Kirsten Hemmy
Chandrika Balasubramanian *Editors*

World Englishes, Global Classrooms

The Future of English Literary and Linguistic Studies

Springer

World Englishes, Global Classrooms

Kirsten Hemmy · Chandrika Balasubramanian
Editors

World Englishes, Global Classrooms

The Future of English Literary and Linguistic Studies

Springer

Editors
Kirsten Hemmy
Mount Mary University
Milwaukee, USA

Chandrika Balasubramanian
Sultan Qaboos University
Muscat, Oman

ISBN 978-981-19-4032-3 ISBN 978-981-19-4033-0 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-4033-0

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
The registered company address is: 152 Beach Road, #21-01/04 Gateway East, Singapore 189721, Singapore

Foreword

New Englishes, New Questions—New Answers

Barbarism, conquests, contracts, hook n' crook Christian theologies, and missionary crusades were just a few of the ways the British Empire expanded beyond the comparatively small island that the country of England occupies. The British monarchy was strategic and efficient at collecting the bounty of the Earth's resources and land. By the 1920s, 24% of the Earth's land mass was considered the British Empire. As a result, the English language was adopted and reshaped by each of these spaces and more importantly by each person's "mother tongue." In this day and time, about 1.5 billion people speak English globally. How does infusion of politics, geographies, and cultures impact the ways people speak English? How do these factors impact the ways each person learns the English language?

World Englishes, Global Classrooms: The Future of English Literary and Linguistic Studies is a comprehensive anthology and starting point for answering these questions. This book also begins to explore new answers and how these new answers are impacted by technologies and new philosophies. In kind, this book serves as a catalyst for exploring how "new" Englishes give way to new questions. *World Englishes, Global Classrooms: The Future of English Literary and Linguistic Studies* is authored by 22 scholar educators. The editors Dr. Kirsten Hemmy and Dr. Chandrika Balasubramanian bring together experts from around the globe to explore the complexity and cultural dexterity of the English language from both a pedagogical and linguistic theoretical perspective. The Englishes explored in this book include Englishes from Asia, Africa, Oceana, the Western Hemisphere and sometimes Europe.

The book offers a unique and contemporary perspective of English language and translation studies. Considering the uses of English around the world, the book is comprised of two sections. The first illustrates to us how to recognize the ways we ignore the flaws in English language and translation studies. It also gives us practical suggestions about how to teach English and translation studies in this contemporary moment. This section of the book concludes by providing us a glimpse into the future

of the field. The second portion of the book challenges readers how to embrace the concept of universalism. Likewise, it encourages us to develop pedagogical practices that encourage the wealth and diversity of Englishes in the Humanities.

Editors Hemmy and Balasubramanian have produced a manual that will guide this important field of study into the next century. *World Englishes, Global Classrooms: The Future of English Literary and Linguistic Studies* is a truly significant contribution to English language, translation, and twenty-first Century Studies. I am elated that the College of Arts and Social Sciences at Sultan Qaboos University and to the Department of English Language and Literature sponsored the 2020 conference on Exploring Cultural Intersections. Without that important work, this necessary anthology may have been delayed.

Dr. DaMaris B. Hill, Ph.D.
Professor of Creative Writing
English and African American Studies
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky, USA

Preface

Introduction: Envisioning the English Department of the Future

In the early days of 2020, when many of the scholars in this volume met in Muscat, Oman, for a conference whose purpose was *Exploring Cultural Intersections* in the disciplines of Language, Linguistics, Literature and Translation, there was a distinct feeling that something was afoot, in our lives, in the field, in the world. Some scholars were unable to make it due to security issues in their home countries; still others were beginning to feel the concerns of traveling while this new virus unfurled into what would become a global pandemic. In the Sultanate, His Majesty Sultan Qaboos had just passed away, bringing palpable uncertainty and sense of change to the country. In the days leading up to the conference, the organizers planned how to make guests feel at home without conveying any sense of celebration during the mourning period for the country's beloved leader. Change, flux, was in the air. It seems now, in retrospect, that we could feel it.

The editors of this book knew that we wanted to edit a volume as a result of the conference, and thus we eagerly shared our experiences listening to panels that inspired us: challenges to the literary canon, new ways of thinking about World Englishes, discussions about translation that accounted for Western paradigms and their shortcomings, pedagogical papers that considered the global classroom from decentered or newly centered perspectives. What we knew in those days was that the center could not hold: the current cultural moment, even before we understood the pandemic, even as we were continuing to grapple with massive global political reckonings, necessitated change. And though as editors, colleagues, and friends, we'd been talking about this for years, how and why English departments seem to be the final frontier for upholding and reifying essentialist notions of value, why even in global spaces we see an attenuation toward antiquated heuristic tools and texts; whether there was any valid reason to maintain standard varieties of English

and the Western literary canon, we felt energized by a gathering of so many like-minded peers from around the world. We began to believe that these weren't radical conversations; people were having them everywhere.

In the weeks and months following the conference, COVID-19 became everyone's reality. Now, at the time of publication of this volume, in this moment of still and after, the very meaning of linguistic and literary studies is being reshaped by the global pandemic and increasing political polarization. The texts printed here offer new ways of reading and understanding our discipline and our pedagogy at this particular moment in history. The two-part structure of this collection is designed to feel as much as possible like that final conference pre-pandemic, an organized conversation that critically and probingly links analyses of language and translations studies in English Departments from across the globe and literary pedagogy with an eye toward moving beyond past flaws to broaden the field in the twenty-first century. The essays we've chosen are broad in their range and provocative in their arguments and recommendations. The first section of our collection provides analyses of how and why English Studies can be in the twenty-first century; the second section offers readings of a variety of literary texts within the context of the first section's analyses.

Coming from very different, yet related perspectives, the editors of this collection endeavor to identify how World Englishes, literary and linguistic studies, and the field of translation are imagined in a global context, and whether these global paradigms could influence the future of the discipline.

All the chapters in the first part of the book point out the inherent flaws with language and translation studies in English Departments across the world. The chapters consider how to broaden the field of English language and translation studies in the twenty-first century.

The section begins with Balasubramanian's chapter, which focuses on the state of the art of English Language Teaching (with a focus on EFL contexts). The chapter examines why, despite repeated calls for the recognition of the pluricentricity of English, language classrooms are still dominated by Inner Circle, traditionally L1 varieties of English. The section concludes with a chapter by Sarah Hopkyns, whose arguments are similar to those made by Balasubramanian. Hopkyns describes that despite significant advances made in the field, native-speakerism still has a strong presence both in students' ideologies as well as in recruitment practices all over the world. She concludes with practical ways to move beyond the native-speaker/non-native-speaker binary.

Chilton's essay focuses on recognizing and more fully articulating what universalism means in developing and shaping classroom practices in the humanities. Essentially, he suggests re-thinking pedagogical practices, specifically of a literary nature, in order for literary studies to remain sustainable in a world that increasingly views literature as a commodity; in essence, he proposes re-shaping literary studies from being results-oriented to process-oriented. In a similar vein, Knellwolf King introduces an interdisciplinary humanities course, which teaches Social and Emotional Learning as a means of equipping students with the skills needed to make them better able to function in a more inclusive society. She argues that English studies be re-thought to focus on skills that contribute to students' openness

to cultural differences, and that equip them with the necessary interpersonal and communication skills to function in today's global world. Both Chilton and Knellwolf King, then, propose a movement away from hegemonic universals steeped in western ideology toward empathic universals.

Making an argument similar to that made by Knellwolf King, Hofmyer stresses the need to better prepare students for today's increasingly interconnected world. With a focus on Japan, her proposal is that language classrooms focus less on linguistic competence, still dominated by traditionally native-speaker norms, whether British or American, and focus more on cultivating intercultural communicative competence in students.

The chapters by Bennoudi and Kahlaoui focus on translation studies today. Bennoudi, in her chapters, discusses the translation of Mohamed Choukri's novel, *For Bread Alone*. While praising the skill of translator Paul Bowles in making the text accessible to a western audience, Bennoudi, is, nevertheless, clear in her critique of certain strategies employed by Bowles, strategies she labels "manipulative", resulting in a text that is skewed toward the sensibilities of a western audience. Kahlaoui's paper focuses more on grammatical issues in translation, specifically between English and Arabic in EFL contexts. In describing the problems students face when translating aspect from English to Arabic, Kahlaoui stresses the need to update available pedagogical grammars to better reflect the working of language in natural contexts; students' translation errors, he claims, stem from their continued reliance on conventional prescriptive grammars, which focus exclusively on the norms of an Inner Circle English.

The papers by Hendrix, and Lake and Lee, both discuss how instruction in a one-size-fits-all variety, namely Standard British or Standard American English do not prepare students to function successfully in today's global world. Hendrix and Lake and Lee focus specifically on pedagogical issues in writing classrooms. With a focus on an EFL context like the Sultanate of Oman, Hendrix discusses the obstacles still facing the inclusion of a more World Englishes-based pedagogy, particularly in writing classrooms, and concludes with a list of recommendations on how this can be accomplished. Lake and Lee focus on the need to transform academic discourse communities' concept of acceptable writing.

The Haswell and Schachter chapter is notably different in its format. The paper focuses on describing a series of interviews conducted by the authors with experts on English as a Lingua Franca, World Englishes, and English as an International Language. Through the interviews, presented in the form of a podcast, the authors demonstrate the clear pedagogical implications on scholarship on World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, and English as an International Language, scholarship that points, in no uncertain terms, to the importance of the language classroom moving away from Inner Circle Englishes. What is perhaps most relevant about this chapter, however, is that it demonstrates, as Hendrix, Balasubramanian, and Hopkyns all stress in their chapters, that a re-envisioning of the very *concept* of what is *academic* is possible. The authors present the podcast as an alternative to traditional methods of disseminating academic information such as publishing in journals.

Part II of this volume, "On Literature and Culture," weaves together the present and possible future(s) for literature in a variety of contexts. For all authors of all the chapters in this section, the past is the past, and the present requires a reckoning of canonical notions that serve to reify dominant academic paradigms, particularly those that reaffirm Western hierarchical models and make only superficial movements toward inclusivity and equity. The future, as seen in this section of the book, is exciting, extending beyond the original vision of *Weltliteratur* into a literary terrain that encourages something beyond comparativism,

Chapter 11, "When They See Us: Using Texts of Affirmation in the Global Literature Classroom" calls for the decolonization of the literary canon, a reconfiguring of the center to (a) allow students to see the value in their own literature as a starting place and (b) to encourage students in Western, predominantly white spaces to disconnect from a personal and social attachment to the center. Anna Fancett, in Chap. 12, bridges the temporal and geographical distance between China Achebe and Sir Walter Scott, discussing the similarities between the authors' uses of orality. This chapter dispels the notion of the oral as simple, showing us that in these texts, orality is indeed as critical as the written, appearing straightforward, all the while presenting us with cultures and ways of being that are exceedingly complex.

Mary Wardle writes about novelist Jhumpa Lahiri's decision to "abandon" English and write in Italian, and how a new language, importantly *not* English, serves as a space of liberation at the intersection between language, culture and translation. Mary L. Tabakow and Staci Strobl, in Chap. 14, "Border Skirmishes: Questioning Blurring Boundaries Between Fiction and Nonfiction," ask what it means to run up against the edges of what nonfiction can be, and what this means to different cultures, societies, and age groups. In a global context, creative nonfiction is more important—and more fiscally powerful—than ever before, so what's true and what's embellished matters, everywhere.

Inas Younis delivers a thoughtful analysis of the cultural imaginary, using Mohsin Hamid's *Exit West* to show the enduring importance—and potential for disruption—of imagined borders and communities. Khulud Al-Mehmadi looks at the spread of ideas through translation, noting the strategic, measured decisions Kamil Kilani made with *Gulliver's Travels*, and what meaning this makes upon the text, with implications for the larger field of children's literature. Kodhandaraman Chinnathambi, in his chapter on indigenous Canadian autobiographies, presents the most important voices on the very prescient topic of Native education in the Americas, indigenous students and their parents. Their stories are organized here without the point of view of the government, or the oppressor, and from a truly global viewpoint.

Rosalind Buckton-Tucker's essay in Chap. 18 considers the cross-cultural dynamics of humor, how for humor to be successful in travel literature, it must meet certain criteria; it shows us how humor is universal and simultaneously culturally unique. In Chap. 19, Azzeddine Bouhassoun considers how two Algerian novelists, Zaoui and Daoud, traverse notions of linguistic and cultural independence and dependence, intellectual quest, and cultural alienation through their narrators. In the final chapter, Cyrus Patell uses a cosmopolitan approach to view the text of Frankenstein as a global text, leading us on a journey of the text's "global cultural heritage,"

exploring first the text's cultural legacy, as well as the interplay of sameness and difference, the universal and the particular, the global and the local.

One could do worse than to be a student, scholar, or seeker of cosmopolitanism, to think deeply of what it means to be a world citizen, not rooted to anywhere and at the same time respectful of everywhere. This collection explores identity through language, through literature and through culture, is dissatisfied with traditional comparisons, with continuations of hierarchies, institutional determinations of value, and seeks solutions in new ways of approaching the word, the text, and what they can mean in relationship. The editors of this volume hope that readers can find answers to new questions here. We would like to thank all contributors for their words and ideas, as well as for their patience and persistence. Special thanks also to the College of Arts and Social Sciences at Sultan Qaboos University and to the Department of English Language and Literature, whose 2020 conference, *Exploring Cultural Intersections*, was the initial inspiration for this anthology. Thanks to conference organizers Dr. Fathiya Al-Rashdi and Dr. Sandhya Rao Mehta, as well as to Dr. Khalsa Al-Aghbari and to the editorial staff at Springer, in particular Satvinder Kaur, without whose support none of this would be possible.

Muscat, Oman
2021

Kirsten Hemmy
Chandrika Balasubramanian

Contents

About the Editors

Kirsten Hemmy's book of poetry, *The Atrocity of Water*, was a Tom Lombardo selection for Press 53 (2010). Hemmy is currently completing a book on Muslim women in history (2022). Her poetry has recently appeared in *Sonora Review, Alaska Quarterly Review, Bellingham Review, Southern Humanities Review, Glass Poetry,* and elsewhere. Hemmy, a recipient of the Linda Flowers Literary Award for Poetry, is a two-time Fulbright scholar (2003 and 2012) who currently lives in the Sultanate of Oman, where she teaches world literature and creative writing at Sultan Qaboos University.

Chandrika Balasubramanian's book *Register Variation in Indian English* (2009) was one of the first large-scale empirical, corpus-based investigations of variation within an international English. While she predominantly has published on World Englishes, and specifically on Indian English, she has also published on various areas of language pedagogy, and her recent work focuses on the pedagogical implications of World Englishes scholarship. Balasubramanian currently lives and works at Sultan Qaboos University in Muscat, Oman, where she teaches sociolinguistics and language.

Abbreviations and Symbols

AAP	Association of American Publishers
BANA	Britain, Australia, and North America
CEFR	Common European Frame of Reference
CNF	Creative Nonfiction
DH	Digital Humanities
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EIL	English as an International Language
ELF	English as a Lingua Franca
ELT	English Language Teaching
EMI	English as a Medium of Instruction
ESL	English as a Second Language
GELT	Global English Language Teaching
ICC	Intercultural Communicative Competence
IELTS	International English Language Teaching System
JEMI	Journal of English as a Medium of Instruction
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LB	Lexical Bundle
LCA	Literary Criticism Article
LCW	Literary Criticism Writing
MEXT	Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, Technology (in Japan)
MICUSP	Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers
MSA	Modern Standard Arabic
NAR	North American Review
NELP	National English Language Plan/Policy
NF	Nonfiction
NNS	Non-native Speaker
NS	Native Speaker
PBL	Project-based Learning
RULER	Recognizing, Understanding, Labeling, Expressing, Regulating
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

SEL	Social and Emotional Learning
SL	Source Language
ST	Source Text
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
TBL	Task-based Learning
TEIL	Teaching English as an International Language
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
TL	Target Language
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
TT	Target Text
WE	World Englishes
WL	World Literature
YA	Young Adult (Literature)

Part I
On Language and Culture

Chapter 1
World Englishes in the EFL Classroom: The Reality

Chandrika Balasubramanian

Abstract As recently as the mid 1960s, English programs in both the UK and the US were mostly focused on national views of language, and the English language has been studied from the perspectives of two largely monolingual countries (Bolton, in 'Thank you for calling': Asian Englishes and 'native-like' performance in Asian call centres). Despite the vast changes, English departments have seen in the last 60 years, including calls for the recognition, and indeed acceptance, of the pluricentricity of English, a movement away from a largely monolingual ideology that has, at its center, the idea that English has a single standard, little has changed in the language classroom, particularly in EFL contexts. Theoretical discussions about English and Englishes abound, and today, even though World Englishes-based language teaching pedagogy is increasingly discussed, such discussions have not moved beyond the theoretical. Attempts to integrate either new varieties of Englishes into the language classroom, particularly in EFL contexts, have been met with opposition at best and hostility at worst. This paper begins with an overview of scholarship on World Englishes and then examines first the role of World Englishes scholarship in general, followed by an account of the role of the academic world in perpetuating the powerful position of Inner Circle varieties today. It concludes with a section on how best WE-informed pedagogical practices might be incorporated into language programs and classrooms.

Keywords World Englishes · EFL · Globalism · Classism · The classroom · Postcolonial

Emergence and Development of World Englishes

The field of World Englishes (WE) was created and has developed over the past six decades into a robust discipline because it has become increasingly clear that the notion of a single standard English creates tremendous room for marginalization.

C. Balasubramanian (✉)
Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman
e-mail: chandribala@squ.edu.om; chandribala@gmail.com

K. Hemmy and C. Balasubramanian (eds.), *World Englishes, Global Classrooms*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-4033-0_1

Kachru, arguably the strongest proponent of the field, argued for a recognition of English not as a single standard language, but as a diverse entity with many centers of prestige. WE as a discipline, then, gained popularity because it problematized the hitherto accepted notion of the native-speaker, a notion that took as a given that Inner Circle countries, and specifically the US and the UK, set the English language standards for users of English in the rest of the world. Even the term "World Englishes," the pluralizing of English, was to demonstrate not just an acceptance, but the advocacy of an idea that the language belongs to whoever uses it as a first language, or an additional language, whether "in its standard form or in its localized form" (Kachru & Smith, 1985, p. 210). The reason World Englishes, as a discipline, has, over the past several decades, blossomed into a rigorous field of study, is undoubtedly due to the rapid and hitherto unpreceded spread and subsequent diversification of the language into numerous new varieties. Today, it is widely recognized and accepted that numerous localized varieties of English exist all over the world, and they are variously called World Englishes, International Englishes, and New Varieties of English.

The study of World Englishes started from anecdotal accounts of variation within a certain national variety, followed by more empirical accounts of various international varieties. While earlier empirical studies focused more on differentiating various international varieties from traditional native-speaker Inner Circle varieties, later scholarship, focusing more on legitimizing the different international varieties, studied the variation *within* a new international variety. These later studies are more corpus-based, and study different international Englishes with a view to providing descriptions, describing register differences within them, and ultimately, focusing on the variety emerging as a norm-provider (as opposed to remaining dependent on Inner Circle norms), when hitherto, only traditionally native varieties from the Inner Circle countries had been regarded as norm-providing.

Indian English is one of the new international Englishes that has been studied now for several decades. One cannot think about the present-day status of English in India without recalling the words of Macaulay (1835) (cited in Kachru, 1976), after which it was introduced to the Indian education system:

> We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population.

A few decades later, Charles Wentworth Dilke, on the necessity for the teaching of English in India said the following:

> So long as the natives remain ignorant of the English tongue, they remain ignorant of all the civilization of our time—ignorant alike of political and physical science, of philosophy and true learning…English, as the tongue of the ruling race, has the vast advantage that its acquisition by the Hindoos will soon place the government of India in native hands, and thus, gradually relieving us of an almost intolerable burthen will civilize and set free the people of Hindoostan. (Dilke, 1872, p. 224)

And so English, and the Queen's English to be specific, came to occupy a central position in the Indian education system, and education systems all over the world. The assumption was that someone without access specifically to the variety of English of the educated Briton was not "fit" and would remain "ignorant."

With the spread and diversification of English with globalization, however, it became increasingly apparent that the numbers of people using English as a second language (such as those in India), and as a foreign language far exceeded the traditional native users of the language. Continuing to accept a single standard, therefore, means perpetuating the hegemonic practices and attitudes advocated by Macaulay and Dilke. Today, with 60 yearsof WE scholarship as evidence, Yano (2001) states that "even though the distinction between standard and non-standard use of English remains prevalent in the field today, the notion of native norm has become more than ever, questionable as a plurality of norms have started to emerge: Speakers of English, native and non-native alike, are increasingly aware of the existence of different norms and English for global use should be dissociated from the norm of any English-speaking society" (Yano 2001, p. 129, cited in Deshors, 2018, p. 10).

So, what does this awareness mean in language classrooms, particularly those in EFL contexts like the university in the Gulf, where I teach? Unfortunately, not much. Native speaking teachers of English—British, American, Australian, Canadian, or those from New Zealand, are still valued far more than are those from countries like India, perpetuating the marginalization of the latter. The next section focuses on the possible role of WE scholarship itself for the continued dominance of traditional L1 Englishes.

The Role of WE Scholarship in Perpetuating the Continued Dominance of L1 Englishes

World Englishes scholarship has been extremely prolific in the past several decades. While there is no denying all the field has accomplished in our understanding of how English has spread and changed, I'd like here, to provide a critique of the nature of much WE scholarship to date. By addressing what WE scholarship has accomplished, I also must acknowledge the gap, and discuss what it has not sufficiently accomplished: an alternative or alternatives to the use of the English of the white world, the colonizing powers, in Departments of English across the world.

Back in 1997, Graddol described the rapid spread of English as a global communication tool, predicted its continued spread, and predicted that it would "continue to exert pressure towards global uniformity, requiring mutual intelligibility and common standard" (p. 56). While Graddol's prediction has proven true in terms of the sheer spread of English, its globalization has, rather than maintaining a "common standard," resulted in the development of a huge variety of Englishes around the world, with mutual intelligibility between them not always being assured. In other words, to

quote Mair, "the more English spreads globally, the more heterogeneous it becomes internally" (2013, p. 255).

Linguists and sociolinguists alike have been fascinated with the spread and results of the spread of English. Particularly robust has been the line of scholarship focusing on models of World Englishes, and no scholar of World Englishes is unaware of Kachru's Concentric Circle Model. Since then, however, the field has seen the development of many other models, and today, earlier models including Kachru's Concentric Circles, McArthur's Circle of World English Model (1987), and Modiano's Model of English as an International Language (1999) are widely critiqued. Later models, such as Schneider's Dynamic Model, focusing on the evolution of a new variety of English, have critiqued earlier models for having been based on too colonial a framework. Mair, for example, is clear in his critique of older models and how they fail to address the idea that "what dominates the linguistic ecology of the world today is not one standard language, but the whole English Language Complex" (2013, p. 275).

Theoretical models such as Mair's certainly warrant recognition for their call for WE to move away from mere geography in the construction of certain national varieties, to the influence of what he calls a hub variety, namely, Standard American English, being a factor to consider when discussing the development of any national variety. While his model is groundbreaking in terms of acknowledging the world superpower, what it still does not fully explain is how (or if) new varieties, particularly those in post-colonial contexts, enjoy prestige, particularly in contexts outside their country of origin. Similar critiques have, however, been leveled against even recent models such as Schneider's Dynamic and Transnational Model (2016), Buschfeld and Kawtzsch's (2017) Theoretical Model of Extra and Intra Territorial Forces simply because they still do not grasp the complexities of today's global spread and status of English. What this line of scholarship on models of World Englishes fails to accomplish is a line of thought beyond the abstract and theoretical.

Further, while critiques such as those of Mair, arguing against static models such as Kachru's are certainly valid, what they fail to acknowledge is that at the heart of models such as Kachru's and even Schneider (2013), is the idea that some varieties (traditional ESL varieties like Indian English) are norm-developing, while other varieties (traditional EFL varieties) are norm-dependent. The idea of some World Englishes being norm-developing is an important one if one is to truly accept the idea that non-native varieties of English are just as valid as traditional native ones. The idea took hold in World Englishes scholarship, with calls for some ESL varieties, Indian English being one among them, to become pedagogical models. This seemed a shift in the field from being an almost entirely theoretical one to one that was now addressing pedagogical implications of such hitherto theoretical ivory tower ruminations.

But where have we gone from here? WE scholarship over the past few decades has produced a wide range of handbooks and has contributed significantly to traditions established in fields such as sociolinguistics and dialect geography, particularly since the development of modern computer-based corpus linguistics methodology, which has allowed for investigations of different international varieties of English with a

depth not formerly possible. However, while scholars such as Schneider (2016) might claim that WE scholarship has also produced textbooks such as those of Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008) and Schneider himself (2011), these are textbooks that are more suitable for the theoretical components of graduate or upper-level undergraduate curricula of TESOL, Applied Linguistics, or Sociolinguistics programs. These textbooks provide no practical guidelines to how WE can be taught in the language classrooms of the world. They are books *about* WE, their spread, their structures, but are certainly not books *on how to teach* WE. As early as 1996, Sridhar stated that reliable descriptions of various WEs were essential to produce reference grammars of the varieties. Today, reference grammars exist, but those reference grammars have resulted in few textbooks that are used in an ESL or EFL classroom setting.

The models do accomplish a lot—capturing the complexity of today's World System of Englishes (Mair, 2013) and the immense diversity in this system. But returning to the issue of the continued dominance of L1 Englishes in language classrooms, particularly EFL classrooms, I argue that the reason the colonized position of English departments across the world, including in the Gulf, remains a reality is largely because WE scholarship has remained theoretical. The pedagogical implications, and implications for language policy, have, by and large, stayed suggestions. In other words, while WE scholarship has focused on the need to move away from the simplistic native/non-native dichotomy, the scholarship has provided no concrete ways of accomplishing that in pedagogical terms: in academic settings, therefore, the native/non-native distinction is alive and well. The department and university where I work (as well as other institutions of higher learning in this part of the world) illustrate this well; as mentioned before, in their preference for native-speaking teachers over non-native-speaking teachers, a strong preference for "correct" English, and a generally prescriptive attitude toward grammar. Irrespective of what course the students take, the evaluations of all their work have a language component in them—a language component that is based entirely on prescriptive, established, native-speaker norms, and my department is by no means an exception.

Schneider (2016) is right in his claim that in today's world, "World Englishes have become an important component of global sociolinguistic reality" (p. 254). What I question, however, is his claim that they are not merely "elusive objects of a scholarly ivory tower" (p. 254). While the international varieties themselves are not exclusive to the ruminations of those inhabiting a scholarly ivory tower, scholarship on them remains so. Outside the scholarly ivory towers of the world, in both the western world and outside, WE are still regarded as largely ungrammatical or accented; to the non-linguist (and even to many linguists), the different and unfamiliar accents, words, or structures that constitute WE are still regarded as wrong, particularly when intelligibility either is an issue, or becomes an issue because of a listener's attitude. The next section focuses on the role of academia in perpetuating this status-quo.

Standard L1 Englishes Versus World Englishes: The Role of Academia in the Maintenance of a Status-Quo

In such a discussion of the pedagogical implications of WE research, it would be wrong to not acknowledge the power Inner Circle, and in specific, Standard British and American Englishes still have in the world. English has for long been recognized as essential for success. Kachru claimed that in India, possessing a knowledge of English was like possessing the famed Alladin's lamp. However, it is not just *English* that is a passport to privilege in the world; it is certain prestigious varieties of English. I argue that academia has played a major role in allowing Inner Circle Englishes to maintain their stranglehold. The next three sections focus on the role of academia in maintaining the status quo first on (a) language teachers and professionals, (b) students of English as a second/foreign language, and (c) notions of what academic discourse itself is.

Language Teachers and Professionals

That scholars, particularly those from the countries of the Periphery, still face obstacles, because the varieties of English they use, is well documented. Kumaravadivelu (2016), known for his work on ELT pedagogy, for example, is honest in his account of his difficulty in entering the world of publishing simply because of his non-native status. He explained that after much struggle, he realized that mainstream publishers were not interested in his work simply because he wasn't considered enough of an expert (even in ELT methodology)—because of his status as a non-native academic. Lee and Canagarajah (2018) explain that there are many studies that show that non-native English speaker teachers are consistently less tolerated than native-speaker English teachers because of their non-native status. Indeed, they explain, even the continued use of the binary "reifies the underlying ideologies promoting language nativity and ownership" (p. 352). Similarly, Orelus (2018) shows how subaltern professors in predominantly white institutions face various forms of discrimination, not the least of which is because of the variety of English they use: "…those who speak English with a distinct accent routinely face intersecting forms of oppression, like accent and language discrimination…" (p. 170). The recognition in Orelus's paper of such discrimination at predominantly white institutions is noteworthy; Gerald (2020), a black American scholar and language educator, shows that the discrimination is not attributable to a simplistic native/non-native distinction. Any user of a variety of English that is not Standard American (and therefore, white), or Standard British, is prey to similar discrimination. He goes so far as to say that the field of ELT "frames whiteness as both a prize and a goal" (p. 44) by discriminating against users of English that are not white.

In considering the reasons for the maintenance of a status quo in academic settings, it is impossible to put aside the idea suggested by Milroy and Milroy (1985) that the

attitudes and suggestions of linguists seem to have little effect on the regular general public, who still consult dictionaries and handbooks for "correct" language use; who look at academics, therefore, to provide them with what is "correct". Further, another issue to consider when considering the advocacy of WE in classrooms, is who is doing the advocating? Most of the voices calling for change come from scholars from the Center. Kumaravadivelu (2016) explains that for WE scholarship to truly make a difference in discontinuing the marginalization of vast numbers of largely non-white communities of the world, the voices advocating change need to come not from the Center, but from the Periphery. Kumaravadivelu and Canagarajah are two scholars who do represent the voices of the periphery. What is telling, however, is that though both scholars (and they are two among many others) have, for years, been very vocal in their call for language classrooms to become more embracing of New Englishes, their own writing follows native norms, the norms of prestige varieties. Bolton (2006) reiterates this point when he explains that even today, academics from communities belonging to the periphery still face "difficulties in finding a voice in major journals in the field (although notable exceptions include *English Today* and *World Englishes*), as well as in book production" (p. 263).

It would, therefore, be remiss of us not to also consider whether the voices calling for these changes are unconsciously serving the advertising of the "specialness of the mediating first world" person? (Gandhi, 1998, p. 85, cited in Pourqoli & Pouralifard, 2017)). Is this why the calls come largely from either white voices, or those who have already "made it," and not those who are still striving for a foothold into the rarefied air of the chambers in which the former live and thrive? In other words, by seeking to de-dichotomize the us-other contrast, are we essentializing it?

In speaking to a few of my colleagues at my university, it is clear that their attitude toward teaching my students about WE or allowing them to use features of Arabic English are not favorable at all because they are convinced that they will be doing their students a disservice. As one colleague put it, there are still gatekeepers, all of whom advocate the use of native-speaker norms. In an EFL context like Oman, then, the belief that students need to approach native-like proficiency in English to be able to succeed in a career continues to come in the way of WE-based pedagogical practices.

Applied linguists have often been criticized for not being aware of the realities of the communities whose language use they study and document. Schneider, while accepting that "Authorities and politicians everywhere promote the standard variety, partly for fear of losing competitiveness in international communication, notably business" (p. 212), still maintains his conviction in people's ultimate ability to overcome institutional obstacles and use their varieties of English,—citing Singapore as an example where the public's "strong and stubborn defense of the use of Singlish against an official government position" as evidence. What Schneider, and most other scholars supporting the use of WE pedagogically do not, however, address, is the contexts in which varieties such as Singlish can be used. Certainly not in academe. In most Outer and Expanding Circle countries, people's motivations for learning English are still, by and large, instrumental. While that remains a reality, academic notions of correct and incorrect will remain, and local varieties of English will continue to grow

and perhaps flourish, *only in certain contexts*. Entry into certain professional fields is still very much governed by one's ability to have at one's command the prestigious varieties of English, and while that remains true, native-speaker norms will still be preferred to new varieties of English.

Students

The role academia plays in maintaining the status quo with respect to students' attitudes toward the valued position of native-speaker norms is also well documented. Jee (2016) claims that in Korea, students' favorable views of Inner Circle speakers of English, and students' desire to learn English from Anglophone speakers from an Inner Circle country stems from their "imagined" world, where one assumes that speaking native-like English is directly related to success in the Korean job market. One wonders how "imagined" their world really is. Jee explains that while World Englishes are "practically and locally" (p. 241) used, unfavorable responses to and perceptions toward various international varieties of English are well documented. In many EFL contexts, even today, Bourdieu's argument that "the power of English as a symbolic system in the global linguistic market is such that its legitimacy tends to be uncritically accepted" (1992, p. 5) remains true and continues to refer to Inner Circle varieties of English.

Another study in an EFL context that focuses on students' positive attitudes toward L1 Englishes is Kang and Rubin (2009), which shows that even today, students' attitudes play a major role in their ability (or supposed inability) to understand the English they were listening to. Suzuki (2011), reporting on the use of international varieties of English in the EFL classrooms in Singapore, showed that students considered varieties such as Singaporean English or Indian English "peculiar" (p. 150). Balasubramanian (2009, 2016, 2017) also shows that with Indian English, spoken registers show, by far, the greater use of Indian grammatical forms. However, with written registers, Indian forms are still not frequently used, particularly when one considers written academic English—where both published and unpublished student work show very few Indian grammatical structures. This point was again made clear by other scholars studying other WEs in classroom settings, such as Hamid (2014), Kamwangmalu (2013), Wang (2016), to name just a few. All these studies reveal by and large, students (and teachers) in various EFL and ESL contexts are more comfortable accepting WE forms in students' spoken work, but not in their written work.

When scholarship on WE started gaining momentum, Quirk (1990) cautioned strongly against promoting WE over standard English in classroom settings: "to displace Standard English from the center of attention is to deny learners access to the wider world of international communication" (p. 14). He continued that "It is neither liberal nor liberating to permit learners to settle for lower standards than the best and it is a travesty of liberalism to tolerate low standards which will lock the least fortunate into the least rewarding careers" (pp. 22–23). "Students 'liberally'

permitted to think their 'new variety' of English was acceptable, would be defenseless before the harsher but more realistic judgement of those with authority to employ or promote them" (p. 24).

Notions of Appropriateness in Academic Discourse

An important factor that contributes to WE scholarship remaining largely theoretical is that our notion of what is appropriate in academic discourse has not changed at all. Duff (2010) defined academic discourse as "forms of oral and written language and communication—genres, register, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional patterns—that are privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalized, or ritualized, and therefore, usually evaluated by instructors, institutions, editors, and others in educational and professional contexts" (p. 175). How true Duff's definition is even today is clear when considering the teaching of writing in academic settings, for example, even recent scholarship still focuses heavily on form and accuracy-based, of course, on British or American models of English—over meaning or creativity. Scholarship (Abrams, 2019; Swain, 2000) on the assessment of L2 writing in a classroom, for example, is entirely based on grammatical and lexical accuracy, syntactic complexity, and vocabulary diversity. This ever-present focus on form, specifically a focus on grammatical accuracy and vocabulary, in second language acquisition research is particularly significant for EFL university settings where students are learning not only the language, but getting degrees, either undergraduate or graduate, in English. The gap suggests that as much as the disciplines of Applied Linguistics and ELT have stressed a need to move away from a purely accuracy-based model of language teaching, the reality is that it has not. If the field of ELT is still so focused on accuracy, and accuracy is defined by the standards set by American and British varieties of English, what chance exists for WEs to become pedagogical models? And, perhaps more importantly, the question to ask is this: which World English should become the pedagogical model? Further, in addition to classroom tests, well-established and powerful English language tests such as the TOEFL and the IELTS are still fundamentally connected with native-speaker norms. Language classrooms are, even today, much more tolerant of new English structures in *spoken* English, but not in *written* English (Balasubramanian, 2017). Elder and Davies (2006) are frank in their criticism of the acceptance of WEs in assessment and suggest that calls for new approaches to the assessment of WE structures are "stronger on politics than on applied linguistic realities" (quoted in Davies 2006, p. 86). As much as we'd like to think otherwise, ELT professionals have not moved their classroom practice away from an ideology that privileges Kachru's Inner Circle varieties.

The picture I have painted thus far is grim. I have discussed the obstacles the integration of WE into language classes face, particularly in EFL and ESL contexts, and it seems that scholarship on WE will continue to remain theoretical. There are, however, certain concrete moves language teaching practitioners can make to ensure

a wider representation of Englishes, even within academia. The next section provides some suggestions.

World Englishes in Academia: Where Can We Go?

Matsuda (2018) explains that Teaching English as an International Language (TEIL), alternatively called We-informed ELT is based on a desire to "move away from teaching native-speaker competence" (p. 25). Matsuda hastens to add that EIL is not a single homogeneous variety of English that is preferred, but one that views English as a functional lingua franca that connects users from various linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Matsuda focuses on changes in the language classroom being a movement from a the space being a conveyor of linguistic (and specifically, Inner Circle) structures, toward a space that facilitates a student's acquisition of intercultural competence, an ability to negotiate in an arena where there is more ambiguity than not. Matsuda acknowledges that a language classroom should be a place where pedagogical practices focus on "raising awareness of different varieties of English and developing respectful attitudes" (p. 27).

Matsuda's ideas, then, do not suggest that certain non-Inner Circle varieties become pedagogical models. What Matsuda and other scholars of WE-based ELT pedagogy suggest is that we make language classrooms more culturally-relevant to the lives of learners, and move away from English representing just Western culture. Matsuda rightly explains that "the proficiency in intercultural communication, which is highly emphasized in TEIL" be the focus of language classes. One way of accomplishing this, a topic that has been explored in some depth in other chapters of this volume, is by exposing students to more diverse literature, literatures in English from various parts of the world; literatures through which students are not only exposed to different Englishes but also everything the study of different varieties would entail, linguistic and otherwise.

Early in the brief history of World Englishes studies, Kachru (1985) coined the term "bilingual creativity," which he defined as the process of designing texts using the linguistic resources of two different languages, i.e., the languages a bilingual has at his or her disposal. This bilingual creativity, Kachru explained, rather than producing erroneous forms (as judged by the norms of traditional native varieties of a language) of language, produces language that is distinctive, full of creative innovations, and therefore, different from either one of the two languages in the bilingual's repertoire. The results of such bilingual creativity, Kachru claimed, include new varieties of English, and new literatures in English that were redefining the English literary canon. As evidence for his ideas, Kachru discussed the works of authors such as Raja Rao and Chinua Achebe and showed that their writing was defined by patterns of "code mixing, switching, and discourse," in addition to Asian and African cultural dimensions, rather than by patterns of native English morphology and syntax and the cultural assumptions associated with the (largely white) Britain or America. Works

such as these, he explained, decanonized traditional literary conventions and genres of English.

It is ironic that for as long as WE has existed and flourished as a discipline worthy of study and given the reasons because of which it developed into as robust a field as it currently is, that it has not more adequately addressed this possible solution: To introduce WEs to students in the forms of diverse literatures, literatures that represent cultures other than predominantly western white cultures, literatures written in the Englishes used in these diverse cultures. By de-colonizing English Departments and including works of literature from various parts of the world, written partly in their various Englishes, then, we *can* introduce WE into language classes and help them gain intercultural competence, without which it is becoming increasingly difficult to function in a multicultural environment.

It has been shown by many scholars that nativized varieties of English such as Indian English are much more acceptable in literature, where creativity, with the use of traditionally "non-native" grammatical structures and lexical items, is stressed because of the resulting flavor of the writing. More than acceptable, it is encouraged and seen as a sign of good writing. Using a horticultural metaphor to describe the diversity and spread of New Englishes, with a specific reference to their use in literature, Llamazon argues that a new variety of English can grow into a healthy plant by virtue of its "fruits—the literary masterpieces of novels, short stories, poems, dramas, and songs of its speakers and writers" (quoted in Bolton, 2006, p. 242). Authors of creative genres do feel "freer" (Iyer, 1993, p. 53, quoted in Bolton, 2006, p. 242), producing works that are "expressions of their regional identities and of community" (Schneider, 2011, p. 212) by using their regional varieties of Englishes. The New Englishes here are more accepted than any other written forms of New Englishes, even within academia. It seems then, that exposing students to WEs through literature should be an obvious choice; as Ashcrot et al. (1989, quoted in Bolton, 2010, p. 460) put it, "the very existence of post-colonial literatures completely undermines any project for literary studies in English which is postulated on a single culture masquerading as the original center."

So why isn't this happening more? What has come in the way of accepting more diverse literatures? It seems that Macaulay's well-known attitude about the general superiority of English literature, an attitude he claimed was based on the "valuation of the Orientalists themselves" prevails even today: "I have never found one of them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia" (cited in Ramanathan, 1999a, b, p. 223).

Another reason could be a certain unwillingness on the parts of literature teachers simply because of an unfamiliarity with non-canonical literatures. It is very possible that instructors are reluctant to introduce non-canonical literature to their students because of a lack in their own training in, and therefore, an ignorance of, non-canonical literatures with their non-standard English structures. This begs the question, however: Are we so complacent in our spaces that we cannot conceive moving out of our comfort zones?

And then, perhaps, a way to accomplish what I suggest in this paper, despite all the obstacles, would be to move the teaching of English language and literatures

outside the hallowed halls of academe. Perhaps, if English departments functioned more to facilitate the pursuit of the soul rather than commerce, changes such as those I discuss in this paper could be more easily realized. And then, perhaps, I dream.

References

Abrams. (2019). Collaborative writing and text quality in Googledocs. *Language Learning and Technology, 23*(2), 22–42.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1989). The empire writes back: throry and practice in post-colonial literatures. London: Routledge.

Balasubramanian, C. (2009). *Register variation in Indian English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Balasubramanian, C. (2016). How Indian is Indian English? Indian words in registers of Indian English. *Asiatic: A Journal of English Language and Literature: Special Issue on Contemporary Asian Englishes, 10*(2), 89–110.

Balasubramanian, C. (2017). Indian English: A pedagogical model (even) in India? In E. Friginal (Ed.), *Studies in corpus-based sociolinguistics* (pp. 136–156). London: Routledge.

Bolton, K. (2006). World Englishes today. In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world englishes* (pp. 240–269), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bolton, K. (2010). 'Thank you for calling': Asian Englishes and 'native-like' performance in Asian call centres.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity.

Buschfeld, S., & Kautzsch, A. (2017). Towards an integrative approach to postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes. *World Englishes, 36*, 104–126.

Canagarajah, S. (2019). Weaving the text: Changing literacy practices and orientations. *College English, 82*(1), 7–28.

Deshors, S. (2018). *Modeling world Englishes: Assessing the interplay of emancipation and globalization of ESL varieties.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dilke, C. W. (1872). *Greater Britain: A record of travel in English-speaking countries during 1866 and 1867* (6th ed.). London: Macmillan and Co.

Duff, P. (2010). Language socialization into academic discourse communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 30*, 169–192.

Elder, C., & Davies, A. (2006). *The handbook of applied linguistics.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gandhi, L. (1998). Postcolonial theory: a critical introduction. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Gerald, J. P. B. (2020). Worth the risk: Towards decentring whiteness in English language teaching. *BC TEAL, 5*(1), 44–54.

Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English*? The British Council.

Hamid, O. (2014). World Englishes in international proficiency tests. *World Englishes, 33*(2), 263–277.

Iyer, P. (1993). The empire writes back. In: Jonathan Westphal & Carl Avren Levenson (eds.), Time. Hackett Pub. Co. pp. 8–46.

Jee, Y. (2016). Critical perspectives of World Englishes on EFL teachers' identity and employment in Korea: An ethnoautobiography. *Multicultural Education Review, 8*(4), 240–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2016.1237705

Kachru, B. B. (1976). Indian English: A sociolinguistic profile of a transplanted language. ERIC Document # ED132854.

Kachru, B. B., & Smith, L. (1985). Editorial. *World Englishes, 4*(2), 209–212.

Kachru, B.B. (1985) Standard, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the english language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H. Widdowson (eds.) English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 11–30.