A Trendy and Multi-Dialectical English: A Descriptive Review of Changes and Current Status

Mohammad Qasim Al-Tarawneh
Department of English
AlGhad International Colleges for Health Sciences
Dammam, **KSA**

ABSTRACT

This study, as the name suggests, aims at sketching the scenario of English being described today as a trendy and multi-dialectal language and as a means of international and intercultural communication. This is due to the fact that the language has turned out to be the natural choice for all of its users, regardless their linguistic or cultural backgrounds. It also reviews the literature to show how globally and locally the language has been treated to undergo processes of nativization and internationalization, reflecting how important it has become in the context of globalization and how slippery concepts like native-speakerism and standardization have been waxed. More importantly, the study gives some descriptions of the current status of the language in terms of the changes that have taken place in its internal linguistic make-up (i.e. linguistic elements including phonology, morphology, syntax, lexico-grammar, pragmatics, etc). Implications for the ELT profession have been taken into account in the study, especially those related to awareness-raising of different varieties of English in the global cottages as well as to the importance of considering multiple context-specific competencies. To account for a theoretical and conceptual framework for all of the aforementioned, the study subsidizes itself with five sections each of which is dealt with separately before the conclusion is stated. These sections are: worldly English, the slippery status of native speakerism, glocality of English, descriptive changes in the language, and finally implications for the ELT profession.

1. Introduction

This study gives a bird's-eye view to analyze and describe how trendy and pluricentric the English language has become in the context of internationalization and globalization due it its multi-dialectical and multi-varietal use and usage throughout the globe. It seeks to subsidize the literature on the issues of native-speakerism, standardization, and nativization and show how these conceptions have become changeable as people (native or non-native speakers) have been using English in their own local contexts, adding to it their own cultural flavors. Importantly, the study draws on the literature to build its theoretical framework with the aim of presenting the de facto of English to know where it stands nowadays as a result of being globally and glocally used. Such presentation of the current status of the language may not be completely pictured unless evidences are given and examples of the changes in the worldly language's internal built-in are carefully described and thoroughly discussed. The building of this theoretical framework includes some discussions on issues like English as a world language, the slippery status of native-speakerism, glocality of English, and descriptive changes in the language in terms of current research trends. Implications to English language teaching ELT as a profession are stated in a way that shows how related and of benefit the discussed topics are to ELT and TESOL professionals.

2. Worldly English

In today's world, languages are shaped by their use. Whenever this applies to English as an internationally used language, native speakers are now statistically considered a "minority for language use, and thus in practice for language change, for language maintenance, and for the ideologies and beliefs associated with the language – at least in so far as non-native speakers use the language for a wide range of public and personal needs." (Brumfit 2001, p. 16). This clearly indicates the wide spread of English and its effect on changing concepts such as English as a native language (ENL), English as a first language (L1) and language ownership. Interestingly, the ownership of English has been redefined to mean, as Brumfit (2001) puts it, "the power to adapt and change" the language (p. 116) and has become basically dependent on the people who use it regardless being either monolingual or multilingual.

As a consequence of such a massive hegemony of English as a global language, research has come up with some new different names and perspectives which indicate various ideologies and ways of thinking in connection to people's use of the language for commerce, business, international and intercultural communication, tourism, and most importantly for pedagogical purposes. Names like English as an International Language (EIL) (Matsuda, 2003; Pakir, 1999), English as a lingua franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2000; Bjorkman, 2008; Prodroumou, 2007; Kuo, 2006), English as an intercultural language (EIcL) (Sifakis, 2004; Byram & Feng, 2005; Sowden, 2007; Alptekin, 2002), World Englishes (WEes) (Y. Kachru, 2005; Brutt-Griffler, 2002; B. Kachru, 1986, 1992; Jenkins, 2006); nativization or indigenous Englishes (Y. Kachru, 2005; Jenkins, 2006), English as a global language (Cystal, 2003; Graddol, 1997), English as an additional language (Warschauer, 2000; Markee, 2000), and English as a glocal language (Pakir, 1999) have been all seriously taken into consideration to discuss how English has been institutionalized and internationalized in terms of its use all around the world. For example, people in East Africa or those in East Asian countries like Malaysia and Singapore have successfully culturally adopted English as a language of their own to project their identity and use it for their own sake and in their own flavors, developing new varieties of English such as Manglish and Singlish (Pakir, 1999; Warschauer, 2000).

3. The Slippery Status of a Native Speaker

The current status of English is getting promoted by the changes happening to it

through the multiplicity of its use in every world spot; a thing which has led to a significant debatable issue of who a native speaker is and what a standard form of the language means. Different concepts have been suggested to replace native-speakerism and native-like competence in a way that makes others in the Kachruvian model of the three concentric circles (i.e. Inner, Outer, and Expanding) participate, develop and innovate their nativized and indigenized varieties of English, reflecting their own norms and cultural identity. Learning English has been reshaped and replaced in terms of language use, and learners of English have become users of English as a lingua franca (Bjorkman, 2008; Seidlhofer, 2004; Jenkins, 2006, 2009), especially in our multicultural and seemingly monolingual world.

By the same token, other suggestions have been offered such as the learner's 'ultimate attainment' of the language (Davies, 2007), bilinguals with borderline competence between two languages (Kramsch, 1995, as cited in Alptekin, 2002), expert/less expert speakers (Jenkins, 2006), and proficient language users (Paikeday, 1985, as cited in Alptekin, 2002). Suggestively, Pakir (1999) deplores native-like competence and favors "English-knowing bilingualism" instead, claiming that in the contexts of globalization in the 21st century, it will be necessary for people to connect with English-knowing and English-using bilinguals. This indicates the need to internationalize English in a way that makes its users; either native or non-native, bilingual speakers of English beside their own native languages. They will definitely need English for their own national and international transactions, so they should learn and use the language, considering it an additional language whenever cross-cultural communication is concerned.

In her support to cultural variability and pluralism, Kramsch (1998; as cited in Tomlinson, 2005, p.149) questions the very basic concept of native speaker and what it represents in a multi-dialectal and multi-cultural world where there is an increasing potential change within global economy. She defines native speaker as a "monolingual and mono-cultural abstraction"; the one who is restricted to speak his/her "standardized" form and to live by one "standardized national culture" (p. 149). Confessing the reality of the changing world towards multi-culturalism and multi-dialectlaism of English as a language of the globe (Crystal, 2003; Brutt-Griffler, 2002), Kramsch (1998; 2001) continues to oppose native-speakerism by asserting that the concept is no longer suitable and useful to account for cultural diversity, clearly because most people speak different languages or language varieties and live by various cultures and sub-cultures.

Different varieties of English, especially those from outside the inner circles have been given a growing role as a result of the outnumbering of L2 speakers. Instead of focusing on the native-speaker model in language use or in language teaching, for example, there is a necessity to show respect to bidialectalism and multidialectalism, taking users' or learners' needs into consideration (Warschauer, 2000; Markee, 2000). Increasingly, multidialectalism has been asserted to be importantly needed not only for receptive communication (Warschauer, 2000; Crystal, 2003), but also for language production (Warschauer, 2000). This role of multi-varietal English is said to affect how the language is shaped in terms of its internal linguistic corpus (i.e. grammar, syntax, semantics, phonology, lexis, pragmatics, etc.).

Another interesting proposal by Warschauer (2000) is that native speakers are suggested to participate in multidialectalism or World Englishes as well by learning the dialects of others, especially those used in the Outer and Expanding circles for the sake of both understanding and effective communication in international settings where Inner circle colloquial dialects seem inappropriate (Warschauer, 2000). This proposal is of great importance as it asks all users of English, natives or non-natives, to adjust their speeches

and language uses in a way that ensures mutual intelligibility and leads to some universal and internationalized features of language use. This, by so doing, may set a grounding basis for English as an international language (EIL) (Matsuda, 2003; Warschauer, 2000; Sifakis, 2004; Pakir, 1999; Jenkins, 2006), English as a lingua Franca (ELF) (Bjorkman, 2008; Jenkins, 2006; Wraschauer, 2000; Prodromou, 2006; Kuo, 2006), or English as an intercultural language (EIcL) (Byram & Feng, 2005; Sifakis, 2004; Atkinson, 1999; Nagel, 2010; Alptekin, 2002; Sowlen, 2007).

4. Glocality of English

Glocalization as a term, although has been implicitly referred to in various research studies (see Warschauer, 2000; Sifakis, 2004; Jenkins, 2000; Y. Kachru, 2005; Castells, 1996), has been overtly introduced by Pakir (1999), and can be better understood by examining the notion of "English-knowing bilingualism" (Pakir, 1999, p. 109-110). In her research article entitled *'Connecting with English in the Context of Internationalization'*, Pakir (1999) addresses the fact that in the global economy of the 21st century, English has become indigenized and multi-dialectical in a way that it has developed and is developing its own cultural norms depending on its use in particular contexts. This explains how the glocality of the language is locally rooted in a global sense and how its users in the Outer and Expanding circles (or what she termed 'English-knowing bilinguals) act globally with "a glocal destination" (p.109).

Language in this sense is being taken by local people as their own, spoken in their own flavors with some cultural norms and changes in terms of its linguistic aspects including grammar, phonology, pragmatics, lexis, etc. for the purpose of projecting their identity and of catching up with the world's technological, economic and industrial advancements. The idea of English as a glocal language has also been present in the sociolinguistic profile of World Englishes (WEes) (Y. Kachru, 2005), where it has been attested that as there are

varieties of English in the Inner Circle world, there are different varieties in the Outer and Expanding Circles as well, each of which functions within its own socio-cultural context. Therefore, English with its pluricentric nature should give rise to different norms in different geographical regions and be globally "yet locally-rooted in the local contexts of its users" (Pakir, 1999, p. 108).

To sum, the term, glocal language has not come only due to people's needs to project their cultural identity by developing their endo-normative Englishes, but also as a result of the fact that the world as an international community (Pakir, 1999) with its interests in global economy, should recognize the local aspects in their global reach in a way that makes it possible for their multinational corporations to survive worldwide. This clearly demonstrates what has been previously stated by Castells (1996, as cited in Warschauer, 2000, p. 513) to whom Informationalism as a term is traced back, that as a result of Information Communication Technology (ICT) and global economy "we are not living in a global village, but in customized cottages globally produced and locally distributed" (p. 513).

5. Descriptive Changes in the Language

Recently, research on the changes, happening to English due to its international status as a world language, came to address the nature of these changes in terms of its internal linguistic make-up (i.e. phonology, syntax, morphology, etc.) while being used by different users all around the world and from the three Kachruvian (1986) concentric circles: Inner, Outer, and Expanding. This body of research has further considered English as a global commodity that is contextualized to reflect people's concerns about cultural assumptions and practice within a particular social context. As a result of this process of glocalizing the language due to the vast numbers of English-using bilinguals (Pakir, 1999), changes into the language have become increasingly evidenced in terms of its linguistic

componential elements. For example, according to the English Company (Graddol, 1997, as cited in Pakir, 1999), the number of vocabulary has been boosted to reach 8 billion words demonstrating localized uses and flavors. Other changes in the language with respect to phonological, morphosyntactic, lexico-grammatical and pragmatic aspects, have also been captured in recent research studies and spoken corpora such as Seidlhofer's (2004) *Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE)*, Mauranen's (2006) *English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings corpus work* (ELFA), and Jenkins's (2000) *English as a Lingua Franca Core (ELFC)*. Besides, multiple communicative competencies have been culturally introduced, new grammatical structures have been created, and new and different speech acts have been added (Bjorkman, 2008; Jenkins, 2009, 2006; Pakir, 1999; Byram & Feng, 2005; Alptekin, 2002).

The literature on changes into English in consequence of its localized use has provided a clear picture that captures the emergence of new lexical, intonational, syllabic, and phonological patterns of the language. An example of this is *Euro-English* as a variety spoken in Europe, which has undergone some changes in its intonational patterns to be with a more syllable-based intonation instead of the traditional stress-based intonation of British and American patterns. Another example which focuses on culture-specific pragmatic differences is taken from Warschauer (2000) when working in Egypt. He states that his colleagues from the country were usually modifying correspondences written by Americans for the purpose of helping to ensure that the standards of pragmatics and politeness of the use of English for communication (even if between two Americans) in Egypt has been met.

As far as mutual intelligibility is concerned, it has been suggested that no single variety is privileged over other varieties of English (Matsuda, 2003; Y. Kachru, 2005), and that the

more exposure to different varieties, the more one learns and develops his/her ability to accommodate the differences in accent, lexicogrammar, and discourse strategies (Smith, 1992, as cited in Y. Kachru, 2005). Nowadays, getting exposed to mutli-varietal English is easier through recent technological devices and multimedia. In her review of literature on documentations of World Englishes, Y. Kachru (2005) gives reference to different research studies which discuss descriptions of changes happening to the language (phonological, lexical, and grammatical features). She also referred to other changes in dictionary-making, corpora, spoken/written discourse conventions and multi-cultural literary works. With regards dictionary-making for example, she states that there are a number of dictionaries that incorporate items from various regional Englishes such as *Encarta World English Dictionary, 1999*, which had consultants from different Inner and Outer Circle countries (e.g. East Africa, Hong Kong, Hawai, Malaysia-Singapore, South Africa, South Asia, U.K. Black English, and U.S African American English), and *The Macquarie Dictionary 1997*, which incorporates lexical items from different Southeast Asian Englishes (e.g. Malaysia, Singapore, and The Philippines). Like dictionary-making industry, corpus-based projects have been initiated in the late 1980s (Y. Kachru, 2005) to collect data from different contextual varieties of English and compile them in a form of corpus. An example of such projects is *The International Corpus of English (ICE)* project which is based on gathered data from 18 countries from the different circles.

5.1. Related Research Trends

Jenkins's (2000) ground-breaking research on English as a Lingua Franca Core (ELFC) where core and non-core are areas of intelligibility, is a well known example indicating the change in the language in terms of a new emerging branch of spoken English worldwide. Another important and influential

work on ELF developments is Seidlhofer's *Vienna Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE)* (Jenkins, 2006; Bjorkman, 2008), a large corpus of spoken English including recordings of 1 million European English words from professional, academic, and informal settings (Bjorkman, 2008). This project increasingly helps in putting ELF into practice through descriptions of features that are systematically and frequently produced by

L2 speakers (i.e. in the Outer and Expanding Circles), and are different from the native speakers' use, provided that these features do not make any breakdowns in communication. Focusing on lexicogrammar as being important to language teaching and learning, Seidlhofer (2004, as cited in Jenkins, 2006) has addressed in VOICE a number of the most regular features of ELF lexicogrammar. Table (1) gives a reference to these features.

Table 1: Seidlhofer's features of ELF Lexicogrammar

Seidlfofer's (2004) ELF Lexicogrammar features as cited in Jenkins (2006, p. 170)	
• non-use of the third person present tense–s ("She look very sad")	• increasing of redundancy by adding prepositions ("We have to study about . . ." and "can we discuss about . . ?"), or by increasing explicitness ("black colour" vs. "black" and "How long time?" vs. "How long?")
• interchangeable use of the relative pronouns *who* and *which* ("a book who," "a person which")	
• omission of the definite and indefinite articles where they are obligatory in native speaker English and insertion where they do not occur in native speaker English	• heavy reliance on certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*
	• pluralisation of nouns which are considered uncountable in native speaker English ("informations," "staffs," "advices")
• use of an all-purpose question tag such as *isn't it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn't they?* ("They should arrive soon, isn't it?")	• use of that-clauses instead of infinitive constructions ("I want that we discuss about my dissertation")

In the same line, Bjorkman's (2008) study on frequent morphosyntactic features of ELF speech investigates how multicultural university engineering students use English as a lingua franca effectively in content courses at a technical university in Sweden. Her study was partial and preliminary in terms of its results as it sought to figure out authentic speech being recorded when students were group-working. The study's main focus was to identify the type of divergent features of the students' English use from the morphosytactic forms of standard English, especially those that lead to breakdown or disturbance in understanding ELF speech. The results of her study revealed that the ELF speakers in the study seemed to have developed common procedures for effective communication, and

that there were regularities in the participants' usages of morphosyntactic features. These regularities were in line with the common features reported in previous research; however, with some additional usages by the non-native-speaking students, being categorized into three groups; namely, non-standard usages that leads to disturbance, successful reductions of redundancy, and devices that increase comprehensibility. Through analyzing the students' ELF speech, the findings presented the students' non-native-like usage of morphosyntactic structures as not leading to explicit disturbance in communication; a thing which makes her study effective in context. Table (2) shows the findings of this study in the dialogic material in terms of the most common morphosyntactic structures.

Table 2: Bjorkman's ELF Morphosyntactic Features

Bjorkman's (2008) ELF morphosyntactic features	
Features in Harmony with Previous Research	**New Additional Features from the Study Context**
• Words with new meanings such as *boringdom, discriminization, forsify, levelize, to stable* (adjective form used as a verb), *comparing* (used as a noun) etc. • 'Overuse' of common verbs • Uncountable nouns Some cases used countably • *who/which* (interchangeable) • Problematic article use *"**The** poor people use...", "I have **a** exam.", ...solve the problem as ? whole,", "This is ? more tricky one,", "But they have ? very good subway system,", "It's not ? effective solution.", "We need to give **some** proposal", "Did you get it from **some** sources on the Internet?", "In high school, you do **some** examination report."* • Question tags invariable • Left dislocation *"**This rate** you have **it**.", "**Diffusivity** you need **it**", . "**This report** we'll do **it** later.", "**The composition of the liquid it's** the same,..", "**All these chemical reactions they** are reversible."*. • Prepositions • Tense and aspect issues such as 'Subject-verb disagreement', 'Tense and aspect issues' and 'Passive and Active voice problems'. Examples: *"A power system is called a power system, because **it is using** different generator systems.", "But **we affect** by the flow..", "Some of these graphics devices **can attach** to your pc... It **can be happened** that..."*.	• Negation *"It looks **not** good. (cf. It doesn't look good.)", "I think he wo**n't** be here.(cf. I don't think he'll be there.)", "This point is supposed to **not** move. (cf. This point is not supposed to move.)"*. • Problematic plurals: Not marking the plural on the noun such as *"200 **degree**", "...two **type** of...", "We have four **parameter**", "...two more **condition**.", "Over 10 **meter**...", "...ten glass **vessel**", "...all the **detail**...", "...just to get **result**.", "There are some **difference**....", "..several **conclusion**...", and "There are other **reason**."* • Question formulation such as *"How many pages they have", "So where we are?", "Why it is black?", "What other equation I would use?", "Why the function looks like that?",* and *"We should go through every topic?"* •Comparative/ superlative forms (incorrect) such as *more big, more easy, more clear* etc. Notice: Question formulation was the only morphosyntactic feature that has made disturbance and breakdown in meaning**.**

Violations to syntactic rules are considered from the changes happening to English in its multi-varietal forms, and are used to facilitate communication of shared subjective knowledge (Brutt-Griffler, 2002). Like syntax, pragmatics or the norms of interaction is also bound to contextual changes of the language.

Table (3) shows a number of examples of these syntactic and pragmatic changes in World Englishes in Africa and India.

Table 3: Examples of Syntactic and Pragmatic Features from African/Indian Englishes

Syntactic rule/ pragmatic use	Meaning/ reason of such use
The use of the past *could/would* in Indian English instead of *can/will*	Past forms are more tentative and more polite.
The use of *"is it/isn't it?"* in Indian English to replace all ways of making tag questions in the Standard American English like *"Has/hasn't it?", "Was/wasn't it?", and Did/didn't it?"*	Such constrained use of tag questioning can override considerations of syntactic rule-governed use. Directing questioning of an interlocutor simplifies the structure and thus be understandable.
The use of *"they/ their"* instead of *"he/his, she/her"*, *"Did that person get the bag they left in the office?"*	Encompassing masculine and feminine problematic discourse forms in Gender neutrality and sex-indefinite markers (they/their), contributing to stabilization of forms in different varieties of English.
Double negation in South Asian English Vs. American/British English	Double negation in South Asian English is used to intensify negation whereas in American/British English, it renders positive meaning.
The West African constructions *"They like themselves"* instead of *"They like each other"* and *"They speak to themselves in English"* instead of *"They speak to each other"*	Liking themselves and speaking to themselves are used as a characteristic of the entire group, rather than being constructed as a number of individual identities.

Conversing nouns with singular forms but with plural meanings into plural nouns such *"furnitures"*, *"luggages"* in Indian and Black South African usages.	The use of the word by itself connotes a different meaning. Therefore, *"furniture"* and *"luggage"* as singular forms mean *"a piece of furniture"* and *"a piece of luggage"*, respectively.
African uses of *focus constructions* such as *thematization* (*Things* he despises. *People* he despises), *double subjects* (*This woman she is needing help*), and *resumptive references* (*They are clever, the strangers*)	Communicative strategies used to achieve emphasis and thematization. Their use underscores the logic of many African languages, enabling speakers to reorder the English language to reflect their thought channels.
Notice: These examples are taken from Brutt-Griffler (2002) in his review of different studies; namely, Bodine (1998), Trudgill & Hannah (1985), Bhatt (1995), Chisanga & Kamwangamal (1997), B. Kachru (1990), Platt et al. (1984), and Bamiro (2000)	

The factual evidence that meaning is socially (co)constructed and culturally negotiated (Hymes, 1996) makes it obvious that semantics is also influenced by the changes brought by new Englishes. In other words, meaning undergoes a process of renaming and redefining as a result of not being fixed (Cameron, 1998); a thing which makes word meanings across contexts difficult to study in isolation from the context in which they arise as well as from the social meaning. English words in this case are assigned new meanings relevant to the new users. For example, the Southern African English word *"ripe"* when applied to a young woman, means *"ready for marriage"*, whereas the use of the noun *"damage"* refers to the impregnation of a young female (Chisanga & Kamwangamalu, 1997, as cited in Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p.154). In the same source, Brutt-Griffler (2002) reviews some examples of words taken from Adejbija's (1998) and Bokamba's (1992) studies on Nigerian English in which the verb *"settle"* is intransitively used *"He has been settled"* to mean *"receiving some gratification or favor to keep one quiet"*, while *"town council"* refers to the department of sanitation. Table (4) gives reference to a list of semantic uses of South African English.

Table 4: Examples of Semantic features from South African Englishes

Word/idiom in context	Its meaning
The adjective "ripe" when used in a female sense	Ready for marriage
The noun "damage"	Impregnation of a young female
The verb "settle" used intransitively in Nigerian English "He has been settled"	Receiving some gratification or favor to keep one quiet
Town council (Nigerian English)	The department of sanitation
The idiomatic expression "to put to bed" (Nigerian English)	To give birth to a child
The idiomatic expression "to take in" (Nigerian English)	To become pregnant
The idiomatic expression "white-blackman" (Nigerian English)	A black intellectual who behaves as a white man
The idiomatic expression "European appointment" (Nigerian English)	A high-level white collar position
The use of the request forms *I ask/ I request for an extension* instead of the British/American use of modals as in *"Could you please give me an extension"*.	This usage indicates the African norm of acknowledging the status of granting a request to a subordinate petitioner.
Notice: These examples are taken from Brutt-Griffler (2002) in a review of different studies; namely, Chisanga & Kamwangamal (1997), Adejbija (1998), and Bokamba (1992)	

Even Stylistics has undergone changes as a result of the emergence of world Englishes (WEes), especially in the Outer circle countries in East Africa and South East Asia. For instance, in South East African countries, academic writers' formal written English has stylistic features that differ from those Westernized notions of style in a way that makes their usage of academic written English share with other new Englishes the "penchant to the florid" referring to the "tendency towards ornamental English including

circumlocution" (Gough, 1996, as cited in Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p. 152-153). This usage could be explained differently in terms of lack of exposure to the formal conventions of academic literacy, representations of standardized English, and people's cultural preferences. Other examples of the use of different stylistic features can be taken from Ghana and India where in the former, Ghanaian people have a general preference in "flamboyance of English prose and style" (Sey, 1973, as cited in Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p.153), whereas in the latter, the Indians have a tendency of the infusion of the tempo of their life into their English expression just as the same tempo of American or Irish life (B. Kachru, 1983, as cited in Brutt-Griffler, 2002, p.153).

Likewise, phonological differences are found between different varieties of English even in the Inner Circle world. In this regard, Wells (1982, as cited in Bauer, 2002) provides an interesting framework for classifying pronunciation differences between varieties, which could be applied to both colonial varieties as well as local accents. His framework interestingly implies that varieties may have different pronunciations as a result of four major areas including phonetic realization, phonotactic distribution, phonemic systems, and lexical distribution. Table (5) gives some explanations of these areas with some given examples taken from Bauer (2002).

Table 5: Bauer's (2002) Explanations and Examples of Wells's Framework

Area of Pronunciation	Meaning	Examples
Phonetic realization	Refers to the details of pronunciation of a sound and includes those cases where one variety has major allophones which another does not have, or a different range of allophones	- Canadian English distinguishes the vowels in *lout* and *loud* ([ləʊt] and [laʊd] in a way which does not happen in standard varieties elsewhere. - RP has a more palatalised version of /l/ before a vowel, while most other standard international varieties have a rather darker version of /l/ in this position (*lull* or *little*).
phonotactic distribution	- refers to the ways in which sounds can co-occur in words. - The major phonotactic division of English accents is made between rhotic (or 'r-ful') and non-rhotic (or 'r-less')	General American, Canadian, Scottish and Irish varieties of English are rhotic, whereas RP, Australian, New Zealand and South African Englishes are non-rhotic.
phonemic systems	- the phonemic system for a particular variety is based on the minimum number of symbols needed to transcribe that variety. - it has to deal with lexica sets	(see table below)
lexical distribution	- The kind of pronunciation difference which is most easily noticed and commented on. - This is the case where one variety puts a particular word in a different lexical set from another.	In RP the word *tomato* has its second (stressed) vowel in the PALM lexical set, while in American it is in the FACE lexical set

Lexical Set	RP	American	Scottish
Goat	oʊ	**O:**	**o**
Force	ɔ:	**O:**	**o**
Thought	ɔ:	ɔ:	ɒ

In another context, where the focus is still on the phonological changes, Pakir (1999) suggests that the phonological paradigm which is currently used in teaching English as a second or a foreign language should be reconsidered as it heavily focuses on *accent*

reduction (i.e. native speaker model). This reconsideration is represented by the inclusion of *accent addition* in the teaching model depending on World Englishes and ELF research clearly because of the debatable issues related to the inappropriateness of the native speaker model in teaching phonological aspects of the language. Interestingly, this suggestion has been supported by many World Englishes and ELF researchers, especially those who are challenging the Interlanguage theory (Selinker, 1972; 1992) in a way that makes them consider errors and deficiencies unproblematic to the learning and teaching of English, justifying at the same time fossilization as a way to project users' or learners' cultural identity within a particular sociocultural context (Jenkins, 2006; Y. Kachru, 1993, 2005; Kachru & Nelson, 1996). Examples of this issue could be brought in from Singapore and Malaysia where they have culturally adopted English (Singlish and Manglish varieties) as their own language for additional communication to catch up with contemporary technological and economic advancements (Pakir, 1999; Jenkins, 2006; Warschauer, 2000). As a reference to Malaysian English, please see the example taken from
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qQyjWXTGkcM

6. Implications for the ELT Profession

It has become quite noticeable to the ELT profession that English is gaining an international status being the most natural and preferred choice when communication across cultural boundaries takes place between its users all around the globe. Enthusiastically speaking, as learning English is currently a choice in different parts of the world, it will no longer be a choice for the next generations due to its global spread as a fire in dry chaff. Considering the plucentricity of English (Warschauer, 2000; Jenkins, 2006; Y. Kachru, 2005) and its variations in different loco-cultural contexts, teachers, as being affected by these varieties, are said to rethink the structural built-in of the language and of the use of correct language in terms of its standardization and native-speakerness. In this globalizing era, all speakers and users of English are ever more in need to depart from "grassroots practice" (Jenkins, 2006, p.172) or what they have been taught correct for the sake of better comprehensibility between interlocutors from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, little emphasis should be put on learning decontextualized rules which bring little or no avail to the learners.

Interestingly, awareness of all users of English, especially those in the Outer and Expanding Circles, should be raised so as to think globally and act locally in a way that makes them view English as their own language of additional communication rather than as a foreign language controlled by the time-honored and gray-haired concept of native-speakerism (Hui, 2001; Warschauer, 2000; Atkinson, 1999; Tomlinson, 2005) which departs them from the big circle of language use. It is in this way not in another, as has been put by Warschauer (2000), teachers can make use of this situation through generating opportunities for communication that are highly and mainly dependent on values, learners' needs, and cultural norms instead of being heavily based on British and American-oriented syllabuses. Similarly, Pakir (1999) suggests that teachers should be prepared for a world where English has a high-status place as a global language, claiming that it is the role of those involved in the ELT profession (individuals and organizations) to give a hand in internationalizing "the connected community" with English (p. 113). She continues to demonstrate that teachers, whichever circle they are from (Inner, Outer, or Expanding), should be aware of English internationalization as an inevitable process that cannot be easily neglected.

The growth of English as a world language (Brutt-Griffler, 2002) has resulted in a shift in its balance of forces within which L2 speakers are statistically outnumbering L1 speakers (Crystal, 2003; Brumfit, 2001; Warschauer, 2000; Kuo, 2006; Gnutzmann, 2000). This

shift of the balance of powers in terms of numbers of English speakers all around the world has led to another shift of views towards communicative language teaching (CLT) as the currently prominent ELT approach in language teaching (Warschauer, 2000). Put differently, communicative competence has been viewed as "unrealistic" and "utopian" (Alptekin, 2002, p. 57) unless it is culturally redefined and reconsidered in terms of its multiple competencies; namely, linguistic or grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Byram and Feng, 2005; Alptekin, 2002). The reason why the current native speaker model of communicative competence is characterized by utopian and unrealistic (Alptekin, 2002) is that it monolithically perceives its target language (variety of English) and culture as "best-placed" (Jenkins, 2006, p. 172) to be taught and learned all over the world regardless cultural variability.

It is suggested, therefore, that oppositions to this model should be understandable and tolerated and that insistence on adapting to a British/American model by all learners would be rather odd. This could be true when considering the fact that L2 speakers' numbers and their transactions in English with other L2 speakers are highly increasing compared to those with native speakers. Let alone, the needs for international communication and its demands of mutual intelligibility have turned out an imperative (Warschauer, 2000; Jenkins, 2006; Gnutzmann, 2000; Y. Kachru, 2005). This has been attested by Gnutzmann (2000) as he quotes, "It has been estimated that about 80 per cent of verbal exchanges in which English is used as a second or foreign language do not involve native speakers of English"(p. 357).

7. Conclusion

This study has taken a descriptive nature in reviewing the literature on the international status of English as a language that is worldly treated and discussed in terms of both globalization and glocalization. In other words,

the study has shown how trendy and multi-dialectal English language is nowadays as a result of the emergence of New Englishes in different parts of the world, resulting in a great shift in its internal linguistic built-in, which has led to significant locally-treated changes in phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and stylistic elements of the language.

These glocal changes in the language has made it clear that the current status of native speakerism and standardization is no longer useful and appropriate in language pedagogy unless World Englishes (WEes), English as an international language (EIL), English as a lingua franca (ELF), and English as an intercultural language (EIcL) are taken into consideration. Moreover, the study has shed light on the importance of cultural re-modification of communicative competence to include different competencies suitable to a particular sociocultural context where a different variety of English is used. More importantly, the study takes the form of awareness-raising as it gathered data from a wide variety of sources and research studies being incorporated and unified for the purpose of carrying the reader to different river banks in various geographical world spots to be conscious of the global changes that are taking place in the language and of the implications of these changes to the glocal ELT profession.

About the Author:

Mohammad Qasim Al-Tarawneh is a Jordanian applied linguistics practitioner who, besides working as an EFL lecturer at AlGhad International Colleges for Health Sciences in Saudi Arabia, is currently pursuing his Doctoral study in English Language Teaching [ELT] at Eastern Mediterranean University [EMU] in North Cyprus. He has taught English in Jordan, Malaysia and Saudi Arabia as an EFL/ESL lecturer and a teacher. His main research interests are ESP curriculum development, language program evaluation, and language teaching/learning. He is also attentive to teacherly applied-linguistics

related issues like native-speakerism, World Englishes, globalization, pragmatism and discourse analysis.

References

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal, 56* (1), 59-64.

Atkinson, D. (1999). TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 625-654.

Bauer, L. (2002). *An introduction to international varieties of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Bjorkman, B. (2008). 'So where we are?' Spoken lingua franca English at a technical university in Sweden. *English Today, 24*(2), 35-41.

Brumfit, C. J. (2001). *Individual freedom in language teaching: Helping learners to develop a dialect of their own*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Byram, M. & **Feng**, A. (2005). Teaching and researching intercultural competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.). *Handbook of research in second language learning and teaching* (pp. 911-930). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Cameron, D. (1998). Feminist linguistic theories. In S. Jackson & J. Jones (eds.). *Contemporary feminist theories* (pp. 147-161). New York: New York University Press.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Malden, MA: Basil Blackwell.

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

Davies, A. (2007). *An introduction to applied linguistics: From theory to practice (2nd edition)*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gnutzmann, C. (2000), Lingua franca. In M. Byram (ed.). *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 356-359). London: Routledge.

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

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qQyjWXTGkcM

Hui, D. (2001). The globalization of the English language: Reflections on the teaching of English in China. *International Education Journal, 2*(4), 126-133.

Hymes, D. H. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. Bristole, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200–207.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40* (1), 157-181.

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

Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kachru, B. B. (ed.) (1992). *The other tongue (2nd ed.)*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B. B., & Nelson, C. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.). *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 71–102). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Y. (2005). Teaching and Learning of World Englishes. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 155-173). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Kachru, Y. (1993). Interlanguage and language acquisition research. [Review of the book *Rediscovering interlanguage*. *World Englishes 12*, 265–268.

Kramsch, C. (2001). Intercultural Communication. In R. Carter & D. Nunan. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages* (pp. 201-206). Cambridge, Uk: Cambridge University Press.

Kramsch; C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kuo, I. V. (2006). Addressing the issue of teaching English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 60* (3), 213-221.

Markee, N. (2000). Some thoughts on globalization: A response to Warschauer. *TESOL Quarterly,34* (3), 569-574

Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 719-729.

Mauranen, A. (2006). 'A rich domain of ELF: The ELFA corpus of academic discourse'. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 5*(2), 145–59.

Nagel, A. (2010). A dynamic approach to the teaching of language and culture: Intercultural communication in action on the university learning platform. In M. Cal Varela, F. J. F. Polo, L. G. Garcia, & I. M. P. Martinez (Eds.) *Current issues in English language teaching and learning. An international perspectiv*e (pp. 101-111). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Pakir, A. (1999). Connecting with English in the context of internationalization. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(1), 103-114.

Prodromou, L. (2007). 'Is ELF a variety of English?'. *English Today, 23*(2), 47–53.

Prodromou, L. (2006). A reader responds to J. Jenkins's 'Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca'. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 409–413.

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). 'Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 209–39.

Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10,* 209– 231.

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

Sowden, C. (2007). Culture and the 'good teacher' in the English language classroom. *ELT Journal, 61*(4), 304-310.

Tomlinson, B. (2005). English a foreign language: Matching procedures to the context of learning. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 137-153). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Warschauer, M. (2000). The changing global economy and the future of English teaching. *TESOL Quaterly, 34*(3), 511-535.