Critical Inquiry in Language Studies

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

'English is a mish mash of everything': examining the language attitudes and teaching beliefs of British-Asian multilingual teachers

Journal:	*Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*
Manuscript ID	HCIL-2018-0005.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Language ideology, Language attitudes, Multilingualism, English language varieties

Abstract:	This paper reports on a qualitative investigation of the language attitudes of multilingual British-South-Asian English language teachers. Data is drawn from both interviews and focus groups to demonstrate the participants underlying conception of language and their awareness and attitudes towards Indian English and how they coalesce their 'duty' as English language teachers and their beliefs about language variation. The paper observes underlying differences in the attitudes of first and second-generation migrants and argues that this is related to their early experiences of English language variation and their exposure to either single or dual language ideologies. Therefore, the paper supports other research that attitudes related to 'correct' language is ingrained in childhood experiences. It is also argued that changes are required in current teacher training to raise awareness of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca to equip teachers with the necessary skills to respond to a new global linguistic landscape.

‘English is a mish mash of everything’: examining the language attitudes and teaching beliefs of British-Asian multilingual teachers

Robert Weekly

AB234B
199 Taikang East Road
The University of Nottingham Ningbo
Ningbo
315100
China

Rj.weekly42@gmail.com

ORCID identifier: 0000-0002-2929-1951

Research conducted at the University of Southampton

Abstract: This paper reports on a qualitative investigation of the language attitudes of multilingual British-South-Asian English language teachers. Data is drawn from both interviews and focus groups to demonstrate the participants underlying conception of language and their awareness and attitudes towards Indian English and how they coalesce their 'duty' as English language teachers and their beliefs about language variation. The paper observes underlying differences in the attitudes of first and second-generation migrants and argues that this is related to their early experiences of English language variation and their exposure to either single or dual language ideologies. Therefore, the paper supports other research that attitudes related to 'correct' language is ingrained in childhood experiences. It is also argued that changes are required in current teacher training to raise awareness of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca to equip teachers with the necessary skills to respond to a new global linguistic landscape.

Keywords: Language attitudes, Language ideologies, Multilingualism, Varieties of English.

Introduction

Numerous studies have examined the attitudes of English language users towards multilingual varieties of English including He and Miller (2011), McKenzie (2008), Rivers (2011), Sasayama (2013), Saxena and Omoniyi (2010), Scales, Wennerstrom, Richard and Wu (2006) and Zhang (2013). These studies have tended to find negative evaluations of multilingual English varieties, and a preference for 'native' varieties such as American (AmE) and British (BrE) English. However other studies indicate a more positive attitude towards multilingual varieties of English such as Bernaisch's (2012) study in Sri Lanka, and Chand's (2009) and Sahgal's (1991) studies in India, which may be related to the extent that English has become nativized in the local context (Schneider, 2007). There is also a growing body of literature that examine English language teachers' attitudes (Ahn, 2014, 2015; Jenkins, 2007; McDonald & McRae, 2010; Sadtono, 2000; Sifakis & Sougari, 2006; Young & Walsh, 2010), and again there is a tendency for teachers to show an underlying preference for 'native' varieties of English, albeit with a recognition that these are not representative of how English is spoken in many contexts. This study hopes to contribute to this growing area of research by examining the language attitudes of multilingual English language teachers, who have English as one of their first languages.

Ontologies of language variation in World Englishes research have seen a corresponding development in the two related research areas of language ideologies and multilingualism. Language ideologies research has highlighted the ways in which the organizational structures of society normalise views about language and perpetuate language hierarchies (Blommaert, 1999; Cooke & Simpson, 2012). Language attitudes do not exist in a vacuum but are situated in a social context and are shaped, managed, controlled and influenced by socio-economic power relations and interests (Blackledge, 2005; Gal, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004; McGroaty, 2010). Normalised beliefs are formed in mainstream education and maintained through

societal structures that situate languages as separate units of analysis. This conception of parallel monolingualism (Heller, 1999) or separate bilingualism (Creese & Blackledge, 2011), sits in contrast with Cook's (1996; 2007) notion of multicompetence, in which Cook has demonstrated that bilinguals and multilinguals have one integrated language system. This recognition and reformulation of bilingualism and multilingualism has led to a plethora of new terms to capture the dynamic nature of multilingual speakers' linguistic repertoire, including translanguaging (García, 2009; García & Wei, 2014).

Therefore, multilingual English language teachers are confronted with an array of sometimes conflicting and contradictory language ideologies in different contexts that position languages as both fixed and mobile, bounded and de-territorialized (Blommaert, 2010). Drawing on their own experience the teachers in this study have exposure to and contact with language diversity through their family, friends, the local community, and through transnational communities. At the same time, the teachers are influenced by a standard language ideology in the social environment, and by their profession as English language teachers, whose job it is to teach standard English as a fixed stable code. This paper brings together three interrelated research fields of language ideologies, multilingualism and World Englishes to understand these teachers' language attitudes.

There are two aims to this study: (a) to further contribute to the existing knowledge of multilingual English language teachers' attitudes towards multilingual varieties of English and (b) to develop an understanding of how different language ideologies influence multilingual English language teachers' attitudes.

Theoretical Framework

Language Ideologies

Arguably the most prevalent language ideology in many countries is a standard one, which is considered the most prestigious variety, and situated at the top of the language hierarchy

(Bourdieu, 1991; Kroskrity, 2004; Milroy & Milroy, 2012). Speech which deviates from the standard language is given limited status as a dialect-or variety derived from 'the norm' (Edwards, 2004; Milroy & Milroy, 2012). Moreover, the almost exclusive focus on the standard language tends to obscure the existence of other languages in the public sphere, contributing to the formation of a monolingual mindset in many countries (Clyne, 2008). This has the effect of legitimising language discrimination, which acts as a proxy for racial and ethnic discrimination (Blackledge, 2000; Ellis, 2006). Therefore while democratic multilingual societies tolerate heterogeneity in several aspects, Blackledge (2000) argues that linguistic diversity is ignored or undervalued.

This monolingual mindset also contributes to the underlying belief that proficiency in many languages is an exception, problematic or transitory, and that the standard language can be effortlessly acquired by dialectal speakers of the language (Milroy & Milroy, 2012). Consequently ESL provision in most schools is usually only extended to the point where children have sufficient English to integrate (Blackledge, 2000). Although the monolingual fallacy and standard language ideologies have been extensively questioned by linguists, these ideologies are still prevalent in language policies, language teaching practices and language tests, which have been designed predominantly by monolingual speakers (Blackledge, 2000; Ellis, 2006; Ndhlovu, 2015).

Recently, however, critical ontologies have destabilised notions of language, and consequently previously held conceptions of multilingualism and practices, such as codeswitching, have been questioned (García & Wei, 2014; Li, 2017; Makoni & Pennycook, 2007; 2012). García and Wei (2014) argue that the discursive practices of multilingual speakers should be reconceptualised as translanguaging, which they define as the "original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be assigned to one or other language repertoire" (p. 22). Spoken discourse therefore should not be viewed as an object enshrined in

dictionaries, grammar books or language academies but primarily as a system of communication. It has been argued that instead of analysing languages, linguists should focus on 'voice' (Blommaert, 2010), 'linguistic or verbal repertoires' (Blackledge & Creese, 2010; Busch, 2012) and 'language practices' (Heller, 2007). In many multilingual societies, the belief of language as a discursive practice is perhaps accepted as normal and it is observable in their attitudes and practices (Canagarajah, 2013; Makoni & Pennycook, 2012). This attempt to re-conceptualise language in current western discourse is a consequence of the 're-creation' of multilingual communities in western societies through migration, despite these practices always being present 'on the ground' in Europe (Canagarajah, 2013).

Canagarajah (2013) further argues that attitudes towards multilingualism, in some countries, sustain the conditions for, what he terms, translingual practices. Pollock (2006), for example, has identified differences in discourses between pre-modern Europe and pre-colonial South-Asia which may indicate reasons why there are existing differences between the language attitudes of the people who live in these regions. The discourses suggest that pre-colonial South-Asian peoples' attitudes towards multilingualism were more accepting than in pre-modern Europe. Perhaps this could partly explain why a standard language ideology was able to become prevalent in 18th and 19th century Europe: because it was commensurate with existing ideologies about language in pre-modern Europe. These competing ideologies in South-Asia appear to be evident in Chand's (2009) extensive study of attitudes to Indian English (IE), with the Indian participants' negotiating between a standard language ideology, and one more attuned to what could be termed a translingual practices ideology.

Therefore, the research in ideologies suggest that the environment and context in which an English language teacher grew up in, and currently operates in, would have a significant impact on their language attitudes. However, it is also important to recognise that teachers'

attitudes may change when they are influenced by various factors, one of which could be the adaptations to the existing ideologies in society.

Teachers' Language Attitudes

Definitions of attitudes predominantly specify that they are an evaluation of an object (Maio & Haddock, 2009), and in respect to language attitudinal research the object could relate to a language, a phonetic feature or a single lexical item. However, the reality is that it is questionable whether individual language items can be isolated from other language features and the socio-political context in which languages exists. Moreover, attitudes to a language cannot easily be separated from the speakers and in some respects are formed not only from their first-hand experience of language use, but also in the collective imagination of stereotypes (Garrett, 2010; Garrett, Coupland & Williams, 2003; Niedzielski & Preston, 2009).

It is also necessary to consider teachers' beliefs (Borg, 2006; Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver & Thwaite, 2001; Woods, 1996) and the influence these beliefs have on teachers' pedagogical practices (Borg, 1998; Farrell, 2008; Pajares, 1992). Language teachers' beliefs are influenced by several interrelated factors including personal experiences, experience of schooling and formal knowledge (Richardson, 1996), their own language learning experience, teacher education, reflections on their own practices (Tsui, 2003; Zheng, 2009), and the workplace culture (Sato & Kleinsasser, 2004). Trujillo (1996, 2005) and Razfar (2012), have argued that the connection between beliefs, attitudes and practices, which are enacted through, and are products of the social structure that these beliefs inhabit, constitute teaching ideologies. Therefore, teachers' language attitudes and teaching beliefs must be seen in relation to power dynamics, values, norms and expectations of the wider society. In some respects, with training which stress the importance of accuracy and concepts such as

interlanguage and fossilization (Dewey, 2012; Nelson, 2011), language teachers may be more inclined towards accepting a standard language ideology than other teachers.

Studies, which have examined teacher training with an SLA component, have tended to indicate that teachers' beliefs about language teaching modifies, with teachers' incorporating what they have learnt with their current teaching practices and their own language learning experience (Busch, 2010; Erlam, 2008; MacDonald, Badger & White, 2001; Markham, Rice, Darban & Weng, 2017). While these studies do not specifically address how this new knowledge influences language attitudes, fossilization in Busch's (2010) study appears to have a consolidating function for the teacher's existing beliefs. Three teachers noted that the failure to correct students could result in fossilization, and some participants commented that learning in an English-speaking country may prevent fossilization. One participant commented that 'learning about fossilization taught me that people just won't absorb a language if not helped and challenged with it' (Busch, 2010, p. 331). Furthermore, the importance given to interlanguage is evident on the undergraduate course in Macdonald et al's (2001) study, with four of the nine modules including interlanguage in their title. Although these concepts have been challenged in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Ortega, 2013, 2014) fossilization and interlanguage retain an explanatory function by teachers for students 'non-native' like performance, especially among experienced teachers. Moreover as May (2014, p. 2) notes traditional SLA researchers and the TESOL industry "remain, to this day, largely untouched, uninterested, and unperturbed" by developments in multilingual research. This is perhaps because variability is more difficult to explain conceptually, and, perhaps more significantly, difficult to teach.

As noted above there have been a few studies of English language teachers' attitudes, and although there is a continued deference towards American (AmE) and British (BrE) English, the teachers also indicate that multilingual varieties of English also have value. For example

McDonald & McRae (2010) in a study of four teachers' language attitudes towards Konglish, which the authors define as English loan words and English words mixed with Korean and both used in a Korean context, found slightly contradictory beliefs. Despite recognising language variability in English and observing that the native speaker concept in ELT is outdated they still correct Konglish in the classroom and believe it would inhibit communication outside of Korea. Similarly the teachers' in Ahn's (2014) study of attitudes towards Korean English, a formal variety spoken by educated Koreans with observed lexico-grammatical and pragmatic features, assert that AmE is preferable in the classroom. However the teachers' also state that Korean English is a "practical" and " useful" communicative tool and "had the potential to become a legitimate variety of English" (Ahn, 2014, p. 214). The teachers also held negative attitudes towards other Asian varieties of English spoken in Singapore, Japan, China and India which they consider "problematic" and "strange" (Ahn, 2015, p. 145). Sifakis and Sougari (2006) examining Greek teacher's attitudes towards pronunciation found that they also orientate towards 'the norm' in the classroom as a context to prepare students for standardised tests. However, although the teachers associate a good accent with a native accent, they also recognise that for communication purposes mutual intelligibility was crucial, and this does not necessarily entail conforming to a native variety. The teachers from a number of expanding circle countries in Jenkins' study (2007) also tend to defer to native varieties of English. However most of the participants are also in principle open to the conceptual notion of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), while noting the barriers to enable this to be implemented in a classroom context due to teaching materials and testing standards. Young and Walsh (2010) also, examine the beliefs of English language teachers predominantly from the outer circle, which corroborated Jenkins' findings: that the teachers orientated towards a standard English variety despite acknowledging that "it does not really correspond to the reality of Englishes which are in use worldwide" (p. 135).

Therefore, although the teachers in these studies tend to orientate primarily towards Standard English or AmE and BrE, there is some indication that the teachers recognise these labels are unable to fully encapsulate English usage. Jenkins (2006, 2014) (Table 1) highlights different orientations towards English and implies that an English as Foreign Language (EFL) orientation is inclined towards a standard language ideology which position languages as fixed and stable, while an ELF orientation is situated in an ideology that considers language as a social practice (Seidlhofer, 2011). These different orientations are evident in the above studies of English teachers' attitudes, and can be seen as continuum with teachers negotiating between different ideological orientations depending on contextual conditions, their linguistic backgrounds and identity positioning.

[Insert Table 1]

Research of attitudes in World Englishes have tended to adopt a view of varieties of English as inner, outer and expanding circles. However it is perhaps more appropriate to visualise language attitudes through a framework of ELF (Jenkins, 2007), or translingual practices (Canagarajah, 2013), prioritising language practices rather than national labels. While World Englishes research focuses on bounded nationally defined varieties, ELF emphasises the use of English 'as fluid, flexible, contingent, hybrid and deeply intercultural' (Jenkins, Cogo & Dewey, 2011, p. 284). This requires a methodological and theoretical approach that incorporates ideologies and multilingualism into an understanding of people's attitudes towards different languages. An ELF attitudinal framework would also require considering attitudes towards related concepts such as multilingualism, native speakerism, Standard English, codeswitching and language itself, rather than individuals simply responding to nationally defined English varieties either by listening to a speech sample or perceptually judging a region of English speakers. Nevertheless, it may be necessary to use named varieties during the research process to enable individual's conceptualisation of

different Englishes. Finally, an ELF approach would also need to consider the wider context in which people and languages operate. With these considerations in mind, and the minimal studies which examine multilingual English language teachers' language attitudes, the following research questions have guided this study:

1. What are multilingual English language teachers' attitudes to multilingual varieties of English?
2. What is the significance of experiences, background, training and the social environment in influencing teachers' beliefs?

Methodology

Context

The institutional setting of the study is a further education college[1] in a multicultural UK city and the participants work in the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) department. There is an eclectic mix of teachers in the ESOL department which is reflective of the multicultural city. This article focuses on the language attitudes of five South-Asian multilingual ESOL teachers in the UK, who participated in interviews and focus groups[2]. Extracts were chosen from the interviews and focus groups from these participants as being reflective of the differences in awareness and attitudes between first and second-generation migrants. This article is restricted to discussing 5 participants, who were selected as they participated in both the interviews and focus groups. Moreover, Arti and Ashna were in the same focus group, as were Jashith and Nalini, which allowed me to compare and contrast these participants' views. The other participants in the study make similar comments to the

[1] Further Education Colleges teach post-compulsory subjects, vocational subjects and adult education.
[2] The total number of participants in the study was 20, which included 13 first generation migrants and 7 second generation migrants, though not all the participants were involved in both the interviews and focus groups.

ones discussed in this article in either the interviews or focus groups, or both. All the participants' names have been anonymised and any detail which might lead to identification modified.

Participants

[Insert Table 2]

There are some similarities between the participants (Table 2): all the participants have friends and relatives who speak a non-standard variety of English, all the participants, as English language teachers, incorporate teaching ideologies (Trujillo, 1996, 2005) into their belief system, all of the participants are bi- or multilingual speakers and they all share the same ethnicity. The first-generation teachers migrated from Indian communities in African countries, Ashna from Malawi, and Nalini and Mahima from Kenya. One difference between the two groups is that first-generation migrants tend to speak more languages than second generation migrants. Despite the similarities between the participants' ethno-linguistic and professional backgrounds, there were differences in their language awareness and attitudes towards multilingual varieties of English which I argue stem from the participants' exposure to different language ideologies. Moreover, it is notable that second generation migrants appear to have retained language attitudes derived from their early language experiences, despite residing in the UK for over thirty or forty years, where the influence of a standard language ideology is more prevalent. This would seem to support both the assertion that attitudes towards correct language are formed in childhood (Niedzielski & Preston, 2009), and that language attitudes have a strong affective component and appear to be resistant to change (Illés, 2016; Pajares, 1992).

All the teachers are female and of South-Asian cultural heritage and have undertaken teacher training: a PGCE for teaching in further education, which is a broad teaching qualification for all teachers in the different departments, and an ESOL level 5 diploma

which focuses specifically on English language teaching. However, in this course, no consideration is given to multilingual varieties of English or ELF. Moreover, there is no unit in the course which includes SLA theory, and instead there is a focus on grammatical, lexical and phonetical knowledge and discourse and how this knowledge could be applied in the language classroom. The only aspect of SLA theory which is addressed is related to culture and issues of power, and how this may impact on classroom teaching. As mentioned interviews and focus groups were chosen as methodological tools in this study to enable comparisons between the two data sets and analyse the strength and consistency of the participants' attitudes expressed in an individual interview and as part of a group.

The interviews were semi-structured and based around three main topic areas: participants' background, participants' views about language and teaching. For the focus groups three discussion cards were constructed around the areas of language, error correction, varieties of English, materials, culture in the classroom, functional English, testing and language targets. They were not direct questions but were what could be considered contentious quotes, assembled from newspaper articles (Jenkins, 2004; Meddings, 2004a, b) and a short journal article (Farrell & Martin, 2009).

Analytical Framework

The analytical framework I have used in this study is holistic, utilizing elements from content analysis (Bazeley, 2013; Franzosi, 2004; Krippendorff, 2013), discourse analysis (Gee, 1999; Gill, 2000; Johnstone, 2002; Potter, 2004; Tannen, 2007), conversation analysis (Clayman & Gill, 2004; Heritage, 2004; Peräkylä, 2007) and constructionist perspectives of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2001, 2006, 2008, 2011). In many respects it is necessary for qualitative researchers to use different frameworks to analyse their data in order to understand the potential contained in the data and, as Silverman (2006, p. 237) highlights,

'thoughtful researchers will often want to use a combination of methods'. There are many similarities between different qualitative analytical approaches, with several core elements such as being exploratory in nature, a focus on communication, and the aim to gain a greater understanding of the social world by examining both the explicit meaning and the underlying meaning. Indeed, Krippendorff (2013) refers to content analysis as a 'contemporary grounded method', and also Discourse Analysis (DA) and Conversation Analysis (CA) are included under the umbrella of content analysis by some authors (Krippendorff, 2013). Both Franzoi (2004) and Krippendorff (2013) note that content analysis has evolved into a repertoire of methods of research and is also increasingly being used in various disciplines. Krippendorff asserts that a framework to use content analysis requires a text, research questions and a context to enable the researcher to make inferences and validate evidence 'in principle'. Texts do not have a single meaning in themselves, but are open to different interpretations by different people, with the specific meaning dependant on the interests of the researcher and built around a context to situate the data. Krippendorff (2013) argues that a careful reading of the text narrows the range of possible inferences, and 'grounds' content analysis empirically to enable the researcher to discover trends, patterns and differences, and validate findings.

Open coding and then focused coding was used in analysing the data, (Bazeley, 2013; Charmaz, 2008) with no *a priori* codes, to avoid 'forcing' the data as Glaser (1998) argues many researchers tend to do. Then the most interesting parts of the data were linked, and the most important codes were 'raised' to themes and the data was organised into a hierarchal structure (Bazeley, 2013). The chosen extracts in this paper have been narrowly transcribed to understand how meaning was produced in each sequential turn (Mann, 2011; Talmy, 2011) and enable me to identify details such as silences, pauses, word choice and the prosodic features of speech, and allows a more detailed analysis of the participants' contributions.

Moreover, this is an exact transcription as spoken by the participants and may include infelicities in terms of grammar, word forms and incomplete sentences as is commonly found in spoken discourse. The transcription conventions (Appendix 1) were adapted from Potter (1999) Clayman and Gill (2004) and the VOICE corpus (2013).

Findings

Awareness and Attitudes to English Language Variation

The participants express language attitudes that derive from their exposure to different language ideologies, which is notable in the differences between first and second-generation migrants. The differences are reflected in their awareness and attitudes to Indian English (IE). This would suggest that exposure through the social environment is an essential element in teachers' language beliefs. Second generation migrants tend to describe these varieties within a framework of being deficient in relation to British English norms indexing an EFL orientation, with teacher training consolidating their existing beliefs. In contrast, first generation migrants describe IE from a difference perspective which suggests that their language attitudes have greater flexibility. The focus in the following analysis is the inter-relationship between the teachers' language attitudes and societal ideologies and how this may impact on their beliefs about their teaching practices. The following sections of data analysis are divided into language awareness and competing language ideologies.

The first extract is an interview with Arti, who was born in the UK and is bilingual in English and Punjabi. She notes that growing up in the UK there were very few families of Indian origin with around 20 individuals in her school who were of ethnic origins. Her formal education was in the UK state school system. She never attended heritage language classes in the UK, as there was limited provision for Punjabi at the time. She has minimal contact with

her heritage country, India, but she has visited India three times and occasionally communicates with an elderly relative. In the first extract Arti gives a definition of Indian English from a deficit perspective.

Extract 1

1	Arti:	=Indian English is when you erm:: (0.5) take out for example especially th-
2		the (.) long term Asians if you like (.) what they do is (.) they erm (.) when
3		the grammar's (.) not correct for example like I would say I would say my
4		mum talks Indian English
5	I:	Right okay
6	Arti:	Indian English English Indian whatever she does it because she doesn't err
7		formulate (.) you know correct sentence if you like but the meaning's there
8		Errm

Arti's experience of IE is predominantly from the UK and she considers IE speakers as ones who have migrated to, and been living in, the UK for a long period of time. One of the people she identifies as an IE speaker is her mother. She appears to have a deficit perspective of language as being either correct or incorrect, and twice (3 and 7) states that IE is incorrect which stems from a standard language ideology and EFL orientation. However, she also acknowledges that meaning is relevant (7) despite her perceived incorrectness of the language in relation to British English.

Beliefs about correctness and IE are also evident in the attitudes of another second-generation migrant, Jashith, who associates IE speakers with her students. Jashith, like Arti, was also born in the UK, and had formal state education. She states that she speaks Gujarati with older members of the family and older members of the local Gujarati community, but with siblings and peers she tends to speak English. In the home environment, her parents predominantly spoke Guajarati, and she went to Gujarati language classes, where she also

learnt Hindi. She visited India four times when she was younger, but has not returned in adulthood. She has cousins in India, but maintains minimal contact, and expresses a desire to return to India 'as a tourist'. Jashith also perceives IE as a deficient language.

Extract 2

1	Jashith:	How would I describe it it's different to (0.5) how (0.5) because I've
2		seen students who have come from India and they do they get the word
3		order wrong
4	I:	Right
5	Jashith:	You know and the pronunciation obviously is different so:: even
6		though they have studied there sometimes it's hard to understand what
7		they're saying as well […] yes it's Indian English isn't it yeah
8	I:	Wh- wh- what do you understand by Indian English
9	Jashith:	Well to me that's I think that's what I mentioned already that you
10		know the pronunciation and they also substitute certain words and the
11		words (1.0) are not (0.5) used in right context as well

Jashith's description of IE relates to her experience of students, and perhaps other contexts within the UK. Although initially she notes that IE is different, her description is predominantly from a deficit perspective, identifying problems with word order (2) and vocabulary (10-11). She views the grammar and lexis of IE as deficient, but the pronunciation as different. Therefore, in terms of attitudes to pronunciation, this suggests that Jashith is more ELF orientated than EFL, and indicates that she has different orientations for different aspects of language.

In contrast first generation migrants tended not to use negative terminology to describe IE. Mahima arrived to the UK from Kenya at the age of 16, and completed her secondary education in the UK, having been educated in an international school in Kenya. Mahima has

never visited India, and the last time she returned to Kenya was nearly forty years ago. Mahima appears to apply personal experience of IE from her youth and instead of using negative descriptive words, she relates the variety to Hinglish and describes a mixing of English and Hindi.

Extract 3

1	I:	Have you ever heard of the phrase Indian English before
2	Mahima:	err:: what they call erm (1.5) Hinglish
3	I:	And how would how would you describe it
4	Mahima:	Its erm what they do is they start of talking in eng- in er start with
5		English then they sort of break it in er: go into Punjabi Hindi or
6		whatever language they speak and then and if you listen to erm if you
7		listen to their conversation in one sentence they speak there would be
8		at least five or six English words
9	I:	yeah (2.0) and then
10	Mahima:	It's all mixture of everything it's like (2.0) Swahili when we came to
11		er when we sort of like we developed the Swahili language for in (2.0)
12		there was a lot of common words that we (.) we thought were (.)
13		Punjabi but they're not they're Swahili words we thought they were
14		Punjabi so if I were to speak somebody from India and use that in
15		those words they'd look at us and say °what is she talking° about but
16		like i said the Indian English or Hinglish as they call them call it

Instead of using negative terminology Mahima seems to view IE positively. Mahima associates IE with another term Hinglish (2), which is considered derogatory by some (Edwards, 2004; Nelson, 2011). Though she states that it is other people who use the term

Hinglish, which might imply that she also sees it as a derogatory term, using 'they' on two occasions (2 and 16). She also refers to IE as code-switching and draws parallels with a mixture of Swahili and Punjabi from her own experience of mixed codes. This implies that she is more inclined towards an ELF orientation in relation to codeswitching rather than an EFL one, as she explains IE as a linguistic resource. However, despite acknowledging the mixing of languages, she also refers to named languages with boundaries (11-15). Therefore, although education provides the *habitus* for the separation of languages into distinct codes (Bourdieu, 1991; Fairclough, 2001), the awareness of distinct languages also stems from interacting with other speakers. Other first-generation migrants also give a relatively positive interpretation of IE, referring to it as a dialect rather than being deficient.

Nalini, for example, arrived in the UK in her early twenties after meeting her husband, so her primary education was in Kenya. She learnt English from birth, and English and Guajarati at primary and nursery schools and 'picked up' Hindi, Urdu, and Swahili, from movies and the social environment. She visits India every year, for religious purposes with her entire family to attend a religious festival, and visits Kenya nearly every year. In the following extract Nalini tends to describe IE more positively than second generation migrants.

Extract 4

1	I:	Do you notice anything different about the way they speak their
2		English
3	Nalini:	Oh yes yeah::: what do you call it (1.0) the stress and intonation is
4		different
5	I:	Yeah
6	Nalini:	Yeah erm (1.0) sometimes in India if somebody speaks in English I I
7		my family my children will laugh you know ha ha ha why are they
8		speaking you know the dialect is different the accent is different

9 I: right

10 Nalini: It is different (.) it is different

When Nalini is comparing how they speak English in India to British English, she uses a difference perspective rather than a deficit perspective She also describes IE as a dialect which places IE at a level with other 'native' dialects in the UK. This perspective would seem to include IE as a variety equal to other Englishes and not as deficit, as second-generation migrants tend to view the language. Although viewing IE as a dialect rather than a language derives from a standard language ideology, she recognises IE as a stable variety, rather than one that is deficient and as an interlanguage moving towards a 'native' variety. It is also noticeable that her children who are second generation migrants respond to IE speakers by laughing, which Nalini appears to present as a negative response to the language. Nalini's positive attitude to different varieties of English is also evident in the focus groups where the participants were discussing which model of English to teach.

Extract 5

1. Jashith: Well if if people want to learn English as a foreign language is it then
2. they would expect to be taught (.) you know the British model
3. Nalini: I don't think people who really don't want to come out of their own
4. origin place do want to learn British or or or or American English I
5. don't think so if I was in Kenya I would stick to my Kenya I didn't
6. want to learn (.) how they speak in Britain

As is evident from the extract, Jashith framework is centred around standard English models, which contrasts with Nalini's view of how English is spoken in other countries. She draws on her own experience of living in Kenya and the way that English is spoken there and suggests that these speakers would reject a model of English based on AmE or BrE.

Second generation migrants generally have difficulty perceiving multilingual or 'non-native' varieties as authentic. They view varieties, such as IE, as deficient in comparison to American or British English and use terminology such as error, wrong or incorrect. In contrast, first generation migrants appear to be more accepting of language variation and acknowledge the authenticity of multilingual varieties of English. This is arguably derived from exposure to dual or multiple language ideologies, the experience of growing up in a multilingual society, and a higher level of exposure to different varieties of English. First generation migrants appear to be more open to different varieties of English, referring to these as dialects and they also appear to consider the distinction between named languages and language as a social practice. The influence of competing ideologies is evident in the attitudes of first generation migrants, suggesting that these attitudes are formed at a young age and retained into adulthood despite the more prevalent influence of a standard language ideology while they have been living in the UK.

Competing Ideologies

One reason for the difference in language attitudes of the participants is the linguistic environment in which first generation migrants grew up. Ashna, for example, was born in Malawi and arrived in the UK around the age of 13. She maintains strong links with Gujarat because of her mother's family, and through her connections with the local Gujarat community in Leicester. Ashna's first language is Gujarati, and her initial education was in Gujarati, but she was later taught at school in English. In the following extract from one of the focus groups, Ashna explains her language use in Malawi and the UK.

Extract 6

1. Ashna: I I I used to speak English at the school (.) but I wasn't exposed like
2. you know like when we we went school we used to speak English but

3. then when we came back home (.) it was Guajarati all the time but
4. when I came to this country and when I started learning English it was
5. like we we we went to school in the morning and then we come back at
6. about 3 so then english just went all the way through it just run and the
7. programmes were in English everything was in English so (???) have
8. to speak in English everything conver- even with my mum
9. conversation became English even though my mum would answer in
10. Gujarati but I would speak in English (.) whereas before when I was in
11. Africa that wasn't the case English was in the school as soon as we
12. come back home it was Gujarati Gujarti Gujarati

The extract gives an indication of the multilingual linguistic environment in which Ashna grew up in Malawi. At school in the formal environment, Ashna notes that English was used, while upon returning home she would switch with her family to using Gujarati. In contrast, in the UK, she would predominantly use English both at school and at home, though noting that some of the elements of the linguistic environment were maintained as her mother continued to use Gujarati. It is likely that Ashna's linguistic environment during her formative years helped shape her language attitudes, which have been maintained to a certain degree since she arrived in the UK, Access to five different languages, Gujarati, English, Urdu, Hindi, and Chichewa provided a diverse linguistic environment which included codeswitching and exposure to different varieties of spoken English.

The differences between first and second-generation migrants is evident in the following extract from a focus group where Ashna and Arti are discussing teachers' prejudice towards other teachers whose first language is not English. Ashna appears to be more open to language variation and view language more in terms of a continuum, while Arti views language in binary terms, either being correct/incorrect or perfect/imperfect.

Extract 7

Ashna: I have heard some of the in in::: in our teaching environment they will say well I just hate it when somebody speaks like that then I [yeah

Arti: [They can't use correct English why are they teaching yeah course you do there is

Ashna: They can't teach and I'm thinking to myself well what are you talking about English is a mish mash of everything so (.) I think you need to go and (.) research your language @@@@@@@@

[…]

Ashna: I've come across I've come across teachers that will say that and they say oh I really hate it you know oh I don't watch that I mean have you seen in the oh I don't think his English correct and I'm thinking well what are you talking about are you saying that your English is=

Arti: =Perfect

Ashna: Superior

Both Ashna and Arti agree that they have heard linguicism in the teaching environment and express their dislike of this, positioning themselves as being more open to accepting language variation. However, there are some underlying differences in Ashna's and Arti's perception of this prejudice. For example, Arti states that 'they can't use correct English' (3-4), referring to teachers who are recipients of prejudice. Although Arti is reporting what other people believe, she appears to be agreeing that some teachers do not speak 'correct English'. However, despite her apparent agreement that the language used by 'non-native' teachers is incorrect, she indicates that they should not be the recipients of prejudice from other English language teachers. In contrast, Ashna also uses the term 'correct English' in reference to

other teachers' beliefs, but indicates strong disagreement with belief that the language is inaccurate (6 and 13).

Ashna's language beliefs are also evident when she mentions the mixing of English with other languages in (6), showing an awareness of variation, language change and borrowing in English, and implying that these teachers do not have this awareness. She also distances herself from ownership of English, suggesting she believes the language belongs to 'native speakers' with the phrase 'I think you need to go and research your language' (7-8) in criticism of these teachers' attitudes. The differences in the attitudes of the two teachers is also evident when Arti completes Ashna's sentence 'are you saying your English is' with the word 'perfect' (13-15). However, rather than accepting this word choice, Ashna feels it necessary to give a more nuanced word: 'superior'. This perhaps suggests Ashna's views of language ability are on a cline, whereas the word 'perfect' may indicate that Arti conceives language more in binary terms. There are some similarities between the participants, but their choice of vocabulary and their presentation of other teachers' views suggest moderate difference in their attitudes to language variability in English, and perhaps they have different conceptualisations of language, based on personal experiences and background.

However, although first generation migrants were exposed to greater variation in language ideologies, this does not necessarily translate into conflict in their attitudes. In fact, it was second generation migrants who sometimes have problems to coalesce their awareness of different Englishes, multilingualism and the influence of a standard language ideology. For example, Ashna uses seemingly conflicting terminology when she describes how she responds to her students' spoken language.

Extract 8

1 Ashna: Because you are teaching them the main (.) you know purpose of
2 language you know for them to learn in appropriate way you can't

3 teach them all you know because >he's Indian he speak differently<
4 but in the classroom if they speak you know with their own accent if
5 they're pronouncing wrong (.) then I would say you would interfere
6 like someone would pronounce it wrong then I would say it's not like
7 that you don't say it like that you actually say this (0.5) >but that's
8 what I mean< but if they're speaking in their (.) dialect you know I
9 don't normally change I've got in classroom you know they speak in
10 their singing English that I was telling them you know but this way I
11 just let it because this what it is

Ashna uses several negative words to describe the pronunciation of her students and how she would respond to it: 'wrong' (5 and 6), 'interfere', (5) 'it's not like that' (6). She also places stress on certain words which perhaps indicates a strong attitude and belief about this topic (2-7). This appears to index a standard language ideology which is derived from her educational experience in her birth country and the UK which treat languages separately, as well as from her training as an English language teacher. Interestingly, while she objects to criticism of British-Asian English language teachers' spoken English by other teachers in the previous extract, she still perceptually envisages language in terms of right and wrong in relation to her students' spoken language. She notes that if the accent and pronunciation is 'wrong' she would use error correction methods (7). However, she performs a mock Indian accent (3), with syllable-timing and omitting the third person singular, and refers to it as a dialect and argues that she would not change it (7-9). The 'singing English' which she mentions relates back to an earlier discussion on the rhythm and tone of the way IE is spoken (10). This would seem to represent a conflicting response to students' language, and it is unclear in what situation she would deem it appropriate to correct the language. These appear to represent a duality of language attitudes, though seemingly not conflictual, of recognising

and accepting different varieties of English, but still believing that students should conform to British English norms.

On some occasions, it is second generation migrants who struggle to convey their moderate awareness of diverse Englishes and their conformity to 'correct language'. For example, Arti finds difficulty to express her belief in the importance of Standardised English.

Extract 9

Arti: Just because it's erm (5.0) I think it's I know it sounds really bad this does but I think it's the correct way to (1.0) er I don't know I think it's the correct way to er (3.0) because you need standard English to write basically that's what I'm trying to say it's fu- it's funny that transition (.) do you know what I mean I don't think we should be so hung up on it then you know if articles aren't in the right place or whether you know they're n- they're not using the past perfect for example no I don't think that makes an issue at all right because they are communicating and you know that I- it's enough to get (.) through (.) you're day to day life it's functional

It is noticeable that Arti struggles to find the words to express her meaning in terms of describing Standardised English, saying the 'correct way' twice (2), but retreating from completing the sentence. There are also long pauses (1-3) as she tries to formulate her opinion. She tries to balance her beliefs about functional English and 'correct' English, and as a compromise, relates Standardised English to writing. She has a noticeable difficulty balancing her beliefs about accuracy and communication. Arti also mentions articles and the past perfect as features which 'we should not be hung up on' (5-7).

These extracts suggest that there are some differences in the underlying attitudes towards language between first and second-generation migrants. It appears that first generation migrants do not necessarily consider language in the same way that second generation

migrants do. This may be related to their personal experience of engaging with different varieties of English, living in a multilingual environment and being influenced by multiple language ideologies. Second generation migrants are more inclined to view language as having boundaries and belonging to 'native speakers', indexing a standard language ideology and an EFL orientation. In contrast first generation migrants are negotiating between an EFL and ELF orientation, perhaps as a consequence of being influenced by competing language ideologies, which has some similarities with Chand's (2009) study of attitudes towards IE.

Conclusion

In returning to the first research question it is apparent that there are certain differences between the multilingual speakers in this study. While the first-generation migrants tend to give a positive definition of different varieties of English, the second-generation migrants view these varieties as deficient in comparison to Standard or British English and as an interlanguage. Although the five participants have South-Asian ancestry and are multilingual, there are attitudinal differences which appear to be related to their experience of different exposure to language ideologies. It appears from the analysis of the data that second-generation migrants orientate more towards a standard language ideology and an EFL orientation, while first generation migrants are influenced by competing language ideologies, and indicate elements of both an EFL and ELF perspective. However, it should be noted that the data presented in this study is drawn from just five individuals and a wider study would be required to ascertain the validity of this assertion.

Both Makoni and Pennycook (2012) and Canagarajah and Liyanage (2012) argue that people in some multilingual non-western countries are more open to variation because the "language ideologies and values that still exist there sustain plurilingual practices" (Canagarajah & Liyanage, 2012, p. 51). Elements of this belief system appear to be retained

by the first-generation migrant participants in this paper. However, there appears to be no ideological transference in the belief system to second generation migrants. Interestingly the three participants who migrated at an early age and have been living in Britain for thirty or forty years still retain this openness to language variation to a certain extent. Therefore, societal ideologies in relation to language variation appear to impose a strong attitude on participants and become relatively fixed when people are children or young adults.

Niedzielski and Preston (2009) assert that attitudes towards correct language are formed in adolescence, and this is related to the environment that an individual has experienced. Although the five participants in this study are multilingual this does not translate into a uniform opinion about language and English language varieties. Ellis (2004) has argued that there is a more relevant division between monolingual and multilingual teachers than the distinction between 'native' and 'non-native' speakers in relation to language and language learning. However, this small-scale study suggests that this might depend on the type of education and environment that the multilingual individual experienced in their formative years, and how languages are treated and conceptualised in society. The findings from this study suggest that attitudes towards what is considered correct language are deep-rooted, and that it is necessary to incorporate critical language awareness, World Englishes and ELF more centrally in teacher training. However it is questionable how effective a transformative approach (Sifakis & Bayyurt, 2015) would be in changing the attitudes of English language teachers towards World Englishes and ELF, given that language attitudes are formed in adolescence, have a strong affective component and are resistant to change (Illés, 2016; Pajares, 1992).

While the three first-generation migrants view language in different terms and are more accepting of variation in spoken English, they also tend to support Standard British English most specifically in the classroom environment. Therefore, in terms of the second research

question, the influence on their teaching beliefs from their experiences, background, training and the social environment, there is less of a sharp distinction between the five participants. While as mentioned, teacher training does not appear to influence the teachers' underlying conception of language, the five teachers believe students need to conform to Standard English in the classroom environment, but they also stress the importance of language for communication purposes, and that meaning is more important than accuracy. Maio and Haddock (2009) point out that attitudes are dependent on normative behaviour; how people, who are important to the individual, expect him or her to act to comply with expectations. Teachers might be prohibited from performing an action or believe specific individuals will approve or disapprove of their behaviour and are therefore conditioned into acting in certain ways in the classroom. This will impact on how the teachers in this study articulate their attitudes towards language and their teaching practices. However, it should be noted that this study included a small group of teachers and further research is needed with teachers in other contexts with different language and teacher training backgrounds to give a fuller understanding of how societal ideologies interact with teacher training to formulate teachers' attitudes about language. This would contribute to how teacher training programmes can be developed in the future to maximise the effectiveness of critical language awareness among English language teachers. Moreover although this study has outlined teachers' beliefs about their teaching practices, attitudes do not always correspond with behaviour in the classroom, (Garrett, 2010) and therefore understanding the relationship between multilingual teachers' attitudes and their teaching practices still needs further investigation.

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Jennifer Jenkins for comments on an earlier version of this paper and also two anonymous reviewers. I would also like to thank Claire Molloy for her contribution to this paper.

References

Ahn, H. (2014). Teachers' attitudes towards Korean English in South Korea. *World Englishes* 33(2), 195-222 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12081.

Ahn, H. (2015). Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: a study of English teachers in South Korea. *Asian Englishes* 17(2), 132-151 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2015.1036602.

Bazeley, P. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Bernaisch, T. (2012). Attitudes towards Englishes in Sri Lanka. *World Englishes* 31(3), 279-291 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2012.01753.x

Blackledge, A. (2000). Monolingual ideologies in multilingual states: Language, hegemony and social justice in Western liberal democracies. *Estudios de sociolingüística* 1(2), 25-45.

Blackledge, A. (2005). *Discourse and power in a multilingual world*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Blackledge, A. & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism*. London, UK: Continuum.

Blommaert, J., Ed. (1999). *Language ideological debates*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' Pedagogical Systems and Grammar Teaching: A Qualitative Study. *TESOL Quarterly* 32(1), 9-38.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. London, UK: Continuum.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Breen, M. P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R. & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making Sense of Language Teaching: Teachers' Principles and Classroom Practices. *Applied Linguistics* 22(4), 470-501 doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.4.470.

Busch, B. (2012). The Lingusitic Repertoire revisited. *Applied Linguistics* 33(5), 503-523 doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams056.

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research* 14(3), 318-337 doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365239.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Translingual practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, A. S. & Liyanage, I. (2012). Lessons from pre-colonial multilingualism. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (Eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. (pp. 49-65). London, UK: Routledge.

Chand, V. (2009). [v]at is going on? Local and global ideologies about Indian English. *Language in Society* 38(4), 393-419 doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404509990200.

Charmaz, K. (2001). Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein (Eds) *Handbook of Interview Research*. (pp. 675-694). London, UK: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis* London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In J. A. Smith (Eds) *Qualitative psychology: a practical guide to research methods* (pp. 81-110). Los Angeles, LA: SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2011). Grounded Theory Methods in Social Justice Research. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds) *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 359-380). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Clayman, S. E. & Gill, V. T. (2004). Conversation analysis. In M. Hardy and A. Bryman (Eds) *Handbook of data analysis*. (pp. 589-606). London, UK: SAGE.

Clyne, M. (2008). The monolingual mindset as an impediment to the development of plurilingual potential in Australia. *Sociolinguistic Studies* 2(3), 347-365 doi: 10.1558/sols.v2i3.347.

Cook, V. (1996). Competence and multi-competence. In G. Brown, K. Malmkjaer and J. Williams (Eds) *Performance and competence in second language acquisition*. (pp. 57-69). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. J. (2007). Multi-competence: Black-hole or worm-hole for second language acquisition research. In Z. Han (Eds) *Understanding second language process*. (pp. 16-26). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cooke, M. & Simpson, J. (2012). Discourses about linguistic diversity. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (Eds) *The routledge handbook of multilingualism*. (pp. 116-130). London, UK: Routledge.

Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, (1196-1208) doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006.

Dewey, M. (2012). Toward a *post-normative* approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1), 141-170 doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0007.

Edwards, J. V. (2004). Foundations of Bilingualism. In T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (Eds) *Handbook of Bilingualism*. (pp. 7-31). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Ellis, E. (2004). The invisible multilingual teacher: The contribution of language background to Australian ESL teachers' professional knowledge and beliefs. *The International Journal of Multilingualism* 1(2), 90-108 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668181.

Ellis, E. (2006). Monolingualism: The unmarked case. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 7(2), 173-196.

Erlam, R. (2008). What do you researchers know about language teaching? Bridging the gap between SLA research and language pedagogy. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 2(3), 253-267 doi: 10.1080/17501220802158958.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London, UK: Longman.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2008). *Reflective language teaching: from research to practice*. London, UK: Continuum.

Farrell, T. S. C. & Martin, S. (2009). To teach standard English or World Englishes? A balanced Approach to Instruction *English Teaching Forum* 47(2), 2-7.

Franzosi, R. P. (2004). Content Analysis. In M. Hardy and A. Bryman (Eds) *Handbook of data Analysis*. (pp. 547-566). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and Contestation among Linguistic Ideologies. In K. Woolard, B. Schieffelin and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds) *In Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. (pp. 317-331). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

García, O. (2009). Emergent Bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a Name? *TESOL Quarterly* 43(2), 322-326.

García, O. & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillian.

Garrett, P. (2010). *Attitudes to Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Garrett, P., Coupland, N. & Williams, A. (2003). *Investigating Language Attitudes: Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance* Cardiff, UK: University of Wales Press.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse Analysis. In M. W. Baur and G. Gaskell (Eds) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*. (pp. 172-190). Los Angles, LA: SAGE.
Glaser, B. G. (1998). *Doing grounded theory: issues and discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
He, D. & Miller, L. (2011). English teacher preference: the case of China's non-English-major students. *World Englishes* 30(3), 428-443 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01716.x.
Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: a sociolinguistic ethnography*. Harlow, UK: Addison Wesey Longman Limited.
Heller, M. (2007). Bilingualism as ideology and practice. In M. Heller (Eds) *Bilingualism: a social approach*. (pp. 1-22). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillian.
Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation Analysis and institutional talk: analysing data. In D. Silverman (Eds) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. (pp. 222-245). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
Illés, É. (2016). Issues in ELF-aware teacher education. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 5(1), 135-145 doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2016-0006.
Jenkins, J. (2004, Thursday 22 January). Beware the natives and their norms *The Guardian* Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2004/jan/22/tefl.wordsandlanguage?INTCMP=SRCH.
Jenkins, J. (2006). English Pronunciation and second language speaker identities In T. Omoniyi and G. White (Eds) *The Sociolinguistics of Identity*. (pp. 75-91). New York, NY: Continuum.
Jenkins, J. (2007). *English as Lingua Franca: attitude and identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Jenkins, J. (2014). *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University: The politics of academic English language policy*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
Jenkins, J., Cogo, A. & Dewey, M. (2011). Review of developments in research into English as a Lingua Franca. *Language Testing* 44(3), 281-315 doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000115.
Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications
Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies In A. Duranti (Eds) *A Companion to linguistic anthropology*. (pp. 496-517). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Li, W. (2017). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-23 doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039.
MacDonald, M., Badger, R. & White, G. (2001). Changing values: what use are theories of language learning and teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17(8), 949-963 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00042-7.
Maio, G. R. & Haddock, G. (2009). *The Psychology of Attitudes and Attitude Change*. London, UK: SAGE Publictions
Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni and A. Pennycook (Eds) *Disinventing and reconstituting languages*. (pp. 1-42). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (2012). Disinventing multilingualism; from monological multilingualism to multilingua francas. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge and A. Creese (Eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism*. (pp. 439-453). London: Routledge.
Mann, S. (2011). A Critical review of qualitative interviews in applied linguistics. *Applied linguistics* 32(1), 6-24 doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq043.

Markham, P., Rice, M., Darban, B. & Weng, T. H. (2017). Teachers' Declared Intentions to Shift Practice to Incorporate Second Language Acquisition (SLA) Theories. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 8(6), 1023-1031.

May, S., Ed. (2014). *The Mulilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McDonald, C. & McRae, S. (2010). A pre-trial collection and investigation of what perceptions and attitudes of Konglish exist among foreign and Korean English language teachers in terms of English education in Korea. *Asian EFL* 12(1), 134-164.

McGroaty, M. E. (2010). Languages and Ideologies. In N. H. Hornberger (Eds) *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*. (pp. 3-39). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McKenzie, R. M. (2008). The role of variety recognition in Japanese University students' attitudes towards English speech varieties *Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 29(2), 139-153 doi: https://doi.org/10.2167/jmmd565.0.

Meddings, L. (2004a, Tuesday 21 December). All the world's an English stage. *The Guardian* Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2004/dec/21/tefl?INTCMP=SRCH.

Meddings, L. (2004b, Saturday 28 February). Free the world from coursebook English. *The Guardian* Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2004/feb/28/highereducation.uk?INTCMP=SRCH.

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in language: investigating standard English*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ndhlovu, F. (2015). Ignored Lingualism: Another Resource for Overcoming the Monolingual Mindset in Language Education Policy. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 35(4), 398-414 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2015.1087365.

Nelson, C. L. (2011). *Intelligibility in World Englishes* New York, NY: Routledge.

Niedzielski, N. & Preston, D. R. (2009). Folk linguistics. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (Eds) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. (pp. 356-373). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning* 63(s1), 1-24 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00735.x

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways Forward for a Bi/Multilingual Turn in SLA. In S. May (Eds) *The Multilingual Turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and Bilingual Education*. (pp. 32-53). New York, NY: Routledge.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research* 62(3), 307-332 doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307.

Peräkylä, A. (2007). Conversation Analysis. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium and D. Silverman (Eds) *Qualitative Reserach Practice*. (pp. 153-167). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Pollock, S. (2006). *The language of the gods in the world of men: Sanskrit, culture, and power in premodern India*. Los Angeles, LA: University of California.

Potter, J. (1999). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In A. Bryant and R. G. Burgess (Eds) *Qualitative research*. (pp. 323-341). London, UK: SAGE.

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse Analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Eds) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Methods and Practice*. (pp. 200-221). London, UK: SAGE.

Razfar, A. (2012). Narrating beliefs: A language ideologies approach to teacher beliefs. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 43(1), 61-81 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1492.2011.01157.x

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Eds) *Handbook of research on teacher education*. (pp. 102-119). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Rivers, D. J. (2011). Intercultural processes in accented English. *World Englishes* 30(3), 375-391 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01707.x

Sadtono, E. (2000). Intercultural Understanding: To Teach or Not to Teach? In H. W. Kam and C. Ward (Eds) *Language in the Global Context*. (pp. 164-194). Singapore: SEAMEO-RELC.

Sahgal, A. (1991). Patterns of Language use in a bilingual setting in India. In J. Cheshire (Eds) *English around the world: sociolinguistic perspectives*. (pp. 299-307). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Sasayama, S. (2013). Japanese college students' atttiudes towards Japan English and American English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(3), 264-278 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.767341.

Sato, K. & Kleinsasser, R. C. (2004). Beliefs, practices, and interactions of teachers in a Japanese high school English department. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20(8), 797-816 doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.09.004.

Saxena, M. & Omoniyi, T., Eds. (2010). *Contending with Globalization in World Englishes* Bristol, UK: Mulitilingual Matters.

Scales, J., Wennerstrom, A., Richard, D. & Wu, S. H. (2006). Language learners' perceptions of accent. *TESOL Quarterly* 40(4), 715-738 doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/40264305.

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

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sifakis, N. C. & Bayyurt, Y. (2015). Insights from ELF and WE in teacher training in Greece and Turkey. *World Englishes* 34(3), 471-484 doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12150

Sifakis, N. C. & Sougari, A.-M. (2006). Pronunciation Issues and EIL Pedagogy in the Periphery: A Survey of Greek State School Teachers' Beliefs. *TESOL Quarterly* 39(3), 467-488 doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/3588490.

Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative acheivement: Interaction, identity, and ideology is a speech event. *Applied linguistics* 32(1), 25-42 doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amq027.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking Voices*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Trujillo, A. (1996). In search of Aztán. Movimiento ideology and the creation of the Chicano worldview through Schooling. In B. A. Levinson (Eds) *The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice*. (pp. 119-148). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Trujillo, A. (2005). Politics, School Philosophy, and Language Policy: The Case of Crystal City Schools. *Educational Policy* 19(4), 621-654 doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904805278064.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: case studies of second language teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

VOICE (2013). The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (version 2.0 XML). B. Seidlhofer, A. Breiteneder, T. Klimpfinger et al.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Young, T. J. & Walsh, S. (2010). Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 23(2), 123-127 doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/07908311003797627.

Zhang, Q. (2013). The atttiudes of Hong Kong students towards Hong Kong English and Mandarin-accented English. *English Today* 29(2), 9-16 doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078413000096.

Zheng, H. (2009). A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Cambridge Studies* 4(1), 73-81.

Appendix A - TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

@@@@	Laughter: The length of the @ indicates the length of the laughter
[	Left sided bracket indicate where overlapping speech occurs
°	Indicates talk which is noticeably quieter than the surrounding talk
> <	'Greater than' and 'less than' symbols indicate talk which is noticeably faster than the surrounding talk
(1.5)	Numbers in parentheses indicate the periods of silence in tenths of second
(.)	Indicates a pause in talk of less than 0.2 seconds
Becas-	A hyphen indicates words which are incomplete because of abrupt cut off or self-interruption
He says	Underlined words indicate stress or emphasis
=	Equal signs indicate latching with no noticeable silence between the talk of different people
:::	Colons indicate the sound was prolonged
[…]	Parentheses with three dots indicate that there is a gap between the sections of the transcription which were not included

Table 1: EFL contrasted with ELF (Jenkins 2006, 140)

EFL: Part of modern Foreign Languages	**ELF: Part of World Englishes**
Deficit Perspective	Difference perspective
Transfer/interference and fossilization metaphors	Contact/evolution
Conformative, monolingual bias	Transformative, bilingual
Codeswitching/code-mixing = interference errors	Code-switching/codemixing = bilingual resources

Table 2: Participant Information

Name	Age	Generation and arrival in UK	Number of spoken languages	Years of English Teaching Experience
Arti	46	2nd generation	2: Punjabi, English	15 years
Jashith	43	2nd generation	3: Hindi Gujarati English	8 years
Nalini	54	1st generation: arrived in the UK aged 21	6: Hindi, Gujarati, Urdu, English, Swahili, Punjabi	17 years
Mahima	56	1st generation arrived in the UK aged 16	4: English, Urdu, Arabic Gujarati	18 years
Ashna	49	1st generation: arrived in the UK aged 14	5: Gujarati, Hindi, Urdu, English Chichewa	12 years