Standard Language Ideologies, World Englishes, and English Language Teaching: An Overview

Maredil León
The University of Arizona

Abstract

This paper presents an overview of terms and issues related to Standard Language Ideologies, World Englishes, and English Education. First, I present a discussion of the concept of language ideologies and their connection to constantly problematized issues in ELT (e.g., the native/non-native dichotomy). Then, a detailed description of *pro language variation approaches* is provided, a term coined by the author. I also argue that these approaches represent an option to counteract the negative effects of standard language ideologies in language teaching. Their strengths and weaknesses are also discussed, with supporting evidence from scholarly research. This paper ends with pedagogical implications resulting from these paradigms with an emphasis on classroom practice applicability, and changes needed in teacher education programs.

Keywords: World Englishes, Standard Language Ideologies, English Education

Introduction

English is commonly thought to be one of the most powerful languages in the world. Its major spread throughout the globe has been studied and perceived from many different perspectives. Crystal (2003) traces this spread throughout history and explains that at some points, e.g. the industrial revolution, the spread of English was a manner of coincidence; it just happened to be the language being used in the right place at the right time. Even though it is difficult to provide an exact number, there are an estimated 1.5 billion people using English around the globe nowadays, and the vast majority of these users are the so-called non-native speakers (Statista, 2016). Given this wide global spread, English has been commonly recognized as an international language, *the* global Lingua Franca, or as the international business language (Matsuda 2012). However, looking into the realities that surround the use of English engages us in a far more complicated discussion.

Even though popular discourses attribute English's popularity to globalization and present it as a harmless natural evolution of the *world's language*, there is a vast body of literature that problematizes the spread of English and positions it as an inherently political matter (Adamo, 2005; Canagarajah, 2013; Phillipson, 1992). In this paper, I critically review the literature on language ideologies and non-traditional approaches such as World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, and English as an International Language in connection to issues of marginalization in the field of English teaching and potential change in the future of the profession. The goal of this paper is to provide a detailed description of the core principles of World Englishes, English as a Lingua Franca, and English as an International language as well as critically assess their pedagogical potential in English Language Teaching (ELT).

In the next section, I start with a discussion of the concept of language ideologies and their connection to constantly problematized issues in ELT, such as the native/non-native dichotomy. I

then provide a detailed description of what I call *pro language variation approaches* and argue they represent an option to counteract the negative effects of standard language ideologies in language teaching. Since these approaches are currently gaining momentum in the critical applied linguistics literature, it is important to acknowledge their strengths and weaknesses, and explore the type of scholarly research being done in these areas. Finally, I discuss the pedagogical implications of these paradigms with an emphasis on classroom practice applicability, and changes needed in teacher education programs.

Language Ideologies: What are they? How are they relevant in language education?

Ideologies have historically been the focus of study of anthropologists, philosophers, and sociolinguists. Multiple definitions of ideologies have been discussed, but I will delve into the theory of ideology that defines it as a system of belief (Seliger, 1976 cited in Thompson, 1984). Criticizing the Marxists definition of ideology as *negative and pejorative*, Seliger (1976) presented a more realistic alternative to defining ideologies as present in *all* political belief systems. Friedrich (1989) defines ideologies as a "system of ideas, strategies, tactics, and practical symbols of promoting, perpetuating, or changing a social and cultural order; in brief, it is political ideas in action." (p. 301). Considering that ideologies are not only personal but also social and born out of social phenomena (Paffey, 2012), they cannot be studied in isolation but instead, should be situated within its particular social context (Thompson, 1984). Language ideologies are never unitary, they are grounded in social positions, moral, and political stances, and they are never really only about language (Gal, 2006; Paffey, 2012). They are also complex systems and a usual site of conflict that tends to be unnoticed, taken for granted and not always challenged (Bloommaert, 2006; Mackiney, 2016)

Thompson (1984) discusses three modes by which ideology operates: legitimation, dissimulation, and reification. The first one signifies power being rooted in the notion of legitimacy which is usually appealed to by using the rational ground. The second refers to the inherent feature of ideologies denying or concealing the idea that what benefits a particular group does not necessarily benefit everyone. The final one is about the strategy of naturalizing ideologies in the form of history or common sense. Thompson (1984) clarifies that these modes are not unique – there may be many more that will only be discovered through research in this field – and that they are not mutually exclusive as they sometimes overlap and intersect with each other.

Language itself is an ideologically-defined social practice that constantly indexes ideological processes of dominance and contestation (Irvine & Gal, 2009). Hence, language ideologies are defined as "cultural conceptions about language, its nature, structure and use, and about the place of communicative behavior in social life" (Gal, 2006, p. 179). Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) complement this definition by clarifying that language ideologies are "those cultural presuppositions and metalinguistic notions that name, frame and evaluate linguistic practices, linking them to the political, moral and aesthetic positions of the speakers, and to the institutions that support those positions and practices" (cited in Gal, 2006, p. 163). To put this in simple terms, language ideologies refer to what people believe about language, its use, and its users.

One of the most pervasive language ideologies present in the field of education is standard language ideology (SLI). SLI is defined as a "bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogeneous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 64). SLI refers to the socially constructed idea of the existence of a uniformly consistent variety of a language that is/should be shared by all its users (Lippi-Green, 1997). SLI is very

common in societies where global languages like English, Spanish or French are used, and Milroy (2001) refers to them as *standard language cultures*. People living in these cultures tend to believe that "a homogeneous, standardized, one-size-fits-all language" (Lippi-Green, 1997, p. 65) is not only desirable, but an actual possibility and this idea is heavily instilled not only in society but also in the language education field (Lippi-Green, 1997).

The notion of standard varieties of language becomes problematic as it violates the core principle of language as a pluricentric living organism in constant evolution. To further problematize this construct, Fairclough (2001) refers to standardized language varieties as *mythical national languages* and Lippi-Green (1997) goes even further to refer to them as an idealized version of language that unfortunately only exists in the minds of the speakers. SLI stems from the notion of a lack of uniformity within a language that needs to be fixed with standardization, which can be problematic because if languages were fixed systems by nature, there would not be a need of standardization in the first place. What this means instead is that the core principles of SLI are linked to prestige and power.

Milroy (2001) argues that standard varieties tend to equate with the "'highest prestige variety' rather than with the variety that is characterized by the highest degree of uniformity" (p. 532) meaning that a standard variety may not be the most uniform, but it is instead the one chosen by those in power to be presented as the homogenous language variety used by the general population. A clear example of this can be seen in the use of Castilian Spanish as the variety chosen to represent standard Spanish historically. Castilian Spanish was chosen for purely political reasons and it has been imposed not only in Spain but across Latin America too (Paffey, 2012). It is important to clarify that language varieties on their own cannot carry prestige; it is the speakers of such varieties that are assigned such attributes. Therefore, the prestige, or lack of it, attributed to language varieties is indexical of the social lives of its speakers, which includes social class, race, etc. (Milroy, 2001). Once a language has been promoted as standardized, it is not only viewed as a functional tool but also as an icon of national identity, making it indexical of what a good speaker of this language should look and sound like (Lippi-Green, 1997; Mackiney, 2016).

Language standardization creates a division between those who speak the standard and those outside the community of speakers of the idealized variety (Fairclough, 2001; Paffey, 2012), and this divide is not only associated with language use. Rosa and Flores (2015) coined the term *raciolinguistic ideologies* to describe the phenomenon of standard language varieties in association with racial features of its speakers. Standard varieties tend to be associated with a specific country and the stereotyped version of its citizens.

Rooted in this connection of language variety to national identity, comes another problematic consequence of the perpetuation of SLI. That is, the notion that native speakers – those born in the place where the language is spoken – have undeniable authority and ownership of the standardized language. To refer to this particular belief system, Train (2007) uses the term Native Standard Language which is defined as "a constellation of hegemonic ideologies of language, (non)standardness, and (non)nativeness that has come to define within the dominant culture of standardization the constructed realities of language, community, and identity" (p. 209). The construct of nativeness is incredibly ambiguous on its own, but in standard language cultures, it is even more complicated as this system only confers "privileged native-speakership on users of the standard language" (Train, 2007, p. 213) which may leave a large mass of population as outsiders even within their own countries. This is one of the most pervasive ideologies that affect language teaching, especially in the case of global languages like English and Spanish.

In relation to the maintenance and spread of these ideologies, Paffey (2012) uses the term ideology brokers to refer to ideology creators/enforcers. These creators can come from institutional levels in cases such as language academies or macro level policymakers, but regular language users tend to also be heavy enforcers of standard language ideologies. Milroy (2001) highlights the key role of linguists and other language experts in maintaining the hegemony of standard language ideologies. He claims that traditional linguistic codifications view language under the scope of stability and consistency as an inherent feature of the system, which has historically supported the perpetuation of SLI.

When discussing the direct influence of SLI in the field of ELT, it is important to start with how these ideologies are at the core the ELT industry as a whole. Mahboob (2011) expounds that the industry of ELT has been built at the expense of myths and perpetuation of ideologies that marginalize vast populations. He describes the *English industry* as a multi-million-dollar business that profits on maintaining Western hegemonic interests based on political and economic reasons. Mahboob (2011) estimated the worth of the English textbook industry, which is mostly centered in American or British English, at £5,455 billion at the time of his research, which paints a pretty clear picture of the economic forces that drive ELT towards the notion of Native Standard language. The fastest and further English spreads, the more this industry grows generating a greater need for materials, instruction, and other profit-generating services, and the backbone of this commercialization of language is based on the myth of native standard language.

Native standard language ideologies, even though not always identified as such, have been vastly discussed in the literature of critical applied linguistics with the purpose of explaining the negative effects this brings upon language teachers. Nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2005), similarly described by Phillipson (1997) as the native speaker fallacy, is defined as an established belief in which native-speaker teachers represent Western culture from which the ideals of English language and of English language teaching methodology unequivocally come from. In other words, this is the belief that native-speakers have more authority over the language, hence are more qualified to teach English, and that Western-centric models should, therefore, be the most appropriate teaching models to follow. This pervasive idea generates massive marginalization in ELT, which makes it one of the most damaging ideologies as it positions teachers and students as inherently and unavoidably deficient users of the language based on their place of birth. Nativespeakerism is rooted in the idea that language intuition is only attainable by native speakers; however, this is contradictory to the basic premise, previously discussed, that proposing a standard means a lack of uniformity in the language to begin with. The standard language is only obtained by those who learn it in school, which means it is not innate of the people born in the region where it is spoken, and, just like language learners, native speakers acquire this variety through education (Milroy, 2001).

The pervasiveness of native standard language ideologies in ELT has functioned as a gatekeeping device for Non-native English Speaker Teachers (NNESTs) who tend to be heavily marginalized even though they currently represent an obvious majority in the field. Within ELT, there is an almost ubiquitous notion of an idealized speaker of English from which ethnic and linguistic minorities are automatically excluded (Leung et al.1997 in Norton, 1997, p. 423). These ideal speakers tend to be associated with white monolingual English speakers from Western countries (Norton, 1997), while other minority populations are immediately excluded. Since language ideologies are usually presented as natural and related to common sense, it is not surprising that the so-called non-native speakers play a huge role in reproducing the ideologies that lead them to self-marginalization. Llurda (2009) criticizes the preference of prestigious

standard varieties of English by NNESTs and makes a radical claim saying that NNESTs suffer from something similar to Stockholm syndrome since they continue perpetuating the ideologies that keep oppressing them. Even though these ideologies are deeply ingrained in ELT, there are alternatives for change in the future of the field.

Pro Language Variation Approaches

As an alternative to counteract oppressive views on language use and an attempt to find ways to break the oppression cycle within ELT, there is a scholarship branch within applied linguistics that focuses on defending and promoting the idea of multiple varieties of English that should be recognized as more than defective versions of the native varieties. I will refer to these approaches as "pro language variation" because they actively try to resist Standard Language ideologies by working under four common axioms: 1) Emphasizing the pluricentricity of English; 2) Seeking variety recognition; 3) Accepting language change and adaptation in different or new environments; and 4) Emphasizing discourse strategies for English bilinguals (Pakir, 2009). In this section, I will review their core principles, similarities, differences, strengths, and weaknesses.

Braj Kachru's (1985) World Englishes (WE) was one of the most prominent and revolutionary proposals to language variation approaches at the time. This paradigm intended to move away from the idea of English as a singular standard language variety, acknowledging instead that non-prestigious varieties of English are not pidgins or creole versions of the standard language, but are instead fully-formed languages with syntactic, phonological, and grammatical features of their own. WE scholars believe that as a language is relocated to a new sociolinguistic and sociocultural environment it is nativized, which means that it is fully adapted to the local context, including its linguistics features such as syntax, phonology, morphology, lexicon, etc. (Matsuda, 2012); hence, the plural term *Englishes*. Kachru (1985) introduced the concentric circle model which, at the time, presented a convenient way to capture the multiple functions of English in different parts of the world. The model distributes countries into three circles depending on "the types of spread, patterns of acquisition and the functional domain" of English within the region (Kachru, 1985, p. 12).

The Inner Circle is composed by the historically dominant users of English; countries like Canada, Australia, England, and the United States who also represent the population that is commonly recognized as the native speakers of English. Varieties from the Inner Circle are the most prestigious and widely identified as models for the teaching of English worldwide. Users within this circle have been historically granted the privilege of English ownership and are recognized as the norm-providers of the language (Kachru, 1985).

The Outer Circle is formed by countries like India, Singapore, Hong Kong and Nigeria, where English spread because of colonization and has an institutional historically set role that allows for intranational communication in the language. English in the Outer Circle has "an extended functional *range* in a variety of social, educational, administrative and literary domains" (Kachru, 1985, p. 13) that has led to a nativization process. Regions in the Outer Circle tend to have conflicts between linguistic norms and linguistic behavior, which makes them norm-developing, meaning they are both endonormative (i.e., they follow local linguistic features) and exonormative (i.e., they adopt linguistic features from outside).

Finally, the Expanding Circle represents countries like Brazil, China, Germany, and Indonesia in which English does not have extended institutional functions, but it is often taught as the most popular foreign language (often mandatory) in educational settings. This is the circle where the massive spread of English as a global language is most evident as English has wide

symbolic power in areas like advertising, marketing, and pop culture (Matsuda, 2012). Kachru (1985) clarified that the Expanding and Outer circles are difficult to demarcate because they share multiple characteristics. Furthermore, the status of English as a second versus a foreign language can rapidly change depending on language policies, enabling the transition of countries from the Expanding to the Outer Circle. Even though he clarifies the boundaries between these two circles can become unclear, Kachru (1985) described the Expanding Circle as norm-dependent meaning that, in his view, users in these regions function under exonormativity only.

At the time, and still for some, Kachru's (1985) ideas were revolutionary and provocative as he was trying to rebel against the historically imposed power of the Inner Circle varieties of English. Quirk (1990) even labeled his approach as *liberation linguistics*. Kachru's contribution to the field of language learning and teaching was immense as his WE paradigm was incredibly effective in drawing attention away from the Inner Circle for the first time. Beyond that, it is thanks to Kachru and the scholars following his paradigm that many Outer Circle varieties are now recognized as more than "bastard offsprings of English" (Park & Wee, 2012, p. 19). However, authors such as Marlina (2014) clarify that even though the concentric circle model proposed a more accurate perspective on the global use of English, it is not fully applicable in today's postmodern era due to the increased human mobility across the globe. Given the mass migrations, it is not truly accurate to talk about linguistic homogeneity within the countries in the concentric circles as the more English spreads, the more varieties will arise (Marlina, 2014). In the same way, Park and Wee (2012) mention that the biggest weakness of Kachru's model is that it links English varieties to national identities as they are "perceived and distributed within national boundaries" which doesn't "account for the heterogeneity and dynamics of English as it is used within the boundaries of each country" (p. 19).

Another big criticism of this paradigm comes from the type of studies being done by WE scholars who acknowledge sociolinguistic aspects of language variation but tend to provide normative linguistic codification of Englishes as the core of their studies (e.g. Britain, 2010; Garesh, 2006; Mendis & Rambukwella, 2010). Typical studies within WE focus on describing linguistic features of Outer or Expanding Circle Englishes by contrasting local patterns of language use with 'standard' British or American Englishes to demonstrate variation/nativization of the language in the described region. Kachru, Kachru, and Nelson (2006) and Kirkpatrick (2010) in their handbooks of World Englishes are full of examples of linguistic descriptions of nativized Englishes (e.g. Bautista & Gonzalez 2006; Schmied, 2006; Ling, 2010; Zhichang, 2010), which are clearly important contributions to the language variation academic discussion but tend to be seen as problematic as well. This type of scholarship has been problematized for two main reasons: first, because it tends to only focus on Outer Circle varieties positioning the Expanding Circle as inferior (Hino, 2012; Marlina, 2014; Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012); second, because they create the impression of a *single* English variety that can be developed and spoken within a country or geographical region (Canagarajah 1999; Jenks & Lee, 2016; Mahboob & Liang, 2014).

The neglect of Expanding Circle varieties even began with Kachru's (1985) original proposal where, as mentioned before, he describes the Expanding Circle as unquestionably norm-dependent since his model only recognizes nativization in settings where English has an institutionalized role (Kachru, 1992). This principle originally led a lot of WE scholars to disregard Expanding Circle Englishes positioning the speakers in these countries as passive language users only expected to imitate native speakers from the Inner Circle (Hino, 2009 in Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012). Hino (2009) criticizes this principle claiming that "the World Englishes paradigm creates a hierarchy that privileges the Inner and Outer Circles in the same way that the traditional monolithic

view of English, which the World Englishes challenged, privileges the Inner Circle varieties" (as cited in Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012, p. 20).

The perceived homogeneity in the linguistic descriptions of Englishes based on the concentric circle model is further problematized as it inherently carries the danger of "reifying the stark distinction between native and non-native speakers due to its dependence on clearly distinguishable categories of nationhood as a basis for description" (Park & Wee, 2012, p. 19). Providing rigid linguistic principles of Englishes can give the impression that they are in a way a standard form within the nativized language variety, which can be seen as contradictory to the intended resistance to the hegemony of prestigious Standard Englishes from the Inner Circle. Canagarajah (1999) argues that even though it is very important to explore the unique linguistic features used within regions, they cannot/should not be presented in a way that denies the existence of different varieties within varieties. Likewise, Mahboob and Liang (2014) criticize the methodological approaches being used under the WE paradigm considering it too simplistic and impractical. The authors acknowledge the value of language-internal descriptions but claim that "there seems to be little effort made to understand the semiotics of these variations, how widely they are used in that particular variety, in what contexts are they usually found, and/or how they relate to other varieties of English" (Mahboob & Liang, 2014, p. 125). They claim that there is now a significant number of descriptions of Englishes, which are indeed interesting, but have little application or use, which may be the reason why WE studies are not seen as significant contributions to language theories yet.

As an alternative to the gaps within the WE paradigm emerged the scholarship on English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). The term Lingua Franca is not innovative on its own since it has been historically used for many other languages. Seidlhofer (2005) states that under this paradigm, a lingua franca is described as a language used for communication by users who do not share a mother tongue or common culture. In this context, the term is used to particularly describe English as a global language used for specific communication among the so-called non-natives. ELF shares the core values of Kachru's (1985) paradigm by acknowledging the pluricentric nature on English and defending language variation and ownership outside of the Inner Circle. However, Lingua franca English is not necessarily described as a specific variety but instead as a combination of multiple varieties that were merged to fulfill the purpose of intelligibility in particular contexts at an international level (Jenkins, 2009).

ELF studies started rising in the 1990s with the purpose of describing the linguistic features of English interactions between non-natives with the ultimate purpose of disputing the idea of a standard variety of English coming only from native speakers. Instead, ELF, as a paradigm, acknowledges the linguistic nativization of English regardless of location, based on its current global status (Dewey & Jenkins, 2010). Scholars following this paradigm mostly focus on Expanding Circle users and approach their descriptions from a descriptive linguistic perspective (Dewey & Jenkins, 2010). This way, ELF positions Expanding Circle users of English not as outsiders trying/expected to imitate native speaker varieties, like WE is claimed to do, but as *languagers* who are fully involved and engaged in English language use and transformation (Seidlhofer, 2009).

By analyzing and describing non-native to non-native naturally-occurring interactions in multiple settings, ELF scholars describe the English of proficient speakers whose innovations are systematically different from native speaker forms, seeing these changes not as errors but as examples of language creativity and ownership (Dewey & Jenkins, 2010). In contrast to the methodology used in some WE studies, ELF researchers explore and explain English use in "its

own terms rather than by comparison with some kind of British or North American yardstick" (Dewey & Jenkins, 2010, p. 73). Seidlhofer (2006) claims that the ELF paradigm is making the groundbreaking change of contributing to, rather than denying, the diversity of Englishes around the globe. She claims that even though there needs to be some linguistic common ground (e.g. a number of 'core' features) among ELF users to facilitate mutual intelligibility, the way in which ELF approaches language description still leaves a vast scope for regional variation.

The methodological core of ELF research draws from corpus linguistics to report on second language interactions in natural settings. Currently, there are two major corpora that specifically report on the use of English as a lingua franca in the Expanding Circle: the *Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (VOICE) (Seidlhofer, 2001) and the *English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings Corpus* (ELFA) (Mauranen, 2003). Both projects come from European universities and, at least at this stage, report only on interactions from users of English mostly within Europe. These projects are the base of ELF research and their final versions, both published fairly recently (2013 and 2008 respectively), are used to describe second language use in Expanding Circle contexts to better understand the nature of the ELF phenomenon (Seidlhofer, 2005).

Empirical studies under this paradigm have found linguistic transformations currently and continually occurring in the way English is being spoken in the Expanding Circle. According to Cogo and Dewey (2007), the ELF phenomenon has important linguistic implications as "pragmatic motives often lead to changes in the lexis and grammar, and in turn lexicogrammatical innovations [that] have significant impact on pragmatic norms and strategies" (p. 87). Dewey (2007) reports on typical features of lexicogrammar innovation that occurs naturally in ELF talk such as user exploitation of redundancy and omission of non-essential items. The author found widespread use of the zero article in contexts where 'native' Standard Englishes would require the definite article; yet the frequency with which this occurred and the fact that the definite article serves no communicative purpose, lead Dewey (2007) to conclude that "this is not an item simply being omitted, but rather a resource being deployed in different and innovative ways" (p. 84). In the same way, Jenkins (2002) reports on the phonological innovations explaining that the 'th' sounds /ð/ /ɵ/, commonly regarded as very difficult for non-native speakers, are no longer necessary for intelligibility as they have been dropped or modified by language users and this does not impede communication. The same happens for grammatical features like third person singular present tense marking of '-s' which is now considered an anomaly even in Inner Circle varieties (Dewey, 2007; Jenkins, 2002).

Even though ELF studies are addressing the neglect of English varieties in the Expanding Circle and offer a less normative description of language variation, this paradigm is heavily criticized for its perpetuation of elitist ideologies and its lack of practicality in ELT contexts. The concept of a lingua franca has historically been related to elite members of society (Mckay, 2002), which is a primary cause of tension towards this paradigm. Park and Wee (2012) make a very compelling argument by explaining that the ELF corpora only collect data and describe English usage from privileged members of the English-speaking community such as international businessmen, academics, employees of multinational companies, and English teachers. By only describing English usage within these privileged spheres, ELF is promoting the idea of a target proficiency level based on standards that may not be attainable by all users. This reduces the opportunity of viewing ELF as a practical paradigm for English teaching; how can we, for example, expect a student from a rural school to attain the same level of English proficiency as the CEO of a multinational company who constantly travels around the globe? Furthermore,

promoting this view of English use is similar to standard language ideologies in the sense that the language described as the ideal is that of an educated elite (Park & Wee, 2012).

Another heavily debated feature of ELF is the exclusion of native speakers and speakers of Inner/Outer Circle varieties in general from their corpora with the concern of data "pollution". The VOICE corpus only included in their data less than 7% of interactions where native speakers were involved because interactions with non-natives alter or damage the authentic use of ELF in the particular contexts described (VOICE, 2009). Interactions with Inner Circle users are "restricted to ensure that they do not distort the data with a surplus of ENL forms or (unwittingly) act as norm-providers, making the other speakers feel under pressure to speak like them" (Jenkins, 2009, p. 2001). This is particularly problematic because it is a very purist position for a paradigm claiming to challenge purist ideologies of language (Park & Wee, 2012). Even though most interactions in English nowadays do occur between non-natives, it is not realistic to simply ignore prestigious or native varieties or expect no interaction between these populations (Park & Wee, 2012). Jenkins (2009) also claims ELF does not exclude native speakers as a form of marginalization, but this simply happens because it is outside the scope of their research interests, which focuses on Englishes in the Expanding Circle only.

Acknowledging the shortcomings of WE and ELF, another group of scholars proposed the English as an international language (EIL) paradigm, which encompasses the core values of both paradigms while having a more pedagogically-aimed scope. EIL is defined by Sharifian (2009) as "a paradigm for thinking, research and practice" (p. 2) that arose in applied linguistics and TESOL in response to the complexities associated with the spread of English as a global or international language. EIL embraces the Kachruvian concentric circle model (Kachru, 1985) but it recognizes its limitations and weaknesses based on the current status of English around the world, which is why they propose a different term (Marlina, 2014; McKay, 2002; Sharifian, 2009). When it comes to differentiating from ELF, EIL moves from the elitist confinements of the lingua franca concept by associating English use with multiple levels of society and not just with a privileged few (McKay, 2002).

The conception of English as an international language comes from the three principles presented by Smith (1976): 1) learners do not internalize the cultural norms of the native speakers; 2) an international language is 'de-nationalized' removing ownership from specific nations; and 3) this language is learned with the ultimate purpose of sharing users' ideas and cultures with others (McKay, 2002). These principles are a far better match to the current realities of English presenting an inclusive and realistic perspective to language use. Sharifian (2009) clarifies that placing the emphasis on international usage breaks the prominence on the native/non-native dichotomy making this paradigm fully inclusive. Furthermore, Llurda (2009) presents the EIL paradigm as a potential source of empowerment to NNESTs since it gives full ownership of the language to *all* competent users regardless of the variety they speak. This could counter the stigma of NNESTs being positioned in a perennial state of language learning that takes away their recognition as legitimate language users (Llurda, 2009).

Delimiting the differences between EIL and the other two paradigms is a bit controversial as some scholars see EIL as a completely unique paradigm on its own (e.g. Sharifian, 2009; Mastuda, 2012; Marlina, 2014), while others see it as an umbrella term that encompasses the best of WE and ELF under a slightly different scope (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017). Sharifian (2009), for example, completely disregards the link of EIL with ELF by stating that EIL completely rejects the idea of English used as a single lingua franca variety while it acknowledges a major proximity to WE, stating that both paradigms contribute to make each other more relevant. On the other hand,

authors like Hino (2012) and Friedrich (2012) claim that the WE paradigm is not apt to describe the current realities of English use in the world, so they align instead with the idea of Englishes across the world being part of the ELF phenomenon. Hino (2012) expounds that EIL is clearly different from WE as intranational or domestic use of English is not seen as a relevant factor that may impede the process of nativization of Englishes. In an attempt to take a more neutral approach to the debate, Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017) explain that the definition of EIL is still under construction but that it is irrefutably "an umbrella term that incorporates orientations about the different roles of English around the world (most notably, WE and ELF)" (p. 6).

In terms of research methodology, EIL borrows techniques from sociolinguistics and applied linguistics while at the same time welcoming emerging approaches from qualitative research like narrative inquiry (Sharifian, 2009). EIL studies are fundamentally connected to the WE principles using it as part of their theoretical framework (Bayyurt & Altinmakas, 2012; D'Angelo, 2012; Lee, 2012); however, they also occasionally rely on ELF methodologies such as using corpus linguistics (Hino, 2012; 2017). The purpose of EIL scholarship is not to describe linguistic features of English varieties or to favor any of the varieties within the Concentric Circle model. This paradigm instead focuses on the practical matters that influence language use and language teaching (Sharifian, 2009).

The importance of the paradigms and issues discussed so far is widely acknowledged, but there is still some skepticism on how applicable these concepts truly are in language teaching practices. The three approaches discussed in this section potentially represent a major shift in terms of pedagogies used in ELT, however, EIL is the one that directly attempts to make the most contributions to the field of English language learning and teaching. Hence, using the term EIL as proposed by Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017), I will finish this paper with pedagogically-relevant examples of the contributions of EIL scholars and potential pedagogical implications they bring to the field of ELT.

Pedagogical Implications of Pro Language Variation Approaches

Even though the pedagogical frameworks proposed by pro language variation approaches have been described with multiple terms – e.g. ELF-aware pedagogy (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2015), teaching EIL (Matsuda, 2012), (WE)-informed ELT (Matsuda,2017) – EIL scholarship has a lot of commonalities (Matsuda, 2017). As clarified by Alsagoff (2012), for example, "the literature on EIL, however diverse in opinion, is united in the desire to move away from teaching for native-speaker competence" (p. 116). In the same way, Matsuda (2017) explains that regardless of the term used, scholars working under these paradigms agree that the *messy* state of English nowadays calls for significant reconstruction of the normative ways in which ELT has conceptualized English and its use. Matsuda (2017) states that another shared principle is the need to find ways to prepare teachers and students for this *messiness,* which calls for more adequate pedagogical approaches. For this pedagogical innovation to happen, the issue is being approached from two primary angles: classroom practice applicability and needed changes in terms of teacher education.

Most of the conceptual claims made by pro language variation approaches are accepted and valued at this point; however, there is uncertainty on how applicable these principles are in classroom practice (Matsuda, 2012). One of the primary challenges can be the decision of what variety to teach in the English classroom. Should teachers choose a local variety only? Should they create awareness on varieties, or still just teach Inner Circle Englishes? Matsuda and Friedrich (2012) examine the difficulty of these questions and explain there is no definite or correct answer for them. They give teachers 3 options: 1) teach the international variety of English; 2) teach

speaker's own variety of English; and 3) teach an established variety of English. These authors explain that choosing any of these options has pros and cons and it is not an easy choice to make. Teaching the international variety of English, according to Matsuda and Friedrich (2012), would mean trying to teach common set of principles that would lead students to intelligible and successful English communication in international contexts. This option would be validated by ELF literature and the VOICE and ELFA corpora would be good resources for this type of teaching practice. However, this choice can be problematic because the use of English as a lingua franca in international settings is context-specific and "negotiated by each set of speakers for their particular purposes" (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012, p. 18).

The option of teaching the speaker's own variety of English is very thought-provoking. Matsuda and Friedrich (2012) explain that, thanks to the linguistic codification of Outer Circle Englishes done by WE scholars, it would be possible to teach local language varieties (e.g. teach Indian English in Indian schools). However, this option is not limited to the Outer Circle only. An example of pedagogically-relevant studies following this option, is the work of Hino (2012) and his Model of Japanese English (MJE) which he defines as "English for expressing Japanese values in international communication" (p. 30). MJE has phonological, grammatical, lexical, and discursive features specifically adapted to the sociocultural realities of Japan. This model was designed and implemented with the purpose of demonstrating the possibility and need for endonormative production models in the Expanding Circle since conventional Anglo-American models deprive Japanese students of their cultural identities (Hino, 2012). The issue that may rise from this option is that the available models are very limited as the literature on Expanding Circle Englishes is very thin (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012).

The final option is to select an established variety of English as the dominant instructional variety. Matsuda and Friedrich (2012) clarify that even though this option may sound as a favoring one to Inner Circle Englishes, what they propose is the selection of *any* established English variety that is widely codified and used for a wide variety of communication functions to be presented in the classroom *along* with other varieties. The authors clarify that this selection would be determined by the course goals and students' needs along with other important aspects such as the availability of teaching materials, teacher's linguistic repertoires, and societal acceptance of language variation. Also addressing the complexity of these choices, Matsuda and Matsuda (2010) argue that bringing WE-informed pedagogies in the classroom does not mean having to dismiss the idea of teaching Inner Circle standard varieties or completely dismissing prestigious varieties. The point of engaging in these discussions is mostly to create awareness and slowly adapt to a more appropriate teaching model to match the massive spread of English around the world and meet the local needs of the language users. Regardless of the option teachers choose, it is important for students to understand that the English variety they are learning is one out many others with equal value (Matsuda & Friedrich, 2012).

Besides choosing an instructional English variety, another difficult decision teachers have to make is in terms of appropriate teaching methodologies. As discussed in the standard language ideology section, there is a common trend among NNESTs to favor Inner Circle English varieties and Western-centric methodologies, which tends to make teachers feel that one of their responsibilities is to serve as custodian of standard English (Bayyurt, 2006; Sifakis & Sougary, 2005). That feeling, in turn, leads to the preference of Inner Circle teaching methodologies to be considered the most appropriate one for all contexts (Llurda, 2014; Mckay, 2002). As stated by Seidlhofer (1999):

> Most practical matters which impinge directly in teacher's daily practice, such as textbooks, reference works, supplementary materials, examinations and qualifications still make almost exclusive reference to notions of the native speaker culture as the (uncontaminated?) source providing the language to be taught (Seidlhofer, 1999, p. 234).

One of the core principles of EIL-informed pedagogies is a call for NNESTs to assume ownership not only of the English language, but also of the methods used to teach it (Mckay, 2002). Mckay (2002) argues that bilingual English teachers should not have the need to look at Inner Circle countries to provide for target models of English instruction; they should instead focus on developing their own models based on local needs. Western-centric models like communicative language teaching (CLT) have been proven to not be appropriate in certain Expanding Circle countries as they do not match the cultural expectations of in-classroom practice (e.g. Ellis, 1996). Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) coined the term *pedagogy of appropriation* to discuss the importance/need for language teachers to claim ownership over the pedagogies they choose to use in the classroom. These localized on language pedagogies will provide a more appropriate learning environment that can potentially empower both teachers and students as language users (Mckay, 2002; Llurda, 2014).

Mckay (2012) lists five key principles for EIL material development. First, EIL materials need to be relevant within their particular learning contexts. This principle touches on the issue of authenticity, challenging the traditional view that authentic materials are only those coming from native speakers. Instead, Mckay (2012) explains that authentic materials in the EIL context are any type of materials that are appropriate for the students' level of proficiency, learning objectives, and social context. The second principle states that EIL materials should include examples of the diversity of English varieties used nowadays in order to give equal status to all varieties and promote awareness of variation in English use. Third, EIL materials should exemplify L2-L2 interactions, specially of users from the Expanding Circle, as this will give students a more realistic perspective of language use since the majority of English interactions currently occur between L2 users. Fourth, EIL materials should give full recognition to other languages spoken by English users in order to break the historical tendency of portraying English users as monolingual. This principle also encourages the promotion of codeswitching and first language use as a means of developing English proficiency. Finally, Mckay (2012) clarifies in her fifth principle that EIL should be taught in a way that respects the local culture of learning, which makes local teachers the ideal developers of teaching materials since they are familiar with local expectations regarding the roles of teachers and students. If followed, these principles could "hopefully encourage the kind of language learning that results in competent users of English" (Mckay, 2012, p. 80) who are fully aware of English' great diversity and status as an international mean of communication.

For the previously discussed pedagogical changes to happen, teachers need to be aware of these issues and need to be properly trained to address them. The role of teacher education programs in perpetuating SLI has been vastly discussed and problematized (Llurda, 2009; Mahboob, 2017; Matsuda 2017; Nunan, 2017; Varguese, 2017) with the purpose of generating an urgent change at the very core of the profession. Dogancay-Aktuna and Hardman (2012) call for expanding teachers' professional development to include the necessary awareness of the diversity of English varieties across the globe. Seidlhofer (2004) problematizes teacher education programs as usually preparing educators with a set of restricted pre-formulated techniques that are not comprehensive enough within the current context of English use.

Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017) talk about the importance of implementing EIL-aware teacher education by claiming that the purpose of their proposal is not to indoctrinate teachers into believing in the EIL construct, but they instead aim to prompt "ESOL teachers to grow into more autonomous, independent, critical practitioners, capable of deciding on the extent to which they integrate EIL issues in their own teaching context" (p. 8). Bayyurt and Sifakis' (2017) proposal involves three phases:

> a) exposing teachers to the intricacies of the global spread of English and the multiplicities of communicative contexts it today's global reality; b) raising their awareness of the challenges those intricacies can have for their own teaching context in a critical and practical way; and c) involving them in an action plan that would help them to integrate elements from EIL, ELF, and WE research they deem important and relevant for their own context (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017, p. 7).

Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017) see their proposal as a way for teachers to grow not only personally but also professionally. EIL-aware teacher education is applicable for both native and nonnative teachers and it is presented as possible way to empower NNESTS as these ideas "may help them see their value as NNEST in the post-EFL world" (Bayyurt & Sifakis, 2017, p. 15).

In a similar way, Dogancay-Aktuna and Hardman (2017) present a *Meta-Praxis* framework to incorporate EIL principles in teacher education programs. Their model looks at teacher education "in terms of an interaction between *place, proficiency, praxis,* and a set of *understandings* about language, culture, identity, and teaching that are relevant to teaching EIL" (Dogancay-Aktuna & Hardman, 2017, p. 21). These authors believe that their model will give teachers a more accurate perspective on the current sociolinguistic profile of English, which will expand their views in terms of proficiency in the language and relevance of these issues in their particular contexts. Their model also aims to integrate teacher thought, teacher identity, and classroom action.

Besides theorizing the pedagogical models of teacher education, EIL scholars have also empirically implemented these ideas in teacher education programs (graduate and undergraduate) (e.g. Bayyurt & Altinmakas, 2012; Galloway, 2017; Selvi, 2017; Sharifian & Marlina 2012). Bayyurt and Altinmakas (2012) developed and implemented an English oral communication course using EIL principles at a Turkish university. When they began the term, their students had almost no awareness of English varieties besides Inner Circle ones; however, at the end of the course, students indicated they had enjoyed learning about language variation and World Englishes, and this project resulted in institutional changes in terms of how English classes are currently designed. These practical changes in teacher education programs could create a big difference in the future of ELT. A good example could be the department of EIL in Monash University in Australia, which incorporates the EIL/WE paradigms into the courses/degrees they offer (Sharifian & Marlina, 2012). This EIL program currently has approximately 250 students (including graduate programs) and it offers undergraduate courses such as EIL3102: World Englishes, EIL3210: Writing Across Cultures, and EIL2120: Language and Globalization. At the postgraduate level, this program offers courses such as EIL4401: English in International Professional Contexts, EIL4404: Issues in Teaching English as an International Language, and EIL5001: Research Project in EIL.

Even though the pedagogical uses of pro language variation approaches still need further development and investigation, this branch of scholarship demonstrates incredible potential for reinventing the ELT field. What EIL/ELF/WE scholars are proposing is not a complete reinvention

of English structures, but an adaptation to the contextual realities of the students and the teachers. Forcing students to acquire and use language features that only work in particular contexts and have absolutely no meaning for them, is not practical and it could be even seen as unfair. In the same way, as previously discussed, EIL/ELF/WE-informed pedagogies represent a potential source of empowerment for both teachers and learners in the Expanding Circle, which could eventually stop the marginalization they face in the field, and possibly change the circulating discourses that perpetuate standard language ideologies.

REFERENCES

Adamo, G. (2005). Globalization, terrorism, and the English language in Nigeria. *English Today, 21*, 4, 21-26.

Alsagoff, L. (2012). Another Book on EIL? Heralding the Need for New Ways of Thinking, Doing, and Being. In Alsagoff, L., Mckay, S., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. (2012) *Principles and Practices for Teaching English as an International Language.* New York: Routledge.

Bautista, M. & Gonzalez, A. (2006). Southeast Asian Englishes. In Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Bayyurt, Y. & Altinmakas, N. (2012). A World Englishes course at a foundation university in Turkey. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bayyurt, Y. & Sifakis, N. (2015). Developing and ELF-Aware Pedagogy: Insights from a self-education programme. In Vettorel, P. (2015) *New Frontiers in Teaching and Learning English.* Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Bayyurt, Y. & Sifakis, N. (2017). Foundations of an EIL-aware Teacher Education. In Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Bayyurt, Y. (2006). Non-native English Language Teachers' Perspective on Culture in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms. *Teacher Development, 10*(2), 233-247.

Blommaert J (2006), Language Ideology. In: Keith Brown,. *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics.* (2nd ed., Vol. 6, pp. 510-522). Oxford: Elsevier.

Britain, D. (2010). Grammatical variation in the contemporary spoken English of England. In Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results. In Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, N.J: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Canagarajah, S. (2013). Redefining Proficiency in Global English. In N. Zacharias & C. Manara, *Conceptualizing the Pedagogy of English as an International Language: Issues and Tensions* (1st ed.). Newscastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cogo, A. & Dewey, M. (2006) Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies 5*(2),

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed). Cambridge: England: Cambridge University Press.

D'Angelo, J. (2012). WE-Informed EIL curriculum at Chukyo: Towards a Functional Educated, Multilingual Outcome. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dewey, M. & Jenkins, J. (2010). English as a Lingua Franca in the Global Context: Interconnectedness, Variation and Change. In Saxena, M., & Omoniyi, T. (2010). *Contending with globalization in world Englishes*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Dewey, M. (2007) English as a Lingua Franca and globalization: An interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 17(3), 332–354.

Dogankay-Aktuna, S. & Hardman, J. (2012). Teacher Education for EIL: Working Toward a Situated Meta-Praxis. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dogankay-Aktuna, S. & Hardman, J. (2017). A Framework for Incorporating an English as an International Language Perspective into TESOL Teacher Education. In Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

ELFA 2008. The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings. Director: Anna Mauranen. http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorpus. (07/20/2018).

Ellis, G. (1996). How Culturally Appropriate is the Communicative Approach?. *ELT Journal, 50*(3), 213-224.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Pearson Education.

Friedrich, P. (2012). ELF, Intercultural Communication and the Strategic Aspect of Communicative Competence. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gal, S. (2006). Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of practices and publics. *Social Anthropology, 14*(2), 163-181.

Galloway, N. (2017). Global Englishes for Language Teaching: Preparing MSc TESOL Students to Teach in a Globalized World. In Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Garesh, R. (2006). South Asian Englishes. In Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Hino, N. (2012) Endonormative Models of EIL for the Expanding Circle. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hino, N. (2017). Training Graduate Students in Japan to be EIL Teachers. In Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Holliday, A. (2005). *The Struggle to teach English as an international language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irvine, J., & Gal, S. (2009). *Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. Linguistic anthropology: A reader*, 402-434.

Jenkins, J. (2002) A Sociolinguistically Based, Empirically Researched Pronunciation Syllabus for English as an International Language. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(1), 83–103.

Jenkins, J. (2009), English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*: 200–207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01582.x

Jenks, C., & Lee, J. (2016). Heteroglossic ideologies in world Englishes: an examination of the Hong Kong context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 384-402.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In Randolph Quirk and Henry G. Widdowson (1985) (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2009). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge handbook of world Englishes.* London: Routledge.

Kramsch, C. & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate Pedagogy. *ELT Journal, 50.* 199-212.

Lee, H. (2012). World Englishes in a High School English Class: A Case from Japan. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lee, H. (2012). World Englishes in a High School English Class: A Case for Japan. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Ling, L. (2010). English in Singapore and Malaysia: differences and similarities. In Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent Language, Ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 314-323. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2004.00068.x

Llurda, E. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an International Language: The Pervasiveness of Native Models among L2 Users and Teachers. In Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an*

international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mackinney, E. (2016). Language Ideologies and Bilingual Realities: The Case of Coral Way. In Nancy H., H. (2016). *Honoring Richard Ruiz And His Work On Language Planning And Bilingual Education.* Clevedon, Unknown: Multilingual Matters.

Mahboob, A. (2011). English: The Industry. *Journal of Postcolonial Cultures and Societies, 2*(4).

Mahboob, A. (2017). Recognizing the local in language teacher identity. In Barkhuizen, G. (2017). *Reflections on language teacher identity research*. New York: Routledge.

Mahboob, A., & Liang, J. (2014). Researching and Critiquing World Englishes. *Asian Englishes, 16*(2), 125-140.

Marlina, R. (2014). Chapter One: The Pedagogy of English As An International Language (EIL): More Reflections and Dialogues. In Marlina, R., & In Giri, R. A. (2014). *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Perspectives from scholars, teachers, and students.* New York: Springer.

Matsuda, A. & Friedrich, P. (2011), English as an International Language: A Curriculum Blueprint. *World Englishes, 30*, 332–344. Doi:10.1111/J.1467-971x.2011.01717.X

Matsuda, A. & Matsuda, P. K. (2010), World Englishes and the Teaching of Writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*, 369–374. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.222222

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international* language. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mckay, S. (2012). Teaching Materials for English as an International Language. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mendis, D. & Rambukwella, H. (2010). Sri Lankan Englishes. In Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics 5*(4), 530-555.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL quarterly*, 409-429.

Nunan, D. (2017). Language teacher identity in teacher education. In Barkhuizen, G. (2017). *Reflections on language teacher identity research*. New York: Routledge.

Paffey, D. (2012). *Language Ideologies and the Globalization of 'Standard' Spanish.* Bloomsbury Academic.

Pakir, A. (2009). English as a lingua franca: analyzing research frameworks in international English, world Englishes, and ELF. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 224-235. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971x.2009.01585.x

Park, S., & Wee, L. (2012). *Markets of English: Linguistic capital and language policy in a globalizing world.* New York: Routledge.

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

Quirk, R. (1990). Language Varieties and Standard Language. *JALT Journal, 11*(1), pp. 14-25

Rosa, J., Flores, N. (2015). Undoing Appropriateness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies and Language Diversity in Education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Schmied, J. (2006). East African Englishes. In Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double Standards: Teacher Education in the Expanding Circle. *World Englishes,18*(2), 233-245. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-971x.00136

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research Perspectives on Teaching English as a Lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 209-239.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a Lingua Franca. *Elt Journal, 59,* 4, 339-341.

Seidlhofer, B. (2006) English as a Lingua Franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't. In R. Rubdy and M. Saraceni (eds) *English in the World: Global Rules, Global Roles* (pp. 40–50). London: Continuum.

Seidlhofer, B. (2009), Common ground and Different Realities: World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca*. World Englishes, 28,* 236–245. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01592.x

Selvi, A. (2017). Preparing Teachers to Teach English as an International Language: Reflections from Northern Cyprus. In Matsuda, A. (2017). *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sharifian & Marlina (2012). English as an International Language: An Innovative Academic Program. In Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sharifian, F. (2009). English as an International Language: An Overview. In Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sifakis, N. & Sougari, A. (2005). Pronunciation Issues and EIL Pedagogy in the Periphery: A Survey on Greek State Schools Teacher's Beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly, 39*(4), 467-488.

Smith, L. (1976). English as an International Auxiliary Language. *RELC Journal, 7*(2), 38-43.

Thompson, J. (1984). *Theories of Ideology and Methods of discourse analysis. In Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Train, R. (2007). "Real Spanish:" Historical Perspectives on the Ideological Construction of a (Foreign) Language. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*, 207-235.

Varghese, M. (2017) Language Teacher Educator Identity and Language Teacher Identity. In Barkhuizen, G. (2017). *Reflections on language teacher identity research.* New York: Routledge.

VOICE. 2009. The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (version 1.0 online). Director: Barbara Seidlhofer; Researchers: Angelika Breiteneder, Theresa Klimpfinger, Stefan Majewski, Marie-Luise Pitzl. http://voice.univie.ac.at (07/26/2018).

Zhichang, X. (2010). Chinese English: a future power?. In Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge.