'Global Englishes' vs. the Common European Framework? Cultural Studies Impulses for Teaching Spoken Language Use and Teacher Education

Göran Nieragden[1]

Die Spezifikationen des Gemeinsamen europäischen Referenzrahmens / Common European Framework (= CEF) zur Bewertung des mündlichen Sprachgebrauchs verlangen auf den höchsten Kompetenzstufen C1-2 Kategorien wie "verschiedene linguistische Formen", "flüssiges, gut strukturiertes mündlichen Ausdrucksvermögen", "eine stets zugängliche Bandbreite von Diskursfunktionen", "Beherrschung komplexer Sprache", "einen natürlichen umgangssprachlichen Redefluss" oder "Variabilität der Organistionsmuster". Die Realität des Englischunterrichts beinhaltet jedoch, klarer als in jeder anderen Zielsprache, das Dilemma der Auswahl unter einerseits diversen 'schulbuchsuggerierten' und präskriptiven Standards und andererseits multiplen tatsächlichen Erscheinungsvarianten in Form von Akzenten und Dialekten. Vor dem Hintergrund dieser Diversität der 'Global Englishes' in der rasch wachsenden Zahl der englischsprachigen Länder nicht-muttersprachlicher Prägung müssen Englischlehrkräfte ihre eigenen Zielvorstellungen der mündlichen Kompetenz im Netzwerk der verfügbaren, mitunter miteinander konkurrierenden Modelle (z.B. ESL, EFL, ELF, NNE; ESP) positionieren. Ihre universitäre Ausbildung muss diese Sachlage äußerst ernst nehmen, da es zu den späteren Aufgaben in der Schule gehört, einzelne Varianten zu Lasten von anderen auszuwählen, zu befürworten, auszuschließen und zu sanktionieren. Der Aufsatz skizziert die derzeitige Lage in der deutschen Lehramtsausbildung Englisch, benennt (paradigmatisch) die Einstellung von Kölner (Erstsemester-)Studierenden zum Thema und argumentiert für einen diversitätstoleranten Ansatz innerhalb der auf mündliche Fertigkeiten bezogenen Fachdidaktik, welcher in der Kultur- und Literaturwissenschaft bereits seit langem etabliert ist.[2]

1. Introduction: ELT and Cultural-Literary Studies

In Continental Europe, more and more University Chairs are created for 'Anglophone Literatures and/or Cultures' (cf. Ahrens et al. 2012), and it thus seems almost inevitable to re-consider also the other subdiscipline as 'Ang-

1 Korrespondenzadresse: Dr. Göran Nieragden, M.A., Universität zu Köln, Englisches Seminar II, Gronewaldstr. 2, 50931 Köln, Tel. 0221-4704628, E-mail: goeran.nieragden@uni-koeln.de

2 A first rough version of the paper was given as a talk at the "Cercles Seminar: The central role of the learner in using the CEF and the Euroepan Language Portfolio" on November 25, 2011 at the University of Groningen. I am very grateful to the editorial team of the ZFF for substantial and helpful suggestions for improvement.

lophone Languages'. The question of realising such a welcoming of multilingualism in mastering two to four different varieties of English, however, is far from being addressed objectively. In such a project, the aim could be a range of assimilated varieties whose users might be likely to look to Europe or Asia for their norms of correctness, not necessarily to the comparatively small number of native speakers in the UK. In that manner, positively connotated pluricultural and plurilingual identities would become a desirable aim of the ELT classroom, especially for parts of the world that are not traditionally under the influence of the Anglosphere where: "[...] together with encouraging and valuing users' appropriation of English, it is important to acknowledge and promote ways that individuals take ownership of English" (Phan 2009: 201; cf. also Rivers 2010). If it is a trite that language study seems senseless if learners know nothing about the people who speak it, or the country in which it is spoken, the case of English is indeed the most complex one in light of the many peoples and countries concerned.

A suitable definiton of the general field of English studies as "the diversity of different discourses and practices in the English-speaking world" (Antor 2010: 4) has long been realised in Cultural and Literary Studies with their acceptance of underlying concepts like hybridity, interspace, and de-centering as key. For "EFL teaching this means that there is a need to rethink its non-linguistic thematic content" (Kolb 2012: 44). These fields have become less essentialist, less prescriptive in assessing norms of behaviour, maps of meaning, and diversified cultural codes. In fiction studies, for instance, it is especially the polyphonic and heteroglossic nature of the genre that is praised and highlighted and is taken to be a testing ground of how we can "cope with the resulting heterogeneity of the multiple alterities we are constantly confronted with" (Antor 2010: 4). Such alterities, I believe, reside in the area of English language as much as in that of cultural and literary practices. It is from these that the field of English Language Teaching (= ELT) can gain some fresh impulses concerning methodological and materials-related issues for the central competence of speaking (as opposed to reading and writing).

As target learners can be expected to encounter and negotiate in English with other language users from ever-increasing, and ever-diversifying cultural, spatial and ideological identity platforms, Common European Framework (= CEF) key notions like "the enriching experience of otherness" (Council of Europe 2001: 1) could thus lose the character of idealistic wishful thinking when applied to the realities of English as spoken outside the

classroom, despite the conceptual and practical difficulties which concern definitions as much as implementations.

2. The CEF, Standard English and Spoken English

The major need that deserves attention when teaching languages against the backdrop of transnational 'agreed-upon' standards and principles is that the current version of the CEF, with all its usefulness for comparing and contrasting achievements, raises one serious problem that concerns the teaching of the most important and influential language of all times: "the increase in the importance of English has been the most significant global geolinguistic event in the past fifty years" (Hoffmann 2011: 10; cf. also Ehrenreich 2009; Jenkins 2007). As useful as the partition into proficiency levels and competence fields is, a(ny) language's different varieties of realisation, its versions, its 'lects', as yet play little to no role in these systems' character as tools for the teacher and examiner, and benchmarks for the learner. In the most recent version of the CEF, the target competence of speaking on the advanced levels C1-C2 is formulated like this (excerpts only):

	Range	Accuracy	Fluency	Interaction	Coherence
C2	... great flexibility reformulating ideas in differing linguistic forms ... finer shades of meaning ... good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.	...consistent grammatical control of complex language ...	... with a natural colloquial flow...	... interweave his/ her contribution into the joint discourse with fully natural turntaking ...	... full and appropriate use of a variety of organisational patterns ...
C1	... good command of a broad range of language ... in an appropriate style	... relatively high degree of grammatical accuracy ...	... fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly...	... select a suitable phrase from a readily available range of discourse functions ...	... produce clear, smoothly flowing, well structured speech ...

Figure 1: Common Reference Levels: Qualitative aspects of spoken language (assembled from Council of Europe 2001: *passim*)

A careful look at these formulations reveals the difficulty of making these epithets work for English: which of its real-life versions should form the basis for "differing linguistic forms", "a natural colloquial flow" or "a broad range of language"? Which of its many global realisations, known under the common heading of English as a Lingua Franca (=ELF), will become more significant, i.e. more useful, for the coming generation of users? How straightforward and undisputed can the criterion of "consistent grammatical control" under "Accuracy" be under these circumstances? The idea of "appropriateness" is referred to twice ("Range"; "Coherence") and seems to hold a stronger promise; it is this very ability to act appropriately that can benefit from being observed from a Cultural Studies perspective which, moreover, would be an antidote to the CEF- and *Bildungsstandards*-influenced present-day almost exclusive "interest in testability" (Kolb 2012: 44).

Indeed, any static and preservative understanding of linguistic contents to be taught seems ill-founded in the issue at hand, if we recall that the CEF fixes the targets in Foreign Language Skills Training for state school learners (each at a varying degree of proficiency, of course) in a very dynamic and broad manner:

Reception ⇒	ability to understand spoken and written language
Production ⇒	ability to use spoken and written language
Interaction ⇒	ability to hold conversations and to correspond
Mediation ⇒	ability to mediate in writing and speaking by translation and paraphrase

Figure 2: Targets in Foreign Language Teaching under the *CEF* (assembled from Council of Europe 2001: *passim*).

The underlying 'can do'-approach – instead of a 'must-know' one – can do a lot towards liberating language learners form the position of being linguistically in a permanent defensive (cf. Bardi 2011). (Beginning) learners of English often ask to be taught a 'pure' and 'correct' language variety (cf. Decke-Cornill 2008; Timmis 2002) – here, teachers will have to walk the tightrope between supplying what the (application; job; test administering) market is asking for, and providing 'Englishes' that 'work' with people around the world (cf. Ehrenreich 2010; Norbrook 2008). According to recent surveys carried out by Aboshiha & Holliday (2009), Ozturk & Atay (2010) and Henderson (2011), the main challenge for Non-Native Speaker (=NNS) teachers seems to be the prevalent wish of their learners to be taught by a Native Speaker (=NS) teacher, not a substantial lack of personal linguistic or didactic competences. A future challenge will therefore be to inform learners of their own increasing activity as users of the language within NNs contexts. Benchmark systems and testing formats like the CEF will not have to be discarded; yet they must not be "misused as a normative document" (Vogt 2012: 92) and need not stick to an older, exclusively (British English) NS-oriented variety. Some recent projects are already trying to systematize the changes within English that come with increased NNs usage (cf. Baker 2011; Kelly 2011; Rupp et al. 2008). After all, it is the main commitment of the CEF to promote language learning as a means of extending learners' communicative and behavioural abilities and, certainly, this should include the permanently extending range of English users throughout the world.

3. Critique of 'Native-Speakerness' as Counter-Argument

For any model to become a standard in teaching and assessment, the phenomenon modelled must be clearly delineated in size, range and depth; it must be mutually and multilaterally intelligible in an unambiguous way. Looking at the abundance of existing models of English in this day of its

globalized usage, it is clear that all recent suggestions display a certain degree of elaboration on the levels of lexis, pronunciation and 'good usage' among a specific group of users (e.g. international business people or transcontinental co-workers). They are increasingly used throughout the world, contribute to a community's sense of selfhood (LKVE), have their own technical vocabulary (EAP; ESP) or standardized (reduced) grammar (CCE; GWLC; ISSE; LFC):

BGE	Basic Global English (Grzega)
CCE	Common Core English (Carter)
EAP	English for Academic Purposes (various)
EFL	English as a Foreign Language (=NNS only)
EIL	English as an International Language (=including NS)
ESP	English for Specific Purposes (various)
EYL	English for Young Learners (various)
ISSE	International Standard Spoken English (Crystal)
LFC	Lingua Franca Core (Jenkins)
LKVE	Lesser Known Varieties of English (Schreier at al.)
PEL	Polyethnic Englishes (Kachru)

Figure 3: Common abbreviations for the most prominent models of 'alternative' standards of English (assembled from Crystal 2003; Grzega 2008; Jenkins 2000, 2003; Higgins 2009; Meshtrie & Bhatt 2008; Prodromou 2008; Schreier et al. 2010; Sharifian 2009; Svartvik & Leech 2006)

All these new projections lack a clear standard of codification concerning the category of "Accuracy" that is emphasised in the CEF (cf. Fig. 1). This lack has led some experts to discard thema as a chimera, simply acknowledging that more and more people use the language without sufficient grasp of its intricacies. Maley (2010: 35), for instance, calls the entire ELF concept a "myth", and claims that "[n]either ELT publishers nor examination boards can see any profit in killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, namely a standard variety of English, in favour of an ugly duckling with dubious public support among learners, teachers or sponsors". It is revealing, however, that this apodictic statement is chiefly based on commercialised arguments, not free of bias, and also ignores contributions from sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and intercultural communication. It is in particular these disciplines which constantly remind us of, broadly speaking, language's adaptability and context-dependence, and have influenced our understanding of concepts such as linguistic correctness, appropriateness, functionality and acceptability.

Furthermore, the frequent claim that it is exactly because of the immense variety of 'Englishes' that ELT needs NS as exclusive reference points in order to stop language disintegration, seems to be suffering from two weaknesses, one quantitative, the other qualitative. The term disintegration suggests a homogeneous, ubiquitously accepted and inherently more 'sound' variety which never existed anywhere anyway (it is enough to remind ourselves of the role that accent used to play within the confines of British class traditions). Language diversification is a much more attractive notion which, again, shows a leaning towards the less evaluative and essentialist thinking that is at the heart of Cultural Studies. Moreover, even if agreement could be reached here, the underlying problem of establishing the one standard variety would still remain, as there is enough diversification within the inner circle of NS as it is (cf. Amador Moreno 2007); respectively the very circle boundaries appear more fuzzy than was the case in the 1980s-1990s (cf. Tsiplakou 2009).

We can thus conclude that a number of the hindrances at welcoming English as a dislocated, de-nativized language may well prove to be ideological and subjective, not systematic (cf. Holliday 2009; Jenkins 2007; Mair 2003; Schneider 2011). Within English Studies in general, they also appear somewhat peculiar to ELT, as studies on migration and travel have been willing to take the idea of displaced subjects for granted ever since the 1980s. In other words, if we accept 'Sino-American' as a workable epithet for cultural and verbal arts, it seems hard to justify to simply discard the expressive power of *Chinglish*, *Japlish* and their emergent brothers. The attempt at overcoming cultural imperialism and ethnocentrism should not stop at the borders of linguistic and pedagogical ones.

Maley's strong defense of (British English?) NS norms rests on a seemingly common-sense finding: "Anything goes, up to a point ... but not all the time and in every situation. Learners need clear-cut and authoritative guidance" (2010: 40). This is true for practical aspects of classroom teaching as well as for conceptual ones as long as the alternative models (cf. Fig. 3) lack unambigousness. Attempting a rigid codification of e.g., ELF Europe, ELF Asia, ELF Africa, ELF South America, would certainly prove an impossible task. Yet the problematic question remains: Who What Which is the authority to support English teachers' role in providing authority, guidance and finality in their teaching? The reflexive answer would certainly be, the NS, but even this category is one that is fast losing its clear definition. Alan Davies' seminal study *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality* (2003) calls the NS of English "an emperor without any clothes" (Davies

2003: 213), and argues that, with the exception of earliest childhood exposure, all criteria for NS status are contingent, and that the area where NS and NNS differ most is in judgments, not in performance. His conclusion that the whole opposition is in fact one of confidence and sense of identity rather than one of knowledge and competence (cf. already Wardhaugh 1999) mirrors one more lesson on the position-dependence of all evaluative criteria that Cultural Studies have been willing to accept for a long time. In a 2002 white paper commissioned by the European commission itself, Michael Byram formulated the consequences of this as follows:

> Furthermore, intercultural competence is only partially a question of knowledge, and it is the other dimensions (*savoir être*, *savoir apprendre*/*faire*, *savoir comprendre and savoir s'engager*) which must be given importance in the teaching and learning process. These savoirs are however not automatically acquired by the native speaker since they focus on how people interact with other cultures. So a native speaker who has never ventured out of their country or even out of their restricted local society, does not have these other savoirs which are crucial to intercultural competence. Thus, a non-native speaker inferiority complex is only the result of misunderstanding and prejudice. What is more important than native speaker knowledge is an ability to analyse and specific training in systemic cultural analysis is an important aid in becoming a foreign language teacher, regardless of the teacher's mother-tongue (Byram et al. 2002: 17f.).

Seen from this angle, the view of NNS as, by definition, deficient users, needs correction: it is not only in light of demographic developments that it seems more suitable to characterise them as users with a difference. Such a change would also be warranted against by sheer quantity, as, even though there are languages that have more native speakers than English, e.g. Mandarin, English has the widest geographical distribution and is the only contemporary language that has more NNS than NS.

Finally, where the difficulty of agreeing on any new model for an internationalised ELT should prove the main reason for supporting the old one, and would thus constitute a real, objective hindrance, Davies (2003) also reminds us that defining the latter is not really any easier (cf. also Aboshiha & Holliday 2009). Native English, too, is prone to change, and appears much less monolithic, timeless and static in sensible curricular phrasing and schoolbook publishing than was the case in earlier editions. In the light of these arguments, the fact that a rather close variant of, e.g., Received Pronunciation is still expected from NNS in speaking English, especially from those who are set to become future English teachers, can seem somewhat outdated or even awkward.

4. Needs Perception, Learners' Self-Characterisation and the Realities of ELT

Language learners of today will experience a thoroughly globalised world as language users tomorrow: a class excursion to London will see more German / European pupils outside a *Chicken Curry Parlour* than inside a pub ordering a *Ploughman's Lunch*; in many other medium-sized cities they are likely to encounter more saris than pin-stripe suits, more dreadlocks than flat tops (cf. Hammer 2012). The mediated culture-coded version of Great Britain or England, for that matter, which they will know is not the one from *Fawlty Towers*, but the one from *Bend It Like Beckham* (obligatory for A-levels in Northrhine-Westphalia). They will have heard English as spoken in the stand-up comedy world of Ali G., *Omid Djalili* or similar, but not the gentrified estuary accents in *Yes, Minister*. Contemporary Arts & Humanities already do their best to offer plausible descriptive and comparative criteria when investigating ideologies, power relations and senses of belonging: Black British is an established field of enquiry; American Studies at School and University Level include non-WASP ('White Anglo-Saxon Protestant'), non-DWEM ('Dead White European Male'), Native American, *TexMex* and *Chicana* contributions. When the topography of London is at the heart of teaching literary texts, Monica Ali's *Brick Lane* will be of much greater relevance than Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*. Likewise, events such as the World Cup 2010 in South Africa, and the 2022 one in Qatar make units on, say, the lexical features of South African English or the phonology of Arabic English appear credible and useful.

Recent years have shown that the majority of beginning students at Western European universities now name General American English as their 'more normal', 'more familiar' and indeed preferred variety, thus supporting Crystal's claim on that variety's dominance made as early as 2003 (Crystal 2003). Approximately 30% of first-year students majoring in ELT for Primary, Secondary and also Special Needs / Additional Requirements Schools have been to the US; only 12% have been to the UK; 4% have first-hand experience of Australia/New Zealand; less than 2% have been to Ireland.[3] These figures reveal their repercussions in students' written work on the le-

3 Figures come from asking first-term students at my home department (ca. 300 per year) in seminars and lectures between winter 2009 and summer 2012. Bardi (2011) and Kelly (2011) report on similar results in other European contexts.

vel of spelling and lexis; in oral contributions, on the level of (Americanised) pronunciation.

Most of these students have learned English through, and are not entirely unlikely to teach it themselves by recourse to, the current array of schoolbooks tailor-made for the competence levels and objectives of the named school forms. These materials, however, use British English / RP as the 'default' variety for the purposes of rule explanation, audio samples, pattern drill, formal grading and corrective feedback. Observations on differences to American English are limited to footnotes or the appendix, hardly ever mentioning the existence of the countless other varieties at all.[4] This not only "degrades dialectal variation" (Keßler & Plesser (2011: 39; cf. also Gnutzmann & Intermann 2009; Kirkpatrick 2007) in general, but has far-reaching consequences for the learners' evolving view of their future subject: by failing to take the pluri-ethnic and multi-centred reality of English into account, publishers and educational boards alike contribute to a falsely homogeneous attitude that seems especially harmful during the pre-service phases of teacher training at university.

In the highly federalistic system of Germany's educational landscape many political reforms of recent years "have conceptually incorporated the notion of world Englishes" (Sing 2007: 241), yet teacher education itself, and the accompanying media and methods, are still a long way from a real implementation, with offered forms of needs analysis not really incorporating global issues of the language's development. They need to incorporate the new vantage point that English is no longer only one of many school subjects, but "has attained more of the status of a *Kulturtechnik* – a basic elementary educational skill like literacy and numeracy" (Klippel 2009: 15; cf. also Klippel 2012). And in an age, when intercultural competence is the agreed-upon major aim of all foreign language teaching, language classes must equip students with the ability to relate to diverse cultures and critically reflect on their own. This implies a critical thinking that extends from mere linguistic knowledge into (cross-) cultural studies.

4 A recent book survey on "Global English and ELT Coursebooks" rounds this off ironically: "The authors of English language courses would have no difficulty in obtaining samples of non-native pronunciation. In Britain today it might be enough to step out of their front door and stop the first person they see" (Buckledee 2010: 150-151). Kolb (2012: 42-43) systematizes the (small) number of positive exceptions among canonical *Lehrwerke* in the German state school system; cf. Clandfield (2011) for a prime example of a series of adult education materials (Macmillan's Global Series) that give as much room to non-native Englishes as to its native varieties.

5. Diversity Fostering Strategies for ELT

In what follows, I shall try to bring this sense of diversity tolerance onto the field of English language teacher education, the major aim being a raised awareness of the sheer multiplicity of their subject matter and their own changing role as keepers of a 'standard' that has stopped being unambiguous or unanimous. The points suggested below can support those elements of pre-service teacher training which concentrate on active and passive spoken language use. During the in-service phases, teachers-to-be will have to be exposed to a reality check that, naturally, needs to consider third-party demands concerning test and exam contents (cf. also Snow et al. 2006). Ideally, training future English teachers at university toward a more flexible understanding of their subject would have long-term effects for a greater awareness and acceptance of 'Englishes' in school.

Linguistic input of spoken language needs to be much more varied across the range of Englishes. Though Chinese, Russian or Indian accents in speaking English are at first 'harder' to understand to German (and other West European) learners, as they are linguistically further removed, it will be these which the former and their pupils are going to encounter much more frequently in their later professional life. Schöpper-Grabe (2012: 136) reports on a large-scale company survey conducted in 2006:

> English was clearly dominant when communicating with business partners abroad. Apart from doing business with the USA and Great Britain, even most of the communication with China (92%), Portugal (84%), Russia (79%), Latin America (75%) and Spain (71%), for instance, was in English. Communicating in the customer's language had a comparatively low importance – between 17% and 31% of the communication with France, Italy, Spain and Latin America, for example, were conducted in the language of the customer [...].

Performance targets need to be very clearly defined. Regarding the formulations in the CEF (cf. fig. 1 and 2), it must be made clear whether the patterns of conversing and mediating concern NN–N (British), NN–N (American), NN–N (other), or NN–NN contexts. The cultural implications related to power, dominance, and function of these constellations are more than plain (cf. Block & Cameron 2002; Kachru & Smith 2008). Hence, apart from linguistic competence, in the sense of purposeful communicative functionality, not abstract memory retrieval of rules per se, language awareness should be addressed, i.e. a conscious perception of and sensitivity to (variants of) language usage.

Error tolerance should on the one hand be more lenient if the 'errors' committed are indeed acceptable in an established variety of English (especially true for word order; tense usage and pronunciation; cf. McKay 2002); on the other, it needs to be very aware of the difference between a 'bad', sense-blocking mistake and a 'regional turn of phrase' (cf. McKay & Bokhorst-Heng 2008). Following Jenkins (2007), one might extend this point up to the encouragement, but at least to the acceptance of innovations that NN bring to the language. If error correction were less strict when it comes to spoken English, teaching pronunciation would no longer be a fight for foreign accent reduction, but a clarifying of scales of tolerability (cf. Walker 2008). The by far more significant role that speaking plays in everyday encounters (over writing) should accordingly be considered in lesson planning, not least from a quantitative perspective. It is a trite that without sufficient speaking time, even advanced readers of English in the upper classes may remain shy as concerns oral participation: "The real world shows that there is a demand for oral proficiency training but it still plays a subordinate role for many teachers" (Schmitt-Egner 2012: 237).

Hence, corrective feedback should always be a positive stimulus, not only a 'mistake reminder', but one of the potential 'aptness' of chunks, phrases, patterns, forms, sounds in certain varieties of the language (cf. Rubdy 2009). Permanent 'butting in' will certainly keep learners from practising their spoken English willingly and enthusiastically;[5] petrifying the ideal of 'sounding just like' a Brit or an American as the only desirable outcome will fail to support communicative encounters with three quarters of the world population. It also produces a high sense of failure, poor marks and, consequently, a strong inhibition to use the language: research has shown that this is indeed one of the main reasons for "learner anxiety" and "students' low self-esteem" (Kęblowska 2007: 169, cf. also Graddol 2006). Similarly, empirical studies undertaken by Rebuck (2011) on the reaction of NN (Japanese) learners to NS teachers' attitudes promise highly interesting results for overcoming the frequent inhibition to speak and write when the NS (teacher) is in the only alleged power position. Seen from a Cultural Studies perspective, declaring the imitation of NS language behaviour the exclusive aim is nothing short of a strong sense of othering the learner whose quality as foreign will then always have pejorative subtones.

5 Naturally, the default variant against which written work is assessed must also be made explicit, not necessarily as the only correct form of written discourse, but as a norm fulfilling the purposes of teaching and assessing.

Whereas until the 1980s foreign language pedagogy believed in the principle of no L1 usage in the L2 classroom, a growing awareness of the learner language's function as a useful and helpful tool can now be ascertained. Especially when areas of Contrastive Linguistics among the languages are addressed (cf. Kaupmann 2012), the mother tongue is a useful tool in learning a foreign one, not an obstacle: "while in the classroom the teachers try to keep the two languages separate, the learners in their own minds keep the two in contact" (Widdowson 2003: 150).[6] The common employment of N and NN teachers in teams or in turns could prove very beneficial here: whereas the first are authentic role models of – geographically distinct – fluency, accuracy and target culture contexts, the latter have the advantages of the learner language as a perfect help utility, and the knowledge of those target language's pitfalls (e.g. false friends; syntax) which are specific to learners with identical linguistic backgrounds. NN teachers will also know about the psychological difficulties that surround second language pronunciation and thus bring empathy and positive encouragement to their learners' respective state of 'interlanguage'. Rao (2010; cf. also Lin 2009) summarises the results from analysing questionnaires returned by Chinese learners studying for an ELT degree like this:

> [...] EFL students felt that some additional qualities were required for native speakers to become competent English teachers in EFL contexts. Some students were dissatisfied with their NS teachers' classroom performance because they were insensitive to students' linguistic problems, inconsistent with students' learning styles and unfamiliar with the local cultural and educational system (Rao 2010: 55).

Through giving N and NN teachers a common platform, the English in the classroom can become feasible as a realistic mode of communication among N and NN alike. Together, such teams whose members teach "the variety of English they actually use and feel more confident with" (Benrabah-Djennane 2007: 234) could do their best to make learners not only have recourse to one model, but maximise their linguistic capital which helps them to reach the aim of clarity of speech and easeness of understanding rather than formal accuracy alone. Simon Sweeney's reply to his Italian learners' desire to be taught '*l'inglese della regina*' seems worth remembering for

6 This needs to be measured carefully against the principle of early foreign language teaching promoting immersion and thus encouraging learners' capacity for self-monitoring, self-correction and, thus, unconscious self-learning (cf. Kolb 2009). Yet it is sincerely to be hoped that days are over when German English Teachers pretended not to understand, and hence refused to react to, questions, queries and comments in German (Decke-Cornill 2008; Klippel 2009).

the whole (language) teaching profession: "If you learn English from me, it'll be the English I speak" (Sweeney 2005: 35).

The usefulness of pragmatic components and strategies for learners of any language found entry into teaching materials in the 1990s and is now evident. But although contrastive-comparative types of explanation are common for some fields of lexis (false friends; phrasal verbs etc.), they still seem to be lacking in matters of politeness, hedging, face-saving, and indirectness:

> In actual communication, speakers will quickly find out that knowledge of linguistic forms alone does not insure successful communication, it is also crucial to know when to use which form, i.e. it is also crucial to be familiar with politeness strategies, since politeness strategies can vary significantly from civilization to civilization. [...] 'over-politeness' can be as confusing for the interlocutor as "under-politeness" (Grzega 2008: 141).

Especially when strategies from these areas are highlighted referring to various 'Englishes', language aptness, language diversity, and, again, language awareness could be fostered through such a contrastive pragmatics (cf. Mukherjee & Hundt 2010). The strong differences between the culturally safe employment of direct vs. indirect speech acts, the degree of ambiguity tolerated or indeed called for with users of a specific variety of English might be ultimately more useful for a communication-driven language teaching that is fed by "data driven" rather than "categorical pragmatics" (Grundy 2008: 197). In a German context, a study from the late 1990s questioning English users ten years after leaving school revealed:

> Die mangelnde Konfrontation mit authentischen Hörsituationen verhinderte die Ausbildung von Hörverstehensstrategien, die die Bewältigung auch schwieriger, anspruchsvoller Kommunikationssituationen ermöglichen. Auch Umgangssprache und Alltagskommunikation fanden nicht genügend Berücksichtigung. So wurde die mangelnde Beherrschung von Floskeln, Wendungen und Kommunikationsstrategien für *small talk* und informelle Gespräche als "peinlich" und "sehr störend" und damit auch als Ursache eines kommunikationsbegleitenden Unsicherheitsgefühls empfunden, das "die Freude am Gespräch" immer wieder beeinträchtigte (Aßbeck & Schraml 2011: 109).

A further lesson to be learned from Literary and Cultural Studies can be to attribute the role that regionalism already plays in the choice of narrative texts, song lyrics, tourism inquiries, websites and videoclips to regional varieties of English. Units on dialectology fruitfully complete the learners' understanding of both the dynamic character of the target language and the ab-

stract, more static notion of the (school) bookish variety (cf. also Kolb 2012; Seidlhofer 2011).

Teachers need to revise their own role understanding and stop considering themselves as, exclusively, instructors; they will have to become diversity scouts when 'handling English aptly' rather than 'using English correctly' is at stake. Wright (2009: 41), for instance, argues for an innovative form of "empowering solution" especially in initial teacher training, as the very teaching content has become the world's major communicative instrument.

6. Conclusion: From Multiculturalism to Multilingualism in ELT

The above named proficiency descriptors of the CEF (cf. fig. 1) appear to be in need of 'globalisation' in the very near future if they want to keep up the claim of benchmarking the communicative abilities of learners. Objectives such as "an appropriate style", "range of discourse functions" or "variety of organisational patterns" will need more than one norm for the key goal of learner autonomy that the CEF wants to help realise (cf. Lennon 2012; Little 2009). And the CEF, in its own words, will have to allow for a broader "range of language" concerning how geolinguistically idiosyncratic the levels it wants its disciples to achieve sound, look and 'feel' in real life. In future editions, it will certainly have to incorporate – and set rules of acceptance for – features from the many developing non-native varieties of English. For these, the task ahead will be to fill categories such as accuracy, appropriateness, naturalness and suitability with life:

> Die Nützlichkeit des Englischen im außerschulischen Leben [...] wird von den meisten Schülern/Schülerinnen in der Möglichkeit der globalen Kommunikation gesehen. Die Attraktivität des Englischunterrichts ist daher eng an die Entwicklung der (mündlichen) Kommunikationsfähigkeit gekoppelt, da diese Kompetenz als das eigentliche Ziel des Fremdsprachenunterrichts betrachtet wird (Aßbeck & Schraml 2011: 114).

Eingang des revidierten Manuskripts 19.12.2012

References

Aboshiha, Pam & Holliday, Adrian (2009), The denial of ideology in perceptions of 'nonnative speaker' teachers. *TESOL Quarterly* 43, 669-689.

Ahrens, Rüdiger, Maria Eisenmann & Hammer, Julia (Hrsg.) (2012), *Anglophone Literaturdidaktik: Zukunftsperspektiven für den Englischunterricht*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Amador Moreno, Carolina Pilar (2007), Varieties of English – varieties of literature. Some notes on Irish English and ELT. *Teanga* 22, 53-69.

Antor, Heinz (2010), From postcolonialism and interculturalism to the ethics of transculturalism in the age of globalization. In: Antor, Heinz, Matthias Merkl, Klaus Stierstorfer & Laurenz Volkmann (Hrsg.) (2010), *From Interculturalism to Transculturalism. Mediating Encounters in Cosmopolitan Contexts*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1-13.

Aßbeck, Johann & Schraml, Annette (2011), Nicht nur für die Schule, sondern für das Leben lernen wir – gilt das auch für den Englischunterricht? *Forum Sprache* 6/2011, 107-118.

Baker, Will (2011), Intercultural awareness: modelling an understanding of cultures in intercultural communication through English as a lingua franca. *Language & Intercultural Communication* 11, 197-214.

Bardi, Mirela (2011), Common evaluation frameworks for language teachers, *Forum Sprache 5/2011*, 100-112

Beaven, Briony (Hrsg.) (2007), *IATEFL 2006. Harrogate Conference Selections*. Canterbury: IATEFL.

Benrabah-Djennane, Nadia (2007), Questions around ELF: investigating teachers' attitudes. In: Beaven, Briony (Hrsg.) (2007), 233-235.

Block, David & Cameron, Deborah (Hrsg.) (2002), *Globalization and Language Teaching*. London: Routledge.

Buckledee, Steve (2010), Global English and ELT coursebooks. In: Gagliardi & Maley (Hrsg.) (2010), 141-151.

Byram, Michael, Bella Gribkova & Hugh Starkey (2002). *Developing the Intercultural Dimension in Language Teaching. A Practical Introduction for Teachers*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Carter, Ronald (1997), *Investigating English Discourse. Language, Literacy and Literature*. London: Routledge.

Clandfield, Lindsay (2011), *Global Intermediate Coursebook*. London: Macmillan.

Council of Europe (2001), *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (2003), *English as a Global Language* (2. Aufl.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, Alan (2003), *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Decke-Cornill, Helene (2008), Educational perspectives on English as a lingua franca. In: Delanoy, Werner & Volkmann, Laurenz (Hrsg.) (2008), *Future Perspectives for English Language Teaching*. Tübingen: Narr, 159-171.

Ehrenreich, Susanne (2009), Englisch als Fremdsprache auf dem global-lokalen Prüfstand. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung* 20, 3-36.

Ehrenreich, Susanne (2010), Lingua Franca Englishes in internationalen Unternehmen: Stand der Forschung und Zwischenbilanz eines Forschungsprojekts. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 35, 7-42.

Gagliardi, Cesare & Maley, Alan (Hrsg.) (2010), *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and Learning Issues*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Gnutzmann, Claus & Intermann, Frauke (Hrsg.) (2009), *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom* (2. Aufl.). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Graddol, David (2006), *English Next. Why Global English May Mean the End of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: The British Council.

Grundy, Peter (2008), ELT and why we need a new pragmatics. In Beaven, Briony (Hrsg.) (2008), *IATEFL 2007. Aberdeen Conference Selections*. Canterbury: IATEFL, 196-197.

Grzega, Joachim (2008), Lingua Franca English as a way to intercultural and transcultural competence. *Journal for EuroLinguistiX* 5, 134-161.

Hammer, Julia (2012), *Die Auswirkungen der Globalisierung auf den modernen Fremdsprachenunterricht. Globale Herausforderungen als Lernziele und Inhalte des fortgeschrittenen Englischunterrichts. Are We Facing the Future?* Heidelberg: Winter.

Henderson, Juliet (2011), New and not so new horizons: brief encounters between UK undergraduate native-speaker and non-native-speaker Englishes. *Language & Intercultural Communication* 11, 270-284.

Higgins, Christina (2009), *English as a Local Language. Post-Colonial Identities and Multilingual Practices*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Hoffmann, Zsuzsa (2011), *Ways of the World's Words. Language Contact in the Age of Globalization*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Holliday, Adrian (2009) English as a lingua franca: 'non-native speakers' and cosmopolitan realities In: Sharifian, Farzad (Hrsg.) (2009), *English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 21-33.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2000), *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: OUP.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2003), *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2007), *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. (1986), *The Alchemy of English. The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Yamuna & Smith, Larry E. (2008), *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes*. London: Routledge.

Kaupmann, Kathrin (2012), Lexical compensatory strategies among learners of different age levels: implications for teachers. In: Lennon, Paul (Hrsg.) (2012), 177-203.

Kęblowska, Magdalena (2007), The factors contributing to proficient English users' language classroom anxiety. In: Beaven, Briony (Hrsg.) (2007), 168-170.

Kelly, Michael (2011), Strategic issues for language teacher education in Europe, *Forum* Sprache 5/2011, 22-41.
Keßler, Jörg-U. & Plesser, Anja (2011), *Teaching Grammar*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
Kirkpatrick, Andy (2007), *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Klippel, Friederike (2009), Teaching English as a foreign language: new approaches and challenges. *Anglistik* 20, 13-26.
Klippel, Friederike (2012), English Language Teacher Education. *Anglistik* 23, 153-163.
Kolb, Elisabeth (2009), Finite Resources – Infinite Communication: Sprachmittlung im Englischunterricht der Unterstufe. *Forum Sprache* 1/2009, 69-87
Kolb, Elisabeth (2012), Statements and Cultural Content: More Than Knowledge About Target Language Countries. *Anglistik* 23, 39-47.
Lennon, Paul (Hrsg.) (2012), *Learner Autonomy in the English Classroom. Empirical Studies and Ideas for Teachers*. Berne: Peter Lang.
Lennon, Paul (2012), The story of learner autonomy: from self-access to social learning. In: Lennon, Paul (Hrsg.) (2012), 19-64.
Lin, Lu-Fang (2009). Second Language Learners' Identity toward Their Home Culture: Adding Pragmatic Knowledge to Language Learning Curriculum. *Asian Social Science* 5, 43-51.
Little, David (2009), Language learner autonomy and the European Language Portfolio: two L2 English examples. *Language Learning* 42, 222-233.
Mair, Christian (Hrsg.) (2003), *The Politics of English as a World Language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
Maley, Alan (2010), The Reality of EIL and the Myth of ELF. In: Gagliardi & Maley (Hrsg. (2010), 25-44.
McKay, Sandra Lee (2002), *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
McKay, Sandra Lee & Bokhorst-Heng, Wendy D. (2008), *International English in its Sociolinguistic Contexts. Towards a Socially Sensitive EIL Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
Meshtrie, Rajend & Bhatt, Rakesh M. (2008), *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: CUP.
Mukherjee, Joybrato & Hundt, Marianne (Hrsg.) (2010), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Norbrook, Hamish (2008), The English of Broadcast News: When English is Not the First Language of the Audience. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 33, 263-283.
Ozturk, Ulku & Atay, Derin (2010), Challenges of being a non-native English teacher. *Educational Research* 1, 135-139
Phan, Le Ha (2009), English as an international language: international student and identity formation. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 9, 201-214.
Prodromou, Luke (2008), *English as Lingua Franca*. London: Continuum.

Rao, Zhenhui (2010), Chinese students' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers in EFL teaching. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 31, 55-68.

Rebuck, Mark (2011), Using the L1 'errors' of native speakers in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal* 65, 33-41.

Rivers, Damian J. (2010), National identification and intercultural relations in foreign language teaching. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 10, 318-336.

Rubdy, Rani (2009), Reclaiming the local in teaching EIL. *Language and Intercultural Communication* 9, 156-174.

Rupp, André; Vock, Miriam; Harsch, Claudia & Köller, Olaf (2008), *Developing Standards-Based Assessment Tasks for English as First Foreign Language. Context, Processess and Outcomes in Germany*. Münster: Waxmann.

Schmitt-Egner, Diana (2012), "Raise your voice!" An autonomous learning concept to improve oral proficiency in the EFL classroom. In: Lennon, Paul (Hrsg.) (2012), 235-271.

Schneider, Edgar W. (2011), *English Around the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.

Schöpper-Grabe, Sigrid (2012), Adult Education: English in the Workplace. *Anglistik* 23, 135-144.

Schreier, Daniel, Peter Trudgill, Edgar W. Schneider & Jeffrey P. Williams (Hrsg.). (2010), *The Lesser-Known Varieties of English: An Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2011), *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sharifian, Farzad (Hrsg.) (2009), *English as an International Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Sing, Christine S. (2007), The discourse of didacticization of English in Germany. *World Englishes* 26, 241-257.

Snow, Marguerite Ann, Lía D. Kamhi-Stein & Donna M. Brinton (2006), Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 26, 261-281.

Svartvik, Ian & Leech, Geoffrey (2006), *One Tongue: Many Voices*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sweeney, Simon (2005), Work-life Balance. *English Teaching Professional* 41, 35-37.

Timmis, Ivor (2002), Native-speaker norms and international English: a classroom view. *ELT Journal* 56, 240-249.

Tsiplakou, Stavroula (2009), English in Cyprus: Outer or Expanding Circle? *Anglistik* 20, 75-87.

Vogt, Karin (2012), Assessment: Washback of the CEFR and Pisa. *Anglistik* 23, 87-95.

Walker, Robin (2008), An achievable target for specific learners. *IATEFL VOICES* 200, 8-9.

Wardhaugh, Ronald B. (1999), *Proper English. Myths and Misunderstandings about Our Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, Henry G. (2003), *Defining Issues in English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wright, Tony (2009), Towards a revised role for English language teacher education in the developing world. In: Hussain, Nasreen, Azra Ahmed & Mohammad Zafar (Hrsg.) (2009), *English and Empowerment in the Developing World*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 27-43.