John Robert Schmitz
john.schmitz@uol.com.br

The native speaker and nonnative speaker debate: what are the issues and what are the outcomes?[1]

O debate sobre o falante nativo e não nativo: quais são os assuntos e quais os resultados?

ABSTRACT - In this paper I examine the notions "native speaker" and "non-native speaker". In the first part, I review the literature on the notions that was sparked off by Coulmas' (1981) collection of articles, followed by Paikeday's (1985) debate with different linguists, and continued in the 90s with Davies' text (1991). The year 1995 marks the publication of three articles published in one issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* in which voices of scholars from the East exchange views with some Western researchers on the issue of nativity and non-nativeness. In the second part, I point to the outcomes of the debate that have brought about a reevaluation of the non-native speaker concept and have contributed to the modification or correction of views with regard to the notion "native speaker". Despite a critical revision, the notion has survived the debate, but is employed with more care and without an exclusionary stance by those who use the term in the fields of linguistics, applied linguistics and in the area of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). In the third and final part of the article, I first present a personal narrative with respect to the terms "native speaker" and "nonnative speakers" and secondly, set out some implications for the role of English for Brazil in the ensuing years. My objective here is to present the state of the art with respect to the history of thinking about the complex term "native speaker" in language studies. Therefore, I will not approach the topic based on data-based empirical research that might very likely be the subject of another study.

Key words: native speaker, nonnative speaker, full replication, failed replication, standard language ideology.

RESUMO - Neste trabalho examino as noções "falante nativo" e "falante não nativo". Na primeira parte do artigo, resenho a bibliografia especializada sobre as referidas noções iniciadas por Coulmas (1981) numa coletânea, seguida por um debate com vários linguistas organizado por Paikeday (1985) e também o livro de Davies (1991). Refiro-me a três artigos seminais publicados na revista *Journal of Pragmatics* nos quais vários especialistas renomados da Ásia e da África interagem com pesquisadores do Ocidente sobre o tema. Na segunda parte da apresentação, indico os resultados do debate que têm contribuído para a reavaliação da noção "falante não nativo" e que têm corrigido ou modificado as nossas ideias com respeito à noção bastante polêmica de "falante nativo". A despeito da revisão crítica do termo, ele ainda resiste, mas é usado pelos especialistas com mais cuidado, isto é, desprovido de atribuição de privilégios. A nova postura é de interesse para as áreas de linguística, linguística aplicada e também na área de Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Na última parte do trabalho, apresento, em primeiro lugar, uma narrativa pessoal sobre a noção e, em segundo lugar, avento as implicações dos resultados da controvérsia para uma política de ensino de inglês nos próximos anos. O meu objetivo é apresentar o desenvolvimento histórico sobre a complexidade do termo falante nativo na área dos estudos da linguagem. É por este motivo, não abordarei o tema com base em dados empíricos que bem poderia ser escopo de ainda outra reflexão.

Palavras-chave: falante nativo, falante não-nativo, replicação plena, replicação fracassada, ideologia língua padrão.

"There's a lot that's *really* (Mey's emphasis) wrong with native speakers (and non-native as well) in many countries of the world**.** Linguists could make a contribution towards the betterment of these wrongs if they stopped quarreling about whose native speaker is right. Rather, let's think about the things that are really wrong about the Native Speaker and try to make them right for him and her. We could, for instance, replace completely the academic concept of "correctness of utterances" by the pragmatic one of "knowing one's way around in one's language", i.e.; understanding the conditions and limitations of one's own and others' linguistic competence in producing and understanding language. Let's get rid of royalty and come down to reality. Kick out the decrepit Burger King from Native Speaker country, and let the speaking workers of all nations unite"! Jacob Mey, *in* Coulmas,1981, p. 82,.

Introduction

In the first part of this paper, I look at the initial thinking on the notions native and nonnative speaker for the purpose of situating where we have been over the last 30 years and where we are at the present time. A history of the development of ideas with respect to native speakerism is essential for an understanding of the radical changes that will affect the fields of English Language Teaching (ELT) and applied linguistics in the coming years. To do this, I comment on a selection of books and articles that have contributed to the development of ideas about the notions "native speaker", "nonnative speaker" and "new-nonnative speaker". The first two books that I examine contain contributions about the native speaker notion by scholars exclusively from the West while the three articles published in the *Journal of Pragmatics* include voices from Asia and Africa with respect to native/nonnative issue, thereby widening the global scope of the issue.

In the second section, my objective is to point to the outcomes concerning the debate about the notions for the field of applied linguistics and for the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)[2]. I will use the third part of the article to discuss, first of all, my own reaction to the issue of the native speaker debate and secondly to present implications with regard to English as a globalized language or international language that functions as global *lingua franca*.

The Development of Thought about the Native/Nonnative Speaker Notions

A Bit of History

To come to grips with the complexity of the native/nonnative speaker issue, I analyze in this section three books selected from the vast literature on the topic, namely Coulmas (1981) [1.1], Paikeday (1985) [1.2], Davies (1991) [1.3.] and three articles published in a issue of the *Journal of Pragmatics* (1995) [1.4.1-1.4.3]. The respective authors resort to musical metaphors to characterize their interaction. The first paper is subtitled a quartet (1.4.1), the second is quite appropriately called a *gamelon*[3] due to the polyphony of voices in the article (1.4.2) and the last (1.4.3) is a coda.

The native speakers are given a Festschrift

The value of the text, probably the first publication on the topic, lies in the fact that Coulmas and the participating authors examine critically the notion of just what a native speaker is or is not. Different views are presented about the "native speaker", varying from Nida's (1981, p. 171) conception as the "unsung hero of linguistics" based on his work with informants in Africa, the Americas and elsewhere who provided a vast amount of data about an impressive number of so-called "exotic" languages as well as Mey's opposing view who considers the native speaker as being "a king with no realm" (p. 83). Coulmas, in his introduction, does not deny that the "native speaker plays a part in the study of language"; he speculates, however, "how this undeniable part should be defined". In his conclusion, Coulmas states that "[N]ative speakerhood is one of the most human traits of man" (p. 22). He comments that the objective of the book is to set out the varied functions of the native speaker in the field of linguistics.

Coulmas contends that the notion "native speaker" would be more useful for linguists if it could be explained *what the native speaker actually does* (his emphasis), (p. 3). This is indeed a good point for not much thought has been given before the 80s to the actual role of the "native speaker". One fact raised by Coulmas (p. 13) is that the native speaker cannot be viewed as always reliable in providing data about his or her language, but he goes on to argue that this unreliability in judgment about a specific language does not imply that "speaker intuitions" and "self-observation" can be dispensed with regard to the study of language. On the whole, the papers included in the *Festschrift* are informative with regard to what a native speaker might be. I would take exception to parts of Balmer's article (1981) for he states that children are native speakers but adds that they do not speak "the full-blown language" for they speak, in his words, a "variance" (p. 58). One would wonder what "full-blown" English might be for not all speakers (and writers) of English have the same competence, be it communicative, discourse or pragmatic. Balmer (1981) considers "non-"nonnative speakers" to be a varied group of individuals – aphasics, mutes, deaf-mutes as well as stutterers, lispers, the elderly and tells us that "bilinguals are generally not "good" speakers of any language". His remarks are indeed questionable.

The Death of the Native Speaker

Paikeday (1985) was the first to point to the construction of the native speaker concept to discriminate against equally qualified nonnative speakers. It was much later, precisely in the mid- 90s that scholars came to view the native speaker notion as exclusionary. Paikeday's (1985, p. 33) words ring true today**:**

---

[2] Ensino de Inglês para falantes de outras línguas.

[3] In the field of music, *a gamelon* is an ensemble of different musical instruments (drums, gongs, xylophones, bamboo flutes and string instruments from the Indonesian islands of Java and Bali).

… sometimes you begin to wonder, when people start recruiting 'native speakers' of English, for example, whether they don't really mean "White Anglo-Saxon protestants", Scots, maybe, but no Irish need apply.

As coordinator of the debate, Paikeday's (1985, p. 95-96) intent is to present his own views about the notion native speaker and his remarks are straightforward. For him, the native speaker concept is a "myth"; in the course of the book, the author asks very pointed questions. Here are a few of them.

Can the distinction between native and nonnative speaker, especially since it happens to favour one group of speakers of each language, become discriminatory in some of its applications such as hiring for language-teaching positions—a question debated at a recent MLA Annual Meeting? If the difference is real or legitimate, is it necessarily of one of kind or merely of degree as implied by the expression 'educated native speaker'?

Paikeday anticipates many of the concerns about the privileged position of the native speaker in employment practices, not only for teaching positions but also for work in lexicography. There is no reason why qualified nonnatives cannot write dictionary entries for their bilingual status also qualifies them to contribute to bilingual dictionary projects. I would argue that it depends on the qualifications of the candidate being considered for a position in the writing of a dictionary. I agree with Paikeday that being a native speaker (that is, the criterion of place of birth) is not a qualification for participating in the preparation of a dictionary, writing textbooks or teaching English. Competence is what is needed and not ties of blood, particular set of genes or place of birth. I would, however, not go as far as he does in proclaiming the death of the native speaker, but rather the *death (or the elimination) of the privileged status* (my emphasis) of the native speaker.

This discriminatory practice unfortunately still prevails at this writing. Bonfiglio (2007, p.1) points to cases in Singapore where Caucasians are preferred over qualified Asian teachers. It was in the early 90s of the last century that the TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) as an institution took a stand against discrimination in hiring practices on the part of TESOL-affiliated schools and institutes throughout the world. In 2002 TESOL formulated a more incisive and inclusive statement against discrimination:

TESOL is opposed to discrimination that affects the employment and professional lives of the TESOL membership (TESOL Forward Plan, revised 1999) on the grounds of race, ethnicity, nationality, language background, disability, health/medical condition, including HIV/AIDS, age, religion, gender, gender identity, and sexual orientation.

Quite pertinent to the whole issue is Paikeday's inclusion (p. 93-4, appendix 1) of a poem "Song of the Native Speaker" written by Frederic G. Cassidy that did not receive much attention when it was read in at the Linguistic Circle of Madison, Wisconsin way back in 1962. Here are the first eight lines of the poem:

"Hail to the Native Speaker,
He never can go wrong!
For by some process mystic,
Subliminal, sublinguistic,
And utterly spectacular,
He knows his own vernacular
To every last detail---
He simply cannot fail!"

It would appear that Cassidy's poem had little repercussion in the 1960s and it took twenty years or so for the poem to be given wider currency in the literature of linguistics. Two sentences in the poem are indeed revealing: "the native speaker can never go wrong" and "he simply cannot fail". Cassidy lays bare the ideology prevalent in linguistics in the 1960s and throughout the 1970s of the last century that the native speaker never makes a mistake. This is not the case based on the research of Hockett (1973) and Fromkin (1973, 1980) whose respective findings show that native speakers do indeed slip and do err.

Underlying the notion "native speaker", there lie dangerous ideologies of superiority, racial purity, asymmetrical power relationships, the native having the upper hand while the nonnative is often viewed as deviant and deficient. Schmitz (2006) points to a number of ways in which the notion is understood. First, there is the "age of acquisition native" who acquired a specific language from infancy; second, there is the "loyalty native" who claims that she is a native of a particular language when the case is that her command of the language is limited or nil. Third, there is the well-known "ideal native speaker" constructed by generative-transformational linguists, a concept that does not refer to a specific individual. In a later pioneering book, Bonfiglio (2010a) looks at the history of the construction of the native speaker and the notion of "mother tongue" particularly in Europe and exposes the position of power in these notions. I believe Bonfiglio was the first to historicize the notions "native speaker" and "mother tongue". To avoid the ambiguity of the notion "native speaker" and the sensitive term "nonnative", Bonfiglio (2010b) proposes respectively the use of L1 and L2. If one looks at the subfield of linguistic fieldwork in the discipline of Linguistics, one can find a variety of alternative terms for the native speaker. Newman and Ratliff (2001, p. 2) refer to the following, no doubt less emotional words, as "consultant", "speaker", "teacher", "interlocutor", "source", "subject", "assistant" and "informant".

The Native Speaker: A Problem for Applied Linguistics

Davies is a stalwart supporter of the native speaker notion and differs from the view of those writers in

Coulmas' *Festschrift* who are keen on knowing what the native speaker does and what might be his/her role in the field of linguistics. Davies looks at the native speaker from the standpoint of *his* view of applied linguistics (my emphasis). In Paikeday's view, the native speaker is indeed moribund and not at all a useful term. For Davies the native speaker is indeed "alive and kicking".

Davies (1991) contends that nonnative speakers are different from native speakers. He argues that native speakers "move from a position of insecurity to one of security, while nonnative speakers move in the reverse direction" (p. 35). He also states that nonnative speakers have control of their L1, but the learning of an L2 on their part requires them to "abandon the security of their L1 to become less and less sure in the L2 of what was so familiar in the L1" (p. 36).

B. Kachru's (1990) well-known mapping of English into three concentric circles (inner, outer and expanding) is useful to understand how different researchers situate themselves in the world and how they view their world. Davies teaches applied linguistics in a renowned university and deals with students, that is, learners who come from different parts of the world to his university in the United Kingdom to improve their English and to gain "security", to use his words, in their L2. Many of them come from countries where English is considered a foreign language (expanding circle countries, Argentina, Japan, and Italy). Others may come from the outer circle (India, Nigeria and Singapore) where English is institutionalized as the language of government, business and higher education. From my reading of Davies, it is not clear to me whether or not users of English in India or Singapore are native speakers or whether "nativity" is only attributed to speakers in Britain, the USA or Australia. In his situation, he is dealing with two groups: First of all, there are individuals from the expanding circle (Brazil, Spain) who study abroad to improve their language skills for employment upon their return to the respective countries. Secondly, there are others from the outer circle countries (cited above) who are not learners of English and who study in the United Kingdom to work for advanced degrees in the area of language studies and many other disciplines. The two groups should not and cannot be treated in the same manner. Part of the problem lies with the ambiguity of the notion "second language" (L2). It would appear that the bilingualism (or multilingualism) of some (or all?) of the Indians, Nigerians and Singaporeans denies them native-speaker status while bilingual speakers in Britain or Canada are not denied "nativeness". The reality of the "accident of birth" tends to lead Davies into a somewhat rigid view of the native speaker/nonnative distinction.

In addition, Davies' statement that native speakers move from "insecurity to security" is not always the case for a number of them are insecure pragmatically and do not know their "way around in language" as Mey puts it (1981, p. 82). Insecurity in language use is not restricted to nonnatives but to natives as well.

Some musical metaphors: interaction from West to East and East to West

A quartet from Southeast Asia: Non-Western voices are heard

The three papers published (quartet, *gamelon* and coda) in the *Journal of Pragmatics* serve as a questioning of the native/nonnative distinction, between Indian English/Nigerian English, on one hand and British English/American English, on the other. In Paikeday's book, all the participants were from inner circle countries: Canada, the USA, Australia and Britain. The authors in Coulmas' text are from the expanding circle (Europe, Israel and Japan) and from the inner circle (USA) with no voices from the outer circle countries (Asia or Africa). The publication of the three articles is/was indeed a step forward.

The articles are felicitous for readers have the opportunity to read what different scholars have to say about the number of different varieties of English that have appeared throughout the world due to the growth and expansion of the language. For the first time, specialists from the outer circle (India, Singapore, Nigeria and Malaysia) interact with those from inner circle (Britain, Ireland) and also the expanding circle (Denmark). The fact that the participating authors are not all from the so-called "center", that is, the West (particularly Europe and North America) permits readers to hear what scholars from Asia and Africa have to say about their experience with English. The three articles point to the globalization of English no longer restricted to voices from the West.

Briefly, the main conclusions of the interaction of the members of the quartet are the following (p. 283-294):

> 1. The distinction between native varieties and nonnative ones is discriminatory and exclusionary.
> 2. There is no construction or structure x that the native varieties have that the non-natives ones lack.
> 3. British English and American English are viewed as standard varieties while Indian English and Nigerian English are not. Such a state of affairs is indeed unjust.
> 4. British English and Canadian English are varieties of English just as Indian English or Singaporean English are.
> 5. The word "new" in the term "new nonnative English" is not valid for many of the varieties are far from being new. Indian English, for example, developed in the course of the 18th Century.

Point 1 echoes Paikeday's thoughts (1985). Things have changed radically since the late 90s (when the members of the quartet began their questioning of the privileging of inner circle varieties; we will see in section 2.4 that the status of the hegemonic varieties (British and American Englishes) have been challenged owing to the

John Robert Schmitz

steady development of English as a Língua Franca (ELF) in the world. English Language Teaching (ELT), according to Kirkpatrick (2007, *in* Baylis, 2008), is "moving away from the 'native speaker as best model" (p. 86).

Point 2 is indeed interesting but it may be problematic. Would all varieties of Indian English be "native" ones? For example, Khubchandani and Hosali (1999, p. 251) refer to Indians who have what they call "grassroots English with a near zero level grasp of English in everyday communication" and can only "claim a rudimentary grasp of English". In my own imaginary, I would think that there are in India (and other) speakers who acquired English from the cradle or from nursery school and kindergarten and went on to English-language medium schools, while others came to English after puberty or in late adolescence. I would contend that there are differences among those varied language users with regard to competence and proficiency in speaking, reading and writing. The first group would be "native", based on their early acquisition while the other one would be L2 speakers. It would appear that the word "nonnative" is the problem. In my view, point no. 2 is in need of more case studies in different parts of the world.

I have no quarrel with point 3. British English and American English are considered as standard (for good or bad) due to the political clout and economic power of the United Kingdom and the USA. The issue is political and not linguistic for the other varieties are viewed as deficient. Users of English in different parts of the world identify with their variety of the language and mold it to suit their purposes.

There is no doubt about the existence of an ethnocentric or racist (Rajagopalan, 1997, p. 229) stance with regard to the notion "native speaker" for it bestows privileges on certain speakers and excludes others. For Rajagopalan, the concept of the native speaker notion points to "… a potentially dangerous ideological agenda", entailing race and gender. Indeed a very important point.

D'Souza (Singh *et. al.,* 1995, p. 287) views all varieties of English as "a totality and not as a set of differences" and he goes on to argue that accepting British English as the "yardstick" of what is correct is "faulty reasoning" He makes another point in stating that all varieties of English are transplanted and nativized with the exception of British English. For him, Indian English and American English are on an equal footing.

Indeed the problem of whose standard should prevail is the crux of the issue of native/nonnative speaker. Mohanan *in* Singh *et al.*, 1995, p. 288, does not mince his words:

> Any notion of standard, whether it is for the language community as a whole, or for particular sub-communities within the community, entails an unfair prestige asymmetry. We can either accept the need for standards and live with the social injustice, or refuse to live with social justice and reject all standards.

To do away with standards is complex for they are part and parcel of language in use. Language(s) do not have standards but their users create them and unfortunately use those standards as instruments of empowerment to silence, humiliate and exclude those speakers who do not conform to what is constructed as the prestige variety. Whose standards count? With respect to point 4, it is certainly the case that Nigerian English, New Zealand English and Indian English are varieties of the same language.

With regard to point 5 and to the modifier "new" in the notion "new/non-native", I would state that some varieties of English are relatively "new", but not all of them. A good example of a "newer variety" is Philippine English that developed in the country after 1898 when Spain was forced to cede the islands to the USA. Indian English was in place quite some time before the 20th spread of English in the Philippines.

Mohanan *in* Singh *et al.*, 1995, p. 206) has some quite pertinent remarks with respect to the issue of nativity or nativeness. He points to members of a bilingual community in Quebec (Canada) who learn English and French at the same time and also to bilinguals in Kerala (India) who first learn Malayalam followed by English as their second language. While the author does not take his observation to its ultimate consequences, one could conjecture that there might be less variance in the Canadian bilinguals than in the Indian ones. And possibly in the case of those who learned Malayalam first, there could exist a bit or a great amount of mixing and code switching that might not occur as markedly in Canada. To be sure, as Mohanan states, I agree that there is a need for continued research in the study of pidgins, creoles as well as the areas of second language acquisition and bilingualism. It would be interesting to have comparative longitudinal case studies of Indians or Singaporeans who learned English from infancy (in the cradle and then in school) and those who began the study in late adolescence or sometime in adulthood. Mohanan's situatedness is pertinent here for he is from India and is a university professor in Singapore where many children learn English at home and continue in school. In this scenario, those Singaporeans are L1 speakers and many consider themselves to be native speakers. Yet there are others who learn the language later on in life and others who come to Singapore to learn English. And then again, there are others who (prefer to?) speak Singapore Colloquial English (henceforth Singlish).

With regard to standards, Prabhu *in* Singh *et al.*, 1995, p. 289) points out that Indian English has developed, over the years, a standard that is handed down to successive generations. For him, this variety is a "shared system" and all the members of the community have "full replication" of that norm and operate it "as a social organ" (p. 289). To use as a measuring rod "native" varieties from outside, be they Australian or Canadian English, to judge Indian English is unfair for it views Indian "full

replication" as an instance of "failed replication". The notion of "replication" is a key issue in the native/nonnative speaker debate and I will return to it in the course of this article. The opportunity to achieve "full replication" is most likely open to those Indians from the upper and middle classes who have the socio-economic means to study English from an early age through higher education (with extensive study in Britain or the USA) and have the wherewithal to reach the standard variety in that country or adopt an exonormative one.

A polyphony of voices from East and West: The gamelon

Continuing the musical metaphor used by the authors of the "quartet", Afendras and collaborating authors (1995) chose the word *gamelon* that refers to an orchestra from Java and Bali (as I pointed out earlier on), noted for its "highly developed polyphony and heterophony" (p. 295). The *gamelon* (as well as the quartet and coda) point to different voices and views concerning the notion "new/non-native English". Indeed there is no consensus on the part of the writers with regard to the issues. Afendras, who teaches in Malaysia, points to political and economic factors underlying the notion "native speaker". He reports that in the 70s of the last century, Singapore "imported" hundreds of "Native speaker English teachers" from Britain to offset the local standard of Singlish. Malaysia sent large numbers of their teachers to Britain for "training" in institutions of higher learning. Afendras makes it clear that both countries are capitalist outposts in the East and are intent on maintaining an exonormative standard, that is, British English or American English in order to enable its citizens to do business effectively with Britain and other Western nations. The context is quite different from India. The language policies of Singapore and Malaysia attempt to discourage the development of local norms, at least at the present time, in those countries. The attempt to impose standards by decree may not be the best policy for those nations for imposition by governmental fiat invites resistance. Omar (2000), however, presents a different view for English in Malaysia is steadily becoming a "Malaysian" language, something unheard of sixty years ago.

Millar, a speaker of Northern Irish English and a university instructor in Denmark, rejects the dichotomy of "new/old or native or non-native" and states that the real issue is World Englishes is the overarching presence of status. It is, in her view, "standard southern English English or standard American English versus all the rest", based on her experience of teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Denmark (p. 300). But things are not that simple in a world where there are more nonnative speakers than native ones and where indigenized or nativized varieties have established their own standards that compete with the so-called native ones. Her viewpoint

will be taken up and critiqued by other scholars in later years, as I will point out in section 2.

Mac Aogáin brings to the *gamelon* his work as a teacher of Irish in the Republic of Ireland. I agree with his remark that it is "a little drastic" to refuse to carry out comparative studies of the different Englishes in the world as if they automatically bloomed "full-formed" in their respective locations all of them having a *sui generis* status (p. 303). Mac Aogáin makes two points about the use of the term *nonnative*. First, he states that viewing a language as nonnative "could be harmless in a pedagogic situation" but quite harmful in the realm of language planning where the term is equivalent to meaning "second-rate" (p. 302). With regard to the classroom and language pedagogy, I would question the implications of using the inner circle varieties of English as a yardstick to relegate speakers to the category of nonnative. In language testing, speakers of Indian English have been penalized because the tests reflect inner circle norms (Lowenberg, 2000).

Mac Aogáin is correct in his remark that the view of Irish English or Indian English as nonnative varieties is an insult to these nations. In his last words, he refers to the notion of purity or the attribution of "purer forms" in one English variety over another and concludes that such an endeavor is "definitely not a useful occupation" (p.302). Incidentally, some commercial language schools in Brazil and in other countries use the fiction of "purity" to sell their particular variety of English to the public and increase their enrollments. Back in the 80s, a bi-national center in Brazil only hired native speakers for teaching posts, many of them were hired "right off the jet" with little or no knowledge of Portuguese and not all those 'natives' held degrees in language teaching and applied linguistics.

Bamgboṣe differs radically from the other participants of the *gamelon* for he uses the words "native Englishes" and "non-native Englishes" freely and states that both are "accepted as varieties of English". No doubt, based on his experience as a Nigerian, Bamgboṣe claims that "non-native Englishes differ from native ones" in the following ways (p. 302-305):

> (i) Nonnative varieties have developed owing to the imposition of English on groups of people who speak other languages; the result is those speakers become bilinguals.
> (ii) The other languages or indigenous tongues leave a "permanent mark" on English in terms of "borrowing, loan translation, code-mixing, style, and register-shift."
> (iii) These new forms of English are used creatively by their speakers and mold new forms of expression.
> (iv) Even in the light of the development of local norms, there still exist references to outside norms, particularly from the countries that initially carried or "forced" their language and culture as colonial masters upon varied ethnic groups in many parts of the world.

Bamgboṣe advocates that the nonnative varieties of English develop their own respective norms, that is, an

endonormative standard and with regard to this point, he agrees with Singh.

Yamuna Kachru, the second woman on a panel of 8 men, states at the outset that the "discussion is based on profound misunderstandings resulting from a noticeable indifference to or ignorance of three decades of research on world Englishes" (p. 305). Y. Kachru's counter-arguments are the following: (i) outer circles varieties (Indian English, Nigerian English, Singaporean English) are in general acquired in schools; (ii) in the outer circle English was "transplanted" while in the inner circle (USA, Canada, South Africa, Australia) thousands and thousands of people migrated, took English with them and became settlers; (iii) the different outer circle varieties are in general not L1 speakers. For Y. Kachru, English, in the outer circle, functions as an additional "code in the linguistic repertoire of its users" (p. 305). What I consider much to the point with regard to Kachru's remarks is her reminder that the field of World Englishes (WEs) is concerned with crucial issues such as "the attitudinal bias that rejects educated Singaporean English as a standard variety, but accepts educated Australian English as legitimate" (p. 307). Prejudice with respect to language variety is indeed a serious problem for TESOL and also for the field of applied linguistics. In the second part of this article, I will examine the outcomes of the debate on "native"/ "nonnative", standard/ non-standard and the notions L1 and L2 for TESOL and applied linguistics. What is important about the native and nonnative speaker debate on the part of members of the quartet and the *gamelon* (followed by Singh's coda, 1995), is that the interaction of the participating scholars has contributed to a revision about the nature of English and its role in the world.

Saleemi writes from the perspective of a Singaporean who teaches English language and literature at the National University of that country. His point of view is directly opposed to that of Singh for he contends that the native/ nonnative distinction "…is the only one that might eventually turn out to be worth saving […], especially if understood in the developmental-linguistic terms" (p. 311). His argument is based on the viewpoint of development linked to when, that is, the time English was acquired and the way or manner in which the language was acquired. Saleemi agrees with Mohanan who sees a difference in those users of English who are "early acquirers" =native speakers and those who are "late acquirers"= nonnatives. Saleemi, in support of his position, observes that "[I]t is a fairly well-known fact that early acquisition almost invariably culminates in the end-state of competence, whereas late acquisition in the general case tends to trail-off at some pre-final stage" (p. 308). For Saleemi, then, the norm with regard to late acquisition is partial success, or "limited proficiency" while the norm with respect to early acquisition is success. It would seem to me that Saleemi's claim may be too strong for there are "late acquisitioners" (L2s) whose proficiency is high and their performance in speaking and writing is far from being a "partial success" or pointing to "limited proficiency" or "failed replication". Saleemi's use of the notion end-state (end-state competence) may be attributed to his situatedness in Singapore, a nation that is locked by government fiat into inner circle varieties (British or American English) where the goal is to approximate those standards. Or the notion of "end-state of competence" for Saleemi may refer to learners (late adolescents and adults) in that country or from outside who take up the study of a foreign language (for those learners), be it Spanish or French. Udaya N. Singh (1998, p. 23) points to the difference between the acquisition of a language in early childhood and the "knowledge of a foreign language acquired later in life, which is open to interferences of various kinds – particularly in situations of stress and fatigue." Such notions as interlanguage, fossilization and interference are not applicable in situations of language contact as in India or Singapore; the three notions only apply in all three circles, that is, when adult Americans (inner circle), Indians (outer circle) and Brazilians (expanding circle) respectively study, for example, Russian or Arabic. These notions are dear to the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that tends to study foreign language learning (Spanish or French) in English-speaking inner and expanding circle nations and equates "full replication", "full attainment", "ultimate attainment" (Birdsong, 2004,p. 100), end-state or final state with native competency in the two aforementioned languages. The multilingualism of the outer circle and its "de-foreignization" of English is not part of the scope of SLA. But, to be fair, SLA is a vibrant field concerned with the acquisition of foreign languages by children and adults. Sorace (2003, p. 131) states that "[M]uch research to date adopts as points of reference the monolingual native speaker and L1 acquisition by monolinguals". While some researchers conclude that the notion of near-nativeness is vague, for Sorace "near-nativeness" is part of the research paradigm with which she works. There are in the world many learners of English who have "full attainment" in English and may very well be considered "near natives", "native-like" or even accepted as "natives" by those born in inner circle countries.

Pertinent to Saleemi's remarks, another observer of English in Singapore holds a different view from the members of the *gamelon*. Zhiming (2003, p.25) argues that in the case of Singapore, there exists a stigma attached to Singlish, while Standard Singapore English (SSE) "is not different from standard English elsewhere, such as standard British or American English, with differences being confined to accent and lexical borrowings." He concludes that nonnative English "is grammatically dependent on native English" **(**p. 23). This author is referring specifically to Singapore, a different venue from India or Nigeria where

The native speaker and nonnative speaker debate: what are the issues and what are the outcomes?

141

endonormative standards are not a problem and where the two varieties are not dependent of "native English". In the case of Singapore, Lee and Norton (2009, p. 279) contend that the government policy in promoting the standard over the colloquial variety ignores the link between "language and identity" and brings up the question about who "counts as a speaker of English" in that nation. What is important in Zhiming's (2003) remark that "SSE is not different from standard English elsewhere" is that high quality language teaching from the early years of schooling and on produce people who consider English their property and who view themselves as native speakers.

The issues are indeed complex. I wonder, however, if we can argue *in all cases* (my emphasis) that all late acquirers fail to reach the "end-state of competence". Saleemi equates end-state competence with native speaker status. I would counter-argue with respect to his statement that not all native speakers reach "end-state competence" for some are very articulate while others are not, some fail to understand what they read, others have limited vocabulary. Not all native speakers are competent writers and nobody looks for "native writers" or "native readers". It would seem to me that the notion "end-state" is slippery. One would think that all "native speakers" know everything about their language. Moussu and Llurda (2008, p. 318) point to problems that some learners have with native speakers "who speak fairly local or substandard varieties of the language, and whose language is hardly intelligible for speakers of other varieties of English." These scholars make a good point that is worth repeating: "[I]n other words, many so-called NSs (native speakers) can be far less intelligible in global settings than well-educated proficient speakers of a second language" (p. 318).

Turning now to another member of the *gamelon,* Preisler rejects the argument that new/nonnative Englishes and native ones are structurally similar. This author states that the quartet deals more with "political correctness than sociolinguistics" (p. 311). Preisler is concerned with defining the native and nonnative speaker in functional terms and considers the arguments based on (the supposed?) lack of a structural difference between nonnative and native varieties proposed by Singh *et al.*, 1995, p. 311, as "untenable assumptions and irrelevant or unreasonable arguments". Preisler informs his readers that he, as a University professor of English, has "relatively stable well-formedness judgments with the general community of educated speakers of American English who acquired English as their first language" (p. 312). He refers to "full replication of the system of English," but does not view himself as a native speaker of the language. He tells us that he is not a native speaker of English for he resorts to Danish when speaking exclusively to other Danes. If non-Danish speaking people are present, he switches to English. The problem with this view is that Priesler uses as the measuring rod for "full attainment" and "well-formedness" a native variety of English in his case, American English. While Priesler limits his remarks to his own status, I wonder if he would agree that his colleagues from India, Singapore and Malaysia also have "full replication", "full attainment" with "well-formedness judgments" *in their respective varieties of English* (my emphasis). I am sure that he is *not* (my emphasis) suggesting that all users of English in the outer circle are cases of "failed replication".

Preisler, however, does indeed raise an important issue when he points out that those who want to prove that "speakers of New Englishes are native speakers of English" (p. 312) fail to mention the implication of their viewpoint with regard to their Indian compatriots who speak indigenous languages and are excluded from being able to learn English due to their social condition. Exclusion from the study of English owing to socio-economic situation of different people in the world is not only a problem in India. Underlying the notion "native speaker" there lurks a stance of self-interest. Yet the fact is that there are many native speakers of Indian English in India. Period! I will return to Priesler and his thoughts when I deal with the English as a Lingua Franca debate in section 2.4.

Trudgill *in* Afendras *et. al.,* 1995, p. 314, questions why some speakers of English object to the term "nonnative" while others do not. For example, Trudgill points to "Swedish and Dutch Professors of Linguistics who know far more about the English language than the average native speaker" (p. 314) but who do not view themselves as native speakers of English but respectively of Swedish and Dutch. This author also adds that they do not feel oppressed by not being considered "native speakers". He asks why should speakers of Indian English feel threatened. I would contend that the answer lies in the fact that speakers of Indian English are excluded from the "club" of native speakers due to racial prejudice. With regard to the "native and nonnative" distinction, Trudgill insists that there is potentially "a degree of difference and not of kind"; that difference is "a real and vital difference as far as the theory and practice of linguistics are concerned and not one which we should pretend does not exist" (p. 317). While Trudgill disagrees with Singh with respect to the issue of non-nativeness, he is in complete agreement about the danger of linguistic prejudice. Here are his words:

> "Irrational prejudice against language varieties, of which there is far too much in the world, does not distinguish in its intolerance between varieties spoken by native speakers and those spoken by non-natives. There is no reason why those of us who are trying to combat this unreason, in our attempts to spread linguistic justice and enlightenment, should do so either (Trudgill, *in* Alfendras *et al.,* 1995, p. 317).

Florian Coulmas *in* Afendras *et. al.,* 1995, p. 317, whose text we examined above (1981), also participated in the *gamelon.* I find his remarks somewhat disappointing for he confesses his difficulty in pinning down what

a native speaker might be. He informs his readers that he agrees with Singh:

> For the past 15 years or so I have been haunted by the native speaker who seems to be elusive, changing identities (including sex) at will as he/she/it jumps from one paper to another (p. 317).

My question to Coulmas would be the following: Couldn't nonnative speakers or L2 speakers change identities (or gender) independently of their learning one or more L2s? Sex changes have nothing to do with being nonnative or native of any language. Doesn't changing languages, switching from one to another or moving from one country to another, affect identities? Quite telling are Coulmas' examples of nonnative or foreign speech that most likely no native would produce: (1) "It is forbidden to enter a woman, even a foreigner, if dressed as a man.", (ii) "A lot of water has been passed under the bridge since this variation has been played." He asks his readers if the sentences are non-native and answers – "Very likely" (p. 317). It would seem to me that Coulmas conceives of learner language, L2 or nonnative speech but hangs on to Singh's contention that the notion "nonnative" is untenable.

The last contributor to the *gamelon* is Dasgupta. He states that he does not think it feasible for Indians to consider themselves as native speakers of English "in face of all the forces and themes the word "native" sets in motion the moment we invoke it." (p. 320). The terms "native" or "nonnative" are not the problem for Dasgupta for the real issue is to "*eliminate* (his emphasis) the privilege of Native Speakers' Intuitions from the discourse of linguistics, not by withdrawing the boundaries of which people count as native speakers of what language" (p. 320). It is with regard to this point that there is consensus among the members of the *gamelon*.

Having examined the remarks of the members of the *gamelon*, I intend to critique the concluding thoughts provided by Singh to his colleagues. I will look at this in the next part of the paper.

A coda from the East

Singh's (1995) replies to his colleagues are cerebral and the sources he cites as counter-arguments point to the wealth of information on the subject as well as its complexity. With regard to the imposition of English in India and other countries on the part of the British Crown, Singh refers to the USA and argues that the English language was imposed on populations who spoke other languages as German, Polish and Swedish. Those who emigrated to the USA from non-English speaking countries were indeed aware that the vast majority of the people were speakers of English. Singh is correct, particularly with regard to German, for according to Gonzalez (2000, p. 209), in the year 1900, "as many as 600,000 children in American pub-

lic and parochial schools were being taught in German". Gonzalez remarks that a policy of Americanization that accompanied World War I unfortunately spelt the removal of German as a language of instruction in schools (p. 209).

There were and still are non-English language newspapers, magazines and radio programs and a good number of high schools traditionally offer a number of foreign languages. In some cases language loyalties in the USA were maintained but, to be sure, there was a pressure to learn English (and abandon their L1s). [I am not saying that the abandonment of a heritage language is a sound policy]. Present from the beginning of the settlement on the eastern coast of North America was the printing press in English that began in the "colonies" in 1639, more than 370 years ago. Those who came from continental Europe and Asia knew what to expect with regard to language. Only the most tenacious were able to hold on to their L1s.

One problem that I encountered in reading the quartet, the *gamelon* and the coda is the quite aggressive tone that the discussion takes by some of the authors. Y. Kachru employs the word "absurd" with regard to some of Singh's statements. In his turn, Singh, for example, invites readers to read Mac Aogáin "backwards from end to beginning, and leave it at that. I prefer to read it that way myself." (p. 330). All the bickering does not take us very far in understanding the issues.

My reading of the three papers leads me to state that I agree with Singh that he and his colleagues are native speakers based on the criterion of early acquisition. Singh himself remarks that Trudgill is a "native speaker of English English" and Mohanan "a native speaker of a particular variety of Indian English" (p. 328). This statement would point to variation in Indian English just as there exists variation, regional and social, in American or British Englishes. I would like, however, to know more about Singh's and Mohanan's contact with English. Indeed we need more narratives on how real people acquire or learn English. Was the language acquired from early childhood, continued in elementary school, secondary school (particularly in English-medium schools) and in higher education? Was English the language of the home? Or was English acquired after puberty as an L2? I would speculate that both scholars are early acquirers or L1 speakers of English. Indeed India is a very fascinating region for the study of language for there are, on one hand, Anglo-Indians who make English the language of the home. In addition, there are parents who speak their variety of English to their children and if continued, their children would most likely to be native or L1 speakers of that particular variety of English. But on the other hand, there are many, many Indians who learn English in late adolescence or at some point in their adult life. I would *not* (my emphasis) consider this later group to be L1 speakers. With regard to the word "learner", Singh states that speakers of Indian and Singaporean English "are not

learners of anything – they are speakers of these varieties." (p. 328). To my mind, his statement would appear to be an overgeneralization and researchers would indeed have to examine in depth the two countries. One issue not examined by the writers of the quartet, *gamelon* and coda is that English needs to be decolonialized *in* India (my emphasis). Mehrotra (2000, p. 140) points to the impressive growth of Indian literature in English and argues for the teaching of that literature rather than overemphasis on Shakespeare, William Blake and John Donne in Indian University departments of English. His remarks make sense in the Indian context:

> If in spite of such formidable output we are not able to introduce Indian Literature in English in a big way at various levels in our educational system, the fault no longer lies with the erstwhile British colonizers. What is needed is a shift in the colonial mind-set.

As in all intellectual concerns, there is always more to say and nobody has the last word. A seminar paper (Schneider, 2001) considers that the different varieties of English, be they Nigerian, British or Australian, share an underlying process that "drives their formation". *All* the varieties (my emphasis) pass or have passed through six different phases, namely: (i) foundation (the language is "born" in England, (ii) exonormative (the speakers move to other regions and maintain the founding norm, (ii) stabilization. (iii) nativization (slowly but surely, a new variety appears), (iv) endonormative stabilization (a "new" local norm exists, (v) differentiation. Schneider (2001, p. 234) states his view in the following terms:

> I claim that these similarities are more than chance results and coincidences; instead, they are products of fundamentally similar contact processes, to be accounted for by theories of communication, accommodation, and identity formation. I propose that the New Englishes emerge in characteristic phases that ultimately result in new dialect formation, and that the entire process is driven by identity reconstruction by the parties involved that are to some extent determined by similar parameters of the respective contact situation.

What I find to be original in Schneider's paper is that the different varieties of English are not "independent of each other" but are "products of unique circumstances determined by geography and history." In his case study of seven countries (Fiji, Hong Kong, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand), Schneider (2001, p. 261) reports some pertinent facts about identity with respect to English in the world. In Malaysia, for example, he comments that "there has emerged a new generation of Malaysians for whom English has become the *first* language (my emphasis) and by whom the original ancestral language has been discarded" (David, 2000, p. 65). He also cites a paper by Omar (2000, p. 13) who states that "about one percent of all Malaysians speak English as a native language, and about a third of the population are

estimated to speak it." (Omar 1996, p. 513). With regard to Singapore, Schneider (2001, p. 266) cites Pakir (2001) and remarks that "Singapore English is moving into B. Kachru's inner circle". Schneider (2001, p. 264) observes that in Singapore "[E]very child is educated in English as a first language". It would appear, then, that nativeness is appearing in other parts of the world. This reality changes the texture in Kachru's three concentric circles for they tend not to be homogeneous. Kachru's contribution to the study of world Englishes has been invaluable. Be that as it may, U.N. Singh (1998, p.16) refers to him as an "Anglistician" who considers Indian English as a variety of English and "their speakers are not native speakers of English". Surprisingly, B. Kachru (1990) would appear to be in agreement with those members of the *gamelon* as Bamgboṣe, Y. Kachru, Saleemi, Priesler, Trudgill and Dasgupta who favor the maintaining the native/nonnative dichotomy. The two writers who are ambivalent with regard to the issue are Millar and Mac Aogáin while Prahbu, Afendras, Coulmas and particularly R. Singh endorse the elimination of the dichotomy.

My reaction to the whole issue is that while there is no consensus with regard to the removal of the notions "native"/"nonnative" the debate has contributed to laying bare the ideologies underlying the term "native".

Having discussed in some detail the complex and often emotional issue of nativity, I want, in the next section, to refer to the outcomes of the debate in the real world.

What are the outcomes of the controversy over "native"/ "nonnative" and standard/ nonstandard?

The controversy, outlined and critiqued in the first part of this article, has contributed to a rethinking of the notions 'native speaker'/'nonnative speaker', 'standard language'/ 'non-standard variety' and 'mother tongue' in the discipline of linguistics. The books and articles have served as a corrective, laying bare the racist agendas, in many cases, underlying the different notions. In this section, I examine a number of the outcomes of the exchange brought about by all the scholars who had something to say with regard to nativity, nativeness or "native speakerism" (Holliday, 2006) and the different varieties of English. The issues I will look at are the following: (i) the empowerment of the nonnative speaker, (ii) the "deconstruction" of the native speaker, (iii) the "ownership" of the language and (iv) the appearance of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF).

The nonnative speaker in the spotlight: the move toward empowerment

An important outcome of the 'native'/'nonnative' issue is that little by little in the specialized literature in applied linguistics and language teaching, the nonnative

speaker has become the subject of detailed "state of the art" reviews: Moussu and Llurda (2008), Soheili-Mehr (2008), and a number of books, Medgyes (1998), Kamhi-Stein (2004) and Llurda (2005). With the growth and expansion of English, it became apparent that some of those individuals viewed as "nonnatives" born in India, Singapore or Malaysia are L1 speakers. The world-wide spread of English led to the realization that nonnative speakers (L2s) in the world outnumbered those L1s born in Sydney, Seattle and Salisbury. To consider the vast number of L2 speakers as "failed natives" with "failed replication" is unfair and not accurate. In all parts of the world there are numbers of L2 speakers of English of country *x* who use English effectively with other L2 speakers from country *y*. L1 speakers of English, particularly from Britain and the USA who travel on business or for pleasure throughout the world, in many cases, tend to be monolingual and are dependent for their survival on English L2 speakers. Here is the success of second/ foreign language learning. People become bilinguals in and out of school. With regard to L2 teachers of English, it was indeed embarrassing for ELT organizations to consider their members as not up to the standard of the L1 speakers of English who, by accident of birth, were born supposedly "in the right place", be it London or Boston. One important asset of L2 speakers, often ignored, is the fact that they often know the language of their students and are aware of the similarities and differences between the students L1 and English. Cook (1999, p. 195) is correct in stating that "L2 users have to be looked at in their own right as genuine L2 users, not as imitation native speakers". Kramsch (1997, p. 368) considers the bilingualism or multilingualism of nonnatives as a "privilege" that (monolingual) natives lack.

A reading of the papers and books dealing with the nonnative speaker that were published in the course of the first decade of the 21st Century (cited above) have contributed to the field of teacher education, applied linguistics and general linguistics. Here are some of the major contributions.

Criticism of the native speaker notion has exposed the discriminatory stance underlying the notion (Bonfiglio, 2010a, p. 642-643), Moussu and Llurda (2008, p. 316). Hence, the "other", the nonnative speaker as well as the native speaker teacher have become the subject of research projects in the area of language studies (Llurda, 2005), Medgyes (1998). All these books and articles lead me to consider that the nonnative users or L2s are having their own *Festschrift*. This is indeed an important outcome of the long-standing debate about the native speakers. Some of the topics of research about nonnative speakers are as follows:

• The study of nonnative students (learners) in the area of teacher preparation (Liu, 1999);
• The analysis of programs designed to prepare nonnative teachers for the classroom (Kamhi-Stein, 2004);

• Advantages and disadvantages of both native and nonnative in teacher preparation courses (Medgyes, 1998), Árva and Medgyes, (2000);
• Empowerment of *both* native *and* nonnative teachers (my emphasis) (Tsui, 2003), (Canagarajah, 2002);
• Development of new research tools for the study of both native and nonnative speakers:
  (i) narratives, (ii) surveys, (iii) interviews, (iv) classroom observations (Moussu and Llurda, 2008);
• Preferences of students – native or nonnative? Native and nonnative working together (Lasagabaster and Sierra 2005).

What is pertinent at this time is the change of focus in the field of language teaching and applied linguistics research from the reverence of the native speaker to the reevaluation of the nonnative speaker teacher who is a bilingual (or maybe a multilingual) and who knows the L1 of his students. For Rampton (1996), the case is no longer "who you are", that is, place of birth but "what you are", that is, what you know in terms of (i) teaching ability, (ii) knowledge of linguistics, applied linguistics and methodology. To my mind, (i) and (ii) translate into Rampton's rather broad notion of "expertise".

Deconstructing the native speaker, a necessary corrective, but the notion persists

Looking at the entries above marked by bullets (•), one quickly observes that the word *nonnative* appears in all of the sources and the term *native* has not disappeared despite all the convincing arguments with regard to the ideology of privilege and power underlying it. It would appear, hopefully, that the native speaker notion used in the sources cited above has been denuded of its negative connotations. What is important here is that both language users are talked about *together* (my emphasis). Note that both groups have "advantages and disadvantages" (Mey, 1981, p. 82). This is indeed a change in thinking. Nonnatives and natives are both objects of research and students are consulted in order to ascertain their preferences with regard to nonnative and natives in teaching. The literature also points to team teaching with both native and nonnatives. An extremely important result of the often very emotional debate about native speakers has enabled language teaching professionals to look for ways to empower nonnative speakers and teachers. Quite felicitous also is the attempt in the field of applied linguistics to help "nonnative" scholars who are intent on publishing articles and reviews in international journals. It is not always a question of correct usage and style for publishing. Many potential contributors to journals face enormous difficulties for they have to cope with deficient libraries, insufficient number of computers and censorship of the internet as well as e-mails on the part of authoritarian governments.

The native speaker and nonnative speaker debate: what are the issues and what are the outcomes?

145

Scholars from the outer and expanding circles publish in their respective national languages but publications in English-medium scholarly journals count more for career advancement. The selection process in some international journals can be unfair, for in some cases, a paper is rejected solely on the grounds that the writer who submitted an article is "definitely not a native speaker" (Flowerdew, 2000, p. 186). In some cases, the referees say nothing about the content or the possible contribution of the paper to the area of language teaching. In order to overcome hegemonic practices underlying international publishing, in English, Curry and Lillis (2004) urge TESOL practitioners to act as "mediators of literacy" to encourage scholars in different parts of the world to "seek out English-speaking insiders (from all three circles) within their disciplines to offer expert commentary on their texts and by helping scholars to make decisions about textual changes based on such commentary" (p. 682). Quite moving is Canagarajah's (2002) narrative about his personal struggles in trying to carry out scholarly research in his native Sri Lanka and quite admirable indeed is his scholarship *in* English! The articles published in THE TESOL QUARTERLY by Flowerdew (2000) and Curry and Lillis (2004) indicate a supportive stance with respect to the submission of papers in English to journals. One would wonder if such an editorial policy on the part of TESOL that encourages nonnative scholars to submit papers is also the case of journals published in French, Spanish or German. Or is that supportive policy due to the fact that there are more nonnative teachers in the world than native ones?

In the next section, I want to look at the natural outcome of English as a world language – the democratization of "ownership".

The ownership of English: whose English counts?

Another important contribution with regard to the questioning of the privilege and power given to the native speaker has made it clear that English is not the private property of one nation or one group of speakers. Gone are the days (I hope!) where there are those "who would claim copyright to communicative competence and mock others who are generally viewed as mere deviant performers" (Singh, 1998, p. 15). For Brutt-Griffler (1998, p.381), English has not only spread but changed to become an international language. The use of the participle *changed* points to the different varieties (as we observed above). English is not the private property of Canadians or Nigerians. All those who use the language are in fact "owners" of the language. Gone are the days when a small group of speakers in a specific part of what is now called the British Isles could consider English as their private property.

Higgins (2003, p. 625-626) presents a pertinent piece of research as an alternative to the rigid native speaker and nonnative speaker dichotomy. She administered tests to teachers and students from India, Nigeria, Singapore, Malaysia, Kenya and other countries that consisted of a number of grammatical structures in English and others invented; the informants were asked to distinguish those sentences that were English from those that were made up. The participants' words "you can say that in English" or "that's not English" point to a degree of ownership of English and suggest that L2 users, in some cases, consider the language to be their "property".

Higgins (p. 619) confirms the views held by some of the participants in the *gamelon* that "some speakers in the outer circle are NSs (native speakers) in their own right". According to her, this stance "adopts a pluralistic understanding of English that is not based only on the inner-circle varieties".

The case is that the hegemonic varieties, that is British and American English, and to a lesser extent Canadian and Australian Englishes, are no longer viewed by many users of other varieties in the world as *the* standard(s) that fix norms for the entire world. Indeed Uncle Sam's English as well as the Queen's variety are being questioned today as the sole models in teaching and learning. This is indeed a healthy sign.

The issue of competing norms of English as well as the impressive number of L2 speakers in the world and the so-called "decline of the native speaker" has occasioned some concern by governmental agencies, particularly the British Council. While Graddol (1998, pgs. 10, 63) admits, on one hand, that "those who speak English as a second or foreign language will determine its world future", he, on the other hand, evinces some apprehension about the changes in the role of English in the world today. He has this to say:

> the need to adapt to a changing business environment, or a moral requirement to work within an ethical framework, the ELT industry will have to respond to changing international social values. This would bring a major exporting activity into the same framework which is now expected to regulate trading relations with other countries and would help to ensure that the reputation of Britain, of the British people and their language, is enhanced rather than diminished.

There is no doubt that English Language Teaching for the hegemonic nations is a multi-million dollar enterprise. The questioning of whose standard counts along with the growth of competing varieties are indeed, it would appear, to be a threat to the "ELT industry" (as Graddol, 2006, p. 68 writes). I do not follow Graddol's words with respect to what the growth and spread of English in the world have to do with the reputation of Britain as a nation or its people. With regard to English, it is no longer solely *their* language, but belongs to all those who use it in the

four corners of the world. It is not clear to me whose ethical framework is being referred to in the author's remarks. Whose ethics are we talking about here? With respect to speakers of English spoken in Europe, Graddol (1999. p. 67) points to the ever-increasing numbers of fluent speakers of English "who do not conform to the traditional definition of L2 speaker and who are excluded from most estimates of L2 usage". This is an important observation.

In Graddol's more recent book (2006, p. 12), I note that he is rightly concerned, first of all, with the fact that speakers of English in the outer and expanding circles are, for the most part, multilingual while the British people tend to remain in general monolingual. Secondly, he observes that English is also transformed or modified as it is rapidly becoming part of other languages. In his introductory words in *English Next,* Graddol (2006) points to the dramatic changes in the role of English in the world. He writes:

> Anyone who believes that native speakers of English remain in control of these developments will be very troubled […] it is native-speakers who, perhaps, should be the most concerned.

I am not so sure that *all* native speakers (my emphasis) are worried, "troubled" or even aware of the change. Most likely native speaker teachers, language institute directors, university researchers in language studies may feel that their prestige and power are on the wane due to the new reality: there are more nonnative users of English than native ones. The monopoly with respect to teaching English in the "center" (particularly Britain, the USA and more recently Australia) is receiving competition from universities in Europe and Asia that offer programs in teacher preparation as well as advanced degrees in English studies, general and applied linguistics.

Bruthiaux (2002, p.130) observes that English is spoken in a large number of countries (as an L1 or an L2) by an ever-increasing number of people. This means that English is not going to disappear in the event that Anglo-American power and influence diminish. Speculation about the near future or particularly the distant future fails to take us very far. Indeed political and economic conditions change. If China, for example, as a world power, strengthens commercial ties with Australia or New Zealand, it is possible that the Chinese may prefer to learn Australian or New Zealand standard Englishes, rather than American or British Englishes. There is always the possibility that some Chinese may prefer to study Indian English or maybe English as a Lingua Franca (see 2.4). Singapore, as I have commented, has embarked on a "speak good English" campaign to offset the use of Singlish where "good" is either the American or British variety. The speakers of Singlish may thwart the efforts of the government in the coming years. Indeed power is always present but, fortunately, so is resistance.

ELF: English as a Lingua Franca: nonnative speakers with a variety of their own

The rise of ELF in the world represents a parting of English and the teaching of the language from its long-time and very-intimate relationship with native speaker inner circle varieties. Based on corpora, namely the Vienna Voice (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (http:// www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php? Pge+what_is –voice) and the Finland-based ELFA (English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings) as well as research on the phonology of English (Jenkins, 2000) and numerous scholarly articles (Jenkins (2006a, 2006b), Seidlhofer (2003), Mauranen (2005), ELF offers users of English an alternative to the pursuit of a specific native variety, often unreachable for many individuals. English as a Lingua Franca is a contact language used in day-to-day interactions among thousands and thousands of people who speak different L1s and who are not L1 speakers of English. If one listens to the corpus material, one observes that the speakers are fluent; they work together to complete tasks and do not correct one another and if misunderstanding occurs in the different interactions, the participants work together, negotiate meaning to complete the task at hand. In this way, the users are free to develop a variety of their own and are not controlled or intimidated by the presence of native speakers. The phonology of ELF proposed by Jenkins does not oblige language users to sound like natives, thereby preserving the identity of those who engage in nonnative to nonnative exchanges.

ELF, however, has its critics for those who having invested heavily in approximating a native standard over the years are not always receptive to the change in focus. Lingua Franca English indeed challenges the field of Second Language Acquisition (Firth and Wagner, 1997) that has traditionally been wedded to the supremacy of native varieties of English. In addition, the field of language testing (Jenkins, 2006a, 2006b; Lowenberg, 2000) has undergone some rethinking.

This was brought about by the change of emphasis in the field of English Language Teaching from the Chomksyan "linguistic or grammatical competence" to "communicative competence" inspired by the work of Hymes (1971) who was addressing himself not to language teachers but to researchers in ethnography (Leung, 2005). Hymes' proposal was not directed specifically to English but to the study of all languages and to their respective speakers in real-world contexts. According to Leung (2005, p. 120), the different versions of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) "that appear in a vast array of ELT teacher training and teaching materials, is itself in need of examination and possibly recasting." The problem here is that the notion was appropriated from ethnographic research and relegated to the communicative competence of native speakers of British English or General American,

The native speaker and nonnative speaker debate: what are the issues and what are the outcomes?

147

thereby excluding the communicative competence of speakers of Indian English or Filipino English. It is no wonder then that many Indians and other speakers of English had trouble with standard tests based on what might be communicatively appropriate in American English but not in Indian or Nigerian English.

Users of English in the outer circle also have their own specific communicative competence. Udaya N. Singh (1998, p.15) states that native speakers often "claim copyright to communicative competence" and look down on others who considered "deviant performers".

The appearance of ELF is controversial in some quarters. Priesler (1999, p.263, *in* Jenkins, 2007, p. 40) rejects English as a Lingua Franca for he is beholden to standard language ideology and insists on the teaching of inner circle varieties to nonnative users for international communication. My readers will recall that Priesler in the *gamelon* debate (Alfendras *et al.*, 1995), in spite of his "full attainment" in English refuses to consider himself a native speaker. According to Canagarajah (2006, p. 211), "[T]here is a bias in the field toward "systematized" varieties of languages" that present "significant challenges for applied linguistics".

Priesler's position is revealing for many speakers of English who have invested heavily in learning a standard form (in his case, American English) may not perceive that there may exist problems in identity for some learners in attempting to sound like Americans or Australians. A good number may prefer to "be themselves" in language learning and not be forced to take on a new identity. My readers will recall that it was Priesler who states that he is L2 speaker of English (a nonnative) but with "full replication" and "stable well-formedness" based on American English. My listening to the ELF recordings in the Vienna-Oxford corpus leads me to state that many speakers do indeed have full replication and hold views on what one can say or not say in the language, and are perfectly content to *not* (my emphasis) sound like speakers born in London or in Chicago or parrot idiomatic expressions or specific syntactic patterns of the users in those cities.

Prodromou (2008), another critic of ELF, views its speakers as "stutterers on the world stage". It would appear that Mey's (1981, p. 82) remarks, written some time ago and cited in the epigraph above, have not been heard. He suggests the abandonment of the notion "correction of utterances" and recommends "the pragmatics of knowing one's way around in language". The Vienna-Oxford recordings motivate me to state the ELF speakers do indeed know their way around English and use it to interact and accomplish tasks with other nonnative speakers. To be fair, none of the ELF speakers who participated in the Vienna Voice recording have speech defects.

One important outcome of the rise of ELF (Jenkins, 1998, p. 126) is that her proposal for a specific phonology of English as an International Language will contribute to moving the teaching of pronunciation "center state" rather than "keeping it in the wings" as in the case with the traditional teaching of pronunciation. Jenkins is straightforward for she makes it clear that the presence of ELF in the world does not imply that those students who desire to acquire a native variety will be denied the right to opt for one of the native varieties.

I would think that ELF will free students from having to "sound like natives" and may actually increase the number of speakers of English in the world. If phonology and pronunciation are moved "center state" as Jenkins contends, there will be more work for teachers to do for they will have to be familiar with ELF and also with other varieties in the inner and outer circles. An important contribution of the presence of ELF in the world is the criticism of the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) due to its view of L2 users as failures in comparison with native speakers (Cook, 2002, p. 9).

To conclude my remarks on ELF, I hope that all researchers approach the appearance of ELF with an open mind and listen to one another. There is indeed a large bibliography dealing with ELF; quite felicitous is the attention being given to ELF in the TESOL QUARTERLY, the official journal of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Mauranen, 2005).

In the next section of this article, I want to pull the various threads of thought together in order to comment on the implications of the outcomes, first of all, for me as an L1 user of English as well as an L2 user of Spanish and Portuguese. Secondly, I want to look at the implications for students and teachers of applied linguistics in general and in particular for a language policy for Brazil and other nations where English functions politically as a foreign language for many learners and as a second language for others.

Implications of the outcomes of the native/nonnative debates

A personal narrative as an L1 and L2 user

I had not been in Brazil for six months in the year 1970 when I first heard the word "native speaker", uttered by a Brazilian teacher of English with an intonation that suggested to me a certain reverence for the notion. In my own imaginary at least, I do not believe that I felt superior to my colleague in any way. Her command of English was excellent and I thought that her pronunciation of English was far better than my own in Portuguese. I also observed that her explanations for *some/ any* and *still/yet* were much more to the point that my own.

As a "native" New Yorker, I heard different languages (Spanish, Italian, Polish and German) on the radio. It was only at the age of six when I entered elementary

school did I realize that it was English that we were speaking for there was a subject matter called English that entailed learning an alphabet and learning to read. In addition, in the following years, there were spelling rules and, worse still, spelling bee competitions in which the children who misspelled a word would be corrected, often humiliated and eliminated from the contest. The competitive approach did not improve my spelling ability. I recall that I did enjoy grammar as a subject but did not enjoy writing, no doubt caused by my impatience with punctuation and spelling.

I feel my identity was not with English but with New York City, Ireland, on one hand, where my maternal grandparents were born, and Germany, on the other, from where my paternal grandfather emigrated to New York. I base the representation of my identity on Myhill (2003, p.77-78) who questions the belief that a native language is "inherently central to individual identity". This author argues that many groups –Chinese, Jews, Greeks, Armenians and others– "define their identity in other ways, according to religion, tradition and/or ancestry, but not native language."

It was not until secondary school that I slowly began to identify not with English but with my first L2 which was Spanish. Upon graduation for high school, my identity was with Spanish and things Hispanic (living in New York City reinforced that identity). As a student in high school and college, I studied with some instructors who were L1 speakers and other who were L2 speakers of Spanish. Both users were competent. To be transparent, I do recall regarding the teachers from Spain and Latin America with a certain aura not because they were better teachers but because they came from different places in the world that little by little became the object of my own desire—to travel, live, work and to be part of "another world". I contend that my interest in things Hispanic presented me with another identity, along with a desire, at some moments in life, to "go native".

It was not until the mid 90s of the last century that I, for a number of months, had some reservations about the problematizing of the "native speaker" notion on the past of Coulmas (1981), Singh (1995) and Rajagopalan (1997). My questioning was due in part to a dialogue that I had with a São Paulo taxi-cab driver. In addition, I had only given the specialized literature a cursory reading. The following interaction represents, as far as I can remember, what was said:

> Taxicab driver: Posso perguntar uma coisa para o Sr.?
>   [May I ask you something?]
> Myself: Pois não. Pode perguntar.
>   [Of course, you can.]
> Taxicab driver: O Sr. não é brasileiro?
>   [Are you Brazilian?]
> Myself: Sou de Nova York. Sou naturalizado Brasileiro.
>   [I am from New York. I am naturalized.]
> Taxicab driver: Quanto tempo o Sr. está no Brasil?
>   [How long are you in Brazil?]

> Myself: Mais de vinte e cinco anos.
>   [Over twenty-five years.]
> Taxicab driver: O Sr. pode me explicar alguma coisa?
>   [Can you explain something to me?]
> Myself: Pois não.
>   [Certainly.]
> Taxicab driver: Por que não perdeu o sotaque?
>   [Why do you still have an accent?]

The dialogue is very telling for my accent (for one thing) will motivate others to ask me the question: "Are you Brazilian?" or, simply exclaim outright: "You're not Brazilian!!" The dialogue and many others made it quite clear that I am not an L1 (native speaker) of Portuguese in spite of an unconscious (?) desire to be one. But the dialogue and the problematics underlying the notion "native speaker" obliged me to revise my thinking.

To be sure, Kramsch's (1997, p.363) statement that "native speakers are made and not born" does not indeed apply to me as far as Portuguese is concerned. Her remarks, however, are contradictory for she states earlier in her paper that "students can become fluent in a new language, they can never become native speakers of it" (p. 359).

But I do not think I am a "failed native" in Portuguese as it would appear that many L2 users of English in the world are made to feel. Singh's (1995, p.328) desire that the notion be "blown away in the wind" confused me, in my first reading of his text, for if I am always a "foreigner" and not a native speaker of Portuguese, where did/do I stand with regard to the language (English) which was due to an accident of birth? In case of Spanish and Portuguese, it was I who chose to learn them. Thanks to wider and deeper readings on my part of the specialized literature (most of it cited in the course of this paper), I fully accept that I am a L1 user of English as an L2 user of Portuguese and Spanish.

Returning to Davies (1991), he contends that native speakers recognize a nonnative speaker (and this is indeed my case for in spite of over forty years of residence in Brazil, fluent in Portuguese in addition to published papers in the language), I am not viewed as a native speaker of the language. I agree that some native speakers (L1s) of English (as well as proficient L2s) can detect in the speech of learners, structures which do not occur in the language as well as forms that are not appropriate for a specific context or situation. What I would disagree with is Davies's remark that there exist forms 'reserved' for native speakers, such as slang, obscenities, and extreme informality (1991, p. 166). Slang is common in informal registers and students are keen to learn it. The use of obscenity may be dangerous in certain circumstances but it does serve as a catharsis for some and as a mark of solidarity for others. One would wonder why slang or obscenities should be the private property of *his* native speakers and not for use by all those who speak English.

More important than my personal thoughts about the native/nonnative speaker debate are the implications for students and teachers of English as well as the discipline of applied linguistics in Brazil. I will look at those implications in the next section.

Implications for students and teachers of English and for applied linguistics in Brazil.

The different national standards of English are important for the formation of a Brazilian foreign language policy. It is now apparent that no group owns English and there are many L2 learners in Brazil who, thanks to their proficiency and expertise in teaching are "owners" of English. To be sure, the economic and political power underlying British and American English may hinder an in-depth study of other varieties, but a pluricultural approach to the different varieties and their respective cultures is essential for Brazil in this globalized world. In this article, I have looked at English, that is, World Englishes. This emphasis does not mean that other world languages should not be a part of a Brazilian language policy. An English-only teaching policy is not wise language policy for Brazil in the 21st Century.

The exclusionary and biased view of the native speaker has hopefully been corrected. The nonnative (the L2s) in the field of TESOL has in recent years become the subject of research. This attention is also mirrored in Brazil thanks to the research being carried out in the field of teacher preparation ("formação de professores") at the present time.

An important point in the native/nonnative debate is the understanding that linguistic prejudice in the form of belittling others because of their speech is far from being ethical. Intolerance and impatience with the speech of untutored Brazilians who have been excluded from the right to have an education needs to be removed from the discourse of some journalists and humorists, in particular. All citizens have the right to learn the "standard" form of Portuguese and/or maintain a regional or social dialect. The learning of foreign/second languages should be available to all citizens and not a privilege of a few.

The research on nonnative teachers (L2) in the field of TESOL has important implications for the preparation of teachers of English (and other languages) for public and private schools. Concern with the identity of teachers as professionals, that is, as successful English users (SUEs) (Prodromou, 2008), competent L2s, or bilingual experts (Rampton, 1996; Kramsch, 1997) and not "failed native speakers" has motivated a number of pertinent reflections (Lima 2009) on the art of teaching English in Brazilian schools.

Opportunities for the study of different World Englishes should be presented in University-level English language liberal arts programs. Computer data bases of different World Englishes permit the study of the many "voices" of English in the world.

Applied linguistics as a discipline must also be receptive to the existence of different varieties of English, including English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), International English and Euro-English, and not be tied or beholden to hegemonic varieties of the language.

The appearance of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) on the international scenario may contribute to reducing anxiety and conflicts in identity with regard to striving for an inner circle accent. What is viewed as "correct" can be negotiated among users of ELF and not imposed by those outside that community of practice. Seidlhofer (2003, p.137) claims that "it is highly problematic to discuss aspects of global English, however critically, while at the same time passing native speaker judgments as to what is appropriate in ELF usage."

With respect to English in the world, the question now is whose interests are being served when an option is made in Brazil for a specific variety of English and its respective culture. Pertinent questions for a language policy are (i) whose language (variety)? (ii) whose culture? (iii) who benefits from the answers to queries (i) and (ii)?

References

AFENDRAS, E.A.; MILLAR, S.; MAC AOGÁIN, E.; BAMGBOŠE, A.; KACHRU, Y.; SALEEMI, A. P.; PRIESLER, B.; TRUDGILL, P.; COULMAS, F.; DASGUPTA, P. 1995. On 'new/non-native' Englishes: A gamelon. *Journal of Pragmatics*, **24**:295-321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00030-V

ÁRVA, V.; MEDGYES, P. 2000. Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, **28**:355-372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00017-8

BALMER, T.T. 1981. A typology of the native speaker. *In*: F.A. COULMAS (ed.), *A Festscrhrift for Native Speaker*. The Hague, Mouton Publishers, p. 51-68.

BAYLIS, P. 2008. *Review of A. Kirkpatrick, 2007 World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 263 p.

BIRDSONG, F. 2004. Second language acquisition and ultimate attainment. *In*: A. DAVIES; C. ELDER (Eds). *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Malden, Mass, Blackwell Publishers, p. 82-105.

BONFIGLIO, T.P. 2007. Language, racism and ethnicity. *In:* M. HELLINGER.; A. PAUWELS (eds.), *Handbook of language and communication: Diversity and change*. Berlin, De Gruyter, p. 619-650.

BONFIGLIO, T.P. 2010a. *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker*. Paris, De Gruyter Mouton, 244 p. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9781934078266

BONFIGLIO, T.P. 2010b. Personal communication via e-mail, November, 2010.

BRUTHIAUX, P. 2002. Predicting challenges to English as a global language in the 21st Century. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, **26**(2):129-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lplp.26.2.03bru

BRUTT-GRIFFLER, J. 1998. Comments and reply. Conceptual questions in English as a world language: taking up an issue. *World Englishes*, **17**(3):381-392. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00111

CANAGARAJAH, A.S. 2002. *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh, PA., University of Pittsburgh Press, 332 p.

CANAGARAJAH, A.S. 2006. Negotiating the local in English as a Lingua Franca, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, **26**:197-218. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190506000109

John Robert Schmitz

COOK, V.J. 1999. Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, **33**(6):185-209. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587717

COOK, V.J. 2002. *Portraits of the L2 User*. Clevedon**,** Multilingual Matters, 346 p.

COULMAS, F.A. 1981. *A Festschrift for Native Speaker*. The Hague, Mouton Publishers, 399 p.

CURRY, M.J.; LILLIS, T. 2004. Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands and rewards. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, **38**(4):604-688. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588284

DAVID, M.K. 2000. Creativity in the language of Malaysian youth: an exploratory study**.** *In*: M.S. HALIMAH.; N.K. SIEW (eds.), *English as an Asian language: The Malaysian context.* Kuala Lumpur, Macquarie University. p. 64-72.

DAVIES. A. 1991. *The native speaker in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press. 181 p.

FIRTH, A.; WAGNER, J. 1997. On discourse, communication and some fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, **81**:285-300. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05480.x

FLOWERDEW, J. 2000. Discourse community, linguistic peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL QUARTERLY*. **34**(1):127-150. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588099

FROMKIN, V.A. 1973. *Speech errors as linguistic evidence*. The Hague, Mouton, 269 p.

FROMKIN, V.A. 1980. *Errors in linguistic performance: slips of the tongue, ear, pen, and hand*. New York, Academic Press, 334 p.

GONZALEZ, J. 2000. Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America. New York, Penguin Books, 346 p.

GRADDOL, D. 1998. *The future of English?*: *A guide to forecasting the popularity of English in the 21st Century*. London, The British Council, 65 p**.**

GRADDOL, D. 1999. The decline of the native speaker/ Le decline du locuteur natif. *In*: D. GRADDOL.; U.H. MEINHOF (eds.), *English in a changing world – L'anglais dans un monde changeant. AILA Review*, **14**:37-68.

GRADDOL, D. 2006. *English Next*: Why global English may be the end of English as a foreign language. London, The British Council, 129 p.

HIGGINS, C. 2003. Ownership of English in the outer circle: An alternative to the NS-NSS dichotomoy. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, **37**(4):615-643. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588215

HOLLIDAY, A. 2006. Native speakerism. *ELT Journal*, **60**(4):385-387. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030

HOCKETT, C. 1973. Where the tongue slips, there slip I. *In*: V.A. FROMKIN (ed.), *Speech errors as linguistic evidence.* The Hague, Mouton, p. 93-119.

HYMES, D. *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia, Philadelphia University Press, 1971.

JENKINS, J. 1998. Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an international language. *ELT Journal*, **53**(2):119-126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.2.119

JENKINS, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 266 p.

JENKINS, J. 2006a. The spread of EIL: a testing time for teachers. *ELT Journal*. **60**(1):42-50. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci080

JENKINS, J. 2006b. The times they are (very slowly) a-changin. *ELT Journal*, **60**(1):60-61. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci082

JENKINS, J. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca*: *Attitude and Identity*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 284 p.

KACHRU, B. 1990. *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models in non-native English*. 2nd. Edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press/ Illini Books, 205 p.

KAMHI-STEIN, L.D. 2004. *Language and teaching from experience: perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals*. Ann Arbor, MI., The University of Michigan Press, 345 p.

KIRKPATRICK, A. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications, international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 263 p.

KHUBCHANDANI, L.M.; HOSALI, P. 1999. Grassroots English in a communicative paradigm. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, **28**(3):251-272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/lplp.23.3.04khu

KRAMSCH, C. 1997. *The privilege of the nonnative speaker. Guest Column PMLA - Publication of the Modern Language Association.* New York, MLA. p. 359-369**.**

LASAGABASTER, D.; SIERRA, J.M. 2005. The Nativeness Factor: An Analysis of Students's Preferences. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, **148**:21-44. http://dx.doi.org/10.2143/ITL.148.0.2002063

LEE, E.; NORTON, B. 2009. The English language, multilingualism, and the politics of location. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, **12**(3):227-290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153285

LEUNG, C. 2005. Convivial communication: recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, **15**(2):120-144. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00084.x

LIMA, D. C. de. 2009. *Ensino e Aprendizagem de Língua Inglesa*. São Paulo, Editorial Parábola, 245 p.

LIU, D. 1999. Training non-native TESOL students: challenges for TESOL education in the West. *In*: G. BRAINE (ed.), *Nonnative educators in English Language Teaching*. Mahwah, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum, p.197-198.

LLURDA, E. 2005. *Non-Native Language Teachers*. New York, Springer, 314 p. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/b106233

LOWENBERG, P.H. 2000. Non-native varieties and the sociopolitics of English proficiency assessment. p.67-85.. *In*: J.K. HALL.; W.G. EGGINGTON (eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of English Language Teaching.* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 248 p.

MAURANEN, A. 2005. The corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, **37**(3):513-527. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588402

MEDGYES, P. 1998. *The non-native teacher (ELT)*. New York, Macmillan, 134 p.

MEHROTRA, R.R. 2000. Decolonizing English Teaching in India. *RELC Journal*, **31**(2):134-144. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368820003100207

MEY, J. 1981. "Right or wrong, my native speaker" Estant les Régestes du Noble Souverain de l'Empirie Linguistic avec un Renvoy au Mesme Roy. *In*: F.A. COULMAS (ed.), *A Festschrift for Native Speaker.* The Hague, Mouton Publishers, p. 69-84.

MOUSSU, L.; LLURDA, E. 2008. Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research, "State-of- the Art Article". *Language Teaching*, **41**(3):315-48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444808005028

MYHILL, J. 2003. The native speaker, identity and the authenticity hierarchy. *Language Sciences*, **25**:77-97. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(01)00023-7

NEWMAN, P.; RATLIFF, M. 2001. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 285 p. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511810206

NIDA, E. 1981. Informants or colleagues? *In*: F.A. COULMAS (ed.), *A Festscrhrift for Native Speaker.* The Hague, Mouton Publishers, p.169-174.

OMAR, A.H. 1996. Post-Imperial English in Malaysia. *In*: J. FISHMAN; A.W. CONRAD; A. RUBAL-LOPEZ A. (eds.) *Post-imperial English: status change in former British and American colonies 1940-1990.* Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. *p.* 513-534.

OMAR, A.H. 2000. From imperialism to Malaysianization: A discussion of the path taken by English in becoming a Malaysian language. *In*: M.S. HALIMAH.; N.K. SIEW (eds.) *English as an Asian Language*: The Malaysian Context. Kuala Lumpur, Macquarie University, 195 p.

PAIKEDAY, T. 1985. *The Native Speaker in Dead!* Toronto, Paikeday Publishing Company, Inc. 109 p.

PAKIR, A. 2001. The voices of English-knowing bilinguals and the emergence of new epicenters. *In*: V.B.Y. OOI (ed.) *Evolving identities: The English language in Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore, Times Academic Press, p.1-11.

PRIESLER, B. 1999. Functions and forms of English in a European EFL country. *In*: T. BEX.; R.J. WATTS (eds.), *Standard English: the widening debate*. London, Routledge, p**.** 239-268.

PRODROMOU, L. 2008. *English as a Lingua Franca*: A corpus-based analysis. London, Continuum. 291p.

RAJAGOPALAN, K. 1997. Linguistics and the myth of nativity: Comments on the new/non-native Englishes. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **27**:225-31. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00027-6

RAMPTON, M.B.H. 1996. Displacing the 'native speaker': expertise, affiliation, and inheritance**.** *In*: T. HEDGE.; N. WHITNEY, (eds.) *Power Pedagogy & Practice*. Oxford, Oxford University Press**,** p. 269-268

SCHMITZ, J.R. 2006. On the notion 'native'/'nonnative': A dangerous dichotomy for world Englishes. *Rask* (Institute of Language and Communication, University of Southern Denmark). **21:** 5-25**.** [Published also with permission**:** *Signótica* 2009 (Federal University of Goiás), **21**(2): 341-363**.]**

SCHNEIDER, E.W. 2001 The dynamics of new Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth. *Language*. **79**(2):233-181. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lan.2003.0136

SEIDLHOFER, B. 2003. Closing the conceptual gap: the case for the description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. **11**(2):133-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00011

SINGH, R. 1995. 'New/non-native' Englishes revisited: a reply to my colleagues. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **24**:323-333. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00037-S

SINGH, R.; D'SOUZA, J.; MOHANAN, K.P.; PRABHU, N.S. 1995. On 'new non native' Englishes: A quartet. *Journal of Pragmatics*. **24**:283-94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00046-H

SINGH, R. 1998. *The Native speaker: Multilingual Perspectives*. New Delhi, Sage Publication. 226 p.

SINGH, U.N. 1998. Introduction by the Series Editor. p. 11-25. *In:* SINGH, R. (ed.) *The native speaker: Multilingual Perspectives*. New Delhi, Sage Publication. 226 p.

SOHEILI-MEHR, A.H. 2008. Native and non-native speakers of English: Recent perspectives on theory, research and practice. *Language Teaching*. **41**(3):445-57.

SORACE, A. 2003. Near-Nativeness. *In*: C.J. DOUGHERTY; M. LONG, (eds.) *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden, MA., Blackwell Publishing Company. p. 130-151. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492.ch6

TESOL (TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES, INC. 1991. A TESOL statement on non-native speakers of English and Hiring Practices. TESOL Matters. **12**(2) Disponível em: http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/sec_document.asp.?CID=193&DID=

TSUI. A.B. 2003. Understanding expertise in teaching. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. 320 p**.**

Vienna Voice (Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (http://www.univie.ac.at/voice/voice.php? Pge+what_is –voice

ZHIMING, B. 2003 Social stigma and grammatical autonomy in non-native varieties of English. *Language in Society*. **32**(1)**:**23-46.

John Robert Schmitz
Universidade Estadual de Campinas.
Cidade Universitária, Campus da Unicamp,
Bairro Barão Geraldo,
13025-003, Campinas, SP, Brasil