The Use of Non-Standard Varieties of English in Dutch High Schools

Anniek de Ruiter

5698782

English Language and Culture: Education and Communication

First reader: Dr. Trenton Hagar

Second reader: Dr. Deborah Cole

June 2020

Abstract

Where language spreads, language changes, and in a globalizing world, new Englishes arise. The importance of the English language is evident to Dutch teachers of English, yet non-standard varieties of English are neglected in the classroom. To understand this issue, this study looked into the beliefs Dutch teachers of English have about non-standard varieties of English and the possibility of introducing those varieties in the classroom. By means of a Likert-scale questionnaire and interviews, the opinions about non-standard varieties of eleven Dutch teachers of English were mapped out. The results indicate that the standard varieties of English are seen as norm-providing as teachers want their students to acquire native-like competence. Standard varieties are believed to offer higher future educational and business success. Although teaching a non-standard variety of English was seen as inferior to teaching a standard variety of English, some teachers showed interest in the notion of communicative competence whereby conveying a message is more important than being able to speak a standard variety of English.

Keywords: Non-standard varieties, Englishes, Monolithism, Pluralism, Communicative effectiveness, High school English

Table of Contents

1.   Introduction

The English language is an extremely popular language. Today, there are more speakers of

English as a second language than there are native speakers of English (Alsagoff et al., 2012,

Caine, 2008). This is a result of social and economic globalization, which requires a

commonly spoken language that can be used between speakers of different nations. For many

speakers of English, this means that they use the language as a lingua franca (Alptekin,

2002). The widespread use of English is believed to have resulted in language change as a

result of language contact (Hinkel, 2011). That a language may change over time is a view in

line with a pluricentric model of language. Besides language change, language variety is a

key concept of a pluricentric view; "one that moves away from any view of there being just

one standard form against which all others are measured" (Hinkel, 2011, p. 125). According

to Hall (2012), a monolithic view of English is commonly held by stakeholders who believe

non-standard varieties are inferior to a standard target variety. The monolithic view of

English is reflected in the standard language ideology. This ideology is best described by

Lippi-Green (1997):

> [A] bias toward an abstract, idealized homogenous spoken language, which is
>
> imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model
>
> the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the
>
> upper middle class. (cited in Tollefson, 2007, p. 26)

Adopting a pluralistic or monolithic view of language is an ongoing debate that also affects

English language teaching. The monolithic view of language can be found in education

systems all over the world, because traditionally, "L2 pedagogy and research have been

dominated by the assumption that the goal of bilingual users of English is to achieve

nativelike competence in English" (Alsagoff et al., 2012, p. 29). Another reason to teach a

standard variety of English is the belief that speaking native or near-native English will

support communication in international context (Nejjari et al., 2012). For years, and still, this ideology is reflected in textbooks, teaching methods and guides, databases and dictionaries which all show native speaker usage of the English language (Alptekin, 2002; Tollefson, 2007). This research focuses on mapping Dutch high school teachers of English's opinions about non-standard varieties of English and answering the question whether Dutch high school teachers of English are open to the idea of including non-standard varieties of English intro the classroom.

2.   Theoretical Background

2.1 English in the Netherlands

The development of English as an international working language and lingua franca is one of the reasons why English has been a mandatory subject in Dutch primary schools since 1986 (SLO, 2019). Janet van Hell, professor of language development at Radboud University, believes that native, or at least near-native speakers, should be teaching English at Dutch primary schools (Radboud University Nijmegen, 2010). This belief is resonated in other research. Simon (2005) writes that the standard variety Received Pronunciation is clearly still the target variety in the Netherlands. The two standard varieties that are most commonly used in teaching methods are American and British English (Tollefson, 2007). These standards are not only used in Dutch primary schools, but also set the norms for Dutch high school students. As mentioned before, teaching tools such as guides and teaching methods advocate a monolithic view as their databases contain solely native varieties of English. However, "educational institutions play a crucial role in imposing [these standards], through systematic sanctions against those who do not speak the standard, and rewards (e.g. good grades in school) for those who do (Tollefson, 2007, p. 26). In a publication commissioned by SLO (the Dutch center for curriculum development), Fasoglio and Tuin (2018) found that high school teachers use rubrics to assess their students' English-speaking skills. In addition to vocabulary and fluency, grammar and pronunciation are the assessment

criteria. These criteria are based on native English varieties, mainly British and American English.

2.2 Exemplary Situation of Monolithisim; English in Korea

The current situation in Korea is interesting to look at as it shows how Neoliberal politics changed the language ideology and the school curriculum. According to Park (2017), the neoliberal positioning of English language competence as a condition for future success is mainly pointed at American English competence as the United States has been their economic and political ally in the past.

English competence has always been important to Koreans as "English emerged as an important indicator of a job candidate's preparedness for work, due to its associations with global communicative ability and a cosmopolitan outlook, both qualities that were seen as crucial for competition in the global economy" (Park, 2017, p.57). Two ideologies of English competence are prevalent in Korean discourse: the ideology of self-deprecation (which presents a homogenous inherently incompetent English-speaking Korean society) and the ideology of stratified competence (English competence is tied to the socioeconomic conditions of the speaker; creating a heterogeneous Korean society) (Park, 2017; Song, 2017). That English is of great importance to Koreans can be seen in the amount of strategies that the country tries to make into a success to improve its inhabitants' English competence, for example *jogi yuhak* (early study abroad). The pressure laid upon its inhabitants by Korea and the two language ideologies that are prevalent in this country lead to a belief that English language competence is an identity marker:

Koreans generally have much awareness and sensitivity to the material conditions that serve as the basis for any correlation between social class and [English] competence. We might attribute this to the politically charged nature of the discourse on English and

> social class in Korea, in which evaluations of others' competence always carry implications of political struggle (Park, 2017, p. 63)

The link between English competence and identity can also be seen in Korean education. Korean teachers, aiming to teach American English, are indirectly teaching Korean English as their English usage shows distinctive features that separate Korean English from any other (standard) variety of English (Song, 2017). This is one reason why English teaching jobs are predominantly given to native speakers of English. Many teachers try to study or work abroad, preferably in North America, to acquire a native sound. This wish is noteworthy, as it contradicts how teachers in Korea act towards students who studied abroad. According to Song (2017), "teachers legitimatize the linguistic and cultural experiences of returnees from inner circle countries while delegitimizing the experiences of returnees from other outer circle locations" (p. 216). However, even students who have managed to acquire a native-like English sound from the United States, the anxiety rooted in Korean teachers results in a negative evaluation of those students as teachers are supposed to be ELT professionals but the Korean language ideology does not give them the self-esteem they need (Song, 2017).

The situation in Korea is an example of monolithism. Speaking American English is the ultimate goal for Koreans and using any variety other than that standard means that people will believe that your English competence is not what it should be. This ultimately reduces the status of any Korean who does not master the American English variety. However, it also shows that monolithism does not work in practice, the prevailing language ideology causes Koreans to root a feeling that, despite their education and experience, their English will never be good enough. This anxiety results in negative evaluation of students who return from their study in the United States as English language trainers fear for their status and devaluing of the English variety they use.

2.3 Problems in Current Teaching Practice

The monolithic language ideology is problematic for a number of reasons. First of all, the standard language ideology assumes that native speakers of the English language all speak the same language, without any variation. According to Alptekin (2002), this "perception of language and culture . . . has made the current native speaker-based model of communicative competence utopian in character" (p. 59). The variation that occurs in native English speech is often neglected in English Language Teaching (ELT) research (Tollefson, 2007). This is supported by Bruthiaux (2003), who writes that "given the self-declared intention by promoters to be subversive, the model reinforces perceptions of Inner Circle varieties of English as largely monolithic and standardized because it offers no account of dialectal variation within each of the varieties that it lists" (p. 161-162). While the monolithic view presupposes that there is one standard language, there is, in reality, no such thing.

Secondly, saying that there is a standard variety of a language means that English non-native speakers use is inferior to the standard varieties of English. Although it is not explicit what the standard variety entails, other than being a native variety, it is socially constructed that any variety that is not native, is non-standard (Alptekin, 2002; Chan, 2017; Tollefson, 2007). Baldauf (1994) writes that the decisions that are taken regarding language attitude are power related as language policy and planning have a huge impact on society. The notion of a standard variety of English is thereby constructed by stakeholders, such as publishers of teaching methods, who abide by these socially-constructed standards (Chan, 2017). However, according to Sayer (2008), "both consciously and subconsciously, people mark their speech to express affinities of social class, gender, subculture membership, and so forth. Sociolinguists study how language use corresponds to social categories and thus can be seen as an identity marker" (p. 100). Instead of it being a non-standard variety of English, variation in English language is a way of expressing one's individuality (Hinkel, 2011). If our language marks our identity, one of the many problems that occur when people place one

variety of a language above another, is that the speakers of the varieties that end up as inferior will speak a language that marks them as inferior.

Another problem of the monolithic perspective of the English language is the misrepresentation of the current situation. The English language is spreading globally and today's native speakers of English are outnumbered by the number of speakers of English as a second or foreign language (Yamanaka, 2006). For many years, it was believed that learners of English as a second language targeted at native English competence (Alsagoff et al., 2012). Recently, however, it is said that "learners from expanding circle parts of the world (e.g., Korea, Egypt, Japan) are becoming more accepting of English speakers from the outer circle as pronunciation models" (Murphy, 2014, p. 259). This development is a step towards pluralism in language teaching, yet, it also shows how deficit the current practice is. While native speaker standards are still the norm, many scholars have pointed out the fact that second language learners have very little chance to acquire native-like competence (Van Hattum & Rupp, 2014; Murphy, 2014). Kyndt et al. (2011) write about the connection between workload and motivation, as asking too much of students will discourage them. As few students will be able to meet the demands that native speaker standards ask of them, continuing to aim for native speaker competence will likely result in frustration (Van Hattum & Rupp, 2014).

However, there are also many scholars who support a monolithic view of language. The main reason for this is so-called ineffective communication, when non-native use of English leads to a lack of intelligibility (Hinkel, 2011; Tollefson, 2007). Because, when all learners of English speak a different variety of English, and the native standard norms are no longer a reference point, how will one make sure that all speakers of English are able to communicate effectively? A possible solution is the Lingua Franca Core by Jenkins (2005), which focuses "primarily on those phonological features that can impede communication"

(Hinkel, 2011, p. 133). Van Hattum and Rupp (2014) and Hinkel (2011) refer to the ideas of Jenkins (2005) as she argues that teachers of English should focus on teaching strategies on understanding and accommodating to other English accents.

Another objection towards the plurality of English often made by followers of the standard language ideology, is mentioning the stigmatization concerning non-standard varieties of English (; Nejjari et al., 2012; Van den Doel, 2010). Van Hattum and Rupp (2014) provide a brief overview of studies regarding attitudes towards and accrediting status to non-native English accents. Their review shows that speakers with non-native English pronunciation, and Dutch English pronunciation in particular, were undermined and assigned less status. This effect, however, is a result of the social status that has been accredited to standard English varieties. As mentioned before, this status comes from stakeholders who benefit from a monolithic language view and the historical view of authority these varieties benefit from (Hinkel, 2011; Yoo, 2014).

2.4 Opportunities for Dutch Teachers of English

For many years now, English varieties are allocated to countries in Kachru's Three Concentric Circles. "The circles represent the spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional allocation of English in diverse cultural contexts (Xiaoqiong & Xianxing, 2011, p. 221). The Netherlands is particularly interesting to consider as scholars are analyzing its shifting position from Kachru's Expanding into the Outer Circle (Edwards, 2014; Edwards & Laporte, 2015; Gerritsen et al., 2016). According to Bruthiaux (2003), a result of the overlapping of Kachru's circles means acknowledging the plurality of English and accrediting these varieties an equal status. This, however, is determined by a country's language planning and policy, which is why "[i]t is of paramount importance for people in the Expanding Circle to realize that it is up to them to decide whether to master the language or, instead, allow themselves to be mastered by it" (Rajagopalan, 2011, p. 62). This decision comes down to the debate concerning language monolithism and pluralism, which is

important for the educational field as it affects language learning and teaching. Much research has been done on learners' needs and beliefs regarding non-standard English varieties and a growing number of articles concern teachers' attitudes towards this discussion. Alsagoff et al. (2012), Van Hattum and Rupp (2014) and Hinkel (2011) agree on the notion that teachers have the opportunity to create awareness of non-standard English varieties and, that in the end, they are the people who are able to guarantee a classroom in which the plural of English is welcome. In order to do so, teachers need to be open to the idea of English pluralism. The first step towards a pluralistic teaching practice in the Netherlands is mapping the perceptions of Dutch teachers of English on including non-standard varieties of English into the classroom. The aim of this research is to map the beliefs Dutch teachers of English have about non-standard varieties of English and the possibility of implementing these varieties into the classroom.

This research will use Kachru's (2011) concentric circles to characterize standard and non-standard varieties of English. Taking into account the acquisitional, sociocultural, motivational and functional dimension of the English language, countries are divided into the Inner Circle (IC), Outer Circle (OC) or Expanding Circle (EC). The acquisitional perspective is of interest here, as this represents the speakers of a nation as native, second language speaker or foreign language speaker. The IC represents English native speakers, the OC represents speakers of English as a second language and the EC represents speakers of English as a foreign language (Low, 2010). What is important about this, is the notion that the IC is norm-providing; "English standards are therefore determined by these speakers" (Low, 2010, p. 395). Kachru's concentric circles have been up for debate in relation to English Language Teaching. Some scholars argue that presenting the IC varieties as norm-providing does not reflect the current status of English and they call for a language ideology change (Caine, 2008; Bruthiaux, 2003; Xiaogiong & Xianxing, 2011). As mentioned earlier,

there are many arguments that call for a change in English language teaching, moving from monolithic perspective to a pluralistic language view. According to Caine (2008), the first step is to examine the underlying assumptions teachers have of the English language. This research will contribute by analyzing Dutch teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English and the possibilities of using non-standard varieties of English in the classroom.

3. Methodology

The present study is based on a Likert-scale questionnaire and interviews. The Likert-scale questionnaire was designed to identify teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English and to research whether Dutch teachers of English were open to the idea of incorporating non-standard varieties of English into their teaching practice. The Likert-scale questionnaire involved statements about non-standard varieties of English (L) and some open questions (O). The questionnaire was based on previous research by Chan (2017), Miyagi (2006), Tajeddin, Alemi and Pashmforoosh (2018) and Young and Walsh (2010).

The questions of the Likert-scale questionnaire can be grouped into two different types of questions: the first being about teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English, the second being about the application of non-standard varieties of English into their classrooms.

Teachers participating in the questionnaire were asked to participate in an in-depth interview in which their answers to the questionnaire were further explored. The data from the thematic analysis was used to exemplify the results from the questionnaire, using the theme reports to illustrate teacher's beliefs about and possibilities of applying non-standard varieties of English.

3.1 *Participants*

Eleven Dutch high school teachers of English (five male, six female) filled in the questionnaire. The participants' age ranged from 24 to 62, their years of teaching ranged from

1 to 40 with a mean of 11.6. All participants worked at the same public secondary school in Gelderland, the Netherlands, and provided English classes for junior to senior grades of MAVO, HAVO and VWO. An email was sent to all English teachers at the high school that was the focus of this study, solely teachers who responded participated in this study.

Out of the eleven participants, five (two male, three female) agreed to further analyze their attitudes towards non-standard varieties of English during an interview.

3.2 *Instruments*

3.2.1 Questionnaire

According to Greenlaw and Brown-Welty (2009) and Jamieson (2004), a Likert-scale questionnaire is suited to evaluate opinions and attitudes. That is why, in order to map Dutch teachers of English' perceptions of non-standard varieties of English, the participants were asked to rate ten statements; whether they 1) strongly disagree 2) disagree 3) neutral 4) agree or 5) strongly agree (see Appendix A). The questionnaire was sent using Google Forms.

The questions were categorized into beliefs about and application of non-standard varieties of English. Questions *O1*, *O5*, *L1*, *L3*, *L4*, *L5*, *L8*, *L9* and *L10* were designed to measure teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English (see Appendix A). Questions *O2*, *O3*, *O4*, *L2*, *L6* and *L7* were designed to map the possibilities of applying non-standard varieties of English into the classroom.

3.2.2 Interviews

Teachers who completed the questionnaire were asked to participate in interview sessions. According to Turner (1993), open-ended questions "may provide more accurate, powerful measurement of respondents' characteristics, attitudes and opinions" (p. 738). The interviews followed a structured form (see Appendix B), however, whenever participants wanted to elaborate on questions, or whenever answers led to asking different questions, no restrictions were made.

3.3 *Collecting Data*

The data collection was completed in the Netherlands, between February and March 2020. For the scope of this research, the analysis focused on one high school in the Netherlands. Besides, the results of this study could have an impact on the current teaching practice at the school, which is an indirect aim of this research into a pluralistic language view. To collect data, the questionnaire was sent via e-mail to all the sixteen staff members of the English department at a public secondary school in Gelderland, the Netherlands. Prior to answering the questionnaire and participating in the interviews, the participants were informed about the purpose of this research through a written introduction that preceded the questionnaire. By partaking in the questionnaire, the participants agreed to having their answers used anonymously for the purpose of this research. To ensure anonymity, the participants were referred to as Female 1,2 and 3 and Male 1 and 2.

Five teachers agreed to partake in the interview. The interviews were carried out in Dutch, the mother tongue of both the interviewees and the researcher. The interviews took place through Google Meet and took around 20 minutes to complete. The interviews were recorded by tape and an intelligent verbatim transcription was written. The transcriptions were later translated by the researcher. As pointed out by Temple and Young (2004), "if researchers see themselves as neutral and objective transmitters of messages . . . the translation act itself poses technical issues that can be overcome" (p.167). Although the researcher was part of the same English department as the participants, as translating is the process of packaging data in such a way that it can be dealt with, the translation and translator are simply part of the practical data-processing procedures (Temple & Young, 2004). Possible limitations as a result of this were discussed in the conclusion. All respondents of the questionnaire and the interviewees participated voluntarily.

3.4 *Analyzing Data*

The data gathered from the Likert-scale questionnaire was summarized in figures that show

the percentages of participants either strongly disagreeing, disagreeing, having a neutral

opinion, agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statements. The median was also calculated to

measure central tendency (Jamieson, 2004; Sullivan & Artino, 2013). The mean and standard

deviation are not appropriate measurements for ordinal data such as Likert-scale responses as

"the response categories have a rank order, but the intervals between values cannot be

presumed equal" (Jamieson, 2004, p. 1217). The open questions were used as a mean to

collect opinions and attitudes towards varieties of English and the use of these varieties in

class. The answers to questions *O1, O2*, *O3* and *O4* were categorized using Kachru's

concentric circles to give insight into the tendency the teachers had to identify standard

versus non-standard varieties of English. The answers to question *O5* were summarized and

used to recognize teachers' opinions about the role of the English language for students.

Nearly all purposes that were listed fit into four general categories, the amount of purposes in

one category were counted to determine percentages for each category.

The interviews provided more insight into teachers' opinions and beliefs about

teaching non-standard varieties of English. The interviews were thematically analyzed using

the transcriptions (Braun & Clarke, 2012). This means that patterns were identified by data

familiarization, data coding and reviewing and defining themes. The transcriptions were

inductively coded after experiential orientation of the data. After coding the transcriptions,

themes were defined to capture the most significant data in relation to the research question.

The reason for this is that the data, the interviews, determined the course of coding (Braun &

Clarke, 2012). The most significant and important findings were summarized and interpreted

in the results section to answer the research question. The results of this study will be

compared to the research described in the theoretical framework.

4. Results

In the following section, the results of the questionnaire and interviews are reported.

4.1 Questionnaire

As explained earlier, the five open and ten Likert-scale questions were categorized

into *beliefs about non-standard varieties of English* and *possibilities of applying non-*

standard varieties of English into the classroom.

4.1.1 Beliefs about non-standard varieties of English

Table 4.1 shows the results of the first category, teachers' beliefs about non-standard

varieties of English, including statements L1, L3, L4, L5, L8, L9 and L10. A summary of

how respondents ranked the statements can be found below.

Table 4.1
Teacher's beliefs about non-standard varieties of English

SA	*N*	8	3	/	7	2	/	2
	%	72.7	27.3	/	63.6	18.2	/	18.2
A	*N*	3	7	5	4	7	1	1
	%	27.3	63.6	45.5	36.4	63.6	9.1	9.1
N	*N*	/	/	5	/	1	4	3
	%	/	/	45.5	/	9.1	36.4	27.3
D	*N*	/	1	1	/	1	3	4
	%	/	9.1	9.1	/	9.1	27.3	36.4
SD	*N*	/	/	/	/	/	3	1
	%	/	/	/	/	/	27.3	9.1
Mdn		5	4	3	5	4	2	3
		L1	L3	L4	L5	L8	L9	L10

Note. **SA**= Strongly agree, **A**= Agree, **N**= Neutral, **D** =Disagree, **SD** =Strongly disagree.

For L1, all teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that English is an international common

language.

For L3, a great majority of teachers (90.9%) agreed or strongly agreed that native

English is the varieties that are spoken in the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

There was one teacher who disagreed with the statement.

For L4, there were 5 teachers (45.5%) who ranked neutral as well as there were 5 teachers who agreed with the statement that students will have more opportunities to use English with non-native speakers of English (such as people who live in Austria) than native speakers. There was one teacher who disagreed.

For L5, all teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that students will have more opportunities (e.g. educational, business) if they acquire a good command of English.

For L8, a majority of teachers (81.8%) either agreed or strongly agreed that they want their students to acquire the sound of standard English. There was one teacher who disagreed with this statement and one teacher who responded neutrally.

For L9, a small majority of teachers (54.6%) either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that as long as one gets the meaning across, how s/he speaks English does not matter. Most of the other respondents felt neutral (36.4%), one teacher agreed with the statement.

For L10, the median shows that the central tendency is neutral for believing in a monolithic view of language, rather than a pluralistic view. After adding up numbers, most teachers (45.5%) either strongly disagreed or disagreed. A smaller number of teachers (27.3%) either agreed or strongly agreed.

Open questions 1 and 5 were also designed to measure teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English. For O1, teachers had to list varieties of English other than American English and British English that they could think of. The answers are summarized in table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Varieties of English other than American English and British English

Inner C.	f	Outer C.	f	Expanding C.	f
Australia	10	India	7	Europa	1
Canada	8	South Africa	7	Caribbean	1
Ireland	8	Pakistan	2		

New Zealand	7	Nigeria	2
Scotland	6	Singapore	1
		Zambia	1
		Zimbabwe	1

Note. f = frequency of times the varieties were listed by teachers.

Of the 62 responses, 39 (62.9%) varieties belonged to Inner Circle countries, 21 (33.9%)

varieties belonged to Outer Circle countries and 2 (3.2%) belonged to Expanding Circle

countries.

To answer question O5: *Why do you think Dutch children need to learn English?* all

participants ranked three reasons why Dutch children need to learn English in order of

importance. Going through the answers, four categories have been identified into which most

answers could be divided. The results of this are below in table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Purposes of learning English

	English as a means of communication worldwide	*English learning to prepare for future education*	*English learning to enhance knowledge of the world*	*English learning to prepare for future jobs*
%	27.3%	24.2%	24.2%	15.2%

The percentages do not add up to 100% as there were three purposes listed which did not fit

into either category. These were: "Learning languages in general is good for your

development", "The fact that it is a beautiful language" and "General knowledge".

4.1.2 Possibilities of applying non-standard varieties into the classroom

Table 4.4 shows the results of the second category, possibilities of applying non-

standard varieties into the classroom, including question statements L2, L6 and L7.

Table 4.4
Possibilities of applying non-standard varieties

SA	N	/	/	1
	%	/	/	9.1
A	N	4	9	6
	%	36.4	81.8	54.5
N	N	3	1	4
	%	27.3	9.1	36.4
D	N	2	1	/
	%	18.2	9.1	/
SD	N	2	/	/
	%	18.2	/	/
Mdn		3	4	4
		L2	L6	L7

Note. **SA**= Strongly agree, **A**= Agree, **N**= Neutral, **D** =Disagree, **SD** =Strongly disagree.

For L2, four teachers (36.4%) agreed with the statement that because there are more

nonnative speakers than native speakers of English, EFL teaching should be reshaped to

move beyond the native-speaker norms to incorporate the commonly international linguistic

norms. An equal amount of teachers either strongly disagreed or disagreed (36.4%). The

second highest percentage answered neutrally.

For L6, a clear majority of teachers (81.8%) agreed with the notion of being interested

in introducing different varieties of English in their lessons.

For L7, a majority of teachers (63.6%) either agreed or strongly agreed with the

statement that apart from American and British English, secondary school students should

learn about other English varieties. The remaining 36.4% answered neutral.

Open questions 2, 3 and 4 were also designed to measure possibilities of applying

non-standard varieties of English into the classroom. For O2, teachers had to answer the

question which variety of English they thought they spoke (table 4.5). All respondents

answered that they speak a standard variety of English while teaching, a majority (72.7%)

speaks British English while the others (27.3%) speak American English. For O3, teachers

were given the opportunity to list a variety of English that they would like to teach (table

4.6). All respondents answered that they would like to continue teaching the variety that they

are currently teaching, which means that a majority of teachers (72.7%) would like to

continue teaching British English while the others (27.3%) would like to continue teaching

American English.

Table 4.5
Self-reported variety teachers are teaching

Inner C.	f	Outer C.	f	Expanding C.	f
British	8	/	0	/	0
American	3	/	0	/	0

Note. f = frequency of times the varieties were listed by teachers.

Table 4.6
Self-reported variety teachers would like to teach

Inner C.	f	Outer C.	f	Expanding C.	f
British	8	/	0	/	0
American	3	/	0	/	0

Note. f = frequency of times the varieties were listed by teachers.

For O4, teachers had to label the varieties of English they listed in question O1 as either

appropriate or inappropriate to teach (table 4.7). The majority of Inner Circle varieties of

English (71.1%) were labelled as appropriate to teach while the majority of Outer Circle

varieties (80%) and Expanding Circle varieties (100%) were labelled as inappropriate to

teach.

Table 4.7

Teaching appropriateness of varieties listed in O1

		Appropriate	Not Appropriate
Inner C.	N	27	11
	%	71.1	28.9
Outer C.	N	4	16
	%	20	80
Expanding C.	N	0	2
	%	0	100

4.2 Interviews

The qualitative data of the interviews have been thematically analyzed. Three themes have been identified from the data: 1) The importance of Inner Circle varieties over Outer and Expanding Circle varieties, 2) Teaching non-standard varieties: "A nice to have, not a must have" and 3) A standard variety of English as a daily example for students. The three theme reports are below.

4.2.1 Report of Theme 1: The importance of Inner Circle varieties over Outer and Expanding Circle varieties

During the interviews, all participants clearly showed that standard varieties of English (Inner Circle varieties) are of more importance than non-standard varieties (Outer or Expanding Circle varieties). Whenever participants provided an example of classroom activities that would incorporate non-standard varieties, they would still mostly use standard varieties to clarify their ideas. One participant explained a recent classroom activity: "The other day we had a lesson about Canada and I liked that very much, that we show our students, in Canada they also speak English but the English there sounds different, but is also English" (Female 2), and another interviewee described an activity in which students had to notice the differences between Irish slang (which is still associated with standard English) and standard English. Both participants use an Inner Circle variety while they both believe

they are exemplifying a situation in which it would be acceptable for students to use a non-standard variety.

The first general agreement from the participants, was that a standard variety of English (or IC variety) set the norm for teachers and students. All participants affirmed that they use a standard variety of English while teaching, all teachers either use British English or American English in front of their students. They also confirmed that they had been taught a standard variety of English during their studies. Everyone, either directly or indirectly, agreed that a standard variety of English should be the norm for their students. An example of an indirect agreement that came from one participant: "I try to teach them the English language as if it were their first language, I think. Just, in terms of pronunciation. I like it when they sound American or British or... and not Dutch" (Female 1). With this quote, this participant clarifies that students should learn British or American English and indirectly or, in other words, a standard variety of English. The sole reason for this seems personal preference: "I try to teach them the English language as if it were their first language, I think. Just, in terms of pronunciation. I like it when they sound American or British or... and not Dutch. I'm not going to tell them how they speak English in France" (Female 1). When this situation was presented to the participants, one answered that this is because of "general agreement"; we, as a society, all contributed to this belief that a standard variety of English should be the norm. This becomes particularly apparent when the interviewer proposed the following situation:

> *Interviewer: And what about the use of non-standard varieties? Let's suppose that your students start writing essays in Black English Vernacular.*
> *Female 1: Yes, but we don't accept that at school.*
> *Interviewer: No, but of course we don't accept that because we have a standard, which is either British or American. And everything that deviates from that standard is wrong.*
> *Female 1: Yes, in writing, yes. If you have someone who talks like that during an oral test, is that right or wrong? Actually, I don't know. Actually, I think it is. I don't know if I think that's wrong per se, but that's what everyone at our school thinks.*

Here, Female 1 feels that, because all teachers at work agree upon the fact that the use of a non-standard variety is wrong in writing and in speaking skills, the participant also adheres to that agreement while teaching. Whether or not the use of a non-standard variety of English is actually wrong (in the sense that its use is worse or not as good as the use of a standard variety of English) all participants agreed that a standard variety of English, preferably American or British English, should be the norm.

Although not directly linked to the question why a standard variety of English should be the norm, one participant explains that students should learn an "authentic" English accent:

> *Female 3: Well, I do hope my English has an American accent. Because I want to give my students the most authentic accent. I don't really feel like I have an extremely Dutch accent, so I think that's okay.*
> *Interviewer: Yeah, so now you're saying it's all right. So would you think it wouldn't be alright if your accent sounded Dutch?*
> *Female 3: Yeah.*
> *Interviewer: Why so?*
> *Female 3: Yes, because I still want them to have an authentic English accent. So even if that were to be an Australian English, it would still be an existing accent. A Dutch English accent is not an authentic English accent.*
> *Interviewer: And is an accent authentic when you were born and raised speaking that language? Or is that somehow linked to the country you're born in?*
> *Female 3: If English is the first language, I think it is an authentic English accent.*

Apparently, the Inner Circle varieties are norm providing because of the inhabitants of IC countries who have English as their mother tongue. Another participant also expressed personal feelings towards OC varieties: "I think it has to do with the fact that I think my students should learn a kind of pure form, and that Canadian is a language, and that I have less of that feeling with Singapore and India. For me those varieties are less than 100% pure, so that I'm like: they don't have to know that, because I don't see that as 100% good" (Female 2). This again has to do with this general agreement that most people think standard varieties of English should be norm providing. This is not a substantiated argument but rather is based on personal preferences.

Apparently, IC varieties are also norm providing for the English that is used by the interviewees themselves. Three participants provided examples of situations during which their English did not sound Dutch, but rather British or American English, and people responded to that. For all these participants, having their English accents recognized as a native accent was a compliment. This also works the other way around; two participants illustrated situations in which they either heard someone else speak English with a Dutch accent or when they felt that they spoke English with a Dutch accent themselves, for both situations the participants felt that the speaker should work on his or her English because it did not come across as professional but rather as incompetent:

> *Interviewer: But you did say, that fact that they don't hear that I'm from the*
> *Netherlands is a positive thing.*
> *Female 2: Yes.*
> *Interviewer: So, doesn't that have a certain value?*
> *Female 2: Yes. For example, when I hear people in higher positions speak with a*
> *Dutch accent, then I think, you should work on your English. So there's an*
> *association, unconsciously, that when you're rather intelligent or have a*
> *prominent job, you really have to sound like an Englishman.*

Examples like these were frequently reported, sometimes related to the accent of the participant him- or herself and sometimes related to the participants' students. What became apparent is the fact that, for all participants, varieties from Inner Circle countries were the first they thought of (even when asked about non-standard variety classroom activities), the varieties they were proud to be speaking and ultimately became the varieties the participants feel they have to teach to their students.

4.2.2 Report of Theme 2: Teaching non-standard varieties: "A nice to have, not a must have"

Responding to the possibility of teaching non-standard varieties of English, the interviewees saw the opportunity of how it could benefit their students, but at the same time wondered at what costs. The first general agreement from the participants was that teaching non-standard varieties of English should not take too much time. Almost everyone felt that deciding whether to spend time on non-standard varieties was up to the teacher because he or

she could best decide if there was time left. One participant explained this situation: "I personally think teaching about the non-standard varieties is more of a "Nice to have" than a "Must-have". . . . I notice that I don't make time for it during the classes that I teach. I have plenty of other things to do" (Male 1). Two conclusions came from this general agreement: 1) teachers already have much work to do, and teaching non-standard varieties increases workload and 2) teachers only see a possibility of teaching non-standard varieties if and when they have time left during class.

Teachers only feel they can spend time on non-standard varieties when there is time left because spending too much time means having less time for the standard varieties. One participant provides an example of this by saying: "I wouldn't put too much time into it. Because I do think I want to spend more time in raising their English level, in speaking and writing. It doesn't have to be disadvantageous, as long as you don't put too much time into it" and later, even more specifically: "I believe that time is better spent expanding your British or American vocabulary or use of language" (Female 2). By providing examples like these, the participants indirectly prioritize the standard varieties of English over the non-standard varieties. Summarizing other arguments of why teachers would not include non-standard varieties into their classroom include students' demotivation or disinterest in non-standard varieties and teachers' fear of students taking over sounds from non-standard varieties of English.

Although the participants agreed that introducing non-standard varieties to their students was not a priority, several arguments were listed that note how the non-standard varieties could benefit the students. All participants agreed that teaching non-standard varieties would raise students' global awareness:

> *Interviewer: So what would you suggest or want to see in terms of change?*
> *Male 2: Well, sometimes during listening exercises my students hear a certain accent*
> *   that they don't recognize, I would like to respond to that, that they become*
> *   aware that not everything is British or American but also that there are so*

> *many varieties, people from India also speak English but in a different*
> *manner, that you focus on that.*
> Interviewer: *So, that would be raising the students' awareness?*
> Male 2: *Yes.*

Many teachers provided similar examples of how non-standard varieties could raise students'

awareness, "I think it's good that they know that there are different accents", how it could

help them understand the world better, "It's also important to know that you can do more with

the English language than just speak properly in England or America, but that when you go

live or work somewhere else it is very useful because it is spoken in a lot of places". Some of

the interviewees also talked about countering stigmas, knowing that varieties other than

American and British come with a certain prejudice:

> Interviewer: *What do you think are the advantages of introducing non-standard*
> *varieties of English to your students?*
> Female 2: *I do think it would be good to show them that English is a widely spoken*
> *language and that there are many varieties of it, to show its international*
> *usefulness. And also to counter some sort of stigma, to show that it [non-*
> *standard varieties] is also normal, and that they need to be able to understand*
> *it. So also to enlarge their world view, I think that really should be part of our*
> *education.*

Raising awareness, countering stigmas and preparing them for the globalized world were all

listed as an advantage of introducing non-standard varieties into the classroom. The fact these

arguments surfaced many times during the interviews shows teachers feel non-standard

varieties of English are a way of teaching culture and are not so much about teaching a

language. The possibilities of a student opting for a non-standard variety because it might

benefit the student more because of personal reasons (a second language, future migration

plans, etc.), because the student simply prefers a different variety, feels more connected to

another variety or feels better qualified learning another variety were never listed during the

interviews.

A final benefit for students that came up many times during the interviews was that

students might learn to recognize and understand different varieties of English; this could

help them during tests or later on in life, when they would go to work in an international

workplace.

Teaching or introducing non-standard varieties of English is seen as something that

might be fun to do during class but will never be a priority. It seems that some conditions

need to be in place before students will come into contact with non-standard varieties: 1)

There is time left during class and 2) It does not disinterest, demotivate, or weaken students'

English skills. As stated before, resulting from the interviews it seems non-standard varieties

are inferior to standard varieties of English when it comes to dedicated teaching time.

4.2.3 Report of Theme 3: A standard variety of English as a daily example for students
One of the clearest results from the questionnaire was that teachers consciously and

subconsciously chose a standard variety of English as their accent. This was also reported

during the interviews. Some teachers felt this was a conscious choice:

> *Interviewer: Do you try to speak a standard variety of English when you are*
> *teaching? And by standard English I mean specifically the native varieties as*
> *you know them, so American English, British English, Australian English,*
> *those varieties.*
> *Female 1: So the question is, do I?*
> *Interviewer: Yes, is that what you're trying to do?*
> *Female 1: Yes, I guess my intention is to always hold on to that, in terms of accent.*

However, most teachers argued that this was something that happened subconsciously. That

means that, even though all teachers reported to speak a standard variety of English during

classes, this is something they do because they are used to doing it this way and not because

they felt that students need a teacher who speaks a standard variety of English. Many

interviewees listed education, travel and previous jobs as reasons why their accent belonged

to a standard variety of English. An illustrative quote comes from a participant who said:

"[S]o basically I can't help it" (Male 1). Whether or not teachers consciously have chosen to

speak a standard variety of English, it still means that their students are being taught either

British or American English.

Even though teaching a standard variety is not a conscious choice, according to the teachers, there is apparently a need for a standard variety because students encounter those more in their daily lives. A non-standard variety might be confusing for students to listen to or learn from because as they watch television or listen to music most of the English will be a standard variety of English. Teachers even thought that it might be confusing for students whenever a teacher would use a non-standard variety because they are not used to hearing anything else other than mainly British or American English. This means that the participants know that non-standard varieties of English do not play an important role in students' life, but consciously make the choice to exclude them from their education as well. This eventually results in a vicious circle; students do not come in contact with non-standard varieties in their daily lives, teachers fear they will not understand or appreciate them during school time, students will not come in contact with non-standard varieties at any time and will not get better at recognizing or understanding them.

Although some interviewees reported the importance of using a standard variety during teaching, consistency appeared to be of greater importance. All teachers participating in this research noted that students' consistency while speaking English is what they aim for. One teacher concluded: "I personally don't even mind if they speak with a Dutch accent. I don't care about my students having to speak either British or American as a standard, I think it's more important that they speak consistently. So if they have a certain sound, that they continue to use that, that it doesn't sound messy" (Male 2). Although not all interviewees thought it was acceptable for students to use a non-standard variety of English, everyone agreed students should try to hold on to one accent. Teachers felt consistency was important because students then sound better and it might help students learn a language better. While debating consistency, some teachers discussed the notion of communicative effectiveness. This was a highly controversial topic and led to questioning the standards teachers set for

students. Although it might be impossible for many students to ever attain native-like

competence, there were some teachers who argued that lowering expectations would result in

a poorer command of the English language:

> *Interviewer: But I also feel like, are you setting the bar too high for students who have*
> *fifty minutes of English class three times a week?*
> *Male 1: Depends, you could also say, basically this is the goal, this is what we're*
> *trying to achieve. It's just that I think it's annoying that these days everything*
> *is okay by saying: at least you've done the best you could. Like, forget all*
> *rules, as long as you know how to make yourself understood. I think the focus*
> *is too much on communicative effectiveness, so we end up with students who*
> *do not master the basics sufficiently. . . . Otherwise we really lower our*
> *standards too much.*

There were, however, teachers who believed the exact opposite: "It's difficult. If you can

make yourself understood but you pronounce the word wrong, yet I know what you mean and

your message comes across, what is more important?". (Male 2)

While discussing students' needs during the interviews, it became clear that one group

of teachers believed that teaching students a standard variety of English could only benefit

them because of 1) the status attached to a standard variety and because 2) having higher

standards means having better learning outcomes. The other group of teachers believed that

communicative effectiveness was of more importance than the variety of English students

would use during their communications.

5.   Discussion

To provide an answer to the research question, the results of this study have been categorized

into 1) teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English and 2) possibilities of

applying non-standard varieties of English into the classroom. The questionnaire and

interview results will be discussed separately after which a summary for each category

follows.

5.1 Teachers' beliefs about non-standard varieties of English
5.1.1 Questionnaire results

To determine the underlying assumptions teachers have about non-standard varieties of English, seven Likert-scale questions and two open questions have been asked. There are several striking observations that can be made from the results. First of all, every participant agreed that English is an international common language. Meaning that all participants acknowledge English is used globally and is not solely a language used by native speakers of English. However, when asked about native varieties of English, 90.9% of the participants agreed that these are the varieties spoken in Inner Circle countries. This could lead to the assumption that teachers acknowledge the global usage of English, yet still think of native varieties as standard varieties. This can also be seen from the 81.8% of participants who want their students to acquire the sound of standard English. This is most likely the results of the belief that students will have more future opportunities in life of they acquire a good command of English (everyone either agreed or strongly with that statement). A good command of English cannot be interpreted as a good command of non-standard English, as only one participant thought it did not matter how her/his student spoke English as long as she/he was communicatively effective. Most participants either disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement. The belief that a native variety of English is a standard variety of English is resonated in research by Alptekin (2002), Chan (2017) and Tollefson (2007). As it is socially constructed that native varieties of English are norm providing and this belief is held up by stakeholders, it becomes increasingly difficult for teachers of English to counter this stigma.

From these statements and the results, it can be said that teachers are aware of the fact that English is spreading globally and that it is reasonable to assume that students will use their English more to communicate with non-native users of English than native users of English. There seems to be awareness of the lingua franca status of English, yet there is still a belief that a good command of a standard variety of English will benefit students more in

their future (educational) careers. As the statement regarding a monolithic language view versus a pluralistic language view was answered neutrally, no major conclusions can be drawn. This might be an unfortunate result of not knowing whether the participants were familiar with the terms. However, it provides a window for discussion for the teachers at the secondary school in Gelderland. Especially when comparing the results of the questionnaire to the results of the question why teachers believe that their students need to learn English; the reason that was listed the most was that students needed English as a means of communication worldwide.

5.1.2 *Interviews results*
The first and third theme report are discussed below as these themes have to do with teacher's beliefs about non-standard varieties of English.

The first theme that was generated from the data analysis of the interviews already shows how teachers at the secondary school in Gelderland feel about non-standard varieties of English. Whenever teachers were confronted with questions regarding non-standard varieties of English, most of the time they would still refer to varieties of English that are associated with standard (or native) varieties of English in their classroom examples. This could indicate many things among which: a) they are not familiar with non-standard varieties (because teacher training and/or teaching methods do not include these varieties and b) they feel non-standard varieties are inferior to standard varieties. Argument A is based on the statement teachers made regarding their own standard variety accents which always led back to their education and argument B is based on the fact that teachers indicated that teaching anything but standard varieties of English would be the same as lowering expectations. Literature on teaching non-standard varieties of English does not include teachers' expectations of students, yet this leads back to the belief that anything that deviates from a native variety of English is undesirable. However, research by Murhpy (2014) shows that learners from OC countries are opening up to non-standard varieties as norm providing.

This was also discussed in theme 3, although teachers felt that they did not consciously choose to speak a standard variety of English because they are teaching and they feel that they should talk in a certain way, they still referred to standard varieties of English as their preferred way of speaking. This might be a result of the general belief that students encounter more standard varieties of English than non-standard varieties of English and teachers feel a need to conform to this. As stated in the theme report, this means that teachers consciously make a choice to exclude non-standard varieties of English. This is something that happens worldwide as the current educational system fails to reflect the current status of the globalization of the English language (Bruthiaux, 2003; Tollefson, 2007). As the teachers at the public secondary school in Gelderland choose to exclude non-standard varieties from their teaching practice, the conclusion can be drawn that the non-standard varieties are of lesser, or even no, importance to the teachers in this context.

5.2 *Applying non-standard varieties of English into the classroom*
5.2.1 *Questionnaire results*
In order to get a clearer picture of the possibilities of applying non-standard varieties into the classroom, three Likert-scale questions and three open questions have been asked.

Some general agreements came to light by comparing the answers to the statement regarding teaching non-standard varieties of English. First, apart from one teacher, all teachers are interested in introducing different varieties of English during their classes. Secondly, not one teacher disagreed with the statement that American and British English should not be the sole variety of English with which students come into contact. However, different varieties could still mean a different standard variety of English. The importance of introducing and learning about different varieties of English is something that all teachers seem to acknowledge. Reshaping teachers' teaching practice to accommodate the global spread of the English language is, however, something else. Yet, teachers' acknowledgement of the importance of non-standard varieties of English might be a first step towards

introducing pluralistic language teaching as teachers are in charge of what is taught in their classroom (Alsagoff et al., 2012; Hinkel, 2011; Van Hattum & Rupp, 2014).

The answers to the open questions provided more insight into the actual possibility of teaching a non-standard variety of English as all teachers reported that they currently speak a standard variety of English while teaching and preferred to continue doing so. The same goes for listing varieties of English that were either appropriate or inappropriate to teach, where the majority of IC varieties were listed as appropriate while OC and EC varieties were, apart from four others, were listed as inappropriate.

5.2.2 *Interviews results*
All themes are briefly discussed below as they provide more detail about the possibilities of using non-standard varieties during classes.

The first theme, as previously stated, shows how teachers think about using non-standard varieties; they do not use them themselves and would not prefer their students to use one either. Even though this might be a result of the general covert agreement that standard varieties of English sound better, this affects the current teaching practice in the end. The decision to not actively engage in teaching non-standard varieties of English is therefore based on a feeling or preference instead of research and students' needs. Focusing on standard varieties of English while excluding non-standard varieties based on a feeling or belief seems to contradict research findings that state learning English as a foreign language will unlikely result in native-like competence. Besides, by setting a standard that is inaccessible, language learning will result in frustration and fear of using the language and by imposing a standard, anyone who's language skill deviates from that standard will be looked at as inferior to others who master the standard (Chan, 2017; Kyndt et al., 2011; Murphy, 2014; Van Hattum & Rupp, 2014).

An analysis of the second theme, however, demonstrates that teachers see a dominant reason to teach non-standard varieties: global awareness. Many times, teaching OC and EC

varieties was linked to teaching culture instead of language. This reflects the global widespread of the English language, yet still denies the lingua franca status. The participants all agreed that teaching non-standard varieties was something to do when there was time left after teaching the standard variety of English. Apparently, there is even some fear for students' level of English when too much time is spent on non-standard varieties of English. At all times, teachers said that they felt that teaching a standard variety of English would benefit students more and it was in the students' favor to do so. This means that the possibility of including non-standard varieties of English in the classroom is rather limited.

Students' needs was the final theme and provided more insight into what teachers believe was necessary to teach students. During the interviews, discussing the benefits of introducing non-standard varieties led to the topic of communicative effectiveness. Some teachers linked this to non-standard varieties because they were undecided whether it was more important to them that students were able to convey a message or speak properly according to IC norms. It seems that communicating effectively is an objective to some teachers while to others it is seen as lowering the standards or, in other words, forgetting the native speaker norms. The teachers who thought of communicative effectiveness as positive also showed more interest in introducing non-standard varieties into the classroom and vice versa, which is in line with the monolithic versus pluralistic language view debate. Stakeholders of monolithic language education advocate for native varieties as norm-proving to prevent miscommunication (Hinkel, 2011; Tollefson, 2007). Possible solutions for miscommunication such as the Lingua Franca Core (Jenkins, 2005), are increasingly presented by pluralistic language ideologists and represented in language education research.

The participants of this study all indicated that they wanted their students to acquire the sound of a standard variety of English because of the belief that native-like competence will result in more educational and business opportunities in the future. Although the lingua

franca status of English is clear to teachers, more training is needed when it comes to the

substantiated research regarding stakeholders of the monolithic language view who ignore

language variation in standard varieties and students' needs when it comes to achievable

language competence.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Research question

This study aimed at analyzing the beliefs Dutch teachers of English at one school have about

non-standard varieties of English and the possibility of introducing those varieties into the

classroom. Firstly, the data that has been gathered through questionnaires and interviews was

used to formulate an answer to the research question. Secondly, the data has been compared

to the literature review to substantiate the conclusions that can be drawn from the data.

6.2 Major conclusions

Concerning the opinions Dutch teachers of English have about non-standard varieties of

English, this research shows that non-standard varieties are still seen as inferior to standard

varieties. Even though teachers are aware of the globalizing role of English and the

outnumbering of native English speakers by non-native speakers, there is still a preference for

standard varieties of English. This is a possible result of their teacher training and the need to

conform to norms that have been provided a long time ago. A general covert agreement

ensures that teachers see non-standard varieties of English as errors because they want their

students to acquire the sound of either British or American English. Teachers believe that

teaching a standard variety of English is accommodating to students' needs as, despite

English spreading globally, the use of a standard variety is linked to future educational and/or

career success.

As for the possibility of using non-standard varieties of English in the classroom, the

data shows that teachers are willing to introduce non-standard varieties of English, however,

reshaping their teaching practice to accommodate to the plurilithic status of English is not

something teachers are eager about. Teaching or using non-standard varieties of English in the classroom is something that is linked to teaching culture instead of language, and because many teachers prefer their students to develop their English language skills before learning about culture, teaching OC and EC varieties of English is only incorporated into their teaching practice if there is time left during class.

Despite the fact that all participants thought of introducing non-standard varieties of English as something that could possibly be done when they had some time left, there seems to be a small minority of teachers who are willing to forget the native speaker norms and conform to communicative effectiveness. Although focusing on communicative effectiveness is not necessarily the same as applying non-standard varieties into the classroom, it might be a first step towards forgetting the IC norms and conforming to the lingua franca status of English. There appears to be an opportunity for the teachers at the secondary school in Gelderland when it comes to communicative effectiveness as half of the participants agreed that this was something that they were interested in. As said before, communicative effectiveness does not necessarily equal teaching non-standard varieties of English, yet it is a first step towards disregarding the native speaker standards and moving towards accepting the global use of the English language.

6.3 Limitations of the study

Several limitations were found during this study which need to be taken into account. First of all, regarding the method that was applied, the study focused on one high school in the Netherlands which does not represent a wider population. The same goes for the participant population which included eleven teachers of English. This means that the conclusions that have been drawn from the data do not necessarily apply to a wider audience. Secondly, the interviews were carried out by the researcher, transcribed by the researcher and translated by the researcher, which could suggest that subjective observations and decisions have been made. Appendix C and D show an example of the translation process that has been utilized.

Despite these limitations, this study aims at providing a closer look into the possibilities for non-standard varieties of English in Dutch high schools.

6.4 Suggestions for future research
As the current study presents a small scale study, future research might focus on a broader public; including more high schools and more high school teachers. Besides, ensuring participants have a clear understanding of all terminology used in the questionnaire is of importance as this might have an effect on the conclusions that have already been drawn. Although it seems that teachers are aware of the global widespread of the English language yet ignore the lingua franca status, teachers in this study suggested that communicative effectiveness was something they were interested in. A future study could focus on the opportunity to incorporate Jenkins (2002) lingua franca core into the classroom to better aid students' needs in a globalizing world. This would include educating teachers about stakeholders of the monolithic language view and the implications they have on language policy and planning.

References

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. ELT journal, 56(1), 57-64.

Alsagoff, L., McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2012). Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language. Routledge.

Baldauf, R. B. (1994). [Unplanned] Language Policy and Planning. Annual review of applied linguistics, 14, 82-89.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2012) Thematic analysis. In Cooper, H. (Ed.), The Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology. American Psychological Association.

Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. International journal of applied linguistics, 13(2), 159-178.

Caine, T. M. (2008). Do you speak global?: The spread of English and the implications for English language teaching. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education/Revue canadienne des jeunes chercheures et chercheurs en éducation*, *1*(1).

Chan, J. Y. H. (2017). Stakeholders' perceptions of language variation, English language teaching and language use: the case of Hong Kong. Journal of multilingual and multicultural development, 38(1), 2-18.

Edwards, A. (2014). The progressive aspect in the Netherlands and the ESL/EFL continuum. World Englishes, 33(2), 173-194.

Edwards, A., & Laporte, S. (2015). Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes: The competing roles of norm orientation and proficiency levels. English World-Wide, 36(2), 135-169.

Fasoglio, D., & Tuin, D. (2018). Speaking skill levels of English attained in Dutch secondary education. SLO.

Gerritsen, M., Van Meurs, F., Planken, B., & Korzilius, H. (2016). A reconsideration of the status of English in the Netherlands within the Kachruvian Three Circles model. World Englishes, 35(3), 457-474.

Greenlaw, C., & Brown-Welty, S. (2009). A comparison of web-based and paper-based survey methods: testing assumptions of survey mode and response cost. *Evaluation review*, *33*(5), 464-480.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2011). Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning (Vol. 2). Routledge.

Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: how to (ab) use them. *Medical education*, *38*(12), 1217-1218.

Jenkins, J. (2005). Teaching pronunciation for English as a lingua franca: A sociopolitical perspective. *The globalisation of English and the English language classroom*, 145-158.

Kachru, Y. (2011). Contexts and Relevance for Language Education. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, *2*, 155.

Kyndt, E., Dochy, F., Struyven, K., & Cascallar, E. (2011). The perception of workload and task complexity and its influence on students' approaches to learning: A study in higher education. *European journal of psychology of education*, *26*(3), 393-415.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States. London: Routledge.

Low, E. L. (2010). The acoustic reality of the Kachruvian circles: A rhythmic perspective. *World Englishes*, *29*(3), 394-405.

Miyagi, K. (2006). Japanese EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Nonnative Varieties of English: Are They Ready to Include Other Englishes in Their Classrooms? (Doctoral dissertation, McGill University).

Murphy, J. M. (2014). Intelligible, comprehensible, non-native models in ESL/EFL

pronunciation teaching. System, 42, 258-269.

Nejjari, W., Gerritsen, M., Van der Haagen, M., & Korzilius, H. (2012). Responses to Dutch-

accented English. World Englishes, 31(2), 248-267.

Park, J. S. Y. (2017). Class, competence, and language ideology: Beyond Korean Englishes.

In *Korean Englishes in transnational contexts* (pp. 53-72). Palgrave Macmillan,

Cham.

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. (2010). 'Laat native speaker Engels geven op basisschool.'

Retrieved from https://www.nemokennislink.nl/publicaties/laat-native-speaker-

engels-geven-op-basisschool/

Rajagopalan, K. (2011). The 'Outer Circle'as a role model for the 'Expanding Circle':

Learning lessons on English worldwide. English Today, 27(4), 58-63.

Sayer, P. (2008). Demystifying language mixing: Spanglish in school. Journal of Latinos and

Education, 7(2), 94-112.

Simon, E. (2005). How native-like do you want to sound? A study of the pronunciation target

of advanced learners of English in Flanders. Moderna Sprak, 99(1), 12-21.

SLO. (2019). Engels in het basisonderwijs. https://slo.nl/thema/vakspecifieke-

thema/mvt/engels/

Song, J. (2017). Korean English Teachers' Conflicts and Struggles Over Local, Global, and

'Legitimate'Englishes in School. In *Korean Englishes in Transnational Contexts* (pp.

201-220). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Sullivan, G. M., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type

scales. *Journal of graduate medical education*, *5*(4), 541-542.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2018). Idealized native-speaker linguistic and

pragmatic norms in English as an international language: Exploring the perceptions of

nonnative English teachers. Language and Intercultural Communication, 18(3), 300-314.

Temple, B., & Young, A. (2004). Qualitative research and translation dilemmas. *Qualitative research*, *4*(2), 161-178.

Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Ideology, language varieties, and ELT. In International handbook of English language teaching (pp. 25-36).

Turner, J. (1993). Using Likert scales in L2 research. Another researcher comments. *TESOL Quarterly*, *27*(4), 736-739.

Van den Doel, R. (2010). Native and non-native models in ELT: Advantages, disadvantages, and the implications of accent parallelism. Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics, 46(3), 349-365.

Van Hattum, J., & Rupp, L. (2014). English pronunciation teaching at Dutch secondary schools: Taught or caught. *Pronunciation Matters Accents of English in the Netherlands and Elsewhere*, 69.

Xiaoqiong, B. H., & Xianxing, J. (2011). Kachru's three concentric circles and English teaching fallacies in EFL and ESL contexts. Changing English, 18(2), 219-228.

Yamanaka, N. (2006). An evaluation of English textbooks in Japan from the viewpoint of nations in the inner, outer, and expanding circles. JALT journal, 28(1), 57.

Yoo, I. W. (2014). Nonnative teachers in the expanding circle and the ownership of English. Applied linguistics, 35(1), 82-86.

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), 123-137.

Appendix A

Questionnaire (Likert-scale and open questions)

Dear colleagues,

For my MA thesis at Utrecht University I am doing research into the plurality of the English language. Nowadays, there are more users of the English language as a lingua franca than there are native speakers, however, contemporary education continues to focus on the English used in countries where English is the mother tongue (Great Britain, America, Australia, etc.). With the help of literature research and the results of this questionnaire and subsequent interviews, I hope to get a better picture of whether teachers of English are interested in introducing and/or using non-standard varieties in the classroom.

This questionnaire includes open questions and Likert-scale questions which need rating (strongly disagree – strongly agree). Please complete the entire questionnaire.

I would really appreciate it if you would be open for an interview based on questions related to the topic of my thesis. This interview will be held in Dutch for practical reasons. Below this questionnaire you can inform me whether you would like to participate.

The answers will be processed anonymously in my thesis; the reason I ask for age and years of experience is because I need this information for my methodology. By participating in this questionnaire and/or interview you agree and give consent to having your answers used for my research.

Thank you in advance,

Kind regards

Gender:
Female / Male

Age:

Years of experience:

Level of teaching (onderbouw/bovenbouw, MAVO/HAVO/VWO):

O1. Please list varieties of English other than American English and British English

that you can think of.

O2. Which English do you think you are teaching?

O3. Which English would you like to teach?

O4. Please divide the varieties of English you have listed in Q1 into two groups: the types of English you think are appropriate to teach in your class and the types of English you think are not appropriate to teach in your class. Please give the reasons for your classification.

O5. Why do you think Dutch children need to learn English? Please list three reasons in order of importance.

L1. English is an international common language.

L2. As there are more nonnative speakers than native speakers of English, EFL teaching should be reshaped to move beyond the native-speaker norms to incorporate the commonly accepted international linguistic norms.

L3. "Native" English is the varieties that are spoken in the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

L4. I foresee that my students will have more opportunities to use English with non-native speakers of English (such as people who live in Austria) than native speakers.

L5. I believe that students will have more opportunities (e.g. educational, business) if they acquire a good command of English.

L6. I am interested in introducing different varieties of English in my lessons.

L7. Apart from American and British English, secondary school students should learn about other English varieties.

L8. I want my students to acquire the sound of standard English.

L9. As long as one gets the meaning across, how s/he speaks English does not matter.

L10. I believe in a monolithic view of language, rather than a pluralistic view.

I would like to participate in an interview concerning the topic: native and non-native varieties of English in the classroom:
Yes / No

Appendix B

Interview Guideline

- Do you try to speak a standard variety of English in front of the class? Why?

- Do you think you have a strong accent (e.g. Dutch English)? How do you feel about this?

- Do you think it is important for students to learn about non-standard varieties of English? Why?

- Do you feel that, using the current teaching method, students learn enough about non-standard varieties of English? Why?

- Would you be open to the idea of introducing non-standard varieties of English to your students? Why?

- What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of introducing non-standard varieties of English to your students? Why?

- How important do you feel it is that your students speak a standard variety of English? Why?

- Do you feel using standard English is more important in writing than in speaking? Why?

Appendix B (Dutch translation)

Richtlijnen Interview

- Probeer je een standaard variant Engels te praten wanneer je voor de klas staat les te geven? Waarom?

- Heb je het idee dat je Engels accent erg Nederlands klinkt? Wat vind je daar van?

- Vind je het belangrijk dat je leerlingen meer te weten komen over het Engels dat gebruikt wordt in landen waar Engels een tweede of vreemde taal is? Waarom?

- Vind je dat leerlingen in het huidige Engels onderwijs genoeg leren over niet-standaard varianten van Engels? Waarom?

- Sta je open voor het idee om niet-standaard varianten van Engels te introduceren aan je leerlingen? Waarom?

- Wat zijn, volgens jou, de voordelen en nadelen van het introduceren van niet-standaard varianten van Engels aan je leerlingen? Waarom?

- Hoe belangrijk vind je het dat je leerlingen een standaard variant Engels kunnen spreken? Waarom?

- Vind je het gebruik van een standaard variant Engels belangrijker tijdens schrijfvaardigheid dan tijdens spreekvaardigheid? Waarom?

Appendix C

Sample Excerpts from Interviews (Translated English Transcript)

(19/03/2020) *Interviewer: Do you think it's important that your students learn more about the English used in countries where English is a second or foreign language?*
Male 1: I don't make that an active learning objective. I especially like them to get in touch with it by showing a movie or having them listen to different accents now and then during various listening exercises, also because they come across accents like Welsh or Irish during the final exam, so in that sense I think it's good to vary.
Interviewer: Now you mention accents that are all associated with a standard variety of English.
Male 1: Yes, that's true. I don't necessarily think they're standard, but I get your point. I personally think teaching about the non-standard varieties is more of a "Nice to have" than a "Must-have". I would link non-standard varieties more to culture, cultural history, colonization and so on. But I notice that I don't make time for it during the classes that I teach. I have plenty of other things to do.

(24/03/2020) Female 2: I think it is good that they do that, show that that's also English. But I would rather emphasize what the standard varieties are and which are less well known than American and British, than that I would really explain or teach a non-standard variety. Because in my opinion it adds less to English education, and it's not some kind of objective. I believe that time is better spent expanding your British or American vocabulary or use of language.
Interviewer: What do you think are the advantages of introducing non-standard variaties of English to your students?
Female 2: I do think it would be good to show them that English is a widely spoken language and that there are many varieties of it, to show its international usefulness. And also to counter some kind of stigma, to show that it [non-standard varieties] is also normal, and that they need to be able to understand it. So also to enlarge their world view, I think that really is part of our education.

(23/03/2020) Female 1: I try to teach them the English language as if it were their first language, I think. Just, in terms of pronunciation. I like it when they sound American or British or... and not Dutch. I'm not going to tell them how they speak English in France.
Interviewer: Okay, so do you think that students in contemporary English education, so the way we teach it now, learn enough about non-standard varieties of English?
Female 1: Well they don't learn much about it. But that's not really necessary, I think. I don't really know. I've never thought about it like that. I think... they just learn the language the way they hear it, on TV or in music. So there's not really any attention to that in class. I explain sometimes, this is British and this is American. It's like, you can pick an accent by yourself. As long as you hold on to one accent.

Appendix D

Sample Excerpt from Interviews (Original Dutch Transcript)

(19/03/2020) *Interviewer: Vind je het belangrijk dat jouw leerlingen meer te weten komen over het Engels dat gebruikt wordt in landen waar Engels een tweede of vreemde taal is?*
Man 1: Ik maak daar geen actief leerdoel van. Ik vind het vooral leuk dat ze er mee in contact komen door af en toe een filmpje te laten zien of iets te laten horen, ook omdat ze tijdens het eindexamen accenten krijgen zoals Welsh of Iers, dus in die zin vind ik het goed om daarin te variëren.
Interviewer: Nu noem je dus wel weer accenten die geassocieerd worden met een standaard Engels.
Man 1: Ja dat is waar. Ik vind ze niet per se standaard, maar ik snap je punt. Ik vind informatie over de niet standaard varianten persoonlijk meer een "Nice to have" dan een "Musthave", dat is het meer. Ik zou niet-standaard varianten meer koppelen aan cultuur, cultuurgeschiedenis, kolonisatie enzovoorts. Maar ik merk dat ik er geen tijd voor maak tijdens de lessen. Ik heb op zich genoeg andere dingen te doen.

(24/03/2020) Vrouw 2: Ik vind het wel goed dat ze dat doen, laten zien dat dat ook Engels is. Maar ik zou eerder dan de nadruk leggen op wat de standaard varianten zijn en die dan minder bekend zijn dan Amerikaans en Brits, dan dat ik echt een niet standaard variant zou gaan toelichten. Omdat dat voor mijn gevoel minder toevoegt, en ook niet een soort einddoel is. Die tijd kan je dan beter stoppen in het uitbreiden van je Britse of Amerikaanse vocabulaire of taalgebruik.
Interviewer: Wat zijn dan volgens jou de voordelen van het introduceren van niet-standaard varianten van Engels aan je leerlingen?
Vrouw 2: Ik denk wel dat het goed is m te laten zien dat Engels een taal is die overal wordt gesproken en dat er veel varianten van zijn, om het internationale nut ervan te laten zien. En ook om een soort stigma tegen te gaan, om te laten zien dat dat ook normaal is, en dat ze dat moeten kunnen begrijpen en verstaan. Dus ook het vergroten van hun wereldbeeld, ik vind dat echt onderdeel van ons onderwijs.

(23/03/2020) Vrouw 1: Ik probeer ze de taal te leren alsof het hun eerste taal is, denk ik. Gewoon, qua uitspraak. Ik vind het toch wel fijn als ze Amerikaans klinken of Brits of.. en niet Nederlands. Ik ga ze niet vertellen hoe ze Engels praten in Frankrijk.
Interviewer: Oké, vind je dan dat leerlingen in het huidige Engels onderwijs, zoals we het dus nu geven, genoeg leren over niet-standaard varianten van Engels?
Vrouw 1: Nou ze leren er niet zoveel over. Maar dat is ook niet echt nodig, denk ik. Weet ik eigenlijk niet. Ik heb daar nooit zo over nagedacht. Ik denk.. zij leren gewoon de taal van de manier waarop ze het horen, op tv of in muziek. Dus in de les is daar niet echt aandacht voor. Ik leg weleens uit, dit is Brits en dit is Amerikaans. Zo van: je mag het helemaal zelf weten. Zolang je maar vasthoudt aan één accent.