

# Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xii
<i>Notes on the Contributors</i>	xiii
Introduction	xvii
<b>PART I ATTITUDES AND IDEOLOGIES</b>	
<b>1 Uncovering the sociopolitical situatedness of accents in the World Englishes paradigm</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Jasmine C.M. Luk and Angel M.Y. Lin</i>	
Introduction: Englishes in a world tug-of-war	3
Accent and World Englishes	6
Positioning postcolonial Hong Kong in the WE paradigm: speculations and realities	7
Moving away from the WE paradigm? Signifying practices in postcolonial Hong Kong	9
Uncovering the sociopolitics in hegemonic privileging of BANA-centric accents in postcolonial Hong Kong	12
Deconstructing the BANA-centric hegemony of English in Hong Kong: its likelihood of success	15
Towards three reform paradigms: assessment, research, and curriculum	16
Conclusion	19
Notes	19
Bibliography	20
<b>2 What the other half gives: the interlocutor's role in non-native speaker performance</b>	<b>23</b>
<i>Stephanie Lindemann</i>	
Introduction	23
It takes (at least) two to converse	24
'Hearing with an accent' may not require interaction with the speaker	28
'Hearing with an accent' may not require negative attitudes to the speaker	31

Expectations may influence reactions to non-native speakers in conflicting ways	34
Implications	36
Appendix	45
Note	46
Bibliography	46
<b>PART II PROSODY: NEW MODELS FOR MEANING</b>	
<b>3 Reading aloud</b>	<b>53</b>
<i>Wallace Chafe</i>	
Introduction	53
The nature of reading aloud	54
Conference practices	57
Listenability	58
An example	59
The role of prosody	62
Another example	64
Silent reading	66
Conclusion	69
Bibliography	70
<b>4 Intonational meaning starting from talk</b>	<b>72</b>
<i>Ann Wennerstrom</i>	
Introduction	72
Theoretical models of intonational meaning	74
Intonation and the discourse of language learners	77
Sample analyses	80
Conclusion	92
Appendix	94
Notes	94
Bibliography	94
<b>5 A review of recent research on speech rhythm: some insights for language acquisition, language disorders and language teaching</b>	<b>99</b>
<i>Ee Ling Low</i>	
Early research on speech rhythm	99
Recent research on speech rhythm	102
Applications of rhythmic indexes	117
Conclusion	122
Notes	122
Bibliography	122

<b>6</b>	<b>Factors affecting turn-taking behaviour: genre meets prosody</b>	<b>126</b>
	<i>Rebecca Hughes and Beatrice Szczeppek Reed</i>	
	Introduction	126
	Previous literature on turn-taking	126
	Towards an understanding of what speakers must know	129
	Exploring the hypotheses through instances of turn-taking	132
	Conclusion	136
	Appendix	138
	Notes	139
	Bibliography	139
<b>PART III SPOKEN DISCOURSE AND LANGUAGE PEDAGOGY</b>		
<b>7</b>	<b>Spoken discourse, academics and global English: a corpus perspective</b>	<b>143</b>
	<i>Anna Mauranen</i>	
	Introduction	143
	Speaking and language	144
	Speaking, the corpus and the classroom	148
	Speaking English in today's world	151
	Conclusion	154
	Bibliography	155
<b>8</b>	<b>Spoken grammar: vague language and EAP</b>	<b>159</b>
	<i>Joan Cutting</i>	
	Introduction	159
	Discourse analysis	160
	Pedagogical grammars	171
	Language learning theory, teaching methodology and EFL coursebooks	172
	Conclusion	177
	Appendix	177
	Bibliography	179
<b>9</b>	<b>Reflecting on reflections: the spoken word as a professional development tool in language teacher education</b>	<b>182</b>
	<i>Fiona Farr</i>	
	Introduction	182
	Reflective practice and action research	183

	The reflective practices of language teacher educators	185
	The emerging role of teacher educators	186
	The role of language	187
	Language in context, genre and communities of practice	189
	The place of computerized spoken corpora	191
	The genre of POTTI: a qualitative analysis	193
	Participation and interactivity in POTTI	204
	Conclusion	207
	Appendix	208
	Bibliography	208
<b>10</b>	<b>Analyzing classroom discourse: a variable approach</b>	<b>216</b>
	<i>Steve Walsh</i>	
	Introduction	216
	Why study classroom discourse?	217
	What are the features of L2 classroom discourse?	218
	How can classroom discourse be investigated?	223
	Conclusion	238
	Bibliography	238
<b>PART VI ASSESSING SPEAKING</b>		
<b>11</b>	<b>Pronunciation and the assessment of spoken language</b>	<b>245</b>
	<i>John M. Levis</i>	
	Introduction	245
	How diagnostic assessment can inform proficiency assessment	246
	Why pronunciation accuracy should not be assessed	248
	Intelligibility and comprehensibility: the key to pronunciation assessment	252
	Listener factors	259
	Fluency and assessment	261
	Conclusion	267
	Note	267
	Bibliography	268
<b>12</b>	<b>Local and dialogic language ability and its implication for language teaching and testing</b>	<b>271</b>
	<i>Marysia Johnson Gerson</i>	
	Introduction	271
	Key concepts of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and Bakhtin's literary theory	272

Some implications of local and dialogic ability for language teaching and testing	279
Note	285
Bibliography	285
<i>Index</i>	287

# **Part 1**

## **Attitudes and Ideologies**



# 1

## Uncovering the Sociopolitical Situatedness of Accents in the World Englishes Paradigm

*Jasmine C.M. Luk and Angel M.Y. Lin*

### **Introduction: Englishes in a world tug-of-war**

The emergence of the ‘World Englishes’ paradigm over the last two decades has boosted the morale and confidence of many ESL/EFL users in the outer and expanding circles<sup>1</sup> (Kachru, 1992). Sobering and thought-provoking questions challenging the hegemonic status of BANA-centric<sup>2</sup> norms were proffered by Inner Circle experts (e.g. Phillipson, 1992; Widdowson, 1993; Pennycook, 1994). Who owns English? Who are the native speakers of English? Is there ‘Standard English’? Whose standards should be followed? These questions capture the hearts of many souls in the former colonies of Britain and America. The paradigm shift seems to have resulted in a more liberal attitude towards local varieties of English. Local usage not conforming to the British and American norms may not be regarded as errors as long as it is commonly adopted by the local community. As argued by Smith (1983: 39), who is one of the early advocates of world Englishes, ‘a non-mother-tongue user does not need to become more like Americans, the British, the Australians, the Canadians or any other English speaker in order to lay claim on the language’.

The WE paradigm has boosted ESL/EFL users’ confidence and heightens their awareness of their language rights. For example, Baxter (1991) boldly argues for the legitimate rights for Japanese to speak English in a manner appropriate to the local community because speaking English Japanese-ly ‘does not threaten the speaker nor come into conflict with this person’s identity’ (p. 65).

At a more practical applied linguistic level, there have been various attempts to establish an international variety of English (EIL) (for example, Modiano, 1999) or a World Standard English (for example, McArthur, 1987; Crystal, 2003) which English users engaging in inter-

national communication should employ to facilitate mutual intelligibility. It is believed that this international variety of English could even supersede the British and American varieties (see Jenkins (2003) for a comprehensive review). In this sense, the paradigm seems to be moving from 'World Englishes' to an internationally accepted 'World English' (Brutt-Griffler, 2002). Jenkins' (2000; 2002) work on establishing a Lingua Franca Core (LFC) of English phonology for international communication is a representative and concrete endeavour to bring about a common understanding among World English users of what segmental and suprasegmental components ESL/EFL students and teachers should aim to master for mutual intelligibility in realistic interethnic communications. Her work was based on empirical and contrived studies that draw on data from natural interactions between EIL (English as an International Language) users from Japan, Switzerland, Germany, France, Taiwan, and Korea. Jenkins's (2000) work enhances mother-tongue and non-mother-tongue English users' awareness of pronunciation variants across varieties due largely to the inherent differences and practices of speech across different national phonological systems. Apart from adopting a teachability–learnability criterion, Jenkins (2000) selects phonological features to be included in a LFC core on two considerations: (1) whether empirical data have shown phonological features to be hampering speech intelligibility in real interethnic communications; and (2) whether the phonological features are commonly realized in most of the major phonological systems of world languages. For example, the voiced interdental fricative 'th' sound as in 'there' was found to be commonly substituted with the dental variant [d] by many L1 and L2 English users; or the dark [ɫ] was found to be becoming vocalic in most other varieties of English and therefore it was quite unproblematic for words such as 'bill' to be pronounced as /bɪl/. The voiced interdental fricative 'th' and the dark /ɫ/ are thus *not* to be included in the LFC core.

Jenkins's (2000) work seems to have pointed to a clear direction forward for a common understanding to be achieved about what a World variety of English used by people across all nations would be like. However, the everyday scenario may not really be that orderly and optimistic. As pointed out by Jenkins (2000), speakers substituting /t/ and /d/ for /θ/ and /ð/ respectively would still be stigmatized in the English L1 communities by speakers of RP, GA, and other more standard L1 varieties.

Brutt-Griffler (2002) also points out the resiliency of the tacitly assumed standpoint that the 'ownership of English' still rests with

mother tongue users of English. The founding theorist of 'linguistic imperialism', Robert Phillipson, has on more than one occasion warned that ideology revealing 'linguistic ethnocentricity' and 'linguicism' largely goes unchallenged. He observes that there were still 'inequalities and asymmetry in "international communication" [which] places non-native users of English lower on a hierarchy of norms of communication than native English-speakers', and there were still tendencies to view 'Other' cultures and languages as 'deficits' (Phillipson, 2000b: 275).

So, what matters more seems not to be 'who owns English', but who owns the authority and control over value judgement of different norms of usage of English varieties. English as a commodity comes in many brands. Owning only the low-end English (i.e. English spoken with distinct non-standard characteristics) may not yield too much benefit to its owner. Brutt-Griffler (2002) mentions attempts to view the use of English as an international language (EIL) as reflecting features of an 'interlanguage' (IL) (Selinker, 1992) from a second language learning (SLA) perspective. Though these attempts have not been successful, they imply that users of English as an international language may be viewed by some mainstream second language educators as simply having deficient English proficiency.

The large body of work on World Englishes has recently been criticized by Pennycook (2003) who suggests that this represents only circular arguments because 'the WE paradigm focuses only on standardized norms of English in limited domains' (p. 517). Uncodified varieties in the expanding circle still hold the status of errors. It seems clear that hegemony continues to exist in the World English paradigm that is 'far too exclusionary to be able to account for many uses of English around the world' (p. 521). He offers support to Parakrama's (1995: 17) view that the WE paradigm 'cannot do justice to those Other Englishes as long as they remain within the over-arching structures that these Englishes bring to crisis. To take these new/Other Englishes seriously would require a fundamental revaluation of linguistic paradigms, and not merely a slight accommodation or adjustment.' Pennycook (2003) calls for actions to break away from the exclusionary constrictive circles that only incorporate codified national varieties and take seriously varieties arising from globalization, popular culture and Other Englishes.

The crux of the issue, perhaps, is *how* the new/Other Englishes should be taken seriously, by *whom*, and *who* would benefit from such an outcome. This chapter attempts to contribute to the discussion by revealing how English linguistic hegemony continues, perhaps with

increased strength, to manifest itself through various social and political institutional apparatuses in the latest member of the post-colonial club, Hong Kong, with particular reference to accents and speaking proficiency. Through a critical analysis of the research literature, evidence from public discourses, and reflexive analysis of lived experiences of ESL/EFL speakers including the authors themselves, we will investigate how local people might have actually suffered, instead of benefited, from the WE paradigm. We will explore two forces at work that are pulling at different ends, one representing an applied linguistic theoretical view focusing on mutual intelligibility, and one representing an underlying sociopolitical ideology focusing on social stigmatization of accents in pronunciation. We will discuss how and why it would be difficult, and may not be desirable, to achieve ‘a fundamental reevaluation of linguistic paradigm’, as advocated by Pennycook, in places such as Hong Kong.

### **Accent and World Englishes**

We have chosen World Englishes accents to be our focus of analysis because of the intricate role speech accents play as a sociolinguistic phenomenon as well as, if not more than, a linguistic phenomenon. Accents are defined by Lippi-Green (1997) as ‘loose bundles of prosodic and segmental features distributed over geographic and/or social space’. Accent is more than anything else a powerful linguistic marker of age generations, social identity, social class, education level, and ethnicity. The accent used by the flower girl in George Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion (My Fair Lady)* immediately marked her off as belonging to a lower socio-economic class and a poor region. Stories about how L2 English users and their accented speech are negatively discriminated against in contexts ranging from the classroom to the workplace have been well documented (e.g. Eisenstein, 1983; Canagarajah, 1999; Lippi-Green, 1997). There were regular advertisements publicizing ‘accent elimination’ services and news broadcasting successful efforts.

Accent discrimination does not only happen to non-mother-tongue English speakers. As pointed out by Jenkins (2000), many teachers considered (which was felt to be wrong by Jenkins) Standard English to mean English spoken with a prestigious accent, RP, or a modified form of it. This implies that English spoken with non-RP accent will be perceived as sub-standard. Subjective and emotional adjectives such as ‘stupid’ were sometimes used to refer to regional accents. This negative mentality towards accents was also reflected in an early definition of

the term 'accent' in a prestigious dictionary with a heavy judgemental tone by including 'mispronunciation of vowels or consonants, misplacing of stress, and misinflection of a sentence' (*Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989, quoted in Lippi-Green, 1997: 58) as features of accents. The authors of this chapter checked the 2003 version of the *Cambridge Advanced Learners' Dictionary* and found a much more neutral definition – 'the way in which people in a particular area, country or social group pronounce words'. However, one of the examples given ('She's French but she speaks with an impeccable English accent') still carries the myth behind accent and proficiency. First, there is an 'impeccable' English accent. Second, it is beyond most people's expectation that a non-native English speaker could speak with that impeccable English accent. Even recently, there were findings showing a general tendency to connect accent with teaching competence. Foreign teaching assistants speaking English with an accent perceived to be intelligible by the students were considered to have higher teaching competence than those who speak with a less intelligible accent (Bresnahan *et al.*, 2002).

Over the last two decades, there have been clear efforts to raise English users' awareness of the inequalities arising from such language ideology and attempts to counteract language subordination were proposed. Lippi-Green (1997) argues forcefully that language subordination based on accent discrimination is not about 'relative standards', but about 'taking away a basic human right: to speak freely in the mother tongue without intimidation, without standing in the shadow of other languages and peoples' (p. 243). To resist the process of language subordination, according to Lippi-Green, is to ask for 'recognition, and acknowledgement' of such linguistic human rights. However, the authors of this chapter would like to point out that to obtain recognition and acknowledgement of such human rights is one issue; to evaluate the gains and losses of social and cultural capital in highly sociopolitical situations arising from an overt display of such human rights is perhaps another.

### **Positioning postcolonial Hong Kong in the WE paradigm: speculations and realities**

In the last few years running up to the handover of sovereignty from Britain to China on 1 July 1997, speculations about the language profile of the Hong Kong society permeated the public and academic discourses. Views were of course diverse, but one representative view tended to envisage a declining importance of English in Hong Kong.

For example, in his paper discussing societal accommodation to English and Putonghua in Hong Kong at the twentieth century's end, Pierson (1998) quotes several references (e.g. Harris, 1989; Purves, 1989; Lau, 1991; Godfrey, 1992; Surry, 1994) published a few years earlier predicting decreasing value of English as one of Hong Kong's greatest assets. It was reported that demand for English instruction had already experienced a noticeable slump, leading to the closing down of some commercially operated English tuition centres (Godfrey, 1992). It was even suggested by Surry (1994) that the ability to use English well is no longer of much concern to the business community. Lau (1991) speculated that Putonghua would replace English as the 'language of success'.

These views that forecast a decline in the status of English in preference for the national language of China, Putonghua, though speculative in nature, were by no means groundless as precedents could easily be found in other former colonies of Britain. In speculating the future of English as a global language, Crystal (2003) points out a common dilemma in several colonies-turned independent states such as Africa, India, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Singapore is that post-colonial subjects often display 'a strong reaction against continuity to use the language of the former colonial power, and in favor of promoting the indigenous languages' (Crystal, 2003: 124). However, Crystal (2003) was quick to add that it does not mean that these nations had totally rejected English. To fulfil the need to assert their national identity while making sure not to be left out from important world affairs, most of these postcolonial people continue to learn to master English, but tend to prefer using English in their 'own way' or a hybridized form of speech constituting several linguistic codes (Canagarajah, 2000). As suggested before, the feeling of identity and group solidarity has been found to be most palpable in the choice of accents in speaking the language of the former colonial masters. Kachru (1990 (1986)), for example, reports findings from a number of studies conducted in former colonies of Britain and America such as India, Singapore, Malaysia, Puerto Rico, the Phillipines, Nigeria, and Sri Lanka showing an almost unanimous attitude of the postcolonial subjects to demonstrate their preference for the localized varieties, and an overt unfavourable attitude towards accents bearing traits of the colonizers' speech.

As a new member of the post-colonial club, Hong Kong, however, does not seem to have displayed similar attitudes as described above.

In Kachru's (1992) concentric-circle model of World Englishes, India, Kenya, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, and Singapore were all situated in the 'Outer Circle', which was described to be 'norm-developing' by Kachru. Hong Kong, as part of China, was situated under the 'Expanding Circle', which was said to be 'norm-dependent'. About a year before Hong Kong changed its sovereignty, a new colleague of the first author coming from the United States asked the first author after reading a book on common spoken errors in Hong Kong (Boyle and Boyle, 1991) why some of those examples mentioned in the book were considered errors, but not features of a local variety. The fact is, although a Hong Kong variety does exist with general public awareness in terms of a distinct accent (Bolton and Kwok, 1990; Luk, 1998; Hung, 2000) and a body of new vocabularies (*Macquarie Dictionary*, quoted in Bolton, 2000), it is not accepted as the variety to which Hong Kong English speakers aspire. Hong Kong English speakers, be they teachers or students, still look up to exonormative norms; that is, the norms provided by native-speaking countries, particularly Britain (for example, Luk, 1998; Tsui and Bunton, 2000) for correct and acceptable models of pronunciation and usage. The interesting thing is that this kind of mentality does not seem to be reflecting only linguistic imperialism under colonial rule, but seems to be becoming increasingly deep-seated and naturalized in the minds of most Hong Kong citizens after Hong Kong has ceased to be a British colony for almost ten years. The following section reports some typical practices signifying a general tendency to move away from the WE paradigm in Hong Kong.

### **Moving away from the WE paradigm? Signifying practices in postcolonial Hong Kong**

The following evidence has been collected through the lived experience of the two authors over the last few years, signifying a force that seems to be diverging from the WE paradigm.

#### **Language proficiency assessments for English teachers**

The most powerful mechanism to bring about standardization of norms conforming to the BANA-centric models in Hong Kong is by far the Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (LPAT for short). The LPAT started to be enforced in 2001 to ensure that teachers of English and Putonghua all reached a publicly recognized benchmark in terms

of language proficiency. Pronunciation is an assessment item for the read aloud task of the speaking test and classroom language use. It was generally believed that only 'native' speakers or speakers with 'native-like' proficiency could attain level 5, which is the highest level in terms of pronunciation, stress and intonation, because the descriptors at this level require pronunciation to be 'completely error-free with no noticeable first language (L1) characteristics' (Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, 2000: 110). These descriptors allude to a close connection between pronunciation errors and L1 characteristics, and also imply that *error-free* pronunciation is also *accent-free*.

Shohamy (2003) argues forcefully how powerful language tests can be in changing people's behaviour. The impact of LPAT tests on public attitude towards language proficiency has been tremendous. Glenwright (2002) reveals a growing tendency for Hong Kong school-teachers to focus more than ever on accuracy in marking pupils' writing because one component in the LPAT writing tests requires candidates to identify and explain pupils' errors in compositions. This was found to be undermining pupils' creativity in writing. Similar self-disciplining has also been observed in the aspect of pronunciation.

Ms K (a pseudonym), a Cantonese-speaking local teacher educator who was by training a speech pathologist in the United States, has been actively involved in concrete application of the criteria in actual assessments of LPAT candidates' pronunciation, stress and intonation. In one of the standardization meetings Ms K conducted for a group of potential assessors which the first author attended, Ms K classified as errors pronunciation features such as replacing /ð/ with /d/ (e.g. 'there' pronounced as 'dare'); replacing the dark /l/ with /u/ (e.g. 'apple' pronounced as /'æpəu/) or dropping it altogether (e.g. 'mall' pronounced as 'more'); and placing equal stress on multisyllabic words (e.g. 'autumn' pronounced as /'ɔ:'tʌm/). In an interview with the first author, Ms K asserted that although these features did not normally create intelligibility problems, any features that do not conform to the British RP or American GA accents would be considered problematic by her. However, she went on to clarify that her judgements excluded accent features of other native English varieties such as Australian, New Zealand, or Canadian accents. Ms K admitted that this was discriminative but inevitable because of the existence of LPAT. In her job as a speech consultant at a teacher education institute in Hong Kong, she would advise local student teachers to try to reduce and/or eliminate any L1 characteristics because, in her understanding, these L1 characteristics would disadvantage them in their LPAT assessments.

### **An ever-high deferential attitude towards the NETs<sup>3</sup> (native English-speaking teachers)**

The massive employment of NETs since 1998 was presented as a measure to raise English standards of both the students and the local English teachers 'with immediate effect' (Chief Executive, 1998). A questionnaire survey conducted by the first author in 1998 concerning secondary students' attitude towards the NETs reveals that most students favoured the recruitment of NETs in schools because they were felt to speak more 'accurate' and 'standard' English (Luk, 2001). A similar attitude has been found to prevail among tertiary level students. In a lecturer-student consultative meeting at the Institute of which the first author is a member, English major students who were all in-service English teachers commented negatively on the English accents used by some local lecturers teaching English and requested more expatriate lecturers.

Even school principals and education officials seem to be upholding the idea that native speaker models should be sought for English learning purposes. For example, at a focus group meeting organized by the Education and Manpower Bureau to develop Basic Competency Assessment tasks for primary pupils, a local English teacher pointed out the importance of clear and proper pronunciation in the audio-recordings. This point was immediately taken up by the chairperson and some other members as indicating the need to recruit native speakers to do the recording. Native English lecturers are also always the first choice many local school principals would consider inviting to give talks on English teaching and learning to staff and students.

### **Media and public discourses on 'proper' English pronunciation**

The deferential attitude towards NETs has also been reinforced by the mass media. Recently, a Radio Hong Kong early morning infotainment programme began to air a 10-minute section on English idioms. At the beginning, the male host (who in the authors' opinion speaks good English) demonstrated the reading of the idioms. However, a few days later, a native speaker model was provided and the male host reiterated that this was the standard model and urged the public to follow the native speaker model.

There has also been a deluge of advertisements for learning packages and courses that flaunt the provision of standard native speaker models. A campaign was launched jointly by the Hong Kong Education City and Oxford University Press to teach teachers and students IPA in

order to enhance their awareness of the differences between Cantonese and English phonology. According to the consultant of the project, who is a Chinese teaching comparative phonetics at the University of Hong Kong, 'Cantonese speakers are *particularly prone to accent-laden spoken English*' because 'more than 40 per cent of the English phonetic sounds are different from the Cantonese ones' (South China Morning Post, emphasis added). This seems to imply that only Cantonese-accented English is a kind of accent, and the phonological features of Cantonese, by being so different from those of the English phonetic system, have created 'obstacles' to speaking 'better' English (as suggested by the name of their website *www.speakbetterenglish.com.hk*). This might have given the public the impression that 'good' English is spoken *without* an accent.

All of the above evidence seems to be suggesting that Hong Kong's linguistic ecology after 1997 is diverging from the WE paradigm. It seems to be a strong case illuminating Phillipson's (1992) configuration of 'English linguistic imperialism' and 'linguicism' (which means the inequitable allocation of language rights; see Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998) in which people engage themselves in a 'biased process of hierarchization of "legitimate and illegitimate offspring of English"' (Phillipson, 2000a: 88, quoting Mufwene, 1997) and the people who produce them. The question, however, is who are the agents effectuating the process of linguistic imperialism in post-colonial Hong Kong? Pennycook (2000) points out the importance of understanding the politics of global dominance of English through 'contextual sociologies rather than a priori assumptions about imperialistic effects' (p. 118). What have sustained the local hegemony of English may largely be the local forces. In the next section, we will attempt to explain such local hegemony in Hong Kong by drawing on theory from post-colonial and sociocultural studies.

### **Uncovering the sociopolitics in hegemonic privileging of BANA-centric accents in postcolonial Hong Kong**

While the domination of English in Hong Kong is a clear case of colonialism and linguistic imperialism, the perpetuation of the local hegemony of English and, in particular, English spoken with the BANA-centric linguistic norms, seems to be an ideology of local production. Hegemony, in Gramsci's (1971: 28) sense, means 'domination by consent':

Fundamentally, hegemony is the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are the interests of all. Domination is thus exerted not by force, nor even necessarily by active persuasion, but by a more subtle and inclusive power over the economy, and over state apparatuses such as education and the media, by which the ruling class's interest is presented as the common interest and thus comes to be taken for granted. (Ashcroft *et al.*, 2000: 116)

In this sense, the privileging of the BANA-centric pronunciation norms is a clear case of hegemony in Hong Kong. The radio programme, the proliferation of the NET Scheme, the LPAT assessment, and the 'speakbetterEnglish' campaign are all examples of 'state apparatuses' to construct and effectuate an accent-based linguistic hierarchization, with Inner Circle norms being given privileged status while local features are suppressed to the lower end and presented as errors. Some readers might feel puzzled about the emergence of this mentality as the change of sovereignty has been in effect since 1 July 1997 and the ruling class is no longer the colonial master from Great Britain. Why would the ruling class, which is almost entirely composed of Hong Kong Chinese, still want to subscribe to the hegemonic domination of the former colonizers' language and their linguistic norms? Why is Hong Kong unlike other post-colonial places such as India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka where citizens took pride in speaking the colonizers' language in their local manner?

A widely accepted explanation points to the utilitarian and practical minds of Hong Kong people. The Chief Executive of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Tung Chee-wah, in his October 1999 Policy Address, highlighted his vision of Hong Kong as a 'world-class city', explaining that 'Hong Kong should not only be a major Chinese city, but could become the most cosmopolitan city in Asia, enjoying a status comparable to that of New York in North America and London in Europe' (Bolton, 2000: 283). To be a cosmopolitan city, a high English standard is indispensable. Actually, the hegemonic status of English all over the world has often been fortified by the notion of 'globalization'. In the face of a globalized economy and the need to conduct transnational communication, the ability to speak intelligible English as an international language is of crucial importance. Even in Singapore, where local people prefer using local varieties in order to sound like Singaporeans but not like Englishmen, Standard English is

still generally viewed to be superior and the 'ideal' form of English to which highly educated people would aspire (Milroy and Milroy, 1999). Therefore, having a good English standard is believed to be able to bring about personal social advancement. Li (2002), for example, after making a comprehensive review of Hong Kong's colonial history and language attitude development, argues that perpetuating the status and demand for English in the postcolonial period (as evident in the parents' strong preference for English-medium education) reveals a pragmatic self-pursuit of English as a 'value-adding commodity' (p. 50) rather than a passive acceptance of social control through linguistic imperialism. Therefore, when the mastery of the former colonizers' accent proves to be value-adding social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991), many people would strive hard to attain that goal. For example, obtaining level 4 in LPAT would qualify the candidate to obtain promotion to the English panel chair position. A pragmatic self-pursuit of English seems to be a personal choice on the surface, but may indeed be a self-naturalized uncritical acceptance of linguistic control under the coercive force of state apparatuses. This seems exactly the kind of 'domination by consent' to which Gramsci refers.

Apart from understanding the issue from Bourdieu's capital theory, we might be able to find some insights from a postcolonial mentality labelled as 'post-colonial re-membering' (Gandhi, 1998). According to Gandhi (1998), postcolonial remembering denotes an ambivalent stage during which the colonized (i.e. the Orientals) tend to long for a certain form of continuity with the colonizers (e.g. the US and UK) who have often portrayed themselves as 'the disinterested purveyor of cultural enlightenment and reform' (Gandhi, 1998: 14), or, in Phillipson's (2000a: 98) words, 'altruistic' in their foreign language policy. When the colonizers had left, people in the former colony may suffer a 'stigma of unauthenticity' because '[t]he Europe they [that is, the colonized] know and value so intimately is always elsewhere. Its reality is infinitely deferred, always withheld from them' (Gandhi, 1998: 12). It must be pointed out that the majority of the ruling party in post-colonial Hong Kong were government officials holding crucial posts in the colonial government. Most of them had children studying overseas, particularly in Britain. These government officials, who are still playing a part in devising Hong Kong's education and language policy, may still be affectively attached to the former colonizer. This mentality might have been further reinforced by a mixed feeling of apprehension and mistrust towards the Mainland China Communist ruling party, particularly after the 4 June incident in 1989.

It has been documented in works by local sociolinguists such as Chan (2002) and Lai (2003) that Hong Kong people before and after the 1997 sovereignty handover, particularly those born in Hong Kong, were very anxious to preserve and assert their Hong Kong identity. Accents, being powerful linguistic and identity markers, may have conveniently provided a form of social and cultural symbol for Hong Kong people to distinguish themselves from their fellow Mainlanders. Apart from speaking Cantonese with a 'pure' Hong Kong accent, it seems that a Hong Kong identity also consists of the ability to speak English with a 'standard' prestigious accent from the West.

### **Deconstructing the BANA-centric hegemony of English in Hong Kong: its likelihood of success**

From a sociopolitical perspective, as long as high-stake English proficiency assessment mechanisms such as TOFEL, IELTS, and LPAT continue to be in the control of the Anglo- and US-centric hands, it is unlikely for World Englishes varieties to enjoy high status and wide acceptance as institutional varieties of English. To enable L2 English learners to score good grades in these tests so that they could have better advancements in their life opportunities, educationalists are often subject to demands that they should teach pupils to speak and write English 'properly' by conforming to the 'standard' models.

From an applied linguistics perspective, the term 'World Englishes' by its nature seems to be defeating its purpose of achieving globally intelligible communication by advocating 'pluricentricity' (Clyne, 1992) of standards. As Jenkins (1998) argues, when local norms diverge too far from each other, international unintelligibility will be the result. Informal sharing with fellow local colleagues in Hong Kong by the authors reveals that we often had difficulties understanding English spoken with strong national accents such as Japanese or Korean at international conferences. We conjecture that if we speak with a strong Hong Kong accent, some Japanese or Koreans might find our speech unintelligible too. Therefore, who is to suffer with the continued promotion of World Englishes? It could be the World Englishes speakers themselves. By speaking English in their own ways, they may feel gratified by being able to assert their national identity. However, at the same time, they may also be diverging from the 'points of reference and models for guidance' (Jenkins, 1998: 124) so far that what they speak is beyond recognition by other World Englishes users.

Are we then suggesting that the WE paradigm should be forgotten and we should let Inner Circle varieties of English continue to enjoy their hegemony? Not really. By revealing representative signifying practices epitomizing the hegemonic privileging of English varieties spoken with Anglo- and US-centric accents in postcolonial Hong Kong due to social and political considerations, the authors wish to make their voices heard by proposing three paradigmatic reforms in terms of *assessment*, *research*, and *curriculum* for the reflection of World Englishes users and activists.

### **Towards three reform paradigms: assessment, research, and curriculum**

In the assessment paradigm, the authors feel that there is a need to review the concepts of accents and errors in high-stake proficiency assessment mechanisms such as LPAT in Hong Kong. As rightly argued by Davidson (1993), 'part of a test's standard is ... the linguistic norm it promotes', and that '[i]t would be detrimental to believe that the linguistic standard promoted by a language test is somehow divorced from other considerations of testing ethics' and, therefore, it would be 'unwise to develop and promote EFL tests without attention to the linguistic norms to which those tests adhere' (p. 114). In the case of LPAT, the descriptors seem to imply that pronunciation free from L1 characteristics would be considered error-free. The general belief that only candidates with native speaker proficiency could attain the highest level for pronunciation, stress and intonation seems to be conveying the faulty view that native English speakers do not speak with an accent, and their linguistic features would be taken to be the norms for the standards of the test. This is problematic because it has been well documented that Inner Circle native English speakers speak English with a range of variations (see Bauer, 2003). However, the situation with LPAT is that although the 'L1 characteristics' of some of these 'native' English speakers may be noticeable, their 'L1' characteristics would not be considered errors by assessors such as Ms K, and probably the chief examiners and the assessors, the majority of whom are Inner Circle native English speakers who are relatively more familiar with most Inner Circle accents than those from the outer and expanding circles. It will therefore not be surprising that a native Australian who speaks English with a noticeable Australian English accent would be likely to score higher than a native Chinese who speaks with a noticeable Chinese accent even though both speak English with an accent.

Taking into consideration how high-stake assessment exercises such as LPAT affect people's life chances, something needs to be done to counteract this 'linguistic subordination' (Lippi-Green, 1997) and hegemonic practices.

However, we do understand that there is a need for any assessment mechanism to have an agreed standard. We acknowledge the need to distinguish between local accents and careless speech. Our contention is that if English is to enjoy the status of a world language, it should not be the sole privilege of the BANA-centric speakers to dictate the norms of usages for a more or less equal, or indeed growing, number of English L2 users<sup>4</sup> (Lowenberg, 2000). So, there is an urgent need for test designers and assessors in ESL/EFL settings to set standards based on a widely accepted local educated speaker variation. Such a variation should have its linguistic base established on a wider spectrum of educated professionals, not just a narrow circle of elitist language specialists. Reference could be made to representative literature (e.g. Bolton and Kwok, 1990; Hung, 2000) reporting the existence of a local variation of Hong Kong English with systematic features of its own used by educated people (for example, university graduates). However, as mentioned before, national/regional varieties that deviate too far from the standardized Inner Circle models may result from mutual unintelligibility among their users. Therefore, World Englishes variations would still need to undergo some sort of 'standardization' process, though not necessarily converging to the BANA-centric norms, to ensure that they serve the purpose of facilitating international communication, and this leads us to the research paradigm.

### **The research paradigm**

The adoption of the singular form 'World English' by Brutt-Griffler (2002) seems to be a result of the realization that there needs to be some internationally acceptable norms for a World language. However, exactly what this 'World English' entails in terms of phonology, syntax, lexis and pragmatics remains uncertain. Jenkin's (2000) work to establish a core set of phonological features for an international variety of English is a laudable attempt. However, the selection of features based on the criteria of frequency of occurrence and teachability–learnability might not fully reflect phonological features of native languages in the outer and expanding circles, and might not fully address pronunciation-based communication problems. An international language for communication across the world must take into consideration the linguistic features of different families of languages across the

world. The establishment of the common denominator of the World English phonologies, for example, should be a world project that solicits the joint efforts of phonologists from a variety of ethnic backgrounds well-versed in the major standard English varieties and their own L1 phonological systems. To begin with, a common regional system could be established first. For example, there could be an Asian Pacific variety of World English pronunciation based on representative authentic speech samples from educated speakers from the composite varieties. Some form of corpora could be established from which mutual identifications of unintelligible phonological features could be identified from regional informants. For every target phonological feature, there could be a range of variants, some of which could be incorporated as acceptable variants in the common regional variety after taking into consideration their systematicity in occurrence and degree of impact on cross-linguistic intelligibility.

The establishment of a regional variety of English with high mutual intelligibility does not aim to extinguish other forms of new Englishes suggested by Pennycook (2003) within a national boundary to cater for creativity and popular culture. However, we would like to see some sort of linguistic 'role differentiation' (as against hierarchization) in the different forms of Englishes within a nation or a region. We believe that a truly multilingual person should have at his/her command a repertoire of varieties to suit different communicative contexts and purposes.

### **The curriculum paradigm**

Any attempt to establish non-BANA-based common regional varieties of English would be in vain however if the World Englishes users are not aware of their existence, or are not motivated to accept their variants as codified and institutionalized models of usage (Brown, 2001). It has now been widely recognized that the achievement of common understanding in cross-ethnic and cross-cultural communication is the 'mutual responsibility' and joint efforts of both interlocutors (Davis, 1991; Lippi-Green, 1997). As argued by Baxter (1991), Japanese English teachers could also speak English internationally if all speakers of English, including L1 speakers, could make an effort to cooperate to create an atmosphere of mutual acceptance. In this connection, we propose incorporating the more or less codified regional varieties of English into the English learning curriculum for all English users, with the intention of conducting international communication in English. These users should include those native English-speaking teachers, TESOL consultants, language proficiency assessors, TESOL curriculum, and materials designers from all sectors of the concentric circles. This

curriculum paradigm would necessitate a kind of ‘reverse training’ on the part of the Inner Circle native English speakers of the diversity of acceptable linguistic variants emerging from World Englishes. A WE curriculum should also consist of an ideological critique against the entrenched and long-standing linguistic hegemony that naturalizes the status and privileges of speakers who happen to speak in the accents of the colonial masters.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, we discuss how and why British–Australian–North American models of English accents continue to enjoy hegemonic status in postcolonial Hong Kong, despite the call for a liberal acceptance of multiple standards under the World Englishes paradigm. We approach the issue from a sociopolitical perspective, focusing on the connection between linguistic capital, and social and cultural capital. We also adopt an applied linguistic perspective, focusing on the need to establish international mutual intelligibility. To counteract an uncritical naturalization of the hegemonic ideology, we call for world efforts in reforming three paradigms – namely the assessment, the research, and the curriculum paradigms – with a view to reviewing test standards in EFL settings, achieving common understanding of mutually intelligible regional varieties of English beyond national boundaries, and establishing World Englishes linguistic systems as core components in TESOL curriculum.

## Notes

- 1 The global spread and use of English is conceptualized by Kachru (1992) as forming three concentric circles; namely, the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle comprises countries where English is spoken as a native language. The Outer Circle consists of mainly former colonies of Britain and the United States, where English is used as a second language, whereas the Expanding Circle refers to countries where English is learned as a foreign language.
- 2 BANA is a term adopted by Halliday (1994, p.12) to refer to the British–Australasia–North American model of English.
- 3 In 1998, the first batch of more than 300 NETs was recruited to teach at secondary levels on a territory-wide basis. With the NETs, the government hopes that an authentic environment for using English will be created in local secondary schools, and the English standard of both the students and the local English teachers can be raised. Two years later, the NET Scheme was extended to primary level schools.
- 4 According to Crystal (1997), the figure for L2 English speakers could amount to 350 million as compared to 340 million of L1 speakers.

## Bibliography

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (2000) *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Bauer, L. (2003) *An Introduction to International Varieties of English* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press).
- Baxter, J. (1991) 'How should I speak English? American-ly, Japanese-ly, or internationally?', in A. Brown (ed.), *Teaching English Pronunciations: A Book of Readings* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Bolton, K. (2000) 'The sociolinguistics of Hong Kong and the space for Hong Kong English', *World Englishes*, 19, 3: 265–85.
- Bolton, K. and Kwok, H. (1990) 'The dynamics of the Hong Kong accent: social identity and sociolinguistic description', *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 1, 1: 147–73.
- Boyle, J. and Boyle, L. (1991) *Common Spoken English Errors in Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Longman).
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Bresnahan, M.J., Ohashi, R., Nebashi, R., Liu, W.Y., and Shearman, S.M. (2002) 'Attitude and affective response toward accented English', *Language & Communication*, 22: 171–85.
- Brown, K. (2001) 'World Englishes in TESOL programs: An infusion model of curricular innovation', in A. Burns and C. Coffin (eds), *Analysing English in a Global Context: A Reader* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002) *World English: A Study of its Development* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters).
- Canagarajah, A.S. (1999) 'Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": non-linguistic roots, non-pedagogical results', in G. Braine (ed.), *Non-native Educators in English Language Teaching* (Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum) 77–92.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (2000) 'Negotiating ideologies through English: Strategies from periphery', in T. Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins).
- Chan, E. (2002) 'Beyond pedagogy: language and identity in post-colonial Hong Kong', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23, 2: 271–85.
- Chief Executive, the Honourable Tung Chee Hwa (1997) *Building Hong Kong for a New Era*, Address at the Provisional Legislative Council Meeting (Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China).
- Clyne, M. (1992) *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter).
- Crystal, D. (1997) *English as a Global Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Davis, A. (1991) *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Davidson, F. (1993) 'Testing English across cultures: summary and comments', *World Englishes*, 12, 1: 113–25.
- Eisenstein, M. (1983) 'Native reactions to non-native speech: a review of empirical research', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 2: 160–76.

- Gandhi, L. (1998) *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press).
- Glenwright, P. (2002) 'Language proficiency assessment for teachers: the effects of benchmarking on writing assessment in Hong Kong schools', *Assessing Writing*, 8: 84–109.
- Godfrey, P. (1992) 'Josiah's school drops English', *Window*, 2, 19: 32–6.
- Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (2000) *Syllabus Specifications for the Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers (English Language)* (Hong Kong).
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (Q. Hoare and N. Smith, comps and eds) (London: Lawrence & Wishart).
- Halliday, A. (1994) *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context* (Glasgow: Cambridge University Press).
- Harris, R. (1989) 'The Worst English in the World', Inaugural lecture by the chair of English language (University of Hong Kong).
- Hung, T.T.H. (2000) 'Towards a phonology of Hong Kong English', *World Englishes*, 19, 3: 337–56.
- Jenkins, J. (1998) 'Which pronunciation norms and models for English as an international language?', *ELT Journal*, 52, 2: 119–26.
- Jenkins, J. (2000) *The Phonology of English as an International Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Jenkins, J. (2002) 'A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an international language', *Applied Linguistics*, 23, 1: 83–103.
- Jenkins, J. (2003) *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*, (London and New York: Routledge).
- Kachru, B. (1990 (1986)) *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes*, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1986, printed Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).
- Kachru, B. (1992) 'Teaching World Englishes', in B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue. English Across Cultures*, 2nd edn (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press).
- Lai, M.L. (2003) 'Cultural Identity and Language Attitudes in Postcolonial Hong Kong', Paper presented at the International Conference in Language, Education, and Identity (LED).
- Lau, E. (1991) 'The future tense', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 151, 4: 18–19.
- Li, D. (2002) 'Hong Kong parents' preference for English-medium education: passive victims of imperialism or active agents of pragmatism?', in A. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *Englishes in Asia: Communication, Identity, Power & Education* (Australia: Language Australia) 29–62.
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997) *English With An Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Lowenberg, P.H. (2000) 'Non-native varieties and the sociopolitics of English proficiency assessment', in J.K. Hall and W.G. Eggington (eds), *The Sociopolitics of English* (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters).
- Luk, J.C.M. (1998) 'Hong Kong students' awareness of and reactions to accent differences', *Multilingua*, 17, 1: 93–106.
- Luk, J.C.M. (2001) 'Exploring the sociocultural implications of the Native English-speaker Teacher Scheme in Hong Kong through the eyes of the students', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Language in Education*, 4, 2: 19–50.

- McArther, T. (1987) 'The English Languages', *English Today*, 11: 9–13.
- McArther, T. (1993) 'The English language or the English languages?', in W.F. Bolton and D. Crystal (eds), *The English Language* (London: Penguin Books).
- Milroy, J., and Milroy, L. (1999) *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Modiano, M. (1999) 'Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca', *English Today*, 15, 4: 3–13.
- Mufwene, S. (1997) 'The legitimate and illegitimate offspring of English', in L. Smith and M.L. Forman (eds), *World Englishes* (Hawaii: University of Hawaii and East-West Center) 182–203.
- Parakrama, A. (1995) *De-hegemonizing Language Standards: Learning From (Post-) colonial Englishes About 'Englishes'* (Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan).
- Pierson, H.D. (1998) 'Societal accommodation to English and Putonghua in Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong', in M.C. Pennington (ed.) *Language in Hong Kong at Century's End* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press).
- Pennycook, A. (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language* (London and New York: Longman).
- Pennycook, A. (2000) 'Language, ideology and hindsight: lessons from colonial language policies', in T. Ricento and T. Wiley (eds), *Ideology, Politics, and Language Policies: Focus on English* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins) 49–65.
- Pennycook, A. (2003) 'Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity', *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 4: 513–33.
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Phillipson, R. (2000a) 'English in the New World Order: variations on a theme of linguistic imperialism and "World" English', in T. Ricento (ed.), *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies: Focus on English* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins).
- Phillipson, R. (2000b) 'Integrative comment: living with vision and commitment', in R. Phillipson (ed.), *Rights to Language, Equity, Power, and Education: Celebrating the 60th Birthday of Tove Skutnabb-Kangas* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum) 264–79.
- Purves, W. (1989) Statement to shareholders by W. Purves, Chairman, at the Annual General Meeting on 9 May 1989 (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Bank).
- Selinker, L. (1992) *Rediscovering Interlanguage* (London: Longman).
- Shohamy, E. (2003) 'The power of language tests in supressing language diversity in multilingual societies', Paper presented in the International Conference in Language, Education, and Identity (LED).
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1998) 'Human rights and language wrongs: a future for diversity?', *Language Sciences*, 20, 1: 5–28.
- Smith, L. (ed.) (1983) *Readings in English as an International Language* (Oxford: Pergamon Press).
- South China Morning Post (2003) 'ELT site provides teacher support', 15 November 2003.
- Surry, M. (1994) 'English not spoken here', *Window*, 3, 12: 32–7.
- Tsui, A.B.M. and Bunton, D. (2000) 'The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong', *World Englishes*, 19, 3: 287–303.
- Widdowson, H. (1993) 'The ownership of English', *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 2: 377–89.

# Index

- academic language 60  
accent 3, 6–17, 19, 246, 248, 250,  
253, 256–60  
accent discrimination 6–7  
accuracy 247–52  
action research 182–4, 187, 207  
African-American English 34, 38, 43  
articulation 85  
assessment 24, 40–1, 245–67  
attitude 24–31, 33–6, 38–9, 41,  
43–4
- Bakhtin's dialogized heteroglossia  
271, 276–7  
BASE corpus 144, 149  
Bolinger, Dwight 66–7  
Bush, George W. 64–6
- chunking 150  
classroom discourse 216–42  
cloze test 33  
colloquial language 60–1, 65–6  
communication strategies 26, 28  
communicative burden 25–7, 42  
communicative competence 23, 25  
comprehensibility 30–1, 37, 248,  
252–5, 257–8  
comprehension 25, 30  
contextualization cues 160, 162,  
164–5, 167, 170  
conversation 276, 280–2  
conversation partners 80  
conversational implicature 161,  
164–5, 171  
cooperative principle 161
- deaccent 77  
detachment 60  
dialogic relationship 276–7, 284  
Discourse Analysis 159–60, 172  
discourse particles 143, 145  
discrimination 37, 43–4  
discursive practices 271, 277–9,  
281  
dynamic assessment (DA) 281–2  
interventionist 283–4  
interactionist 283–4
- ELFA corpus 144, 149, 153  
ellipsis 160–1, 164, 171  
English as a lingua franca 144, 149,  
152–3, 155  
error 245, 247–53, 259, 262, 264  
exophoric reference 160  
expanding circle 151
- fluency 246, 248, 262–7  
grammar 84  
language processing 85  
lexicon 85  
monitoring 85  
pause 81, 84  
rate of speech 84
- foreigner talk  
grammar 86–7  
language acquisition 86–9  
lexicon 86–7  
listening comprehension 86  
rate of speech 87
- gender 31–2  
genetic law of cultural development  
273  
genre 72, 75–7, 81, 126, 129–32,  
134–8  
genre and corpus linguistics 91  
genre in assessment 92
- hedges 145, 154  
hegemony of English 5, 12–13,  
15–16, 19  
high involvement style 160  
Hong Kong variety 9
- idiolect 131–2, 136–8  
implicature 160–1, 164–5, 171  
implicit language 159, 161–5,  
169–71, 174–7  
implicitness 159–62, 164–5, 167,  
175–7  
imprecise references 162  
in-group 159–62, 164–5, 168–9,  
174, 176–7  
Indian speakers of English 79  
indirectness 160, 171

- information focus 74, 77  
 inner circle 151  
 intelligibility 4, 6, 10, 18–19, 30–1,  
 246, 248, 251–5, 257–63, 265,  
 267  
 interactional sociolinguistics 160–1,  
 164  
 interlocutor collaboration 41  
 international English 153–4  
 international teaching assistants 24,  
 40, 79  
 intertextuality 162  
**intonation** 27, 38–9, 72–98  
   accent discrimination 77  
   attitude 72, 89  
   boundaries 75–6, 82–3  
   cohesion 72, 76  
   communication strategies 78  
   communicative competence 72,  
   92  
   contrast 77, 93  
   Discourse Analysis 72–98  
   emotion 74, 77, 89–91  
   evaluation 89–145  
   fluency 81, 83–5, 93  
   foreigner talk 80, 86–9, 93  
   gender 91  
   genre 77, 81, 91–4  
   individual differences 84  
   information structure 77, 80,  
   88–9  
   input 73, 80, 86, 88  
   irritation 253  
   instruction 115, 85, 143–4  
   interruption 79–80, 83  
   intonational key 76, 78  
   intonational phrasing 75, 77,  
   80–1, 84–5, 93  
   involvement 60, 64  
   language acquisition 92–3  
   language processing 118–19, 80,  
   83–4, 88, 93  
   language universals 92  
   learning style 84–5  
   lexical chunks 85  
   listening comprehension 81, 92  
   monitoring 84, 93  
   parentese 88  
   politeness 90  
   pragmatics 77, 81, 89–93  
   quoted speech 81, 89–93  
   self-expression 72, 80–1, 89  
   social identity 77  
   theoretical models 74–7  
   topic 72, 75, 92  
   transfer 73, 78, 82–3, 90  
   turn-taking 72, 76, 80, 93  
   units 62–5, 67–9
- James, Henry 67–8  
 language acquisition 99, 117  
 Language Acquisition Device 271  
 language awareness 218, 236  
 language disorders 99, 117–18  
 language teaching 99, 117, 119  
 language teacher education  
   182–215  
 lecture 29, 33  
 lexical item 159, 163  
 lexicon 55–6  
 learning style and language  
   acquisition 84–5  
 learning style and social networks  
   85  
 Linguistic Society of America 57  
 listenability 57–9, 61  
 listener factors 248, 259–60  
 listening 53, 55–6, 58–9  
 local and dialogic approach to SLA  
   278, 281  
 local second language ability 271–2,  
   279, 284  
 MICASE corpus 144–6, 149, 153  
 map task 26, 27–8  
 McGurk effect 29  
 memorability 57  
 miscommunication, cross-cultural  
   79  
 mispronunciation detection 40  
 mora-timing 100–1, 107–9  
 native-like 23, 33, 37–8, 43  
 non-anaphoric demonstrative 166,  
   168–9  
 ontogenesis 273  
 oral proficiency interview 41  
 pitch 72–98  
   pitch accent 77, 82  
   pitch range 38–9, 75–7, 79, 86,  
   88–91  
   positive politeness strategies 161  
   potential level of language  
   development 284  
   power 161–2, 171, 173

- practical oral language ability (POLA) 281
- prejudice 29, 31, 33–4, 37, 42–5
- prepositional phrases 61
- presuppositions 160
- principle of mutual responsibility 25
- proactive strategies 146
- professional development 182, 184, 187, 192–3, 207
- pronominalizations 162
- pronunciation 23, 31, 36–40, 42, 245–70
- prosody 38–9, 53–71, 85, 90, 92, 126–40
- punctuation 66–8, 70
- raters 247, 253, 255, 260–3, 266
- reading 53–71
- reading aloud 53–71
- reflective practice 182–3, 185–7, 207
- repairs 146, 153
- repunctuators 67–8, 70
- retroactive strategies 146
- rhythmic classification 102, 111, 118
- Rhythm Indexes 102, 110–11, 116–19
- segmental features 40
- segmental pronunciation 85
- silent reading 56, 66–9
- speaker knowledge 126–40
- speakers of
- Chinese 30, 78–9
  - German 79, 89
  - Japanese 80
  - Korean 25–8, 30–1, 33, 35
- speaking 53–71, 245–70
- speaking rate 38–9
- speech genre 275–8, 280–1
- speech perception 29, 31
- spoken language corpora 182, 193, 208
- statistical approaches to assessment 283
- stereotype maintenance 29
- stress-timing 99–103, 106–10, 117–21
- syllable-timing 99–103, 106–10, 117–21
- syntax 55–7, 64, 66, 70
- teacher development 218
- teacher talk 218, 220
- teaching practice feedback 193–4, 197, 200, 204–6, 208
- teaching pragmatics 91
- tone concord 76
- turn-taking 126–40
- unspoken assumptions 160
- VOICE corpus 149
- vague language 159–81
- Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory 271–5
- Welty, Eudora 66–7
- World Englishes 3–22
- writing 53–6, 60–1, 63, 66–7, 69
- zone of proximal development (ZPD) 274, 280, 282

