English as a Lingua Franca: Improving Technical Writing and Communication Methods for

International Audiences

A Thesis Submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences

In Candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts in Professional Writing

By

Alyssa Serrani

June 26, 2020

Liberty University

College of Arts and Sciences
Master of Arts in Professional Writing

Student: Alyssa Serrani

_____

Sarah Rice, Ph.D., Chair                                                             Date

_____

Bruce Bell, Ph.D., Reader                                                            Date

Abstract

This thesis centers on the role of English as a lingua franca in global communication, particularly as it pertains to technical written communication. Over the 20th century, English emerged as the primary language used in global communication. As a result, efforts have been made to standardize the language and teach this standardized English in schools and writing programs around the world. Standard American and British English are dominant in academic and professional fields, which inhibits both native and nonnative language learners from reaching their full potential. This project focuses on the most prominent language acquisition methodologies - Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes - as well as a potential solution to this linguistic paradox. In this thesis, I argue that translingualism is needed in congruence with Standard English, ELF, and World Englishes in order to provide a thorough language education to language learners. English as a lingua franca awareness must be prioritized in the education of professional writers in order to identify best practices and establish consistent terminology, linguistic practices, and writing goals.

## Dedication

I dedicate this work first and foremost to Jesus Christ, who is my rock and my refuge. In 1 Corinthians 14:10, the Lord proclaims: "There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning" (ESV). Language is the very foundation of existence, and this is why I chose to pursue a degree in Professional Writing and why I will continue to share language and the Word with others. I also wish to dedicate this work to my family, and in particular to my parents who taught me that if you can read, you can do anything. I have carried this love of words throughout my life, and will continue to share it with anyone who will listen.

Acknowledgements

This project would never have come to fruition without the help, encouragement, and wisdom of my professors at Liberty University. In particular, I wish to thank my advisor Dr. Sarah Rice for believing in this project and her guidance and patience throughout this process. Our shared love of language and communicating that love brought us together on this project, and it is this mutual passion that has made us such an effective team over the last few months. Additionally, I wish to thank Dr. Bruce Bell whose class served as a catalyst for this project and who has been a reader for this project. Of course, I would not be here without my wonderful family and friends and their endless support and love. Above all, I give thanks to my Heavenly Father.

Contents

**Introduction**

In an increasingly global world where communication is often taken for granted, it is easy to forget how pivotal language is to human interaction and progress. The workplace is becoming increasingly global, and English has emerged as the *lingua franca* (ELF), or common language, on the international business stage. Most significantly, the workplace and their target audience are increasingly populated by people who do not speak English as a first language. Communication is key for progress and efficiency in the workplace; without it, nothing would ever be accomplished and international businesses could not flourish. Due to this, it is essential ELF awareness be implemented into the workplace, as well as the education of professional writers, by identifying best practices and establishing consistent terminology, linguistic practices, and goals.

This thesis will examine the current standing of English as an international language, define and explore the desired methodology or methodologies that should be implemented in the classroom, and ultimately determine how to educate professional writers to compose for an international audience. These conclusions will be drawn from previous studies conducted on this topic as well as an examination of the results of the implemented methodologies. These methodologies include the teaching of Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and the World Englishes paradigm.

The Bible chronicles how the world became multilingual rather than monolingual (Horner, Lu, Royster, & Trimbur, 2011, p. 463). The origins of language are rooted in the juxtaposing intentions of creation and defiance. Genesis 11:1 states that the world had "one language and one common speech" (NIV) before men chose to defy God and build a tower that would reach the heavens. In response to this act of defiance, God declared that He would confuse His people's

language and consequently "scattered them over the face of the whole earth" (Genesis 11:9

NIV). Since the fall of Babel, there have been numerous *lingua francas* from Latin to French to

English. Instead of being sinful, the common language, which was once used to defy God, can

now be used to honor Him. While the reality and necessity of an English as a lingua franca

should be acknowledged, the diversity and multiplicity of languages should also be embraced.

Instead of defying God, language can and should be used to defy the worldly limitations placed

upon it. Language is not only mankind's greatest means of communication, it is the ultimate way

to honor God and spread His word, and the way it is taught and applied should reflect that.

Language teachers and users across the globe lay the foundation for the leaders of the

future through the gift of language. However, the significance of language beyond everyday

interactions and essential communication is rarely explored to the fullest. For many years,

Standard English has been the commonly accepted methodology of English acquisition and

communication in education and professional writing circles. While there are many benefits to

Standard English and there are aspects of language that need to be standardized in order to

communicate effectively, the flaws of Standard English need to be studied and acknowledged.

Furthermore, these studies should account for alternate means of language education, acquisition,

standardization and analysis. Translingualism, the relatively modern concept of transferring

language and learning between people and cultures, is a potential answer to this linguistic

paradox. This thesis will explore both schools of linguistic education in-depth, weigh the pros

and cons of each, and propose an alternative solution to the current linguistic paradox that

nonnative and native speakers alike face each and every day.

Ultimately, rather than limiting language to basic interaction and foundational

communication, writers should acknowledge and embrace the differences in language and the

learning and writing processes. Language is an ever-changing, fluid concept that cannot be limited to a single definition, and should therefore be accepted as a living concept that can transition and transform along with those who use it. This thesis will include a description of each methodology, including analyses of key literature and studies in the field, and an examination of the research and methodologies will commence in the subsequent sections.

## Chapter Descriptions

This thesis is organized in five chapters, each of which detail distinct sections of this study. The first chapter describes the problem that English as an international language poses to nonnative English speakers as well as native speakers, namely writers. This section outlines how, beginning with linguistic and writing education, students are taught a standardized version of English that is deemed acceptable in academic and technical writing. These skills transfer to the workplace when the students enter the workforce after school. In both the classroom and the office, there is a clear barrier of communication between the native and nonnative speakers, and this study focuses on the writing portion of communication and how writers can overcome those barriers by using clear, plain English that conveys the desired message to everyone.

The second chapter is a review of literature on the topic of ELF and related methodologies relevant to this study. The major linguistic methodologies - Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes - are described in detail, as well as the broader distinctions of monolingualism and multilingualism, which are umbrella terms that each of these methodologies fall under. Additionally, this section details the concept and application of Plain English, as well as relevant literature on the subject, which are expanded on in later chapters.

The third chapter of the thesis examines the application of these methodologies in the classroom and workplace as evidenced in a variety of studies all over the world. International academic and professional studies on Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes are all detailed in this section, as well as an analysis of my findings. I also contrast the methods and their implementation with the goal of determining the best method of linguistic acquisition and education as evidenced by the findings.

The fourth section examines the results of the studies described in chapter three, looking at the results of said studies in detail. I provide an overview and recommendations for future studies and practical application as concluded from the results of various studies, as well as the opinions of experts in the field. The fifth and final chapter is the conclusion, featuring a summary of the major results of the studies, the author's observations from said studies, and my final thoughts based on the studies and suggested best practices. Ultimately, this study aims to provide a thorough analysis of the current standing of English as a lingua franca as well as its future and the necessary studies, research, and modifications to the Standard English taught and applied in curriculums across the English-speaking world in order to improve international, translingual communication for future generations.

**Chapter I: Statement of the Problem**

**Misconceptions About English as a Lingua Franca**

In recent years, the term English as a lingua franca (ELF) has emerged in linguistic studies to refer to English as the global or international language, as well as the communication in English between speakers with different native languages. As of 2019, it is estimated that, of the world's estimated 7.5 billion inhabitants, approximately 1.75 billion speak English to varying degrees of fluency and 1.5 of these are English language learners. However, many of these 1.75 billion are not native speakers. According to the British Council's (2019) report "The English Effect," these international English learners are divided into two distinct groups: approximately 750 million are deemed English as foreign language learners (EFL) and 375 million are considered English as a second language learners (ESL) (p. 5). The British Council (2019) distinguishes these terms by classifying EFL speakers as those who only speak English for the purposes of "business or pleasure," whereas ESL learners regularly use English on a daily basis.

There is a common misconception that ESL, EFL, and ELF speakers only learn English to communicate with native speakers for business opportunities and engagement in countries where English is the dominant language, and this is partly true. However, it is also true that English is the lingua franca in countries where English is not considered the primary language. Rather, these nations, where many languages are spoken, use English as the common tongue to bridge the linguistic gap and make business and cultural transactions more efficient and convenient (British Council, 2019, p. 5). This linguistic phenomenon has led to English being more widely taught and spoken than ever before. As a result of this dominant language, many nonnative English speakers face difficulty assimilating into the English-speaking world that exists on a grander scale than ever before. Today, much communication is written, whether

online or in print, and as such it is imperative that English as a lingua franca education be prioritized beginning in the classroom, notably universities, as well as in the workplace.

## History of English as a Lingua Franca

In the beginning, language was a bridge with no barriers. All the people in the world spoke a common tongue to communicate with one another and with God Himself. The Tower of Babel marked a turning point when language went from being a universal means of communication and became fractured and scattered across the Earth. English is a relatively modern language that has developed significantly over the last 1,400 years. Considered part of the West Germanic language family, English has a long and varied history with influences from a number of diverse languages, both ancient and modern, including Old Norse, Latin, and French (British Council, 2019, p. 5).

The British Council (2019) identifies two distinct qualities in the evolutionary rise of English as the lingua franca: "momentum and adaptability" (p. 5). This momentum can trace its roots to political, military, religious and merchant necessity as well as colonization, Christian missionaries, and trade throughout the Americas, North Africa, the Indies, and China. While other languages, such as Arabic and Spanish, experienced a similar spread through conquest and trade, English proved the more flexible and adaptable lingua franca. As it spread, English absorbed a broad and diverse vocabulary from many other languages such as Arabic, Spanish, Hindi and Malay, in addition to the lexicon formed a thousand years earlier from Old Norse and Norman French, which in turn flourished during the Renaissance with the influence Latin and Ancient Greek (British Council, 2019, p. 5).

As technology, scientific discoveries, and other advancements are made, English continues to adapt and adopt. The international lexicon is now full of English technological

terms ranging from "mouse" to "email" to "Google" and a number of popular cultural terms that are instantly recognizable on all corners of the globe. According to the British Council (2019) study, "the only constant is change" (p. 5). The globalization of languages, notably English, has led to the emergence of a wide range of Englishes that differ from Standard English as well as from each other. Over the years, English vocabulary has developed beyond the limitations of Standard English to include words that do not exist in the dictionary and would not be recognized by native English speakers outside of these particular groups (p. 5).

In this development of global or World Englishes, there are a number of smaller movements within this methodology, including dialects informed by their users. Dialect applies not only to regions or ethnic groups, but also social groups and, in particular, online communication. As regional dialects gradually decline, language is becoming more "geographically homogenized," but it is also becoming increasingly difficult to standardize (British Council, 2019, p. 6). While Standard English is dominant in many fields, English has splintered into so many dialects and sub-groups that it is nearly impossible to classify.

As English continues to expand and adapt, linguists are required to address the advantages and disadvantages of Standard English as alternative methodologies in order to create an even wider reach and to educate future generations of ELF learners as well as native speakers who write for an international audience. Communication is no longer limited to physical means, be they face-to-face interactions or the written word. In this digital age of the Internet and social media, written English communication is more widespread than ever before. This contributes to the linguistic "momentum" that is rapidly re-shaping culture on a global scale. Because it already has widespread usage, applicability, and cultural resonance, English is the most attractive option for wide reaching communication and exchange (British Council, 2019, p. 6).

**English as an International Language in the Modern Age**

Throughout the twentieth century, English has dominated the academic and professional fields and everything in between, from schools and universities to business, trade, science, technology, media, and much more. English is the language of some of the world's greatest literature and other art, the most commonly used language in science and technology as well as political and philosophical debate. Moreover, it is the world's largest language with the Oxford English dictionary containing over 500,000 words (British Council, 2019, p. 5).

Professor of English and Linguistics Barbara Seidlhofer (2005) asserts that, "as a consequence of its international use, English is being shaped at least as much by its nonnative speakers as by its native speakers" (p. 339). In other words, the globalization of English has affected the English language, and as a result it is becoming increasingly difficult to standardize. Seidlhofer (2005) also states that, "for the majority of its users, English is a foreign language, and the vast majority of verbal exchanges in English do not involve any native speakers of the language at all" (p. 339). Statistics support that the majority of English users are not native speakers, and Seidlhofer's claims about spoken English between nonnative learners also applies to written English, particularly in the digital age (p. 339). As a result of this ongoing linguistic evolution, the way English is used, taught, and written is a crucial issue that linguists, educators, and professional writers must address.

Because language is so rich and ever changing, it can be a source of confusion and miscommunication between different cultures and even speakers of the same tongue. Non-English-speaking workers regularly relocate to countries where English is the official language, either to find work or for their existing jobs. Once in this new country, they are confronted with the reality of the English-speaking world. They quickly learn that the world is different from

their English classrooms or what they have seen on television: everyone speaks in different

accents and dialects and has distinct speech patterns, writing styles, and personal linguistic

touches. These nonnative English or foreign language speakers face challenges in understanding

and being understood, which affects their work performance, experience, potential to succeed,

and overall livelihood. In both foreign and domestic schools, students are taught a fixed,

immovable Standard English that adheres to one structure, one pronunciation, and one meaning.

In the English-speaking world, however, they are immediately faced with innumerable variations

of English. The diversity of language cannot be summarized by education alone, but education

opens doors between cultures and communication and is therefore the key to unlocking this

linguistic paradigm.

The ability to speak, read, and write English is proven to correlate with education

attainment and English acquisition is generally obtained over a period of time (Education

Commission of the States, 2013, p. 1). While foreign-born children and children of immigrants

are increasingly likely to learn English, many families do not speak English at home and/or fall

below "basic" English skill level. According to a study conducted by the *Washington Examiner*,

67% of immigrants who have spent 15 years in the United States cannot speak English fluently

or at an advanced level (Bertrand, 2017). This lack of English proficiency and education can

prove devastating for people's professional mobility, and as a result ELF education needs to be

assessed. In particular, writing education and research is vital to the advancement of ELF in all

areas of culture.

The ability to speak, read, and write English is a necessity for employment on an

international scale. Having a working knowledge of English is essential in order to communicate

in any occupation, and many employers consider a working knowledge of English to be an

attractive asset. English language knowledge creates employment and promotional opportunities,

particularly in high-demand, international industries including science and technology,

engineering, medicine, banking, business, and media. Businesses in particular attract people from

all nations who are either transferred to a country where English is the dominant language for

their existing job or move to said country in hopes of finding employment.

Furthermore, the application process can prove challenging for a nonnative English

speaker due to the complex language used in business writing. For example, job postings and

resumés are often written in such a way that can leave EFL speakers perplexed and isolated.

These challenges include regularly changing verb tenses and irregular sentence structure that is

otherwise uncommon in written English and unheard of in spoken English. The often complex

and irregular structure of business English are closely examined in the studies surrounding ELF

and other methodologies featured in chapters three and four of this study.

Moreover, the English education system currently in place throughout the United States

and abroad advocates for Standard English in the classroom and workplace. The concept of

Standard English has been adopted over a long period to address the communication confusion

both native and nonnative English speakers face in relation to the written and spoken word. In an

international setting or corporation, the importance of communicating effectively is vital. In such

cases, there is little room for mistranslation, interpretation, or variation of dialect. Standard

English relies on established patterns, word choice, and syntax in order to create a consistent

form of English to be used in academic and professional settings for the sake of cross-cultural

communication.

However, while the concept of a Standard English that adheres to strict rules is logical and

necessary for clear communication, the application is not entirely realistic because every English

speaker, be they native or nonnative, uses language differently, regardless of setting. Rather than enforce the rigid, unobtainable structure of Standard English, these differences should be acknowledged and embraced from the classroom to the cubical. Ultimately, there is a need for change in the way English is taught and used in international communication, and this change must stem from detailed studies on the matter to determine the best means of ELF education.

Translingualism is a proposed alternative to Standard English because it is a fluid, non-fixed means of linguistic study that allows for the nonnative speaker to learn English while maintaining their native language. Studies on monolingualism and multilingualism/bilingualism conducted by esteemed scholars such as Elizabeth Ellis (2007) and Jason Cenoz (2013), among others, have revealed that nonnative English speakers are often required to sacrifice their native languages in favor of English rather than retaining two or more linguistic identities (p. 177; p. 4). This inability, or rather supposed incompatibility, to retain two or more linguistic identities directly affects nonnative speakers who have to use English in their everyday lives.

Due to either a lack of education or lacking education, these individuals and entire groups who immigrate to English-dominant countries struggle to comprehend complex written English. For example, there is a necessity in many industries to have instructions in multiple languages in countries where English is the official language partly because instruction manuals, official documents, and even marketing collateral is often written in vague, complex language that can prove confusing for a native speaker, let alone an ESL speaker. This content, which is typically targeted towards native English speakers (NES), needs to be made for English as a second language (ESL) and ELF speakers as well in order to foster more efficient communication channels. Whether it is in an office report or an advertising campaign, content and copy are made to be viewed by a target audience, which typically includes all genders, ethnicities, and

international backgrounds. However, the intricacies of language and the degree of the audience's

fluency in English often hinder the ESL speakers' comprehension of the content.

Due to the significance of English language acquisition in professional development, it is

imperative that writing educators empower their students by establishing common means of

written communication that will resonate with both native and nonnative English speakers.

Furthermore, written content must be composed with the intention of communicating with

speakers with varying levels of proficiency. This study will examine the methodologies that have

proven most effective in the writing classroom for the purpose of educating professional writing

students who will carry these methods into the workplace. In the later chapters, I will examine

the application of these studies in the classroom and workplace and detail their conclusions based

on the literature and findings described in this study.

**Chapter II: Literature Review**

Before exploring the methodology and best practices associated with professional writing for an international audience, a foundation must be laid for the key terminology and literature related to the linguistic study of English as an international language in order to improve future written communication between native and nonnative English speakers. Recent scholarship based on studies by linguists from all over the world has identified numerous sub-genres of English instruction and learning, notably Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca (ELF), and World Englishes, which are all examined in this thesis. All language speakers fall somewhere on the spectrum of monolingualism and multilingualism, and this also affects the language learning process and the studies conducted in the field. This section of the thesis will define and examine each of these schools of English learning, the best practices associated with them, and significant scholarship and literature on these methodologies.

Languages are shaped by the way they are used, and therefore it is essential to study these various uses in order to determine the most efficient means of cross-cultural communication (Al-Tarawneh, 2014, p. 2). The authors in this section analyze and advocate for different methods of language acquisition and application in the writing classroom and beyond, particularly in the world of professional writing. The researcher will identify how this data can be applied to the education of professional writers for the purpose of efficiently communicating with an international audience, as well as bettering English education as a whole. This section will define the concepts of monolingualism, multilingualism, Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes, as well as notable literature and voices in the field of linguistics. This section will also include definitions of the terminology used in the paper as well as brief summaries of key sources and their findings.

**Monolingualism**

Before examining the various schools of language study, the terms and broader concepts of monolingualism and multilingualism must be defined and examined in order to lay the foundation for the linguistic overview detailed in the rest of this study. As the name suggests, monolingualism refers to the use of one language in written and verbal communication and to people that only speak or communicate in one language. Similar to Standard English, monolingualism enforces the concept of speaking one language, specifically English, which is the official international language or *lingua franca*.

The term monolingualism is defined by Australian professor of Linguistics Elizabeth Ellis (2007) as part of a "continuum." Ellis (2007) notably proposes that it is often an "unmarked case" (p. 174-175) and argues that there are three representations of monolingualism, which she applies to linguistics literature. The first representation is the aforementioned "unmarked case" or "baseline" where there is a clear delineation between monolingualism and multilingualism. Linguistic theories often presume monolingualism to be the norm and this tends to be the dominant view, particularly in primarily English-speaking societies. The second view is that monolingualism is a limitation to social and vocational communication, based on linguists who promote the study of foreign languages. Ellis' third view is that monolingualism as a "pathological state" which affects "educational and social language policy and practices" (p. 174). This third position is taken by some writers cited by Ellis (2007) who view it in regards to the "sociopolitical contexts of language use" and language policy and practice (p. 174).

Ellis (2007) defines monolingualism and multilingualism as a "continuum" that varies depending on the interests of those proposing it (p. 175). She describes the monolingual individual as one who "does not have access to more than one linguistic code as a means of

social communication" and reiterates that monolingualism exists on a spectrum that separates

those who recognize certain foreign words or phrases from those who have a basic knowledge of

another language or those who have no knowledge of a foreign language (p. 176). In regards to

her claim that monolingualism is an "unmarked case," Ellis (2007) provides examples of

"marked" and "unmarked language." She uses the terms "marked" and "unmarked" to refer to

properties of language that are used frequently or infrequently and provides the example:" the

article form 'a' is unmarked (or, for some theorists, less marked) and the form 'an' is marked

because 'an' occurs less frequently, can only occur before vowels, and has an extra sound /n/" (p.

177).

Additionally, the term "unmarked" has also been used in gendered language, which

applies to the majority of world languages. English is a notable exception in this respect because

it does not have gendered articles. However, there are still exceptions such as "a" and "an" that

are dependent on the first letter of the following word. This example serves to demonstrate the

linguistic difference and changeability that can prove challenging for English learners, who will

often view English through the lens of their native language. For example, if a language learner

is accustomed to masculine and feminine articles that precede a noun, they will be more likely to

apply these rules to English, where "the," "an," and "a" precede common nouns, but is often

dropped before a proper noun.

Ellis (2007) also examines the relationship between monolingualism and multilingualism

on the spectrum. Notably, linguists are often the ones who regard monolingualism as the norm

and monolingualism is otherwise taken for granted by native and nonnative English speakers in

the field and beyond. Ellis introduces the term second language acquisition (SLA), which

assumes that position that monolingualism is a starting point and bilingualism is the ultimate

goal of the learner (p. 177). Furthermore, Ellis (2007) notes that people in developed countries whose language is used in international communication are accustomed to their native language as the norm and often view language as something nonnative speakers must do in order to conform to their new society (p. 177).

The most dominant models of SLA have been developed in monolingual Western countries, notably countries where English is the lingua franca. Many linguists and instructors concur that linguistic discourse primarily takes place in countries where English is the dominant language (Ellis, 2007, p. 178). Although multilingualism is the international norm, it is supplanted by monolingualism as the supposed norm in nations where an international, standard language is spoken, notably English-speaking nations.

The previously held perceptions of monolingualism are being challenged by linguists and language instructors around the world in various studies, as noted by Ellis. Other notable scholars in this field include Bruce Horner and John Trimbur. Horner is a renowned professor of composition theory, pedagogy, and literary studies at the University of Louisville who has written extensively about monolingual, multilingual, and translingual practices in the classroom as well as the relationships between the globalizing English, the globalizing economy, the U.S. "English Only" movement, and composition studies. John Trimbur specializes in rhetoric and writing studies at Emerson College and has conducted studies of cultural literacy and translingualism. In their 2002 study "English Only and U.S. College Composition," Horner and Trimbur identify the formation of U.S. college courses that adopt a monolingual, "English Only" approach to writing education (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 594). They go on to argue that "a tacit language policy of unidirectional English monolingualism has shaped the historical formation of U.S. writing instruction and continues to influence its theory and practice in

shadowy, largely unexamined way" (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 594-595). Horner and Trimbur (2002) acknowledge that writing instructors have historically implemented English only language curriculums and concede that these courses must continue to be conducted in English. Rather, they argue for an examination of the "sense of inevitability" that accompanies monolingual English instruction (p. 595).

Additionally, Horner and Trimbur (2002) criticize the current writing curriculum, which was standardized in the late 19th and early 20th century as part of a larger initiative, and they claim it is in need of reform. What they describe as a "defeat of the ancients by the moderns" in reference to the decline of classical, multilingual education, has resulted in a monolingual language policy that has replaced the once standard bilingualism and multilingualism (p. 596). As a result, throughout the 20th and 21st centuries, monolingualism has become the new standard in English-speaking countries. These practices have resulted in a "territorialization" of languages that has given way to the canon of "proper usage," otherwise referred to as Standard English (p. 596). As such, monolingualism and Standard English are closely related. Horner and Trimbur's observations of monolingualism are further examined in chapter three of this study.

Furthermore, the study of monolingualism and multilingualism are often discussed in tandem. In regards to the relationship between monolingualism and multilingualism, there are many academic studies oriented towards multilingualism, but few that examine the advantages and disadvantages of monolingualism. David Grambling and Bethany Wiggin are professors of German studies at the University of Arizona who have conducted multiple studies on monolingualism as it relates to the German language, but also how it affects people on a global scale. Their article "The Fall, or Rise, of Monolingualism?" originates from the German studies department of their university. They applied the concepts of monolingualism and multilingualism

in their official seminar and conducted a study with various professionals, including literary scholars, an applied linguist and translator, a historical linguist, and other historical specialists. In addition to monolingualism being dominant in academic and professional writing, Grambling and Wiggin's writings also examine how monolingualism relates to global politics and relations, discourse analysis, and the "disobedience" of language that is not considered standard.

Additionally, Grambling and Wiggin (2018) cite Elizabeth Ellis' statement that monolingualism is an "unmarked case," which has become a commonly-cited phrase in academic discourse in regards to the study of monolingualism. They note that with recent studies conducted on the subject, scholars are able to view monolingualism "in all its contingency, consequence, and historical contour" (p. 457). They also trace what they describe as "the long and slow rise (or fall?) of monolingualism" and pose the question of whether or not monolingualism is still relevant or achievable in the modern world, as well as its historical and cultural significance in global communication (Grambling & Wiggin, 2018, p. 459). Moreover, they note that, "Monolingualism may be merely getting better, subtler, and more innovative in achieving its structural objective of managing and containing 'other languages' and 'others' language' in a wide range of social spaces and textual genres" (p. 458). In other words, while the umbrella term "monolingualism" is used, there are a wide range of outside cultural and linguistic influences that affect the one language in question. They proceed to state that: "multi- and monolingualism are elite abstractions that have little to do with the actual experiences of speakers in everyday contexts" (p. 458). This observation is significant in that mono and multilingualism are largely academic constructs that have little to no relevance in the minds of the average person, regardless of the language(s) they speak.

Furthermore, Grambling and Wiggin (2018) conducted a detailed study on monolingualism in German history, literature, and culture in order to determine whether or not monolingualism even exists as its own category and if it is still relevant in the modern, global age. They state: "It is not only time to move beyond the chronotope of the nation and its would-be monolingual literature, but also to move before it" (p. 459). In other words, monolingualism can no longer stand up against the global, multinational workforce, and therefore instructors should look past it towards the future. Grambling and Wiggin (2018) survey monolingualism from a historical perspective, noting the ever-changing styles, and claim: "disinventing monolingualism necessarily impacts long-held presuppositions about the process and product of translating" (p. 461). Ultimately, regardless of historical perspective or medium, monolingualism is quickly becoming an abstract term of the past as society progresses into an increasingly global, communication-driven future.

**Multilingualism**

Similar to monolingualism, multilingualism is viewed as a spectrum. However, long before monolingualism became the accepted norm, multilingualism was widespread, dating back to ancient times. It is still a very common phenomenon today, although not portrayed as the norm is predominantly English-speaking countries. There are now more languages than there are countries (approximately 7,000, not including dialects), and globalization has endangered the many smaller languages in favor of the larger, official languages, notably English, which has emerged as the *lingua franca* over the last century (Cenoz, 2013, p. 4). According to Jasone Cenoz (2013), Professor of Research Methods in Education at the University of Basque Country, multilingualism is applied within the study of linguistics and approached from various perspectives and has many definitions, including an individual who can "communicate in more

than one language, be it active (through speaking and writing) or passive (through listening and reading)" (p. 5). This definition can be expanded to refer to societies as a whole and their ability to communicate with each other in a common tongue in their everyday lives.

In addition to the broader, more literal definition of multilingualism, it is also individual, social, and societal. Multilingualism can refer to someone who speaks two or more languages, while other related terms are more specific, such as bilingualism, someone who speaks two languages, and plurilingualism, someone who speaks three or more languages. Distinctly, multilingualism is defined as: "the presence in a geographical area, large or small, of more than one 'variety of language'... in such an area individual may be monolingual, speaking only their own variety" (p. 5). In contrast, individual multilingualism refers to one's "experience of acquiring and using languages" which varies from person to person (p. 5). However, at a societal level, Cenoz (2013) notes an important distinction between "additive" and "subtractive" multilingualism, which further relates to the study of translingualism. "Additive" multilingualism refers to a language being added to a speaker's repertoire while the first language continues to be developed, such as an American student who takes Spanish in school as well as English, or vice versa. Subtractive multilingualism, in contrast, refers to situations where the second language replaces the first, such as a child who immigrated to the U.S. and no longer practices their first language (pp. 5-6). Additive multilingualism is more likely to occur when the speaker of a lingua franca, such as English, acquires another language, while subtraction occurs more often with speakers of smaller, less global languages.

Furthermore, Cenoz (2013) differentiates between "balanced" and "unbalanced" multilingualism. A balanced multilingual refers to a person who speaks two languages proficiently, whereas an unbalanced speaker is proficient in their first language and speaks,

reads, and writes a second language to varying degrees of fluency. However, having perfect

fluency in a second language is no longer considered a requirement to be considered bilingual (p.

6). Additionally, studies reveal that there is a cognitive difference between monolinguals and

multilinguals in terms of attention span and "inhibitory control" (p. 7). In other words,

multilinguals "develop resources that allow them to perform better on some metalinguistic

tasks…" (pp. 7-8).

Many scholars suggest that there is a link between multilingualism and conceptualization.

Some suggest that there is an overlap between monolinguals and multilinguals and that they

possess the same "conceptual base," while others suggest there are quantitative and qualitative

differences between the two (Cenoz, 2013, p. 8). Researchers have also conducted studies on the

multilingual brain, including language processing and bilingual processing. Although the article

does not go in-depth about this subject and Cenoz (2013) states that additional research is

required, the techniques used suggest there are significant differences in multilingual and

bilingual processing as opposed to monolingual processing (p. 8).

Cenoz (2013) also asserts that multilingualism is closely related to globalization and

technology. The study of multilingualism has traditionally been based on various, separate

elements rather than the relationship between these elements such as atomistic research (syntax,

phonetics, and lexis) in the language development and acquisition process. The atomistic view is

most common in multi-linguistic studies and centers on individual characteristics of language

and asserts the view that languages are fixed, concrete entities (p. 10).

In summary, the research on multilingualism is based on multiple theories and is an

ongoing study being conducted by linguists as well as other experts in education,

psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and neurolinguistics. Multilingualism exists on a spectrum

and is therefore difficult to classify or put in a box (Cenoz, 2013, p. 14). Furthermore, it is widespread worldwide in education, professional environments, and at home and therefore has no real limitations or fixed ideas as a concept.

Ultimately, the study of multilingualism is ongoing and enlightening. While monolingual speakers can be very successful, particularly in monolingual societies, it is now possible for multilingual speakers to achieve the same levels of success within the same societies. The spread of English as a lingua franca has made it possible for monolingual speakers to live in multilingual areas and multilingual individuals to live in monolingual areas. This linguistic diversity, as well as having a common language to communicate in, creates professional and socio-economic mobility and provides many people with opportunities they may not have otherwise. Rather than restricting the language, writing, and forms of communication used in the classroom and workplace, writing educators should embrace the endless possibilities that multilingualism presents while still acknowledging set practices in grammar and syntax.

## Standard English

Standard English (SE) is perhaps the most widely taught and accepted form of English, and can be sub-categorized by nationality such as Standard American English (SAE) and Standard British English (SBE) (Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur, 2011, p. 463). Standard English is most commonly used in academic and professional settings, particularly in writing. The concept of Standard English is based on the idea that any variety of English other than what is considered to be "standard" is wrong and should be corrected. According to Horner, Lu, Royster, and Trimbur (2011), traditional writing approaches in the United States "take as the norm a linguistically homogeneous situation: one where writers, speakers, and readers are expected to use Standard English or Edited American English (SEAE) – imagined ideally as uniform – to the

exclusion of other languages and language variations" (p. 463). However, they argue that such standardization does not impede language or communication, but rather gives the language-user a clear set of rules and ideologies to adhere to (p. 463).

According to Horner et al. (2011), the primary issue with the traditionalist approach of Standard English and its response to language is that it seeks to "eradicate difference in the name of achieving correctness" and replace the diversity of language with Standard English or SEAE (p. 465). The SE approach poses four major issues:

1.  It does not consider the significant differences between world Englishes or different writing genres,

2.  it disregards the historically-proven changes of linguistic conventions,

3.  it places emphasis on particular language practices to the detriment of others, and

4.  it ignores ordinary, everyday language users and learners and their potential to develop (Horner et al., 2011, p. 464).

Because Standard English as it currently is does not account for these things, an alternative approach is needed in scholarly curricula that is more accommodating than the traditionalist approach and "acknowledges differences in language use" (Horner et al., 2011, p. 466). However, this approach is also flawed as it advocates for codification of language and ignores the "fluctuating character of each set of language practices," as well as the ways these codified sets relate to each other, the importance of the reader's response, and the appropriateness of certain English practices, suggesting that certain language should be limited to the private sphere (p. 466). Horner et al. (2011) conclude that, while it is important to have strategies in place to identify particular linguistic practices, the aim of language users and educators should be to

"honor their linguistic ingenuity and to encourage other innovative strategies" rather than enforce outdated, limiting rules (p. 466).

Furthermore, in the article "The Inevitability of 'Standard' English," Dr. Bethany Davila (2016), Associate Professor of Rhetorical and Writing at the University of New Mexico, challenges the traditional practices of SEAE in writing and communication in order to increase higher education opportunities for under-represented social groups (p. 128). The goal of this study, according to Davila (2016), is "increasing access to higher education for often-underrepresented social groups by challenging the pervasive, dominant role of SEAE in writing theory and pedagogy" (p. 128). Across campuses worldwide, scholars struggle to define and enforce Standard English practices, but the assumption, according to Horner et al. (2011) and others, is that Standard English will always be taught in classrooms to some extent (p. 464)

In 1974, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) adopted "Students' Rights to the Their Own Language" (SRTOL) which was intended to supplant Standard English and monolingualism in the classroom (Horner et al., 2011, p. 464). However, despite this decision, educators still struggle to implement and enact these practices, due in large part to the "inevitability" of SEAE (Davila, 2016, p. 128). In spite of SRTOL, it is an unspoken agreement among educators that SEAE will always be taught in some capacity or other (Horner et al., 2011, p. 464).

Davila (2016) and Horner et al. (2011) concur that Standard English practices limit the fluidity, negotiability, and heterogeneous nature of language (p. 130; p. 465). Although SEAE will always be taught, the path that students are encouraged to take to master Standard English and eliminate linguistic differences can change (Horner & Trimbur, 2002, p. 596). The assumption that SEAE is superior and will continue to be the primary linguistic method

perpetuate the common scholarly belief that "standard language ideologies that advance beliefs about one, stable, correct language variety that is a superior and, therefore, commonsense dialect for school, business, and public settings" (Davila, 2016, p. 128). This methodology deserves scholarly study and criticism, particularly in regards to "language that both reveals writing studies' reliance on standard language ideologies and perpetuates standard language ideologies within the field" (Davila, 2016, p. 128).

Furthermore, Paul Kei Matsuda (2006) argues that widespread use of monolingualism and standardization enforces the idea that all writers are native speakers of Standard English (p. 638). This idea is harmful to the diversity of languages, the inclusion of other languages and dialects, and the "Students' Right to Their Own Language" ruling. Unless linguistic multiplicity is acknowledged, Standard English will eventually supplant the distinct, cultural accents that make language unique. A compromise must be made between the standardization and versatility of language. Language in technical writing should adhere to an established structure in order to convey a specific message to international audiences, but should not place limitations on the broader multiplicity of language.

### Translingualism

One potential solution to the linguistic diversity conundrum is translingualism. The term translingualism, much like language itself, is not simple to define. As both a word and a concept, it has multiple meanings and functions. Two leading voices in translingual research are Professors Rebecca Lorimer Leonard and Rebecca S. Nowacek. Lorimer Leonard teaches courses on literary studies, language diversity, and research methods at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Professor Nowacek specializes in research on the transfer of writing and learning across disciplines. Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016) define translingualism in

relation to the transfer of language and learning between people and cultures. Therefore, the term "translingualism" has as many definitions and uses as the word "transfer" (p. 259). To transfer means to move from one point to another or to share something. When applied to language, it means to progress from one area of language to another and to share the knowledge of language with others. The multiple meanings applied to translingualism stem from recent work within composition studies that "reminds the field of the fluidity of language use in writing" (Leonard Lorimer & Nowacek, 2016, p. 259; Horner et al., 2011, p. 436).

In contrast, Horner et al. (2011) define translingualism as an approach that "sees the difference in language not as a barrier to overcome or as a problem to manage, but as a resource for producing meaning in writing, speaking, reading, and listening" (p. 436). Whereas traditional ways of communicating and understanding language are outdated and based on structure and standard, translingualism encourages writers, speakers, readers, and listeners to respect and embrace the differences in language. Rather than prevent change or "interfere" with standard language practices, Horner et al. (2011) suggest teachers, writers, and all language users aim to "develop alternatives to conventional treatments of language difference" (p. 463). By doing so, the way language is viewed will gradually change and develop into a more all-inclusive, fluid practice.

Furthermore, Dylan B. Dryer (2016), Professor of English at the University of Maine, advocates that alternative understandings of language and language education should be critically examined in an academic setting. He also notes that it is sensible to adhere to grammatical and stylistic structures and it is reasonable to "patrol grammar, genre, register, semantic prosody, and style while advancing some attenuated version of 'academic' writing as the universal and universally desired practice" (p. 274). However, it is well-documented that

most language users in most contexts "refrain from such patrolling." Therefore, it is more important to identify the "roles and dispositions" of the language users and writers before taking steps to transfer or transform language (p. 274). In order to achieve this, language and approaches to language must be examined, tested, and evaluated for efficiency.

Dryer further criticizes the assessments of English proficiency tests, and argues that a valid assessment must be demonstratively theoretically sound. This includes their construct, optics and their ability to inform responsible decision-making (i.e. its "consequential validity") (2016, p. 275). The same applies to documents targeted towards monolingual versus multilingual speakers.

Additionally, Juan Guerra, a professor at the University of Washington, provides his own definition of translingualism. Guerra's (2016) definition is based upon a research question regarding writing instructors taking a translingual approach to linguistic differences and whether or not they should encourage their students to develop a new "code-meshing" style of writing or if they should develop a "rhetorical sensibility" about language that treats language as fluid rather than standard:

> .... (translingualism is) something more than an empty performance meant to fulfill a particular set of teacherly expectations about how we use language. It is a concept that reflects the belief that every student needs to develop a critical awareness about what language does, rather than what it is, in the context of very specific circumstances informed—as the second question suggests—by a critical awareness of the choices made in the context of the various competing ideological approaches to language difference currently available to us. (p. 228)

Guerra's definition differs from that of Dryer and Horner et al. in that he applies translingualism directly to practical use in the classroom rather than a broad technical definition of the term.

Rather than being a rigid methodology, translingualism allows for freedom and fluidity in

language acquisition and application by empowering learners to develop critical awareness of

language and their own linguistic practices.

Furthermore, Guerra (2016) describes a study he conducted with 34 international

students, in which they read Horner et al.'s (2011) article "Language Difference in Writing:

Toward a Translingual Approach." The students were asked to identify three separate, competing

"ideological approaches to language and culture" and these approaches were then tested. These

approaches were framed as a spectrum of monolingual/monocultural, multilingual/multicultural

and translingual/transcultural. The test subjects described their linguistic process and what they

called "hybrid language" (p. 229).

One subject named Mina came from a multilingual background and learned English at

university after she came to the United States from Laos. Mina viewed the English she learned in

school and the "hybrid" translingual English she spoke with her family as two distinct entities.

Ultimately, while she likes the idea behind translingualism, she found that taking a translingual,

hybrid approach too far did her more harm than good as it is too "open-ended" and lacks the

necessary structure to communicate and comprehend intended meaning. She also critiques

Standard American English (SAE) practices, noting that SAE has "a place of superiority" in

academic writing. Ultimately, she summarizes her impressions of translingualism: "When there

are no rules governing language use then there's nothing to say whether something is or is not

English, and there's no way for an evaluator to provide correction since "correct" is always

relative" (p. 231).

In summary, the student, Mina, found both the extreme rigidity of Standard English and

the "not rule governed" translingual approach lacking for her. Guerra (2016) describes the

student subject as "not yet as rhetorically attuned to academic discourse as she is to the home language practices she described earlier" (p. 231). In Guerra's opinion, a hybrid/translingual language is possible and practical after one has "mastered the rules that inform their hybrid language" (p. 231).

Translingual language must have rules and structure in order to be effective, but it also provides a more personal and realistic approach to language learning and writing as opposed to the traditional academic approach which lacks "social, personal, and inter-relational stakes — as well as the intimate, rhetorical familiarity" (p. 231). Guerra (2016) believes his mistake in this study was assuming that students could ignore their circumstances, such as a classroom, and that they could transfer their language practices from one circumstance to another. He cites Lorimer Leonard, stating "researchers (and teachers) often inadvertently focus 'on writers' knowledge rather than their rhetorical activities—what their literate resources are rather than how they are used'" (p. 231). Ultimately, in order to apply a translingual approach, writing instructors must avoid the mistake of treating translingualism as a hybrid language and instead encourage students to "call on the rhetorical sensibilities many of them already possess but put aside because of what they see as a jarring shift in context" (Guerra, 2016, p. 232).

In the article "Translingual Literacy, Language Difference, and Matters of Agency," authors Min-Zahn Lu and Bruce Horner (2013) define translingualism and apply their definition to the writing classroom:

> Rather than putting students in the unenviable position of seeming to have to choose between being either submissive victims to demands of the dominant for conformity or tragic heroes resisting those demands against all odds, and at personal academic and economic risk; and rather than treating language difference as a characteristic

distinguishing some students as deviations from the norm, teachers can pose more productive and, we argue, valid questions to students about what kind of difference to attempt to make through their work with and on conventions in their writing, how, and why: questions that should resonate with students' own sense of writing, and with the choices all writers face. (pp. 596–97)

One of the main theoreticians of second language writing research is Paul Matsuda, a Japanese-born American professor of English and director of second language writing at the University of Arizona. In his article "The Lure of Translingual Writing," Matsuda (2014) criticizes translingualism, stating that "inflating a term and concept has serious consequences - the term can lose its descriptive and explanatory power, leading to the trivialization and eventual dismissal of the concept" (p. 478). Matsuda (2014) goes on to add that the rhetorical excess of translingualism can eventually prevent scholars from having critical discussions about language difference (p. 478). He defines translingualism as "still in search of its own meaning" and a "loosely related set of ideas" and cites the aforementioned Horner et al. (2011) among the influential advocates for the adoption of this study of language differences. While he is correct in his assessment that translingualism is an underdeveloped concept lacking a definitive definition or rules, his work does not acknowledge the possibility of adopting translingualism in tandem with another method such as Standard English or the possibility of further development, such as standardized rules within translingualism.

In response to this definition, Juan C. Guerra (2016) cites Matsuda's critique in his article "Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom" and counters that it is time to "engage in the process of explicitly demystifying the various approaches to language difference — including the translingual—by inviting our students to consider how each of them

influences the choices they make in the writing classroom" (p. 232). Guerra (2016) also cites colleagues that concur the conversation surrounding translingualism should be expanded beyond scholarly debate and applied in more writing courses in order to measure the "competing ideologies that inform their current writing and future teaching as well" (p. 232).

In short, upon further study, translingualism has the potential to be implemented in more university writing courses in conjunction with traditional, standardized language practices in order to make room for realistic linguistic diversity within academic settings. This would have the dual benefit of acknowledging the fluidity of language in an academic setting and beyond. Moreover, adopting translingualism into the curricula would potentially eliminate the restrictions enforced upon writing students, particularly nonnative English speakers, that ultimately hinder the language acquisition process.

## English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

For years, English has been standardized and simplified for international audiences so that they can better comprehend and communicate with native English speaking (NES) audiences. As a result, teachers have adopted monolingualism, Standard English, and Plain English, a variant of Standard English, rather than translingualism and multilingualism to solidify an overarching language that can be used internationally. The desire for a standard version of English stems from the need to communicate efficiently.

English is the official language of fifty-five sovereign states and twenty-seven non-sovereign entities. Approximately 375 million people speak English as a second language (ESL), while 750 million speak it as a foreign language (EFL), meaning English is a third, fourth, or even fifth language for them. This reality has prompted an increase in research and education on the subject and to standardize ELF as its own linguistic practice (Leyland, 2011, p. 25). Due to

the English language's significance in politics, trade, and business affairs, the need to communicate accurately and effectively is great. English can even vary widely depending on the region of English-speaking countries. Based on this research, it can be argued that Standard English is an unachievable goal since there is not even agreement among English-speaking countries on standard linguistic practices, spelling, or vocabulary and ELF interactions are entirely variable.

An ELF study was conducted at the University of Vienna by Professor of English Language and Linguistics Cornelia Hülmbauer, as well as Barbara Seidlhofer and Heike Böhringer. They argue that English as a lingua franca is only one option of many and that students should not be limited by the predetermined rules put in place by native English speakers 2008, p. 25). ELF is not a "fixed" language, but rather a flexible one, and should therefore be negotiable and not viewed as "wrong" or "bad" English. The authors call for "acknowledgement of the language as being dissociated from its primary lingua-cultural roots and transferred to new communicative contexts with ever-changing constellations of interactions" (p. 25). In other words, the number of ELF speakers far outweighs the number of NES, yet the most accessible English-language material caters to native speakers. Communications programs must acknowledge that language is not fixed, but complex and multi-faceted, and ELF speakers should be given various options of communication in the classroom.

There are a number of interpretations of English as a lingua franca and its role on the global stage, whether in the classroom or the boardroom. Dr. Mario Saraceni, a senior lecturer in English and Applied Linguistics at the University of Portsmouth in the UK, critiques the notion of English as a lingua franca in his article "English as a Lingua Franca: Between Form and Function." In this study, Saraceni (2008) ponders the question of "a singular English, used

around the world, or that of a plurality of Englishes used in different parts of the world" (p. 20).

Saraceni (2008) considers ELF from a global perspective by analyzing various debates

surrounding World Englishes and the idea that there are as many versions of English as there are

countries and peoples that speak English. He also comments on the "idea of a singular English,

used around the world, or that of a plurality of Englishes used in different parts of the world" and

whether or not this is feasible (p. 20).

Furthermore, Saraceni (2008) focuses on the history of ELF and its role in international

communication and critiques the concept of the lingua franca and standardized language.

Saraceni emphasizes the unreliability of ELF and Standard English and suggests an alternative to

the standard methods of teaching ESL that will meet the needs of individual learners (p. 20). He

also asserts that ELF has continuously gone unchallenged as the definitive model for language

acquisition and emphasizes the need for a new model as an alternative that can meet the needs of

international English users. This model should be based on empirical research and descriptions

of the ways people actually use ELF in academia, work, and daily life (p. 21).

Furthermore, Saraceni (2008) claims that the issue with the ELF model is that it constantly

seeks to replace all other models and that ELF is only concerned with "efficiency" rather than

long-term, comprehensive language acquisition (p. 21). Additionally, Saraceni (2008) conducted

a study with his international students who came from a variety of nations and linguistic

backgrounds and went abroad to teach English as a second language. They found that "despite

the quantity and quality of the academic discourse around English in the world, there seemed to

be very little tangible change in actual English language teaching practice" (p. 22). For these

students, English is not only "a passport to a better career and education, but also something that

would grant them access to a body of knowledge and possibilities of communication that would

otherwise remain virtually unreachable" (Saraceni, 2008, p. 22). He invited experts in the field to collect a variety of views on the subject and compiled a list of scholars that were pro and anti ELF. The authors concluded that ELF, as well as World Englishes (WE), are "aspects of the same phenomenon, namely the existence of varieties and uses of English outside and beyond ENL that need to be granted full recognition" (p. 23). Saraceni (2008) also asserts based on his findings that only a minority of linguistic scholars recognize ELF as legitimate and efficient in the long term (p. 23).

Moreover, Saraceni (2008) seeks to characterize and define ELF and identifies the source of confusion in regards to how ELF is consistently classified and regarded. For example, part of the confusion stems from "whether the term ELF refers to a language variety (or set of varieties) or, more simply, to the role that English plays in various situations worldwide" (p. 24). It is also uncertain whether ELF is based on "form or function," as the title of the article suggests. One interpretation is that there are many Englishes in the world, and ELF is just one of them. This interpretation assumes ELF is not the primary language, but rather a form of English that exists "between" others. However, there are recognized varieties, such as American and British English, and therefore it can also be reasoned that English is plural, not singular, and develops organically based on its contact with nonnative speakers. In this view, it is dependent upon the learners what variety of English they use, whether it is EFL, ELF or ESL or somewhere along this communication continuum (Saraceni, 2008, p. 24).

Additionally, Saraceni (2008) refers to Barbara Seidlhofer's work on ELF where she argues that the native of ELF must be studied in order for it to be accepted alongside English as a native language, including "what it looks and sounds like and how people actually use it and make it work" (Seidlhofer, 2005, p. 339–40). In summary, ELF refers neither to Standard English,

translingualism, or World Englishes, but rather its own vague and organic form of communication that exists between nonnative English speakers (NNESs). Therefore, ELF must be studied further in order to be properly understood and defined.

Using Seidlhofer as a reference, Saraceni (2008) concludes that there are three potential readings of ELF:

1. English used as a common language among nonnative speakers that does not exclude native speakers,

2. varieties of English that arise internationally, and

3. a variety of English "with its own phonological and lexico-grammatical features" that evolves from interactions between primarily nonnative speakers (p. 25).

Ultimately, Saraceni (2008) asserts that the ELF paradigm is a natural, ever-changing phenomenon and that there is too much scholarly focus on the form of English as a lingua franca and what it is rather when the focus should be on the function (p. 26). Going forward, the emphasis should be on what English is and how it is used rather than which English to use.

In addition to the form and function, the interest in ELF extends to how English as an international language (EIL) is taught and internalized in schools. Guangwei Hu (2012), a professor who specializes in applied linguistics and literacy education at Nanyang University in Singapore, proposes a means of assessing EIL, World Englishes (WE), and ELF. In particular, he focuses on "weak" and "strong" approaches to assessing English that defy and expand on the standard testing currently in place "not in terms of Standard American or British English, but in terms of EIL/WE/ELF in its own right an English proficiency tests, especially high-stakes ones, have huge consequences for English language learners and users" (p. 123). Hu (2012) also maintains that the traditional standard varieties of native English, such as American and British,

have been "taken for granted" in the broader definition of English proficiency for tests and practical use (p. 123). In other words, many authors concur that the assumption that ELF is the only standard for language learning and assessment is potentially limiting and even damaging to long-term language acquisition and communication.

**World Englishes**

World Englishes is a relatively contemporary term that is often used synonymously with ELF because both terms refer to the globalization of English. The term World Englishes (WE) refers to the forms of English spoken all over the world and the localized forms of English that writers and everyone else encounter in everyday life. Because language is unique to each culture and each person, Standard English is ultimately not an achievable goal, though some standardization is necessary. However, there are ways to communicate cross-culturally without standardizing English or forcing the nonnative English speaker to give up their own linguistic practices.

A three-circle model of World Englishes was proposed by Braj Kachru, an acclaimed Indian linguist who taught at the University of Illinois. Kachru coined the term "World English" or "International English" to describe a global means of communication that includes numerous dialects, as well as advocates for a movement towards an international standard for English. Kachru categorizes World Englishes into either the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, or the Expanding Circle. According to Kachru, the only solution to current English language teaching and research is a "paradigm shift" and clear distinction between the use of English in monolingual and multilingual societies (Schmitz, 2014, p. 373). Additionally, emphasis must be made on the native and nonnative varieties of English; one variety is the focus on teaching and another is dedicated to English awareness and function.

In Kachru's model, the "Inner Circle" is made up of traditional foundations of English and the L1 or native speakers are the ones who set the norms. The Inner Circle also refers to the places where these norms originated and spread to the outer circles. The most prominent countries that form the Inner Circle are the USA, UK, and Canada (Schmitz, 2014, p. 373).

The Outer Circle refers to countries where English is an official language due to the country's history of colonization, and the varieties of English spoken are predominantly nonnative and ESL. Some examples of Outer Circle countries include India, Nigeria, and various other African nations. Lastly, the Expanding Circle is composed of EFL speakers in countries where English is not the official language or typically spoken in everyday conversation. The users in this circle follow the rules established by the Inner Circle, that is in turn developed by the Outer Circle. Some examples of countries in this circle include China, Russia, and Brazil (Schmitz, 2014, p. 373).

Linguistic researchers tend to rely on Kachru's model to reveal the different circles: "(i) the proficiency level of the speakers, (ii) the variation that exists in the different dialects of the language, and (iii) how the many users appropriate the language to perform their daily routine" (Schmitz, 2014, p. 373). While this model gives insight into the people who speak World English and the subgenres of English they speak, the issue with the model is that it does not offer a clear explanation as to who World English is dominant, nor does it challenge the "native speaker domain." Based on the data, it can be asserted that there is an inherent bias against multilingualism, and by extension translingualism and ELF, the linguistic individuality of nonnative speakers, and the "hegemony of English in relation to other languages" (Schmitz, 2014, p. 374). In order to go beyond the three circle model, the dominant ideologies of English must be explored and challenged.

In addition to research regarding the people who use and influence World Englishes, WE have also been applied to academic writing studies. Professor of English Michael Bokor hails from Ghana in West Africa and is an EFL user. Bokor directs the emphasis to writing and the intended audience of a written work. He refers to the international audience as the "other" or the unknown. Before one can write for the "other," they must first be able to identify and understand them. According to Bokor (2011), "As a globalized and globalizing linguistic paradigm, the ensemble of World Englishes reflects cultural and linguistic nuances that portray the worldviews and dispositions of nonnative speakers of English" (p. 210).

Bokor (2011) also argues that there is an "English language problem" that has not been properly addressed in the classroom when teaching native English speaking (NES) students to communicate with international audiences. He proposes a new strategy that incorporates World Englishes into these training programs. Additionally, he draws attention to the limitations of the current strategies used for training native English speakers in international audience analysis, rather than the supposed "failings" of nonnative speakers and their educators (p. 113).

The strategies for training NES students to communicate with international audiences are currently lacking, and in order to address this issue, new and improved strategies must be developed and applied in the classroom and beyond. A substantial amount of scholarship on this topic focuses on the disparity of the native and nonnative speakers, as evidenced in the previous sections of this chapter. Bokor (2011) explains that the nonnative speaker or "other" is often judged for their lack of proficiency or comprehension whereas the native speakers are presumed to be competent enough in their own language to communicate efficiently (p. 209). Bokor (2011) also suggests incorporating the World Englishes perspective into education and training

programs in order to improve the manner in which English is taught to NES and ELF speakers alike (p. 114).

It is important and significant for writers to know their audience in any circumstance. In addition to understanding different perspectives, technical writers must understand the mechanics of writing for a particular audience and be able to differentiate between effective and non-effective practices. Bokor (2011) states that "cultural differences between the source and target audiences, incompatible rhetorical practices and expectations, and the role of the English language are identified as some of the major causes" of communication failure (p. 208). If researchers can identify the reasons for communication failure, they can also identify the reasons for success.

In addition to being a globalized English, World Englishes refers to localized or indigenized dialects of English based on context, culture, geography, and sociopolitical background. In regards to pedagogy, Bal Krishna Sharma (2008) of the University of Idaho examines the World Englishes and ELF perspectives and their benefits and challenges and notes that WEs are a result of centuries worth of various social, political, and cultural factors (p. 121). Therefore, the concept is broad and encompasses many different approaches to English language learning and application. Additionally, there is no single, identifiable type of native speaker or nonnative speaker, and as a result "to make the learners able to communicate with the native speakers of English … is (an) unattainable or irrelevant target" (p. 122). Sharma (2008) concludes that the best solution is to "appropriate pedagogy as required by the local contexts" and that, while there should be a standard educational procedure, teaching English must be taken on a case-by-case basis in the classroom (p. 129). Ultimately, language should focus on

communication and intelligibility of the intended message whilst leaving room for different

cultures (p. 129).

## Chapter III: Methodologies in the Classroom

This section of the study seeks to explore the relationship between professional writing and the multiplicity of the English language. This section describes the methodology utilized for this study, and this chapter is dedicated to exploring methods of English learning based on accredited sources and proven successful methods, including Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes, as well as related studies such as Plain English. Additionally, this section will address the research questions, research design, explanation of approaches, and significant interpretative practices that relate to the topic. Lastly, I will examine the application of the aforementioned methods to determine the most effective use of English in professional writing for the purpose of cross-cultural communication.

## Standard English Studies

While much emphasis has been placed on ELF and globalizing English in recent years, Standard English has been commonly accepted as the norm by experts and is promoted in universities and offices around the world. In "The Inevitability of Standard English," Bethany Davila (2016) conducted a Standard English study that drew from interviews with 18 writing instructors from three public research universities, two in the Midwest and one in the Southwest of the United States. For the study, the instructors read and assessed three out of nine randomly selected anonymous essays written by first year students prior to the interview with Davila. The essay prompt asked the students to read a published article and to write an "academic essay . . . [that] clearly articulate(s) a position and support(s) that position using evidence" (Davila, 2016, p. 131). The essays were then evaluated by Davila and the 18 instructors for focus, structure, and evidence/analysis. All of the students involved in the study were native English speakers, but came from different ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds including Caucasian,

African-American, and Hispanic and ranged from working class to middle class (Davila, 2016, p.

131).

According to Davila (2016), this project's aim was to observe the instructors' responses

to the students' written language and what language they considered marked or unmarked:

> My goal in this project was not to try to anticipate how instructors would respond to
>
> various features in the texts; instead, I wanted to know what language was un/ marked,
>
> what kinds of identities the un/marked language signaled, and how instructors would talk
>
> about identity and standardness when reading anonymous student texts. (p. 132)

During the interviews, Davila asked the instructors to describe the students they pictured as

having written the essays, explain their comments on the essays, identify common patterns in

student writing that did not meet their expectations for standard academic writing, identify the

qualities of each paper that stood out, and describe who they believed to be the student-authors

who may have written each essay. Davila then asked follow-up questions about the instructor's

responses and asked them to identify what specifically about the text led them to the conclusions

they made in their responses (2016, p. 132).

The specific interview questions Davila asked the instructors included a preliminary

questionnaire about their teaching backgrounds and their perception of the authors of the essays

they had read for this study:

- Pick one text and walk me through the notes you made to the paper. As you are talking,

  use as much detail as possible to explain what you marked and why you marked it.

  Please also tell me how you would talk to the student who you imagine wrote this paper

  about what you marked.

- From your experience, what does it look like when writing doesn't meet your expectations? How do you account for these instances?

- Are there particular details that are striking to you in this paper? Why?

- In as much detail as possible, describe the student you pictured as having written this paper.

- In your experience, how common are these occurrences? (Davila, 2016, p. 145)

Other significant questions in the study related to what the instructors believed the student's socio-economic background to be, where the student was from, their education level, and whether or not they were native English speakers based on their level of Standard English comprehension and application. In the conclusion of the study, Davila found that the language the instructors marked was either "standard" or "nonstandard" as opposed to comprehensible or non-comprehensible or even correct or incorrect. The instructors also connected these nonstandard instances to larger patterns. For example, one instructor commented: "this one.. had trouble with verb tenses. And that's a—to me, that's a bad sign . . . that's, that's an inner city sign" (Davila, 2016, p. 132). This comment displays clear bias related to the student's background and language use rather than the education system.

Ultimately, Davila (2016) notes that this study cannot be taken as a generalization of all writing instructors, but rather provides an insight into the effects of Standard English in the American education system and how it is or is not being addressed. The instructors featured in this study all regarded Standard English practices as normal, "non-interfering," and superior and came into the study with preconceived notions and biases in SEAEs favor (p. 132). This view of Standard English is limited, but provides an insight into how students and instructors view the

current English curricula and how future studies might implement Standard English in congruence with other methodologies.

In contrast, Paul Matsuda (2006) clearly classifies Standard English as problematic, stating that linguistic homogeneity is a "myth" (p. 639). He argues that language differences in the classroom render students "invisible in the professional discourse," while "pedagogical practices based on an inaccurate image of students continue to alienate students who do not fit the image" (p. 639). Furthermore, Matsuda critiques the current Standard English methods used in composition courses, particularly the lack of attention to sentence-level and language issues. He states that teachers are often overwhelmed by language differences and resort to telling students to "proofread more carefully" or to "go to the writing center" rather than giving specific advice or setting learning goals for the student. In short, Matsuda (2006) argues that nonnative speakers are "being held accountable for what is not being taught" (640). As a result, students do not enter college composition courses with a previously internalized variety or methodology of English learning, yet they are expected to be at a certain level prior to beginning college.

Matsuda (2006) also asserts the Standard English approach to composition instruction has "been facilitated by the concomitant policy of linguistic containment that has kept language differences invisible in the required composition course and in the discourse of composition studies" (p. 642). Furthermore, he described first-year composition placement exams as part of an effort to segregate students together by year and/or level of fluency until their writing met the university's idea of "standard" (p. 642). He also states that students whose writing is not considered standard are simply passed off to the writing center, where the peer tutors are unequipped to work with language differences (p. 642).

In Matsuda's (2006) view, the assumption of the native speaker norm and the ability to speak "privileged" varieties of English have hindered nonnative English learners (p. 643). Although ESL students have been attending U.S. institutions since at least 1784, the U.S. education's institutional support for international support is still lacking in linguistic and cultural adjustments (p. 644). Despite the increased influx of international students, linguistic instruction has been primarily oriented toward helping students "fit the dominant image," which has to some extent prevented educating students about language differences in composition courses (p. 647).

In order to respond to Matsuda's criticisms, a compromise must be made between necessary standardization and introducing alternate methodologies in the composition classroom. Matsuda concludes his essay with a proposed solution to address the myth of linguistic homogeneity:

> By pointing out the problem of the policy of containment, however, I do not mean to suggest that these placement practices be abandoned. On the contrary, many students do need and even prefer these placement options. […] To deny these support programs would be to further marginalize nonnative speakers of English in institutions of higher education where the myth of linguistic homogeneity will likely continue to inform the curriculum as well as many teachers' attitudes toward language differences…. To work effectively with the student population in the twenty-first century, all composition teachers need to reimagine the composition classroom as the multilingual space that it is, where the presence of language differences is the default. (Matsuda, 2006, p. 649)

Moreover, the importance of writing centers should not be ignored. Rather, writing tutors, like students, should be made aware of language difference through the implementation of translingualism alongside Standard English practices.

**Translingualism Studies**

In his study "Cultivating a Rhetorical Sensibility in the Translingual Writing Classroom," Juan Guerra describes how he took a translingual approach in the classroom and the results of that study. Guerra frames the approaches taken in his classroom as a continuum with a monolingual/monocultural approach at one end of the spectrum, a multilingual/multicultural approach in the center, and a translingual/transcultural approach at the opposite end. He believes that each of these approaches influences how students approach and construct their own notions of language and culture and "deploy them in academic writing and beyond" (2016, p. 229). In this study, he clearly presented each of these approaches to his students in detail to ensure that they were familiar with the different methodologies. Furthermore, Guerra specifically looked at the writing and perception of one of his students based on two self-reflective essays on the students' language use, as well as their reflection on the studies of Horner et al. (2011) and their own personal research essays.

The first student used in this study grew up in Laos when it was a French colony and learned French, Chinese and Lao before coming to the United States and learning English. She described how she and her siblings "worked their way into our own vocabulary, and then we just built new ones off of that" (Guerra, 2016, p. 230). The subject further described her versatile and unique approach to language:

The way that I speak around my family is my favorite way of speaking. I don't have to think through what I want to say before I say it to make sure it's free of "errors" or "sounds smart." I can just say what's in my head and if I can't think of a word I make one up or use a sound effect or gesture in its place. But there is only a very little bit of how I speak with my family in how I speak with other people who I'm close with; I think this is because the

way I speak with my family would make me sound unintelligent or silly to others. (Guerra,

2016, p. 230)

This "hybrid language," which expanded over a period of time to include aspects of English,

French, Lao and/or Thai, Hebrew, Russian, Spanish, and Arabic, is, for the subject, as effective a

means of communication as monolingualism is for others. Guerra (2016) notes that the subject's

language "performance" was judged on the basis of standardized English expectations (p. 230).

The subject, referred to as Mina, praised translingualism, stating the approach takes a

"giant step toward social equality" by not enforcing SAE (Standard American English), the

previously recognized "superior" method in the writing world. Mina also noted, "It promotes the

academic success of students who use a stigmatized dialect by not overwhelming them with a lot

of rules and standards that society at large is continually telling them they'll never master. . ."

(Guerra, 2016, p. 230). However, Mina also critiqued her "hybrid" language practices, describing

translingualism as "too open-ended" because if there are no rules governing language use, then

there is no means of evaluating whether something is or is not English or to correct anything if

"correct" is a relative term (Guerra, 2016, p. 230).

This study reveals some pros and cons of translingualism on its own as well as applied in

conjunction with other theories, such as ELF. Guerra (2016) argues that Mina was highly

encouraged to engage in an "SEA only" approach to academic writing, regardless of her

translingual background and established practices (p. 231). This SEA only approach stifles

creativity, but in contrast a purely translingual approach lacks the necessary structure to form a

comprehensive and effective school of English language acquisition.

When Guerra (2016) encouraged his students to "perform and produce language" for the

purpose of his study, the results were decidedly mixed:

> Mina and her classmates balked, not because they are incapable of calling on their rich repertoires of multilingual practices, but because the school context lacked the social, personal, and inter-relational stakes—as well as the intimate, rhetorical familiarity—that they readily found at home with their friends and families. (p. 231)

Guerra (2016) concedes that he made a mistake by assuming that the students could "ignore the circumstances they face in the new rhetorical situation (an assigned essay in a classroom) and can easily transfer their language practices from one site to another" (p. 231). In other words, Guerra (2016) did not recognize that he was assigning students to do the same things with language in two fundamentally different genres, one of which is "highly situated" (p. 231). As a result, the study was inconclusive but showcased the potential of translingualism in the writing classroom when students are allowed to transfer their linguistic knowledge.

Similarly, Rebecca Lorimer Leonard and Rebecca Nowacek's (2016) study on translingualism featured six multilingual writers who displayed a range of writing and linguistic practices. Lorimer Lenoard and Nowacek (2016) assert that researchers and writing instructors alike often focus on "writers' knowledge rather than their rhetorical activities—what their literate resources are rather than how they are used" (p. 258). Additionally, Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016) analyzed the correlation between language and location through their research on immigrants' literary practices in relation to linguistic and geographical experience (p. 258). They found the correlation between transfer and translingualism by examining the deeper meaning behind both terms. Transfer applies to the application of language, but can also refer to a language "interfering" with the acquisition of another (Lorimer Leonard & Nowacek, 2016, p. 259).

In contrast, translingualism poses the question of what a language difference or deviation does, how it functions "expressively, rhetorically, communicatively" and "for whom, under what conditions, and how" (Leonard Lorimer & Nowacek, 2016, pp. 260-261; Horner et al., 2011, pp. 303–4). Who the language is intended for, their native language, and how language is used all inform how communication is perceived. The slightest deviation or change in structure can change the subject's intended meaning. Moreover, communication varies drastically in context and depending on the method of communication. As such, the transfer of information is significant in the application of translingualism.

Furthermore, while transfer and translingualism share many qualities, writing practices are viewed "not as static possessions that can be carried and applied, but as emergent and in-process activities sensitive to an immediate context" (Leonard and Nowacek, 2016, p. 260). Translingualism focuses on the nature of language used in writing and Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016) emphasize that writing in Standard English is never neutral, but rather complicates communication because the focus is on power dynamics rather than language acquisition (p. 260). Therefore, language ideologies and knowledge must be accounted for when analyzing the writing skills of a subject for proper context.

Questions about the transfer of learning have been examined by scholars observing first-year university students' rhetoric and composition. According to Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016), the focus by instructors, employers, and colleagues on the transfer of learning has caused emphasis to be placed on "whether students are using what they have already learned (or at least been exposed to) to succeed in a new context" (p. 259). In contrast, transfer scholarship offers a more dynamic understanding of how students use language, which allows for not only the transfer of information, but also the transformation. For example, a teacher that assesses a

student's linguistic needs and advocate for a variety of linguistic practices and rhetorical

strategies, as well as "language beliefs and values," in order for the student's individual writing

style to flourish (Lorimer Leonard & Nowacek, 2016, p. 260). Translingualism approaches

language difference as a variation or different means of expressing the same core concept rather

than a problem or failure to be overcome, which could have the benefit of encouraging

researchers to reassess their understanding of and approach to language as a whole.

Moreover, Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016) view translingualism through the lens

of theoretical research and composition scholarship, including the studies of Lu and Horner

(2013) (pp. 261-262). The emphasis of these studies was single writers and single-classrooms as

opposed to broader classroom or institutional settings. These cross-classroom methodologies are

often used in research and, according to Lorimer Leonard and Nowacek (2016), would make a

translingual approach more relevant and applicable to a wider range of students (p. 262).

Ultimately, both transfer and translingualism research "might be best understood not as

prescribed pedagogies or policies, but as terms with explanatory value: small theories that help

open up changing practices in our writing lives" (Lorimer Leonard & Nowacek, 2016, p. 262).

Ultimately, a translingual approach to linguistic research would encourage deeper study of the

transfer of language challenge preconceived notions about language and standardization.

## English as a Lingua Franca Studies

Another prominent area of study is English as a lingua franca (ELF) in the classroom. Enric

Llurda (2009), Professor of English at the University of Lleida in Spain, conducted a study

involving native and nonnative speakers of English. Language speakers are often classified into

one of two broad groups, native speakers (NS) and nonnative speakers (NNS). Llurda (2009)

advocates for the rights of nonnative teachers, and a series of studies was conducted to judge the students' reactions and progress in response to NS and NNS teachers (p. 3).

Llurda (2009) cites a study involving a series of email interviews with seven different teachers conducted over a period of eight months. One of the key insights gained from this study was that there was no consensus of the meaning of NS, and three participants "expressed difficulty in affiliating themselves with either category" (p. 4). One of the main arguments that stemmed from this study was the need to think of NNS professionals as being seen along "a multidimensional and multilayered continuum" (p. 4).

In two complementary studies using both closed and open questionnaires, university students' perceptions about NESTs and NNESTs in the context of ELF were observed by different experts in the field. They found that students tend to prefer NESTs over NNESTs, and the majority of students advocated for a combination of the two. The students were also asked to categorize their preferences based on level of education (primary, secondary, and tertiary) and it was concluded that students with high levels of education predominantly favored NST (Llurda, 2009, p. 5).

Llurda (2009) also references a study involving 422 Hungarians learning English. The students were given a questionnaire with five-point scale questions that make statements about NSs and NNSs based on Medgyes' described characteristics of NS and NNS teachers. Ultimately, Benke and Medgyes concluded that the majority of students considered NNS to be more "demanding and traditional" than the NS instructors, who were described as more "outgoing, casual, and talkative" (p. 5).

Furthermore, Llurda himself conducted a survey in 2005 among TESOL program supervisors in North American Universities. In this survey, participants were questioned about

their views on the performance of nonnative students in their practice teaching as compared to

the NES teachers (2009, p. 6). The nonnative students were, as a whole, relatively comfortable

communicating in English, although some of them were "clearly lacking language proficiency"

(p. 6). In total, fourteen supervisors were interviewed and the majority agreed that the NNSs

displayed a lack of confidence, which stemmed from their language skills to the environment.

The ESL settings were ultimately regarded as more demanding on the NNS instructors as

opposed to EFL settings (p. 6).

Moreover, linguists Paul and Aya Matsuda (2011) state that writers need to be properly

prepared to write in global situations and incorporate global perspectives into writing (p. 172).

They conducted a study based on the findings of eight textbooks and four in-depth analyses and

highlights the limitations of linguistic and multicultural awareness in technical communication

education. The Matsudas' article discusses how and to what extent global perspectives feature in

writing. They also examine the representation of technical communication and communicators as

well as multiculturalism and multilingualism in technical writing textbooks. Moreover, they

highlight the limitations of said textbooks due to the vast and ever-expanding complexity of

global technical communication.

The Matsudas conclude that U.S. college composition courses play a significant role in

how people view international discourse and writing studies (p. 173). In order to improve these

cross-cultural communication practices, educators must identify the source of the linguistic and

communicative shortcomings in order to improve. This means preparing technical writers for

global writing situations and language difference beginning in university composition courses.

The results of this study are examined in-depth in chapter four of this thesis, where I analyze the

Matsudas' findings of the technical writing textbooks.

**World Englishes Studies**

In recent years, numerous studies have been conducted to demonstrate the correlation between the concept of World Englishes and translingualism. Michael Bokor, who taught ESL students of various levels of proficiency as well as native English speaking (NES) students, conducted a study to expose to the "World Englishes paradigm" he had observed in the classroom in the article "Connecting with the 'Other' in Technical Communication." The 30 students involved in the qualitative research experiment "completed assignments that enhanced their understanding of how the English language affects discursive tasks in international audience adaptation" (p. 208). Bokor (2011) asserts that World Englishes are "historically validated varieties of English" that are used to "transform the ethos" of both the NES and NNES (nonnative English speaking) students in an introductory technical writing course (p. 209).

Bokor's (2011) research is based on the hypothesis that not only would the NNES students benefit from exposure to World Englishes, but the NES would as well (p. 210). Furthermore, he cites Kachru's (1995) delineation of World Englishes, which informed his study. In his class, Bokor (2011) taught on the theme ''cross-cultural dimensions of international technical communication (ITC)" as well as theories and concepts in the form of lectures, workshops, and invited three guest speakers to educate the students about the linguistic and cultural nuances of nonnative speakers for whom many technical documents are written (p. 212). According to Bokor (2011), the purpose of these exercises was to "enhance the students' efforts at learning and deploying a greater range of rhetorical options to accommodate technology to international audiences" (pp. 212-213). Additionally, the course focused on English as it relates to culture, writing style, and international audience analysis for the purpose of using English for technical, written discourse (p. 212). In order to do this, Bokor (2011) proposes that critical language

awareness can be achieved by providing students with "a language through which they could critically analyze their own lived relations and experience" (p. 213).

The students involved in this study also read and discussed assigned texts, including technical documents by nonnative speakers, and wrote rhetorical analyses about the linguistics differences and cultural peculiarities. They also read similar documents by native English speakers for the purpose of comparison (Bokor, 2011, p. 218). Additionally, Bokor (2011) collected text-based data over the course of a school year for the purpose of his study. He distributed a number of questionnaires with closed-ended and open-ended questions:

- education experiences, career objectives, and writing abilities (e.g., ''What kind of writing will you need to do in your future profession?'')

- perceptions of the English language in cross-boundary communicative events (e.g., ''What is your impression about nonnative English speakers' use of English?''); and

- their cross-cultural or intercultural experiences (e.g., ''Have you ever written any document for people from other cultures? In your opinion, what are some important issues to bear in mind when communicating with people from other cultures?'') (Bokor, 2011, p. 220)

These questions required answers directly related to the students' experiences and viewpoints in regards to nonnative English teaching approaching versus native ones and writing assignments connected to nonnative English users (Bokor, 2011, p. 220). The results of these analyses demonstrate linguistic imperatives in the World English paradigm as they relate to how native and nonnative English speakers approach each other's work and intersections between communication (pp. 218-219). When the participants were surveyed, 19 of 24 (79.2%) respondents felt that the course had ''internationalized'' their learning experiences (p. 221). In

response to whether having a nonnative English speaker as a teacher negatively affected their learning experiences, 24 students responded with the majority describing the experience as positive (p. 221). The students affirmed that "the course would give them the opportunity to improve their own cultural awareness and sensitize them toward nonnative speakers of English" (p. 223).

Ultimately, Bokor (2011) found the World Englishes approach, particularly when related to translingualism, was beneficial to his class and their perception of language and communication. He also found this paradigm had a positive effect on the native English-speaking students and their linguistic abilities and relayed his observations of the students' progress and noted that the course demanded a survey approach to introduce students to the nuances and performance of language (p. 213). Based on this study, he also makes the assertion that no single rhetorical Standard English can be used in all global communication contexts because of the diversity of communities and their linguistic practices (p. 213). Therefore, educators should develop a systematic approach that meets both NES and NNES students' individual needs and can be adapted to international audiences.

In another study on World Englishes, Christopher Leyland (2011), a Professor of Applied Linguistics at Newcastle University, applied micro-analysis informed by Conversation Analysis (CA) to an interaction in which the two subjects used English as a lingua franca (ELF). The interview subjects were Russell, an Austrian interviewer who worked for a website called "Eurovision Song Contest Today" about the Eurovision Song Contest, and Intars Busulis, a Latvian interviewee who was a representative in the 2009 contest (p. 26). The Eurovision contest, as well as its official website and interviews, were all in English, which was used as a

lingua franca to allow the audience and participants to communicate with one another (Leyland, 2011, p. 30).

This ten-minute interview was conducted in English. The purpose of study was to determine whether the participants, who had different first languages and accents, needed to standardize their English use with certain "core" elements in order to be understood by the other. Despite not adhering to strictly standardized EFL, Russell and Busulis were able to converse and communicate effectively and intelligibly.

In part one of the interview, Leyland observed the introduction and small talk portions of the conversation line by line, and in part two he analyzed a series of questions. Leyland (2011) notes that, in the interview, "strategies are used which shed light on the plausibility of ELF being standardized or mutually negotiated during the interaction" (p. 31). Throughout the conversation, Russell continuously applied a back-and-forth technique in the conversation. Occasionally, Russell helped Busulis by finishing the second part of a statement or repeating certain words (pp. 32-33). For example, Busulis used the word, "Latoni" which means "Latvia" in Latvian (p. 33). This could have potentially caused confusion for Russell, but because he had prior knowledge of the subject he was able to follow and repeated the word "Latoni" to indicate to Busulis that he understood (p. 34). This instance is a clear sign of Busulis's communication difficulty, as he continuously struggled with his strong Latvian accent throughout the interview (p. 34).

Another such example occurred when Busulis made two utterances in Latvian, which led to a micro-pause. This time, Russell did not repeat the Latvian words, but instead redirected the "negotiation" of the interview by proceeding in English (p. 34). Russell further directed the conversation away from small talk stating, "Latvian beer is great," which added a more personal touch to the dialogue even though it broke the previously established sequencing (p. 35). As a

result, Busulis gave his longest response yet: "Oh yes, I know. It's the greatest beer actually" (p. 35). This contrast between this longer response and his previous one- and two-word answers and multilingual answers is significant because, by deviating from the script, Russell was able to make Busulis more comfortable and establish a rapport.

Ultimately, Russell's acceptance of non-standard English aided the flow of conversation and established a sense of trust between the subjects. As the interviewer and more fluent in English of the two, Russell led the conversation by adapting to Busulis's needs. His first question was: "Why did you choose a ROCK song for Eurovision for Latvia?" (p. 36). Busulis replied, "I don't know. Just like that" (p. 36). This reply could be seen as "nonnative" or "dysfluent" as it does not necessarily adhere to a Standard English reply to the question asked, yet he was understood and the conversation progressed relatively smoothly. By allowing Busulis to correct himself and recognize his own mistakes, the "content of the interaction is deemed more important than the form suggesting that, in this case, mutual intelligibility is not affected by non-standard use of English" (p. 41).

According to Leyland's (2011) findings and additional studies, standardization is not necessary for intelligibility in ELF interactions. Rather, he deemed it likely that standardization would actually inhibit ELF interaction (p. 42). He states that intelligibility in ELF interactions is dependent on a balance of "appropriate grammatical, phonological, and lexical range between participants as well as the appropriate discourse strategies" (p. 42). In other words, ELF interactions are as varied as the number of ELF users, which makes standardization or codification nonviable. Mutual intelligibility is possible through an ongoing "negotiation of language-use depending on the language-use of the other participant, and through the use of various discourse strategies" (p. 28).

This study suggests that ELF interactions are entirely variable and ultimately cannot be entirely standardized because in real life conversation is random and unpredictable. There are numerous independent variables that cannot be accounted for ahead of time. For example, Russell could not have anticipated a nonnative response such as "just like that" from Busulis, not how to respond to it, if he did not have previous experience with language differences and non-standard English. Consequently, moving beyond Standard English allowed the subjects to connect rather than simply achieve an objective (i.e. completing the interview). This is applicable to a classroom where students can communicate through trial and error with nonnative speakers in order to challenge the language learners and help them arrive at a comprehensible, practical English that is unique to them.

Moreover, Dr. Kingsley Bolton, Professor of English Linguistics at various universities and co-editor of the international journal *World Englishes*, reflects on the works of Dr. Yamuna Kachru and her studies on World Englishes. Specifically, Kachru (1995) asserted that there is a monolingual bias in language education. Throughout her many works on the subject, Kachru explored the significance of sociocultural factors in communication. She analyzed fifty essays written by Indian college students and texts from an Indian news magazine called *India Today* and identified key stylistic differences between Indian English and American English academic writing. Kachru specifically focused on "stance-marking adverbials" in both Englishes that indicate "the high involvement of the writer with the topic, such as absolutely, actually, basically, certainly, clearly, definitely, hopefully, ironically, miserably, naturally, etc." (Bolton, 2015, p. 38). This specific use of language, which is elaborated on in the sectioned of the study entitled "Plain English," stresses the need for strong but basic words that can be easily understood by the NNESs but also adds necessary emphasis to a subject.

The results of Bolton's study and Kachru's work reveal that there was a significantly higher use of adverbials in Indian English as compared to American English texts (Bolton, 2015, p. 38). Kachru also notes that "IE (Indian English) rhetorical style is characterized by high involvement as compared to the AE (American English) rhetorical style" (p. 38). In other words, while Indian English adheres to the same rules as Standard American English, it is inherently different, just as all world Englishes are distinct from one another. This can be applied to numerous forms of English where the nonnative user's culture informs their writing as much, if not more so, as their education.

Furthermore, Bolton (2015), citing Kachru's research, asserts that there are not always well-established norms academic writing or otherwise and that textual evaluation is dependent on the context of the culture and the writer's individual situation. Traditional rhetorical rules can potentially undermine the "orally-transmitted knowledge," which is part of many cultures, especially in India. Additionally, there is a subjective and biased view of what qualifies as "good writing" that can potentially prevent some studies from being published and the American academies in India adhere to a narrow notion of English composition because they "exhibit variation from the idealized pattern(s)" (1995, p. 29). Moreover, Kachru comments that the world English users were multilinguals and English is just one part of their wider repertoire and states, "The lexical, grammar and discoursal patterns they use in English represent their ways of saying and meaning [...] as filtered through their awareness of other conventions" (1995, p. 27). Kachru concludes that "all ESL/EFL research should recognize the rhetorical styles that represent the multiple voices of the native as well as nonnative users of English in the world" (1995, p. 30).

Ultimately, World Englishes is a broad but ultimately effective term used to describe the countless varieties of English spoken throughout the world. This also applies to forms of English emerging from diverse sociolinguistic contexts globally and analyzing their sociolinguistic histories and functional contexts in order to determine how language is used in that society. The primary function of language is to fulfill the needs of the societies that use them, as well as communicate an intended message. However, Language goes beyond technical components and is an internalized form of expression that is highly personable and variable from person to person. In order to effectively communicate across cultures, emphasis must be placed on the various contexts of language in various parts of the world. First, the form and function of the language must be accounted for, as well as the differences between American, British, and Indian English, for example. Once these differences are determined, the context of the communication must be identified in order to fulfill the linguistic needs at hand.

Because individual societies and language learners have a distinctly personal range of needs, there can be no single variety of English, but rather there are a vast range of variations. These variations are not limited to word choice. They also include spelling, pronunciation, sentence structure, accent, and intended meaning. As linguistic adaptations emerge over time, these distinct varieties of English can be eventually identified. Once identified, World Englishes scholars can a apply different criteria to recognize a new variant of English. Ultimately, in order to build bridges between language barriers, World Englishes research should be conducted to better understand the multiplicity of voices and styles of nonnative English speakers.

### Plain English Studies

While researchers such as the Matsudas and Bokor focus on the "why" of technical writing, the "how" must also be considered.  This includes the use of Plain English, a simplified form of

written communication that can be applied to technical writing courses and practice. While each

of the aforementioned methodologies have their strengths and weaknesses, as will be explored in

the following chapter, it is also significant to acknowledge alternative methods that adopt

different aspects from the various linguistic schools. It is also imperative to consider these

linguistic methodologies as they relate to writing for a global audience. As with any form of

writing or communication, the writer must know their audience and consider the product,

organization, or whatever they are writing about from the audience's point of view.

Experienced technical writer Tanja Roth (2018) insists that using the "persona technique"

or stepping into the audience's shoes can help the writer empathize with and focus on their target

audience. While it may be difficult for writers to easily identify ambiguities, the audience may

struggle to understand vague sentences or information that native speakers take for granted. Roth

(2018) suggests that the writer ask themselves a series of questions before writing a document

intended for an international audience:

- Does the sentence also work for readers without in-depth knowledge of the topic?

- Does it work for readers with limited language skills?

- Is the grammatical relationship between all sentence parts clear?

Consistency is key for communication. Writers must be consistent with formatting, construction,

punctuation, tense, voice, and style. Doing otherwise can lead to confusion on the reader's part.

Roth (2018) establishes clear and concise rules that blend EFL with the best practices of

Standard English and translingualism:

1. Remove redundant content.

2. Focus on the content that is relevant for the audience in question.

3. Avoid fillers or unnecessary wordiness that could isolate the reader.

4.  Be consistent with formatting, construction, punctuation, tense, voice, and style. Doing

     otherwise can lead to confusion on the reader's part.

As soon as a nonnative English speaker sees a particularly long or wordy sentence, they

may immediately tune out and become discouraged. Therefore, technical writers must avoid this

reaction at all costs because if the audience is frightened away by overly complex phrases, they

will not be able to convey the intended message to them. Roth (2018) suggests using simpler

verb tenses, vocabulary words, and synonyms:

"utilize" → "use"

"indicate" → "show", "tell", "say"

"prerequisite" → "requirement"

Moreover, writers must avoid ambiguities in their work and determine who their audience is and

how diverse their audience is both culturally and in terms of knowledge. If they are writing for a

specific audience, for example the people they work with at an international corporation, then

they must consider where their co-workers come from. Additionally, they must ask a series of

questions:

●  Does the sentence also work for readers without in-depth knowledge of the topic?

●  Does it work for readers with limited language skills?

●  Is the grammatical relationship between all sentence parts clear? (Roth, 2018)

 Once these aspects are determined and any ambiguities have been addressed, the writer can

focus on the readability of the text from an ELF perspective.

Additionally, a subgenre of study related to Standard English that adopts aspects of

translingualism is Plain English. Emily Thrush, a professor of Applied Linguistics and

Professional Writing who specializes in professional communication and issues in second

language reading and writing, proposes the concept of "Plain English." In her article "Plain

English? A Study of Plain English Vocabulary and International Audiences," Thrush (2001),

describes the concept of "Plain English" and gives specific examples of a standardized, easy-to-

understand English:

1.  Determine whether or not the writing is clear.

2.  Whether the principles advocated by proponents of Plain English make documents more

    readable for people whose native language is not English.

3.  Whether the kinds of "simplification" that writers do for English speaking audiences are

    the appropriate ones for international audiences. (289)

Thrush's first study examined the phrasal verb comprehension of native French and German

speakers using a list of 27 items taken from Plain English guidelines. The subjects of this study

were asked to match the Latinate term with a synonym as a substitute (Thrush, 2001, p. 290). In

one test, a group of thirteen native English speakers had an average of 26.5 out of 27 correct

answers when given a list of items to match. In a separate test, a small group of students of

various language groups (Spanish, Thai, Mandarin Chinese, French, and Russian) who were all

enrolled in an International MBA were given the same lists. These students were all advanced

English learners enrolled in an advanced business English course and had scored above 600 on

the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), which is the standard score for admission

into graduate programs (Thrush, 2001, p. 291).

| Instead of: | Use: |
| --- | --- |
| accomplish | do |
| ascertain | find out |
| disseminate | send out |
| endeavor | try |
| expedite | hasten, speed up |
| facilitate | make easier, help |

| formulate | work out, devise, form |
|-----------|------------------------|
| in lieu of | instead of |
| locality | place |
| optimum | best, greatest, most |
| strategize | plan |
| utilize | use |

These thirteen students averaged 17 correct answers on the 27-item list of phrasal verbs. Notably, the scores varied widely depending on their linguistic background. The speakers of European languages such as French and German had average scores in the low 20s while the subjects who spoke an Asian language had an average of ten or less correct answers. Based on these results, it can be concluded that phrasal verbs are a challenge for even advanced ESL learners, and particularly for those of non-European backgrounds.

The second figure displays a list given to native French and German speakers for a second test. The results on this test were not significantly different as both groups were able to identify about one-third of the phrasal verbs listed and match them with their definitions. The second part of the study focused on everyday English words of Germanic origin and tested the subjects' comprehensibility, notably speakers of Latin languages. Thrush tested whether students recognized and/or preferred one type of lexical item over another and if the choice in vocabulary impeded their overall comprehension. To measure this, Thrush used two tests on the native German and French speaking students.

| Instead of | Use (phrasal verbs) |
|------------|---------------------|
| accelerate | speed up |
| acquaint yourself with | find out about |
| aligned | lined up |
| ascertain | find out |
| assemble | put together |
| calculate | work out |
| circumvent | get around |
| complete | fill in |

| | |
|---|---|
| comply with | keep to |
| comprises | is made up of |
| constitutes | makes up |
| contemplate | think about |
| cumulative | added up |
| deduct | take off |
| defer | put off |
| delete | cross out |
| designate | point out |
| determine | work out |
| disburse | pay out |
| discharge | carry out |
| disconnect | cut off |
| establish | set up |
| exclude | leave out |
| expire | run out |
| fabricate | make up |
| implement | carry out |
| insert | put in |
| participate | join in |
| reimburse | pay back |
| represent | stand for |
| review, scrutinize | look at |

First, Thrust used passages from TOEIC (Test of English for International

Communication) textbooks. This test is frequently used by employers and business schools to

ascertain the students' level of comprehension and fluency. Thrust removed some key words

from each passage and then gave the subjects a list of vocabulary words to choose from. This list

included a combination of the original terms taken from the passage and a synonym of each

term. For the Latinate words removed, Thrush provided a Germanic equivalent and vice versa.

Each individual subject demonstrated a preference for either the Latinate or Germanic term. All

the native French-speaking and German-speaking subjects included in this study chose more

words of Latin origin than those of Germanic origin, with more than half of the results being

Latinate words. However, the French-speaking subjects chose substantially more Latinate words.

The second half of the test examined the overall English language comprehension of the students. Again, passages from the TOEIC test were used. This time they were rewritten so there were two different versions. One version consisted of various Latinate terms and the other Germanic terms. The two versions of the text were labeled L for Latinate and G for Germanic and distributed at random to the French and German speaking subjects. Ultimately, no significant differences were found in the comprehension of either version of the text by either group.

Ultimately, this area requires further testing to reach a definitive conclusion due to the limited number of subjects and the time constraints that allotted only two tests to be conducted. The results of this study indicate that phrasal verbs are a significant challenge for nonnative speakers regardless of their background, but particularly for those from non-European countries.

When discussing the implications for teachers and writers, Thrush (2001) states that "the keys to successful professional writing are audience and purpose" (p. 295). According to her, the native language of the reader should be considered when the writer is making decisions and building their "repertoire." She notes that nonnative speakers are most likely to struggle with the idiomatic aspects of English, notably phrasal verbs. Thrush (2001) traces the origins of English and its evolution, describing it as a "strange amalgam of Germanic syntax with Latin, Greek, French, and Germanic vocabulary" (p. 295). For speakers of a language not related to the origin languages, Japanese for example, it is much more difficult to derive and comprehend meaning from English vocabulary and sentences. Therefore, writing targeted towards a Japanese audience, for example, must be judicious in its use of complicated syntax and advanced vocabulary in order to convey one's intended meaning.

Thrush proposes that students/subjects whose native language is not English take a test with a document they have written and similar tests to those featured above. She also suggests

that teachers should recruit subjects from ESL classes to conduct further studies on the "Plain English" that is most effective in communication. Thrush (2001) notes that, "students are often surprised to find that their carefully crafted texts (and graphics) have cultural, syntactic, or semantic problems for even quite fluent learners of English" (p. 295). In other words, these texts written by and for international subjects require further investigation in order to create clear Plain English guidelines. There is a clear linguistic barrier that needs to be addressed and examined in order to prepare technical documents and materials for nonnative speakers. As evidenced by the study, there are certain features of Plain English that are more or less applicable depending on the target audience, such as speakers of Latinate or Germanic languages versus speakers of Asian or Slavic languages, or even speakers of other dialects of English. In order to compile a more definitive study, a larger number of test subjects of various linguistic backgrounds and levels of proficiency should be given the same tests to determine the common obstacles nonnative speakers face. In many cases, comprehension of written material is critical and the language used often unnecessarily complicates business writing, and by extension the ability to communicate with international audiences. By carefully examining their word choices, writers can create a more effective means of international communication.

## Chapter IV: Data Analysis and Findings

In this section, I examine the results of the studies described in chapter three, looking at the results of said studies in detail. I also analyze their findings and recommendations for future studies and practical application as concluded from the results of various studies, as well as the opinions of experts in the field. These analyses include studies on Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes studies.

### Standard English Analysis

The studies regarding Standard English primarily focus on the curricula in technical writing courses and textbooks. Additional studies have been conducted to determine how writing instructors respond to language differences in student's papers and whether or not their use of language adheres to "standard" practices that are expected from native English speakers. Moreover, the study analyzes the assumptions these instructors make about the students/authors based on whether or not their writing style meets "standard" criteria. Inherent biases and misconceptions about nonnative speakers and language difference significantly affect the way people read a text. Additionally, the lack of attention to alternative language methodologies in writing textbooks and classrooms has negatively affected the way language is perceived and Standard English is taken for granted in technical writing communication.

In Bethany Davila's (2016) study relied on instructors using Standard English in a "non-interfering" and widely accessible way and treating SE as a "neutral" dialect (p. 133). She argues that the results of the study are a "manifestation of standard language ideologies and, therefore, (re)produce powerful and enduring understanding of standard language" (pp. 133-134). The interview transcripts were coded for unmarked language, non/standard writing, and perceptions of the student/author identity. The instructors noted what stood out to them about the

papers, what was "wrong" with them, and what met or fell below their expectations for undergraduate academic writing. Then, the language was categorized as standard or non-standard (p. 132).

Davila (2016) analyzed the data coded as non/standard and un/marked using rhetorical and discourse analysis asking questions about the discourse and what expressions imply certain things and to what effect. Additionally, she asked "what kinds of discursive practices constitute SEAE as linguistically neutral?" (pp. 132-133). She also identified a recurring theme that she dubbed standard language discourse (SLD), which "reflects and perpetuates standard language ideologies" (p. 133). In other words, this discourse gives the appearance of linguistic debate, but really conserves standard linguistic ideologies and takes ideological discourse for granted (p. 133).

Additionally, Davila (2016) asserts that a blend of discourse and rhetorical analysis is significant in order to examine best practices. She states, "Focusing on language in this way allows me to examine the effects of language within a small sample size, revealing common discursive patterns" (p. 134). One limitation of Davila's study, according to her, is the anonymity of the student authors because writing instructors are typically likely to know the students whose work they are evaluating, and are therefore less likely to be unbiased about the student's background and use of language (p. 135). Davila goes on to challenge the perception of Standard English as normal and non-interfering, stating that it cannot be linguistically unbiased (p. 143).

Ultimately, Davila believes there is value in identifying and examining patterns in order to determine the benefits and shortcomings of standard language ideology (p. 143). Significantly, this research cannot be generalized to apply to all writing instructors. Rather, teachers and students alike can come together to develop an approach that can be applied in classrooms by

shifting the focus of linguistic practices, studies, and assumptions. This includes unlearning previously held notions and biases about language and critically discussing and developing alternative methodologies (Horner et al., 2011, p. 313).

Davila's (2016) conclusions led her to discourage strict standardization and encourage writing instructors and scholars to challenge the supposed "inevitability" of Standard English (p. 143). Moreover, she calls for writing instructors and scholars to actively identify features of Standard English in language, pedagogy, and administration:

> This means naming the standard, being clear about the relationship between language and meaning, making language a focal point, resisting the urge to refer to language use as clear, and not being so quick to assume that SEAE is the language variety used in students' reading materials, homes, or previous schools, or that students simply have an ear for this one language variety. (Davila, 2016, p. 143)

Finally, she suggests that Standard Edited American English should be classified as a dialect and terminology such as language "correctness" should instead be deemed as language "appropriateness" and the labels "conventional" and "unconventional" should be used in place of "correct and "incorrect" (pp. 143-144). This change of attitude demonstrated by the language used would have the benefit of discouraging the inherent biases against all forms of English considered non-standard and therefore make it more accessible for native and nonnative speakers alike.

An alternate stance on Standard English comes from Paul Matsuda who asserts that linguistic homogeneity or Standard English in U.S. college composition courses is a myth, "facilitated by the concomitant policy of linguistic containment that has kept language differences invisible in the required composition course and in the discourse of composition

studies" (p. 642). Matsuda cites Bruce Horner and John Trimbur (2002), who ultimately assert that standardized English is "the only conceivable way of dealing with language issues in composition instruction" (2006, p. 637). Matsuda challenges this, arguing that the U.S. education system has not only accepted Standard English as the norm, but has encouraged it.

Furthermore, few graduate programs offer courses on composition studies for nonnative speakers, and as a result are largely unprepared to meet the needs of NNES who enroll in English composition courses (2006, p. 637). Matsuda (2006) also states, in response to Horner and Trimbur (2002), "Even when language differences are recognized by the teacher, those differences are often contained by sending students to the writing center, where students encounter peer tutors who are even less likely to be prepared to work with language differences than are composition teachers" (2006, p. 642). In order to meet students' needs, curriculum reform would need to be all-encompassing. If a student receives contradicting messages about language, it will likely add to their confusion and lead to unnecessary stress and lack of comprehension or clarity in their language acquisition.

Moreover, while Bruce Horner has been outspoken in his advocacy for a shift towards translingualism, as described in this thesis, there must be standardization as a starting point before further methodologies can be applied or developed. In his later work, Horner et al. (2011), take the stance that the traditionalist approach of Standard English subverts the diversity of language by ultimately asserting that there is a single "correct" English, rendering all other forms of Englishes illegitimate (p. 465). Instead, Horner et al. advocate for a translingual model.

The authors in this section are uniformly vocal about the problematic nature of Standard English because it inherently assumes the position that there is only one correct English, when that simply is not the case. Every English-speaking society has its own accepted form of

Standard English, meaning that there are American, British, Australian, Indian, etc. variations of English that are widely practiced across the globe. Moreover, these societies assert their own linguistic rights through their distinct variations of English.

To accept translingualism does not mean that Standard English must be abolished. Rather, the transfer of linguistic ideas should be encouraged in language and writing classrooms and individual language practices and differences should be acknowledged instead of repressed. Standard English has always served a purpose, but that purpose must be re-evaluated in order to improve writing and language curricula for future generations. The solution is not to eliminate Standard Writing practices, but to adapt them.

### Translingual Studies Analysis

Translingualism is a relatively new methodology, and therefore less fixed than Standard English. It is inherently fluid and encourages language users to embrace their linguistic differences. In regards to writing programs, Horner et al. (2011) assert that, "Advancing a translingual approach requires changes to writing programs in the design of writing curricula and in the hiring, training, and professional development of writing teachers" (p. 309). In order to incite change in the way language and technical writing are approached, the education of said writers, both NESs and NNESs, must be closely studied, developed, and reformed as needed.

Most significantly, writing instructors must address language difference in their teaching, and this must begin with a deeper understanding of the issue and making long-term decisions based on a variety of studies to improve the language education system. This may include collaborations of foreign languages and emphasis on the "problems of translation in teaching writing" (Horner et al, 2011, p. 309). In particular, college and graduate rhetorical and composition programs are in need of reform and must account for the students' linguistic

backgrounds and requirements. A potential solution, according to Horner et al. (2011), is to include more multi- and cross-language work into graduate level curricula (p. 309). The challenge and potential reward of embracing translingualism is a collaboration between students, instructors, and other colleagues to reach a conclusion that is beneficial to all.

Horner et al. (2011) conclude that, although there is no definitive solution to the so-called "English language problem," translingualism is the most promising solution because it allows for the incorporation of various strategies and schools of thought. Unlike monolingual theories, "translingualism teaches language users to assume and expect that each new instance of language use brings the need and opportunity to develop new ways of using language, and to draw on a range of language resources" (p. 472). Ultimately, by encouraging cross-cultural and lingual learning, more people will be likely to learn and retain English rather than being burdened with demands for linguistic perfection. Teachers and writers alike can adopt and learn from a translingual approach by changing the way they perceive and participate in language use and learning from the aforementioned methodologies and studies to determine the best way to educate professional writers to write for an international audience.

Rebecca Lorimer Leonard and Rebecca Nowacek (2016) arrive at a similar conclusion regarding translingualism. They believe that translingualism and the "transfer" of information should be viewed "not as prescribed pedagogies or policies, but as terms with explanatory value: small theories that help open up changing practices in our writing lives" (p. 262). Additionally, they cite Horner et al.'s primarily theoretical compositions on translingualism. Many of the case studies have involved single-writer or single-classroom observations, so further research is required to arrive at a definitive method to be implemented into classrooms. Additionally, this theoretical work would benefit from descriptive examples of the student-subjects' who

participate in these studies. Such limited studies can affect the broader observations of writing institutions. In order to make the relevance of translingualism more apparent, further research is required to increase understanding of linguistic diversity and needs.

　　　Applying the translingual methodology in the classroom in tandem with transfer research could potentially make the application of translingualism more apparent to writing instructors and demonstrate "how writing moves across both time (longitudinal) and space (cross-contextual)" (Lorimer Leonard & Nowacek, 2016, p. 262). In other words, the written word is far-reaching and long-lasting, and therefore must be closely examined as it pertains to international communication. A translingual approach would go beyond the long-held Standard English model and depart from the pedagogies and policies in place. However, this is necessary in order to advance the quality of writing curricula.

　　　Moreover, Dylan Dryer (2016) focuses on the tools used to evaluate students' writing and language skills, including: rubrics, grading scales, scoring bands, scoring guides, and trait descriptors (p. 276). Decades of writing scholarship focus primarily on the writing of native speakers and classified many people as "basic" or "advanced" writers, and the same applies to language classifications, with many ELF users placed into certain levels based on standardized tests they are given. He also suggests that language scales should be revised to review any writing that requires "interpretation" and to make that interpretation more accessible (p. 278). He concludes that teachers could accomplish great things with a work with, rather than against, their students to determine classroom practices and language resources (p. 279).

　　　Additionally, Dryer (2016) suggests that writing "errors" should be addressed differently. While errors have consequences, particularly in professional writing, these errors should be weighed in terms of context on a case-by-case basis (p. 279). This is particularly true in a

classroom setting where students are under pressure to succeed, but the only thing at stake is their own grade and not high-stakes cross-cultural communication. Contemporary cognitive theory suggests that writing performance should be measured by context:

> … de-emphasizing the controlled performance goal of these examinations will reduce unproductive demands on working memory (and thus have the effect of diminishing error anyway), while freeing task memory to develop innovative responses that display the kinds of higher-order analytical tasks sought by tertiary education and the global workforce alike. (Dryer, 2016, p. 279)

Furthermore, if the errors are found to be contextual, it is reasonable to take measures to align local practice with international trends. These proposed measures include revising documents and curricula to account for "rhetorical dexterity" and "communicative resourcefulness" that might otherwise inhibit the NNES students (Dryer, 2016, p. 279). In summary, the process of transfer and translingualism must be a collaboration between instructors, institutions, and the students they serve in order to determine best practices for all involved and make lasting changes.

In response to his study on translingualism, Juan Guerra (2016) proposes "code-meshing" as a potential solution (p. 231). Code-meshing combines local, colloquial, and world dialects and vernacular of English and applies this hybrid to everyday writing and conversation. By embracing the diversity of language and combining a native language or dialect with Standard English, code-meshing creates a means of communicating with a broader international audience. Integrating code-meshing into the classroom would also have the benefit of aiding future studies about translingualism in order to gain understanding and determine best practices.

Through the use of traditional models, instructors have led students to believe that they are expected to produce a specific form of writing that mimics "code-meshing" as opposed to understanding the long-term goals of using the "rhetorical sensibilities" they already possess (Guerra, 2016, pp. 231-232). It can be difficult for students to transition for the traditional model of Standard English in favor of a translingual code-meshing method, but variations of this method should also be considered in regards to change in curricula. Lu and Horner (2013) and state that, rather than making students either conform to Standard English or bear the responsibility of enacting change through code-meshing and translingualism, a change in "orientation" is in order (p. 596). Rather, teachers can ask more "productive" and "valid" questions about the students' work and writing styles (Lu & Horner, 2013, pp. 596–97)

Furthermore, scholarly conversations about adopting a translingual approach in the classroom should not be limited to scholarly conferences, but rather open to debate among writing instructors and the students themselves. Breaking down not only language barriers, but also hierarchical barriers, and engaging in honest discussion about approaches to language difference is the surest way to enact change in the writing classroom. Both NES and NNES students deserve to have their voices heard and the opportunity to influence the curricula in the writing classroom. Consequently, these students will be able to develop their rhetorical and composition skills through access to a variety of linguistic approaches, including translingualism.

### English as Lingua Franca Studies Analysis

Similar to the World Englishes paradigm, English as a lingua franca (ELF) refers to the phenomenon of English emerging as the international language for communication across numerous fields. However, it also refers to the education of students whose first language is not English. ELF students are often vulnerable and lacking in the education diversity and opportunity

of native English speakers. Much like a child discovering language, ELF users are dependent on something or someone to get by, be it another person, online translators, grammar books, or technology. When a person learns a language, he or she goes back to being a child in a way, and it is as though you are seeing the world for the first time. Therefore, it is important to consider their perspective, not only on language, but on all forms of communication. If the language used to communicate with NNESs is elementary, they will view themselves as being talked down to. In contrast, if the language is complex and advanced, they will feel embarrassed and uncomfortable. Writers must let the audience know, through the words they use, that they view NNESs as equals and establish a form of trust with the language used. By doing this, writers and educators can gradually begin to break down the language barriers that divide ELF users.

Llurda (2009) encourages writing and language instructors to account for linguistic and cultural diversity. He suggests they should have personal experience with English language diversity, critically examine language learning and instruction, and reflect on the role of multilingualism and ELF in international communication. By doing this, students will "successfully overcome the paradox of being denied the right to own the language and still love it" (Llurda, 2009, p. 22). This individual "ownership" of language relates to the variable nature of language as described by Leyland (2011, p. 42).

In regards to nonnative English speakers reclaiming their first language while also embracing and loving the new one (in this case, English), this process must begin in the classroom. Linguists Paul and Aya Matsuda (2011) stress the need for higher level writing courses to equip students, who will eventually go onto the workforce, to write for a global audience and from a global perspective (p. 172). In their study of numerous technical communication textbooks, the Matsudas (2011) found that the representation of international

technical communication is, unfortunately, limited (p. 187). These textbooks tend to emphasize respecting cultural differences, yet in regards to linguistic diversity these same texts often take a "hierarchical stance in which technical communicators are encouraged to help nonnative English speakers" (p. 188). Moreover, language differences are classified as "deficiencies" and support for nonnative users and linguistic adaptation is minimal in technical writing textbooks. Methodologies that emphasize the need for linguistic diversity and functional variety, notably World Englishes, ELF and translingualism, are either not touched or otherwise briefly analyzed (p. 188).

Despite these shortcomings, there are increasing numbers of technical writers who are nonnative English users who utilize their own linguistic resources for effective communication with an international audience and students in technical writing and communication courses have more options than ever before beyond monolingual NESs. In fact, there are many institutions that require science and engineering students who are nonnative English speakers to take technical communication or English as a second language courses (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2011, p. 188). Although many technical communication textbooks, courses, and instructors do not include alternative linguistic methods to the extent they arguably should, there are more language acquisition opportunities than ever before. There is an increasing demand to include international and multilingual perspectives in communication and writing classrooms across the globe.

While college composition courses and textbooks are an excellent means of education, there is room for improvement. In particular, there is a need to recognize the diversity of the student population, both domestically and internationally. Moreover, language scholars and instructors must go beyond celebrating diversity and actively include students in the conversation about language and communication and the application of alternate methodologies. Their own

instructional and technical rhetoric must also change in order to represent their students and broader audience. By changing their approach to rhetorical and composition difference, writing instructors can achieve a more thorough understanding of their students, and consequently improve technical writing education and practices.

### World Englishes Studies Analysis

World Englishes is another potential solution to improve the training of native English-speaking technical writing students that nicely compliments the literature on translingualism and English as lingua franca. In his study on World Englishes, Michael Bokor (2011) notes that assuming Standard English as the norm and identifying cultural and linguistic differences as "problems" to be overcome is harmful. For instance, if there is a communication failure between the native and nonnative speakers, international audience adaptation must be applied to address linguistic barriers. Additionally, Bokor (2011) asserts that linguistic "appropriateness" is relative because it stems from awareness of different linguistic and cultural habits, which in turn affects people's written and verbal rhetoric (p. 220). Other factors must be accounted for, including the cultural and social characteristics of the language users, and this should be factored into technical writing and communication discourse.

Bokor (2011) collected text-based data over the course of a school year for the purpose of his study using various assignments including "audience analysis reports, technical documents, journals, and end-of-semester analytical essays." He also collected data from his own journal, interviews, and participant observations (p. 220). Bokor concluded from his findings that exposure to the World Englishes paradigm had a positive effect on the participants and challenged their understanding of native and nonnative English speakers, including themselves (p. 234). Additionally, examining how the English language affects technical discourse

adaptation for an international audience allowed the students to connect with the nonnative

speakers and gain a heightened understanding of their sociocultural environment and linguistic

habits. Moreover, this exercise equipped students with standards for determining rhetorical

appropriateness and effectiveness in cross-cultural communication (p. 234).

While the study was limited due to the small number of participants and the course being

an introductory technical writing course, it does provide insight into the benefits of using the

World English model in classrooms, as well as potential setbacks. For example, the course "did

not explore deep-level theories on language and culture or corporate practices in ITC and the

challenges of the technical documentation processes in industry" (Bokor, 2011, p. 235). A

particularly significant limitation is that the students were unable to observe real technical

documents written by or for nonnative speakers, and therefore they could not provide an in-depth

analysis of rhetorical and compositional issues (p. 235). In short, this study is not all-

encompassing or complete. However, Bokor's findings can be generally observed and used to

inform future studies on this subject.

Bokor's findings indicate significant pedagogical problems that need to be addressed in

order to help students flourish in their use of English in international-audience adaptation. The

World Englishes paradigm is one potential lens that can be used to observe linguistic diversity

and theoretical frameworks (Bokor, 2011, p. 235). Ultimately, Bokor (2011) asserts that scholars

and instructors must develop multiple pedagogical approaches to language acquisition and

cultural and linguistic analysis in order to meet individual students' needs (p. 235). Furthermore,

additional research must be conducted to determine how and what extent the World Englishes

paradigm affects professional writing transactions between nonnative speakers. Additional

discussion about technical discourse is also needed in order to raise awareness for international audience adaptation.

In relation, Christopher Leyland's study of World Englishes in conversation between two NNESs provides insight into an often-neglected aspect of world language study. The findings of this study infer that ELF and WE interactions do not require standardization in order to be intelligible (Leyland, 2011, p. 42). Rather, standardization was found to be more likely to hinder the flow of conversation. In order to have a successful interaction between two NNESs, there must be a negotiation where the subjects arrive at a mutual conclusion of the best discourse strategy for them as well as "appropriate grammatical, phonological, and lexical range between participants" (Leyland, 2011, p. 42). Because discourse is so varied and personal, there are infinite forms of WE and ELF, making standardization nearly impossible. Taking these numerous independent variables into account, codification or code-meshing is a more effective means of communication, but ultimately every individual has different linguistic needs, experiences, strengths, and shortcomings, which makes communication almost entirely variable.

## The Writing Classroom

In the future, the complexity and multiplicity of technical global communication must be made a priority in classrooms and workplaces. As U.S. college composition instructors and scholars continue to contribute to the international discourse of writing studies, they must rise to meet the demands of an increasingly global world. As Paul and Aya Matsuda (2011) describe it, the goal should be to "reimagine students in the writing classroom as citizens of the world" (p. 189). Integrating global perspectives in technical writing classrooms is pivotal for the evolution of the English language and its users. In order to advance, technical communicators must go

beyond accepting multilingual students and bring them into the conversation. Only then can English as a lingua franca discourse flourish and affect change on a global scale.

Standard English is essential to communication, and in particular to English education. If there was no standard language, there would never be a way of determining what is and is not correct, and a universally comprehensible English would not be achievable. However, the rigid rules and inherent superiority of Standard English and the attitudes surrounding it are a potential hindrance to aspiring writers, both native and nonnative. Therefore, the current writing curricula needs to be examined and evaluated, not eradicated. By moving beyond the established, standard practices, writers and nonnative English users can reach new, previously unexplored potentials.

Translingualism offers a solution to this linguistic repression. The transfer of information between people is the heart of communication, but it is also infinitely variable because every single English speaker is distinct in their use of language. As evidenced in Leyland's (2011) study, standardization is not essential for mutual comprehension and exchange of ideas. There should be standard grammatical structure in writing, but the emphasis for students should be placed on the communication and comprehension of information.

One means of overcoming language barriers is by painting native and nonnative students in groups. Matsuda and Matsuda (2011) note, "Most collaborative groups in industry and in the classroom include people from other cultures. The challenge for all group members is to understand the ways in which cultural differences can affect group behavior" (p 182). This communication and transfer of ideas between students can potentially challenge the students' previously held notions of language and cultural differences.

The underlying assumption in most writing courses and textbooks is that technical communicators are not just native English speakers, but monolingual native English speakers

(Matsuda & Matsuda, 2011, p. 183). Once this notion is challenged and native speakers are confronted with nonnative users, they will learn to subtly adapt their language use and be able to determine best practices for future interactions through practical application. Additionally, the nonnative students will be challenged to interact with the native speakers free from judgment if the pressure to perform to "standard" is not enforced to its previous extent. Through extensive study, trial, and error, new variations of English will be revealed and identified, and writing instructors can use these observations to strengthen their curricula and determine best language acquisition practices.

Another way to approach technical writing is by using World and Global Englishes. In other words, adapting the use of language based on the intended audience. For every native English speaker, there are at least three nonnative speakers, depending on the demographics the author is writing for. This means that there will always be a sizable portion of any audience who speak a hybrid, "code-meshing" English that may incorporate some aspects of their native language or be influenced by a range of external factors such as education, advertising, and media.

It is significant for written communication to reach as many people as possible. On the whole, the most effective writing consists of short, simple sentences with basic vocabulary and no idiomatic expressions or colloquialisms. If, for example, a writer is targeting a specific audience or promoting a local brand or issue, colloquial jargon or references may be imperative. In such instances, the expressions should be vetted for global readiness or, better yet, adapted to layman's terms (Golota, 2019). In addition to language, the most significant factor of written communication is the target audience. Matsuda and Matsuda (2011) identify the international audience and place them into two distinct categories:

The first category includes people (i.e., clients, audience) from other countries with

whom technical communicators interact as they work with companies and government

agencies from other countries. The other category includes colleagues and coworkers that

technical communicators encounter as a result of international mergers of companies. (p.

184)

Technical communicators should learn as much about these categories and their target audience

as possible, including their culture. This particular transfer begins in the technical writing

classroom between native and nonnative English speakers.

Matsuda and Matsuda (2011) discuss the simplification of written language as one means

of communicating with nonnative speakers on a broader scale. Many textbooks offer strategies

for simplifying English, such as "using imperatives, avoiding idioms, colloquialisms, and slang,

and using short simple sentences structures and vocabulary" (p. 186). Moreover, terminology

and vocabulary should be consistent for the sake of comprehension. As previously stated, some

standardization is necessary, and in the process of cross-cultural communication it is imperative

that the writing is clear and concise as possible. According to technical writer and

communication coordinator Hanna Golota (2019), a consistent voice and tense should be

maintained whenever applicable in order to avoid unnecessary confusion. However, while these

strategies are generally useful for written communication, too much simplification can

potentially amplify the issue.  If nonnative speakers are not challenged, they will not be able to

reach their full linguistic potential.

Therefore, embracing English as a lingua franca is a necessary step towards English

language acquisition. ELF is remarkable in that it has the unique distinction among lingua

francas to be the international language of the digital age. This means that English is reaching

more people than any other language in history. In particular, much of this digital age English is written or computer-mediated. Generally, ELF communication is based on function rather than form. In other words, it is about communication efficiency rather than correctness, and as a consequence, ELF interactions are often a hybrid or "code-switching" of languages.

Just as ELF calls for code-switching of languages, I propose a hybrid of language acquisition methodologies in the writing classroom. While technical communication textbooks often focus on one method or another, language learning is ultimately an exchange or "transfer" of information between the students and their instructor. Due to this pivotal step of transferring knowledge, I conclude that translingualism is the key to potentially solving the linguistic dichotomy between native and nonnative English speakers. By taking the most relevant aspects of language and acknowledging the fluidity between language in conjunction with the structure of Standard English, the function of ELF and the contextual analysis of World Englishes, technical writers can operate across linguistic barriers. Ultimately, the goal of the translingual writer should be to use their language across various contexts and for specific purposes to engage a wide, multicultural audience.

## Chapter V: Conclusion

Language and communication have a long, complex history. In the Beginning, God created a single common tongue for men to communicate and sing His praises with. After the fall and the flood, "... the whole earth had one language and the same words" (Genesis 11:1 ESV). Since the dawn of time, language has been equated with knowledge. It is not only how people communicate, but how they express, grow, and learn. While the perfection the people of who built the Tower of Babel sought was an unattainable and sinful goal, the new linguistic covenant with God offers not only diversity of language, but also diversity of thought. Language is no longer an act of rebellion, but one of celebration. 1 Corinthians 14:10 proclaims, "There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning" (ESV). This reinforces that language is infinitely varied, but every tongue matters equally to the Creator. There are as many languages as there are language users in the world, because everyone speaks their own unique form of their language. In order to communicate with one another, language users need to embrace the multiplicity and diversity of English and other languages.

The purpose of this study is to benefit the academic community and technical writers in the workplace by identifying the ways that English is taught and used and how this translates to how writers write and readers interpret the material. While all writing is subject to interpretation, there are means of communicating information and intention that will reach both native and nonnative speakers alike. There are no limits to language, and therefore there cannot be a single form of a language or definitive method of instruction or acquisition. I conclude that there is a need for some standardization in English education and composition, but instructors must account for the innumerable variables that may present themselves in the writing classroom.

Technical communication in the United States is typically characterized by a monolingual native English Speaker writing for his or her international audience of mostly nonnative English speakers who require cultural and linguistic adaptation. However, with so many NNESs in the United States and abroad and an innumerable number of dialects and World Englishes spoken, these linguistic accommodations are becoming increasingly difficult for technical communicators. Although there is an increasingly diverse population of students on U.S. college campuses, including many NNESs, they are more often than not classified as a linguistic and cultural "Other" and fill the roles of roles of collaborators or colleagues rather than technical communicators themselves (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2011, p. 187). In order to address this issue, academics and technical writers must come together to determine the best means for language acquisition and global technical communication.

A commonality among the scholars featured in this thesis is the call not to eradicate Standard English practices, but to move beyond them. Language is ultimately too diverse and varied to be restrained by a single "official" form. Rather, Standard English should be acknowledged as a dialect, as proposed by Bethany Davila (2016, p. 144). Ultimately, a hybrid of Standard English, translingualism, the World Englishes paradigm, and EFL is needed in language and writing classrooms in order to allow language users to play an active role in developing language and encourage not only diversity of language, but also diversity of thought.

In summary, Standard English, translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and World Englishes are all related yet distinct in the way they are applied in linguistic education across the globe. Some language users desire the fixed, structured Standard English, while others favor the more fluid, organic approach to language acquisition that translingualism offers. However, there is no majority consensus as to which methodology, if any, is definitive, nor is there a set path to

achieve this goal. Over the years, there have been numerous proposals for ways to make International English more accessible to a global audience. Most commonly, there have been proposals for English as a lingua franca education, which allows nonnative speakers to take an active role not only in learning and using language, but in developing it as well. While standard rhetorical and composition rules are needed for a language to be comprehended and to communicate meaning, it is only one facet of a vast linguistic web.

Language is an endlessly complex, organic subject that ultimately cannot be classified into a particular box. However, it can be coded, studied, and standardized to an extent. In order to teach a subject across cultures and professions, some level of standardization is necessary. However, the multiplicity and independent variables must be accounted for through the application of translingualism, English as a lingua franca, and the World Englishes paradigm. The latter methods provide NNESs opportunities to reclaim their own language and inform the language acquisition process. While the studies featured in this thesis do not reach a unified conclusion, they all open the door to further research. In order to determine the best methods for teaching English as a lingua franca, there must be conversation between scholars, instructors, technical writers, and students to reach a consensus.

Ultimately, there are many methods and strategies for learning languages and applying those practices to professional writing. However, translingualism is the only method that advocates for both the preservation of language and the fluidity of it. Understanding someone else's language, no matter how similar or different it may be, is central to understanding that person as well. Whether teachers are instructing NES, ELF, or ESL students, language is central to communication and comprehension, and it is therefore essential that the acquisition of language should consider the differences in an individual's linguistic abilities and potential. By

embracing this approach and confronting the realities of language fluidity and adaptability, individual writers and educators can gradually change the foundation of language acquisition and communication for future generations.

References

Al-Tarawneh, M. Q. (2014). A trendy and multi-dialectal English: A descriptive review of

changes and current status. *International Journal of English Language and Translation

Studies, 2*(3), 1-13. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15948.

Bertrand, P. (2017, July 12). 5 million immigrants granted US citizenship can't speak English.

Retrieved from

https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/5-million-immigrants-granted-us-citizenship-cant-

speak-english

Bokor, M. (2011). Connecting with the "other" in technical communication: world

Englishes and ethos transformation of U.S. native English-speaking students.

*Technical Communication Quarterly*, *20*(2), 208-237.

doi:10.1080/10572252.2011.551503.

Bokor, M. (Dec. 2011). Moving international technical communication forward: A world

Englishes approach. *Journal of Technical Writing & Communication*, *41*(2),

113-138. doi:10.2190/TW.41.2.b.

Bolton, K. (2015). Yamuna Kachru and world Englishes. *World Englishes, 34*(1), 37-44.

https://doi-org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/10.1111/weng.12115

Brady, A. & José, L. (2009). Writing for an international audience in a US technical

communication classroom: Developing competences to communicate knowledge across

cultures. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *8*(1), 41–60. DOI:

http://doi.org/10.35360/njes.182

British Council. (2019). The English effect: The impact of English, what it's worth to the UK

and why it matters to the world. *The British Council*.

https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/english-effect-report-v2.pdf

Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*,

3-18. DOI:10.1017/S026719051300007X

Davila, B. (2016) "The inevitability of "standard English:" discursive constructions of standard

language ideologies. *Written Communication*, *33*(2), 127-148.

https://www.defendandpublish.com/v2/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/2.06_The-

Inevitability-of-Standard-English.pdf

Dryer, D. B. (2016). Appraising translingualism. *College English*, *78*(3), 274-283.

https://search-proquest-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/docview/1750722564/fulltextPDF/FBB8CA748EE14EE6PQ/1?

accountid=12085

Education Commission of the United States. (2013). English language learners. *The Progress of*

*Education Reform, 14*(6), 1-7. Retrieved from

http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/10/20/11020.pdf

Ellis, E. (2006). Monolingualism: The unmarked case. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 7*(2), 173-96.

DOI: 10.1558/sols.v7i2.173

Golota, H. (2019). Writing for a global audience - 25 dos and don'ts. *Globalme language and*

*technology.*

https://www.globalme.net/blog/writing-for-a-global-audience-25-dos-and-donts/

Gramling, D. and Wiggin, B. (2018). The fall, or rise, of monolingualism?. *German*

*Studies Review, 41*(3), 457-462. https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.liberty.edu/article/707205

Guerra, J. C. (January 2016). Cultivating a rhetorical sensibility in the translingual writing

classroom. *College English*, *78*(3), 228-233.

http://ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CE/0783-jan2016/CE0783Cultivati

ng.pdf

Hinkle, E. (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2).

New York, NY: Routledge.

Horner, B., & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *English

Language and Literature Commons*, *53*(4), 594-630.

hp://ir.library.louisville.edu/faculty/89

Horner, B., Lu, M., Royster, J. L., & Trimbur, J. (2011). Opinion: language difference in writing:

toward a translingual approach. In *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing* (7th ed.)

(pp. 463-480). New York, NY: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Horner, B., Ayash, N. B., Kilfoil, C., NeCamp, S., Nordquist, B., Sohan, V. K. (2011). Global

Englishes and language difference. *WPA-CompPile Research Bibliographies, 17*.

http://comppile.org/wpa/bibliographies/Bib17/GlobalEnglishes.pdf

Horner, B., NeCamp, S., & Donahue, C. (Dec. 2011). Toward a multilingual

composition scholarship: from English only to a translingual norm. *English Language

and Literature Commons, 63*(2), 269-300.

https://ir.library.louisville.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1071&context=faculty

Hu, G. W. (2012). Assessing English as an international language. In L. Alsagoff, S. L. McKay,

G. W. Hu & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an

international language* (pp. 123-143). New York: Routledge.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234119866_Assessing_English_as_an_internati

onal_language

Hülmbauer, C., Böhringer, H., Seidlhofer, B. (2008). Introducing English as a lingua franca

(ELF): precursor and partner in international communication. *Synergies Europe, 3*, 25-36.

https://www.gerflint.fr/Base/Europe3/hulmbauer.pdf

Kirpatrick, E., Gaisford, W., Williams, E., Bridley, E., Tembo, D., & Wright, D. (2017).

Understanding plain English summaries. A comparison of two approaches to improve the

quality of plain English summaries in research reports. *Research Involvement and

Engagement, 3*(17), 1-14. DOI 10.1186/s40900-017-0064-0

Leyland, C. (2011). For mutual intelligibility, must English as a lingua franca be

standardized?. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences*, *8*,

25-45. https://research.ncl.ac.uk/media/sites/researchwebsites/arecls/leyland_vol8.pdf

Llurda, E. (2009). Attitudes towards English as an international language: the pervasiveness of

native models among L2 users and teachers. In Sharifian, F. (Ed.), *English as an

International Language. Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues* (pp. 1-29). Clevedon:

Multilingual Matters. DOI: 10.21832/9781847691231-009

Lorimer, R. L., & Nowacek, R. (January 2016). Transfer and translingualism. *College

English*, *78*(3), 258-264. http://ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CE/0783-

jan2016/CE0783Transfer.pdf

Lorimer Leonard, R. (2014). Multilingual writing as rhetorical attunement. *College English

76*(3), 227–47.

https://secure.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CE/0763-jan1014/CE0763

Multi.pdf

Lu, M. and Horner, B. (2013). Translingual literacy, language difference, and matters of

agency. *College English*, *75*(6), 582–607.

https://ir.library.louisville.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1064&context=faculty#:~:text

=By%20foregrounding%20the%20mutual%20interdependence,to%20others%20and%20 the%20world.

Matsuda, A. and Matsuda, P. K. (2011). Globalizing writing studies: The case of U.S. technical communication textbooks. *Written Communication, 28* (2), 172-192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088311399708.

Matsuda, P. K. (2014). The lure of translingual writing. *PMLA 129*(3), 478–83. https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2014.129.3.478

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English*, *68*(6), 637-651. doi:10.2307/25472180

Matsumoto, Y. (2011). Successful ELF communications and implications for ELT: Sequential analysis of ELF pronunciation negotiation strategies. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 97-114. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01172.x

Paltridge, B & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The handbook of English for specific purposes*. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Roth, T. (2018). 5 tips to improve technical writing for an international audience. *Linux*, The Linux Foundation, Web. https://www.linux.com/blog/event/open-source-summit-eu/2017/12/technical-writing-inte rnational-audience.

Saraceni, M. (2008). English as a lingua franca. Between form and function. *English Today 94*, *24*(2), 20-26. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078408000163.

Schmitz, J. R. (2014). Looking under Kachru's (1982, 1985) three circles model of world Englishes: the hidden reality and current challenges. *RBLA, Belo Horizonte, 14*(2), 373-411.  http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S1984-63982014005000010

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). Key concepts in ELT: English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal, 59*(4),

    339-341. doi:10.1093/elt/cci06

Sharifian, F., Holliday, A., Ali, S., Modiano, M., Li, D.C.S., Llurda, E., Petric, B., Ramanathan,

    V., Morgan, B., Matsuda, A., Khan, S. Z., Roberts, P., Canagarajah, S., McKay, S.L.,

    Kirpatrick, A., Anchimbe, E.A. (2009). *English as an international language:*

    *Perspectives and pedagogical issues.* Tonawanda, NY: UTP.

Sharma, B. K. (2008). World Englishes, English as a lingua franca, and English pedagogy.

    *Journal of NELTA, 13*(1-2), 121-130.

    https://www.academia.edu/5677165/Pedagogy_for_English?email_work_card=thumbnail

Sifakis, N. C. (2006). Teaching EIL – teaching international or intercultural English: What

    teachers should know. In Rani Rubdy & Mario Saraceni (Eds.), *English in the World:*

    *Global Rules, Global Roles*. London and New York: Continuum, pp. 151-168.

Thrush, E. A. (2001). Plain English? A study of plain English vocabulary and international

    audiences. *Technical Communication*, *48*(3), 289-296.

    bi.galegroup.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/global/article/GALE%7CA77497899?u=vic_

    liberty&sid=summon.

Topkaraoglu, M. & Dílman, H. (2017). ELF awareness in English language education.

    *International Journal of Language Academy*, *5*, 39-58. DOI:

    http://dx.doi.org/10.18033/ijla.3618

Warren, T. (2005). The elements of international English style: A guide to writing

    correspondence, reports, technical documents, and internet pages for a global

    audience. *Technical Communication*, *52*(4), 478.

http://ezproxy.liberty.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-

com.ezproxy.liberty.edu/docv

iew/220997773?accountid=12085.