English Faculty Publications

Department of English

2009

World Englishes: Practical Implications for Teaching and Research

Fatima Esseili
University of Dayton, fesseili1@udayton.edu

Kyle McIntosh
Purdue University

Cindy Torres
Purdue University

Elena Lawrick
Purdue University

Cristine McMartin-Miller
Purdue University

See next page for additional authors

Author(s)

Fatima Esseili (0000-0003-1127-6240), Kyle McIntosh, Cindy Torres, Elena Lawrick, Cristine McMartin-Miller, and Shih-Yu Chang

World Englishes: Practical Implications for Teaching and Research.

Authors:
Esseili, Fatima; McIntosh, Kyle; Torres, Cindy; Lawrick, Elena; McMartin-Miller, Cristine; Chang, Shih-Yu.

Affiliation:
Purdue University

_____

Introduction

With the emergence of World Englishes (WE) and the continuous flow of international students into universities in the United States, issues surrounding the tolerance and acceptance of varieties of English, the notion of standards, and the concept of nativeness all come to the forefront of research and pedagogy. Since English is the dominant language of international academic publication and since it has been adapted and adopted by a number of countries for various instrumental, institutional, innovative/imaginative, and interpersonal functions (Kachru, 1984), it is essential for teachers and administrators to be aware of the pluricentricity of English and their students' different sociolinguistic backgrounds as outlined in the WE paradigm (Kachru, Kachru, & Nelson, 2006).

A key characteristic of the WE paradigm is the Concentric Circles model in which the world is divided into three circles that describe the spread of English in the world according to users, "patterns of acquisition, and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages" (Kachru, 1985, p. 12). The three circles are the Inner Circle where English is the native language (e.g., the U.S. and the U.K.); the Outer Circle where English became an official/second language as a result of colonialization (e.g., India and South Africa); and the

Expanding Circle where English is taught as a foreign language (e.g., France, Russia, and China). Another element of WE research includes the issues of nativeness and standards. "Who is a native speaker?" and "which standard should we teach?" are two questions that have been debated for the past 60 years. This paper addresses these issues in the classroom and beyond. It contextualizes and identifies the problem with English as a Second Language (ESL) composition classes in the Inner Circle context, specifically the U.S., and examines several methods for incorporating a WE perspective into an ESL composition program. It also challenges English language teacher requirements and an international publication culture that follows Inner Circle standards.

I. Contextualizing teaching Conventions of Western Academic Writing: Where does WE Stand?

> *I do agree this structure can enable people to understand my work more easily. But do I need to do that? Maybe, there is more than one solution. Maybe, there is no right or wrong if you're more considerate. Maybe, more twists and turns will attract people to follow my steps* (an ESL student in a first-year composition course, a Midwestern university).

The above quote from a journal entry written by a student in a first-year composition course for international students succinctly conveys a concern about the appropriateness of teaching the Western conventions of academic writing to ESL students in American universities. Second Language (L2) Writing research articulates this concern in the *ideology v. pragmatism* debate, which represents a continuum of claims regarding a stance the ESL composition instructor might assume while dealing with the influences of native language and culture (L1 and C1) in ESL writers' academic essays. In short, the ideology debate boils down to *who is taking over* or, *whose English should be recognized as legitimate*: Should Western academic writing conventions change to embrace diverse written accents of ESL student-writers or will these

writers succumb to the conventions of the discourse community they are entering? Adherents of critical literacy approaches (cf., Benesch, 1993, 2001; Canagarajah, 2002a, 2006) argue that the current academic writing conventions must be challenged as obsolete exhibits of "native speaker" dominance or, at least, they must be enriched by the unquestionable welcoming of rhetorical and textual features of new varieties of English. The pragmatist camp counter-argues that teaching ESL composition is an ideology-free zone saturated with practical concerns and obligations to student learning, which does not allow space for politics and ideology (see Leki, 1992, 2007; Reid, 1989; Santos, 1992).

The ideology vs. pragmatism debate reflects the status quo of the concept of native speaker: The more questioned native speaker norms become, the more eagerly the teaching of writing conventions is criticized. With the growing awareness that a deluge of non-native English speakers, many of whom currently study in US universities, are challenging their norm-providing counterparts, legitimate concerns about the validity of traditional response to ESL "errors" in the ESL composition course have been put forward. Severino (1993), for example, identifies three ideological stances an ESL writing instructor might assume: *assimilationist* (i.e., enforcing the norms of Western academic writing as solely correct and considering 'nativeness' in ESL texts as errors); *separatist* (i.e., encouraging 'nativeness' in ESL texts despite the ramifications of such encouragement on students' academic performance); and *accommodationist* (i.e., helping ESL student-writers adapt to the conventions of the context in which they will function). In contrast to Severino's unambiguous advocacy of the accommodationist stance, Canagarajah (in Matsuda et al., 2003) pushes an ideology of resistance to "dominant discourses and conventions," suggesting a more elaborated taxonomy of the strategies multilingual writers might adopt: *accommodation, avoidance, opposition,*

transposition, and *appropriation*. The first three strategies closely resemble Severino's ideological stances; they are, in Canagarajah's view, the examples of "uncritical ideology" (p.159). "Critical ideology," on the other hand, manifests in *appropriation*, i.e. "the strategy of writers who take over the dominant conventions for their purposes" (p.160), in order "to stop imposing uniform norms and rules of textuality" (p.162).

Nonetheless, critical resistance to teaching Western conventions of written academic discourse does not solve the plethora of pragmatic concerns the ESL composition instructor deals with on a daily basis. In addition to teaching organization, mechanics, grammar, and punctuation, the plate of the ESL composition instructor is filled with such tasks as fostering students' voice, introducing notions of intellectual ownership and plagiarism, and teaching citation styles, among others. Given that, in many cases, an introductory composition course is often the *first* actual introduction to the conventions and expectations of the U.S. academic community, the ESL composition instructor faces the herculean task of helping students make connections between the rhetoric acquired in their pre-U.S. academic experiences and the new rhetoric of Western academia. The response to this task *is* of the ideological nature discussed above. Yet, the response is also the matter of fulfilling professional obligations, which brings up the question of what the needs of ESL students in a composition course are. Do ESL composition instructors respect the basic principle of teaching when they ignore – in accord with calls for active resistance – the needs of students who *consciously* chose to get an education in a Western university? Clearly, they do not. Do those instructors who fearlessly guard the writing conventions of Western academic discourse while labeling rhetorical and textual varieties of new Englishes as erroneous offer any advantage their students, many of whom will return to their original contexts of English use? Most likely, they do not. The reality is that rhetorical

expectations vary throughout the world. For example, the adversarial 'to-prove-the-claim' style of argumentation expected by Western academic readership would be considered inappropriate in India, where the purpose of argumentation is *to lead* the reader to finding the right solution (Kachru & Smith, 2008). Another example, observed in Hinds (1987), is the different expectations about readers' investment in constructing intertextuality in the Western vs. East Asian traditions. Given the diversity of student needs in an ESL composition course, is it possible to single out a set of needs which determines the "ideology" of instruction?

WE offers a viable solution. Originating from functional approaches to linguistics, the WE paradigm emphasizes "contextual sensitivity" and "appropriateness.*"* Applying these core notions to teaching ESL composition helps us to walk the fine line between ideology and pragmatism. Given that writing *is* a linguistic act bound by context, which determines the language user's choice of rhetorical, discourse, and linguistic means, writing for academic purposes in an American university should be bound by the "rules" of Western academic tradition. As Berns (1990) claims, "The identification of a norm for appropriate structures of written and spoken texts … must be sensitive to the existence of a variety of established, institutionalized patterns of discourse" (p.48). This position has been echoed by other WE scholars. For example, Baumgardener and Brown (2003) argue that the context in which English teaching occurs shapes pedagogical decisions. Kachru contends that "it is perfectly legitimate to make all writers aware of the rhetorical patterns preferred in Inner Circle Englishes [while] it is equally legitimate and desirable to make English educators aware of different rhetorical conventions of world majority users and learners of English" (as cited in Kachru & Smith, 2008, p.161). The following section presents ways to integrate the WE approach into the ESL composition classroom.

II. Incorporating WE in the ESL classroom

The number of international students for whom English is not a first language has increased steadily in colleges and universities in recent years. Although most of the international undergraduate students who enroll in American universities are required to have high TOEFL (including the TWE) scores, in addition to results from standardized norm-referenced admissions tests such as the SAT and the ACT, many of them still struggle with meeting the demands of American academic discourse, especially those who have never studied in an American school and who have never taken classes where English is the instructional medium. The adjustment to meeting the demands of American academic culture is not easy, especially when students come from different social, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds that value different English writing styles.

Choosing English to write represents a user's "way of saying and meaning" (Kachru, Y. 1992); different cultural values and traditions contribute to writing. Studies have shown that the institutionalized varieties of English used in the countries of the Outer Circle have developed their own grammatical and textual forms to express their context of culture (Kachru, Y. 1992). Therefore, it is important for English teachers and administrators to be aware of students' different sociolinguistic realities and backgrounds, to reevaluate the strict Inner Circle ELT attitudes and approaches, and to recognize the complexities of the English language (Kachru, 1984). A college composition class embracing the WE perspective would offer students a way of seeing their native cultures as playing a role in their writing.

Before introducing students to WE, it is necessary to first dispel the myth that there are only one or two fixed forms of English – that is, "standard" British or "standard" American –

which ESL students should seek to emulate. In the U.S., this can be accomplished by raising student awareness of the many different varieties of American English. Audiotapes, maps, and written descriptions of the differences among spoken American dialects can serve as an interesting introduction to WE. In a class she taught, McHenry (2002) began a unit on WE by asking students to share their opinions of different varieties of American English. This allowed her class, which consisted of American and international students, to explore stereotypes associated with certain varieties and to face the challenge of determining which of these varieties is standard vs. correct. Kubota and Ward (2000) raised student awareness of different varieties of English through film. To explore American dialects, they showed the documentary *American Tongues*. To introduce students to speakers of WE, they showed short excerpts from several fictional works. Following each excerpt, Kubota and Ward asked students to guess the speaker's nation of origin, locate the nation on the map, and discuss their perceptions toward that speaker's English.

Once student awareness of the differences among spoken varieties has been raised, the focus can turn specifically to composition. For one, a WE workshop can be held to help students reflect on their own cultural writing experiences. The workshop approach is particularly well suited for use in classrooms because it engages students in self-regulated or self-reflective thinking. The workshop approach involves three key components: reading and analyzing essays written by non-native writers; structured class/small group discussions; and writing personal essays. Each component has a specific purpose. The major purpose of reading and analyzing essays written by non-native writers is to help students see how different cultural and social backgrounds affect writing in terms of linguistics and stylistics, and to encourage students to treasure their own writing styles. Structured class/small group discussions are set up for the

purpose of analyzing essays through peer conversations and exploring the context of utilizing their own cultural writing features within American academic discourse. Writing a personal essay provides students with an opportunity to express, explore, and utilize their own cultural writing features. The WE workshop could be held once a month during normal class hours. Each workshop could target one variety of English (e.g., a Chinese English workshop) and center activities around it. For a better understanding of how this idea could be put into practice, see Zhang's (2002) analysis of Ha Jin's *In The Pond*.

In addition to film and literature workshops, other resources can be used to raise student awareness of WE varieties. For example, Baik and Shim (2003) used the Internet while teaching in Korea to find audiovisual *and* textual samples to demonstrate differences among speakers in Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles. Since the Internet is a global medium, instructors could also use examples from blogs, forums, and social networking sites to show how effective communication can be achieved even when different varieties of English are employed. The Internet proves especially useful when considering the lack of textbooks representing a WE perspective. Because the U.S. and U.K. still produce the majority of teaching materials, Inner Circle Englishes are still being promoted as the norm. As a result, Matsuda (2003), among others, has called for publishers to create textbooks that accurately represent English more as an international language and not as one tied to one or two nations. Ideally, these textbooks would include specific chapters detailing the history of the English language, how it has spread and changed over time, and the growing role speakers of English as an international language play and will continue to play in the future. In the meantime, teachers should choose from among the few textbooks that include characters from Extending and Outer Circle contexts. Furthermore,

dialogues that feature English as a lingua franca and chapters that include images and cultural topics from a variety of contexts can help to promote the ideas of WE.

Alternatively, some teachers, particularly those teaching in EFL contexts, have adapted commercially produced textbooks by removing or re-writing sections that are irrelevant or offensive to the population served in the classroom. In doing so, they are creating what Gray (2002) has called a "glocal" textbook. Scholars like McHenry (2002) argue that the most meaningful materials are currently those created entirely by teachers themselves for a specific context. Although not all teachers have the resources to create such materials, she too cites Baik and Shim's online WE-focused EFL course. In creating their own materials, teachers should not ignore an important resource: their own students. In our composition courses at Purdue University, we have speakers from Inner, Outer and Expanding Circle contexts. Analyzing and discussing texts written by this diverse group of students could serve as an interesting and useful activity in the ESL composition classroom.

Once in the classroom, Baumgardener and Brown (2003) believe that students should be made aware of ideological factors affecting status of particular WE, including their own. For example, students should learn about the realities of (spoken or written) accent intolerance. Baumgardener and Brown also advocate including an explicit contrastive segment, wherein they compare features of a variety of Englishes, in all English language courses. Finally, they explicitly teach when and where it is appropriate to use certain varieties. This is an example that was previously identified as "accommodation."

A WE perspective may also require adjustments as to how teachers approach assessment. According to Matsuda (2003), assessment should focus not only on grammatical accuracy but on communicative effectiveness. On a larger scale, teachers need also to understand the potential

biases of standardized tests. A 2008 study conducted by Hamp-Lyons and Davies questioned whether international tests of English language proficiency – including TOEFL and TOEIC, among others – are unfair to speakers of non-standard forms of English. Although the small sample size and large number of rater variables prevented them from making any definitive conclusions, they argue that more research is needed to address this issue.

There are also pedagogical implications beyond the ESL classroom. Most of these strategies could just as easily be implemented in a mainstream composition class. Kubota (2001), for example, taught a WE lesson to high school students in a North Carolina school. Although the lesson did not result in statistically significant differences in student perceptions of WE speakers or participants' ability to understand them, Kubota argued that, with some modification, this type of lesson could reduce the communicative burden placed on WE speakers. Matsuda (2003) advocates educating the public via mass media. In Japan, for example, some language specialists have advocated a WE approach to language teaching in media such as books, magazines, and newspapers. English teachers in ESL contexts might consider doing the same. The next section sheds more light on the issue. It also examines English language teacher requirements and the problems resulting from hiring English teachers based on their nationality or native language.

III. WE and English Language Teacher Requirements

"English teachers needed immediately!" has become a popular first line in recent English language teacher job ads. Unfortunately, the next line is often: "Native speakers only." In tandem with the global spread of English, the urgent demand for English language teachers has grown rapidly. This is especially the case in Expanding Circle countries where current compulsory

English education policies have been implemented nationwide, creating the immediate need to fill large numbers of vacant teaching positions. Despite the development of research in WE and ELT, there remains what Gupta (2001) describes as a severe gap between the imagined and the real in English language teaching:

> In the imagination of many of those establishing language policies, especially educational ones, English can be ordered and controlled. Intentions about the type of English to be taught may be expressed, and curriculum requirements may specify the variety of English required of learners. However, the imagined learner, the imagined teacher, and the imagined setting of use are often at odds with the reality of the learner's exposure to English, and of the learner's plausible occasions of use. This is one of the many areas in which there is a failure to come to grips with the impact of globalization of English. (365)

This gap creates three main causes for concern: 1) Native speakers (NS) are considered privileged teachers with or without a degree, striking a blow at the English teaching profession as a whole; 2) experienced multilingual local teachers lose the opportunity for such (often more lucrative) positions; and 3) students are often faced with inappropriate curriculum and "unattainable" goals. WE research responds to these concerns by calling for the rethinking of "nativeness" as a teacher qualification, the redesign of teacher education, and the discussion of appropriateness and by implication, accuracy, in relation to pedagogy.

WE research focuses on recognizing and describing the realistic, pluricentric nature of Englishes today. Yet, internationally, in the English language teaching profession, there remains a focus on nativeness – and often nationality – over linguistic and pedagogical competence, among other qualifications. This phenomenon allows English users from Inner Circle countries, with or without teaching degrees or experience, to receive teacher job opportunities and set the norms for ELT models and materials around the world, while many qualified multilingual local teachers are excluded from such opportunities.

Researchers in WE have addressed the roots of this problem by offering a framework for rethinking ELT. Through description of particular, contextualized sociolinguistic realities wherein users employ their English varieties to perform a number of functions, and by suggesting shifts in English language models and teacher training, WE researchers are attempting to help close the gap between the imagined and the real in ELT. Graddol (2006) offers evidence that "non-native" speakers of English have grown to outnumber "native" speakers, suggesting a shift in ownership of English. Additional research describes this shift and the pluricentric nature of WE today (Kachru, B., 1992). Moreover, many researchers (Kachru, B., 1992; Gupta, 2001) agree that the "native speaker" will remain a controversial concept. Despite being considered obsolete in describing current users of WE, nativeness continues to be the primary and sometimes exclusive requirement for English language teachers internationally.

Both Seidlhofer (1999) and Cook (1999) explain that there has been a long tradition of confusing the "competent speaker" with the "competent teacher" based on linguistic ability alone, thus ignoring appropriateness in terms of pedagogical culture and context. A number of employers in Expanding Circle countries continue to show a preference for native speakers – with or without experience – over multilingual local teachers. This attitude implies an expectation that native speakers will be the "best" teachers, offering the "correct" models for students, something researchers describe as an imagined NS privilege that suggests monolinguality is an important strength. Of course, as in any profession, other qualifications are necessary to be a successful English language teaching professional. In fact, researchers like Cook (2001) suggest that local multilingual teachers possess experience and familiarity with learners' contexts that should be seen as unique strengths.

Professionally, there are traditional education degrees (B.A., M.A. and PhD), newer certifications (CELTA, DELTA, TEFL, TESOL) and additional experiences (e.g., teaching, publishing, participation in professional conferences and organizations) that provide teachers with the appropriate basic training to work with learners. Beyond these basic prerequisites, Kirkpatrick (2008) identifies the need for new, more realistically representative models and teacher preparation programs. He suggests that the English teacher education curriculum be redesigned to provide teacher candidates with a current understanding of WE today, including exposure to multiple varieties and models of English, their development (linguistic, rhetorical, and cultural), ranges and functions, as well as the ability to critically analyze, design (or adapt) a curriculum to meet the needs of the learners in their sociocultural contexts. In this sense, awareness and contextualized appropriateness becomes the focus of curriculum. Seidlhofer (1999) adds that Expanding Circle teacher programs should also include objectives that work towards raising teachers' awareness of their multilingual local expertise and prepare them to access this expertise to create suitable pedagogy. Ideally, all teacher candidates should also participate in similar WE based ELT programs, including exposure to varieties, cross-cultural contextual understanding, and optional models for curricula as a prerequisite to teaching.

Considering the status of WE today, global attitudes of professional equality and high standards should be the ultimate goal. The first step has already been taken: growing research in WE and ELT and the dissemination of findings. Topics presented at annual international conferences, such as IAWE, IATEFL, and TESOL, reflect multiculturalism and appropriateness in regards to ELT. Organizations like TESOL are also working to promote the shift towards greater awareness and equality, becoming an advocate of sorts among professional organizations supporting nonnative English-speaking professionals in the field with the development of their

Nonnative English Speakers in TESOL Caucus (NNEST), now an Interest Section, and official declarations about inclusion and language rights in its mission statements.

As a second step, programs for preparing teachers are being designed specifically for teachers who will have knowledge of the systems of Englishes, a range of varieties, multilingual and multicultural backgrounds, and who will evaluate and adapt teaching methods and materials to meet the needs of their students in their contexts. Courses similar to Kirkpatrick's TESEAL program are being designed for pre-service teachers planning to teach in South Asian contexts. In addition, in-service teacher programs are being developed internationally (Kirkpatrick, 2008).

Beyond teacher-focused programs, there needs to be more development of WE-based ELT programs and greater inclusion of other ELT professionals, such as directors, recruiters, and coordinators, as well as other educational stakeholders – including educational policy makers, parents, and even students – who may still cling to the long tradition of preference for native speakers as language teachers. Until professionals in universities, schools, recruitment agencies, and online job forums recognize the need for equality and work together towards a shift, many qualified English teachers will remain excluded from positions in their home countries and abroad. The gap between the imagined and the real persists in ELT, as evidenced by the overwhelming number of international employment forums posting native speaker biased advertisements every day. In order to close the gap, continued discussion and the development of programs promoting awareness and appropriateness must be moved to the forefront of educational agendas as further steps towards the ultimate goal of professional equality.

IV. Publication Culture and WE

English is, without question, the dominant language of international academic publication. According to Tardy (2004), an estimated 95% of all articles published in the hard sciences are in English, making writing ability in the language practically a prerequisite for having one's work recognized in fields like biology, chemistry, and physics. While the percentage is certainly lower for social sciences and humanities because they seek their audiences within the language-cultures being examined, a field like applied linguistics – including TESOL – targets a much more international audience and its journals publish a majority of their articles in English. As a result, "authors based in the Inner Circle in general, and those based in the United States in particular, enjoy a disproportionately large percentage of publications and are more likely to be the 'gatekeepers' of published works" (Tardy, 2004, p. 248). This imbalance allows scholars from Inner Circle to set the standards for publication, as well as the tone of conversations in the field (Canagarajah, 2002b).

While many Inner Circle TESOL professionals may see themselves as tolerant of different varieties of English, there is still a tendency for reviewers to focus on style over substance and to provide more negative comments than positive ones, especially with submissions from non-Inner Circle scholars (Belcher, 2007). There is also the expectation that authors will adhere to the basic structure of English academic articles, or what Swales (1990) refers to as the "IMRD" model (i.e., Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion). While a case can be made for the necessity of each of these components, the accompanying stylistic conventions and overall organizational scheme is far from universal. For example, Canagarajah (2006) notes the relaxed tone that Sri Lankan scholars use when writing introductions in both English and Tamil, a quality he attributes to a lack of competition for tenure in his native country. He also claims that these scholars prefer a more "embodied" methodology based on

experience to one based on experimentation, in part because of the limited facilities and funding available to them for research. Such differences highlight the ways in which standards of writing for publication can be influenced by the cultural context in which they emerge.

Perhaps nowhere are the cultural influences upon academic writing more apparent than in recent discussions of critical thinking, authorial voice, and plagiarism. As Atkinson (1997) explains, critical thinking is highly valued as an approach to problem-solving in cultures where individualism is also valued, but not nearly as much in cultures where the self is defined by social roles. Authorial voice, which many Western editors regard an essential quality of publishable work, is also connected to this view of the self as an individual (see Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999). This affects the way different cultures understand the ownership of texts. Deckert's (1994) recommendations for helping Hong Kong students deal with plagiarism and Pennycook's (1994) critical reply both conclude that plagiarism is culturally-defined. Pecorari's (2003) study of postgraduate student writing, however, reveals little evidence that culture plays a significant role in instances of plagiarism. To further complicate matters, Shi et al. (2005) conclude that "if using other's words and ideas without acknowledgement is considered stealing in North America, it is certainly not a crime that should jeopardize one's career in China" (p. 771). Such contradictions arise whenever culture is used to explain human behaviors that, in turn, define cultures. As researchers, we must closely examine the social context in which a given phenomenon occurs or else risk essentializing an entire group of people based on an observed behavior (Norton, 1995). We must also be aware of what Canagarajah (2002b) calls the "material conditions" of existence, since the availability of writing resources (i.e., anything from paper to computers), access to information (i.e., print and online sources), means of

communication (i.e., postal service or email), and basic survival needs (i.e., food and shelter) can have an impact on the way writers produce and revise their texts.

Although we should continue to work toward equitable conditions worldwide, for the time being it may be more prudent to focus on changing the way Outer and Expanding Circle TESOL professionals are received by international applied linguistics journals. Obviously, the solution is not the unconditional acceptance of submissions from non-Inner Circle scholars combined with a little creative editing. At the same time, the sidelining of potential contributors who may not adhere to a rigid set of culturally-specific and materially-determined standards does a disservice to our field. Journal editors need to find new ways to encourage and accommodate these scholars while continuing to make informed decisions about what *is* or *is not* publishable.

To this end, Flowerdew (2001) suggests placing more non-Inner Circle scholars on editorial boards, although Belcher (2007) cautions that little research has been done to show any difference in the way reviewers from different language-cultures comment on manuscripts written in English. Perhaps then, reviewers might adopt what Hinds (1987) dubs "reader responsibility" and make greater efforts to discern the intended meaning of a text. Even when a paper is not publishable, such engagement might help to make reviewer comments more constructive and less damning. Editors and reviewers should also be sensitive to the material conditions of Outer and Expanding Circle writers instead of holding them to the same stringent standards as their Inner Circle colleagues.

Of course, that does not mean abandoning standards altogether, for "offering apparent encouragement to revise and resubmit when a paper suffers from inappropriate topic choice for a journal or a seriously flawed research design could be more an empty act of charity than one of genuine good will toward the author" (Belcher, 2007, p. 18). In cases where revision could lead

to publication, journal editors need to make the process more amenable to those working outside of the Inner Circle. Canagarajah (2002b) suggests clearer communication with potential contributors to let them know exactly what is expected, including which parts of the revision process are negotiable. Style sheets could also be sent out along with reviewer comments, and photocopies or PDFs of pivotal articles could be sent to authors who may not otherwise have access to these sources.

Happily, there is evidence of progress being made toward the goal of greater inclusion. Organizations like TESOL are making concerted efforts to recruit members from underrepresented parts of the world. Journals like *TESOL Quarterly, English for Specific Purposes*, and *World Englishes* invite submissions from Outer and Expanding Circle scholars and take careful measures to guide these submissions through revision and into publication. Yet, this is just the tip of the iceberg. There is a world of untapped research waiting to be shared, and the fresh perspectives to be gained from non-Inner Circle scholars will provide greater synthesis of insights and information, greater acceptance of different varieties of English and different stylistic conventions, and perhaps most importantly, greater understanding of how culture and context play a central role in all of our writing practices.

V. Conclusion

There is little doubt that it is pedagogically challenging to implement a WE approach in the composition classroom. To do justice to students in an ESL composition course, we, the instructors, need to address their primary current need: to develop a set of writing skills that allow successful functioning in Western academic discourse. Addressing this need requires the explicit teaching of the conventions of the former, but that should not be equated with supporting

the 'dominant ideology.' We must treat L1/C1 rhetorical practices as appropriate for their

original contexts and use them as the foundation for teaching the rhetorical patterns of a new

academic discourse. In today's complex and messy reality of WE, helping students in ESL

composition courses build rich repertoires of rhetorical and linguistic means, while fostering

their awareness of the need to adjust their rhetorical choices to the specific context for which

they are writing, seems to be the only viable teaching strategy, especially when considering the

current publication culture. It is also important to reexamine and evaluate the existing English

teacher requirements in order to create more conducive learning environments for our students.

References

Atkinson, D. (1997). A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 71-94.

Baik, M. J. & Shim, R. J. (2003). Teaching World Englishes via the Internet. *World Englishes, 21*, 427-430.

Baumgardener, R. J., & Brown, K. (2003). World Englishes: Ethics and pedagogy. *World Englishes, 22,* 245-251.

Belcher, D. (2007). Seeking acceptance in an English-only research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 1-22.

Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27* (4), 705-717.

Benesch, S. (2001). Critical pragmatism: A politics of L2 composition. In T. Silva, & P.K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 161-172). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berns, M. (1990). *Contexts of Competence: Social and cultural considerations in communicative language teaching*. New York: Plenum Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002a). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 1, 29-44.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2002b). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). The place of World Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication, 57*, 586-619.

Cook, V. J. (1999) Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*, 185-210.

Cook, V. J. (2001). *Second language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.), London: Arnold.

Deckert, G. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*, 131-148.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Attitudes of journal editors to nonnative speaker contributions. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 121-150.

Graddol, D. (2006). English next: Why global English may mean the end of "English as a foreign language." UK: British Council.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block & D. Cameron (Eds.), *Globalization and English language teaching* (pp. 151-167). London: Routledge.

Gupta, A. (2001). Realism and imagination in the teaching of English. *World Englishes* 20 (3): 365-381.

Hamp-Lyon, L. & Davies, A. (2008) The Englishes of English tests: Bias revisited. *World Englishes, 27*, 26-39.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Longman.

Kachru, B. (1984). World Englishes and the teaching of English to non-native speakers: Context, attitudes, and concerns. *TESOL Newsletter, 8*(5), 25-26.

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world, teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. (1992). Teaching Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed.) (pp. 355-366). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Y. (1992). Culture, style and discourse: Expanding poetics of English. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English cross cultures*. (2nd ed.) (pp.340~352). Urbana: University of Illinois press.

Kachru, Y. (1995). Contrastive rhetoric in world Englishes. *English Today, 11* (1), 21-31.

Kachru, B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (Eds). (2006). *The handbook of world Englishes*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kachru, Y., & Smith, L. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and world Englishes*. New York: Routledge.

Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kubota, R. (2001). Teaching world Englishes to native English speakers in the U.S. *World Englishes, 20*, 47-64.

Kubota, R. & Ward, L. (2000). Exploring linguistic diversity through world Englishes. *English Journal*, *89*(6), 80-86.

Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton-Cook.

Leki, I. (2007). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matsuda, P. K., Canagarajah, A. S., Harklau, L., Hyland, K., & Warschauer, M. (2003). Changing currents in second language writing research: A colloquium. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 151-179.

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

McHenry, T. (2002). Discussion. *World Englishes, (21)*3, 449-455.

Norton Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 9-31.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 317-345.

Pennycook, A. (1994). The complex contexts of plagiarism. A reply to Deckert. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 125-150.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 45-75.

Reid, J. M. (1989). English as a second language composition in higher education: The expectations of the academic audience. In D. M. Johnson & D. H. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp.220-234). New York: Longman.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology and composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 1-15.

Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. *World Englishes, 18*, 233-245.

Severino, C. (1993). The sociopolitical implications of response to second language and second dialect writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*, 181-201.

Shi, L., Wang, W-y., & Xu, J-w. (2005). Publication culture of foreign language education journals in China. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*, 765-776.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tardy, C. (2004). The role of English in scientific communication: *Lingua franca* or *Tyrannosaurus rex*? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 3*, 247-269.

Zhang, H. (2002). Bilingual creativity in Chinese English: Ha Jin's *In the Pond*. *World Englishes, 21*, 305-15.