Some (Re)views on ELT Research:
With Reference to World Englishes
and/or English Lingua Franca*

Myongwon Cho

(Chonnam National University)

Cho, Myongwon. 2002. Some (Re)views on ELT Research: With Reference to World Englishes and/or English Lingua Franca. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 2-1, 123-147. As far as the recent ELT research concerned, it seems to have been no hot 'theoretical' issues, but 'practical' ones in general: e.g., learners and learning, components of proficiency, correlates of L2 learning, etc. This paper focuses on the theme given above, with a special reference to the sub-title: specifically, 1) World English, world Englishes and world's lingua franca; 2) ENL, ESL and EFL; 3) Grammars, style manuals, dictionaries and media; 4) Pronunciation models: RP, BBC model and General American, Network Standard; 5) Lexical, grammatical variations and discourse grammars; 6) Beliefs and subjective theories in foreign language research; 7) Dilemma among radical, canonical and eclectic views. In conclusion, the author offers a modest proposal: we need to appeal to our own experience, intention, feeling and purpose, that is, our identity to express "our own selves" in our contexts toward the world anywhere, if not sounding authentic enough, but producing it plausibly well. It is time for us (with our ethno-cultural autonomy) to need to be complementary to and parallel with its native speakers' linguistic-cultural authenticity in terms of the broadest mutual understanding.

1. World English, World Englishes and World's Lingua Franca

English is only one language out of so many ones (approx. from 5000 to 7000) on earth,[1] and yet there have been ingenious

---

arguments over defining, redefining and re-redefining varieties of English. One of the latest review articles (McArthur 2001) states that the current condition of the English language worldwide is defined as 'both straightforward and convoluted.' According to him, it is straightforward in that English is now widely agreed to be *the* global lingua franca; it is convoluted in that the term *lingua franca* has traditionally referred to low-level makeshift languages, whereas English is a vast complex whose 'innumerable clearly distinguishable varieties' .... Thus, we will see below his somewhat thorough review of term definitions of English as a world language.

1. Global English: a term that emerged in the 1990s, following the increased use of the words *global, globalize, globalization*, etc. 'The future of global English' (title of closing chapter, *English as a global language*, Crystal 1997); 'Recentering English: New English and Global English' (title of an article, Toolan 1997); "In the case of Global, its non-English majority of users are increasingly claiming ownership of it." (Toolan 1997).

2. Global language: a late-20c term used everywhere on earth. "It has become the language of the planet, the first truly global language." (McCrum et al. 1986); *English as a global language* (Crystal 1997).

3. International English: the English language, usually but not necessarily in its standard form, either when used, taught, and studied as a LINGUA FRANCA throughout the world. "[I]t is difficult to predict the shape of international English in the twenty-first century. But it seems likely that more rather than less standardization will result ... all need to be in control of two standard Englishes; the one which gives us our national and

---

[1]According to Crystal (2000:627), "The designation 'language' status is ... dependent on a wide variety of social, linguistic, and political considerations, and as a result, estimates of the number of living languages in the world (usually ranging between 5000 and 7000) are inevitably uncertain, and should be accepted with caution."

local identity, and the other which puts us in touch with the rest of human race." (Crystal 1988, *The English language*); '*International English* in the global village' (title of an article, Modiano 1999, *English Today*).

4. International language: sometimes international auxiliary language. A language, natural, or artificial, used for general communication among the nations of the world. "English, being an international language, has a unique place in the modern world." (letter, *The Sunday Statesman*, Delhi 1985); "The success of English in its function as an international auxiliary language ..." (Görlach 1988, *An historic tongue*).

5. International Standard English (ISE): sometimes pluralized. The standard English language used internationally. "[W]e may hope that the new national standards will take their place as constituents of an International Standard English ..." (Greenbaum 1996, *The Oxford English grammar*); "Make a list of vocabulary differences and grammatical differences between two international Standard Englishes ..." (Wilkinson 1995, *Introducing Standard English*). The term has two linked senses: (1) The sum-total of all standard English usage worldwide, but with reference to the norm of AmE, BrE, and increasingly AusE and other varieties with such works of reference as grammars, dictionaries, and style guides ... (2) Standard usage that has a transnational identity of its own, especially, in print worldwide and in the usage of such organizations as the UN.

6. World English: (1) English as a world language in all its variety. 'World English' (title of an article, McArthur 1967, *Opinion*, Bombay); "... despite its notorious varieties, it is a unifying force in world English." (Quirk et al. 1985, *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*); "Although the history of world English can be traced back 400 years, the current growth spurt in the language has history of less than 40 years." (Crystal 1995, 'The history of world English,' *Cambridge*

encyclopedia of the English language); (2) British English conceived as the standard usage beyond the US. 'Microsoft Encarta 97: World English edition'; (3) An actual, perceived, or hoped-for standard form of English worldwide, in effect synonymous with INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ENGLISH; "This paper outlines *the conceptualization and ... on world English in an Asian* context: the Macquarie Dictionary project." (Butler 1996, *World Englishes,* [but *WE* was renamed in and since 1985, *World Language English*] *The correction is this author's).

7. World Standard English (WSE): Standard English as used worldwide; the standard aspect of WORLD ENGLISH: "If we read the newspaper or listen to the newscasters around the English-speaking world, we will quickly develop the impression of that there is a World Standard English ..." (Crystal 1995).

8. World Englishes: (1) Varieties of English (standard, dialect, national, regional, creole, hybrid, 'broken,' etc.) throughout the world: "... Kachru strongly emphasizes the significances of *literary and other creativity in world Englishes.*" (Bolton 1999, 'World Englishes: the way we were,' a review article of the *Cambridge History of the English Language,* Vol. 5, 1994, *World (Language) English*[es] *corrected). (2) full title *World Englishes: Journal of English as an international and intranational language (WE)* founded in 1981 and edited till 1984 by W. Lee in the UK by Pergamon Press, Oxford, renaming and restructuring in 1985 *World Language English,* currently edited by Kachru and Smith in the US, but usually called 'Englishes.'

9. World language: a language used widely in the world, as discussed. (Bailey and Görlach, edited 1982, *English as a world language*). The term refers to a language used in many parts of the world (such as Spanish and Portuguese), in specific large regions (such as Latin, Arabic, Hindi, and Russian), and widely because of a special role (such as French for diplomatic purposes, especially in the 18-19c. and Sanskrit ...). Many factors

... contribute to the rise of such languages, as for example, empire-building, the spread of a religion, cultural significance, and shifting populations. "It[English] is the main world language of book and newspaper publication, of science and technology, of advertising and pop music, and of computer information storage." (Crystal 2000, 'English,' *The Cambridge encyclopedia*. [The last item is added by this paper author.])

In addition, there's a separate chronological list of some citations, starting from (1) 'English ... a lingua franca,' in article: 'English, English Everywhere,' (Treen et al. 1982, *Newsweek*), that is, a different panel in McArthur's same article (2001), from which only the latest citations are briefly given here: (2) "English the *lingua franca*, the franchise language" (Widdowson 1997, *World Language English*); (3) "As English takes on the responsibility of a *lingua franca*, non-native-speakers are taking a more active role in the development of the language." (Modiano 1999, *English Today*); (4) "English has become the only lingua franca in the world." (Newmark 2000, *The Linguist*).

All these nine terms plus four citations that McArthur (2001) made it seemingly thorough review sound all right, whether 'straightforward' or 'convoluted.' Their terms and cited authorities above can and may be justified in terms of their native-orthodox-scholarly viewpoints, in other words, their 'conservative and pluralistic' ones. Despite 'full sound and fury,' a question is here: the right answer has to be one monolithic, systematic *Standard* English there, i.e., an *haute cuisine/very high standard* lingua franca. Or, is it actual there? If there is, than, *whose* Standard English, and what in any case constitutes the standard for a language whose users are counted in hundreds of millions worldwide, however uncertain the total? As for someone else, he/she would comment on aggressively, making it a point to say, whether explicitly or implicitly, that almost all terms and citations above are rather 'ascendant,' 'superiority complex,'

'condescending,' still even 'linguistic racist' or 'linguistic imperialist.' Such a supposed commentator would be wrong, or too much offensive, however, when there's neither proof nor evidence to the contrary.

Besides mentioned above, some missing sources are found (the exclusions seem rather intentional than inadvertent?). These dropped ones may look not 'core' but only 'peripheral' on the part of the orthodox school or the ELT canon. Just two or three references, nonetheless, should be added out of many (especially, from today's scholars of socio-cultural linguistics), despite time and situation. (1) "The discourse of English as an International Language had its origins in colonialism, but not so much in terms of an expansionist drive as in terms of a will to description." (Pennycook 1994). He points to the broader economic and political forces that impose it, thereby depriving the vast majority of learners of any language choice. He refers to the colonial legacy and the economic framework provided by international capitalists, that have spawned an international language, but places greater emphasis on culture, language, and knowledge, in the overall process of domination. (2) "So the international trade, English lingua franca interactions tend to involve either the normalization or the neutralization of linguistic incompetence and difference. Across and beyond the African diaspora, the contemporary spread of Black English and Creole vernaculars stands in dramatic contrast to this. Rather than normalization, here there is much more of a tendency to de-naturalize and oppose the ideologies that label people as 'other' and 'incompetent,' ... there are lingua franca business varieties of English, and there are diaspora Black vernaculars ... one really can not start to analyse with ideas about native speakers and well-formed language." (Rampton 1997, 'Second language research in late modernity,' *Modern Language Journal*)

Much more straightforwardly, diverse and conflicting forces are

engaged as the irresistible rise of *global English* forces other languages on to the defensive as they strive to maintain their space in a rapidly changing world. All countries are affected but particularly (and paradoxically) those where English is the majority L1. (3) "To what extent will serious and large-scale social motivation for learning other languages be able to survive among L1 English speakers over the next fifty years?" An powerful and eloquent critique of Crystal's *English as a global language* (1997) continues to state that "the case for linguistic diversity within a world in which other forms of diversity (e.g., bio-, cultural) are also to be valued." (Phillipson 1999, 'Voice in global English: unheard chords in Crystal loud and clear,' *Applied Linguistics*).

This last criticism mightn't be related, this author presumes, with no ideas at all of a new 'Linguistic Diversification and the Curriculum,' 'A new Council of Europe Recommendation on Modern Languages,'[2] and 'European Language Portfolio' from the Modern Languages Project of the Council of Europe, (cf. Trim 1998; Coste et al. 1998; Christ 1998). "The globalization of English exercises a powerful psychological hold on many L1 English minds. Although there are strong arguments that spell out for them the advantages of multilingualism, e.g., for

---

[2]According to the adoption of 'Recommendation R(81)18' in 1981, a *Eurobarometer* survey conducted by the European Commission (1997) reports that in 1990 60% of young people (15-24) in the EU countries were able to speak a language other than mother tongue 'well enough to have a conversation.' By 1997 the percentage had risen to 71.3%. That this was not confined to EU countries is indicated by the fact very high percentages were recorded for the three Council of Europe members states newly admitted to EU: Sweden (97.4%), Finland (96%) and Austria (68.1%). However, the ability to use English (53.7%) is far advance of French (19.9%) and German (11%), Spanish (8.7%) is much less spoken as a foreign language, though 23.1% selected it as the language they did not speak but would most like to learn. The full report, *Young Europeans*, is obtainable from the Commission's Internet site: http://europe.eu.int./en/comm/dg22/youth.youth.html (click on 'opinion survey').

educational, leisure and vocational mobility and for equality of opportunity and citizenship in the 'new Europe' (European Union), here are also deep feelings of 'Is it really necessary?'" (Johnstone 2000). These feelings are one factor behind the de-motivation that foreign language teachers face, the very slow uptake post-16 when foreign languages are no longer compulsory and the state of crisis in Higher Education modern language departments.

There was the Nuffield Inquiry (2000), which has been associating the language needs of the UK for the next twenty years has produced a radical set of recommendations designed to confront a rapidly deteriorating situation, when following and fulfilling the requirements from the Council of Europe Projects: e.g., early language learning for all pupils from age 7; an entitlement of all school students to two modern languages, one 'real' and the other 'virtual'; a modern language requirement for entry to Higher Education; a unified framework (drawing on the Council of Europe specifications) for assessing languages from K-12 and HE, etc.

2001 has been declared the European Year of Languages. "The EYL seeks to promote public awareness of the benefits of language learning and to support life long learning of languages. As many within the languages field have understood, it thus make obvious sense to link the promotional imperative of Nuffield to the possibilities offered by the Year of Languages. At a coincidental level the timing could not be more propitious. In the UK the Year of Languages follows from the year of Nuffield (as mentioned above), during which for the first time in many years the policy agenda for languages took center stage. It is of course simplistic to regard this happy coincidence as no more than that." (King 2001)[3]

---

[3]According to King (2001), such indicators as the 1998 national opinion poll, quoted by the Nuffield Inquiry, which suggests that the

While deep universal principles (not necessarily referring to Universal Grammar) may well apply to all language learning, it no longer feels that way. The factors in the socio-cultural-political context are nowadays so powerful that a significant psychological gulf's is emerging between the learning of English (whether as SL or FL) and learning of other languages as foreign languages, especially by native-speakers of English. It is said that much planned progress has been made in 'normalizing' the learning and use of minority first or second languages such as Welsh and Scottish Gaelic, (not to mention the fact that Eire language, i.e., Irish Gaelic is being taught from kindergartens to universities in the Éire Republic), mainly for reasons of heritage, identity and autonomy than instrumentality. This has also been accompanied by the unplanned emergence of dynamic new hybrid language cultures within the multilingual communities that now characterize many parts of UK, particularly the cities.

2. ENL, ESL and EFL

This author has once also made the three distinctions elsewhere (Cho 1998): hence excluding arguable points here, for the topic is too much banal today. Anyway, it is a demographic and geo-socio-political model and typology.

   1. The ENL territories: the home localities of users of English

---

vast majority of people in this country[UK] are at least mildly positive towards the idea of capability in a foreign language, are supported by less tangible but nonetheless convincing anecdotes. Many will recall the quite surprising press reaction when the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair spoke French in the Assemblée Nationale. For those, such as CILT (Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research), involved in support for languages, this event has been symbolic of a different relationship with the media. From indifference or hostility ('Why bother learning FLs?' and 'What's the point of CILT?'), the discourse has moved on to interest and even concern ('Why are we not better at learning languages?'), etc. 2001 is a unique opportunity [for UK] to raise the profile of languages.

as a Native Language (Quirk et al. 1972, *A grammar of contemporary English*). When quoting, alternatively here, the 'Varieties of English'—a renewed kind of typology—of *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*, by Quirk et al. (1985:15-34), it is too lengthy, much more complex and sophisticated); of the members of Inner Circle (Kachru 1991). The more prominent ENL territories are Australia, Canada, England (UK), the Irish Republic, Liberia, New Zealand, Northern Ireland (UK), and the United States.

2. the ESL territories: the home localities of users of English as a Second Language (Quirk et al. 1972); of the members of Outer Circle (Kachru 1991), where English comes after at least one other language, and has been present for at least a century. The more prominent ESL territories are Bangladesh, Bostswana, Cameron, Cyprus, Fiji, Ghana, Hong Kong, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Panama, Pakistan, Papua New Guinia, the Philippines, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe. (Whoever it is, at a glance, he/she's quick on the uptake what a historical background of this category has been.)

3. The EFL territories: the home localities of the users of English as a Foreign Language (Quirk et al. 1972); of the members of Expanding Circle (Kachru 1991), where has traditionally been 'foreign.' It may either have been significantly present for decades, supported by massive public educational programs (as in Korea and China) or be a relatively recent arrival (as with Mozanbique, formerly a Portuguese territory and Uzbekistan, a former republic of the USSR). The list of EFL territories in effect covers the rest of the world. (Besides, there's other typology of English users; cf. Moag 1982; Judd 1987; Smith 1976, 1978; especially, three ESL types of Nayar 1997.)

Concerning this trichotomy, lots of arguments still remain intact. We can imagine that less motivated but much more

innumerable EFL learners/students worldwide (in contrast to ESL) with their 'interlanguage talk' (cf. Selinker 1972), every pace or stage of ethnic 'idiosyncratic dialects' and 'transitional competence' (cf. Corder 1967, 1971) tend to fall into ill courses, since the multibillion-dollar ELT/TESOL enterprises have jumped in to capitalize on the ambiguity of ESL/EFL terminology. It is common to find ESL and EFL used as virtual synonyms. Is it quite all right, however, at all events in the name of 'Whoever it is, a native English expertise's publication is everything' at the expanse of EFL learners?.

3. Grammars, Style Manuals, Dictionaries and Media

Assuming a World Standard English, we have to argue the kinds of conformity in dictionaries, grammars, style manuals and the like that have come into existence to catalogue the language, and such publications have for some time been spreading beyond the traditional sources of conformity, the UK and the US.

Anyhow, it has been inevitable that further publications will emerge that seek to compare, contrast, and synthesize the contents of those works: that is, to internationalize them, and to formulate a statement about what is going on nationally and transnationally. "[W]e have had for some time a World Standard English with a fair degree of standardization for print and writing that is cent(e)red on powerful dual print standard, alongside a much less effective and successful dual pronunciation system and US usage predominates in both. However, the recent development of several international lexicographical and linguistic projects takes everything one stage further ... here five particular projects of the late 1990s." (McArthur 2001).

1. *The Oxford English grammar* (Greenbaum 1996): a work of reference based on the Survey of English Usage (SEU) and the

International Corpus of English (ICE), projects directed and co-ordinated by Greenbaum, the Dept. of English, University College London. The *OEG*'s primary aim is to offer 'a comprehensible account of present-day English that is chiefly focused on the standard varieties of American and British English.' In 2000, his approach was reinforced with *The Oxford reference grammar* (edited from the *OEG*, Weiner of the *Oxford English dictionary*).

2. *The Langscape Project* and a planned international English style guide (1998 onward): initiated and developed by Peters, Macquarie University, Australia, and supported by Cambridge University Press both there and in the UK and the US. Peters formulated a set of style-and-usage-related questionnaires which have been presented, distributed, and discussed through *English Today: the international review of the English language*, the Cambridge journal, over ten issues under the title The Langscape Project.

3. *The new Oxford dictionary of English* (Pearsall edited in 1998): with 29 'World English' consultants; 16 US; 4 Scottish; 2 each for Canada, Australia, and India; and 1 each for the Caribbean, New Zealand, and South Africa. *NODE* is intended as a universalized desk dictionary with UK conventions that can nonetheless serve the world English. Extensive use was made of the British National Corpus and an unspecified corpus of US English.

4. *The Encarta world English dictionary* ('The Encarta' or EWED 1999): originated and published in paper by Bloomsbury (UK version) with St Martins Press (US), and Macmillan (Australia), Rooney (editor-in-chief). There are both a World English Database Advisory Board and a group of World English and Language Consultants, 30 in all. The territories covered the advisors and consultants of English speaking countries worldwide.

5. *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English* (Biber et

al. 1999): a corpus based grammar seeks to give 'equal weight to American and British English.' The primary editor is American; the team is international; and work-in-progress was assessed by a committee of UK linguists, chaired by Quirk. The number of the total Corpus in *LGSWE* attains to the enormous figure of 40,025.700 words. There's core Corpus of four main registers: conversation, fiction, newspaper and academic prose are major categories that span much of the range of situational and linguistic variation of English. "Even a casual inspection of texts from different registers reveals extensive linguistic differences."[4]

6. World Media: *The International Herald Tribune* calls itself 'the world's daily newspaper.' The *Trib* began life in 1887 as an expatriate American broadcast that was available only in Europe,

---

[4]With **multiple negation** matters, for example, we find that one—**dependent** multiple negation—in which the negative forms in the same clause to express a single negative meaning. This represents very old pattern which is found in casual speech, although it is socially stigmatized: e.g., *I told her not to say nothing to nobody.* (conv). cf. 'not to say anything to anybody.' *There ain't nothing we can do.* (fict). cf. 'There isn't anything we can do.' And the other one—**independent** multiple negation—in which the negative forms have independent negative force. e.g., [I]t makes you sleepy, *you can't not sleep.* (conv). <meaning that you just have to sleep>. (Biber et al. 1999:177-179). Incidentally, This author has on occasion read and heard of some such sentences and utterances: e.g., 'Since it's from him, you can't not like it.'(*Time*, Jan. 19, 1987, p. 44) *'I can't not do it.'* and *'I ain't done nothing yet.* (*Time*, ab. 1980s). *'We ain't done nothin' yet—four more years.'* (Reagan, several times on his campaign stumps for winning his second presidential term, through AFKN ab. 1984): it is assumed as 'an illocutionary act': <You'll see right and great stuff that I'll do, when you vote me ... >; *'I ain't done nothin' yet.'* (Gore as a presidential candidate, *Time* ab. Oct. 2000), that is assumed as a parody or an illocution); *'We ain't seen nothin' yet.'* (Bush in his last campaign speech at Tallahassee, Florida, on CNN, ab. Nov. 2000), that is assumed as a cynic locution or proposition against his rival's previous illocutionary speech). A series of those politically implicated 'intentional' cliche proves well enough the saying that English usage is like table etiquette: it is conventional and its sanction is a social one, that is, **'ain't ... nothin','** the dependent multiple negation, is no longer 'socially stigmatized' not only as a 'usage' but as an actual everyday 'use'(?)

based (then as now) in Paris. Its print style and presentational conventions have always been American, it draws on such 'home' sources as the New York Times, and the Washington Post, and the Los Angeles Times, and it makes use of standard wire services such as Agence France Presse (AFP), Associated Press (AP), and Reuters. The EU-based, US-oriented Trib is currently the closest we come to an autonomous global newspaper, since US editorial usage is well known worldwide. It is unsurprising that the IHT continues to apply the rules with which it grew up. In doing so, it offers language scholars, teachers, and other interested persons ample evidence that a strictly US print standard works well internationally.

However, when the IHT is taken together with, most notably, Time (magazine), The Wall Street Journal, Newsweek, and Business Week (US), and The Economist and the Guardian Weekly (UK), it becomes part of a long-standing dual print service at the international level, a point that EL teachers necessary keep in mind for those students who will need global news sources, especially for business and professional purposes. In such cases, familiarity with either AmSE or BrSE written and print convention is not enough: a discriminating awareness of both is needed. It has dipped a toe in the ELT/TESOL business, as for example with their package EFL Teacher's Kit (1986) and In the News (1993), etc.

4. Pronunciation Models: RP, BBC Model and GA, Network Standard

1. IPA and Phonetic dictionary of the English language, (D. Jones with H. Wyld's views, 1913/1917): The PDEL was re-named; An English pronouncing dictionary. The EPD has been since then one of the most influential ELT books. The original EPD, which followed in IPA transcription, had Wyld's 'Public School English'

as its model. Jones adapted this term to 'Public School Pronunciation,' then to 'Received Pronunciation (RP),' in the 1927 edition, a term which had a long reign until Roach and Hartman changed it in 1997 to 'BBC English.' By the mid-20th century, however, a version of the educated English of the US has gained a comparable prestige in the world, and its spoken model 'General American (GA)' or 'Network Standard' has been widely regarded as adequately representing educated US usage. (US scholars generally do not considers that GA corresponds to any kind of real-life usage, however, and many have reservations about its use.)

2. Stress-timed and Syllable-timed Rhythm, (Abercrombie, cf. Crystal 1994, 1996): the former type languages, such as English and Russian have an uneven rhythm like Morse Code (tee-Tum-tee-tee-Tum-tee-Tum), while the latter type languages, such as French, Korean & Japanese have an even machine-gun-like rhythm (rat-a-tat-a-TAT). Other languages, such as Arabic and Hindi, fit neither category well and it may be that no language fits perfectly and that on occasion rhythm may vary within them (Couper-Kuhlem 1993).

3. Rhoticity and Non-rhoticity—dominantly rhotic and dominantly non-rhotic: (1) using a retroflex /r/: Canada, Ireland, south-western England, western and northern states of the US, etc.; (2) using mainly an alveolar tapped or trilled /r/: Scotland. Non-rhotic: Australia. the Caribbean, England (excluding the south-west), New Zealand, Sub-Saharan Africa, Wales, and in the US, three areas the southern states, New York state, and by and large New England east of the Connecticut River, the speech of most African-Americans is non-rhotic (McArthur 2001). We do hope not, by the way, that it is necessary for our children to get their tongue operation for articulating their retroflex /r/ and alveolar tapped or trilled /r/ pronunciation in English, do we?

5. Lexical, Grammatical Variations and Discourse Grammars

Formal instruction, i.e., grammar teaching is still central. The focus on grammar has had both a practical and theoretical motivation. It has helped teachers to understand the factors that determine whether instruction is successful, and it has helped researchers to explore a number of issues of importance for theory building, in particular, the relationship between the linguistic environment and the learner's internal processing mechanism. Yet its methodological options are controversial.[5] Two specific views on global English-related research are here selected to present out of many.

1. Alulu (1998) claims that study of language variation in post-colonial countries is an emergent field in linguistics. Two part study considers the use of some lexical and grammatical variations which rare occur in British Standard English but are common in written English of some other countries. The study is approached from a pedagogical point of view in order that language learners be encouraged to perceive the target language as a means of communication rather than as a set of forms. Lexical variation is the focus, and then grammatical one. Five main areas in the lexical variation can be discussed: archaism, borrowing, coinage, semantic modification and loan translation. In the second part morphology and syntax are considered, in particular the area of number realization and plurality. The author concludes, by stating that awareness of the diversity and multi-dimensionality of English is very important for teachers, as

---

[5]'What kind of formal instruction works best?' Ellis (1994) considers some of the research that has tried to answer this question by focusing on its methodological availability to teachers, giving technically different types: 1) 'Focus on forms vs. focus on form,' 2) 'Implicit vs. explicit instruction,' 3) 'Practice vs. consciousness-raising,' and 4) 'Interpretation vs. practice.'

forms which are in common usage be misconceived in post-colonial or North American contexts may be misconceived as learner errors.

2. Relating to English grammar teaching as SL/FL, on the other hand, Hughes and McCarty (1998) argue that there are very good reasons for developing discourse grammars for second/foreign language teaching, and exemplify the criteria for moving from sentence-based grammar to the discourse level. The criteria are based on pedagogical and descriptive problems in grammar which sentence-based approaches cannot deal with adequacy. The authors identify key areas in which a discourse grammar might make significant contributions. They conclude by considering the problems and prospects for L2 teaching in the kind of probabilistic grammar that emerges from a discourse-based approach. With specific regard to this, incidentally, this author would like to recommend *you* to refer to the chapters: Speech acts & speech event; Rhetorical analysis; Coherence, cohesion, deixis, and discourse; Discourse mode & syntax, etc. in *Discourse and language education* (Hatch 1992).

6. Beliefs and *Subjektive Theorien* in Foreign Language Research

During the last decade of the last century we'd been familiar with the term 'awareness' in various L2 research landscapes, with more or less similar and contrastive terms, such as 'consciousness-raising,' 'noticing,' 'attention,' and so much 'reflection.' There is even a good journal in the name of *Language Awareness* there in the UK. Toward the end of the last millenium, we've encountered with *new* terms, first '*Subjektive Theorien* (Subjective Theories),' starting from a special themed edition of the journal *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen* (*Second Language Teaching and Learning*) in Germany in 1998, and then

the term 'Beliefs' with variously modified phrases in journals from UK during 1998-2001.

1. Subjective theories: according to Grojahan (1998), Subjective Theories are very complex cognitive structures; they are highly individual, relatively stable, and relatively enduring. (Some or most of this paper readers also may now and then go on hesitating to nod in agreement with this author's explanation and persuasion, only *because of* the readers own deeply-rooted 'Subjective Theories' or 'Beliefs' in their minds, perhaps which are quite different from his, ain't he wrong to assume that?) Examples are learners' and teachers' general beliefs about learning and teaching, and about language. STs are an important tool for the explanation and prediction of human action and thought. This methodology is based on both hermeneutics and empiricism, which are integrated into a coherent framework. (In the same issue of the journal *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen*, **27**, 1998, there are also several articles related to Subjective Theories.[6]

2. Teacher Beliefs and Learner Beliefs: largely as a follow-up to the debate on language and learning, especially with Piagetian constructivism (cf. *Language and learning: the debate between J. Piaget and N. Chomsky* 1980) and then socio-cultural learning with Vygotsky's ideas (cf. *Thought and Language* 1934—in Russian edition/1962—in the first English edition) revisited with L2 learning and teaching. The recent much attention seems to be paid to the various 'beliefs' of teachers and their students. According to Johnstone (2000), the term 'beliefs' could be grossly

---

[6]Their titles in English translation are as follows: 'Introduction to the main theme or: the subjective theories of foreign language teachers— how are they useful?' (De Florio-Hansen 1998, **27**, 3-11); 'Subjective parameters describing teaching roles. Toward a theory of tertiary foreign language instruction' (Edmondson 1998, **27**, 81-105): 'The Subjective Theories research program. Theoretical and methodological features and their relevance for foreign language teaching' (Scheele and Groeben 1998, **27**, 12-32)

categorized as follows: (1) Pedagogical beliefs of experienced teachers, (2) Belief-shifts during participant innovation, (3) Beliefs vs. theory concerned CLT, (4) Belief about grammar, (5) Learner beliefs and perceptions, (6) Beliefs about self-instructed L2 learning, (7) Belief about L2 learning and general learning, with a number of recently various references.

7. Dilemma among Radical, Canonical and Eclectic Views

In summary, this author is in an awkward dilemma whether which view among three ways is preferable to, and recommendable to you, but it's a trivial matter, since the author's role here is not to claim any assertions or judgements but only to aim to present some authenticity-look-like sources and references to you. Important is your keen option. your freedom.

1. Two issues for analysis (lingua francas and diaspora vernaculars): As one of components of much controversial article by Firth and Wagner (1997)—a sort of reconceptualization of SLA research, Rampton (1997) argues that "the lingua franca negotiations arise in the internationalization of commerce, and in such settings, the emphasis is on instrumental purpose, so-called 'communication.' But none of this communication is guaranteed by native speakers—either because there are not any, or because natives are unlikely to want to be seen to lord it linguistically. Instead, the central concern is with getting past linguistic and communicative differences, downplaying incompetence, and getting on business, and these objectives may be addressed through, for example, programs of intercultural awareness training, through conversational strategies like ones identified by Firth (1996) and others."

Rampton (1997) continues to contend that the skeptic might

say there are lingua franca business varieties of English, and there are diaspora Black vernaculars. "It is obviously just one configuration of a number of analytic contrasts that could easily combine in different ways: (1) the local vs. national vs. global, (2) standard vs. vernaculars, (3) workplace vs. leisure, (4) learning vs. parody [a weak and unsuccessful copy], and (5) the grammatical vs. the multi-sensory. But presented as an empirical challenge, it raises quite a searching question. L2 research now often says that it is keen to get away from schools and language classrooms.[7] Why? Is this to go and study the heterogeneity outside? Or with notions like 'native speaker,' 'learner,' and 'target grammar,' is it just to get peace to elaborate key concepts in a national curriculum?" Isn't it a radical view?

2. The future of Englishes: In his article, Crystal (1999) examines whether the increasing diversity of English worldwide will lead to a need for new approaches to ELT in the 21st century. It begins by discussing as a family of languages, and social and political issues involved in designating new varieties, using the examples of 'Ebonics' and 'Scots.'[8] It also discusses

---

[7] In the same article, Rampton (1997) argues that, "... in terms of its methodologies and guiding philosophy, a lot of L2 research is profoundly out of tune with the themes of late modernity. SLA ['Second Language Acquisition' as an academic discipline field] is rather exclusively equipped with assumptions that the Scollons call Utilitarian (Scollon and Scollon 1995), that Pennycook characterizes as antinormatic Enlightenment discipline (Pennycook 1994), that Phillipson might call imperial technicism, and that I [Rampton himself] have also associated with liberal modernity (Rampton 1995). More specifically, authors such as these criticize SLA for its assumptions about, or overly hasty pursuit of, universals, referential above indexical meaning, disembedded cognition, value-free inquiry, progress as a natural condition, and assimilation to the norms of an idealized monolingual UK or US national."

[8] The term 'Ebonics' and 'Scots' are rare 'appreciative' ones for 'Black people' and 'Scottish people' respectively, although there are a bunch of 'derogatory' terms against them called by the English people, whereas the very simplistic term 'Goddam' refers to the English people called

'language mixing,' and proposes a continuum of hybridization from standard colloquial English through grammatical and lexical hybrid forms to colloquialisms from the speaker's first language. It is suggested that, for the purposes of mutual intelligibility and pedagogy, internationally accepted, standard varieties of the language for communication in writing and in speaking are required, though these will co-exist with recognized local varieties. The implications for ELT are that input for training students in receptive skills needs to be diverse, while training in productive skills should be conventional. Perhaps, this view might be called 'the ELT canon.'

3. National standards and a world standard (EIL and WSE): According to McArthur (2001), the world has hardly noticed '(Teaching) English as an International English: (T)EIL,' and how to teach it [TEIL]. It has long been a minor theme at the gatherings of such organizations as the UK-centered IATEFL, the US-centered TESOL. More recently, it's been a major theme for an international scholarly group whose interest is MAVEN (Major Varieties of English), its focus being primarily on the larger native-speaking communities worldwide. An interesting aside on MAVEN group is that the initiative in its formation has come not from an ENL or ESL background but from an EFL country: Sweden.

(T)EIL is close to more elegantly phrased 'cosmopolitan English.' Its principal proponents have been L. Smith[9] and the

---

(even still) by the natives colonized under the then British empire and its domination.

[9]Smith (1992) notes the term '(T)EIL' differs from TEFL and TESL in that native speakers are also seen as needing help in cross-national and cross-cultural communication, rather than as representing the norm at which non-natives should aim. It is assumed in TEIL that English belongs to all of its users (whether in its standard or any other form), and that ways of speaking and pattern of discourse are different across nations.

late P. Strevens, a UK applied linguist (the latter had been a residential researcher with the former at the Culture-Learning Institute of the East-West Center, Honolulu), both of whom argued in the 1970s that all speakers of English need to be courteous and tactful with one another, culturally and linguistically, and that no one has an edge of ethnicity or heritage when the aim of a transnational encounter is successful communication. In this approach, it is not assumed that someone who is fluent in English is *ipso facto* above cross-cultural problems while using it, or that the behavior of all native speakers is the same, simply *because* they are native speakers. Certainly, everyone can benefit from keeping more about such matters, so that the kinds of anxiety experienced by most of non-native speakers (NNSs) might be reduced. EIL serves then to remind us that meaning and socio-cultural harmony need to be negotiated, whatever the language or variety of language being used. This paper would name the third view 'eclectic,' comparing with two previous ones.

What do we (its NNSs) mean, then, by learning and teaching "IT" (not an acronym but an emphasized pronoun), whatever the name? At issue finally is to offer a proposal or an alternative answer there, if at all possible. Thus, here is a modest proposal: We need first to admit that we (as its ordinary non-native, rather 'word-spinners-cum-compositors,' except for its few naturally speaking/writing people) are incompatible ever with its native speakers (NSs) in terms of its authenticity (when its bigotry NSs insist upon it till the last), even if we (as its non-native listeners/readers) could receptively be compatible with them (its NSs). Important is that we need (and are able) to appeal to our own experience, intention, feeling, and purpose, that is, our identity to positively express "our own selves" in our contexts toward the world anywhere, if not sounding authentic enough (by its norms, if any) but producing it

plausibly well, with no replicated version of its NSs.[10] We are all *in transition*—in space (in settings) and time (temporarily)—with various implications. It is time for us (with our learner-teacher's ethno-cultural identity) to need to be complementary to and parallel with its NSs' linguistic-cultural authenticity in terms of the broadest mutual understanding and relationship.

References

Ahulu, S. 1998. Lexical variation in international English/Grammatical variation in international English. *English Today* **14**, 3 + **14**, 4, 19-25 + 29-34.

Biber, D. et al. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Essex: Longman

Cho, M. 1998. An autonomy on bubble-free EFL. *English Teaching* (KATE) 53, 49-64.

Christ, I. 1998. European language portfolio. *Language Teaching* 31, 214-7.

Coste, D. et al. 1998. Language: learning, teaching, assessment. a common European framework of reference. *Language Teaching* 31, 136-51.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. 1993. *English Speech Rhythm: Form and Function in Everyday Verbal Intonation*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Crystal, D. 1995. The history of world English. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. CUP.

Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a Global Language*. CUP.

Crystal, D. 1999. The future of Englishes. *English Today* 58, (15: 2)

Crystal, D. 2000. 4th ed. English. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia*. CUP.

Crystal, D. 2000. 4th ed. Language. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia*. CUP.

---

[10]Aside from our main discussions, 'Is it how ever well enough for us (its NNSs) to attain the optimal level of its NSs?' There is, for instance, a dictionary called the *Dictionary of American Regional English*, by Cassidy 1985 onward in 5 volumes, with that we could on occasion enjoy it as ordinary readers/learners of it for referential books, but can't afford the time nor the effort, except for specialists for American regional lexicography in this country, the author thinks, even though *DARE* is so valued as: 'Never—not even with *Oxford English Dictionary* and its *Supplements*—has there been such a reaching-out by lexicographers ...' (W. Safire 1985, *IHT*)

Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.

Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education*. OUP.

Firth, A. 1996 The discourse accomplishment of normality: on 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 26, 1-23.

Firth, A. and L. Wagner. 1997. On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal* 81, 285-300.

Grotjahn, R. 1998. Subjektive Theorien in der Fremdsprachenforschung: Methodologische Grundlagen und Perspektiven. (Subjective theories in foreign language research: methodological bases and perspectives.) *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen* 27, 33-59.

Hughes, R. and M. McCarthy. 1998. From sentence to discourse: discourse grammar and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly* 32, 263-87.

Johnstone, R. 2000. Research on language teaching and learning: 1999. *Language Teaching* 33, 141-62.

Kachru, B. 1991. World English and applied linguistics. In M. Tickoo, ed., *RELC Anthology* (Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre) 26, 178-205.

King, L. 2001. The European year of language—taking forward the languages debate. *Language Teaching* 34, 21-9.

McArthur, T. 2001. World English and world Englishes: trends, tensions, varieties, and standards. *Language Teaching* 34, 1-20.

Nayar, P. 1997. ESL/EFL dichotomy today: language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly* 34, 9-37.

Pennycook, A. 1994. *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*. Essex: Longman.

Phillipson, R. 1999. Voice in global English unheard chords in crystal loud and clear. *Applied Linguistics* 20, 265-76.

Piattelli-Palmarini, ed. 1980. *Language and Learning: The Debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. Cambridge, Mass.: HUP

Quirk, R., et al. 1872. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Essex: Longman.

Rampton, B. 1997. Second language research in late modernity. *Modern Language Journal* 81, 329-33.

Safire, W. 1985. *DARE*: different kind of dictionary. *International Herald Tribune*. (Dec. 9, p. 6)

Smith, R. 1992. Teaching English as an international language. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: OUP.

The Nuffield Languages Inquiry 2000. *Languages: The Next Generation*. London: The Nufffield Foundation.

Trim, J. 1998. European perspectives on modern language learning: introduction. *Language Teaching* 31, 136.

Trim, J. 1998. European perspectives on modern language learning.

Language Teaching 31, 206-14.

Vygotsky, L. tr. E. Hanfmann, and G. Vakar. 1962. *Thought and Language.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT.

조명원
광주광역시 북구 용봉동 300번지
전남대학교 사범대학 영어교육과
우편번호: 500-757
전화번호: 062) 363-1003
E-mail: chomw@chonnam.ac.kr