English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 4 Winter 2016

Standard Ideology in World Englishes: A Case Study of NESs' and NNESs' Language Attitudes Towards Indian English*

HyeJin Lee
(The State University of New York at Buffalo)

Lee, HyeJin (2016). Standard Ideology in World Englishes: A case study of NESs' and NNESs' language attitudes towards Indian English. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *22*(4), 93-118.

Building upon Kachru's three concentric circles model, this research aims to uncover how native-centric norms are conceptualized by NESs and NNESs. Placing a form of English in the Outer Circle (i.e., Indian English) at the focus of discussion, this study addresses how traditionally considered NESs and NNESs position themselves towards varieties of English to probe how deeply entrenched standard English ideology is in the English language teaching (ELT) field. The data were collected from two sets of interviews and one set of responses from questions, which specifically concerned Indian English. The study showed that both NESs and NNESs displayed unfavorable attitudes towards Indian English, and did not regard it as a legitimate variety of English. The findings further revealed that ideologically-laden preferences for American English persist in both NESs and NNESs and that their language attitudes reflect Kachru's six fallacies of the users and uses of English. The participants' monocentric approach to ELT teaching does not sync with scholarly attempts to equalize the variety of Englishes around the world. These findings call attention to the need to further combat linguistic chauvinism (i.e., privileging standard English over other variations) by creating more egalitarian ELT milieus foregrounding the pluralism of Englishes.

[World Englishes/Standard English Ideology/Language Attitudes/ NESs/NNESs]

* NES stands for native English speakers, whereas NNES stands for non-native English speakers. While the precise definitions of what constitutes a native speaker and a non-native speaker remain controversial, this study defines NES as someone who acquires English from birth as a mother tongue, whereas a NNES refers to someone who is currently learning, or has learned, English as a second or foreign language. (Davies, 2003)

I. INTRODUCTION

Several years ago, Kachru (1986) claimed that "knowing English is like possessing the fabled Aladdin's lamp, which permits one to open, as it were, the linguistic gates of international business, technology, science, and travel" (p. 1). Even after three decades, Kachru's words still deeply resonates in the contemporary context but with greater intensity. The rapid process of globalization along with the advancement of information technology have caused English to gain a more internationally crucial position in the transnational arena. The worldwide expansion of English has resulted in diversification of its forms and functions and these different varieties of English are often termed as World Englishes (henceforth WE). Using a circle analogy that explains the diffusion, varieties, and roles of English around the world, Kachru (1992) divides WE into three concentric circles: Inner Circle (English as a Native Language; norm-providing), Outer Circle (English as a Second Language; norm-developing); and Expanding Circle (English as a Foreign language; norm-dependent).

Even with the wide variety of Englishes across the globe, only mainstream Inner Circle varieties of English (i.e., American or British English) are widely deemed as legitimate standard models to be promoted. Along this line, Jenkins (2012) notes that current English language teaching (ELT) fields do not adequately respond to the dynamic reality of global English in that ELT practices are still centered on the Inner Circle norm as a pedagogical benchmark. English teachers may uncritically implement Inner Circle oriented practices that can reproduce and perpetuate existing unequal power structures. The deeply rooted idealization of Inner Circle varieties of English may inevitably lead English learners to be peripherally positioned: English learners might internalize the privileged status of native speakers and thus devalue their own accented English, which does not seem to reflect "standard" English in their minds. In addition, the restricted exposure to varieties of English in class may lead to resistance when English learners are confronted with different types of English users other than those of American and British English.

In the era of globalization where the English language has seeped into all facets of life around the world, "English teachers stand at the very heart of the most crucial educational, cultural, and political issues of our time" (Gee, 2001, p. 190). Within the asymmetric power relations existing within English, it primarily rests upon English teachers either to make students feel marginalized and othered (by surrendering to the dominance of the Inner Circle power) or to endow students with the capacity to have their own voices (to appropriate English in a range of cross-linguistic contexts). English teaching practitioners should be critically aware of the power inequity in the irreversibly growing role of English and the feasibility of the WE paradigm, which stands for a pluralized view of English in the world, depends on ELT professionals. No matter whether it is deliberate or not,

teachers' preferences for and attitudes towards certain English varieties can have constraining implications for their classroom practices and instructional decisions. In other words, teachers' attitudes towards WE can greatly influence the ways in which English varieties are preferred and selected for teaching (Young & Walsh, 2010). Interested in addressing this issue, the present study examines NESs and NNESs' language attitudes towards Indian English and varieties of English to bring the issue of standard English to the fore.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

1. The Kachruvian Paradigm and World Englishes

English has spread as a de facto lingua franca in the era of globalization. The rapid spread of English at the globe scale has brought about the proliferation of different varieties of English around the world. To reflect the global diversity of English, several umbrella terms have been proposed such as "World Englishes" (Kachru, 1985), "English as an Intercultural Language" (Sifakis, 2004), "World English" (Brutt-Griffler, 2002), "English as a Lingua Franca" (Seidlhofer, 2001), and "English as an international language" (Jenkins, 2000). Although all the terms acknowledge the pluralistic existence of English worldwide, each has a different meaning. To illustrate, whether the notion is expressed in its singular or plural forms entail different connotations. For example, the use of the singular form, (e.g., World English) arise from the needs for a common denominator for communication among world-wide English users (Jenkins, 2000). With reference to the target models for the contact language, or English as a lingua franca (ELF), Seidlhofer (2001) maintains that ELF users are not interested in approximating native-speaker norms but are capable of developing their own norms and appropriating the language to suit their own needs. Along this line, some scholars (e.g., Jenkins, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2001, 2004) have identified several recurrent and salient features of English as lingua franca (ELF) usage patterns so as to legitimize ELF as a variety in its own right. While discussing the linguistic features of ELF (English as a lingua franca) in terms of syntax, phonology, and pragmatics is beyond the scope of this research project, some lexicon-grammar features of it include "non-use of the third person present tense–s," "pluralisation of nouns which are considered uncountable in native speaker English" (Seidlhofer, 2004, p. 220).

On the other hand, the term, World Englishes (WE), coined by Kachru (1985), is rooted in the realities of localized or indigenized Englishes on account of the global spread of English. In this WE framework, English is represented in its plural form (i.e., Englishes) to reflect the wide-ranging forms and functions of Englishes based on their own locally

relevant norms. Kachru categorizes the users of WE into three circles: The Inner, Outer, and Expanding circles. To briefly illustrate, Kachru presents a model of three concentric circles of English based on historical and geographical representation: The Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle represents countries where English originally took shape and is used as a first/native language (ENL) of the major population of a country (e.g., the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia). Since English in these communities is regarded as native, the Inner Circle varieties are deemed as "norm-providing" or the "standards". The Outer Circle refers to countries with a history of colonization by the Inner Circle countries through imperial expansion where English functions as a second language (ESL) and/or official language for intra-national as well as international communication (e.g., India, Singapore, Nigeria). Since English functions as a second language, the English varieties in Outer Circle nations are considered as "norm-developing," implying that the multilingual Outer Circle countries are developing their own standards. Lastly, the Expanding Circle, the farthest from the center, consists of nations where English is regarded as a foreign language (EFL) (e.g., Korea, China, Japan). Since English has no official or formal status, the Expanding Circle is "norm dependent," implying that English in these communities relies on the norms provided by the Inner Circle. The use of English as a foreign language is rapidly expanding in these communities as the name, Expanding Circle, denotes.

2. Critique of Kachru's Three Concentric Circles Model

Although Kachru's tripartite division of WE is one of the most commonly used models for grouping the varieties of English in the world, it is not void of criticism. Most of all, Kachru's three circle model has been criticized for its rigidity and its over-simplified representation of Englishes around the world. For example, Jenkins (2014) pinpointed that the demarcation of the three circles are not always clear-cut, and that the categories become fuzzy at the edges in reality: some English speakers in the Outer Circle may use English as their first and only language, and a number of English speakers in Outer and Expanding Circles grow up multilingual these days. In other words, the model does not account for the current sociolinguistic realities of English being spread worldwide, as well as the way speakers identify with English. In response to this point, Kachru (1997) himself acknowledged the fact that categories are not mutually exclusive necessarily, and that gray areas exist between the circles.

Apart from the oversimplified classification of circles, Kachru's model has been criticized as regards its connotation of linguistic hierarchy among circles. To note, as Jenkins (2014, p. 16) accentuated, "Kachru did not intend the term 'Inner' to be taken to imply any sense of superiority" and Kachru (1997, p. 215) clarified his position that "the term 'World Englishes'

is not intended to indicate any divisiveness in the English-using communities." However, several scholars pointed to the connotation of superiority existing in his model, in that it describes the Inner Circle, Outer Circle and Expanding Circle as "norm-providing" "norm-developing" and "norm-dependent". For example, Higgins (2003) claimed that the terms imply that Inner Circle varieties are the only legitimate and target varieties for Outer Circle or Expanding Circle speakers, which is problematic. Similarly, Jenkins (2014) argued that the term Inner Circle confers supremacy to the so-called native speakers of English by placing them at the center of the language. Likewise, Burt (2005) remarked that by denoting English-speakers in the Inner Circle as "norm providing," the model gives them the authority position, with an impression that English belongs to the Inner Circle, while others are expected to conform to Inner Circle norms. Above all, as indicated in Green and Lee's (2016) conceptualized term of English as an Intercultural Language (EIcL), in the contexts of WE, language communication has been actualized through a wide variety of Englishes and the competence and proficiency of English is attained through multi-dialecticism. Looking at the global contexts of EIcL, English is universal given that it has become a heterogeneous language with a plural grammatical and norms. EIcL regards language communication as comprehensibility from user-oriented perspectives, rather than as competency from native-oriented standpoints. Since the ownership of English has become denationalized, no nation can have custodial authority over the English language. This indicates that the traditional binary notion of native versus nonnative speakers is eradicated in EIcL, which markedly differs from Kachru's three circle model.

If Inner Circle varieties are characterized as "norm-providing," functioning to prescribe the forms and functions of English, then any forms that differ from Inner Circle varieties are subject to be regarded as errors, or interlanguage working towards the standardized features of English. In such circumstances, questions can arise when it comes to typifying Outer Circle Englishes in Kachru's three concentric circles model. English speakers in the Outer Circle are believed to develop their own locally relevant norms, rather than subscribing to the Inner Circle norms. Even with scholarly efforts to affirm the legitimacy of Outer Circle Englishes, speakers of these varieties are still not regarded as native speakers in that their English varieties are often treated as non-native or second language varieties (Higgins, 2003). Interested in addressing this issue, this study aims to broaden the scope of investigation through a comparative analysis of native English speakers born and raised in one of the Inner Circle countries (i.e., United States) as well as of non-native English speakers born and raised in one of the Expanding Circle nations (i.e., China). To be specific, this study, drawing on Karchru's three circle concentric model, examines how native and non-native English speakers in a teacher education program form their attitudes toward one of the Outer Circle English varieties.

Among the many different Outer Circle English varieties, I chose Indian English, as the

Indian diaspora comprises one of the largest populations in the country where the study was conducted, the United States. According to the 2015 Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange, the United States hosts the largest number of international students worldwide; it hosted 974,926 international students in 2014-15—a 10% increase from the previous year—44% of which came from China and India (i.e., 304,040 Chinese students and 132,888 Indian students). Among institutions in the United States, this research was conducted in a state-supported public university located in New York State, where Indians constitute one of the largest ethnic groups: the 2014 U.S. Census estimated that more than 679,173 Indians reside in New York State, the highest percentage of such among the 50 states. Moreover, the 2015 Open Doors Report indicated that for the thirteen years in a row, the university where this research was conducted has been ranked among the top 20 U.S. institutions in terms of enrolling the largest number of international students in 2014-15 academic year. India, China and South Korea are the top three countries of origin for these students, representing approximately 51 percent of the total enrollment of international students in the United States. The strong showing of large international student populations in this English-dominant institution presents a unique environment, where interaction between varied forms of English is not only common but pervasive. In particular, on account of the large Indian population, students in this institution are likely to encounter Indian English, a recognized variety of English spoken by many in the Indian subcontinent, as well as in the Indian diaspora across the world. The examination of whether less-standardized Englishes are accepted as legitimate by aspiring native and non-native English teachers may add new insights to current WE research. It would be important to find out participants' varying attitudes toward Outer Circle English varieties in order to further probe the traditional NEST/NNEST dichotomy, as well as to examine the boundaries of standard English. The overarching research question that framed this study is as follows: What are NESs' and NNESs' language attitudes towards Indian English and WE? [1]

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Research Contexts and Participants

In this study, I consider each interview as "a comprehensive case in and of itself" (Merriam, 1998, p.194). That is, individual participant's voices in his/her ways of

[1] Followed by Lee and Green's (2016, p. 162) definition, this study regards language attitudes as "the participants' preferences for or general opinions about different forms of English."

making sense of the self are considered as unique and distinct. This study employed a purposeful, convenience sampling technique and four domestic American students—who identified themselves as NESs—and three international Chinese students—who identified themselves as NNESs—enrolled in a TESOL program housed in the institution were participated in this study. My role as a researcher was to collect and analyze the data from the research participants and none of the participants had acquaintance with me prior to the investigation. The participants were aged between mid-twenties and early fifties and represented a broad range of teaching experience from novice to 20-year veterans. In addition, drawing on Kachru's (1992) tripartite approach of WE, the NESs come from a norm-providing Inner Circle country (i.e. the United States), whereas the NNESs come from a norm-dependent Expanding Circle country (i.e. China). Participants had educational experience in both Inner and Expanding Circle countries: They were all enrolled in a teacher education program in the United States, one of the Inner Circle countries, and except for Jenny, who plans to teach English in China after completion of her MA degree, all six participants had teaching experience in Expanding Circle countries. To ensure confidentiality, the names of the participants have been anonymized and detailed participant demographics are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Demographics of the Participants

Names	Nationality	Gender	Age	Native Language	Teaching Years	Teaching Contexts
Jang	China (EC) [2]	Female	Mid-30s	Mandarin (EFL)	15 years	EFL college teacher in China
Sani	China (EC)	Female	Mid-20s	Mandarin (EFL)	2 years	EFL kindergarten teacher in China
Lee	China (EC)	Female	Mid-20s	Mandarin (EFL)	7 months	EFL private tutor in China
James	United States (IC)	Male	Mid-40s	English (ENL)	9 years	ESL teacher to adult immigrants in U.S. EFL teacher in Argentina
Rebecca	United States (IC)	Female	Late-20s	English (ENL)	2 years	ESL teacher in U.S. Public Schools EFL teacher in Germany
Jenny	United States (IC)	Female	Early-50s	English (ENL)	1 year	ESL teacher in U.S.
Derry	United States (IC)	Male	Late-30s	English (ENL)	2 years	EFL kindergarten/ elementary teacher in Korea

[2] EC stands for Expanding Circle and IC denotes Inner Circle in Kachru's three concentric circle model.

2. Data Collection and Analysis

This research project was conducted in the fall semester of 2015 (from August, 31 to December, 22). The study instruments included a demographic questionnaire, two rounds of individual interviews, and an emailed document specifically directed at Indian English (see Appendix). In the initial data collection stage, the demographic questionnaire and the first interview were carried out; these primarily dealt with participants' personal and educational backgrounds, including their language learning and teaching experience. After the first research tasks, I set up second interview dates and times with individual participants, and emailed them a document which asked for their opinions about Indian English. The emailed document dealt with participants' overall opinions about Indian English, in order to understand their attitudes toward both standard English and different English varieties. The document included a link to a short Youtube video clip that focused on issues Indian speakers face in speaking English in the United States (centering especially on heavy local Indian accents). Via open-ended questions, participants were asked to share their overall opinions about the video and Indian English in general. It should be noted that, although the researcher briefly talked about Indian English by presenting Kachru's (1992) three concentric model after the first interview, in order to explain the nature of the emailed document to participants, there were no instructional activities aimed at raising awareness of Indian English or WE, which is a limitation of this study. This study assumed, on account of the large number of Indian students in the school campus, that participants could readily encounter Indian English speakers on campus. [3]

The second interviews were aimed at understanding both NES and NNES TESOL students' language attitudes toward standard English and English varieties. The interview questions were primarily formulated based upon the key themes drawn from the relevant literature on WE. In particular—given that participants plan to teach English after completing their MA degrees—the interview protocol included participants' preference for certain varieties of English for teaching, which has pedagogical implications. Unless otherwise stated, the data presented in the findings section consist of responses from the emailed document and second interview data.

All the interviews were audio-recorded and the recordings were transcribed verbatim into Microsoft Word. Themes were identified through an inductive coding process to unpack meaningful features naturally emerging from the qualitative data. To further explain the data analysis process, after carefully reading and rereading interview transcripts, the interview data were coded line by line. During the coding process, any key words or

[3] The researcher asked for statistics about the total number of Indian students to the International Students Office, but was unable to get the specific information due to the school's privacy policy.

phrases that captured participant language attitudes were highlighted (e.g., “awful” Indian English), after which, the interview data were cross-examined and compared with responses from the emailed documents and the existing literature on language attitudes/ideologies and WE. To illustrate, from the participants’ written responses gathered from the emailed documents, it was found that Indian English does not resonate with standard English for most participants and they did not evaluate Indian English positively. To verify this, I asked participants’ views on varieties of English and standard English during the second interview, and then juxtaposed participants’ responses with previous studies. For example, in Jenkins’s (2007) study, the participants (326 ESL/EFL teachers) ranked American and British accents as superior to others and evaluated other non-native English accents based upon their proximity to American and British English accents. The participants also made pejorative evaluations of the non-native accents that were perceived to be the furthest from the two inner circle native English accents, namely American and British English: Chinese English was depicted as “quarrel-like” and “appalling,” and Japanese English was portrayed as “weird” and “menacing.” The participants also revealed little knowledge of Outer Circle Englishes as being recognized varieties, resulting in Indian English to be as poorly rated as Chinese and Japanese English in terms of acceptability and pleasantness. Jenkins attributes the study results to the overriding nature of standard English ideology, which was also revealed in the present study. Combining evidence gathered from different data sources expanded my understanding of the phenomenon being studied. Aside from the methodological triangulation, this study also included peer debriefing with one Chinese and one American colleagues, who were versed in qualitative research methods, in order to discuss my tentative analysis and interpretations. During the study phases, I arranged peer debriefing sessions individually with the two colleagues. I brought the data segments along with my interpretations to the colleagues and asked them to evaluate whether my interpretation is reasonable and makes sense, and whether the interpretations can be read from Chinese or American standpoints. Bringing complementary insights from Chinese and American angles through analytical probing not only counterbalanced my partial Korean background as a researcher, but also enabled me to probe deeper into the investigation.

IV. FINDINGS

This section presents the study findings, which are outlined under the two headings. First, participants’ views on Indian English are elicited, which are then related to their attitudes towards the roles of ESL/EFL teachers and their preferred varieties of English for teaching. To frame issues in participants’ own terms, the findings are presented with

the representative quotes from the participants in relation to how they think about Indian English and what matters most to them as English teaching professionals.

1. Attitudes Towards Indian English and Roles of ESL Teachers

1) James

The following is James's position toward Indian English:

> I know a lot of people who speak 'Indian English.' I know that it is accepted as such but I can't decide if I find the term 'Indian English' politically correct or not. My ear understands the sound in the voice, but honestly sometimes it is hard to understand people who speak 'Indian English.' The woman's point in the video and the following comments hit at a horrible truth. In American culture, the accents or the sounds in your voice do matter. Some accents or sounds are more welcome than others. If the quality is hard to understand because of the distortion of vowels or, more importantly, an unfamiliar stress in a word, then people can get turned off. (Responses from the document)

Although James seemed to hide behind his questioning of the politically correct nature of the term "Indian English," he too had difficulty understanding it. This response was in line with his position about the linguistic bias toward certain English varieties within the United States:

> You know what's funny in America? When people hear a British accent, people think the person is smart. If people hear the southern accents, then people think they are slow. If someone speaks with French accented English, then people will love it. When people speak with Italian accents, then forget it. Americans will love it! But when you hear Mexican accented English, then it's not so much. It is sad… it is terrible. It is … who people do that with the sounds. They are biased and there are lots of biases here. (Second Interview)

James acknowledged that there is a socially-constructed accent hierarchy and biases within the nation. James was also aware that "Americans especially New Yorkers, they just lose patience with different accents" because "in American culture, the accents or the sounds in your voice do matter." Due to this "horrible truth in American culture" James believed that it is incumbent upon him, as an ESL teacher, to help English learners be clear and intelligible to as many people as possible so as to facilitate the integration process into

mainstream society.

2) Rebecca

Rebecca commented on Indian English as follows:

> I will admit that I sometimes find 'Indian English' challenging to follow. Despite my experience with English as a second/foreign language speaker, I still struggle to understand different accents… I think that a generalization for Americans would be that 'Indian English' is hard to understand and many are not sympathetic or patient when speaking to someone with a different accent. (Responses from the document)

From Rebecca's perspective, most Americans are not putting in enough effort to understand Indian English. This statement was in line with her view toward the influence of standard English, which surfaced during the second interview:

> I think we are living in a very international and global world and people are very slowly becoming more accepting of accented speech. I think we have to. I think it would be really irrational to think that everyone should speak with the same accent. But I think it depends on the audience. Like whom I am speaking with, if I am speaking German with someone from a smaller town and someone with less exposure to international people, they will be going to have more difficulties in understanding me. Same here, if you are to speak with my dad who has very little interaction with international people he is going to have a harder time to understand than me but like global and international perspectives, I think accented English, non-traditional accents or non-American accents should be validated. (Second Interview)

Rebecca made a point that because of globalization, the realm of the standard should include other types of English that have often been classified as less standardized forms of English. Rebecca also believed that people with cross-cultural experience are more tolerant toward non-traditional or non-American English because it becomes less unfamiliar to them. In this line, Rebecca said "ESL teachers need cross-cultural skills" and maintained that "you should not be the only voice that students hear! You should supplement yourself with various inputs which would include voices from non-native speakers." Rebecca said she wants to let her students understand regional variations that exist within American English. Rebecca knows that her English may sound different from an English speaker in Texas simply due to geography. Rebecca believed that if students are aware of the fact that

different areas have different accents or non-standard English, then they may be more confident about their own L1- influenced accented English.

3) Jenny

Jenny gave her opinion about Indian English as follows:

> Indian English is hard to understand because of the accent. The video makes a lot of sense. This is not putting down Indian English or any other culture, but it's about understanding why Academic English is different and important when communicating correctly and understandably. It is the same when a native English speaker learns a new language, we not only have to learn the new language but its proper pronunciation, and inflections if we want to be clearly understood. Therefore, the same rules apply to ELLs. (Responses from the document)

Jenny's emphasis on communicating correctly and understandably seemed to arise from her own experience. During the interview, Jenny shared an anecdote about the importance of communicating correctly and understandably with proper pronunciation:

> When I first came to this country my accent was so strong; so I have to admit that what I had to do was to try to sound like an American because if I didn't do that, then people wouldn't understand what I was saying. People kept asking me 'What? Could you repeat that?' They would not understand me because I have a Trinidad local dialect. So in order for me to be understood and to save time, I had to give up my Queen's English so that I would not end up feeling uncomfortable that I had to keep repeating myself. (Second Interview)

After migrating from one of the English-speaking islands in the Caribbean to the United States, Jenny decided to reside there permanently as a legitimate citizen. Even though Jenny grew up speaking English, the regional accents in the United States were different from those in her home country. Due to her Trinidad local dialect, Jenny found communication breakdowns uncomfortable. So as to belong to the United States more fully, Jenny said she had to do away with her Queen's English so that she can sound like an American. Even though Jenny believed that pronunciation does not change the meaning of words, she was aware of the significance of intelligibility. The immigration experience placed her in a position to understand and empathize with people with foreign accents. After sharing her own experience, Jenny said "in that respect, I would like people to change their accents so that they can speak clearly so that you would not end up feeling

uncomfortable that you have to keep repeating yourself." Jenny said she wants to encourage students to retain many aspects of their L1 in their English production as long as it does not interfere with intelligibility.

2. Attitude Towards Indian English and American English as a Model

1) Derry

Derry evaluated Indian English as follows:

> Indian English is a strong regional accent. The problem with Indian English is that many of its speakers hold tech support jobs thus communicating with them is a modern day necessity. So, for work purposes at least, an International Standard English should be encouraged. (Responses from the document)

Derry's position about prompting "an International Standard English" corresponded to his worldview about standard English, identified during the interview. When asked about his definition of standard English, Derry responded:

> English is actually kind of strange because so many people speak English compared to how many people speak Korean. English is spoken in so many places all over the world so I think there is no standard English. I mean, there could be some sort of standardized international English like business people use but, there are so many accents of English and there are regional varieties. For example, if you go to India, a lot of people speak English, in government, schools, but it is much different English from what they speak in England, or in New York… someone in India and someone in the United States, they both are native English speakers and they still speak English but it is a matter of their local cultural scenes. (Second Interview)

Derry claimed that it is difficult to define standard English due to the large number of English speaking populations around the world spanning different domains and purposes. Derry believed that the increasing demand for English worldwide also increases the need for a standardized form of English as an international language to guarantee effective communication and intelligibility. In addition, as far as a language model for English teaching is concerned, Derry said he would continually use American English, not just because he is an American, but also because "for business aspects, more people want American accents." Even though Derry was aware that American English is a type of

dialect, by connecting the national power of the United States to American English, he seemed to see the value of it as a pedagogical model.

2) Jang

Jang reported that only while living in the United States did she first encounter Indian English. It seemed that Jang did not view Indian English favorably:

> Before I came to the US, I heard from my friends about how awful Indian English sounds, but I didn't really realize the gravity of the issue until I really heard Indians speak English. It's like they're speaking a totally different language! When they speak, I couldn't understand a word, and I started to lose my concentration on what they say…I'm curious about why Indians make little effort in trying to improve their accent? At least make their accent close to American so that it's easier for them to be understood. That would save them and also the audience a lot of trouble. (Responses from the document)

Jang mentioned her frustration to understand Indian English speakers. By indicating that Indian English speakers should improve their accent, Jang seemed not to see Indian English as a legitimate variety. Jang further offered insights into some possible reasons for her discomfort toward other Englishes:

> I don't have any prejudice on this issue, but I really feel frustrated about not understanding what they're talking about. I think there is a reason I should consider. Throughout my English learning experience, I was exposed to only 'standard' English accents – American English or British English. I practically have no access to other accents! All the English exams in China, if there's a listening comprehension section, are testing us on the standard English accent as well. So it's very understandable that I would feel shocked by not understanding Indian English. (Second Interview)

Jang realized that it is difficult for her to understand less standardized accents, which prompted her to contemplate the conservative monolithic pedagogical model. Jang acknowledged that "it is [a] shortcoming or disadvantage of the English education system in China. They always focus on the most standard English like American English or British English. Students are seldom exposed to any other Englishes." Despite her recognition of the shortcoming of the prescriptive pedagogical model, Jang indicated that she will continue using American or British English as a pedagogical model: Jang regarded this

norm as being the most useful to know for her students because those two are standards and the most encountered variants of English.

3) Sani

Sani voiced her opinion about Indian English as follows: “Indian English has a very unique and strong accent. When I need to communicate with Indians, I can’t understand. I hope they could speak with less of an accent.” Due to her inability to communicate with Indian English speakers, Sani wanted Indian English speakers to reduce their unique and strong accents. Sani explained why she is mainly familiar with American English:

> I feel like there were only two choices either British English or American English but everything was American English, like textbooks, movies… we know that in the workbook, there was British English but teachers only used American English because it will be on the tests… I feel like I got lots of exposure to American English in school. (Responses from the document)

According to Sani, she had almost no access to other Englishes, aside from British English or American English, in China. When asked about her willingness to introduce a variety of Englishes in class, Sani responded: “we know those things like Singapore English, Indian English, or Australian English exist, but as for teaching, I will use American English because it is so popular now, like movies, dramas, songs, pop stars.” A further question was asked about her opinion about presenting Chinese English to students. Sani replied:

> Chinese English? It is problematic. I mean, it is like… an interlanguage. It is on the way to become American English and I saw my Chinese friend who speaks just like an American so I know it is something that can be improved. So, I will encourage students to work towards an American accent. (Second Interview)

Sani witnessed a Chinese speaker of English achieve a native-like American accent, which seemed to lead her to believe that the more or less advanced degree of Chinese English could be improved. By placing Chinese English on the interlanguage continuum, Sani believed that Chinese English is deviant from the target language, and should not be a valid category in itself. Sani does not have full access to American English accent, which she prefers. Sani’s motive to achieve a native English accent goes beyond the issue of intelligibility. Sani’s desire to reduce her Chinese accent in English comes from her belief that an American accent has more power to legitimate her teacher identity. In addition,

during the interview, Sani commented that diverse English varieties are valid forms of Englishes and made a claim that intelligibility is her pedagogical priority. Furthermore, Sani also said that "in the future contexts, they [her students] will come across people from different countries whose native language is not English." This is paradoxically contradicted by her strong preference for American English as a pedagogical model. Sani's account closely fits the study results of non-native English-speaking teachers' attitudes toward their own accents in Jenkins's (2005) study. Jenkins found that NNESTs had a positive attitude toward NNESs' English accents as a medium of representing their own national identities. However, as far as their teacher identity is concerned, regardless of their nationality, the NNESTs wanted to have as native-like accents as possible. Sani similarly seems to see the practical and pedagogical benefits in adhering to the native speaker norms.

4) Lee

Lee offered her opinion about Indian English as follows:

> Personally, because English is not my mother language, I can hardly understand Indian English. The accent is so difficult for me to understand. I remembered during my orientation, I had a tour guide who came from India, I didn't know what he said at all. At first, I tried to ask for clarification, but later, I gave up. The accent is like another language. (Responses from the document)

Lee regarded that Indian English is different from what she is used to in English especially in its phonological realization, which led her to evaluate Indian English as another language. Lee further noted that English users whose first language is not English cannot claim ownership of English:

> Like Chinese, Indian, Korean, Japanese, our first language is not English I don't think we can use the terms like Chinese English, Indian English or Japanese English or Korean English. We have to say Chinese-accented English or Indian-accented English because compared with British or even Australian, English is their first language so we cannot say that. (Second Interview)

The following is Lee's own definition of standard English:

> I think something in a Chinese English textbook is standard English… the entire curriculum was based on American English: the books or tapes, they are all in American English. My English is influenced by my teachers, my teacher's accent

> and all of them I think used American English a lot but teachers cannot [have] that much choice because they had to follow the school curriculum. We don't know which one is American English or British English. We just learn what teachers give us. So it depends on the teachers you meet in school. (Second Interview)

Lee defined standard English with what is authorized by schools. Lee said that the American variety is predominantly used in English teaching materials in China. In this context, Lee believed that teachers were not in a position to change anything due to external restrictions. In particular, Lee pointed out that her English is influenced by her teachers and their accents, indicating that Lee was aware of the role of teachers in influencing students' language attitudes in both subtle and overt ways. When asked about whether she is open to the instruction of a variety of Englishes in class, Lee said: "Nope, that would make our students very confused. I will just focus on what is used in the textbooks. I have to follow the textbooks because they have to take English exams and that's why they want to learn English." Lee believed that exposing other Englishes in class may have no benefit for Chinese students because ELT practices in China are test-oriented and American English is the norm on these exams.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

All forms of a language are created equal in status. However, through a misguided relativism, as this research and the existing literature (e.g., Lee & Green, 2016; Young & Walsh, 2010) have showcased, some languages and varieties are seemed to be more desirable than others in terms of power, prestige, educational attainment, and wealth. The issue on the topic of standard English ideology and WE was discussed, specifically Indian English. The participants' attitudes towards Indian English were that they did not evaluate it positively and their seemingly negative attitudes towards Indian English were attributed to its very unique and strong and awful accents, which stymied mutual comprehension.

Kachru (2009) discussed six myths about WE: the "intelligibility," "interlanguage," "Cassandra," "monocultural," "exocentric," and "interlocutor myths" (pp. 184-185). Notably, the study findings corroborate with Kachru's myths. First, the participants did not evaluate Indian English positively and some participants seemed to not regard Indian English as a legitimate variety. The participants commented on the communicative difficulties with Indian English speakers by pointing to their unique phonological features with the yardstick of American English. Even with the fact that the success of any dialogue depends on both of the interlocutors (i.e., speaker and listener), the

participants pointed to speaker factors (i.e., accented Indian English) as the main reason for communication breakdowns. This result resonates with "the intelligibility myth" in that the participants believed that L2 interlocutors should make themselves intelligible to L1 speakers.

Second, besides Indian English, all three Chinese participants did not evaluate Chinese English positively. Jang said if she spoke Chinese English, she would deem herself not qualified to teach English with the belief that Chinese English is not valid because it does not resonate with standard English. Sani pointed out that Chinese English is problematic by equating it with interlanguage: "Chinese English? It is problematic. I mean, it is like… an interlanguage. It is on the way to become American English and I saw my Chinese friend who speaks just like an American so I know it is something that can be improved (Sani)." The term "interlanguage" is coined by Selinker (1972) who defines it as "the interim grammars constructed by L2 learners on their way to the target language." Sani's comment reflects "the interlanguage myth" in that non-standard forms of English (e.g., Chinese English) are considered as interlanguages primarily because they deviate from the native norms (i.e., American English). In addition, the fact that Sani judged Chinese English as problematic reflects "the Cassandra myth" which describes linguistic variations as deficits rather than differences.

Apart from linguistic differences, "the monocultural myth" also surfaced. During the interview, Lee said she "want[s] to incorporate target cultures into language teaching as much as possible." When asked about what she meant by target cultures, Lee replied, "I mean, American cultures, because I am teaching English so it should be American." Her comment reveals "the monocultural myth," which means English learning entails learning about only American or British cultures as the dominant cultural norms. More to the point, most participants indicated that they will use American English as a pedagogical model and this result mirrors "the exocentric myth" meaning that American or British English linguistic varieties should be used as a model in a globalized context. There is one fallacy, "the interlocutor myth," that is not confirmed by the study results. Kachru defines "the interlocutor myth" as the purpose of English learning is to communicate with native English speakers. All participants were aware that their students will communicate with speakers from diverse linguistic backgrounds, not just NESs, but they nevertheless said they will only use American or British English as pedagogical models.

In accordance with the participants' viewpoints, American or British English may not necessarily be the only English that students would encounter given the wide range of Englishes throughout the world but participants still see it as the most legitimate language model for English teaching. Teachers' confined worldviews of English in the classroom may be directly passed on to students. Subscribing to monocentric views

based on American or British English can be a disservice to students who aspire to attain global competitiveness. Taken the Chinese participants' reports together, one of the fundamental factors causing their lack of awareness of and exposure to other English varieties is attributable to English education policy in China. Based upon participants' reflective accounts, English education in China was their foremost channel for encountering English and the exclusive focus on American English certainly discounts the complexity of the current sociolinguistic reality. On account of a dearth of non-standard varieties, teachers may feel uncomfortable about teaching something they know little about; instead, teachers may lean toward teaching what they know best, resulting in reinforcing standard English as the preferred pedagogical model. After all, it should be noted that American English is only one type, which happened to have become the socio-politically governing dialect due to historical and commercial factors.

The study findings suggest that while the participants acknowledged the existence of diversified Englishes, they seem to validate the linguistic structure of the colonizer (e.g., American or British English) as the primary benchmark for the pedagogic model in ELT. Upholding the prescriptive educational or pedagogical beliefs that students should only receive socially and academically "standard" English input may, however, bring about negative outcomes such as the loss of self-confidence in non-native speakers using English. If English learners cannot switch off their own L1 accents or dialects in producing English, they may inevitably downgrade their own accented English. This study result calls attention to teachers' conscious effort toward exposing students to other English varieties for overall pedagogical practices to meet pragmatic needs in this globalized worlds.

Ⅵ. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Scholars have claimed that teachers are at the center of educational innovation that can lead students toward the emerging WE paradigm, which celebrates the pluricentric nature of English (e.g., Ates, Eslami, & Wright, 2015; Kim, 2013, 2015; Lee, 2012; Lee, Lee, & Lee, 2015). In this context, educational curriculum in teacher preparation programs are in need of attention, in that courses aimed at preparing teacher trainees for the demands of the WE paradigm can raise their awareness of the pedagogical and ideological implications of WE. The study findings suggest that while the participants acknowledged the existence of diversified Englishes, they seem to validate the linguistic structure of the colonizer (e.g., American or British English) as the primary benchmark for the pedagogic model in ELT. Upholding the prescriptive educational or pedagogical beliefs that students should only receive socially and academically the so-called standard

English input may, however, bring about negative outcomes such as the loss of self-confidence in non-native speakers using English. If English learners cannot switch off their own L1 accents or dialects in producing English, they may inevitably downgrade their own accented English.

In this context, ESL/EFL teachers should be informed about the current sociolinguistic evolutions of English uses and users, and ways to reflect such changes in their own instructional practices. Teacher educators can encourage teacher trainees to be more critical about standard English ideology and the pedagogical implications of it. For example, teacher educators can prompt teacher trainees to consciously reflect on standard English ideology and the impact of NES dependent linguistic models on ELT instruction, international English proficiency tests (e.g., TOEFL or IELTS), employment practices (e.g. a preference for teachers with an American or British English accent), and students' learning (e.g., imitating sound patterns versus meaningful communication). In addition, exposing teacher trainees to different varieties of English in terms of semantics, phonology, syntax, lexis and pragmatics, and encouraging them to ponder ways to embrace different kinds of Englishes may help teacher trainees to support the linguistic plurality of WE. Teacher educators may also encourage teacher trainees to initiate discussions about hidden ideologies presented in English teaching materials (e.g., the exclusive usage of American English) and critically question how such stereotypical content can influence English learners' multilingual identity.

This research project was conducted in an ESL context. However, the study findings can have implications to other English teaching contexts such as Korea, in which Inner Circle norms are deeply entrenched. As Yook and Ryu (2015) indicated, English teaching practices in Korea have been dominated by the Standard (American) English ideology. Historically, Korea has had subjugated socio-political and economical relationships to the United States. Thereby, a large proportion of English learning materials is framed within American English contexts. The idealization of Inner Circle varieties of English can be readily found in Korean education systems. For example, Lee's (2009) content analysis of English textbooks revealed the Inner Circle orientations of teaching in Korea. In his analysis of the textbooks, Lee found that these Korean EFL textbooks adopt linguistic samples mostly situated in American contexts and represent dialogue exchanges either between Koreans and native English speakers or among native English speakers within American cultures. Along this line, in her analysis of English programs in Korea, Jeon (2009) similarly noted that American English is the most available and preferred national dialect for English teaching. As witnessed by research conducted in Korean settings, the dominance of American English is prevailing. The current trend of placing excessive values on American English may put Korean learners of English on an

unequal footing with the so-called “native” English speakers, which may corrupt Korean cultural and linguistic values. To effectively accommodate the needs of Korean learners and to empower them as global citizens in an increasingly interconnected world, Korean EFL teachers should firstly be sensitive to and appreciative of the existence of diverse Englishes worldwide so as to be supportive in raising Korean learners’ awareness towards WE. The pedagogical implications mentioned above may enable Korean EFL teachers to facilitate their awareness of the current plurality of Englishes worldwide as well as their openness to adapt their teaching practices within a WE paradigm.

This qualitative research is exploratory and descriptive in nature, and thus, the study findings are by no means representative. Although this study provides insights into the existing literature on WE, it has some limitations that should be taken into account. First of all, the present study is confined to the views of Chinese and American participants, which remains an underlying limitation. The language attitudes of others in different educational, socio-cultural, economic, and historical contexts would be different from those of the participants presented in this study. In addition, the study findings are also limited in scope in that among various Outer Circle Englishes, merely Indian English was selected for investigation. Participants might have different language attitudes towards other Outer Circle Englishes such as Singaporean English, Nigerian English or Pakistan English. Furthermore, it is important to reiterate that this study did not account for the varieties of English within each circle. English is indeed a pluricentric language and there are countless varieties of English not only across the world but also within countries. To illustrate, there exist a great deal of social varieties of American English, including regional varieties (e.g., Southern and Northeastern varieties) and ethnic varieties (e.g., African-American English and Chicano English). Along this line, within Indian English, there is a cline of varieties in that Indian English is extensively used for local, national and international levels. For example, Indian English has different sub-varieties such as Punjabi English, Hindi English, Butler English, and Parsi English, and there is an affluence of regional variations of Indian English in terms of lexis, pronunciation and grammar (see Appendix for linguistic features of Indian English). To extend the scope of the research, future studies broadening the analytical focus by incorporating a broader range of Englishes would be of value.

REFERENCES

Ates, B., Eslami, Z., & Wright, K. L. (2015). Incorporating world Englishes into undergraduate ESL education courses. *World Englishes, 34*(3), 485-501.

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Burt, C. (2005). What is international English? *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 1-20.

Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: Myth and reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gee, J. (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education, 25*(1), 99-125.

Green, R., & Lee, K. (2016). Teaching English as an intercultural language (EIcL) in Korea: Investigating factors affecting university students' perceptions of and attitudes toward EIcL. *The New Studies of English Language & Literature, 63*(3), 25-50.

Higgins, C. (2003). Ownership of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NNS dichotomy. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 615-644.

Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Implementing an international approach to English pronunciation: The role of teacher attitudes and identity. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(3), 535-543.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as an lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a lingua franca from classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal, 66*(4), 486-494.

Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a lingua franca in the international university*. London: Routledge.

Jeon, M. (2009). Globalization and native English speakers in English programme in Korea (EPIK). *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 22*(3), 231-243.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). Teaching world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 355-365). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1997). World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*(3), 66-87.

Kachru, B. B. (2009). Asian Englishes in the Asian age: Contexts and challenges. In K.

Murata & J. Jenkins (Eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian contexts: Current and future debates* (pp. 175-193), New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kim, H. K. (2013). "English is Power": Narratives of Asian English teachers in language education. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 19*(1), 89-109.

Kim, H. K. (2015). The impact of critical practices on Korean English teachers' positioning vis a vis World Englishes. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 21*(3), 65-88.

Lee, H., Lee, N., & Lee, K. (2015). Fostering users of intercultural English language in the world Englishes framework: What to know. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 21*(3), 115-132.

Lee, K. Y. (2009). Treating culture: What 11 high school EFL conversation textbooks in South Korea do. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 8*(1), 76–96.

Lee, K. Y. (2012). Teaching Intercultural English learning/teaching in world Englishes: some classroom activities in South Korea. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 11*(4), 190-205.

Lee, K., & Green, R. (2016). The World Englishes paradigm. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique, 15*(1), 155-168.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sailaja, P. (2012). Indian English: Features and sociolinguistic aspects. Language and *Linguistics Compass, 6*(6), 359-370.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*(1), 209-239.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics. 10*(2), 209-231.

Sifakis, N. (2004). Teaching EIL – teaching international or intercultural English? What teachers should know. *System, 32*(2), 237-250.

Yook, C., & Ryu, H. (2015). World Englishes and culture teaching in the Korean EFL context. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 21*(3), 195-211.

Young, T. J., & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of "non-native" teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 23*(2), 123-137.

APPENDIX

A. Interview Protocol

1. Which variety of English do you think you speak?
2. Have you heard of native (Standard) English? If so, what is your opinion about it?
3. To what extent are your English learning, using, and teaching motivated by native (Standard) English norm?
4. From your perspective, which variety of English should be used for English learning and teaching? Why or why not?
5. From your perspective, what are the main reasons and purposes for your future students to study English?
6. What variety or varieties of English will you present to your English learners?
7. How would you like to promote your English learners' proficiency?
8. Would you like to help them acquire a native or native-like accent or develop their own accented English?

B. Emailed Document

Wonderful American English Accents?

If you follow this Youtube link (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9bQlOvUSN_c), you will see a video clip titled, *American Accent Training for Indian Speakers*. In this video, an American woman focuses on issues Indian speakers face in speaking English and the below are comments from the video viewers. Please share your overall impressions and thoughts about the video and the below comments.

Video Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9bQlOvUSN_c

Comments:

ali maisum

"I'm An American myself, but my parents are originally from India, I speak like native Americans, cause i was born and raised in USA, anyways, lots of people giving their shitty opinions (lol) i mean... Who asked you to give your F** opinion, there're 373,675 views for this Clip, and all viewers are usually Indians, because they want to fix their English, and whatever she said in her clip was absolutely right, come to America and speak with your Shitty Indian accent, people will laugh at you. Cause it's annoying..."

mksahu
We don't want the american English, Indian English speaking is good and most of the time grammatically correct.

Bazla Khan
American accent is wonderful

Q. What do you think of the “Indian English” in general?
What are your overall views of the video and the comments from the video-viewers?
Please share your opinions below:

C. Linguistic Features of Indian English

Phonology	Morphology	Syntax
1. The dental plosives are used instead of the fricatives 2. The voiceless stops /p, t, k/ are pronounced without aspiration in all positions 3. The alveolar and palatal consonants /t d s z l/ are often replaced by retroflex consonants 4. Loss of the distinction between /v/ and /w	1. Hybrid constructions are seen with affixation (wallah = occupation, role) e.g., newspaper wallah (newspaper seller) police wallah (policeman) box-wallah (businessman) 2. Pluralization of mass nouns e.g., aircrafts, furnitures	1.Different types of structures for the ditransitive verbs e.g., X gave a book. (X gave Y a book.) i.e., verb + direct object + null direct object. (verb + indirect object + direct object). 2. The definite article is used with collective nouns with a generic meaning 3. Some verbs (e.g., advise, present, provide and supply) are used as ditransitive verbs in Indian English

(Sailaja, 2012)

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

HyeJin Lee
Department of Learning and Instruction
Graduate School of Education
The State University of New York at Buffalo
505 Baldy Hall, Buffalo, NY 14260-1000. USA
Email: hyejinle@buffalo.edu

Received in October 15th, 2016
Reviewed in November 26th, 2016
Revised version received in December 5th, 2016