World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition

Kingsley Bolton*

*School of Humanities, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Correspondence
Kingsley Bolton, Language and Communication
Centre, Nanyang Technological University,
14 Nanyang Drive, Singapore 637332, Singapore
Email: kbolton@ntu.edu.sg

Abstract
This article starts with an overview of the broad field of studies concerned with world Englishes (WE), before moving on to a discussion of current debates on world Englishes, and the central issue of world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition. The later sections of this article then consider various ways of bridging the gap between the fields of world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition, highlighting the importance of a multilingual perspective in this context.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Over the last three decades or so, the term 'world Englishes' (WE) has become an established term to refer to localised forms of English found throughout the world, particularly in the Caribbean, parts of Africa, and many societies in Asia. Before the 1980s, discussions of English worldwide typically employed a normative vocabulary that utilized a distinction between 'native speakers' and 'non-native speakers', resulting in such categories of description as English as a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL). However, over the last thirty years, world Englishes with its inclusively marked plural form has increasingly become the default descriptor to refer to those areas of linguistics concerned with research and publications on English worldwide.

Although the field of WE as an academic endeavor is typically said to date from the 1980s, debates about the status, functions, and features of varieties of English may be traced back to the mid-nineteen sixties, and not least to the work of Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens, who made the argument at that time that 'English is no longer the possession of the British, or even the British and the Americans, but an international language which [...] exists in an increasingly large number of different varieties' (Halliday, McIntosh, & Strevens, 1964, p. 293). Some twelve years later, Larry Smith described English as 'an international auxiliary language', and asserted

that it was 'time to stop calling it a foreign language or second language', suggesting instead the term 'EIAL' (English as an International Auxiliary Language) which, he asserted, 'more accurately reflects the present state of English language usage around the globe' (Smith, 1976, p. 39). Since then, the work of Braj Kachru, Larry Smith and many other scholars has contributed to a major paradigm shift in English studies. Over this period, there has been a growing recognition of 'Englishes' in the plural, as in 'varieties of English', 'international Englishes', 'new Englishes', 'English languages' and 'world Englishes'. Of all these designations, arguably the most established and inclusive term currently in the literature is that of 'world Englishes' (WE), and the last three decades have seen the rise of this area as a site for scholarly research and publication. There are now three major academic journals—*English Today, English World-Wide,* and *World Englishes*—specialising in such studies, numerous book-length studies dealing with research in this area, publications that complemented by the activities of the International Association for World Englishes (IAWE), which regularly organizes international conferences in the US and across the globe. Interest in the diverse forms and functions of so-called 'new Englishes' throughout the world has been paralleled by a related interest in new literatures in English, particularly from writers originally from former British colonies, such as V. S. Naipaul, Michael Ondaatje, Timothy Mo, Ben Okri, Wole Soyinka, Arundhati Roy, Salman Rushdie, and Derek Walcott (Iyer, 1993).

The term 'world Englishes' may be understood as having both a narrower and wider application. The narrow application of the term refers to schools of thought closely associated with the approach to the study of English worldwide pioneered by Professor Braj B. Kachru and a group of closely related scholars. The wider application of the concept also subsumes many other approaches to the study of English worldwide ranging from the regional Englishes of Britain to varieties of English in the US, Australia, New Zealand, and to the Englishes of East and West Africa and many Asian societies, as well as the study of discourse and genre in those contexts where English is regarded as a second or foreign language. Elsewhere, I have pointed out that research on world Englishes in the widest sense includes at least a dozen distinct approaches including those of English studies, corpus linguistics, the sociology of language, features-based and dialectological studies, pidgin and creole research, 'Kachruvian' linguistics, lexicographical approaches, popular accounts, critical linguistics, and futurological approaches (Bolton, 2006a, 2006b). To this list, we might now add current work on English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), a recently emergent approach to English as an international language, which is now proving particularly popular in Europe (Bolton, 2011). These approaches are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Approaches to world Englishes

Approach	**Focus**	**Timeline**

English studies	The analysis of varieties of English from a synchronic and historical perspectives, against a tradition of English Studies (*Anglistik*), dating from the late 19th century, with the work of Otto Jespersen, Daniel Jones, and Henry Sweet, among others.	1960s–present
English corpus linguistics	The accurate and detailed linguistic descriptions of world Englishes from a features perspective.	1990–present
'Features-based' approaches	The description of English through dialectological and variationist methodologies. Situated against the long tradition of British and European dialectology.	1980s–present
The sociology of language	Research on English in relation to such issues as language maintenance/shift, and ethnolinguistic identity.	1960s–present
Kachruvian studies	The promotion of a pluricentric approach to world Englishes, highlighting both the 'sociolinguistic realities' and 'bilingual creativity' of Outer Circle (and Expanding Circle) societies.	1980s–present
Pidgin and creole studies	The description and analysis of 'mixed' languages and the dynamics of linguistic hybridization in language contact settings.	1930s–present
Applied linguistics	The exploration of the implications of world Englishes for language learning and teaching.	1960s–present
Lexicography	The codification of vocabularies of English worldwide, linked to particular post-colonial societies and issues of linguistic autonomy.	1980s–present
Popularisers	The publication of books on English worldwide aimed at a mass reading public.	1980s–1990s
Critical linguistics	The expression of resistance to the linguistic imperialism and cultural hegemony of English, in tandem with resistance to Anglo-American political power.	1990s–present
Linguistic futurology	The discussion of future scenarios for the spread of English and English language teaching worldwide.	1997–present
English as an International Language (EIL)	The study of English as an international and/or auxiliary language. Concerned with diverse contexts across and between the Three Circles worldwide.	1976-present
English as a	An approach to international English focusing on those	Late 1990s-

Lingua Franca (ELF)	contexts such as universities and international businesses, present where English is used as a common language by speakers of different nationalities and linguistic backgrounds.

As early as the 1960s, the English studies approach was associated with such scholars as Randolph Quirk and others active at the Survey of English Usage at University College London, including David Crystal and Sidney Greenbaum. The work of such UK-based scholars was complemented by the research and publications of a number of German scholars including Manfred Görlach (1995) and Edgar Schneider (2007), as well as that of work in corpus linguistics, which again is closely associated with an English studies approach, as in the work of Greenbaum (1996), Nelson, Wallis and Aarts (2002) and others on the International Corpus of English (ICE) project (ICE, 2015). In addition to the ICE corpora worldwide, research teams have also begun to compile their own regional corpora of Englishes, including the SAVE corpus of South Asian Varieties of English (Bernaisch, Koch, Mukherjee, & Schilk, 2011).

The English studies approach and the work of corpus linguists overlap considerably with the 'features-based approach', which typically involves the linguist in identifying and marking statements about the distinctive features of varieties in terms of pronunciation or 'accent' (phonology), vocabulary (lexis), or grammar (morphology and syntax). Leading examples of this approach include Trudgill and Hannah ([1982] 2013), Schneider, Burridge, Kortmann, Mesthrie and Upton (2004), and Kortmann, Burridge, Mesthrie, Schneider and Kortmann (2004). Schneider has made an important contribution to the field through the formulation of the Dynamic Model of postcolonial Englishes (Schneider, 2003, 2007). Sociolinguistic approaches to world Englishes have included (i) 'the sociology of language' (Fishman, Conrad, & Rubal-Lopez, 1996); (ii) the 'linguistic features' (and dialectological) approach (Trudgill & Hannah, 1982); (iii) pidgin and creole studies; and (iv) 'socially-realistic' studies of world Englishes (B. B. Kachru, 1992). The use of the term 'world Englishes' to refer to a distinct approach to this subject is most closely associated with the work of Braj Kachru. The origin of the term 'world Englishes' can be located in the two conferences on English as a world language that took place in 1978, one in April at the East-West Center in Hawaii, and the second in June-July at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Braj Kachru and Larry Smith played a major role in both conferences. Throughout the 1980s, other conferences were organised through the auspices of such organisations as IATEFL, TESOL, the Georgetown University Round Table, and the East-West Center, so that by the mid-1980s 'world Englishes' had emerged as a distinct area of study. A key theoretical and methodological tenet of the Kachruvian perspective was that the earlier three-fold distinction between ENL, ESL, and EFL was ideologically loaded and intellectually flawed, and instead adopted an approach that categorised varieties of English in terms of a three-fold distinction between Inner Circle societies (such as the UK, US, and Australia), Outer Circle societies (Nigeria, India, Philippines, and so on), and Expanding Circle

contexts (for example, Brazil, China, Germany, Japan, among others).

By the mid-1980s, a number of popular works intended for a general reading audience began to appear, including publications by Crystal (1997, 2004) and Bragg (2003). Critical approaches were particularly stimulated by Phillipson's landmark *Linguistic imperialism* (1992), which encouraged a strong interest in the politics of English, and has also informed the work of a generation of other critical scholars. The futurology perspective is best represented in research reports from Graddol (1997, 2006). From the late 1990s, linguists began to look at the increasing use of English within the Expanding Circle context of Europe, where English was quickly spreading as the common language of international university education and international business. Research on English as an International Language (EIL) was pioneered by Smith (1976, 1981), and has continued to the present (McKay, 2002; Sharifian, 2009; Low, 2015). From the late 1990s, linguists also began to study the increasing use of English within Europe, as a result of the internationalization of education and business, and it was in this context that English as an international language began to be redefined as English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Foundational work in this area includes Seidlhofer (2001), Jenkins (2007), and Mauranen and Ranta (2009), although a number of scholars have suggested that the ELF approach can be traced back to earlier discussions of English as an International Language or 'EIL' (Ehrenreich & Pitzl, 2015).

2 | CURRENT DEBATES ON WORLD ENGLISHES

Today, a pluricentric and pluralistic approach to the 'Englishes' or 'English languages' of the world has become so well-established as to constitute something of an orthodoxy in contemporary English language studies and sociolinguistics. So much so, perhaps, that various linguists have begun to problematize various aspects of the world Englishes approach, including the Kachruvian approach to WE.

One continuing source of debate in this area comes from scholars committed to the analysis of 'linguistic imperialism', an area of discussion of key concern to many concerned with the continuing spread of English, and its potential as a 'killer language' threatening cultural and linguistic diversity. The founding document in this arena, Robert Phillipson's (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism* was a landmark publication, which subsequently politicised the debate on world Englishes and related issues. At the centre of Phillipson's theoretical approach to 'linguistic imperialism' are a series of arguments about the political relations between the 'core English-speaking countries' (Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand) and the 'periphery-English countries' where English either has the status of a second language (such as Nigeria, India, Singapore), or is a foreign and 'international link language' (such as Scandinavia, Japan and so on) (1992: 17). The nature of this relationship, Phillipson argues, is one of structural and systemic inequality, in which the political and economic hegemony of western Anglophone

powers is established or maintained over scores of developing nations, particularly those formerly colonies of European powers, contributing to a form of 'English linguistic imperialism', where '*the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages*' (1992, p. 47, original emphasis). Phillipson's arguments influenced a generation of critical linguists including Canagarajah (1999) and Pennycook (1994, 2001). Although Phillipson was broadly supportive of the world Englishes approach at first, by 2009, Phillipson was arguing that 'global English' was a 'capitalist neoimperial language that serves the interests of the corporate world and the governments that it influences', and that '[t]here are serious theoretical and empirical weaknesses in the way world Englishes are classified and analyzed' (Phillipson 2009, p. 132, 164-165).

Other concerns about the WE approach have been raised by such critics as Bruthiaux (2003) and Saraceni (2010). Much of this criticism has focused on the 'Three Circles' model of the Kachruvian approach, with Bruthiaux declaiming this to be 'largely monolithic and standardized', and challenging the Expanding Circle concept, as 'it is not always clear whether the concept is meant to cover countries, country-based varieties, speakers, or non- (or barely-) speaking learners' (Bruthiaux, 2003, p. 167). In Saraceni's 2010 book on *Relocating English*, a similar set of concerns is voiced, with the author arguing that the world Englishes approach inadvertently replicates an 'Eurocentric conceptualisation of language' not least through the use of the term 'Inner Circle' to refer to societies such as the UK and US where English has historically been the dominant language (Saraceni, 2010, p. 81). One familiar straw man in this critique is the 'Three Circles' model of the spread of English, as if this was conceived as a prescriptive and fixed framework, rather than as a useful and non-pejorative alternative to the previously dominant 'native' versus 'non-native' (and related) distinctions.

A second target for criticism is that the WE approach is mainly concerned with a 'features-based' approach to geographical varieties, with most studies focusing on the description of such varieties in terms of distinctive linguistic features. A closer examination of scholarship in this field demonstrates that this is far from the case, and the analysis of the content of the *World Englishes* journal in the twenty years from 1985-2005 shows that – during this period – only a minority of articles focused predominantly on linguistic features (9.4%) or areal studies (11.4%), with most space in the journal given over to a wide variety of topics ranging from discourse analysis to the sociology of language, from applied linguistics to contact linguistics, and from critical linguistics to bilingual creativity (Bolton & Davis, 2006). More recently, substantial space in the journal has been accorded to topics related to creativity, cultural linguistics, linguistic landscapes, media, popular culture, and a wide range of other topics intellectually distinct from the sole focus on geographically-defined 'varieties' in the classic sense. I would therefore argue that the WE approach as it has developed has been intrinsically dynamic and remains open to both debate and to new perspectives in research, scholarship and

theorization. Indeed I would see this flexibility, diversity, and openness as a crucial element of the 'ethos' of world Englishes (Bolton, 2005).

Very recently, Mario Saraceni published a thoughtful account of world Englishes scholarship, *World Englishes: A critical analysis* (2015), in which he identifies at least two new challenges to the WE enterprise. Here, he argues that, despite the obvious strengths of the Kachruvian approach and the evident success of the WE paradigm shift in English studies, world Englishes research has not kept pace with recent developments related to the effects of globalization, and the impact of these on linguistic ecologies worldwide. Thus he suggests:

> [T]he World Englishes framework has been feeling 'pressure', as it were, from two separate fronts of scholars: on the one hand those who have been engaged with research aimed at providing insights into the forms and functions of English as a lingua franca (ELF) […] on the other hand those who have concentrated their attention on phenomena related to globalization, such as 'super-diversity', language 'hybridity','translanguaging', 'metrolingualism' […] In some ways, it could be said that both ELF and the sociolinguistics of globalization have 'eroded' some of the scope of World Englishes. (Saraceni, 2015, p. 4)

Saraceni's views are constructive in indicating how rapidly the effects of globalization have been felt in changing our perceptions of varietal differentiation on a global scale, and I would agree that what is new here (compared with WE in its earlier years of theorization) are the palpable effects of globalization, which are perhaps most dramatically visible in the European and Asian contexts, but that are doubtless discernible everywhere.

A large part of this shift in language use and varietal differentiation is due to patterns of migration and the movements of peoples. In the case of Europe, in the last three decades in particular, the effects of multiculturalism and multilingualism have been felt everywhere, as a result of the expansion of the European Union, and the movement of Europeans across national boundaries, but also as the result of large-scale immigration into Europe from outside the EU (seen most dramatically in the recent waves of immigration from the war-torn Middle East). Given the relative openness of European colleges and universities, this has also had a major effect on academia, across the EU and even the UK. Whereas four decades ago the vast majority of students in European university classrooms would have been domestic students 'native' to particular European nations, today French, German, Scandinavian and British universities are peopled by substantial numbers of foreign students, and continental European universities have experienced increasing pressure to provide curricula for such students through English. It is hardly surprising therefore that early attempts to provide theorizations and descriptions of 'European English' soon gave way to a more considered attempt to describe the lingua franca English of multicultural students in European classrooms (Jenkins, 2013; Seidlhofer, 2011). It was these educational and sociological conditions, I have suggested elsewhere, that have provided the direct impetus for the emergence of 'English as a Lingua Franca' (ELF) as a distinct field of inquiry, and it may be further helpful here to understand ELF

studies as (in the first instance) as a European phenomenon, or, at least, as a European response to the shifting demographics of the EU as well as European universities (Bolton, 2011).

With reference to the second challenge identified by Saraceni, that of 'super-diversity' studies, there can be little doubt that recent work by Blommaert (2010) on the sociolinguistics of globalization has the strong potential to expand our understanding of language contact and multilingualism in the contemporary world. Here again I would suggest that a major stimulus for such studies has again been the European response to the changing demographics of European cities and societies, as a direct result of immigration. To take one example from Scandinavia, until the 1970s, Sweden was very largely racially and linguistically homogeneous, but by the early 2000s, as a result of the country generously accepting large numbers of international refugees, over 150 different languages were recorded as 'home languages' for Stockholm schoolchildren (Bolton & Meierkord, 2013).

Blommaert has persuasively argued that 'globalization forces sociolinguistics to unthink its classic distinctions and biases and to rethink itself as a sociolinguistics of mobile resources', while further arguing that '[w]e need to replace it [traditional sociolinguistics] with a view of language as something intrinsically and perpetually mobile, through space as well as time, and made for mobility' (Blommaert, 2010, p. 1, xiv). Thus, whereas traditional sociolinguistics is concerned with the use of 'languages' or 'varieties' within or between stable 'speech communities', or with 'code-switching' or 'code-mixing', super-diversity studies have a focus on multilingualism in a globalizing world, where individuals engage in 'polylanguaging' and 'translanguaging'. In Europe, this has now resulted in rethinking sociolinguistics in at least three areas of research: (i) Face-to-face communication, as in recent studies of multicultural urban dialects in the UK; (ii) Internet-based communication, including blogging, gaming, social media, Youtube; and (iii) Linguistic landscape studies, concerned with displayed public languages, commercial signage, street signs, posters, and shop names (Parkin & Arnaut, 2010).

The specific linguistic effects of globalization in Europe are not necessarily duplicated elsewhere, as the linguistic realities here have been re-shaped by the transnationalism of the European Union, high levels of immigration and the increasing awareness of multilingualism. In Asia, the sociolinguistics of many societies have been determined by rather different influences, not least the tension between ongoing national projects and the demands of globalization, resulting in a shift away from traditional linguistic diversity associated with regional and local varieties of languages towards a restricted combination of the standard national language, very often in combination with English. In the United States, it might be argued that such dynamics are again different from those in Europe, for a number of reasons.

First, as many discussions of 'globalization' concede, the driving force of many of those cultural, economic and social phenomena associated with globalization have had their wellspring in the US, particularly since the Second World War, after which America's 'irresistible Empire' of consumer goods, global media, mass production, popular entertainment and

contemporary 'modernity' was spread worldwide (de Grazia, 2005). Second, it may be argued that, whereas many European societies appear to have enjoyed only limited success in integrating large numbers of recent immigrants into their societies, the power of the American dream seems as strong today as ever, at a time in the US when 'ethnic' minorities such as Asians and Hispanics are gaining ever more economic and political clout in society. However speculative such comments may be, such factors may at least help explain why English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) studies have emerged and gained wide popularity in the European context, but have largely failed to gain traction in the US (although see Matsumoto, 2011). Despite the huge influx of overseas students into US universities and colleges in recent years, the expectation is still strong that the vast majority of such students wish to acquire a command of a standardised (or standard-like) variety of US English as part of their educational experience, and to meet such demands, most universities have relatively well-established ESL and academic writing programs in place to meet such needs (Liou, 2012). In this context, as others, it may also be argued that the power of the US variety of English continues to parallel the continuing economic, cultural, military and political power of the United States in many other spheres worldwide (Demont-Heinrich, 2010). To this, one may also add the powerful effects of Internet technology, and its related 'mediating' impact on our reception and use of languages, a technology perceived as global, and yet one whose origins and key stakeholders have (oftentimes) been strategically and compactly located in California's Silicon Valley.

Elsewhere, I have suggested that such theoretical challenges may find some resolution with the recognition of the role of world Englishes in an expanded understanding of the changing and dynamic 'language worlds' of this current era of globalization, where the 'worlds of Englishes' are ineluctably linked to the multilingual matrices of diverse and varied global communities (Bolton, 2013). In this light, the paradigmatic challenges for world Englishes that Saraceni identifies are both constructive and creative, ultimately reminding us of the core principle of Professor Braj B. Kachru's pioneering theorization of the WE field, that the description and analysis of world Englishes should be centrally concerned with the 'sociolinguistic realities' of language use in multilingual societies worldwide (Kachru, 1992, p. 11). However, having now surveyed world Englishes as an academic discipline, as well as current debates in the field, one might move on to consider the central issue of world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition.

3 | WORLD ENGLISHES AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

The question of the relationship between world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition research has been addressed, directly and indirectly, by a number of studies over the years, including influential discussions by Sridhar and Sridhar (1986), Kachru (1990), and Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008).

3.1 | The paradigm gap (Sridhar & Sridhar, 1986)

In 1986, Sridhar and Sridhar published a landmark article entitled 'Bridging the paradigm gap: Second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English', with the term 'indigenous varieties of English' synonymous with 'world Englishes'. In their discussion, they began by identifying a number of 'implicit and explicit assumptions about SLA' that had helped shaped SLA theory and research at that time. These included such beliefs as:

> (i) That the goal of SLA is to acquire a 'native-like competence' in the target language, and that the success of the learner should be judged against 'native-like' criteria;
>
> (ii) That the [linguistic] input available to the learner is comprehensive enough to enable learners to acquire a full range of higher level competence in the second language;
>
> (iii) That Second Language Acquisition studies focus on the linguistic system, rather than the functions of the language in the learners' speech community;
>
> (iv) That the role of the learner's first language is evaluated mainly with reference to 'interference' in learning the target language;
>
> (v) That the ideal form of motivation for second language learners is an 'integrative' motivation, which typically involves learner's in accepting a target culture or speech community other than their own. (Sridhar & Sridhar 1986, p. 5)

The authors then went on to discuss these assumptions in detail, with particular reference to the differences between WE and SLA perspectives on (a) the target language, (b) the nature of linguistic input, (c) the relationship between the second language and other languages in the learner's repertoire, (d) the motivations of second-language learners, as well as (e) lexical and pragmatic aspects of language learning and use. The differences in the two approaches are summarized in Table 2 below:

Table 2. The paradigm gap between SLA and WE approaches

Parameter of learning or use	**SLA perspective**	**WE reality**
Target language	'Native-like' norm	An indigenized norm
Input varieties	'Native' variety of US, UK English	Indigenous varieties of English, for example, Indian English, West African English

Sridhar and Sridhar (1986, pp. 5-7)

Verbal repertoires	Traditionally influenced by monolingual bias	Bilingual and multilingual repertoires
Motivation	Integrative	Instrumental
Lexical/pragmatic aspects	Of minor relevance	Important in WEs

Sridhar and Sridhar later interrogated the terms 'interlanguage', 'pidginization', 'creolization', and 'transfer', highlighting in this discussion the hybridization of language systems in multilingual contact situations typical of world Englishes (and in some senses anticipating contemporary discussions of 'translanguaging' and multilingualism):

> Crucial to the understanding of the role of transfer in WEs is a recognition of the roles of the language being acquired (and used) in the learner's verbal repertoire. As we have seen, English, in multilingual contexts such as in India or Singapore, complements and overlaps with the other languages in the bilingual's repertoire, and it is used to interact with other bilinguals. As a result, the user of English expects bilingual competence in his or her interlocutors. Because of this shared bilingual repertoire, transfer of elements from the shared languages is not an obstacle to easy communication. Far from impeding intelligibility, transfer acts as the grease to make the wheels of bilingual communication turn smoothly. (Sridhar & Sridhar 1986, p. 10)

In this quotation, the authors evoke the context of India, where the cultural and social context favours the transfer of lexical, syntactic and pragmatic features from Indian languages into Indian English in often diverse and subtle fashion. Finally, the authors conclude their discussion by noting the disconnections between SLA theories and research on world Englishes, on the one hand by recognizing the apparent fixation of SLA research on 'monolingual, target language settings', while on the other conceding that studies of world Englishes at that time were typically 'descriptive and atheoretical', and not 'based on rigorous and systematic empirical research' (12).

In a later (1994) article, S. N. Sridhar returned to the topic of SLA theories, noting the monolingual bias of traditional SLA approaches, and the fact that 'the dominant models of SLA have been developed in predominantly monolingual Western countries' and are strongly 'constrained by Western cultural premises'. For Sridhar, what is urgently required here is 'a more functionally oriented and culturally authentic theory, one that is true to the ecology of multilingualism and views the multilingual's linguistic repertoire as a unified, complex, coherent, interconnected, interdependent, organic ecosystem' arguing, quite simply, for 'the need to rebuild SLA theory from the ground up' (Sridhar 1994: 803).

3.2 | World Englishes and applied linguistics (Kachru, 1990)

The relationship between SLA research and world Englishes has also been a topic that has engaged Braj B. Kachru himself. In an influential (1990) article, Kachru explored the relationship

between world Englishes and applied linguistics, and problematized a number of then-prevalent conceptualizations, including the ethnocentricism of applied linguistic perceptions of world Englishes, as well as (once more) a 'paradigm trap' which not only constrains the description of varieties of English worldwide, but also constrains 'creativity' applied to 'the use of the language, models for teaching, and teaching methodology' (Kachru, 1990, p. 15). Kachru also pointed to the shifting constituencies of English users worldwide, presciently highlighting the bilingual and multilingual dynamics of Outer Circle societies around the world:

> In the post-l950s, the dominant paradigms of linguistic research have taken monolingualism as the norm for linguistic behavior in linguistic interactions. This is particularly true of the USA. This position, unfortunately, has resulted in a rather distorted view of bilingual societies, and bilingualism in general [... suggesting] that multilingualism is an aberration and monolingualism is the norm. However, the reality is that monolingualism is the exception, and the largest number of users of English are bi- or multilinguals. (Kachru, 1990, p. 16)

In the same article, Kachru was also concerned to point to the importance of context in influencing and shaping the sociolinguistic realities of Englishes worldwide, with reference to (a) sociolinguistic contexts, (b) functional contexts, (c) pragmatic contexts, and (d) attitudinal contexts (17).

3.3 | The paradigm gap revisited (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008)

In their 2008 volume on *World Englishes*, Mesthrie and Bhatt return to the paradigm gap of the 'lack of interface' between SLA studies and world Englishes, noting that this issue remains 'an underresearched area' (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008, p. 156). Following Sridhar and Sridhar, Mesthrie and Bhatt identify one major thread of SLA theorization related to interlanguage studies, where these typically focus on individual learners in Inner Circle contexts (the UK or USA), where the target language (TL) of the community is easily available. In these contexts, the assumption has typically been that learners should aim at acquiring a 'native-like' competence of the target language, although, as the Sridhars had noted, in most Outer Circle contexts the aim of many if not most learners of English was to become functionally bilingual, while retaining proficiency in the other relevant languages of the society.

Mesthrie and Bhatt agree with the Sridhars that there is a noticeable lack of research from WE researchers relating to key issues related to language acquisition, and for their part suggest ways in which these issues might be researched, through interrelated projects on:

> (1) Comparing the natural Second Language Acquisition of individuals with first language acquisition;
> (2) Comparing classroom acquisition of individuals with natural Second Language Acquisition;
> (3) Comparing (group) 'new English' (WE) acquisition with natural Second Language Acquisition;
> (4) Comparing (group) 'new English' (WE) acquisition with classroom Second Language Acquisition;
> (Adapted from Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008, p. 159)

Mesthrie and Bhatt then proceed to explore the SLA/WE issue according to four overlapping perspectives: (a) routes of development; (b) transfer; (c) linguistic universals; and (d) strategies of processing. By 'routes of development' the authors note the similarities between developmental stages in L1 and L2 acquisition, arguing that similar stages may be identified in the acquisition of world Englishes at an individual and group level. With reference to 'transfer' the authors suggest the influence of 'both the substrate and superstrate' in the formation of WEs, while noting that linguistic innovations arise from language contact in complex fashion. The role of 'linguistic universals' is discussed, *inter alia,* with reference to Chomskyan notions of Universal Grammar, and illustrated with reference to the patterning of Pro-Drop in selected varieties of English. Their 'strategies of processing' strand refers to cognitive views of second language development that argue that L2 acquisition is markedly different from L1 acquisition, so that, for example, cognitivists recognize that '[a]dult L2 learners have access to sophisticated conceptions of temporality, modality and locality, which feature prominently in early SLA', and that, not just syntax but also semantics and pragmatics play an important role in SLA (Ellis 1994). In the case of world Englishes, Mesthrie and Bhatt pay particular attention to a study by Williams (1987), whose functionalist account of WE acquisition highlighted such pragmatic principles as 'economy of production' and 'hyperclarity' (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008, pp. 161-175).

While arguing that the cognitive/psychological dimension of language acquisition is crucial, Mesthrie and Bhatt also highlight importance of language contact, and issues related to multilingualism at an individual and societal level. Their discussion here notes the similarity between WEs and creole languages, quoting Platt's (1975) discussion of such Singapore English features as (i) variable lack of copula, (ii) more than one copula, (iii) variable marking of 3rd person singular, and (iv) variable marking of past tense, which Platt saw as evidence of creole-like or 'creoloid' structures in Singapore English. In this context, one important argument made by Mesthrie and Bhatt is that world Englishes 'owe a great deal to classroom acquisition but are ultimately social phenomena showing a transformation of classroom language as learners begin to use the new code to converse with each other', and that, while there may be some similarities between WEs and creoles, their view is that these are 'prototypically clearly differentiable in their social circumstances and linguistic forms' (183). Mesthrie and Bhatt also review a number of historical issues related to the formation of world Englishes, which highlight the variable nature of the superstrate English in many former colonies worldwide, where the language(s) of missionaries, sailors, settlers, soldiers, and teachers was often very different from an imagined standardised variety of English (pp. 188-198). Finally, the authors suggest, the formation of world Englishes is shaped by 'a synthesis between superstrate(s), substrates, cognitive processes and linguistic universals' (p. 199).

Other recent studies of world Englishes and 'learner Englishes' of relevance to SLA research have included the corpus-based and features-oriented studies of such scholars as Mukherjee

and Hundt (2011), Schneider (2012), and Hamid and Baldauf (2013). However, despite the attempts of Mesthrie, Bhatt and others over the last decade or so, it appears that many of the essential criticisms raised by the Sridhars in the 1980s still remain unresolved.

4 | BRIDGING THE GAP AND THE MULTILINGUAL TURN

The extent to which world Englishes perspectives and SLA perspectives have thus far connected – or failed to connect – may be seen from a scrutiny of some of the standard reference works in the field of Second Language Acquisition. For example, in Doughty and Long's benchmark (2005) *Handbook of second language acquisition*, there are no references to 'world Englishes' in the index, and nor (even more surprisingly) is there a single reference to 'multilingualism'. For the editors the disciplinary orientation of SLA studies, its 'intellectual and institutional home' is unequivocally in the field of cognitive science, which shares a number of key characteristics with SLA, including 'youth, interdisciplinarity, theoretical and methodological diversity' (Doughty & Long, 2005, p. 869). Similarly VanPatten and Williams' influential (2015) *Theories in second language acquisition* explicitly states that 'it does not cover theories that take "a social turn"', declaring its main concern is with 'linguistic, psycholinguistic, and cognitive perspectives in SLA' (p. x). These are just two examples from the literature, although many more could be cited from a large body of published materials.

The disconnect between SLA and WE perspectives was explored in detail by Kachru and Nelson (2006) in a discussion of 'Why SLA theories and world Englishes do not connect' highlighted the Inner Circle and monolingual bias of SLA orientations. Today, the vast majority of English language learners are found not in the US or UK but in Outer Circle and Expanding Circle societies worldwide:

> It is a well-recognized fact that although the vast majority of learners of English learn the language in the Outer and Expanding Circles, their presence and concerns have rarely been acknowledged in building theories of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Most theory building activities have treated the learners who happen to join an institution of higher learning and the immigrant populations in the Inner Circle (the ESL context) as primary sources of data. That is to say, a vast majority of learners of English in the Outer and Expanding Circles are 'invisible' to the theory construction; worse yet, a large number of factors that are crucial in understanding how languages are learnt and used are being almost totally ignored. (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 86)

As Kachru and Nelson proceed to point out, the sociolinguistic realities that apply in Outer and Expanding Circle contexts are very different than those of English-dominant Inner Circle societies, as (i) the linguistic input available learners in the Outer and Expanding Circles is typically an indigenized variety of English (such as Indian English, Philippine English, Singaporean English, and Chinese English); (ii) given the functional differentiation of languages in multilingual societies, competence in the second language does not duplicate the first

language, but complements it; (iii) in WE contexts, language acquisition in multiple languages may involve both functional differentiation and overlap, often manifested through code-switching and mixing; and (iv) world Englishes often manifest creative innovations in grammar, vocabulary, discourse, genres and styles of language use, that warrant recognition as such, rather than stigmatization as 'errors', 'mistakes', or 'fossilizations' (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 89).

Equally, the realities of acquisition processes in Outer and Expanding Circle contexts are very different from those in the US, UK and similar contexts. Outside the Inner Circle societies, English is typically acquired/learnt alongside other languages by multilingual language users in Africa, Asia, Europe and elsewhere, as Kachru and Nelson explain:

> In the multilingual context of Delhi a user of Indian English may use a regional dialect, a regional variety of Hindi, or Punjabi for discussing the dinner menu in the family domain, Punjabi or a regional variety of Hindi with her neighbors who may not speak the same dialect, Sanskrit in her daily Hindu worship, one of the so-called dialects of the area, Punjabi, or Hindi in collective singing of devotional hymns, Standard Hindi and Indian English in her professional environment, listen to Urdu *ghazals* (semi-classical vocal music), Hindi popular songs or English pop music for entertainment, read English and Hindi newspapers and magazines, listen to BBC news, and view Hindi TV serials and prefer English movies. There is nothing unusual about such linguistic behavior, and most educated speakers in Delhi in fact code-switch and code-mix Hindi, Punjabi and English with great facility. (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 89)

Kachru and Nelson further argue that the concepts of 'interlanguage' and 'fossilization' are misleading if and when applied to world Englishes, as, unlike interlanguages, varieties such as Indian, Nigerian, or Singaporean English typically demonstrate a high degree of stability. In addition those forms of language that might be labelled 'fossilized' from a normative perspective can be alternatively seen as regularized features of a WE variety. Kachru and Nelson stress the need to re-assess the role of first or 'primary' languages in SLA, arguing that 'SLA theoretical formulations will be enriched by incorporating the insights offered by the studies of the linguistic behavior of Outer and Expanding Circle users of English', and that 'integrating world Englishes into the paradigms of SLA demands that attempts at theory building take into account the facts of bilingualism/multilingualism, functions of language or languages in the total repertoire of communities, and the creative potential of human linguistic behavior' (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, p. 91).

Today, whatever the disconnections of the past, today there is growing evidence that world Englishes perspectives are impacting SLA theory at a time when SLA researchers have come to appreciate the importance of 'the multilingual turn', to quote the title of May's (2014) edited book on this topic. Lourdes Ortega's (2014) chapter in May's volume resonates strongly with the earlier discussions of the Sridhars and Kachru and Nelson at a number of levels of discussion, which begins with Ortega's declaration that:

> [T]he monolingual bias has become unsustainable for the field of SLA, as for any other field that aspires to understand multiple-language learning as an object of inquiry and to support bi/multilingualism as a societal and individual right and asset. A bi/multilingual turn is urgently needed [and] This bi/multilingual turn demands an epistemic reorientation through concerted collective disciplinary action. (Ortega, 2014, p. 33)

In an insightful unpacking of the monolingual bias, Ortega identifies the core of the problem as ideological in nature:

> In SLA research, the term native speaker is used to denote a language user who not only has had exposure to the language by birth-as the overt meaning of *native* would indicate-but who also has had a monolingual upbringing. [...] Standing as a counterpart is the term nonnative speaker, defined as a language user who has developed (or is developing) functinal ability in more than one language but not from birth. [...] In short, the archetype construct of native speaker stands for a monolingual native speaker (i.e., a language user who has developed functional ability in one language only and from birth), and the archetype construct of nonnative speaker stands for a late bi/multilingual speaker (i.e., a language user who has developed, or is developing, functional ability in more than one language, not from birth but later in life). (Ortega, 2014, p. 35)

Ortega then goes on to explain how the ideological loading and positioning of such terms results in (i) the acceptance of monolingualism as the implicit norm, (ii) the non-recognition of the bilingual abilities of 'non-native' speakers, and (iii) a 'nested belief' that languages are 'discrete entities or fixed systems'. The consequence of this, Ortega argues is that 'monolingualism is taken as the implicit norm, the reality of bi/multilingualism is made invisible, and linguistic ownership by birth and monolingual upbringing is elevated to an inalienable right and advantage' (36). Ortega's solution to this problem is to argue for a Usage-Based Linguistics (UBL) approach broadly-situated in cognitive, linguistic, and functional approaches to language acquisition, where much emphasis is placed on the experiential, environmental, and variational in language acquisition (Ortega, 2014, pp. 39-45). Finally, Ortega concludes by reminding us that

> All research communities [...] need to guard against the monolingual bias. The outlook of much scientific knowledge production about human language and its learning suffers from the monolingual bias because the learning and use of only one language is taken to be the most natural default for human communication by subordinating comparison to which the use of multiple languages can be understood, often as a derivative complication. Nativeness and monolingualism must be abandoned as organizing principles for the study of additional-language learning and replaced by bi/multilingual constructs, methods, and goals. (Ortega, 2014, p. 48)

What is particularly impressive in Ortega's critique of the monolingual bias in Second Language Acquisition is that it comes from a committed SLA researcher rather than from someone outside the discipline, 'as a member of the linguistic-cognitive SLA communities' (in her own words) which she so powerfully critiques. In this critique, moreover, the resonances with earlier

WE approaches to the same issue are many and direct. It is in these connections, and in others related to many other approaches to bilingualism and multilingualism, I believe, that we can see at least the framework of a bridge between Second Language Acquisition studies and world Englishes.

5 | CONCLUSION

This article has set out to explore the interface between world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition studies, albeit largely from the starting point of WE research. This has included a survey of approaches to world Englishes, a review of current debates on world Englishes, a review of the literature on WE and SLA studies, as well as a consideration of possible ways forward in order to bridge the famed paradigm gap between these two fields. One very real opportunity for re-alignment from both sides, it appears, may be through a shared concern with the multilingual ecologies of both world Englishes and Second Language Acquisition studies. WE for its part is not simply concerned with English as a transported and/or localized linguistic system, but with world Englishes as sites of multilingual contact, creativity, hybridization, code-switching and mixing, and a range of related processes. In a 1992 essay on 'Multilingualism and multiculturalism', Braj B. Kachru pointed out that the 'general belief that monolingualism is normal, and multilingualism is a linguistic aberration' is simply fallacious, and that reverse was true (Kachru, 1992b, reprinted in Webster, 2015, p. 222). Since then, the importance of research into all aspects of bilingualism and multilingualism has grown exponentially, and it is now heartening to see the growing importance of the 'multilingual turn' in SLA studies, as witnessed by May's (2014) volume on this topic, and a growing body of related research. Many interesting research issues remain to be explored. From a cognitive-linguistic perspective of SLA we have numerous questions related to multilingual language acquisition and use, including the description of the multilingual native speaker of two or more languages, how multilingual proficiencies might best be measured, issues of bilingual dominance, and much else. From the world Englishes perspective, research into bilingual and multilingual proficiencies may also provide a link to the description of the shared linguistic features of particular varieties of English, while, from a broader perspective, the central WE concern with localized Englishes in multilingual contexts will continue to highlight the central focus in WE studies with the sociolinguistic realities of language use in multilingual societies worldwide.

REFERENCES

Bernaisch, T., Koch, C. Mukherjee, J., & Schilk, M. (2011). *Manual for the South Asian varieties of English (SAVE) corpus*. Giessen: Justus Liebig University, Department of English.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes*, *24*(1), 69-83.

Bolton, K. (2006a). Varieties of world Englishes. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 289-312). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bolton, K. (2006b). World Englishes today. In B. B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), *The handbook of world Englishes* (pp. 240-269). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Bolton, K. (2011, May). World Englishes, Asian Englishes, and English as a Lingua Franca. Invited opening keynote at the Fourth International Conference of English as a Lingua Franca. Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Bolton, K. (2013). World Englishes, globalization, and language worlds. In N.-L Johannesson, G. Melchers & B. Björkman (Eds.), *Of butterflies and birds, of dialects and genres: Essays in honour of Philip Shaw* (pp. 227-251). Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis.

Bolton, K., & Meierkord, C. (2013). English in contemporary Sweden: Perceptions, policies, and narrated practices. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *17*(1), 93-117.

Bolton, K., & Davis, D. (2006). A content analysis of world Englishes. *World Englishes*, *25*(1), 5-6.

Bragg, M. (2003). *The adventure of English.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 159-178.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2004). Subcontinent raises its voice. *Guardian Weekly*, November 19, 2004. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/education/2004/nov/19/tefl

De Grazia, V. (2005). *America's irrestible empire: America's advance through 20th century Europe.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Demont-Heinrich, C. (2010). Linguistically privileged and cursed? American university students and the global hegemony of English. *World Englishes, 29*(2), 281-298.

Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (Eds.). (2005). *The handbook of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Ehrenreich, S., & Pitzl, M.-L. (2015). Precursors: Introductory remarks on Smith (1976, 1983[1981]) and Knapp (1987). *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 4*(1), 157-158.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fishman, J. A., Conrad, A. W., & Rubal-Lopez, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Post-imperial English.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Görlach, M. (1995). Dictionaries of transplanted Englishes. In M. Görlach (Ed.), *More Englishes: New studies in varieties of English 1988-1994* (pp. 124-163). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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

Graddol, D. (2006). *English next.* London: The British Council.

Greenbaum, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Comparing English worldwide*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A., & Strevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching.* London: Longman.

Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf Jr., R. B. (2013). Second language errors and features of world Englishes. *World Englishes, 32*(4), 476-494.

Iyer, P. (1993). The empire writes back. *Time,* February, *8*(6), 48-53.

Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, J. (2013). *English as a lingua franca in the international university: The politics of academic English policy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes, 9*(1), 3-20.

Kachru, B. B. (1992a). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching, 25*, 1-14.

Kachru, B. B. (1992b). Multilingualism and multiculturalism. In W. Bright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of linguistics, volume 1* (pp. 182-186). London/New York: Oxford University Press. Reprinted in J. Webster (2015), *Collected works of Braj B. Kachru, Volume 3*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kortmann, B., Burridge, K., Mesthrie, R., Schneider, E. W., & Upton, C. (2004). *A handbook of varieties of English. Volume 2: Morphology and syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liou, T.-J. (2012). *Chinese-speaking international students' experiences and perspectives of ESL university writing programs* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). New Mexico State University, New Mexico.

Low, E. L. (2015). *Pronunciation for English as an international language: From research to practice*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communication and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(1), 97-114.

Mauranen, A., & Ranta, E. (Eds.). (2009). *English as a lingua franca: Studies and findings*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education.* New York: Routledge.

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mukherjee, J., & Hundt, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Exploring second-language varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a paradigm gap.* Amsterdam/Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Nelson, G., Wallis, S., & Aarts, B. (2002). *Exploring natural language: Working with the British component of the International Corpus of English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32-53). New York: Routledge.

Parkin, D., & Arnaut, K. (2010). Super-diversity & sociolinguistics – a digest. *Tilburg Papers in Cultural Studies, 95*, 1-6.

Pennycook, A. (1994). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* London: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued.* Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan.

Phillipson, R. (2010). Interview. Retrieved from http://nnesintesol.blogspot.com/2009/07/Robert-phillipson.html

Platt, John T. (1975). The Singapore English speech continuum and its basilect 'Singlish' as a 'creoloid'. *Anthropological Linguistics, 17*(7), 363-374.

Saraceni, M. (2010). *The relocation of English: Shifting paradigms in a global era.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saraceni, M. (2015). *World Englishes: A critical analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Schneider, E. (2003). The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language, 79*(2), 233-281.

Schneider, E. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, E. (2012). Exploring the interface between world Englishes and second language acquisition – and implications for English as a lingua franca. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca, 1*(1), 57-91.

Schneider, E. W., Burridge, K., Kortmann, B., Mesthrie, R., & Upton, C. (2004). *A handbook of varieties of English, Volume 1: Phonology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 133-158.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2009). *English as an international language: Perspecitves and pedagogical issues*. Bristol/Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

Smith, L. E. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC Journal, 7*(2), 38-42.

Smith, L. E. (1981). English as an international language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. *Nagoya Gakuin Daigaku, Gaikokugo, Kyoiku Kiyo* [Nagoya Gakuin University Round Table on Languages, Linguistics and Literature], *3*, 27-32.

Sridhar, S. N. (1994). A reality check for SLA trainers. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 800-805.

Sridhar, K. K., & Sridhar, S. N. (1986). Bridging the paradigm gap: Second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English. *World Englishes, 5*(1), 3-14.

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. ([1982]2013). *International English: A guide to varieties of standard English.* London: Arnold.

VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2015). *Theories in second language acquisition.* New York: Routledge.

Williams, J. (1987). Non-native varieties of English: A special case of language acquisition. *English World-Wide, 8*, 161-199.