purposes” currently being taught in many schools attached to mosques in Indonesia and elsewhere (Kirkpatrick 2020).

Fallacy 3

That the goal of learning English is to adopt the native models of English.

The response to this is not as clear cut as the responses to the first two. There are many learners of English whose aim is to achieve a native speaker model and, in

many contexts, this is a perfectly understandable, if not laudable, aim. The problem arises when this goal is placed before all learners of English, despite the context and their reasons for learning English. It is, for example, unclear, why the hundreds of millions of Asian primary school children have a native speaker model as their target. The great majority of Asian children will be learning to communicate in English with each other and the goals of learning English therefore need to take this into account.

Fallacy 4

That the international non-native varieties of English are essentially “interlanguage” striving to achieve “native-like” character.

This is demonstrably not the case. For several decades, linguists have been describing the features of new varieties of English. Examples from Asia include, Indian Englishes, Malaysian English, Singaporean English, Filipino English and Bruneian English; and from Africa, the Englishes of Nigeria, Ghana, Uganda. The Caribbean is a rich source of new varieties of English and include Jamaican, Bajan (Barbados) and St Lucian. Far from striving to achieve a “native-like” character, these have developed their own individual character so that they can adequately represent the lived lives of their users.

Fallacy 5

That the native speakers of English as teachers, academic administrators and materials developers provide a serious input in the global teaching of English, in policy formation, and in determining the channels for the spread of the language. This fallacy retains elements of truth to it. There is no doubt that representatives of native speaker-ism still hold immense power over the English language teaching industry. As Watson Todd and Pojanapunya (2020) have shown, the preference for native English teachers of English by Thai students has actually increased over the past decade, despite the significant increase in the regional Asian use of English as a lingua franca and the increased contact between Asians for whom English is their lingua franca.

Fallacy 6

That the diversity and variation in English is necessarily an indicator of linguistic decay and that restricting the decay is the responsibility of the native scholars of English and ESL programs.

Far from being an indicator of linguistic decay, these new Englishes are indicators of a language blossoming with new growth. Kachru himself described these new Englishes as “liberating” leading to new canons of literatures in English.

The architects of each tradition, each strand, have moulded, reshaped, acculturated, redesigned, and—by doing so—enriched what was a Western medium. The result is a liberated English which contains vitality, innovation, linguistic mix, and cultural identity. And, it is not the creativity of the monolingual and the monocultural—this creativity has rejuvenated the medium from “exhaustion” and has “liberated” it in many ways.

The metaphor of English as a language blossoming with new growth has been captured for Indian English in language that exemplifies Indian English's love of extended metaphor.

Years ago, a slender sapling from a foreign field was grafted by "pale hands" on the mighty and many-branched Indian banyan tree. It has kept growing vigorously and now an organic part of its parent tree, it has spread its own probing roots into the brown soil below. Its young leaves rustle energetically in the strong winds that blow from the western horizon, but the sunshine that warms it and the rain that cools it are from Indian skies; and it continues to draw its vital sap from "this earth, this realm," this India.

Naik and Narayan 2004: 253

It is English as a literary language and its "vernacular transformations" (Ashcroft 2016: 126) that has been a major factor in making it a language, not only in, but of Asia (Kirkpatrick 2020).

Yet, as argued and illustrated above, despite all the scholarship that has described the development of new varieties of English and which has shown how English is being increasingly used as a lingua franca throughout the world, the belief that a native speaker model of English and a native-English speaking teacher is, respectively the ideal target and most appropriate teacher, remains remarkably resilient.

5. Conclusion

So, what is to be done? Do researchers and applied linguists just keep advocating the adoption of a WE-informed philosophy to the teaching of English and/or an ELF-approach and hope that one day English teacher educators and English teachers—and, crucially learners—will eventually see the light and cast off the yoke of the native speaker model and the native speaker teacher? This seems unlikely. One solution, as suggested above by Watson Todd and Pojanapunya would be to address a wider range of stakeholders, not just academics. This wider range of stakeholders needs to include policy makers in Ministries of Education and those who make decisions about the English language curriculum and which model of English to adopt for the classroom. This is because, in the majority of cases, curriculum change is very unlikely to come from the bottom up. Indeed, a key reason why proposals for adopting a WE philosophy and/or an ELF approach are so little taken up in actual English language classrooms is closely connected with teacher autonomy, or rather the lack of it. In their chapter of adopting an ELF-approach reviewed above, Kemaloglu-Er and Bayyurt (2018) note that, adopting such an approach gives teachers autonomy. But how many teachers in today's English language classrooms around the world have the level of autonomy that would allow them to alter the curriculum as they saw fit? In my forty years of experience in teacher education across Asia, I cannot think of a single classroom context where the local primary or secondary school teacher had this type of autonomy. In contrast, in most cases the curriculum, the materials and the goals of English language teaching

classes are fixed. These are decided top down, if not by the relevant national or regional Ministries of Education, by the school's Head Teacher. In these circumstances, it is unrealistic to expect teachers who have just completed professional development courses in which they have learned about WEs and ELF to implement changes to their school's pedagogy and philosophy on their return to their school (or employment at a new school). And, as was noted by Hino above, cultural pedagogical traditions also need to be respected. Such changes can only really be successful and long-lasting, if they are approved by the relevant Ministries, school principals and senior teachers. These are the stakeholders who now need to be addressed. At the same time, we need to be aware just how resilient the desire to sound like a native speaker remains, even though people may be aware that ELF is perfectly appropriate. As an "ELF-aware" Chinese business person recently noted.

We have learnt ENL [English as a native language] for such a long time, probably since primary school. It is always good if someone can use English like native English speakers. It is a matter of ambivalence. ELF works well in the workplaces. I do not speak ENL and my Indian clients do not speak ENL. As long as we have high acceptance to each other's non-standard use of English, we can communicate well and get the job done. It could be very weird if both of us speak English like Britons. I want to be identified as a Chinese when I speak English. However, ENL is socially preferred. No one has it but everyone wants it.

Si 2020: 229

References

- Ali, Z. (2015), "The prospect and potential challenges of teaching Englishes in Pakistan," *Asian Englishes*, 17 (2): 152–69.
- Ashcroft, B. (2016), "English futures," in M. O'Sullivan, D. Hubbard and C. Lee (eds.), *The Future of English in Asia*, 111–27, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bolton, K. (2012), "World Englishes and Asian Englishes: A survey of the field," in A. Kirkpatrick and R. Sussex (eds.), *English as an International Language in Asia. Implications for Language Education*, 13–26, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bolton, K. and J. Bacon-Shone (2020), "The Statistics of English across Asia," in K. Bolton, W. Botha and A. Kirkpatrick (eds.), *The Handbook of Asian Englishes*, 49–80, Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Braine, G., ed. (1999), *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Chang, Y.-J. (2014), "Learning English today: What can world Englishes teach college students in Taiwan?," *English Today*, 30 (1): 21–7.
- Davies, A. (1991), *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Dewey, M. (2012), "Towards a post-normative approach: Learning the pedagogy of ELF," *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1 (1): 141–70.
- Dudzic, D. and Q. T. N. Nguyen (2015), "Vietnam: Building English competency in preparation for ASEAN 2015," in R. Stoupe and K. Kimura (eds.), *ASEAN Integration and the Role of English Language Teaching*, 41–70, Phnom Penh: IDP.

- Fang, F. and W. Ren, (2018), "Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes," *ELT Journal: English Language Teaching Journal*, 72 (4): 384–94.
- Fang, F and H. P. Widodo, eds. (2019), *Critical Perspectives on Global Englishes in Asia*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Fenton-Smith, B., P. Humphreys and I. Walkinshaw, eds. (2017), *English Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Asia-Pacific: From Policy to Pedagogy*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Galloway, N. (2013), "Global Englishes and English Language Teaching (ELT)—Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context," *System*, 41 (3): 786–803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.019>
- Halliday, M.A.K., A. McIntosh and P. Stevens (1964), *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*, London: Longman.
- Hino, N. (2018), *EIL Education for the Expanding Circle: A Japanese model*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992), *The Other Tongue. English Across Cultures*, Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1998), "English as an Asian language," *Links and Letters*, 5: 89–108.
- Kemaloglu-Er, E. and Y. Bayyurt (2018), "ELF-awareness in teaching and teacher education: Explicit and implicit ways of integrating ELF into the English language classroom," in N. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*, 159–74, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2006), "Which model of English: Native speaker, nativised or lingua franca?," in M. Saraceni and R. Rubdy (eds.), *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles*, 71–83, London: Continuum Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012), "English as an Asian lingua franca: The lingua franca approach and implications for language education policy," *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1 (1): 121–40.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2014), "Teaching English in Asia in non-Anglos cultural contexts: Principles of the lingua franca approach," in R. Marlina and R.A. Giri (eds.), *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language*, 23–34, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018a), "Concluding chapter," in N. Sifakis and N. Tsantila (eds.), *ELF for EFL Contexts*, 229–41, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2018b), "From EFL to ELF: The time is right," in S. Zein (ed.) *Teacher Education for English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectives from Indonesia*, 191–203, London and New York: Routledge.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2020), *Is English an Asian Language?*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kobayashi, Y. (2017), "ASEAN English teachers as a model for international English learners: Modified teaching principles," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27 (3): 682–96.
- Marlina, R. (2013), "Learning about English as an international language in Australia from three students' perspectives," *Asian EFL Journal*, 15 (3): 201–28.
- Marlina, R. (2014), "The pedagogy of English as an international language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues," in R. Marlina and R.A. Giri, *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language*, 1–19, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Matsuda, A. (2019), "World Englishes in English language teaching. Kachru's 6 fallacies and the TEIL paradigm," *World Englishes*, 38: 144–54.
- Musthafa, B, F. A. Hamied and S. Zein (2018), "Enhancing the quality of Indonesian teachers in the ELF era: Policy recommendations," in S. Zein (ed.), *Teacher Education*

- for English as a Lingua Franca: Perspectives from Indonesia*, 175–90, London and New York: Routledge.
- Naik, M. K. and S. A. Narayan (2004), *Indian English Literature 1980–2000: A Critical Survey*, New Delhi: Pencraft International.
- Rose, H. and N. Galloway (2019), *Global Englishes for Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, H., J. McKinley and N. Galloway (2020), “Global Englishes and language teaching: A review of pedagogical research,” *Language Teaching*, doi:10.1017/S02614448200000518: 1–33.
- Sadeghpour, M. and F. Sharifian (2019), “World Englishes in English language teaching,” *World Englishes*, 38: 245–58.
- Si, J. (2020), “Is what is taught what is needed? The practicality of ELF-informed teaching in China’s Business English Program,” unpublished PhD thesis, Griffith University, Brisbane.
- Sifakis, N. and N. Tsantila, eds. (2018), *English as a Lingua Franca for EFL Contexts*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Teixeira, A. and R. Pozzi (2014), “Introducing English as an International Language in the Inner-Circle Classroom: Exploring World Englishes,” *CATESOL Journal*, 26 (1): 50–9.
- Vettorel, P. and S. Corrizzato (2016), “Fostering awareness of the pedagogical implications of World Englishes and ELF in teacher education in Italy,” *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6 (3): 487–511.
- Watson Todd, R. and P. Pojanapunya (2020), “Shifting attitudes towards native speakers and local English teachers: an elaborative replication,” *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* DOI 10.1080/014334632.2020.1730861
- Widodo, H. P. and F. Fang (2019), “Global Englishes-oriented English language education,” in F. Fang and H. P. Widodo (eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Global Englishes in Asia*, 194–200, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.