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Abstract

This research is undertaken against the backdrop of changing trends and perspectives surrounding spoken English, and growing calls for target model reform in the English language teaching (ELT) world. Its primary aim is to investigate the relationship between novice and experienced teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) from the Irish English (IE) background, and varieties of spoken English that have hitherto been excluded from this educational domain for normative reasons pertaining to language ‘prestige’. To achieve this, the study adopts a triangulated methodology, and a multidisciplinary analytic approach featuring corpus-assisted discourse analysis, and theories and frameworks from sociolinguistics, pragmatics and SLA for the analysis of primary data from a 60,000 word corpus of teacher talk, on-line teacher questionnaires and semi-structured dyadic interviews. The specific focus of the research is to explore teacher language awareness, teacher language attitudes and teacher classroom language use together with correlations between these dimensions and underlying macro-sociolinguistic influences. Overall results indicate a closer relationship between the novices and the specified varieties represented than the experienced teachers, with language awareness and age seen to act as key underlying determinants. The qualitative analysis further investigates the primary socio-pragmatic and discourse roles played by the specified usages in teacher talk in the local EFL classroom context and key related pedagogical issues and considerations, in order to gauge whether their use can be warranted, and the ways in which this can be successfully mediated for learners. The findings are expected to lead to a more finely-nuanced understanding of the model of English used by teachers in an IE context, which has potential to inform English language teacher education (ELTE) in Ireland and more widely.
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Chapter One

Brave New English Language Teaching World

1.1 Introduction and Rationale

The impetus for this study comes from the rapidly changing English language landscape over the past fifty years or so, which Jenkins (2009: 200) reminds us carries profound and far-reaching implications for all those involved in the teaching and learning of English as a foreign and second language today. As an education and qualifications in English have become increasingly linked to social and economic advancement, so too has there been a rapid expansion in the international ELT industry and profession in an attempt to meet the new demands of the global market place (Graddol et al 2007). This in turn, has led to increased work opportunities for teachers of English as Foreign Language (EFL), especially in Higher Education contexts for graduates holding MA TESOL qualifications. In line with the growing need for competent and well-trained teachers of English, there has been an increased focus on professionalism and more recently, on international standardisation in the ELT educational sector and calls for more effective approaches to their preparation and professional development on post-graduate English language teacher education programmes (ELTE) (Holiday 2005: 385). Amongst the many thousands who seek to avail of the opportunities that have arisen to develop a career in this international educational sector, we find EFL teachers from Ireland whose target English viewpoints and practices as a professional group are explored in this study, against the backdrop of the brave new ELT world which is emerging.

Like ELT practitioners elsewhere, Irish EFL teachers now face a professional environment where they can expect to find different and unique contexts and settings in which the English language is being learned, and both traditional and new approaches to how and what they teach. In particular, the phenomenon of English as a lingua franca, (ELF), has created new sets of issues and questions concerning the nature of the language that is taught as a target
model for learners as the historic Anglo-American approach based on idealised native speaker norms has come under increased criticism and found wanting (Jenkins 2009: 201). As many linguists have observed (see Pennycook 1994, 2000, 2007; Canagarajah 2002, 2005, 2006a; Timmis 2002; Jenkins 2007; Young and Walsh 2010; Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Matsuda 2012; Hall et al 2013), these developments carry major implications for practitioners in terms of their target English choices and decision-making at the ‘chalk face’ and for teacher educators too, in terms of how best to prepare EFL teachers for their future target English role. Accordingly, there is now a growing and need for critical pedagogic guidance in this area informed by empirically-based research carried out in different classroom contexts and settings.

However, while more recently, the on-going academic debate surrounding suitable target English models has started to address teacher and learner attitudes to English in a global context, and the diversity within Englishes, as main stakeholders in the ELT world, (Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994, 2000, 2007; Canagarajah 2002, 2005, 2006a; Timmis 2002; Jenkins 2007; Young and Walsh 2010; Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Matsuda 2012; Hall et al 2013), researchers in the World Englishes ELT field have not yet engaged with the models of English that practitioners use with learners in their target English interactions in the classroom. This is surprising given the key role that teacher talk is accorded in SLA theory as a rich source of target English input for learners in CLT-type classroom settings (communicative language teaching) (Long 1983, 1996; Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011). Accordingly, from this perspective, the classroom language use of the teacher provides an implicit target English model for learners alongside the model explicitly promoted in the ELT curriculum.

The present study sets out to address this gap in the research literature, as identified originally by Jenkins (2007: 44) who stressed the need for classroom-based research that explores what teachers do in terms of the target model choices they make in practice, and the factors influencing their related decision-making, to gain an accurate picture of the current state of play in this area in different teaching contexts and settings. The specific focus of this study is on the models of English used by novice and experienced EFL practitioners from the IE background in the local teaching context at the level of language variety. It also examines the underlying influence of language awareness, language attitudes and sociolinguistic
identity, in order to gain a more complete understanding of the practices observed. In this way, the present research creates opportunities to explore the implications of changing global trends and perspectives surrounding spoken English for native speaker English teachers (NESTs) from the unique IE background, which is important not least because their target English practices have been subject historically to restrictive Anglo-American English norms to the exclusion of their own variety. Accordingly, like NNESTs, they have been expected to promote varieties of English ‘that belong to a distant other’ even when teaching in the local setting, with similar issues of discrimination arising as a result, as White (2006: 228) and Swan (2016: 44) have highlighted. In so doing, it is intended that the insights gained will bring a more finely-nuanced understanding to the assumed NESTs/NNESTs dichotomy which has traditionally accorded NESTs a privileged status in the ELT world by comparison with their NNEST counterparts due to reasons pertaining to ‘language prestige’, and the native speaker ideologies therein reflected (Phillipson 1992, 2008; Pennycook 2001, 2007).

With this key consideration in mind, the discussion in this chapter begins by positioning the present study in relation to ongoing socio-political and linguistic trends surrounding spoken English that are challenging the legitimacy of the existing native speaker target English status quo. It then highlights the conflicting academic discourses these developments have given rise to amongst World English theorists, and the uncertainties increasingly faced by EFL practitioners as a result, in terms of their role as either ‘gatekeepers of existing target English practices or promotors of new ones’, as highlighted by Timmis (2002, 2012). Finally, it explores what these developments might mean for Irish EFL teachers in terms of both the new challenges and the opportunities they can expect in their future target English practices.

Having established the wider research context, the specific objectives to be addressed are set out, followed by a review of the varieties of spoken English that form the basis of its linguistic focus. From this, a further critical appraisal is undertaken of the importance of the present research, including its potential qualitative outcomes for ELTE in the local teaching context, and more widely, given that the researcher is a teacher educator working on an MA teacher education programme in Ireland which prepares novice and experienced EFL teachers for international practice. The chapter closes with an overview of the thesis, which also signals where some of the key issues raised in this introductory chapter are revisited, given their centrality to the research aims.
1.2 The Changing English Language Landscape

1.2.1 Socio-Political Trends Surrounding Spoken English

The academic discussions about suitable target models for ELT stem in large part from the rapid and seemingly unstoppable spread of English internationally over the past fifty years or so, fuelled by the processes of globalisation (Kachru 1985, 1996; Widdowson 1994; Pennycook 2000; Brutt-Griffler 2002; Graddol et al 2007). This phenomenon is viewed by Crystal (2004: 27) as one of the most important linguistic developments of our times, as he perceives: “we have moved in twenty-five years from a fifth to a quarter to a third of the world’s population being speakers of English”. With recent estimates (Crystal 2012: 13) of 350 million native English speakers (NES), in comparison to more than a billion non-native speakers of the language (NNES), the international status of English is no longer based on the number of its native speakers but rather on its global role as a “lingua economica, lingua academica and lingua cultura”, as Phillipson earlier observed (2008: 250). The emergence of new Englishes shaped at the local level by contact with indigenous languages and local communication needs (Milroy 2001: 131), and the reality of English as a lingua franca (ELF), have brought to the fore new sets of questions and controversies concerning the ownership of the language. In particular, it has problematized the concept of native speaker, and native speaker supremacy (see Davies 2003) especially as it is used to define the only legitimate models and targets for language learning (Kramsch 1998; Cook 1999; Leung 2005; Jenkins 2007, 2009, 2012).

Kachru’s work in particular has highlighted the misrepresentation of English use contained in descriptive accounts which have disregarded the sociolinguistic realities of millions of beyond the ‘inner circle ‘of native speakers in England and its former colonies (Hall et al 2013:). His ‘Three Concentric Circles of English’ model has drawn attention to the Englishes used in the ‘Outer Circle’ where the language was institutionalised and gradually indigenised. He also recognised the spread of English as a ‘performance variety’ in the rapidly expanding circle of countries where it is taught and learner as a foreign language. As Figure 1.1 below illustrates, the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles thereby broadly correspond to English as it is used in L1 or native language (ENL), second language (ESL) and foreign language (EFL) settings.
Accordingly, the Inner Circle refers to countries where English was originally codified, and where it is used today as a native language such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Within this grouping, where the language is spoken by about 375 million speakers, main ‘standard’ varieties exist alongside local versions such as Jamaican English, Scots English and Irish English. However, these varieties have remained uncodified and excluded from educational contexts, on the basis of their perceived lack of ‘prestige’ by comparison with ‘standard’ English, despite their common use in local speech communities (Milroy 2001: 131). By contrast, non-native patterns of English are used in the Outer and Expanding Circles with the former referring to countries where English is used mainly as a second language to officially communicate alongside indigenous languages as for example in India, Singapore and Nigeria while the latter term describes settings where English is used as a foreign or additional language, but has no official role, as for example in China, Japan and Spain (Crystal 2004: 27-28; Kirkpatrick 2007: 22). Jenkins (2009: 209) informs us that the most rapid spread of the language is occurring within the Expanding Circle, where there are upwards of a billion speakers if we use the criterion of ‘reasonable competence’, with globalisation and the rapid expansion of information technology serving as key influences.
Despite criticism of Kachru’s framework, not least for its preoccupation with the development of new norms in ‘Outer Circle’ varieties, which is an area that we revisit in the review of the literature in Chapter Two of this study, it has been useful in highlighting the different ways in which the English language is moving away from its standard source, which acted in the past as a benchmark for international standards of usage, towards alternative norms. It has revealed that the greatest diversification of the language has arisen in the Outer Circle, most notably as regards spoken English, with key distinctions now arising in terms of phonology, lexis, grammar, pragmatics and communication styles (Crystal 2004: 37-42). Meanwhile, although Inner Circle varieties have remained fairly close to Standard British/American English as regards the more formal written forms of the language, they too now vary in terms of everyday spoken usage in areas including accent, vocabulary and grammar. Accordingly, as a result of increased diversification, unique, regional, and social varieties now exist in Britain, the United States, Ireland and more widely (Arnett 2002: 787; Sebba 2009: 404-406).

The new English language landscape is, therefore, one which reflects increasing diversity along a continuum. This includes ‘standard’ versions of the language which are taught at school and recognised as politically and economically important, and a spectrum of vernacular varieties spoken in particular social or regional groupings, which are more popular amongst speakers generally. Meanwhile, at the global level, we find ‘prestige’ versions of the language based on Anglo/American native speaker norms, which continue to dominate many English language contexts and act as a yardstick for correctness and appropriateness. However, this ‘idealised’ native speaker model has now become the subject of increasing criticism by linguists, on both ideological and linguistic grounds, due to changing socio-political trends in English, and parallel developments in English language linguistics which we turn to next (Kachru 1992; Gorlach 2002; Seidlhofer 2004; Jenkins 2007, 2009; Matsuda 2012).

1.2.2 Revised Linguistic Perspectives on Spoken English

In line with emergence of English as a lingua franca, there has been a shift towards a World Englishes position amongst linguists which recognises that the many diverse native and non-
native speaker varieties of English that are now used are equal and valid (see McKay 2002; Canagarajah 2006b; Kirkpatrick 2007; Jenkins 2009; Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Matsuda 2012). As the term World Englishes has several possible interpretations (for a detailed overview in this area, see Bolton 2004: 367), it is useful to highlight at this stage how it will be approached in the present study. In its broadest sense, it is used as an ‘umbrella label’ covering all varieties of English worldwide, and the different approaches used to describe and analyse them. It can also refer to the pluricentric approach to the study of English associated with the work of Kachru (1985, 1996) and others (see Seidlhofer 2004; Jenkins 2007; Matsuda 2012). In this study it will be used in both senses: that is, in recognition of the changing socio-political realities surrounding English and in support of the legitimacy of all varieties of the language, native and non-native alike. This position is adopted by many researchers working within the World Englishes research paradigm in the IE context (see Farr and O’Keeffe 2002; Kirk and Kallen 2007; Barron 2008; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Murphy 2010, 2015a; O’Keeffe 2011; Migge 2012; Clancy and Vaughan 2012). This includes Migge (2012: 320-325), who has observed that the significance of World Englishes for the status of all non-main varieties, including those found in the Inner Circle such as Irish English, cannot be overestimated, as it is beginning to remove the social stigma traditionally attached to their use by comparison with main ‘standard’ versions of the language.

Revised perspectives towards the status of spoken English have also been influenced by the wealth of insights provided by corpus linguists in the area of English language description and use (McCarthy 1998; Biber et al 1999; McCarthy et al 2002; Promodrou 2003; Carter and McCarthy 2006; Kirk 2007). This has led to more accurate descriptions of written and spoken varieties and registers, which highlight key differences between them. It has also influenced the development of more finely-nuanced perspectives on ‘standard’ English that attempt to take account of real language use in different contexts and settings, thereby signalling a departure from the rigid, standard/non-standard dichotomy of the past. These advances have started to change how spoken English is viewed, by providing empirical evidence that many of the established beliefs held by linguists about language use are at variance with what speakers actually do in their everyday linguistic practices.

Similarly, the progress made by ethnographic researchers in the fields of discourse analysis, pragmatics and inter-cultural communication has enhanced appreciation of local varieties, by
highlighting the key role they play as a means of expressing the socio-cultural identity of speakers in distinct English language speech communities (see Tannen 1984; Kramsch 1998; Farr and O’Keeffe 2002; Barron 2008; Farr and Murphy 2009; Byram 2010; Murphy 2010, 2015a; Vaughan and Clancy 2011; Clancy and Vaughan 2012; Murphy and Farr 2012). This has inspired an increased interest in the pragmatic and cultural dimensions of learning a second (L2) or foreign language (FL) in the fields of SLA and applied linguistics. These developments have also facilitated the shift towards the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach in the ELT world from the 1970s onwards with its new emphasis on authenticity in language use, which has created opportunities for a wider range of varieties to be introduced into English language pedagogy to meet the more complex needs of today’s learners. However, Promodrou has argued that despite these advances in linguistics, “we are still some way from a general sea-change in target English practices” in the ELT world as English language description and English language pedagogy are not the same thing (2008: 10).

1.2.3 Conflicting Target Model Perspectives

In an attempt to explain the lack of progress in this area, Young and Walsh (2010: 123-124) have highlighted the profound repercussions of any changes made to the prevailing target English status quo for all those involved in the global English language profession and industry, pointing to the significance of the variety of English taught “[which]… lies at the very heart of the ‘what’ of English language teaching. Accordingly, decisions made in relation to the types of English that may or may not be suitable in different ELT contexts and settings are of major importance at all levels including policy making, language planning, classroom pedagogy and for teacher education. Meanwhile, critical linguists have drawn attention to issues of power and ideology that must be addressed, reminding us of the dominant, global forces within the English language teaching world which seek to maintain the hegemony of the restricted Anglo-American mono-centric approach, and the idealised native speaker values it reflects, and continue to act as ‘gatekeepers’ to change (see Pennycook 1994, 2000, 2007; Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Canagarajah 2005; Jenkins 2007, 2009, 2012).
A further factor thwarting change has been the lack of consensus surrounding the precise form a ‘pluricentric’ replacement model should take. Hence, key questions remain unresolved such as whether it should reflect native or non-native speaker norms, or indeed both (see Seidlhofer 2004; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2009, Matsuda 2012), while others argue that an alternative approach based on a new conceptualisation of English as ‘plurilithic’ is now required which would take greater account of localised norms and objectives (Hall et al 2013). Accordingly, despite a growing consensus that the prevailing target English approach fails to equip students for real world needs (see Adger 1997; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2007; Seidlhofer 2011; Matsuda 2012), reform ‘at the chalk face’ has been slow, with many theoretical and practical obstacles remaining. Faced with the conflicting discourses which have arisen concerning the nature of the English that can and should be taught as target models for learners, it is not surprising that EFL practitioners have reported feeling a sense of being “pulled in opposing directions by expert opinion” (Timmis 2002: 242), as they struggle to understand the implications of the changing English language landscape for their own professional practices.

1.2.4 Emergent Target English Challenges and Opportunities in ELT and ELTE

The changing English language landscape has created both challenges and opportunities for EFL teachers in terms of their target English choices and practices. Critical applied linguists, for instance, have argued that, as a logical development of the ongoing diversification of English and the emergence of new standards, practitioners must now learn not a variety of English, but about Englishes, native and non-native alike, their similarities and differences, and issues involved in their intelligibility and acceptability (see Pennycook 2000; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2009; Matsuda 2012). Corpus linguists working in the applied language field (see Carter and McCarthy 2001; Timmis 2002; Promodrou 2003; O’Keefe et al 2007; McCarthy 2008; O’Keefe 2010; O’Keefe and Farr 2011), have also stressed the need for teachers to play a mediating role in order to support the introduction of a wider range of spoken English in the ELT classroom, given the additional linguistic challenges that this would pose for learners. This suggests that practitioners in this educational domain must develop greater levels of critical language awareness and enhanced target English skills if
they are to discern and respond successfully to the ever more diverse and complex language needs of today’s learners. Accordingly, EFL teachers, novice and experienced alike, now face new demands and challenges in their target English role and practices, in what is already a complex and often daunting teaching environment (Oxford 1998: 443; Farrell 2015: 89).

This is especially the case for new recruits who typically enter ELTE programmes with little experience and knowledge. Accordingly, they will now be expected to acquire not only an understanding of existing target English norms and practices, but also critical insight into the ways in which they are changing, in order to be able to adapt and direct their target English use accordingly. Meanwhile, experienced teachers, whose professional practices have been shaped by the prevailing English language dogmas, may need to be encouraged to explore the new target English opportunities that are emerging, which may seem to threaten existing beliefs held as fundamental truths (Timmis 2002; Jenkins 2007; Young and Walsh 2010; Matsuda 2012). Like practitioners everywhere, EFL teachers from the IE background must also expect to face the ongoing gatekeeping restrictions posed by the main international ELT course books and examinations, which continue to largely reflect SBE and SAE norms (Jenkins 2007; Murphy 2011; Timmis and Mishan 2015).

Walsh (2006: 132) has suggested that, as a starting point to acquiring the kind of critical linguistic insight and pedagogic skill that are now required of them, today’s practitioners must be encouraged to develop awareness of the nature of their own language use and its relationship with the models of English that they are expected to provide for learners in different EFL contexts and settings worldwide. This is of particular importance for those whose own versions of English may differ from ‘prestige’ varieties, as in the case for IE speakers. In this regard, Kirk and Kallen (2007: 278-82) have pointed to the typically informal and indirect speech style of the Irish, especially amongst the younger generation of IE speakers. Studies by Migge (2012) and Gasior (2015) have further shown that non-native speakers living in Ireland can find IE confusing due to its unfamiliar grammar, unique pragmatic usages, vocabulary and accent. This suggests that there are particular target English challenges for teachers from this background, especially for novices who often enter the profession with little prior formal knowledge of the workings of English, and poor levels of language awareness (Farrell 2015: 163).
EFL teachers from Ireland can also expect to face increased cultural challenges as a result of the more globalised and culturally diverse nature of the ELT industry (see Byram 1997; Kramsch 1998; Spiro 2013). Byram (1997: 12) has suggested that how well they cope will depend on their ability to develop the type of intercultural sensitivity and strategic competence that enables them “to move sensitively and intelligently from one culture to another”. Walsh (2006: 132) has advised that this can be achieved by developing greater critical awareness and skill in relation to the socio-pragmatic dimensions of language use. This means acquiring critical insight into the underlying conventions of politeness in different cultures, including their own, in areas such as directness/indirectness, and developing a high level of inter-personal skills. This can bring important affective gains in what is a psychologically challenging environment for teachers and learners alike (ibid: 133). Again, these challenges are likely to be greater for novices given that they typically lack confidence in their teacher role in the early years, and struggle with their target English performance (Farrell 2015: 91; Farrell 2016: 42).

The previous discussion has highlighted some of the ways in which the target English practices of EFL teachers are being impacted by changing trends and perspectives surrounding spoken English internationally. It has also identified the particular challenges and opportunities that arise for Irish EFL practitioners as English language users from a non-main Inner Circle background. Finally, it has provided an indication of the kind of superior language awareness and skills they will need to acquire if they are to respond successfully to these developments. This raises important questions for teacher educators in both the ELTE field in Ireland and elsewhere, in relation to how best we prepare teachers to meet these demands. It is against this backdrop of increased professional challenge and change that the present study is undertaken, with a view to informing future practices in ELTE in the local educational context. To this end, it sets out to address five research questions, which are presented in the next section.
1.3 Research Questions

- What is the nature and extent of the language awareness of the novice and experienced EFL teachers participating in this study, with specific reference to varieties of spoken English that have been excluded from the EFL classroom historically, on account of their lack of ‘prestige’, by comparison with ‘standard’ varieties?

- What is the relationship between the teachers in each grouping and the specified varieties, in terms of their reported everyday linguistic practices, and what role, if any, is played by regional background, age and gender as underlying macro-sociolinguistic variables?

- What English language attitudes are held by the teachers in each grouping in relation to the suitability of the specified varieties:
  
  i) for social contexts of use;
  ii) for EFL teacher talk;
  iii) as explicit target models to be taught?

- What is the nature and extent of the teachers’ use of the specified varieties in their target English practices in the local teaching context with learners of English at the intermediate level of English language proficiency?

- What are the implications of the findings for teaching, and teacher education, in the EFL domain in Ireland, and more widely?

Having set out the research objectives, definitions are provided next for the key terms around which they are framed. Such clarification is important, given the ambiguity and lack of specificity which can, at times, surround their use in linguistic circles. The specific items which form the basis of the linguistic analysis are also presented at this stage, together with the systems used for their classification and the criteria and rationale used for their selection.
1.4 Key Definitions, Linguistic Items and Classification Systems

1.4.1 Language Variety

Language variety is the term used by linguists to describe linguistic variation that is associated with different groups of speakers and influenced by regional and social group membership. Linguistic variation of this kind is manifested in different regional and social varieties of a language, which are shaped by geography and societal factors including age, gender, social class and educational background (Watson 2009: 337-41). Sociolinguists have successfully demonstrated that variation in language use is all-pervasive in nature: that is, it can be found in pronunciation, grammatical structures, lexis and at discourse levels (ibid: 337-41). Variation at the level of pronunciation leads to different accents, while differences between varieties at the grammatical and lexical levels lead to different dialects, with the terms ‘varieties’ and ‘dialects’ often used interchangeably by linguists in this regard. A body of research has documented the similarities and differences between different varieties of English across these linguistic variables (Labov 1966a, 1966b; 1972a, 1972b; Trudgill 1984, 1992; Beal 2004). A key finding to emerge is that variation can be found at all linguistic levels and that it is most evident in relation to accent and lexical usage. However, it is also manifested in distinct patterns of grammatical use by speakers in different English language speech communities and by individuals (Trudgill 2000: 9-10).

In the case of geographic influences, the versions of English used by speakers from Britain, the US, Australia, Scotland and Ireland, referred to as British, American, Australian, Scots and Irish English, respectively, represent regional varieties of English, although many also represent a national variety (Watson 2009: 337-338). International varieties also exist, dominating many formal contexts worldwide where English serves as a medium of communication, thus setting the benchmark for the international norms surrounding the language, as has been the case for American and British English. Regional and national varieties of a language also typically contain their own rural, urban and social dialects, known as sub-varieties, with variation at this level referred to as intra-varietal variation, in comparison to inter-varietal variation, which is between different varieties (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Filppula 1999; Eckert and Rickford 2001). Versions of a language which exist only in the spoken form and are used by particular regional or social groups have been
referred to historically by linguists as ‘vernacular’ or ‘non-standard’ varieties in comparison to those that are classified as ‘standard’ (Watson 2009: 338). However, these terms, and the values associated with them, are now contested, particularly ‘non-standard’, which has become problematic on both ideological and linguistic grounds (Milroy 2001: 17). In recognition of the controversies and issues involved, these terms will be differentiated by quotation marks throughout this study (as in ‘standard/non-standard’).

1.4.1.1 ‘Standard’/‘Non-Standard’ Varieties

Crystal (2004: 27) has cautioned that trying to find a commonly accepted definition of ‘standard’ English is “like entering a minefield”, such are the controversies involved. Historically, linguists have used the standard/non-standard dichotomy to describe and classify different varieties of English and English language use more widely. Standard languages are those which have undergone a process of standardisation and systematic classification in grammars and dictionaries, whereas non-standard varieties have remained formally uncodified. Trudgill (1992: 71) provides a detailed account of the processes of language determination, codification and stabilisation whereby during a historic period, a particular version of the language is selected, classified and generally given a more stable form. From this, a historic view of a standard language has emerged as one which is relatively uniform, fixed and stable in comparison with other varieties, and which displays no geographical or social variation.

As the ‘standard’ version is perceived as the most widely understood variety in terms of its intelligibility by comparison with other varieties, it has set the norms for what is acceptable or correct in a wide range of communicative contexts, including professional and educational domains (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 9). As a result, this version has come to carry the greatest ‘prestige’ and ‘currency’ in the ELT world. However, as highlighted previously, this traditional ‘standard/non-standard’ linguistic dichotomy has become increasingly contested, particularly as regards what constitutes ‘standard’ spoken English. This is an area that is revisited in Chapter Two of this study as part of a broader review of changing approaches to ‘standard’ English. At this stage, however, it is important to clarify the position adopted by the present researcher towards the notion of ‘standard’ English, which is that shared by Adger
and others, who view ‘standardness’ or ‘prestige’ as an abstraction characterising one pole of a dialect continuum, and ‘vernacularness’ or stigmatization as defining the other (see Milroy 1999; Pennycook 2000; Jenkins 2007; Kirk 2011). In the following section, the various terms used to refer to English as it is spoken natively in Ireland are reviewed, establishing how this variety will be approached in the present study.

1.4.1.2 Irish English (IE)

The terminology used to describe the spoken English of the Irish people has changed, reflecting different approaches to its study and how it is perceived. This variety has in the past been referred to in the academic literature as Anglo-Irish English, Hiberno-English and more recently Irish English (henceforth IE). Historically, it was more common for scholars to use the term Anglo-Irish (see Van Hamel 1912, Henry 1957, 1977; Moylan 1996). However, due to its colonial associations, the term was replaced by Hiberno-English, as coined by Bliss in the 1980s and used in the academic literature for the next two decades (Harris 1983; Hickey 1983a, 1983b; Guilfoyle 1983, 1986; Lass 1986, 1987; Britton and Fletcher 1990; Corrigan 1990; McCloskey 1991; Odlin 1997a, 1997b; O hUrdail 1997; Van Ryckeghem 1997; Dolan 1998; Filppula 1999, 2012). More recently, IE has become the preferred term, in line with the conventions and approaches used for the study of World Englishes more widely (O’Keeffe 2011: 58). This makes it possible for this variety to be viewed and studied from a World Englishes approach, which recognises all versions as equal, but distinct, based on the unique historic, social and cultural experiences of its speakers (Harris 1990, Kallen 1994; Clarke 1997, 2012; Kirk 1997, 2007, 2012; Farr and O’Keeffe 2002; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Barron 2011; O’Keeffe 2011; Vaughan and Clancy 2012; O’Sullivan 2014). This is the approach adopted in the present research in shared recognition of the World Englishes viewpoint.

At this stage, it is important to point out that in terms of its sociolinguistic distribution the term IE is used to refer to the general English language as spoken in Ireland as well as to designate specific subdivisions of the language. As a national variety, IE contains several dialects and varieties including Ulster Irish and Southern Irish English, the northern and southern variety, with the dialectal boundary approximately corresponding with the political
border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland (O’Keeffe 2011: 58-60). In the present research, the term IE refers to the variety used in Ireland, south of the political border with Britain. In line with the aims of this study, the features of IE as a variety, similarities and differences between this version of the language and main varieties, and issues pertaining to the status and use of particular grammatical and pragmatic usages, as discussed in greater detail in the review of the literature in Chapter Two, which provides the linguistic backdrop to the present research. As this study is concerned with gauging the suitability of these usages in the teacher talk of EFL teachers in their interactions with learners, the concept of speech style, as reviewed in the following section, is also central to the research.

1.4.2 Speech Style

Speech style is the term commonly used by linguists to describe an individual speaker’s habitual communication practices, and is also referred to as a speaker’s idiolect (Trudgill 2000: 13). Speech styles express different levels of formality and are characterised on this basis (Eckert and Rickford 2001: 44). Variation at the level of register and speech style is commonly referred to as stylistic or intra-varietal variation, that is, differences which occur in the speech patterns of individuals. While the terms register and speech style are viewed as related, and often used interchangeably by linguists, some key distinctions can be made which will be observed in the present study. For instance, Trudgill (2000: 14) has argued that the notion of speech style has a more restricted use than register, as it refers to “the type of role interaction, and the set of relevant social relations, permanent and temporary, among the participants involved”. This distinction is adopted in the present research, whereby register is used to refer to the linguistic features used by the teachers at the lexical level, and speech style to the interactional and relational aspects of the teachers’ communication with learners. In the L2 classroom context, this is typically referred to as the teacher’s instructional speech style (Walsh 2006: 34). In this study, the classroom speech styles of EFL teachers from Ireland are investigated in relation to the degree of ‘standardness/non-standardness’, formality/informality, and directness/indirectness expressed, through the grammatical and pragmatic choices they make at the level of variety, in order to address the question of its suitability.
1.5 The Specified Linguistic Items and the Varieties Represented

To address these research objectives, four linguistic items, and related variants where relevant, were selected to represent two distinct categories of spoken English that teachers have been expected to avoid in their own professional language use in the EFL classroom on normative grounds. They are set out in Table 1.1 below, alongside the variety represented in each case and the abbreviations by which they will be referred to for ease of reference throughout this thesis.

Table 1.1: Specified linguistic items, varieties represented and classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC ITEMS</th>
<th>VARIETY</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after perfect/ye</td>
<td>Irish English (IE)</td>
<td>Regionally-differentiated grammar (RDG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite seen/pragmatic like</td>
<td>British/American/Irish English (B/A/I/E)</td>
<td>Socially-differentiated grammar (SDG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.1 Regionally–Differentiated Grammar (RDG)

As illustrated, the first category relates to regionally-differentiated grammar (RDG) (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 5). In this study, it will be explored with specific reference to IE as a non-main Inner Circle variety and the after perfect and ye, which are usages that are largely unique to this variety and distinct from ‘standard’ English where equivalents exist (see Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004; O'Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Clarke 2012; Filppula 2012a, 2012b). Examples of use are provided below, from LCIE, that is, the Limerick Corpus of Irish English (Farr et al 2004), and ICE-Ireland, the International Corpus of English-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2004), alongside the SBE/SAE equivalent in each case (Biber et al 1999).
Table 1.2: Examples of use of *after perfect/ye* (RDG) and SBE equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1: <strong>IE after perfect</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 1:</strong> (LCIE): She’s <em>after leaving</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 2:</strong> (ICE-Ireland): They’re <em>after taking</em> it with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 3:</strong> SBE: We <em>have written</em> to Mr Stevens, but he has ignored our letters. (Biber <em>et al</em> 1999: 460).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 2: <strong>IE ye</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 1:</strong> (LCIE): Are <em>ye</em> going?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 2:</strong> (ICE-Ireland): Where were <em>ye</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample 3 SBE:</strong> Have <em>you</em> decided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Biber <em>et al</em> 1999: 312)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the LCIE (Farr *et al* 2004) mainly represents casual conversations collected across a range of contexts and geographical locations in Ireland (excluding Northern Ireland), while the ICE-Ireland corpus is compiled from the language use of IE speakers in a range of academic and professional domains in both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2004). Therefore, these corpora reflect current usage by native speakers of IE, in informal (LCIE) and more formal speech (ICE-Ireland). As illustrated, the IE *after perfect* is made up of *after + V + ing* participle form (Filppula 1999; Hickey 2009, O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009). In British and American Standard English, it is marked structurally by the auxiliary verb *have + ed* participle. Meanwhile, *ye* is used as a second person plural pronoun by speakers of IE, in place of the SBE/SAE second person pronominal *you* (Filppula 2012b: 86).
1.5.2 Socially-Differentiated Grammar (SDG)

The second type of spoken English under investigation represents grammatical use that has traditionally been classified as socially-differentiated (SDG), by comparison with SBE/SAE (Beal 2004; Kerswill 2009). This type of usage is commonly heard in everyday speech in Ireland as in many Inner Circle countries (Kortmann et al 2004). However, it carries stigmatized associations due to its indexation with particular social groupings (Cheshire 1984, 1999, 2005; Kerswill 2009). In this study, it will be explored with specific reference to *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like*, as illustrated in Table 1.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1: Preterite Seen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1: (LCIE): <em>I seen</em> it there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2: (ICE-Ireland): <em>I seen</em> you go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3: (CANCODE): <em>I seen</em> it there yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4: SE: <em>I saw</em> her earlier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 2: Pragmatic Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1: (LCIE): He stayed back <em>like</em> ten times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2: (ICE-Ireland): What was it she did <em>like</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3: (CANCODE): <em>I'm like</em> ‘Go away’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 4: SE (verb): People <em>like</em> him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5: SE (adjective): She is more <em>like</em> her sister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 5: SE (conjunction): He involved the staff in everything, <em>like</em> a good manager.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples of use provided are from LCIE (Farr et al 2004) and ICE-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2004) reflecting IE, and CANCODE (Carter and McCarthy 2006) representing BE, with ‘standard’ equivalents also illustrated where relevant. As illustrated, *preterite seen* is made up of past participle *seen* used as a past tense verb in place of SBE/SAE *saw* (Carter...
and McCarthy 2006: 235). Meanwhile, like in its pragmatic capacity differs from its ‘standard’ grammatical role as a verb, adjective and conjunction (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 101). The classification systems used to position these items in relation to their current status in social and educational contexts in the wider English-speaking world, and in Ireland specifically, are briefly reviewed in the next section. This is followed by the rationale and criteria used for their selection.

1.5.3 The Classification Systems Used

The structures representing RDG and SDG were classified using the framework proposed by Carter and McCarthy (2006: 235-237) in The Cambridge Grammar of Written and Spoken English, the design of which was pedagogically-motivated. This is informed by extensive corpus-based research based on the CANCODE corpus, which takes account of the practices of speakers from a wide range of ages and social and regional backgrounds within the British Isles, including Northern Ireland. The model categorises grammatical/pragmatic usage in spoken and written English from the viewpoint of five different degrees of grammaticality/acceptability (ibid: 235). From this viewpoint, the items selected for the purpose of this study are classified at level four on the continuum of standard to non-standard, and represent usage which is ‘regionally or socially-marked in standard written and spoken English but widespread and normal within major regional/social varieties of English’ (ibid: 236-237). This indicates that while these forms are commonly used in social contexts they continue to be viewed as unacceptable for use in formal and educational contexts in Britain, and more widely, given the traditional reliance on BSE norms in many international domains, including the ELT sector.

In order to situate the specified items in relation to their current status and use in the IE context, an alternative classification system was used. This made it possible for key distinctions to be made between what might be considered useful and appropriate language use in Ireland, by comparison with the wider English language world (White 2006; Kirk 2007; Murphy 2011). Following Kirk’s argument (2007: 121) that corpora of contemporary IE usage can be drawn on for classification purposes in the absence of a codified standard IE, this approach was considered suitable in the present study, for which the ICE-Ireland corpus
was used (Kirk and Kallen 2004). Reference corpora representing main varieties and various discourse contexts were also drawn on for comparative purposes in the analysis, in relation to each type of usage (as described in greater detail in the methodological discussion in Chapter Four). In the following section, the rationale and criteria used for the selection of the specified items is presented. The decisions taken are further supported by the research literature from the fields of applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics, which is reviewed in Chapter Two of this thesis.

1.5.5 The Rationale and Criteria Used for the Selection of the Specified Items

Several factors informed the selection of the specified grammatical and pragmatic items for the purposes of the present study, as set out below:

- Each of the items represents a type of spoken English that practitioners in the ELT domain have been expected to avoid in their target English use with learners on normative grounds
- A review of the related academic literature has suggested variability in usage and attitudes in relation to these items
- An intensive, initial reading of the transcripts has further suggested variability in usage on the part of the teachers in each professional grouping
- Ambiguity currently surrounds the status of these items in social and educational contexts, although this is more obvious in some cases than in others
- Each usage has particular characteristics relating to its formal linguistic properties and functionality. This suggests variability in the socio-pragmatic and discourse roles they might play in EFL classroom discourse, with the expectation that some will be more important than others
• Their use is expected to involve varying degrees of complexity for EFL learners at the intermediate level of proficiency, in terms of processing effort and comprehension

• Their selection created opportunities to critically explore whether some of the specified usages were more suitable than others for EFL teacher talk with intermediate level learners, the factors influencing decision-making in this area and the ways in which their use could be successfully mediated for learners by practitioners

Having established the linguistic focus of the study, the following section critically appraises its importance, in relation to the existing research literature and to the expected outcomes and applications for ELTE.

1.6 The Importance of the Study

This study is important and timely for several reasons. The IE sociolinguistic setting provides an intriguing venue for research amongst EFL teachers, not least due to the historic tendency in this educational sector for linguistic and cultural issues to be interpreted from a mainstream British or American ethnocentric viewpoint (McKenzie 2010: 36). By focusing on the target English issues and considerations that arise for EFL teachers whose native variety is IE, this study has the potential therefore, to help to redress this imbalance. In so doing, it will add to the pioneering work of White (2006) and Murphy (2011), which recognised that the viewpoints and practices of EFL teachers from Ireland have been overlooked in the suitable target Englishes debate. The further insights to be gained in relation to the issues and challenges faced by Irish EFL teachers as native English language users from a non-main Inner Circle background will also add to our theoretical understanding in relation to the ‘disfavoured’ status of this professional group historically in the ELT world, and the ways in which it is being impacted by changing trends and perspectives surrounding the models of
English taught, which will also help to deconstruct the myth of the NEST/NNEST dichotomy in this educational sector. The findings also have the potential to support or refute the claims made by sociolinguists that attitudes towards IE as a variety are changing in professional and educational contexts in Ireland, reflecting broader trends towards vernacularization in spoken English (Kirk and Kallen 2007; Hickey 2009). In these ways, the present research will add to the body of sociolinguistic research in the variationist and World Englishes fields, which is concerned with mapping the features of different varieties, their linguistic similarities and differences, and critical issues and perspectives surrounding their use in social and educational contexts.

Research which explores the language awareness and language attitudes of EFL teachers will also contribute to the academic literature in the area of teacher cognition wherein a strong tradition exists in the teacher education field (Borg 2006). This has also become an important research paradigm in L2 teacher education in recent times as a result of a growing recognition in general that teachers’ beliefs are likely to influence their professional practices (Farrell 2004; Breen 2006; Young and Walsh 2010). Understanding teachers’ perspectives in relation to different types of spoken English is important, therefore, as they are likely to influence their target model preferences and practices, whether consciously or sub-consciously. In so doing, they can influence learner attitudes towards the status and legitimacy of different varieties (Jenkins 2007; McKenzie 2010). Timmis (2002, 2012) and Matsuda (2012) have also suggested that teachers’ attitudes towards different types of English as target models are likely to be influenced by the extent of their linguistic knowledge and wider sociolinguistic awareness at the level of variety, and that this is an area that merits further empirical research.

While the increased research interest in teachers’ target model perspectives has undoubtedly brought a more bottom-up perspective to the suitable Englishes debate more recently, it is still the case that little is known about the target models that are actually used by teachers in their classroom interactions, as Jenkins has pointed out (2007, 2009). A major advantage of this study, therefore, is that it relies on methodologies and technologies made available by corpus linguistics (CL). These make it possible to provide an accurate, empirical account of grammatical and pragmatic language use found in teacher talk by statistically measuring word frequencies and describing and interpreting language patterns in order to gauge the extent and nature of usage at the level of language variety. For this purpose, an entirely new
corpus of 60,000 words of teacher talk was compiled from recordings of intermediate-level EFL classes taught by novice and experienced EFL teachers. The corpus further features sub-corpora of experienced and novice teacher talk, thereby providing a snapshot of usage from the perspective of practitioners at different stages of their professional careers. In this way, the present research will build on the limited number of studies which have used corpus linguistics as a methodology for the analysis of EFL classroom discourse (Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011; Nicaise 2015). This represents a first attempt to create such a useful pedagogic resource in the EFL context in Ireland, and to exploit its use for empirical research. In this study, corpus-based approaches are enhanced by more qualitative functional discourse analytic approaches from pragmatics and SLA. This makes it possible to achieve a more complete picture of the data, and to acquire qualitative outcomes by exploring correlations between what teachers know and believe, and what they do in practice. This is vital for awareness-raising purposes to help inform the development of ELTE that is both critically-informed and takes a more critical stance.

Alongside the shift towards a World Englishes perspective, there have been growing calls for language teacher education that raises awareness of the ways in which classroom discourse is “socially constructed, politically-motivated, and historically-determined” (Kumaradivelu 1999: 470). This would enable teachers to develop critical understandings of the ways in which global influences and constraints impact their classroom practices with a view to empowering them. To facilitate its development, Kumaradivelu (1999: 470), and others since (see Pennycook 2000, 2007; Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2007, 2009; Matsuda 2012), have called for bottom-up research that explores the underlying dimensions of classroom discourse with a view to transforming current systems and practices, which is a position that many applied linguists now support. Research of this kind is of particular importance in the IE context, given that, as highlighted previously, the target English practices of teachers from this background have been subject historically to SBE norms, to the exclusion of their own variety (White 2006). This study therefore creates exciting opportunities to critically explore what the global reality of English as a lingua franca might mean for teachers from this background in terms of their international practices, and the use, and inclusion of IE in the ELT curriculum as a non-main Inner Circle variety alongside a
wider and more diverse range of native and non-native varieties to challenge the existing monolithic approach.

As the researcher is employed as a teaching practice (TP) supervisor in the ELTE programme that provides the immediate research context, this study thereby represents a research project undertaken for awareness-raising purposes, and to help inform the development of a more critically-informed and critically-oriented target English approach in the local context by identifying strategies that teachers can use to change their own pedagogy, and to contribute to a broader transformation of ELT professional practice. In this way, this study seeks to respond to calls by linguists for critical classroom-based research which provides “thick description and thick explanation” (Greetz 1977: 3), so that the practices of teachers may be investigated from multi-dimensional perspectives and, consequently, improved. For these reasons, it is considered innovative and pioneering in terms of its design, scope and potential qualitative outcomes.

1.7 The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis comprises seven chapters. The review of the literature in Chapter Two provides the linguistic background to the study, through a review of historic and contemporary computer-assisted approaches to the study of variation in spoken English from the sociolinguistic field which reflect multi-disciplinary perspectives. It then establishes the features of IE as a variety and its relationship with SBE/SAE in terms of usage and status. Finally, it revisits the linguistic items representing the varieties of spoken English under investigation in this study, drawing on published accounts, and research, from the fields of applied linguistics, and sociolinguistics. In this way, the review of the literature in Chapter Two serves as a linguistic gateway to the more pedagogically-oriented discussion in Chapter Three.

The focus in Chapter Three is on pedagogical issues and considerations arising for EFL teachers in their target English practices, as a result of the changing English landscape. It begins by briefly retracing the foundation and evolution of ELT, and the historic Anglo-American target English approach. It then establishes the key role played by teachers and
teacher talk in the contemporary CLT classroom with reference to input, interactionist and socio-cultural theories from SLA, politeness theories from the field of pragmatics, and frameworks from critical applied linguistics which are drawn on to provide the multidisciplinary theoretical basis of the study. Following this, the academic debate surrounding what might constitute a more suitable target English approach is revisited, with a review of the distinct theoretical positions which have emerged and progress made to date, as well as a critical appraisal of key on-going forces for target model change in EL pedagogy and obstacles which remain. Research which has explored the target model perspectives of EFL learners and teachers as main stakeholders is also reviewed at this stage. The chapter closes with a critical appraisal of the more complex educational needs of EFL teachers who are at different stages of their professional careers if they are to be enabled to respond effectively to the new realities of English as it is used internationally today.

Chapter Four presents and rationalises the CL/DA approach used in this study, and it sets out and justifies the research methodology in terms of the design of each of the three research instruments, highlighting issues and considerations that arose in the process and the implementation. This involves a detailed description of the process used to thematically identify and code the questionnaire and interview data, and the methods drawn on to identify and classify the corpus analysis in relation to key contextual details including classroom modes and pedagogic goals and functions, for which the adapted SETT framework was used. In the final section of this chapter, a demographic profile is provided of the research participants drawing on the questionnaire data in order to help contextualise the analysis in subsequent chapters.

Chapters Five and Six present and discuss the research findings. Chapter Five is concerned with the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data from the on-line teacher questionnaires, in the areas of language awareness, reported everyday language use and language attitudes, drawing on frameworks from sociolinguistics, critical linguistics and SLA. This will provide crucial insights into the identities of the participants, the ideologies they seek to adhere to in their professional practices, and their pedagogical understandings. Chapter Six presents and analyses the corpus data with specific reference to grammatical and pragmatic use at the level of variety drawing on quantitative and qualitative approaches from CL/DA, SLA and pragmatics. This is with a view to establishing the extent of the teachers’
use of the specified usages, and related variants representing regionally- and socially-
differentiated English. It then explores the primary socio-pragmatic and discourse functions
performed by any usages observed, and key pedagogical considerations arising from their use
in teacher talk through the use of theoretical approaches from pragmatics and SLA, and the
SETT pedagogic framework.

Chapter Seven summarises the main research findings and discusses their significance. It also
draws on the qualitative data from the teacher interviews to support the conclusions reached.
To close the study, recommendations are made for further related research.
Chapter Two

Variation in Spoken English: Key Approaches and Research

No moral judgement or critical evaluation can be validly made about the abstract structures we call language. It is the speakers of languages, and not the languages themselves, who live in a moral universe (Milroy 1999: 16).

2.1 Introduction

The English language has probably received more scholarly attention by linguists than any other. However, the investigation of its spoken form has come of age only in the last fifty years or so in line with the paradigmatic shift towards discourse analysis (DA) and the advent of corpus linguistics (CL). These developments have brought a major influence to bear on the description and study of spoken discourse, providing new approaches and frameworks for the investigation of spoken language use for researchers working from within distinct, but often overlapping, language-related disciplines (Sacks et al 1974; Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Brown and Yule 1983; McCarthy and Stubbs 1983; McCarthy 1991; Schiffrin 1994, 2002; McCarthy et al 2002). More recently, there has also been a growing trend for the combined use of CL/DA to explore distinct dimensions of spoken language use in different English language speech communities and professional and educational contexts, including the EFL and ELTE fields (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003, 2012; Farr 2005, 2010; Walsh 2006, 2011; O’Keeffe et al 2007; Vaughan 2008; Walsh et al 2011; Riordan 2012; Nicaise 2015). This has inspired the use of this approach in the present study for the gains this can provide, as argued for in Chapter Four of this study which sets out the research approach and methodology.

As language variation is a central underlying theme in the present study, it is useful to begin by reviewing approaches from the sociolinguistic field which have sought to explain the elaborate variability that exists in spoken English, and the relationship between how different varieties of English are used and viewed. These include: 1) variationist approaches to variation at the dialectal and situational levels; 2) studies in the field of language attitudes and ‘standard/non-standard’ English; 3) contemporary, computer-assisted discourse studies
(CADS) which are multi-disciplinary in nature; and, 4) critical, linguistic approaches that take a World Englishes perspective. Given that it is IE that provides the linguistic backdrop to the present study, studies which have explored the features of this variety, and attitudes towards its status and use are also reviewed. The chapter closes with a review of the linguistic items that form the focus of the analysis as representative of the distinct spoken English varieties under investigation. In this way, the discussion in this chapter sets out to provide crucial insights into the linguistic choices available to English language users from the IE setting, and changing attitudes towards ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ English in Ireland, and more widely, and their implications.

2.2 Sociolinguistic Approaches to Variation in Spoken English

2.2.1 Variationist Approaches

Variationist researchers led the way in the study of language variation from the 1960s onwards, establishing that it is a common feature of language use everywhere and that it acts as an effective marker of speaker identity (Labov 1966a, 1972a, 1972b, 2001; Trudgill 1972, 2000). Since then, a growing body of studies has explored the ways in which the presence and interplay of key macro-sociolinguistic factors (such as regional background, age, gender and social class) lead to diverse varieties of English, some spoken natively, and others used as a second or foreign language (Giles 1973; Trudgill 1974, 1987; Cheshire 1984). Researchers in this field have also made a major contribution to our understandings of the ways in which contextual and relational influences lead to variation of the situational kind (Labov 1966a, 1966b, 1972; Trudgill 1999a, 2000; Eckert and Rickford 2001; Milroy 2001).

2.2.1.1 Cross-Varietal Variation

Attempts have been made by variationist researchers to classify variation at the inter-varietal level between regional varieties of English in terms of their phonological, grammatical, lexical and discourse features (Labov 1966a, 1972b; Trudgill 1972; Cheshire 1984; Chambers and Trudgill 2014). This has revealed that variation does not occur in an absolute way across
these linguistic features and that it is frequent even within the same regional location, and in every single speaker, as all individuals have their own linguistic system or ‘idiolect’ (Watson 2009: 339). A further key finding to emerge has been that regional and social variation is complex and often intricately interwoven. As Crystal (2003: 285) has observed, “the more we study regional variation, the more we find we cannot make sense of it without taking social variation into account”. For instance, the work of Labov in the US (1966a, 1966b, 1972a, 1972b) and later Trudgill in the UK (1972, 1974, 1984, 1990) examined the relationship between regional and social variation at both phonological and grammatical levels, demonstrating that the influence of regional background on language use is much greater among people of lower social status, and is least significant amongst upper middle class speakers across both types of linguistic variable. This led to the widely-accepted view that varieties of English, as of other languages, are generally simultaneously both geographical and social dialects, which combine to form both geographical and social dialect continua. This makes it possible for different dialects to exist as sub-varieties of a language, which in turn have both regional and social class associations (Trudgill 2002: 37-39).

Beyond geographic influences, other categories explored to a lesser extent, and often as one of a number of other social parameters influencing language use, have been gender (Lakoff 1972; Coates and Cameron 1988; Coates 1993; Eckert 1996; Murphy 2010, 2015a; Murphy and Farr 2012), ethnicity (Labov 1966a, 2001, Laferriere 1979; Wolfram et al 2004; Kerswill, Torgersen and Fox 2008), social networks (Milroy 1987, 2001), age (Romaine and Lange 1991; Stenstrom et al 1996; Eckert 1996, Andersen 2001; Murphy 2010, 2015a) and profession (Pietro 1982; Scollen and Scollen 1995). The influence of socio-economic status on language use in different speech communities has also been investigated extensively, both as a main parameter and as one of several sociolinguistic variables influencing spoken language use (Chambers 1995; Hudson 1980; Labov 2001; Milroy and Gordon 2006; Meyerhoff 2011).

Studies of class dialect have suggested that some societies have more clearly-defined class boundaries than others, which lead to more identifiable features of class dialect. For instance, social class is a more obvious variable in the UK (Trudgill 1974; Cheshire 1984) than in the US (Labov 1966a, 1966b, 1972b) where ethnicity plays a more important determining role (Labov 1966a, 1966b, 1972b; Wolfram and Schilling-Estes 1998; Wolfram 2004). Earlier
research in this area indicated substantially higher ‘non-standard’ grammatical usage by working-class speakers than those from middle-class and upper-class backgrounds (Labov 1966a, Trudgill 1972b; Cheshire 1984). However, later studies which explored how class interacts with other social parameters, notably gender and age, provided counter-evidence, thereby raising questions about such marked linguistic polarisation along class lines. This led to a growing realisation of the extent to which social categories interact to shape how speech communities and individuals use language (Cheshire 1984, Romaine 1984; Eckert 1988; Beal 2004, 2006; Snell 2007).

A further key insight to emerge is that the language used by different groups in society changes over time, as both new and alternative phonological, lexical and grammatical forms and patterns emerge, and others become less popular or even die out completely, with age seen as a key factor in the processes involved (Trudgill 1999b; Watt 2002; Kerswill 2003; Britain 2007; Murphy 2010, 2015a). A related concept is the apparent time construct, which is based on the assumption that the linguistic behaviour of older speakers reflects historically earlier stages of the linguistic system, which leads to age stratification (Labov 2001: 449). However, whether a given distribution represents age–grading or language change in progress can only be determined by comparing the usage of speech communities at two points in time (Romaine 2005: 172). Studies in this area have indicated that teenagers and young adults undergo age–grading in relation to ‘non–standard’ grammatical and pragmatic usage (Cheshire 2005; Schelling-Ester 2004; Stenstrom et al. 1996). However, it has also been shown that they adjust their language to meet the norms and demands of their first job, which thereby highlights that language use is fluid and changing due to situational influences (Sankoff and Laberge 1978, 2005). This realisation led to an increased research interest in the ways in which contextual influences shape variation of the situational kind (Trudgill 1999a; Eckert and Rickford 2001; Milroy 2001).

2.2.1.2 Situational Variation

Studies in the field of situational variation have revealed that the widest possible range of registers exists in English, ranging from the least to the most formal, across both written and spoken forms (Labov 1966a, 1972b; Giles 1973; Cheshire 1984; Eckert 1996; McCarthy
While the repertoire which English language users have access to, and avail of, is likely to differ as a result of their social, educational and professional backgrounds, informal styles of speech have their own constructions which are used by speakers from all backgrounds due to their communicative usefulness (Knowles 1973; Crozier 1984; Cheshire 1991; Beal 2004). These form part of the repertoire of spoken standard language, and may include colloquial features of grammatical and pragmatic use which are both local and unique to specific varieties, and which are shaped by cultural and social group influences (Andersen and Trudgill 1990; Eble 1996; Allen 1998; Kirk and Kallen 2004, 2007; Murphy and Farr 2012). Speakers may also use other grammatical and pragmatic features which are shared universally among national and world varieties (Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004). Meanwhile, research which has examined the spoken professional registers used by educated people has revealed that they may be influenced by their written, professional register or occupational jargon in areas such as grammar and lexical choices (Boden and Zimmerman 1992; Drew and Heritage 1992; Cheshire 1999; Yuling et al 2002). As Cheshire has observed:

Speakers who spend much of their time speaking in formal situations may carry over the linguistic features and constructions typical of formal styles to their conversational speech styles, especially if they are treated with the same respect in their private lives that they command in their professional roles. (1999: 146)

Speakers may therefore use a repertoire of varieties, registers and styles which reflect historical, informal and ‘standard’ features of language use. This leads to stylistic variation whereby they shift between registers and styles of English according to their communicative need, communicative purpose and their audience (Labov 1966a; Bell 1984, 2001).

The notion of style-shifting is central to variationist approaches to spoken English variation. This refers to a shift in speech which is above the level of consciousness and is usually in the direction of linguistic forms which hold ‘prestige’. This phenomenon involves the two further (and related) concepts of overt and covert prestige; the former term, as coined by Trudgill (Chambers and Trudgill 2014: 85), contrasts with Labov’s earlier notion of covert prestige. This refers to his observation that, while speakers who use stigmatised forms are aware of their inferiority, we must suppose that they have a favourable disposition, if only covertly, towards them, in order to maintain the approval of their peer group and to indicate group
loyalty (Labov 1966a: 108). In this way, variationist sociolinguists have postulated a close relationship between how language is viewed by speakers and the linguistic choices they make. The concept of language prestige is central to variationist approaches to variation, and one which has come to have a major bearing on the types of English that are taught in the English-speaking world. As such, it is revisited later in this chapter when research in the area of English language attitudes is reviewed. Before this, we explore approaches which have availed of the new opportunities offered by technology to investigate language variation more extensively and with greater accuracy, with a growing trend towards multi-disciplinary studies which reflect a combined CL/DA approach, which is the approach adopted in the present study.

2.2.2 Computer-Assisted Discourse Studies of Variation

The advent and development of corpus linguistics since the 1970’s (CL) has led to a growing body of research which has sought to map language variation at the level of variety, and different World Englishes and the relationship between them, including IE (Tagliamonte and Lawrence 2000; Farr and O’Keefe 2002; Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004; Barron 2008; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Vaughan and Clancy 2012). This has coincided with the development of new DA approaches to the study of language variation (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Stubbs 1983; Mc Carthy, Mathiessen and Slade 2002 in Schmitt (Ed.) in the fields of sociolinguistics and pragmatics (Yule and Brown 1983; Leech 1983) which have sought to analyse different aspects of language use in context. DA approaches in general, reflect a shift in analytical perspective within linguistics from a narrow form-focused view of language to a more contextualized and communicative orientation in line with the broader paradigm shift within linguistics from prescriptive to descriptive approaches (Carter and McCarthy 2006:6-7).

Accordingly, whilst earlier, variationist studies used traditional, quantitative methodologies to explore linguistic variables relating to the formal properties of language such as phonetics, morphology and syntax (Labov 1972; Trudgill 1974; Cheshire 1982), contemporary researchers have drawn on computer-assisted approaches which have afforded them new opportunities to explore language variation through broader quantitative and more–in depth
qualitative investigations of the functional and the pragmatic use of language. In this way, technological advances and developments in corpus linguistics and DA since the 1970’s (Sankoff and Sankoff 1973; Sinclair 1992) have revolutionized the nature of language research and studies of variation by increasing the availability of language corpora, and by providing a new methodological approach for researchers (Tognelli-Bonini 2001, 2012). This has led to a growing body of corpus-assisted discourse studies of variation. Research of this kind which has been concerned primarily with providing more accurate descriptions of statistical trends and patterns in language variation, including language use at the level of variety, and with the interpretation of the practices observed drawing on DA frameworks from language–related disciplines, are commonly termed computer-assisted or computer-based discourse-studies of variation (Lindquist 2009:17). This is in contrast to corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis which is a research paradigm which exclusively explores the ideologies underpinning language use, and the ways in which they are manifested in distinct discourse genres and contexts (Baker et al 2008).

Computer-assisted discourse studies of variation at the level of variety have been facilitated by the broadening of the empirical database of regional varieties and the availability of data from both large-scale and smaller locally derived corpora, including ICE-Ireland (Kirk and Kallen 2004) and LCIE (Farr et al 2004). These advances have also helped to expand culturally-oriented research in such related fields as cross-cultural communication (Kramsch 1998; Tannen 2000) and inter-cultural pragmatics (Gumperz 1982; Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper 1989; Barron and Schneider 2005; Barron 2008). Cultural theorists have argued that globalisation has brought a need for speakers of English to develop inter-cultural awareness and competence, which entails competences that are much broader than the surface linguistic formulae and correctness (Gumperz 1982, Kramsch 1993, Tannen 1984, Scollon and Scollon 1995). New insights in this area have emerged from studies which have explored different aspects of cross-communication in areas such as turn taking, listenership, formulaicity, formality/informality, directness/indirectness and politeness phenomenae, often from multi-disciplinary perspectives (Widdowson 1990; Kramsch 1993, 1998; Tannen 2000, 2006).

The investigation of politeness norms across different speech communities has become a key area of research interest in the related field of variational pragmatics, which is situated at the interface of pragmatics and variationist sociolinguistics (Barron and Schneider 2005; Murphy
2010, 2015; Murphy and Farr 2012). Studies in this area, which seek to investigate the effect of macro-social pragmatic variation in language use, have revealed how variation of this kind accompanies more general linguistic variation, allowing researchers to begin to address the research gap which has existed in sociolinguistics for variation at the pragmatic level (Andersen and Aijmer 2011: 13-14). These developments have brought new understandings concerning unique aspects of grammatical, lexical and pragmatic language usage by speakers in lesser known sociolinguistic settings, including Ireland, and the cultural discourses which shape these practices (Clancy 2000; Farr and O’Keeffe 2002; O’Sullivan 2004, O’Keeffe et al. 2011; Vaughan and Clancy 2012; Filppula 2012a, 2012b, Murphy and Farr 2012). This study seeks to add to this body of research by exploring underlying cultural and socio-pragmatic influences shaping the target English use of EFL teachers from the IE background.

The increased availability of spoken corpora compiled from a variety of sources, including conversational, academic, professional and educational discourse, has also facilitated comparative register analysis in the applied linguistic field. This had led to a wealth of insights concerning the defining generic characteristics of different types of written and spoken discourse (McCarthy 1998; Biber et al 1999; Carter and McCarthy 2006). For instance, it has provided evidence that language use is highly sensitive to the type and medium of communication chosen, with certain types of language associated with particular forms of activity or registers, and whether communication is in the written or spoken form (McCarthy 1988; Markkanen and Schroder 1992; Jucker et al. 2003; Holmes and Meyerhoff 2003). This has led to a greater appreciation of the differences in structure and expression between written and spoken registers. For example, it has revealed that grammar, like vocabulary, varies markedly according to context and mode (McCarthy 1988; Halliday and Hassan 1989; Romaine and Lange 1991; Biber et al 1999; Carter and McCarthy 2006). Progress has since been made in situating different types of spoken discourse on the continuum of speech genres which includes, for example, informal and formal spoken discourse (McCarthy, Mattiesen and Slade 2002: 59) business and phatic communication (Holmes 2000: 37-38), academic (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons 2002: 27-29) and professional registers (Scollon and Scollon 1995). The findings to emerge from corpus research of this kind have been instrumental in challenging established beliefs concerning what constitutes
standard’ English, which is discussed in the following section, within a broader discussion of language attitudes, given that these are intricately inter-related themes (Chambers and Trudgill 2014:85).

2.2.3 Language Attitudes

Crystal (1997: 215) has defined language attitudes as “the feelings people have about their own language or the language of others”. As a concept, attitude often overlaps with others such as ‘belief’, ‘opinion’, ‘value’, ‘motive’ and ‘ideology’, which are closely related. Nevertheless, Baker (1992: 13-14) has shown that it is possible to make distinctions between them, which are also observed in this study. For instance, beliefs involve factually-based perceptions about the world (for example, ‘I think he smokes’), and can be further classified in terms of prescriptive beliefs (for example, ‘I think he shouldn’t smoke’), which involve evaluative comments about behaviour. Meanwhile, opinions are viewed as overt beliefs, which are verifiable, by comparison with attitudes which may be latent and contain affective responses. Further distinctions are made with ‘values’, which are viewed as higher ideals that individuals may hold and strive for, whereas ‘attitudes’ are more abstract. Meanwhile, ‘motives’ are considered to be latent, goal-specific dispositions by comparison with ‘attitudes’ that are object specific, in that speakers hold attitudes towards something or someone (Ajzen 2005: 7). While ‘attitude’ is a key term used in many fields of social science, notably social psychology, the related concept of ‘ideology’ is more important in the fields of sociolinguistics where critical, theoretical approaches have developed which centre on the notion of standard language ideologies. Milroy (2001: 22) has pointed to the existence of a standard language culture in many English-speaking countries, but suggests that they may differ as a result of the historic, socio-political and socio-cultural experiences of speakers in different English language speech communities.

Within the sociolinguistic field, it is generally recognized that language attitudes influence language use and language variation in several important ways. For instance, they can be explanatory factors behind the motivations involved in language change (Labov 1984: 33); they can help define the identity of speech communities and how certain groups or speakers are viewed in terms of their social or economic standing (Labov 1966a, 1972b; Trudgill
1972; Cheshire 1984); they may determine educational and employment opportunities (Bernstein 1971; Macauley 1986, 2005; Garrett, Coupland and Williams 2003; Britain 2007) and, crucially, they can also influence choices and decisions made by educators and learners in relation to the target language models promoted in second and foreign language education on the basis of their perceived prestige and currency (Timmis 2002; Jenkins 2007; McKenzie 2010; Young and Walsh 2010).

2.2.3.1 Traditional Linguistic Perspectives on ‘Standard’ English

Traditional sociolinguistic approaches to ‘standard’ English have sought to explain standard language use within the broader dimensions of class-related theories of language variation (Labov 1972b; Trudgill 1999a). From this viewpoint, it is the version of the language which is most admired socially, due to the fact that it reflects middle class norms and is associated with ‘educated’ speakers (Trudgill 1999a: 124). As such, it provides “a benchmark … [and] … implies good usage” (ibid: 126). Hence, Trudgill has argued that ‘standard’ English is a specific dialect, as in Standard English. Moreover, it is the version of the language promoted in education, and in many international contexts on the grounds that:

… [It is] by far the most important dialect in the English-speaking world from a social, intellectual and cultural point of view. (1999a: 126)

The association made between ‘standard’ English and social class reflects the interest that sociolinguists have placed historically on the influence of social rules and norms on language use, and the role played by language in shaping and signalling social identity and language attitudes (Labov 1972b). The promotion of ‘standard’ language norms therefore lies at the very core of traditional beliefs and practices surrounding language use in mainstream educational contexts in Inner Circle countries in ways in which are reviewed in the following section.

2.2.3.2 ‘Standard’ English in Education

Education has been the main channel for transmitting the ‘standard’ to speakers of other varieties and of teaching formal and written registers to all. Linguists who have traced the
development and spread of ‘standard’ English from a historical viewpoint (see McArthur 1987; Crystal 1997, 2003, 2004; Watts and Trudgill 2002) have demonstrated that, throughout the twentieth century, a socially and educationally institutionalised version of the language emerged based on prescriptive views of correctness in grammar and style. Prescriptive views about language are concerned with how people should and should not use language. This leads to one version holding greater ‘prestige’ than others and being imposed on the whole of the speech community (Labov 1972b; Trudgill 2002). Descriptive views, on the other hand, are concerned with describing patterns of language use dispassionately, whether they are socially prestigious or not.

Prescriptive arguments have been used by linguists to define and rationalise the presence of standard varieties, as in Quirk’s view that “the existence of standards [...] is an endemic feature of our mortal condition and [...] people feel alienated and disoriented if a standard seems to be missing [...]” (1985: 6). Advocates of this view have successfully argued for the maintenance of an exclusive, ‘standard’ version of English in mainstream educational contexts. This is in spite of criticisms that an insistence on standard norms disadvantages many individuals, given that it is vernacular forms of expression that are most commonly used in the wider speech community (Tannen 1984; Fairclough 1999;). This has led some to argue that vernacular varieties should be more ‘visible’ in educational curricula, and that teaching about language and issues relating to ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ language use should be accorded greater prominence in educational programmes (see Clark et al 1990; Wolfram 1991).

Such views are often strongly resisted by those who fear that changes to the norms governing English language use may lead to a lowering of overall educational standards in schools. A further key consideration often raised by ‘stakeholders’ who seek to defend the current ‘standard’ English status quo concerns the degree of mutual intelligibility of main versus local varieties. Within linguistics in general, intelligibility is a key criterion by which different types of language use are distinguished. Adger has argued that varieties that speakers are more familiar with do not generally present the types of problems which can arise with lesser known Englishes (1997: 14). However, research in the area of language attitudes has suggested that a bias towards prestige varieties may affect intelligibility judgements (McKenzie 2010: 147).
Critical linguists (see Clark et al 1990; Milroy 2001) have challenged conceptualisations of ‘standard English’ which are bound to the notion of ‘prestige’, on the grounds that advocates of this view have failed to establish exactly what the term means or to explain the visible deviance which arises in relation to class-related patterns of speech. Moreover, this view of ‘standard’ fails to account for socio-historical and ideological factors of domination and power from which prescriptive attitudes derive (Phillipson 1992; Canagarajah 2002, 2006a). They also reject the traditional notion of a fixed and invariant version of standard on linguistic grounds pointing out that this does not correspond to the global realities of spoken English usage today. Before exploring the ways in which the changing English landscape is changing the status of local varieties, it is useful to review the body of research which has emerged in the sociolinguistic field in the area of English language attitudes to establish historic trends.

2.2.3.3 Attitudinal Research into ‘Standard/Non-Standard’ English

Language attitudes became a key area of research from the 1970s onwards for researchers working within the related fields of variationist studies (Labov 1972a, 1972b) and perceptual dialectology (Preston 1999). One of the earlier studies of social attitudes towards varieties of English was that undertaken by Tucker and Lambert amongst college students in the US (1969, cited in McKenzie 2010: 23). It reported that non-linguists differentiate among speech varieties within a single language and have stereotyped attitudes towards them. Influential research undertaken by Labov (1966a, 1972a, 1972b) in the 1960’s and 1970s in US contexts also revealed the stigmatised nature of some ‘non-standard’ variables in speech, confirming earlier accounts of stereotyping by speakers in relation to their use. Many studies conducted since then, mainly in Britain and the United States, have supported these earlier findings (Trudgill 1984; Cheshire 1984; Lippi Green 1997; Milroy 2001; Torrance 2002; McKenzie 2010). In general, attitudinal research in this field has provided strong evidence that ‘standard’ speech varieties tend to be evaluated more positively by speakers in terms of the status accorded to them. Several studies, for instance, have reported the persistence of negative attitudes towards regional and working-class accents, and dialectal aspects featuring ‘non-standard’ grammar, which are consistently rated as ‘less correct’, ‘less sophisticated’ or
‘less educated’ than the ‘standard’ usage of middle-class speakers (Trudgill 1984; Cheshire 1984; Giles and Coupland 1991; Lippi Green 1997; Milroy 2001). Unfavourable evaluations of this kind towards regional dialects of English are commonly attributed to a range of negative associations made by speakers, such as poverty, low levels of intelligence, a poor standard of education and racial and historical conflicts (Milroy 2001: 239).

In the British context, researchers have reported that native speakers of English often display negative attitudes towards urban, ‘non-standard’ varieties of speech such as those commonly found in the main British cities such as Manchester, Liverpool and Glasgow (Giles and Coupland 1991; Milroy 1999). Research by Menzies (1991), Macauley (1997) and Torrance (2002) has highlighted, for example, the low status attached, in particular, to the vernacular speech of Glasgow, attributed by the researchers in each of these studies to its association with poverty and violence. McKenzie (2010: 117-119) provides an extensive review of studies carried out in this area which refer to Inner Circle speech communities where the regional and social dialects that are used are poorly evaluated as stigmatised forms, including Wales (Garrett et al 2003), New Zealand (Bayard 1999), Australia (Bradley and Bradley 2001), Canada (Edwards and Jacobsen 1987), and Northern Ireland (Zwickl 2002), although the varieties used more widely in Ireland were not included. A further related research paradigm which has emerged as a sub-field of sociolinguistics since the 1960s, and which is concerned with the investigation of popular beliefs about language use, is that of perceptual dialectology or folklinguistics, as developed most notably by Preston (1999). Studies by perceptual dialectologists have explored everyday views on what constitute ‘good/bad’, ‘acceptable/unacceptable’ language usage, drawing on methodologies which have been designed by researchers working in this field. The findings have typically shown that speakers express strong emotional and negatively evaluative judgements about different forms of expression, particularly those associated with urban and rural working-class speakers (McKenzie 2010: 117).

Critical sociolinguists (see Milroy 2001 and Jenkins 2007, 2009) have suggested that these outcomes foreground the need for informed discussion and research to examine popular language beliefs amongst speakers in different sociolinguistic settings, and to explore factors influencing such strongly negative associations with particular regional and social varieties of English. This is important, as it offers opportunities to explore the ways in which individuals
in a given speech community are affected by standard language ideology, as manifested through these types of beliefs. They have further stressed the need for research which explores socio-cultural issues of power and domination from which these attitudes derive in different ‘standard’ English cultures. This is of particular value in settings where differences arise between the local variety and the ‘standard’ used in professional and educational contexts, and where these norms are being challenged, as is the case in Ireland, in the light of World Englishes. With these considerations in mind, we turn next to critical approaches to language variation which have led to new perspectives on what constitutes ‘standard’ spoken English.

2.2.3.4 Critical Linguistic Approaches to ‘Standard’ English

Critical linguists have been most influential in driving the agenda for the critical discussion of World Englishes and its implications (Bolton 2004: 384). This has stemmed from a concern with raising awareness of issues of power, control and discrimination arising in ‘standard’ English cultures worldwide, as part of a wider social struggle for the empowerment of discriminated minorities or otherwise disenfranchised populations (Phillipson 1992; Fairclough 1999). This is considered crucial for the expression of personal and collective freedoms and identities, as argued for more widely in liberation educational theories and philosophies (Freire 1972). The critical linguist camp can be divided into those who take an anti-imperialist stance and reject outright the expansion of English globally, such as Phillipson (1992), and others who are concerned with ways in which the hegemony of native speaker standards can be resisted through the appropriation of English for their own local use, such as Kachru (1996) and Canagarajah (2006a). A third approach is that taken by Brutt-Griffler (2002) and Jenkins (2007, 2009), who view the spread of World Englishes as resulting from the agency of its non-native speakers and, therefore, as a reflection of their empowerment.

Critical linguists have been at the fore of challenges to the prevailing monocentric ‘standard’ English approach, arguing that, due to the global diversification in English (see Kumaradivelu 1999; Milroy 2001; Canagarajah 2006a; Matsuda 2012), standardisation must
be viewed as a process that is continually in progress, whereby all languages continue to vary and change rather than remain static and invariant. This approach enables ‘standard’ to be seen as more variable and unstable than previously accepted and allows for, and recognizes the existence of, new standard varieties alongside established ones. From this, a pluricentric theoretical approach has emerged which advocates multiple standards. This represents a major departure from the ‘World Standard Spoken English model’ envisaged by Quirk (1985: 6), and others (see; McArthur 1987, 1998; Gorlach 2002; Crystal 2003), which, it is argued, is developing of its own accord, despite strong evidence to the contrary (Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994; Bolton 2000).

Advocates of a pluricentrist approach share the view that the standard may be expressed through multiple standards rather than one variety, and that these can be investigated to determine shared characteristics and what makes each national variety unique (see White 2006; Jenkins 2007; Kirk 2007). This makes it possible to take into account the standard language used in educational contexts, but it does not exclude the possibility of variation within the spoken standard language as a result of different sets of national features, reflecting different demographic and political histories and language influences. While there is a current lack of consensus as to the precise form a pluricentric model of English would take, this revised viewpoint represents an attempt to reconcile some of the difficulties and contradictions which have arisen in relation to the conceptualization and description of ‘standard’ spoken English. This has inspired a growing research interest in local varieties, and brought to the fore issues surrounding their current status and use (Jenkins 2009: 200-209).

2.2.3.5 Revised Linguistic Perspectives on Local Varieties

Prescriptive views of regional and socially-differentiated varieties as ‘ungrammatical’ and ‘incorrect’ have further been challenged by corpus-based studies which have highlighted that they can have a more intricate grammatical structure than main, standard varieties (Watson 2009: 347-9). They have also revealed that local varieties often incorporate unique linguistic features that reflect some aspect of the speaker’s society, which may make them more effective and appropriate than ‘standard’ English in meeting the communication and cultural
needs of their speakers. As Beal (2004: 140) has observed, “[…] for some features [regional varieties] arguably do a better job than the standard forms […]”. This has raised appreciation of their socio-cultural usefulness and relevance.

Research of this kind has also gone some way to addressing some of the limitations of earlier attempts made by sociolinguists to classify international English language use, which failed to take account of the substantial regional and social variation within the broad Inner, Outer and Expanding categories of usage. Bruthiaux (2003: 16) has argued, for instance, that the Kachruvian model ignores the fact that considerable spoken dialectal variation exists within each of these categories, which reinforces misconceptions of the Englishes within these circles as monolithic and standardised. This is a view shared by Millar with specific reference to Inner Circle Englishes. For instance, as a speaker of Northern Irish English, he has rejected terms such as British English on the grounds that “[it]renders invisible many speakers as well as a number of national identities” (2010: 43). These limitations have meant that the particular position of Inner Circle varieties such as IE have been largely overshadowed in the World Englishes debate, and in the related published literature, by a focus on main varieties.

O’Keeffe (2011: 57-63) has argued that a pluricentric World Englishes approach offers a more comprehensive and suitable sociolinguistic framework for the descriptive analysis of non-main Inner Circle varieties, such as IE, which are likely to reflect different standards alongside vernacular usages. The IE setting has been further identified by White (2006: 217-219) as an intriguing venue in which to explore established and changing perspectives on ‘standard’ English in social and educational contexts, due to its long colonial relationship with Britain, and the fact that IE has been positioned and evaluated historically exclusively in relation to SBE norms. This approach is therefore likely to provide a broader comparative basis for the cross-variational study of language norms and language attitudes in different English language contexts and settings in Ireland. With this consideration in mind, we turn next to a review of IE as the variety that forms the linguistic backdrop to the present study.
2.3 Irish English

IE is “the robust national variety spoken by the Irish people” (O’Keeffe 2011: 57). It is this version of English that is used by the vast majority of the Irish people in their everyday communications although it occupies a second position to Gaelic in terms of its official status. By comparison, Gaelic is spoken natively by less than two percent of the population, although it is learned as a compulsory subject at school (CSO 2016: 8). Historical linguists have traced the evolution of IE as a language in relation to colonial developments dating back some eight hundred years, and the process of language shift which occurred rapidly in Ireland in the nineteenth century, whereby Irish was largely replaced by English (Bliss 1979 cited in Filppula 1999: 15). They have also shown that the distinctive features of IE also owe much of their character to the Irish language, which has heavily influenced its forms, particularly as regards its distinctive grammar (Cheshire 1991: 51; Clarke 2012: 101). Despite its lack of formal codification in grammars and dictionaries, the influence of IE has been significant, both historically and culturally, with the spread of many of its features to countries such as Canada, the UK, the US and Australia due to Ireland’s prolonged history of emigration (Amador-Moreno 2010: 11). O’Keeffe (2011: 58) has further highlighted the historic influence of IE in the arts, literature and music, as well as the growing interest for its study as an academic endeavour more recently.

2.3.1 IE: Sociolinguistic Distribution

As Filppula has observed (2012b: 86), IE speakers today use a wide range of both formal and informal forms of expression to suit their everyday communicative needs. In terms of sociolinguistic distribution, IE contains several dialects and varieties including Ulster Irish and Southern Irish English, the northern and southern variety, with the dialectal boundary broadly corresponding with the political border between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Sociolinguistic studies have revealed that as a national variety, it shows differentiation in both social stratification and rural versus urban dialects, as a result of historic and social processes (Hickey 2007: 41; Filppula 2012b: 83). While rural dialects such as those in the west of Ireland tend to display a more conservative character which is greatly
influenced by the speech forms of Gaelic, urban dialects, especially those in Dublin and Belfast, have been shaped more by cross-cultural influences and display many of the ‘non-standard’ forms found in the vernacular, urban dialects of Great Britain. In addition to its regional and social sub-varieties, an educated version of IE is also used which is less distinguishable from SBE, as Quirk et al (1985: 21 cited in Filppula 1999: 85) have observed:

Hiberno-English, or Irish English, may also be considered as a national standard... It is consciously and explicitly regarded as independent of BrE [British English] by educational and broadcasting services. The proximity of Great Britain, the easy movement of population, the pervasive influence of AmE [American English], and like factors mean however that there is little room for the assertion and development of a separate [Irish English] grammar and vocabulary.

It is this version that is typically heard in the formal language of Irish media broadcasting such Radio Telefis Eireann (Crystal 2003: 103). Due to the progress made in various linguistic fields, much more is now known about the defining features of IE as a variety, its relationship with the two main varieties, and its place in the English language world, which are areas we review next.

2.3.2 IE: Linguistic Features and Speech Style

While written English in the Irish context equates broadly to SBE in terms of grammatical and lexical features, IE is most distinguishable from this main variety in its spoken form (Harris 1997; Filppula 1999, 2012b). Filppula (2012b: 86) has observed that, in general, Irish varieties of English are easy to recognize at the levels of phonetics and phonology, with a number of elements common to speakers of all regions (for an extensive list of the range of phonological features on a regional basis see Hickey (2004: 68-97)). However, with regard to grammatical features, he claims that “it would be far-fetched to speak of a separate IE grammar” (Filppula 1999: 86). Nevertheless, corpus researchers have provided evidence of features which distinguish IE as a variety, and the IE speech style, at the grammatical level, often making comparisons with main varieties (Filppula 1999; Clancy 2000; Farr and O’Keeffe 2002; Murphy 2010; O’Keeffe 2011; O’Keeffe et al 2011; Vaughan and Clancy 2011; Clancy and Vaughan 2012; Migge 2012). Studies by Farr and O’Keeffe (2002), for instance, revealed key differences in modal verb use by IE speakers for reasons pertaining to
politeness. Research by O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009) and later, Clark (2012) also explored the wide categories of perfects associated with this variety, including the *after perfect* construction, while differences at the level of the noun phrase in relation to second person pronominal *ye* have been highlighted by O’Keeffe (2011) with specific reference to its use in conversational Irish English.

Corpus studies have also revealed well-known ‘non-standard’ grammatical features used by IE speakers, which are also found in several Inner Circle Englishes, including *preterite seen/done* (Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004; Filppula 2012b). The last twenty years have also seen a steady growth in research of pragmatic aspects of IE in areas such as hedging phenomena (Farr and O’Keeffe 2002); relational work in different interactional contexts (Clancy 2005, 2011; Farr 2005) and pragmatic markers (Amador-Moreno 2009; Vaughan and Clancy 2011; Clancy and Vaughan 2012; Murphy 2015). For instance, several studies have explored the use of *pragmatic like* amongst adults and teenagers across various socio-pragmatic roles, including as a hedging device (Clancy 2000; Farrell 2004; O’Sullivan 2004; Schweinberger 2012). Meanwhile, areas explored at the discourse level have included IE questions, responses and negation, and directives (Connington 2005; Farr 2005, 2010; Kallen 2005b; O’Keeffe 2006).

The IE speech style has also come under investigation with researchers pointing to politeness and informality as overriding traits (Kirk and Kallen 2004; Kallen 2005a; Kirk 2007). Research which has explored politeness norms in this setting has indicated that politeness plays an important social role in Irish culture, with hospitality and friendliness being highly valued, and a preference for avoiding direct conflict (Kallen 2005: 132). This is manifested through an overall orientation in IE towards indirectness, negative politeness and the avoidance of forwardness. This leads to a high use of downtowners and hedges, as highlighted by Clancy (2000), O’Keeffe and Farr (2002) and Murphy (2010). Kallen (2005b) has also suggested that the need for indirectness typically leads to the blurring of the illocutionary force in speech. This has also been substantiated by Connington’s study (2005: 60) which found that IE English speakers tend to be less direct in giving instructions in order to allow for minimal face threat. However, apart from Farr’s 2005 research, which explored politeness phenomena in the context of ELTE in Ireland and broadly supports these findings, little is known about the professional speech styles of IE speakers in educational settings in
Ireland, including in the EFL classroom context. By exploring the ways in which socio-pragmatic and cultural dimensions play out in the context of EFL teacher interactions with learners in the IE setting, this study thereby offers the potential to add to our understandings in this area.

2.3.3 IE: Attitudes and Status

As far as the historical status of IE is concerned, evidence of unfavourable attitudes towards IE date back as far as the end of the nineteenth century, including amongst the Irish themselves. Cronin has observed that alongside the adoption of English by the Irish came an adherence to standard language ideologies, by which the local variety was viewed as ‘deviant’ (2011: 56). Hickey (2009: 62-66) has also pointed to the historic treatment of IE in dictionaries and in popular circles which emphasised colloquial, slightly farcical and vulgar items, thereby presenting this variety as a substandard language not to be taken seriously. He has offered three possible explanations for this: the first relates to the linguistic prejudice against specific features of IE which emerged on the part of the new middle class in Ireland in the nineteenth century, which had the effect of inhibiting the development of a local, supraregional variety of IE and confined speakers to vernacular varieties; the second is the post-colonial attitude which lingers on, that is, that ‘anything home grown is inferior’; the third is the view that “endorsing English in Ireland would be tantamount to disloyalty to Irish” (ibid: 66).

Kallen (1988: 127-128) has argued that the ambivalent attitude towards English on the part of the Irish themselves can be traced to the unique position of IE as a post-colonial variety, as it is a particular case where the shift variety represents the prestige variety of a post-colonial country. This sets IE apart from other Inner Circle language shift settings such as Scotland, where a prestige variety exists (namely Standard Scottish English) alongside vernacular varieties including Scots English (ibid: 127-128). Accordingly, IE is, on the one hand, the native language of the vast majority of the population but, on the other hand, the language of the former colonisers. He has also argued that the lack of recognition of IE by the Irish is due to the divergent nature of IE varieties, with distinctions based on class and region. This has led to a view of IE as a set of oral varieties indexed with socially and regionally distinctive
populations and identities that do not lend themselves easily to positive identification for all Irish people.

Studies which have explored popular attitudes towards IE amongst the Irish have revealed evidence of the low prestige associated with varieties showing transfer effects from Irish, although research in this area has mainly been concerned with IE accents (Filppula 1999: 66). For instance, in a comparison of regional accents by Irish university students RP was evaluated more favourably than IE speakers’ accents (Edwards 1977). Evidence of stigmatisation in relation to the use of IE dialectal forms amongst native IE speakers has also been provided by Hickey (2004a, 2005, 2009), White (2006) and Filppula (2012a, 2012b). As far as the attitudes of the younger generation are concerned, in a paper entitled *Language Use and Attitudes in Ireland* (Hickey 2009: 62-89), the author reported the findings of a large-scale project in which the perceptions of a cross-section of the Irish population were investigated. Its particular focus was on the attitudes of the age group who had grown up during the years of economic prosperity and boom, which began in the early 1990s in Ireland and continued until around 2006. It found that today’s young IE speakers are aware of their own variety of English, and support its being different from BE (ibid: 62-4). Hickey has argued that this is interesting from a sociolinguistic point of view as it shows that they maintain a sense of their own linguistic identity which is unique to Ireland. It further suggested that the attitudes of younger IE speakers towards the local variety may be more favourable than those of older generations and that the status of IE may be undergoing change in Ireland (ibid: 86-89).

Research which has investigated the attitudes of migrant workers from non-native English (NNE) backgrounds towards IE has reported some ambivalence on their part. Migge’s study (2012: 320-325), for instance, found that while many newcomers were largely unaware of IE as a distinct variety on arrival and experienced difficulties in understanding it initially, they became more accustomed to its use over time through interaction with Irish people. The areas of difficulty reported by the participants were mostly associated with accents and phonological aspects, although they were unable to specify particular accents or linguistic features. Lexical features including phrasal verb expressions were also viewed as salient, as were pragmatic aspects including *pragmatic like* (ibid: 320-325). However, structural aspects featured less frequently in the participants’ descriptions of IE. One further area commented
on was the exaggeratedly deferential language use of the Irish with a high frequency of polite forms and tentative language use to convey non-tentative or definite meanings, which many of the participants valued. The study concluded that like Irish people, the newcomers associated the term IE with divergent, marked and non-standard forms of English, rather than using it as a cover term for all varieties of English spoken in Ireland (ibid: 325). A further significant finding from the study was that the participants perceived the professional language use of IE speakers as non-indigenous and conforming to external norms, which were viewed as unmarked and proper. In this regard, some of the interviewees’ perceptions suggested that “IE and unmarked or international English are poles on a continuum and that different points on that continuum relate to different socio-political orientations as well as different social groups within Irish society” (ibid: 320).

On the basis of attitudinal research undertaken in secondary schools in Ireland, White (2006: 225) has pointed to the current ambiguity that surrounds the status of IE amongst mainstream English teachers from the IE background. Despite this, she has argued that SBE should no longer be regarded as the yardstick for language use in professional and educational contexts in Ireland and that the notion of a ‘standard’ variety of IE may be more appropriate as a prestige variety in the Irish educational context, as a main vehicle through which a local identity may be maintained internationally in the face of globalisation (ibid: 225). Filppula (1999: 39), on the other hand, is sceptical as to whether or not ‘standard’ IE can be seen as a prestige variety but rather considers a ‘general’ or ‘common’ IE English vernacular as a ‘reality’ rather than a standard, a view also shared by Bliss (1979) and Lass (1987). Harris (1991: 39) adopts a more flexible and inclusive approach which views IE as a continuum of varieties, from most to least standard-like. The notion of a ‘standard’ English continuum is further supported by Kirk and Kallen (2007: 270-298).

In an attempt to address the issue of what might constitute ‘standard’ IE, Kirk and Kallen (2007) have considered the key concepts of ‘standardisation’ and ‘Celticity’ through a comparative corpus-based analysis of the British and Irish elements of the International Corpus of English (ICE) which represent ‘educated’ and professional speakers of the language. In so doing, they have made the important point that IE speakers have their own repertoire of colloquial features which are unique to Irish usage, in addition to a limited set of dialect features from England and Scotland: that is, they share exonormative as well as local
endonormative features. Hence, they point to the ‘dual nature of ‘Irish Standard English’ which shows “both the effects of the standardisation process common to all standard Englishes and the effects of Celticism arising from a variety of circumstances” (ibid: 295). Accordingly, they have concluded that, despite pressures for standardisation which come from influences such as education, written forms or standard language ideologies, ‘standardisation is never quite fully achieved’ and IE continues to display elements of variation in standard contexts (ibid: 296).

From this they have suggested that ‘standard’ English need not be based on prescriptivism but rather on ‘observation of actual linguistic behaviour, as they have perceived:

In the absence of a specifically codified Irish standard English on either side of the political border, linguistic features associated with traditional dialects and vernacular Irish English are to be found in standard English in Ireland. However, these features are muted relative to the material found in a dialect or sociolinguistic study: muted both quantitatively in low frequencies of occurrence, and qualitatively in the sense that those features which have crossed into the standard constitute a strong marker of Irishness in a standard English corpus (ibid: 298).

This leads them to argue for a revised interpretation of standard, where it is viewed both in terms of an idealised set of shared features which facilitates international communication, and in terms of different sets of national features which show historic and linguistic influences (ibid: 298). This viewpoint, that is, that the language use of ‘educated’ speakers can contain lexical, grammatical, discourse and pragmatic features of IE, albeit in a muted way, is accepted by an increasing number of researchers including White (2006). For instance, in research which drew on a corpus of the speech of young educated language users in the Republic, compiled by the researcher with similar aims and under similar conditions to the ICE-Ireland corpus, White also noted differences at the grammatical and lexical levels between IE and SBE in both formal and informal conversations between the speakers (ibid: 225-226). While some of the features associated with dialectal varieties such as those found by Filppula (1999: 68) occurred very infrequently or not at all, others which are associated with IE, and not with SBE, were more visible (White 2006: 225-226). These findings were seen to support the position that standard IE is best understood in terms of a continuum of more to less standard features as used by ‘educated’ speakers.
In response to the consensus which is emerging in this regard, Mac Mathuna has also considered whether IE is a standard or a mainstream variety of English, or indeed both, referring to the existence of:

a range of Irish English regional and local dialects, some of which are quite traditional, including some urban ones, and others which are less conservative and traditional. The middle-class speakers of each of these various dialects have a kind of standard speech which they can avail of as appropriate and felicitous and it may be postulated that the varieties in question share a sufficient number of distinctive markers to constitute a kind of mainstream variety (2004: 115).

This description of what constitutes standard IE adds weight to the argument for a more flexible approach to ‘standard’, based on the notion of a continuum rather than a clear-cut polarisation between regional, socially-differentiated and prestige dialects of IE. Several researchers, however, have noted the absence of a clear delineation between features of ‘standard’ IE and vernacular usage, which is also reflected in the attitudes of speakers towards IE. This suggests an obvious need for further empirically-based research that explores how particular IE forms are currently being used, and viewed, in diverse social, professional and educational contexts in Ireland with a view to positioning them on a continuum of more to less standard features of IE, which the present research will go some way to addressing. With this in mind, we next revisit the specific linguistic items that form the basis of the analysis in this study as representative of three distinct types of spoken English found in the IE setting.

2.4 Review of the Literature: Specified Linguistic Items

2.4.1 The After Perfect and Ye (RDG)

Within the repertoire of linguistic varieties available to English language speakers in Ireland, the after perfect and ye have traditionally been viewed as vernacular grammatical forms, as they have been linked to the oral tradition and associated with speakers in some, as opposed to all, regional and social groupings in Ireland (Hickey 2007; Filppula 2012a, 2012b). Filppula (2012a: 86) has pointed out that distinctions between IE and other varieties exist both in terms of categorical differences, which are qualitative in nature and based on different grammatical rules or constraints, and usage differences, which are socially, pragmatically or
otherwise conditioned quantitative differences. The *after perfect* and *ye* are observed within the former type.

2.4.1.1 The IE *after perfect*

The tense and aspect system is one of the most frequently investigated areas of IE English due to the important distinctions observed. Sociolinguists have highlighted that IE has distinctive features pertaining to the progressive form, habitual aspect markers and perfect markers, and these differences have been amply documented in the literature in the field (see Kallen 1994; Filppula 1999; Hickey 2007). Clarke (2012: 101) notes that no single analogue exists in IE for the SBE present perfect. Instead, five different perfect forms occur alongside this standard, of which the *after perfect* is one. As Filppula (1999: 18) has observed, this illustrates the richness and complexity of IE by comparison with SBE.

As far as the sociolinguistic distribution of the *after perfect* is concerned, O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009: 520) have pointed to the “robust” use of this form in conversational English, in comparison with the relative infrequency of other perfect forms in spoken IE in general. In contrast, Kirk and Kallen (2007: 279) have highlighted its muted use in ICE-Ireland when representing more formal discourse genres. Despite this, they have argued that the *after perfect* is a marker of Irishness by virtue of its greater frequency in ICE-Ireland than in ICE-GB, the British component of the International Corpus of English (ibid: 279). This position is supported by internationally-oriented corpus research which explored the distribution of the *after perfect* across more than forty World Englishes, and identified it as one of several grammatical usages which are largely unique to IE as a variety (Kortmann and Szmrecsanyi 2004: 1168), thereby confirming its IE credentials.

2.4.1.2 IE *Ye*

Second person pronominal *ye* is a further emblematic feature of IE (Filppula 2012b: 45). Biber *et al* (1999: 328) have highlighted that personal pronouns are ubiquitous in all varieties of English as a main function word class. However, a key difficulty that arises in relation to second person pronominal use in SBE/SAE is that there is no formal means of distinguishing
between second person singular and plural pronouns, in both subject and object positions (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 32). Accordingly, it is not always clear whether the second person pronoun refers to one or more people. This contrasts with the distinction which has existed traditionally in many vernacular varieties of English, where a particular form of the second-person plural is used to mark plurality. For instance, *youse* is found in the dialects of Liverpool, Glasgow, Dublin and Belfast as well as in ‘non-standard’ Australian and New Zealand English, while *y'all* performs this function in Southern US English dialects (Watson 2009: 89).

This type of distinction is also made in IE, where several variants exist including *yez, youse* and *ye* (Filppula 1999; Hickey 2007). Of these, *ye* is thought to be the oldest historic form, with oral records of its use dating back to the twelfth century (Filppulla 1999: 32). Since then, it has become a commonly used feature of local varieties of Southern Ireland but is less known in Northern Ireland and its sub-varieties (Filppula 2012b: 51-60). Given that it plays an important functional role, which is to differentiate between singular and plural ‘you’, *ye* can be viewed as a more complex and efficient structure than its equivalent in SBE/SAE (Hickey 2004; Filppula 2012b). In this regard, Biber *et al* (1999: 330) have pointed out that speakers of SBE/SAE typically have to resort to adding ‘all’ as in ‘you all’ to signal plurality. While linguists have highlighted the important role that dialectal structures often play in filling the gap left by the absence of number contrast for ‘you’ in SBE/SAE, this is an area which has remained largely unexplored in the IE context in general, and in relation to *ye* and its variants in particular, which underscores the merits of corpus-based research of the kind envisaged in this study.

Evidence of the stigmatisation attached historically to IE vernacular grammatical usages has been provided by Filppula (1999) and Hickey (2009). However, Kirk and Kallen’s corpus-based research has suggested that these types of usages are becoming more widely used by IE speakers in general, due to the process of vernacularization (2007: 298). This has led sociolinguists to argue that, from a multiple standards perspective, the use of local forms of speech by educated speakers in professional contexts in this setting may be viewed as representative of an emergent standard IE. However, as discussed previously, the precise degree of ‘standardness’ that different forms reflect and what this may mean for their use in different educational contexts in Ireland remains unclear. For instance, White’s attitudinal
research (2006: 228) found that while the after perfect was largely tolerated by mainstream English teachers, it was rejected by EFL practitioners, although this was largely due to gatekeeping constraints rather than ideological concerns. This suggests that this is an area which merits further corpus-based research to gauge current trends in usage in the local EFL classroom context, and what this might mean. Meanwhile, even less is known about the status and use of ye in educational contexts in Ireland as this feature was not included in White’s study (2006). However, Farr’s research undertaken in the context of supervisor/supervisee TP feedback interviews (2005: 187) has provided indications of its routine use by novices in Teaching Practice on the MA TESOL programme that forms the backdrop to this study. This suggests that it is a usage that may play a more central role in the target English practices of EFL teachers in the IE context than the after perfect. Having established the merits of combined corpus-based and attitudinal research that can shed further light on the status and use of the after perfect and ye in the EFL classroom in Ireland, as representative of the local variety more widely, the following section reviews the academic literature relating to preterite seen and pragmatic like, representing socially-differentiated English of the kind found in Inner Circle Englishes more widely.

2.4.2 Preterite Seen/Pragmatic Like (SDG)

2.4.2.1 Preterite Seen

Preterite Seen is a well-documented feature of informal grammatical use in many parts of Britain, the United States and in Ireland although it has traditionally carried strongly stigmatised associations in social and educational contexts (Cheshire 1998; Beal 2004; Carter and McCarthy 2006). In IE, it has been described and listed as one of a number of non-standard grammatical forms which are widely used in both rural and urban parts of the country, and in some social groupings (see Hickey 2007; Kirk 2007; Filppula 2012b). Studies carried out in the field of perceptual dialectology in UK and US contexts have revealed that this specific usage is typically indexed with “less educated” speakers from socially disadvantaged urban/inner class backgrounds, and that it typically evokes strongly negative emotional reactions (Lippi-Green 1997: 19; Preston 1999: 32). It is a usage that has been
linked, in particular, to the speech patterns of young, working-class males, due to the fact that they associate socially marked features with toughness, which is considered to be a constituent characteristic of maleness in western societies (Cheshire 1998: 15; Labov 2001: 293). By contrast, women in older age categories are considered more likely to favour forms that carry overt prestige and lack stigmatisation, and to refrain from the use of this type of grammar (Romaine 2005: 172). This suggests that there may be age- and gender-differentiated patterns of use of the item amongst the teachers in this study. While this usage is not expected to feature saliently in the professional language use of practitioners in this domain given the well-known stigmatisation involved, this is likely to depend on the teachers’ awareness of its ‘inferior’ status and social-class associations and on their understanding of the normative requirements concerning language use in this educational context.

2.4.2.2 Pragmatic Like

The second type of usage in this category is defined by the age and gender of its speakers, more so than their social class. *Like* in its pragmatic use has inspired a growing body of research literature in recent decades as its use has spread in Inner Circle Englishes (see Underhill (1988); Romaine and Lange (1991); Ferrera and Bell (1995); Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). The usage is viewed as a marker of linguistic innovation and change in Ireland, as elsewhere, due to the process of ‘grammaticalization’ (Traugott 1982: 13), whereby some grammatical forms take on new roles and usages over time as part of ongoing language change (Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). However, there is evidence of an older tradition of usage for the marker amongst IE speakers where it occurs in a clause final position. This pattern dates back two centuries and is thought to have originated in northern parts of England (Weinert and Miller 1996: 37). As is the case for this word class in general (Ostman 1982; Schiffrin 1987; Vaughan and Clancy 2011), *pragmatic like* has a multifunctional capacity, and operates in mainly informal speech where it can perform a wide range of roles. Depending on the particular function intended in a speech act, which is not always easy to identify given its multifunctional capacity, the marker can feature in any one of a number of syntactic positions, including in clause initial, mid-clause and in-clause final position (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 214).
The functionality of the marker has been well-documented, including its role as a hedge to
downtone the assertiveness of propositional statements and questions for reasons of
politeness (Eckert 1996; Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). As highlighted previously in
this chapter, hedging is a commonly used interactional strategy amongst IE speakers due to
the high value placed on indirectness and politeness in this socio-cultural setting (Clancy
2000; Farr and O’Keefe 2002; Schweinberger 2012). This aspect is investigated in the
present study in relation to the use of the marker by both novice and experienced teachers,
when potentially face-threatening functions are being performed, such as in directives and
questions, and when dealing with errors. Further pragmatic roles played by the marker in
teacher talk in the EFL classroom context are also explored to establish the nature and extent
of usage of the marker in this discourse context and setting.

As far as popular attitudes towards pragmatic like are concerned, there is evidence of the
stigmatised status of the marker as far back as the nineteenth century, and that strongly
negative associations have continued since (see Wright 1857; Wright 1981; Partridge 1984).
Today, its use is also still typically commented on in disparaging terms in the media, as one
of a number of linguistic items said to reflect an inarticulate way of speaking that is popular
with teenagers, particularly amongst females in this age group (Romaine and Lange 1991:
22). This has been confirmed to some extent by corpus-based studies carried out in US and
British contexts, although the use of the marker has spread to older age groups (for the US
context see: Tannen 1986; Underhill 1988; Blyth, Rectenwald and Wang 1990; Romaine and
Lange 1991; Ferrera and Bell 1995; Dailey-O’Cain 2000; and for those conducted in relation
to British use see Stenstrom et al 1996; Weinert and Miller 1996; Tagliamonte and Hudson

The sociolinguistic trajectory of the marker has been extensively mapped in the IE setting
(see O’Keeffe 1999; Clancy 2000; Farrell 2004; Schweinberger 2012), with the latter account
based on the ICE-Ireland corpus, the most comprehensive to date. The main findings to
emerge are that the marker is more readily used by younger IE speakers, and that its use
significantly increased among speakers in the twenty to thirty age group over a brief fifteen
year period between 1990 and 2005 (Schweinberger 2012: 179-199). This led the author to
conclude that the use of the marker is undergoing change that affects certain parts of the Irish
speech community more than others “in that, at least in terms of educated IE, it is confined to
younger adults” (ibid: 197). In relation to the present research, it is expected therefore that the marker will be favoured more by the novices than by the experienced teachers, with age a key determinant of use. However, the precise nature and extent of its use in teacher talk in the EFL classroom discourse remains speculative, due to a current dearth of empirically-based research in this area. This underscores the potential gains to be made from the present study which sets out to provide an accurate multi-layered account of usage in this discourse context. Having gained crucial insights into the formal linguistic properties, patterns of use and status currently accorded to the specified items representing each variety of spoken English under investigation in this study, a summary is provided of the main areas covered in the chapter.

2.5 Summary of Chapter

The discussion in this chapter has provided crucial insights into variation in spoken English at the level of variety, through a review of key related approaches and research in the sociolinguistic field. It has also critically explored the complex relationship between language use and language attitudes, focusing on the pivotal notions of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ English, and related practices and controversies. This led to a critical appraisal of new perspectives on ‘standard’ within the World Englishes research paradigm, and the implications this holds for the status and use of local varieties, such as IE. From this, an overview was provided of the defining features of IE as a unique Inner Circle variety, and its relationship with main, ‘standard’ varieties across grammatical, pragmatic and discourse features. Historical and changing attitudes towards IE were then examined, as well as academic arguments which have attempted to address what constitutes ‘standard’ English in the contemporary IE context. This established the need for further empirical research amongst professionals and educated IE speakers in different contexts, in order to position specific usages relative to the degree of ‘standardness’, formality/informality and directness/indirectness reflected. Finally, the discussion highlighted the particular gains to be made from attitudinal and corpus-based research in the IE context that investigates current trends and perspectives surrounding the use of the specified linguistic items, representing the two distinct categories of spoken English under investigation. In this way, the review of the
literature in this chapter has provided crucial insights into the sociolinguistic identities of English language users from the IE background and the linguistic choices available to them in their everyday and professional practices. From this, we proceed to explore normative and pedagogical issues pertaining to the suitability of the varieties/registers of spoken English that EFL teachers use as target models for learners in different teaching contexts and settings, against the backdrop of the changing English language landscape and ongoing challenges to the historic target English status quo.
Chapter Three

Changing Target English Models in the EFL Classroom

To view linguistic differences as a resource instead of as a predicament, gives us more complexity, more understanding and more possibilities (Canagarajah: 2002: 134).

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the implications of the changing English language landscape for practitioners and teacher educators working in the ELT and ELTE domains. As the discussion in Chapter One highlighted, the phenomenon of ELF has generated much theoretical discussion amongst linguists concerning the nature of the English that can and should be taught to today’s learners as target model/s in different ELT contexts and settings. However, the practical issues and considerations arising for teachers, in terms of the varieties they use in their target English interactions with learners, have not been sufficiently addressed through empirical research. The chapter begins by briefly retracing the evolution of ELT as an educational sector and factors which have shaped the historic target English approach. It then critically appraises the implications of the shift towards CLT as an approach for the models of English taught. This leads to a discussion of the central role played by L2 teachers and teacher talk in the CLT classroom context, and key related theories of SLA, which will be drawn on in this study to interpret the suitability of teacher talk from key SLA perspectives alongside normative considerations. From this, we revisit the main theoretical arguments in the debate surrounding what might constitute a more suitable target English approach together with research which has explored the perspectives of EFL learners and teachers in this area as main stakeholders. This leads to a critical review of the ongoing impact of CL as a force for target model change. Finally, we turn to the crucial question of how EFL teachers at different stages of their professional careers can best be prepared for their future target English role and practices, in terms of their own educational needs. The chapter closes with a summary of the main areas covered in the previous discussion.
3.2 The Evolution of ELT and the Anglo-American Target English Approach

EFL education dates back to the 1920s and the pioneering work of British linguist Harold Palmer (McKenzie 2010: 132). From the outset, the model taught exclusively in European universities was Standard British English (SBE), although by the 1960s Standard American English (SAE) was beginning to make inroads in those parts of the world where US socio-political and cultural influences were growing as a result of globalisation (Graddol et al. 2007). The 1960s saw a rapid expansion in the industry as a result of two main influences; the new interest in language learning in the burgeoning Common Market, now the European Union, and subsequent work by the Council of Ministers; and the realisation in the UK and the US that ELT was an eminently marketable and exportable product both in terms of native speaker teachers and pedagogic materials (Howatt 1984: 82). As an education and qualifications in English have become increasingly linked with advancement in the global market place, the ELT industry has expanded exponentially, so that today it represents a vast and highly lucrative international enterprise (Graddol et al. 2007).

The Anglo-American role and influence over the spread of English worldwide has invariably ensured that those who study the language in formal instructional contexts such as schools and universities have been expected to learn either SBE or SAE due to the superior prestige and currency these varieties have been accorded internationally, regardless of whether the language is being learned in EFL or ESL type contexts (Philipson 1992; Pennycook 1994; Seidlhofer 2004). The choice of either target English variety in educational programmes has traditionally been made by governments and institutions on the basis of geographic proximity and historical, cultural, and socio-political links with either the UK or the US. A major global factor influencing the continued maintenance of these varieties has also been the widespread use of these varieties in diverse fields such as science and technology, medicine, economics and business, aviation and tourism and in academia, although it is widely accepted that SBE is fast losing its prestige internationally (Crystal 2003, 2010; Graddol et al. 2007; Timmis and Mishan 2015).

The distinction made between ESL and EFL teaching and learning contexts has been an important one historically as it has influenced decision-making in relation to teaching
materials, syllabus and examinations (Timmis and Mishan 2015: 11). The teaching of EFL takes place typically in either public or private schools in Expanding Circle settings (Kachru 1996); that is, where English is not the native language and has no special status either as a second language or as a language of instruction. ESL contexts, on the other hand, are typically found in Outer Circle settings where it has become the norm for secondary school and university students to learn the content of educational programmes through English (Tomlinson 2011). A further use of the term ESL/ESOL relates to the teaching of English to immigrants and foreigners living in a country, context or culture where English is the first language, as in the case in many Inner Circle settings. This includes the US, the UK, Australia, Canada and, more recently, Ireland. The term EAL, that is, English as an additional language, is also used to describe the teaching of English to young learners from NNES backgrounds in mainstream schools in some of these countries, including Ireland.

3.2.1 The Plurality of ELT Contexts Worldwide

As the ELT industry and educational sector has expanded, a more diverse range of teaching and learning contexts has emerged, which has led to a blurring of the traditional EFL/ESL divide (Crystal 2003: 110; Timmis and Mishan 2015: 32). For instance, today many students learn English in countries where English is used as a first language, such as the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom and Ireland, where they enrol on general EFL programmes designed to help them to develop fluency and general communication skills in authentic English language settings. Short-term EFL summer programmes have also become popular for young learners from European countries such as Spain and France, for whom a now well-established industry has also developed over the past thirty years in Inner Circle countries, including the UK and Ireland (Graddol et al 2007). Jenkins (2009: 206) has also highlighted the potential for further, unparalleled growth in the EFL sector in these settings in response to the ever-increasing need for English in Expanding Circle countries.

A further trend that is expected to continue for the foreseeable future is for young adults from Expanding Circle countries to study more specialised, academic English programmes in English speaking countries, including Ireland, to prepare for third level, undergraduate and post-graduate programmes (Graddol et al 2007: 44). Within this grouping, which includes a
sizeable proportion of learners from Asian and Middle Eastern backgrounds, students commonly study for international English language examinations such as IELTS and Cambridge ESOL, success in which is vital to secure access to university programmes in Inner Circle settings (Jenkins 2007: 14). Such is the prestige now accorded by many foreign governments and students to graduate and post-graduate degree qualifications from universities in these countries, that preparation courses for the various international English language examinations now represent a major area of pedagogic demand and activity.

Teachers working in these contexts are required to provide specialized pedagogy which centres on exam-oriented practice and prescribed texts and course books, which focus largely on SBE or SAE (Canagarajah 2006b; Jenkins 2007; Timmis and Mishan 2015). Foreign students studying in English speaking countries as part of European and international third-level language and cultural exchange programmes, such as Erasmus or Study abroad courses, also commonly attend EFL classes whilst living and studying in Inner Circle contexts. The content of such classes typically consists of a mixture of EFL and ESL type materials, and reflects a general English content based on either of the main varieties as the models promoted with the possibility for some local and colloquial forms of expression to be introduced, usually at the discretion of individual teachers (Timmis and Mishan 2015: 33). The English language programme which provides the context for this study typifies the blurring of the EFL/ESL divide, as it offers general English classes to third-level international and European students while they are living and studying in Ireland, usually for a period of three to six months.

3.2.2 The ELT Sector in Ireland

The influx of immigrants to many English-speaking countries as a result of globalisation and successive expansions of the European Union over the past twenty years has created opportunities for migrant workers and their families to migrate to Britain and Ireland, the two Inner Circle English settings in Europe (Wallen and Kelly-Holmes 2006; Graddol et al 2007; Murphy 2011). While not on the same scale as either the historical or more recent waves of immigration of migrant workers into Britain, Ireland has become home to a growing number of newcomers and foreign nationals since the 1990s. This has transformed the cultural
landscape of the country from a traditional and conservative society to one that is more outward-looking and tolerant. Today, foreign nationals represent about ten percent of the overall population by comparison with only four percent a decade earlier (CSO: 2016: 12). These demographic trends have created the need for successive Irish governments to develop ESL/EAL programmes for non-national adults and for primary and secondary school children within state education systems, in order to address the language needs of speakers in the diverse immigrant communities which now exist in Ireland (Wallen and Kelly-Holmes 2006: Lyons and Little 2009).

There is also now a well-established tradition of teaching EFL in the private and public sectors in Ireland, including in third level contexts, which is an important source of funding for these institutions and for the Irish economy (OECD Report: Ireland 2011: 18). Historically, both the ESL and EFL sectors in Ireland have followed the norms and practices established earlier in Britain, where a longer tradition exists with SBE setting the benchmark for what is considered ‘correct usage’. This has ensured that the types of spoken language that EFL learners have had access to, and have been taught, have been restricted ones derived from standard written norms rather than spoken English forms, as in this educational domain more widely (Carter and McCarthy 2006; O’Keeffe and McCarthy 2010). This has led to a situation where ESL and EFL teachers in Ireland have been expected to formally promote main standard varieties and formal registers which differ from the types of English commonly used in the local speech community, in terms of grammar, lexical expression and phonological aspects (White 2006; Murphy 2011). As elsewhere, these restrictive target English norms and practices have been promoted and maintained through the pedagogical approaches that have developed in this educational sector, which are briefly reviewed in the following section.

3.2.3 English Language Teaching Approaches

3.2.3.1 Historic Approaches

The teaching approach that provided the early theoretical and practical guidelines for EFL/ESL practice was the Grammar Translation Method, which prioritized the written word.
However, due to a major paradigm shift in the 1950s it was replaced by Audiolinguism, which was the first methodology to emphasize spoken patterns of English language use (Howatt 1984: 220-225). A growing awareness of the inadequacies of the Behaviourist learning theories and techniques it relied on, which stressed the mechanistic aspects of language learning and ‘good’ habit formation, led to the search for a more suitable and effective approach that would take greater account of the functional aspects of communication and real-world contexts of communication (Ockenden 1972; O’Neill 1991). Functional-communicative approaches to second language teaching emerged from the 1980s onwards, informed by functional linguistic theory (Halliday 1978). This was concerned with identifying and describing the functions that language performs (Halliday and Hassan 1989; Bloor and Bloor 1995). In essence three broad functions were proposed, ideational, interpersonal and textual, with arguments made for the rejection of formal, idealised descriptions of language based on rules grounded in written language and an idealised standard, and a focus instead on what may be considered appropriate language use based on real spoken and written usage, and in terms of the meaning choices that are available in a particular context. This shift in perspective amongst linguists, which was influenced also by the work of sociologist Hymes (1972), heralded the way for the development of the now widely-established CLT approach.

3.2.3.2 CLT Approach

The advent and development of the CLT approach from the 1970s onwards is viewed as one of the most important developments to occur in the ELT world in the past fifty years, as it changed the focus from English as a system to be studied to English as a tool of communication (Crystal 2003: 374). This marked a radical departure from earlier pedagogical approaches which had prioritized idealised forms of either written or spoken English (Howatt 1984: 47). The new approach created opportunities for the sociolinguistic and socio-cultural dimensions of language use to be taken account of for the first time in English language pedagogy, as well as growing influence from discourse analysis and pragmatics (Crystal 2003: 374). This reflected a recognition that language learning must involve both mastery of linguistic code and knowledge of how to use target English forms appropriately in social
situations and contexts, given that language use is contextually meaningful and functionally determined (Richards and Rodgers 2000: 153-155).

In this way, the shift towards CLT placed considerations such as the socio-cultural relevance and usefulness of different grammatical and lexical forms at the fore, in terms of the types of language that learners have access to, and are taught, with a focus on more authentic input to help develop communicative competence (Hymes 1970; Canale and Swain 1980). It is this core principle that determines the main teaching and learning goals and the linguistic content of course books and syllabuses. Furthermore, it creates the need for the development of courses designed to match the differentiated needs of learners in different context and settings. In theory, therefore, the CLT approach offered greater choices and flexibility as to the types of English that could be taught to distinct ESL and EFL learner groups in both the immediate target English community and the wider ELT world (Kramsch 1993; Leung, Harris and Rampton 1997).

In the early days of the CLT approach, claims about the nature and extent of language use were largely speculative. However, the advent and development of corpus linguistics since the 1990s has made it possible for researchers in the applied linguistic field to examine large quantities of spoken and written texts, revealing language patterns and uses that had previously eluded intuition (Carter and McCarthy 1998; McCarthy 1995; O’Keeffe and Farr 2003). The insights gained have brought into sharp focus the limitations of the language presented in course books and grammars of English that were often based on inaccurate intuition about real language use. McCarthy (1995: 142), for example, pointed to the models of grammar promoted in earlier communicative course books and pedagogy, which were either ‘concocted’ or sourced from traditional, standard, descriptive grammars of English, such as those found in Quirk’s A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language, (1985), which reflected spoken English usage in formal contexts of use. This meant that they excluded features that occur widely in the conversation of native speakers of English (ibid: 158). This view was supported by Carter’s corpus-based research (1998) and that of others (Baymann 1991; Ketterman 1995), which explored different aspects of tense use and found more complex functionality in spoken discourse than previously described.
Studies which compared real spontaneous encounters found in a corpus with the types of speech acts that feature in text book dialogues (see Boxer and Pickering 1995; Carter 1998) also found that they failed to touch on typical modes of speech such as interactive grammar, discourse patterns and pragmatic aspects. As a result, they omitted key features of spoken English such as discourse markers, vague language, ellipsis and hedges. The further findings from corpus research in areas such as fixed phraseology, collocation and language patterning (Sinclair 1991; Aston 1995) confirmed that the narrow and idealized version of English promoted in CLT course books had little resemblance to the real practices of speakers. Since then, corpus linguists working in the applied linguistic field have continued to argue that grammatical and lexical forms typically found in speech and in local varieties have not been given the attention they merit in teaching and learning contexts, despite the widespread adoption of the CLT approach, which had seemed to offer greater opportunities for authentic language use (O’Keeffe and McCarthy 2010: 10).

3.3 The Role of Teachers and Teacher Talk in CLT

Notwithstanding these limitations, contemporary, CLT and Task-based Teaching and Learning Methodologies (TBTL) have brought new communication patterns to the L2 classroom, with high levels of peer interaction and target English use considered essential for language learning (Oxford 1998: 443). This stems from the dual role played by the target language as “both the goal of instruction, and the vehicle through which learning is managed and accomplished” (Allwright and Bailey 1991: 71). As a result, the classroom language use of teachers and learners has taken on a greater significance than in subject-based and traditional L2 classrooms. This in turn, has led to the requirement for practitioners to develop superior levels of insight and expertise in areas such as classroom management and target English use, if they are to create the kind of supportive environment in which learners and learning can flourish (Farrell 2015: 89).

The complex and multi-faceted role played by teachers in the communicative L2 classroom context is now widely acknowledged (Cazden 1986; Chaudron 1988; Breen 1998; Thornbury 1996, 2000; Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011). This has led to a theoretical shift from earlier CLT
principles which envisaged a reduced role for teacher talk, on the basis that it represented a restricted register that should be abandoned as soon as possible or avoided completely with learners (Richards and Rodgers 2000: 168; Walsh 2006: 12). Instead, there has been a growing recognition that it must be understood in its own right, rather than being compared to communication in the ‘real world’, as was previously postulated. As Walsh (2011: 7) has observed:

> teachers use language in their teaching in order to facilitate and promote learning; to help co-construct new meanings, new understandings, knowledge; and, in a language classroom particularly, skills.

Thornbury (1996: 281) has identified the distinct set of linguistic features that teachers use in their classroom language use to facilitate learning in the CLT context, referred to as their instructional style or their classroom idiolect. They include referential questions (genuine questions); display questions (the answer is already known); wait time; the use of speech modifications, hesitation, and rephrasing; clarification requests; repetition. Cullen (1998: 182) later added several more to this list, including form-focused feedback; teacher initiated and dominated feedback; echoing or rephrasing of student responses; sequences of IRF discourse patterns; teacher initiated and dominated talk.

In relation to the types of speech modifications that teacher make, Cabrera and Martinez (2001: 287) have stressed the importance of teachers making two types of linguistic adjustments to their target English use. The first relates to the nature of the input they provide for learners at different proficiency levels, and in distinct learning contexts, at the grammatical, lexical and phonological levels in order to facilitate learner comprehension, and the second to speech modifications made at the interactional level to further support the learning process. They argue that linguistic modifications must be combined with interactional adjustments, proposing that teacher talk is most conducive to language acquisition when both its linguistic and interactional features are fully exploited. The need for interactional modification to make input comprehensible has also been argued for by Walsh (2011: 9) whose research has identified further strategies that teachers can use at the level of interaction to aid learner comprehension and thereby enhance learning outcomes. They include comprehension checks; confirmation checks; rephrasing; reformulation; turn completion; backtracking; back and front chaining (gradual build up). Accordingly, in the
CLT context, there is the expectation and requirement that EFL teachers strategically control and target their interactional language use to enhance learning.

To achieve this, they must take into account key linguistic and socio-cultural considerations, such as the degree of complexity involved for learners, and the usefulness and relevance of the target forms for the context of learning, both specifically and in general (Promodrou 1992, 2003, 2008). This requires an understanding of linguistic and pedagogic theory, which is considered the hallmark of the language teacher’s professionalism and includes a formal knowledge of the workings of English (Carter and Nunan 2001: 5). Practitioners must also acquire insight into the relationship between language form and language use and the systematic patterning found in different language genres (Andrews 2007: 41-43). Developing insight into the creativity and playfulness of language, the double meanings it can convey, and the embedding of language and culture, is also considered crucial to providing learners with a high quality of target English input.

An understanding of the psycholinguistic processes involved in the acquisition of language, such as the order, speed, and rhythm at which acquisition develops, is also required, and how the pace of learning may differ from one learner to another (Andrews 2007: 43). This is important to raise awareness of the difficulties that foreign language learners experience in understanding different forms of grammatical, pragmatic and lexical expression. This is particularly in the case of everyday English which typically includes phrasal verbs, idiomatic expressions, slang and non-mainstream grammar which learners are likely to be unfamiliar with, and find difficult to decipher due to the culturally-rooted meanings typically involved. From this, practitioners can tailor their language use to different classroom micro-contexts; for instance, they can avoid using imprecise, ambiguous and overly informal usages when asking questions to elicit answers, and when giving instructions, checking comprehension and giving feedback on errors, which are key functions where the careful framing of language use is essential (Long and Sato 1983, Tsui 1995; Walsh 2005, 2011). In these ways, they can ensure that their target language is used in more meaningful and effective ways in order to reinforce understanding.

Given the prescriptive norms dictating language use in this educational sector, there has also been a traditional requirement for EFL practitioners to develop an understanding of issues of
‘prestige’ in classroom language use, and the implications arising for their own target English use in terms of the degree of ‘standardness’ and formality/informality reflected. This has been considered crucial if they are to identify when it may or may not be feasible to introduce different types of spoken English to learners in different EFL contexts and settings, including their own variety, without confusing or alienating learners. It has also been viewed as essential to enable them to align their own professional language use to the norms promoted in ELT course books and examinations, which often carry greater ‘prestige’ and ‘currency’ in the eyes of learners and employers.

A further challenge for practitioners in their target English use in this educational domain relates to the affective and cultural dimensions of learning. The relationship between teachers and learners, the quality of learning experiences and the psychological state of the teacher and learner have been attracting increasing research interest in SLA since the emergence of humanistic learning philosophies in the 1970s (see Moskowitz (1978: 14) “affective education is effective education”). Byram (1998, cited in Spiro 2013: 198) has stressed the need for EFL teachers to develop their own social, pragmatic and intercultural knowledge as global citizens in order ‘to be able to live and work comfortably beyond the comfort zone of the familiar. This is viewed of paramount importance if they are to develop good inter-personal skills so that more positive and less stressful learning experiences can be promoted. As far as the psychological difficulties for learners are concerned, it is now widely accepted that stress can impact negatively on learner progress. Studies in this area in SLA have revealed that it is not uncommon for L2 learners to face debilitating insecurities and anxieties about their learning (Horwitz et al 1986). For instance, they often dread being asked questions, and are reluctant to speak English in front of peers due to inhibitions and fear of derision and making mistakes.

Walsh (2006: 42) has observed that these types of difficulties are likely to be exacerbated in multicultural classroom contexts where there is a greater potential for misunderstanding and conflict to arise, both between learners and between teachers and learners. This stems from fundamentally different orientations towards teaching and learning in distinct educational settings. Studies in this area (see Butler 2004; Holliday 2005) have suggested that learners from Asian backgrounds are likely to be unfamiliar with CLT teacher and learner roles, interactional patterns and the kind of ‘confessional style’ classroom discussions that have
been highlighted by Promodrou and Mishan (2008: 196) as typical of western CLT contexts, which they find confusing and embarrassing. Where teachers lack inter-cultural sensitivities they may mistake the silence of learners from this background as boredom or indifference which can place a further strain on teacher-student relationships (Farrell 2015: 93).

To be able respond successfully to these types of challenges, cultural theorists in SLA have highlighted the need for teachers to develop an awareness of the ways in which the expectations, beliefs and preferences of learners may be different from their own (Kramsch 1998; Jenkins 2007). They must also develop socio-pragmatic sensitivities and expertise if they are to successfully navigate learners through the different stages of the lesson while at the same time maintaining their cooperation and a positive classroom environment (Murray 2010; Walsh 2011). By developing a range of face-saving strategies which they can draw on in challenging situations, teachers can ensure that positive social relationships and communication practices are maintained, while still attending to important pedagogic goals such as promoting a high level and quality of learner participation and engagement in the lesson. This type of socio-pragmatic expertise also helps practitioners to become better prepared psychologically for their role in the classroom in terms of attending to their own face needs, and learning to become more comfortable with their position of authority and more confident in their increasingly demanding professional role (Farrell 2015: 97-99).

Having highlighted the centrality of teacher talk to the complex processes involved in SLA, the following section discusses theories which have been developed in this field to support this position.

### 3.3.1 Key Related Theories of SLA

SLA is a broad field of enquiry, in which researchers explore the influences and processes involved in learning a second language, which remain only partially understood (Walsh 2006: 8). A key distinction made in this field is between conscious, planned and systematic learning, as occurs in the formal classroom environment, referred to as second language learning (SLL), and informal unconscious learning, termed second language acquisition (SLA). While these terms are at times used interchangeably, in the present study all references to SLA relate to the formal L2 educational context. The discussion begins with
input theories of SLA, which are associated most notably with the work of Krashen and the 

3.3.1.1 Krashen’s Input Hypotheses

Krashen’s model stresses the importance of comprehensible input for language acquisition 
(1982, 1985, 1998), by postulating that target language input which is adjusted for learners 
could be an indirect causal variable of SLA. The model contains five hypotheses in total, 
including the Acquisition-Learning Theory, the Input and Natural Order Hypotheses, the 
Monitor Hypothesis and the Affective Filter Hypothesis (1985: 1-4). From this perspective, 
acquisition is seen as a sub-conscious process involving input that contains linguistic items 
that are slightly above the actual linguistic competence of learners, which is defined as I +1 
(1982: 20). Here, I refer to the learner’s current proficiency level and +1 to the subsequent 
level that the learner aspires to. A central assumption made by advocates of this approach is 
that L2 learners move along a developmental continuum which involves a natural 
progression. Krashen (1985: 1-4) refers to this progression as the Natural Order, as invoked 
in his idea of the Natural Order Hypothesis. Receiving input which is pitched at the correct 
level is considered sufficient for acquisition to occur, which means that an explicit focus on 
language structures is not considered necessary. However, input which is either too simple or 
too complex will not lead to language acquisition.

This model has attracted criticism in linguistic circles on the grounds that it is vague and 
impossible to verify, as no independently testable definitions of what comprehensible input 
actually consists of, or how it might relate to acquisition are provided (Myles and Mitchell 
2004: 48-49). The assumption that ensuring that input is comprehensible is sufficient in order 
for acquisition to occur without drawing attention to language structures has been refuted by 
those who advocate the importance of ‘consciousness-raising’ and ‘noticing’ if the language 
that learners are exposed to is to become intake see Sharwood-Smith 1981, 1984; Schmidt 
1990). Researchers working within this research paradigm have argued persuasively that 
‘nothing can be learned unless it is noticed’ (Schmidt 1990: 17) with ‘noticing’ now 
commonly viewed as a key part of successful language learning (Lynch 2001). Harmer 
(2007: 27) has proposed that ‘salience’ is a further characteristic of noticing in the sense that
things which are pointed out are more likely to impinge on ‘learner consciousness’. While the limitations of Krashen’s model (1985) are now generally accepted, it has nonetheless been influential in establishing the widely-held view in SLA that teacher talk in the L2 classroom plays a key role in providing comprehensible input for learners, and that this is essential for successful learning (ibid: 28). This position has been strengthened by Long’s work (1981, 1985), which has attempted to explain the role played by interactional speech modifications in the processes involved in SLA.

3.3.1.2 Long’s Interaction Theory

Long’s Interaction theory (1981, 1985, 1996) holds interaction to be central to language learning. Within this tradition, an earlier focus on learner-learner interaction (Swain 1985) has shifted in recent years towards teacher-learner interaction, as it has become increasingly evident that the teacher has a crucial role to play in shaping classroom interaction (Long 1996; van Lier 1996; Ellis 1998; Walsh 2003, 2006). Initially, researchers in this field compared teacher talk with other simplified registers such as foreigner talk, focusing on the types of modifications made, and their effect on learner comprehension and learning (Ferguson 1981; Chaudron 1982; Hatch 1983; Griffiths and Oxford 1990; Mannon 1986). The findings have been somewhat inconclusive; for instance, Hatch’s study suggested that teacher talk and foreigner talk were largely similar in nature. However, later studies have explicitly distinguished between them identifying differences including speech volume, phonological modifications, use of diminutives, inclusion of foreign words and time-space reference (Freed 1981; Ferguson 1981). This supported the conclusions reached earlier by Cazden that teacher talk is more grammatical than other forms of native/non-native interactions. Meanwhile, Chaudron (1988: 55) found that teacher talk does not exhibit differences that are qualitatively distinct and systematic enough to be identified as separate register. This led him to argue that it should be viewed as temporary in nature, serving to support and promote classroom communication.

Later work by Long (1996), and others (see Larsen-Freeman 1991; Pica 1991, 1994a, 1994b; Walsh 2003, 2005, 2011), shifted the focus of attention towards the interactional aspects of classroom discourse in an attempt to explore the social process of negotiation of meaning,
which has since become a major area of research interest in SLA. Studies which have sought to investigate speech modifications by L2 teachers to make input more intelligible for students have focused in particular on the area of teachers’ questions. Long and Sato (1983) detailed the complex role played by teacher questions in classroom discourse; for instance, they can serve to signal turns, aid comprehensibility, provide opportunities for students to participate or even compel involvement. From this, they argued that a teacher’s use of questions is the single, most-used discourse modification to aid and maintain participation among learners.

Further modification devices used by teachers when they failed to elicit any responses from students included syntactic and lexical modifications, such as using fewer ‘non-standard’ forms and idiomatic usages, thereby making the topic salient (Pica 1991, 1994b). Allowing sufficient wait-time for learners (White and Lightbown 1984; Tsui 1996) and teacher feedback are further related areas of interest. Studies have shifted from an earlier simplistic view of teacher feedback as being either negative evaluation or positive reinforcement to a more recent emphasis on the need to re-consider the notion of ‘errors’ and to see teacher feedback as providing the scaffolding for learners as they process the language (van Lier 1996, Walsh 2003). This approach has been influenced by the application of socio-cultural approaches to the study of L2 teacher talk, which we turn to next.

3.3.1.3 Sociocultural Theories of SLA

Socio-cultural theorists view language and language learning in essentially social terms. Central to this approach is the belief that target language interaction cannot be viewed simply as a source of input for learning, but that it has a much more central role to play in the learning process. The notion that learning is quintessentially social, rather than individual, in nature, stems from an interest in applying Vygotskian learning theory (1978) to the L2 domain. This emphasized the social nature of learning and the key role of the more competent ‘knower’. From this perspective, the mind is mediated using tools such as language, so that language constitutes the means for engaging in social and cognitive activities. This is achieved through the process of supportive dialogue, known as scaffolding, which has become a widely accepted concept and interactional strategy used in educational contexts,
including the L2 classroom (Wood, Bruner and Ross 1976). Another key Vygotskyan concept is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD): that is, the domain of knowledge or skill where the learner is not yet capable of independent functioning but can achieve the desired outcome given relevant scaffolded help (Vygotsky 1978: 85). Vygotskian theory has come to be considered as of major relevance to the L2 acquisition context, where learning is viewed as a socially constructed activity with the social, dynamic and collaborative dimensions emphasized (Bruner 1983; Lantolf and Appel 1994; Lantolf 2000).

Bruner (1983, 1990) has highlighted the central role played by L2 teachers in this process by providing ‘scaffolded instruction’. Teacher talk can play a key role in helping learners to acquire new knowledge and by providing them with opportunities for learning by maximizing the quality of classroom interaction and shaping the classroom dialogue which acts as a ‘mediating force’ (Ahmed 1994, cited in van Lier 1996: 17). This leads to a recognized need for teachers to develop socio-cultural competence in the L2 classroom by becoming more aware of the prime role they play in managing and optimizing the classroom learning environment, largely through their own use of the target language.

Many researchers now make the important point that effective teaching practice depends on sensitizing teachers to the purposeful use of interactional strategies to facilitate learning opportunities. For Walsh (2003, 2006, 2011, 2012) and others (van Lier 1996; Tsui 2001) this involves increasing teachers’ awareness of the need to relate interactional strategies to classroom pedagogic goals and learning contexts. SLA studies in the field of interactional analysis have examined the role of teacher talk in shaping the interactional process that unfolds across the different stages of the lesson from the perspective of evaluating teacher competences and strategies for awareness-raising purpose in L2 teacher education (Seedhouse 1996; van Lier 1998; Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011).

The Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk framework (SETT) designed by Walsh (2006: 168) has been instrumental in awareness-raising in this area in relation to teachers’ use of language across different L2 classroom settings and in different classroom micro-contexts or ‘modes’. As such, it can serve as a useful framework to investigate the suitability of the linguistic choices made by teachers at different stages of the lesson when key pedagogic functions are being performed, as is the intention in the present research (see Chapter Four for a more
detailed discussion of the adapted SETT model used in this study and the rationale). In the following section, we review approaches from the fields of intercultural communication and pragmatics, which will also be drawn on in this study to explore the relational aspects of teacher talk in the CLT classroom context.

3.3.1.4 Socio-Pragmatic Theories of SLA

The interface between language and culture has attracted growing academic interest in fields such as inter-cultural communication and pragmatics, as researchers have attempted to account for similarities and differences in the communication practices of speakers from different speech communities and distinct social and professional backgrounds (Byram and Morgan 1994; Kramsch 1998). Pragmatics is a field of research within the broader field of DA, which emerged from the discipline of philosophy in the 1960s and is concerned with the social, cultural and inter-personal motivations in language use (Grice 1975; Leech 2003). Researchers within this field investigate and seek to shed light on the meaning of utterances in specific contexts of use focusing on aspects of meaning which lie beyond the plain sense of words and structures (Verschueren 2003).

Pragmatics is a highly interdisciplinary field of enquiry and brings advantages for language description as it allows for a study of intended meanings, assumptions and actions performed by speakers in interaction. Green (1996: 2) defines it as “the study of understanding intentional human action, involving the interpretation of acts assumed to be undertaken in order to accomplish some purpose”. As such, pragmatics offers the potential for useful insights in the EFL classroom context in relation to the cross-cultural dimensions of communication, and the suitability of the target English use of teachers from socio-pragmatic perspectives (Murray 2010: 293-6). In particular, this approach makes it possible to investigate the degree of formality/informality and directness/indirectness expressed in teacher talk, and related issues of politeness, which are likely to be influenced by cultural and sociolinguistic influences, and context-specific considerations.

Politeness theories from pragmatics offer useful frameworks within which to examine the linguistic choices of the teachers in this study in relation to the key notions of face and face needs. Concepts of politeness derive most notably from Goffman (1976), Grice (1975),
Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory (1978, 1987) and Leech’s Politeness principle (1983), all of which are closely inter-related. From this perspective politeness is defined as:

A special way of treating people, saying and doing things in such a way as to take into account the other person’s feelings. On the whole that means that what one says politely will be less straightforward or more complicated than what one says if one wasn’t taking the other person’s feelings into account. (Brown and Levinson 1987: 114).

The notion of face has been defined by Goffman (1967: 5) as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact”. A further related concept is that of face needs, which comprises the notions of negative and positive face respectively. Negative face refers to the need for individuals to have their personal space respected, while positive face is concerned with the need to be acknowledged and liked. Addressing negative face gives rise to negative politeness and can be demonstrated through indirectness, formality, social distance and respect for the participant’s entitlements. By contrast, positive face gives rise to positive politeness, which is expressed by indicating similarities amongst interactants and expressing appreciation of the interlocutor.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 114) identified a number of linguistic devices and strategies which constitute politeness in a given culture, such as participles, intonation, irony, address forms and discourse strategies. Leech’s (1983, 2003: 104-5) Politeness Principle accords with Brown and Levinson’s theory in that they both hold that politeness investment varies according to contextual factors. These include: social power, social distance and the degree of imposition associated with a given face threatening act. Both studies also assume a positive correlation between politeness and indirectness.

Central to these theories is the notion of face threatening acts (FTAs) which can damage the positive and/or negative face of either the hearer or the speaker. Examples of FTAs include issuing/receiving orders or criticisms. A key distinction made in this regard is between doing an FTA on record or off record; the former means that the hearer can take only one unambiguous meaning from the utterance, while the latter involves the speaker stating things in an ambiguous way, and thus not committing to his/her intention (Brown and Levinson 1987: 60). In this case, hedging or indirect language can be used as a means of achieving
redressive action through mitigation and indirectness, which will give some positive or negative face to the addressee.

The EFL classroom in Ireland is an intriguing venue in which to explore notions of politeness, as sociolinguists have suggested that the IE speech style is typically indirect and tentative. This is due to the high value placed on maintaining good social relations by speakers from background, and a desire to avoid confrontation (O’Keeffe and Farr 2002; Gasior 2015). This study creates opportunities to uncover insights into the particular ways in which politeness plays out in the EFL classroom in Ireland, in terms of teachers’ socio-pragmatic understandings in areas such as directness/indirectness, formality/informality and face management, as manifested through their use of spoken English grammar and pragmatic expression. As research in the area of socio-pragmatic awareness and skills in SLA has previously focused exclusively on learner insights and competencies, rather than those of teachers (Spiro 2013: 191-210), the findings from the present research offer the potential for new and exciting insights in ELT and ELTE. This will also bring a new dimension to the suitable target English/es debate in terms of the socio-pragmatic role/s played by local varieties in the affective realm of classroom communication. Bearing this in mind, the following section revisits the ongoing theoretical discussions concerning the limitations of the existing, mono-centric Anglo-American approach, and what might constitute a suitable replacement model, with a review of the progress made to date.

3.4 The Search for an Alternative Target English Approach

3.4.1 Conflicting Theoretical Discourses Surrounding Suitable Target Models

Up until the early 1990s, there was little questioning of the model of usage for language learners that predominated in the ELT educational domain, which emphasised native speaker norms on the basis of the widely accepted belief in the supremacy of the native speaker (van Ek 1986: 95). However, as the introductory discussion in Chapter One highlighted, the efficacy of the native speaker model has become increasing challenged as problems have been identified with the conceptualisation of the native speaker (NS), an idealised figure conforming only very loosely, if at all, to the actual usage of the majority of first language
(L1) speakers (Kramsch 1993 Leung et al 1997; Alptekin 2002). From a purely sociolinguistic perspective, therefore, native speakership has become ever more difficult to define within increasingly multilingual societies. Moreover, as it has become increasingly apparent that the majority of communication in English is now by NNES with other NNES, with predictions that this trend will increase, opposition to the English native speaker (ENS) model has gained momentum on the grounds that it leads to a deficit model of learning (Kramsch 1998; Cook 1999; Davis 2003, 2006; Jenkins 2007, 2009, 2011; Hall et al 2013).

In this regard, theorists have criticised the content of CLT for its implicit or explicit idealisation of native speaker competence pointing out that bilingual ‘expert’ users (Rampton 1990) can be better models for language learning (Llurda 2004, 2009; Leung 2005; Jenkins 2007, 2012). Moreover, while the need for the imposition of a universal spoken ‘standard’ amongst English language learners internationally is still viewed as a pragmatic necessity by some linguists (see Quirk 1985; Crystal 2003), critical theorists have argued that identifying ‘standard’ English with a particular model of native speaker usage which is used as a yard stick for judgements of linguistic correctness and appropriateness is no longer defensible on ideological or linguistic grounds because it denies the reality of multiple standards (see Pennycook 2000; McKay 2002; Seidlhofer 2004; Jenkins 2009). This criticism has come in particular from researchers studying ELF and from scholars in critical applied linguistics (CALS) although each approach this issue from distinct theoretical, and research perspectives.

Advocates of ELF, for instance, notably Jenkins (2007, 2009) and Seidlhofer (2004, 2011) have argued that World Englishes research has failed to grasp the significance of English use between speakers of different L1’s, especially in expanding circle contexts. They have pointed out that within the ‘Expanding Circle’ there are millions of functionally competent and often expert users of English. This led to an early focus on the possibility of codifying ELF as a universal variety however, this has since given way to a later research interest on uncovering the communicative principles underlying ELF interaction and the types of strategies that speakers use to successfully negotiate and co-construct meaning in multilingual setting (e.g. see Archibald et al 2004; Mauranen and Ranta 2009; Seidlhofer 2011). ELF researchers have also been particularly interested in exploring attitudes towards global diversity in English, especially amongst teachers (Jenkins 2007). This has revealed
strongly-held monolithic assumptions about English whereby it is reified rather than being viewed in terms of performance. Jenkins in particular has questioned such conceptions of English by pointing to the communicative success of much interaction between ELF users, and attempting to provide a detailed description of ELF.

However, critical applied linguists have criticised ELF researchers and World English scholars in general, for not fully embracing a plurilithic vision of English. This term was coined by Pennycook (2009) to refer to the non-monolithic reality underlying English which is socially and politically constructed, and disadvantaging to language learners and teachers, a view shared by Canagarajah (1999, 2007). Hence, while there has been growing support for a pluricentric target English approach based on mainly non-native speaker international norms, which it is believed would carry greater legitimacy, and better represent the new English language landscape than the existing ENS model (see Seidlhofer 2004; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2009; Matsuda 2012), from a CALS perspective, pluricentrist have unwittingly perpetuated the ‘monolithic’ myth of English in their advocacy of a pluricentric, as opposed to a plurilithic vision of English in which the availability of Standard English targets is extended rather than questioned (Makoni and Pennycook 2007).

Hall et al (2006, 2011, 2103) have pointed out that such an approach often alienates teachers and learners due to its uncompromising ideological stance arguing instead for a target English approach that is usage-based and responds to locally-appropriate objectives and outcomes. Moreover, it should be constructed by learners on the basis of their social needs and social experiences. This would necessitate a new understanding of the nature of English which takes into account its diversity and the local dimensions of use from which teachers can identify strategies that they can bring to their own teaching and learning to contribute to a broader transformation of ELT pedagogy (Hall et al 2013). Such an approach would also address some of the further criticisms made in relation to World English research, notably its limited theoretical scope, given that it has been mainly concerned with the legitimacy of newly emergent NN varieties of English. In this regard, White (2006: 233) has pointed to the ‘disfavoured’ position of non-main Inner Circle varieties, such as IE, and the discrimination faced by native speakers from these backgrounds in the ELT world, which has been largely overshadowed in the suitable target Englishes debate. In this regard, she has argued that the points they have made in support of the validity of NN varieties, and their users, are as
relevant for IE given that in this context a similar conflict exists between linguistic norms and linguistic behaviour, with widespread perceptions among IE users that their own version is deficient by comparison with SBE/SAE.

3.4.2 Progress Made in the Search for an Alternative Target English Approach

Against this backdrop of conflicting discourses in the suitable target Englishes academic debate, there have been practical attempts to develop alternative models based around the concepts of EIL and ELF (see Seidlhofer 2004; Canagarajah 2006b; Jenkins 2007, 2012; Matsuda 2012). The term English as an international language (EIL) is commonly used to highlight English as it is currently used internationally, rather than suggesting that there is a single, unitary, international variety, and the main features of the conceptualisation of EIL as a target model are that it is not linked to any one country or culture. It is also the term preferred by those seeking to distance themselves from the alleged triumphalism of Crystal’s ‘Global English’ (1997, 2004), and it still has a wider currency than ‘World English(es)’ (McArthur 1987, 1998; Bolton 2004). An EIL model is currently being actively promoted by Seidlhofer (2004, 2011) in the European secondary school context in Austria and Germany, although there has been little research to explore the progress made and the types of pedagogic issues involved. Meanwhile, attempts have been made by Jenkins (2007, 2012) to develop a model of ELF, especially in the areas of phonology and grammar however many questions remain unresolved as to how this alternate approach would be taught, with materials and assessment seen as two of the greatest areas of challenge (see Lowenberg 2000; Canagarajah 2006b; Jenkins 2009; Matsuda 2012).

Despite this, critical applied linguists who advocate either an alternative ‘pluricentric’ or ‘plurilithic’ target English approach have proposed a number of shared guiding principles. One key requirement is that learners are made aware of the sociolinguistic and socio-political profiles of English and issues surrounding its spread and ownership, as well as the ideologies which underpin the historic target English model (see Kachru 1992; Pennycook 2000, 2007; Modiano 2009; Matsuda 2012). On practical grounds, this would lead to opportunities to explore and become familiar with other varieties of English in order to help facilitate learners’ communication in real life situations when confronted with different types of users.
and uses (Matsuda 2003). As Modiano (2009: 218) has observed, “[a]n understanding of the diversity of English, for production as well as comprehension, makes one a better communicator”.

According to Kachru (1992: 34), this may involve familiarising learners with major native and non-native uses and users, demonstrating examples of spoken genre in multifarious interactional contexts and discussing shared and non-shared linguistic features, such as differences in phonology, grammar and lexical expression. Similarly, Pennycook (2000: 92) has advocated:

opening up the classroom to other varieties aside from British and American varieties so that learners become truly inter-nationally minded speakers who are conscious of the role of English in the world and the world in English.

For Matsuda (2012: 126) this does not mean removing native varieties from English classes or replacing them with local varieties; rather, “they [would] add to the current repertoire and thus enrich the curriculum”. In support of this approach, he points to EFL contexts in Expanding Circles where attempts have been made to incorporate the concept of World Englishes into language curriculum in more recent times, citing initiatives in several universities in Japan (Yoshigawa 2005) and in Thailand (Jindapitak and Teo 2012). However, like Jenkins (2009), Matsuda has pointed to the ‘gate-keeping’ practices of key stakeholders which thwart progress in this area, citing in particular the main international publishers and examination boards (2012: 126). Given the importance of international course books and examinations to classroom teaching and learning in the ELT world, these claims are explored further in the following section.

3.4.3 Obstacles to Target Model Reform

International course books have been the main vehicle through which the historic target English model has been transmitted and maintained. Therefore, it is not surprising that they have become the main focus of criticism by linguists who support target model change, on both ideological and linguistic grounds (Timmis and Mishan 2015: 35). The history and evolution of ELT publication from its establishment in the 1970s in association with main British and, American universities to the multi-billion-euro global enterprise it has become
today, has been well-documented (see Howatt and Widdowson 2004; Mishan 2005; Tomlinson 2011). Since their introduction in the 1970s, they have met with a mixed response in terms of their pedagogic merits. Those in favour of their use point to a number of practical advantages: for instance, they are ready-made, cost-effective and offer a standardized syllabus that can be included in a longer-term curriculum. Accordingly, they are time-saving for busy teachers and can serve as a useful guide for novices (Mishan 2005; Tomlinson 2011). Those who have opposed their use, on the other hand, have tended to do so either on the grounds of their narrow, linguistic focus or because they are seen to reflect a hidden ideological agenda, which is to promote the types of neo-liberal western values and attitudes associated with globalisation (Cunningsworth 1995: 90).

More recently, there has been a growing trend towards ‘localisation’ whereby publishers produce materials within, and for, non-Inner Circle ELT contexts (Tomlinson 2011: 72). This stems from a growing political impetus to promote local versions of English in public English language education programmes in Outer Circle post-colonial countries. This has seen governments in countries such as Singapore, India and Kenya becoming involved in the design of English language course books for schools and university programmes at both national and local levels, often in conjunction with the main international publishing houses. Tomlinson (ibid: 72) has argued that this development is significant as it can be seen to represent an attempt to replace the ‘colonially-tainted’ British norms that were previously adhered to by the locally-used standard to ensure that the English language needs and cultural values of learners are better addressed and represented in public education systems in these settings.

Studies which have explored varietal use in Inner-Circle produced course books for EFL learners have shown that, despite a gradual increase in representation of global Englishes, there is a continuing preponderance of British and American main varieties. This has ensured that ‘standard’ ENS varieties remain the focus of linguistic input in courses and programmes in Inner Circle EFL learning contexts. This is also often the case in ESL type learning contexts in these settings due to an absence of locally-produced course books which are considered commercially unviable by the main publishing houses. As a result, the course books typically used for ESL learners are those designed with international EFL learners in mind (Mishan 2005; Tomlinson 2011). While it is likely that ESL teachers in these contexts
routinely supplement EFL course books with locally-sourced, authentic materials, to provide learners with a more useful and relevant linguistic and cultural content, EFL-type course books remain the mainstay of ESL pedagogy in these settings (Timmis and Mishan 2015: 35-38). As a result, ESL learners in many Inner Circle countries are disadvantaged due to a lack of exposure to the types of local speech norms they need to become familiar with if they are to make a successful transition to the new English language environment. This has been the case too in Ireland, where there has been a similar over-reliance on international publications that reflect SBE norms. For instance, Wallen and Kelly-Holmes (2006: 151) have pointed to the lack of suitable materials for use with EAL learners in state schools in Ireland. Similarly, White (2006: 233) and Murphy (2011: 18) have highlighted the absence of locally-produced course books in the EFL context, as well as the target model constraints this leads to.

The international ELT examination system, which operates in conjunction with the main British and American universities and academic publishing houses, has also been criticised for its ‘gatekeeping’ role (Phillipson 1992; Canagarajah 2006b; Jenkins 2009). Jenkins (2009: 206) has highlighted the growth of the highly lucrative English language examination industry, due to the fact that an education and qualifications in English have become a pre-requisite for entry into many professions. This leads thousands of students to enrol on examination preparation courses every year, which are mainly taught in private language schools and based around programmes that focus on the main varieties that students can expect to be assessed on in international examinations such as Cambridge ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages), TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and IELTS (International English Language Testing System) (Graddol et al 2007; Jenkins 2009; Tomlinson 2011). Critical linguists have argued that this system enhances the ‘prestige’ and ‘currency’ of these versions in the eyes of learners, course and syllabus designers and employers, and it further capitalizes on the hegemony of the native speaker SBE/SAE model and the native speaker teacher (see Canagarajah 2006b; Jenkins 2009; Matsuda 2012).

3.4.4 Proposed Reforms to ELT Course Books andExaminations

Notwithstanding these obstacles, pluricentists have proposed some practical guidelines as to how progress in these areas can be made (see Pennycook 2000; Canagarahah 2006b; Jenkins
Matsuda, for instance, has suggested that the content of course books can include a greater number of characters, dialogues and topics which either feature or represent the use of different World Englishes (2012: 17). He also suggests that textbooks for older learners can specifically address the socio-political issues associated with English language use including internationalization, globalization, the spread of English and issues of power and inequality to encourage the development of a more critical approach to English language pedagogy which enables learners “to seek their own voice in English” (ibid 2012: 18). Meanwhile, Jenkins (2009: 206-209) has argued that reform to the ESOL examination system must involve finding a means to distinguish between learner error and local variety. Lowenberg (2002: 62) has suggested that this can be achieved by introducing classroom assessment which evaluates students on their communicative effectiveness, rather than their knowledge of main variety norms. This would extend the notion of communicative competency and lead to a focus on general comprehensibility rather than merely grammatical accuracy. Jenkins (2009: 206-9) has also proposed that examinations take account of speech accommodations made by learners to show solidarity with, or to promote, intelligibility for an interlocutor without the risk of being penalised because their resultant speech does not conform to native speaker norms. However, she has acknowledged that, beyond the individual classroom and schools, a pluricentric approach poses particular challenges to standardized testing, with the need for the development of standardized exams of localized English and approaches which incorporate varieties of English into a standardized test (ibid: 208-9). Similarly, advocates of a plurilithic approach have conceded that this is a major obstacle which must be overcome if any progress is to be made in these areas, as is changing the viewpoints of learners and teachers, who often resist the notion of target English reform (Hall et al 2013). In this regard, Jenkins (2007: 44), in an earlier publication, called on researchers to look at the underlying reasons for these attitudes, rather than blindly accepting that SBE/SAE remains the preferred model of choice. With this challenge in mind, the following section examines research which has explored the English language attitudes of 1) learners and 2) teachers as main stakeholders in the ELT world, and key factors that have influenced their viewpoints.
3.5 The Target Model Perspectives of EFL Learners and EFL Teachers

3.5.1 EFL Learners’ Perspectives

As a result of a growing number of attitudinal studies carried out from within the World Englishes ELT research paradigm, much more is now known about global trends in target English preferences, and the perspectives of learners in different ELT contexts and settings (Crystal 2003; McKenzie 2010; Young and Walsh 2010; Murphy 2011). The decline of BE usage internationally has been highlighted by many linguists. Graddol et al (2007: 126) have suggested that this international trend may be impacting on learners’ perceptions of the currency of this ‘norm setting’ model, with predictions of a further loss of status in the English language world as a result.

This is supported by McKenzie’s (2010: 43) attitudinal research, carried out amongst EFL students in 14 different universities in Japan, which concluded that SAE is fast becoming the variety of preference for learners from this background due to its superior prestige and currency internationally. It is also consistent with Jenkin’s earlier research in the British EFL context, which found that AE was the variety of choice for learners from a variety of Asian and Middle Eastern backgrounds, as it was considered more ‘correct’ than other varieties (2007; 34). Similarly, Timmis’ 2002 study, carried out amongst EFL learners in forty-five countries, revealed that support for the ENS model remained strong amongst learners for reasons pertaining to ‘prestige’, with AE, once again, the preferred variety (ibid: 247-9).

A further trend observed (see Timmis 2002, 2012; Jenkins 2007; McKenzie 2010) is that when learners of English explicitly make individual decisions about the varieties of English they prefer to learn, it is often for pragmatic reasons relating to future work, or study needs, rather than on the basis of political or cultural bias in favour of a particular variety. They have also been found to lack awareness of the variety they use or to be unaware of choice of variety (Timmis 2002, 2012; Jenkins 2007, 2011; McKenzie 2010). Graddol et al (2007: 124) have pointed to the diminished position of BE globally, and in Asian and Middle Eastern countries in particular, as a significant development, given that these are important and expanding markets in the international ELT industry. This raises questions about the relevance of the continued promotion of SBE as a target model English in contexts and
settings where British linguistic norms have traditionally set the target English benchmark, as has been the case in Ireland.

As far as attitudes towards main, and non-main, Inner Circle versions of English are concerned, McKenzie’s research (2010: 132-134) has revealed that Japanese EFL learners prefer the former type, which they view as “more useful” “more relevant” and “easier to understand”. This was found to be due to the perceived ‘prestige’ of these varieties, and the fact that learners were more familiar with their use. This led the author to conclude that the target model preferences of learners from this background are influenced by several factors, including the status attached, socio-cultural considerations, and the perceived linguistic processing efforts involved in their use (ibid 2010: 133-135). It is interesting to note that in the same study, Scots English and Northern IE were found to be the varieties that were least known to the learners, and the most difficult to understand in terms of accent.

Studies which have explored the perspectives of EFL learners in Ireland towards IE as a variety have uncovered strong correlations between learner attitudes and learner proficiency level. Lonergan’s MA research (2010: 47), for instance, found that intermediate level learners (90%) showed very little interest in learning IE because they felt it would be “too difficult” to understand, whereas learners at upper intermediate and advanced levels were generally more favourable towards learning this variety, as they felt it would be “useful” during their stay in Ireland. A further interesting finding was that although two-thirds of the forty-five participants in the study claimed to be unaware of IE before coming to Ireland, after living in the country for three months almost all reported an increased awareness and understanding of this variety (ibid: 47).

This was most obvious in the case of IE lexical and phonological features, however grammatical and pragmatic aspects of this variety were often viewed as challenging, particularly for learners in the intermediate level grouping (ibid: 48). A majority of the participants in each group also reported becoming more tolerant in their attitudes towards IE as they became more familiar with its use. The main conclusions drawn were that learner awareness of IE and proficiency level were key factors influencing their receptiveness towards the inclusion of IE in EFL programmes in this context, and that their awareness of this variety increased with exposure to its use in the local speech community (ibid: 68).
Further valuable insights into EFL learners’ attitudes towards IE have been provided by Beggs (2012) in the context of MA research carried out in private language schools in Ireland amongst sixty intermediate-level students from Asian and Middle Eastern backgrounds, all of whom were enrolled on a one year IELTS preparation course. The findings were that the vast majority of the participants expressed a preference to learn either SBE or SAE, with a similarly high number rejecting the inclusion of IE in their programme of study due to an expressed need to study varieties that featured in the IELTS examination (ibid: 71). When asked to evaluate the degree of grammaticality associated with different varieties, almost all positioned IE as “less correct” than SBE/SAE. A majority also cited this as a key factor influencing their unfavourable attitude towards this variety (ibid 2012: 72). From this, the author concluded that EFL learners studying in Ireland with a view to taking international English language examinations were “strongly influenced” in their target English preferences by the need to conform to the varieties tested in these types of examinations, which they were acutely aware of, and that this led to stigmatised views of the local variety (ibid 2012: 94).

This adds further weight to Jenkins’ (2007: 34) claim concerning the target English constraints imposed by the prevailing international ELT examination system, and the intolerance this leads to amongst EFL learners. These studies suggest that there may be greater scope for the introduction of IE on general EFL programmes in Ireland, rather than on specialised examinations courses, and that learner proficiency level is a key determining factor. Learners can also be expected to find some aspects of IE English more useful and relevant than others which may challenge and frustrate them. This underscores the need for EFL teachers to develop critical awareness of when it may, and may not, be feasible to introduce local forms of expression to EFL learners, and the crucial ways in which their use can be mediated.

The growing recognition of the central role that teachers can and do play in the promotion of different types of spoken English, including their own variety, has led more recently to an increased focus on teachers’ perspectives in the suitable target English debate (see Seidlhofer 2004, 2011; Jenkins 2007; Young and Walsh 2010). Young and Walsh (2010: 25-7) have stressed that gaining insight into what teachers think in this area is vital due to the well-established link made in education circles between what teachers know and believe, and their professional practices (Borg 2006; Clark and Peterson 1986; Clark and Yinger 1987; Crandall
Accordingly, understanding teachers’ target English perspectives can be expected to provide a window into the target models they use and actively promote with learners and factors influencing their decision-making in this area.

3.4.2 EFL Teachers’ Perspectives

Valuable insights have been gained from the growing number of studies carried out mainly in UK contexts over the past two decades into teachers’ affiliations towards different target Englishes and models, as well as their attitudes towards ‘standard’/’non-standard’ English in general (Timmis 2002, 2012; Jenkins 2007; Johnstone et al 2010; Young and Walsh 2010). Timmis and Mishan (2015: 37) have suggested on the basis of this research that teachers from NES and NNES backgrounds alike tend to support the existing SBE/SAE target model, as it “holds a psychological foothold amongst professionals in this field”. For instance, Johnstone et al’s (2010: 33-35) study undertaken in the British ELTE context explored the attitudes of twenty-six NNES teachers from fourteen different countries in relation to several varieties, including EIL/ ELF and main and non-main varieties more widely, although IE was not included or referred to. They also investigated the teachers’ own learned varieties, and their awareness of the varieties identified as a target in the curricula they operationalised. The findings were that, while the majority of the participants found ELF/EIL conceptually attractive, no participant was clear about the exact nature of these models. Teachers were at times also shown to work without a clear idea of ‘which English’ was the target (ibid: 33-35).

The viewpoint most commonly reported in the study was a belief in the need for a ‘standard’ even though the participants were often aware that this does not correspond to the reality of Englishes which are used worldwide today. All of the participants also expressed the view that the variety they would be teaching in the future was AE English, due to its growing influence in their local contexts, which included Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, South Korea, Vietnam Japan, China, Thailand, Turkey and Greece (ibid 2010: 34). They also felt that this growing dominance was in line with learners’ needs and preferences, although they agreed that these were not always expressed by learners themselves and that this assumption had not been tested empirically. This led the researchers to conclude that:
most teacher participants adopted what they felt to be a very practical and pragmatic perspective on varieties of English, suggesting a need to believe in a ‘standard’ form of the language (Johnson et al 2010:35).

Similar conclusions were reached by Sifakis and Sougari (2010: 314), on the basis of their large-scale study carried out in the Greek EFL context. In this case, the teacher participants expressed attitudes that revealed “a markedly inner-circle orientation” to variety. This stemmed from a belief that “the EFL teachers’ job is to teach Standard English”, despite an awareness on their part that international norms reflected otherwise (ibid 2010: 314). These findings were consistent with Jenkins’ (2007: 34) earlier research, which investigated the attitudes of NESTs and NNESTs towards EFL as an alternative target English approach, and found that most of the participants preferred an ENS ‘standard’ model. The main reason reported by the teachers for these stated preferences was the dislike of the idea of a fragmentation of English, which it was felt would lead to a lowering of standards and to the loss of a ‘standard’ variety as a common point of reference. From this, Jenkins concluded that there was little support for the concept of ELF/EIL as alternate models, and that the teachers adopted mainly pragmatic perspectives with specific varieties and models of English mattering less than having a standard form to teach to learners (ibid: 34).

Timmis’ (2002: 248) earlier research offered a somewhat different perspective, as teachers were found to be moving away from native speaker norms faster than their students were. This study compared the attitudes of teachers and learners in forty-five different EFL settings to International English and an ENS model, with specific reference to preferred models of pronunciation and grammar. The study found that, while teachers and learners alike expressed a desire to conform to native speaker norms, teachers displayed a greater tolerance of informal, native speaker spoken grammar than learners. A further key finding was that many of the teachers reported being uncertain as to what this type of grammar actually was. This led Timmis to raise the question of the link between the teachers’ target model attitudes and their awareness of linguistic variation, and issues relating to the wider debate about native-speaker norms and international English, as well as whether increased awareness in these areas might lead to different results (ibid 249). Crucially, this indicated a correlation between the target English awareness and target English attitudes of EFL teachers, and that this might be worth exploring empirically, as is the intention in the present study.
Studies carried out by White (2006) and Murphy (2011) in the IE context have started to address the particular target English issues and considerations that are likely to arise for EFL practitioners from Ireland, in the light of changing norms and practices surrounding spoken English. For instance, White’s (2006: 217-233) research, carried out from an ideologically-grounded sociolinguistic perspective, compared the attitudes of twenty-two secondary school teachers of English as a mainstream subject and a similar number of EFL practitioners in relation to the use of IE in their professional practices. For this purpose, they were asked to evaluate the acceptability of a range of IE grammatical usages by means of a questionnaire approach. The study found that the secondary school teachers were mostly tolerant of the use of IE English grammar, although key distinctions were made as to the suitability of different structures, with some rejected outright, others approved of, and ambivalence expressed in the remaining cases (ibid: 225). One of the usages explored in the study was the IE after perfect, as highlighted in Chapter Two. This specific IE verb construction was tolerated by twelve of the twenty-two teachers; that is, by a small majority. From this, White (ibid: 227) concluded that there was uncertainty surrounding its current status, with the wider findings pointing to a continuum of IE English from vernacular to standard, and a shift towards vernacularization amongst educated speakers in Ireland, in line with Kirk and Kallen’s (2004: 113) earlier study, and the conclusions reached.

Meanwhile, comparisons made by White (2006: 228) in the same study, in relation to the attitudes of EFL practitioners working in private language schools in Ireland, revealed that all twenty-two of the participants rejected the use of IE grammar by teachers in the local EFL context, due to the need to conform to the SBE norms reflected in the ELT course books they routinely used. From this, the researcher further concluded that there was still a strong investment in established SBE norms in EFL education in Ireland as a result of global ‘gatekeeping’ restrictions (ibid: 233). Similar constraints were reported by the thirty-six EFL teachers who participated in Murphy’s later study (2011: 16). This focused specifically on attitudes towards suitable target models of pronunciation for learners in the local EFL context. However, in this case, almost half of the participants demonstrated a willingness to include IE accents in the curriculum alongside British models. These findings led the author to highlight the need for the development of materials that reflect an IE model, or that provide learners in this context with access to a variety of accents as a model (ibid: 18).
Further to the evidence provided by these accounts of the target English constraints routinely faced by EFL practitioners from Ireland in the local teaching context, Swan’s (2016: 44-48) MA research has revealed that restrictions exist in teaching contexts abroad, such as in Japan and Korea, in relation to the use of IE by teachers from Ireland due to its perceived lack of ‘prestige’ and ‘grammaticality’. Moreover, in all of the ten cases involved, the teachers felt that these restrictions undermined their professional identities, despite their native speaker fluency and status, as the following accounts reveal:

At first, when I arrived in Japan, I was basically asked to stop speaking Irish English. This was very upsetting as I didn’t want to have to change my identity so I could teach American or British English. But that’s what I felt they wanted which made me doubt myself as a teacher (ibid 2016: 44).

When I worked in Korea, they used to keep telling me I was only allowed to speak American English because Irish English wasn’t correct, which made me feel less adequate as a teacher (ibid 2016: 45).

Interestingly, Swan’s study also reported teachers from Expanding Circle backgrounds feeling discriminated against by employment practices in the ELT industry in Ireland, due to their non-native speaker status, as the following comment indicates:

Even though I was better qualified, they still gave the job to the Irish teacher before me because they think my English is not as good (ibid 2016: 48).

From this, the author concluded that, as elsewhere in the ELT world, the industry in Ireland has a vested interest in maintaining the prevailing, exonormative model and that this leads to discrimination for all teachers whose language use is other than the Anglo-American SE model promoted historically (ibid: 49).

These findings are important, as they provide evidence that, in addition to the requirement to explicitly promote SBE/SAE, EFL teachers from Ireland have also been expected to align their speech to this ‘prestige’ model, both when teaching internationally and in the local classroom context, as is the case for EFL and ESL teachers from Outer and Expanding Circle backgrounds more widely. These restrictive practices can be traced to the close relationship that is assumed in CLT approaches between the types of English that are used by teachers in teacher talk and the nature of the English that is learned, as highlighted previously. However, as Jenkins has pointed out, the extent to which EFL teachers have adhered to these norms in their own target English use has remained largely speculative, due to a previous lack of
classroom data (2009: 208-209). Developments in corpus linguistics have now made it possible to gain an accurate picture of the target models used in teacher talk in different ELT contexts and settings, which serve as implicit target input models for learners alongside those explicitly taught in course books, as is the intention in this study with specific reference to the EFL classroom in Ireland. As the insights gained from corpus linguistics are also now bringing a major influence to bear on the types of spoken English explicitly taught in the ELT curriculum, in the following section we critically explore what this might mean for the target English role and practices of EFL teachers in different teaching and learning contexts.

3.6 The Impact of Corpus Linguistics on Target English Models

The impact of CL on English language pedagogy has been profound and far-reaching in terms of its influence on the design and content of dictionaries and reference grammars, language syllabuses, course books and materials, tasks and resources, learner corpora, and as an awareness-raising tool for learners and teachers (Tognini-Bonelli 1996; Carter et al 1998; McCarthy 2004; O’Keeffe et al 2007; Farr 2010; O’Keeffe 2010; Reppen 2010; Chambers et al 2011). For instance, it has helped to inform vastly improved dictionaries (see Fox 1998), grammars (see Biber et al 1999; the Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English; Carter and McCarthy 2006; the Cambridge Grammar of Spoken and Written English) and coursebooks, such as the Touchstone series, which more accurately reflect real patterns of spoken and written English use (McCarthy 2004). The development of learner corpora has also facilitated the analysis of learner errors and competencies at different proficiency levels, which is more accurately informing the design and content of language courses, syllabuses, and examinations. These advances have led to increased opportunities for access and use of a wider range of spoken forms of grammar and lexical expression in the EFL classroom, to better reflect the real world practices of English language speakers, and to raise awareness of linguistic diversity.
3.6.1 Changing Target Models of Spoken English Grammar

One of the most important achievements of CL is that it has led to revised pedagogic descriptions of grammar. This occurrence is changing the priorities set for the teaching of particular grammatical structures, the range of meanings associated with particular forms and the contexts in which they are presented (McCarthy 2004: 6). It has also brought spoken grammar to the forefront of language teaching, with spoken corpora now increasingly used as a valuable classroom resource (Farr 2007: 10). The insights gained from corpus researchers into variation between spoken and written English have also brought to light the fragmentary nature, dysfluencies and vagueness which typically arise in native speaker casual speech, by comparison with the more coherent structuring and precision used by speakers in more formal registers, revolutionising how spoken English grammar is viewed and classified (Biber et al. 1999; Carter and McCarthy 2006).

From this, new pedagogical perspectives on ‘standard’ English have emerged which recognize diversity and variability, thereby reflecting a move away from the restrictive viewpoint of the past which measured grammaticality and standard language use exclusively against the benchmark of written English norms (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 9). This has allowed for more finely-grained frameworks to emerge than those which existed previously, in order to explore the degree of standardness and formality/informality associated with different types of written and spoken English, such as the continuum proposed by Carter and McCarthy, which was highlighted in Chapter One (2006: 9-10). This framework is adopted in the present study in order to make distinctions in relation to the grammatical acceptability of different structures according to their relative usefulness, relevance and appropriacy in different teaching and learning contexts, in line with the principles and goals of the CLT approach, which seek to take account of the sociolinguistic and socio-cultural dimensions of learning English (ibid: 9-10).

3.6.2 Changing Target Models of Spoken English Lexis

The application of CL to the EFL classroom has been no less significant in terms of its impact on how vocabulary is viewed and taught, challenging many previously held
assumptions about the meaning and usage of words. Word frequency is now a key criterion for selecting words to teach, and is reflected in the priorities set in course books for the introduction of new lexis (see Nation 2001, 2004; Grabe 2010). However, corpus linguists working in the applied linguistic field have stressed that frequency must be balanced with additional criteria, such as dividing words that are useful for everyday use and spoken contexts from words which are used in more specialized domains and contexts, for which register-specific spoken corpora can play a useful role (McCarten 2007: 3). Further key insights gained are the different types of lexical and grammatical patterning that feature in written and spoken registers (such as collocations and colligations) and situations and settings in which they are used (Lewis 1993). This has led to a greater focus, in general, in EFL coursebooks on the teaching of ‘lexical chunks’ and ‘prefabricated phrases’ in order to enhance learner communicative fluency, as well as the development of the Lexical Approach wherein lexical ‘chunks’ form the organising principle of the whole syllabus (DeCarrico 2001; Nattinger and DeCarrico 1992).

3.6.3 Future Trends in CL Applications in ELT

Wickens (2013: 78) envisions that there will be greater development and use of more targeted corpora in the future, which will allow teachers and learners to explore grammatical and lexical usage in a range of contexts that are in line with students’ needs and interests. Increased opportunities for real language use will also come from the advent of digital media and technology, which is changing the way we learn, understand and teach language, as well as bringing new words and alternate meanings (ibid: 83). As English spreads and becomes increasingly more diversified, new vocabulary is being generated globally, some of which is shared through the cyber and digital world. Other vocabularies belong to specific native and non-native English language speech communities, and express something unique to their culture and lifestyle. Developments in CL are thus offering new and exciting opportunities in terms of the range of grammar and lexis that learners are exposed to, and formally learn, in the EFL classroom. However, they have also brought new dilemmas for theorists to grapple with and practical challenges for teachers, which are discussed in the following section.
3.6.4 The Challenges of Corpus Linguistics for ELT

The advent of CL has brought into sharper focus the underlying tensions which have always existed between what we know about language and the types of English we teach. Faced with corpus evidence that many of our intuitions about spoken language use are substantially at variance with what we do, theorists in the applied linguistic field have questioned whether, and to what extent, we should try to capture the realities of spoken English in L2 pedagogy, and the best approach to take. Sinclair (2004: 18) has argued that only real examples of speech should be used in language pedagogy, whereas Summers and Rundell (1995) suggested that pedagogic material should be ‘corpus-based’ and not ‘corpus-bound’. Cook (1998: 12) also rejected what he described as a fundamentalist view which holds corpus findings as the only source of truth. This is consistent with Widdowson’s earlier argument that language teaching cannot simply be based on descriptive facts which are “factors to consider, not facts to conform to” (1991: 57). Promodrou (1996: 88-89) also cautioned about moving too hastily from the laboratory to the classroom, as “to assume that what is ‘real’ is also interesting and useful is a fallacy”, arguing instead that the key criterion of relevance and effectiveness must first be met when deciding which forms to teach.

The key question of the pedagogic relevance of corpus insights based on native speaker usage in the context of World Englishes was raised by Willis (1999: 10) who argued that we should place a ‘very low premium’ on conformity to native-speaker norms from a grammatical standpoint, a view supported by Promodrou (2003), as in:

What does the grammar of informal, spoken English mean for the non-native speaker of English, and what is the pedagogic relevance of this particular variety of English in the context of English as an international language (ibid2003: 5).

Timmis (2002: 242), on the other hand, has argued that while it is inappropriate to “foist native speaker norms on students who neither want nor need them”, by the same token “it is scarcely more appropriate to offer students a target which does not meet their aspirations”, thereby reminding us that learner preferences cannot be ignored.

Faced with these challenges, the consensus that seems to be emerging is that, alongside the theoretical and descriptive insights of corpus linguistics, the pedagogic criteria must also be taken into account. Accordingly, teachers must, where possible, adopt an integrated approach
to language teaching, at the centre of which is the learner and the learner’s needs (Timmis 2002; Promodrou 2003; Jenkins 2007). Promodrou (2003: 6) has advised that while the discrepancies between what is taught and the English actually used creates limitations for learners, the move towards a corpus-based syllabus may in fact provide learners with “too much reality”. In support of this view, he has pointed to the richness of vocabulary, idioms, cultural allusions, metaphorical turns of phrase, and variety of styles which are found in naturally-occurring English. Hence, “the very features which define authentic English are precisely what make it difficult for learners to engage with” (ibid: 6). Moreover, their use can prove potentially demoralizing in a classroom context, which has led him to caution that a balance must be struck between what is ‘real’ and what is ‘realisable’ language for learners of English (ibid: 6-7).

Similarly, Timmis (2002: 243) has argued that teachers must ensure that the input provided for learners is both accessible and a reality. This means taking into account the level of language proficiency of the learner when introducing naturally-occurring English into the classroom. From this, teachers can determine the extent to which learners can cope with specific forms of expression, and the degree of pedagogic mediation that may be needed to assist them in interpreting meaning. A further consideration that Promodrou has raised is that learners must be provided with contextual cues if they are to be enabled to determine the discourse and pragmatic dimensions of speech (2003: 11-13). These arguments, which are now widely supported in applied linguistic circles, highlight the benefits of a critically-informed and flexible target model approach in order to allow practitioners to be able to successfully discern and mediate different types of spoken English use with distinct learner groups. This position is compatible with the core principle of CLT, which is that the needs of the individual learner and the learning context must be the starting point for the design of syllabus content, as O’Keeffe et al (2007) and Farr and O’Keeffe (2003, 2012) have also maintained.

Some differences remain, however, as to the extent to which learner wants and preferences should be acknowledged when deciding the target models of English they should be exposed to, and formally taught. Carter and McCarthy (1996: 10) have argued that it is patronizing to learners to decide in advance that they do not need access to certain types of English because it probably does not meet their requirements. Meanwhile, Promodrou (2003: 12) has rejected
what he calls a ‘free market approach’ to syllabus design, on the grounds that it fails to take account of the practical constraints involved in learning and teaching, as the choices available to learners would be so diverse as to be unsustainable in the classroom situation. Instead, there should be joint decision-making, which he believes will take place on an increasingly ad-hoc basis. Timmis (2002: 243), on the other hand, has advised that decisions about target English norms should rest ultimately with learners and that teachers should be aware of their preferences and accept them, even if they may differ from their own. This position is supported by Jenkins (2007: 36), in view of the fact that learner attitudes towards the target language are likely to be a key affective variable in the language learning process. From this, she highlighted the growing need for EFL teachers to include a strong language-awareness focus and some element of critical awareness-raising in their classroom practices in order to enable learners to make better-informed judgements about the suitability of different target models for their own learning needs (ibid: 36).

Carter and McCarthy (1997: 154) have pointed out that while the best course of action would seem to be “to expose learners to natural spoken data wherever possible to raise awareness of real language use”, it is essential that they are also made aware of the critical considerations and sensitivities surrounding different types of spoken English. This should include the values which set the parameters for acceptable English language use in educational and professional contexts. Hence, they have stressed the need for EFL practitioners to strike a balance between affording students opportunities to learn the authentic language forms they will need if they are to cope in real world contexts and the additional cultural and social benefits this brings, and acknowledging and using those varieties which continue to carry the greatest prestige internationally, and which learners may still prefer and need to learn in many contexts (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 6). Hughes and McCarthy (1998: 142) earlier highlighted the difficulties which typically arise when EFL teachers introduce ‘non-standard’ English into the classroom because it is viewed as ‘wrong’ or ‘deviant’ due to underlying SE ideologies. As a result, learners fail to appreciate that features of speech are different from written English in important respects, and play different pragmatic roles. O’Keeffe et al (2007: 10) have argued that this creates an obvious role for the use of corpora in the classroom, in order to explore not only similarities and differences between different versions of English in terms of their grammatical properties but also as a basis for awareness-raising
discussions concerning the social and cultural associations they hold for speakers from different regional and social groupings. This is of particular significance given that varieties of English are also characterised by the cultural and historical associations embedded in them.

Cultural theorists in SLA have also pointed to the numerous benefits for L2 learners from exposure to authentic and diverse forms of expression, particularly those found in local speech varieties (Asian and McCullough 1998; Kramsch 1996; Byram 1998). Kramsch (1996) has observed that vernacular language is often a symbol of local identity and that its use involves cultural and political implications. Providing learners with access to local grammatical and pragmatic usages is essential, therefore, to raising-awareness of the important socio-cultural and pragmatic roles these forms of expression play, such as to signal in-group membership and shared knowledge and values. Asian and McCullogh (1998: 37), working in the IE context, also earlier suggested that sensitizing learners to the fact that local varieties are as complex and systematic as ‘standard’ languages is vital, as they are often viewed as “low, easy, or even comical” versions of English. Accordingly, they have argued that by giving students opportunities to explore their understandings of these forms, and how they reflect and facilitate the deeper cultural discourses around them, they might come to appreciate the attitudes, values and beliefs in the local culture and thereby develop more positive relationships. This suggests the need for a critically-oriented and mediated approach to the use of local forms of expressions by teachers in their classroom interactions to provide learners with valuable exposure to this type of spoken English and an understanding of the discourses that surround their use.

However, a key area of challenge that Walsh has raised more widely for practitioners is the ability to identify and successfully discern the types of usages that may and may not be feasible and suitable to use with different learner groups, and the stages of the lesson where this may be more appropriate (2006: 68). As he has advised, this requires a high degree of awareness on the part of practitioners of their own relationship with this type of spoken English, as well as an understanding of the relevance and usefulness of particular expressions in different socio-cultural contexts (ibid: 68). To help them to make principled decisions of this kind, teachers can draw on corpus-informed grammars which have attempted to identify and classify this type of usage. Corpus linguists (see Promodrou 2003; McCarten 2007;
O'Keeffe et al (2007) have also suggested the merits of using corpora as a starting point to identifying important exemplars of use, for which locally-sourced corpora of classroom data can also play a vital role in establishing key trends and frequencies in localized teaching contexts. So far the present research has provided a critical appraisal of the impact of CL as a force for target model change in ELT, and the ways in which it can inform the development of a more finely-nuanced target English approach. The crucial question of how teachers at different stages of their careers in this field can be helped to achieve this is considered in the following section with reference to the theoretical and practical knowledge base and skills provided on ELTE programmes.

3.7 The Changing Educational Needs of EFL Teachers

3.7.1 The Expanding Knowledge Base of ELT

Carter and Nunan (2001: 5) have pointed out that while language pedagogy is nowhere near developing an agreed-upon set of ‘rules of the game’, there is a rapidly growing knowledge base which recruits entering ELTE programmes can draw on to gain a more developed sense of teacher identity and professionalism. University programmes are typically seen as the start of the teachers’ professional development, with some offering a teaching practicum that is intended to establish links between theory and practice. Subsequent learning takes place in schools through classroom practice, and may involve working with mentors and further professional development initiatives. In the early days of ELT, short pre-service training programmes were introduced to provide recruits with a repertoire of teaching skills that were typically acquired through observing experienced teachers and practice teaching in a controlled setting (Richards 2001: 2-4). This reflected the thinking at the time that good teaching involved the mastery of a set of competencies that could be evaluated. The advent of the discipline of applied linguistics led to a growing body of specialised academic knowledge and theory, in language analysis, learning theory, methodology and sometimes a teaching practicum (ibid: 2-4), which provided the foundation of the curricula of MA programmes offered in universities.
From this, a key distinction was made between ‘teacher training’ courses and ‘teacher development’, with the former being identified with the development of a repertoire of entry-level skills and the latter to the mastery of the discipline of applied linguistics with a focus on the longer-term development of the individual teacher over time (Widdowson 1993: 269). The term ‘teacher education’ is commonly used today to refer to the more inclusive and holistic approach that has developed, which Freeman describes as reflecting ‘a shift from the context, to the person of the teacher, to the process of learning’ (2001: 72-74). The knowledge base of teachers is also constantly expanding in response to both internal and external influences and pressures, which is also the case for EFL teachers.

3.7.2 Changing Trends in ELTE

As the ELT profession has developed and new requirements and demands have arisen, the knowledge base of teachers is being re-examined. In the field of teacher education in general, there has been a move away from models based on knowledge transmission to knowledge construction, whereby teachers build their own understandings through their professional experiences by integrating theory, research and opinion with both empirical and reflective study of their own classroom practices (Freeman 2001: 72-74). This has led to a greater awareness of the importance of teacher cognition, beliefs and prior learning experiences, as key influences shaping their professional practices inspiring a growing body of research in these areas (ibid: 74-76). As a result, new areas have been included in the core curriculum in teacher education programmes, such as reflective practice, classroom research and action research, in order to expand the traditional knowledge base of teaching (Farr 2005; Murphy 2015b). Similarly, within language teacher education, there has been a move away from concern over content and pedagogical methodology to the more challenging and largely unexplored questions of how language teaching is learned with the aim of finding the best ways to teach it (Richards 2001: 72-74). This has led to a growing focus on the processes of teaching and teacher-learning, the beliefs, theories and knowledge which inform language teaching, and the factors influencing teacher identity formation.

3.7.2.1 Teacher Identity
In line with the shift from cognitive to social perspectives in teacher education (Norton and Toohey 2011; Pennington and Richards 2016), there has been a growing interest and focus on the role of identity in our understanding of the nature of teaching and teacher learning. Miller (2006: 10) pointed out that teacher identity is likely to be shaped by many factors including personal attributes and biography, gender, culture, working conditions, age and the institutional and classroom culture. It also involves the acquisition of new modes of discourse and new roles, as well as insight into the issues and struggles that are involved in a particular situated community in relation to its norms and practices. The role of institutional expectations, policies and constraints, as well particular influences from the teaching context are also powerful determinants of teacher role and identity (Miller 2009: 175). As Miller has perceived:

The negotiation of teachers’ professional identities is...powerfully influenced by contextual factors outside of the teacher themselves and their preservice education...[T]he identity resources of the teachers may be tested against conditions that challenge and conflict with their backgrounds, skills, social memberships, use of language, beliefs, values knowledge, attitudes, and so on. Negotiating those challenges forms part of the dynamic of professional identity development (ibid: 175).

From this, a shared consensus has emerged in the academic literature in the field of L2 teacher education whereby teacher identity is viewed as fluid and evolving rather than fixed or imposed. Moreover, it is negotiated through experience and the sense that is made of that experience (Sachs 2005: 15).

The early years are generally considered to be the most difficult in a teacher’s career (Mitchell 1997; Gatbonton 1999; Rodgers and Raider-Roth 2006; Fantilli & McDougall 2009; Farrell 2016). Pennington and Richards (1997) have highlighted the many challenges involved for novices in developing teacher identity and an effective teacher role. In particular, they struggle to achieve the correct balance between maintaining discipline and focus and developing a good relationship with learners. Richards (2006) has argued that most novice teachers take on a traditional or formal pedagogical role as their classroom ‘default identity’ as this provides the type of ‘safe’ structure or hierarchy they feel they need in the early career. By contrast, a minority, adopt a more informal, personal and authentic identity. Zimmerman (1998: 91) has argued that this more informal type of orientation may be less
effective for an inexperienced teacher who has not yet mastered instructional content and pedagogical skills, but that this will depend on the age of the students.

The challenges faced by novices in their initial teaching practice have been attracting increased research interest more recently, including in the ELT profession (Tsui 2003; Walsh 2006; Farr 2010; Farrell 2015; Murphy 2015b; Farrell 2016; Farr and Farrell 2017). Medgyes has observed that “anxiety may be felt by any beginning teacher, whether native or non-native” (1984: 318). Meanwhile, Farrell’s research (2016: 48) has highlighted that novices from all backgrounds tend to be preoccupied with issues and concerns relating to classroom management, how they are viewed by learners and their perceived lack of knowledge and skills, particularly as regards the teaching of grammar. They also typically report feeling uncomfortable with their position of authority, especially in situations where they find themselves teaching learners who are similar in age, or older (ibid: 48). In this regard, Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2006: 13) have highlighted the importance of novices developing ‘teacher presence’, cautioning that learners may lose confidence in the competencies and skills of those who fail to achieve this, which can place a strain on teacher-student relationships.

Research in teacher learning in language teaching has further shown that language teacher identity evolves over time with novices moving from a focus on materials and classroom procedures to a focus on their students and interaction (see e.g. Pennington 1995b; Farrell 2009, 2016). However, while teacher professional development is intended to bring about change in teachers, it is commonly accepted that such change takes place in the longer-term. This position is supported by research which has indicated that there is often little immediate evidence for change in teachers’ practice (Waters and Vilches 2005). Key factors influencing the adoption of educational innovations include perceptions of the amount of risk involved, the communicability of the innovation, compatibility with existing practices, the number of gatekeepers involved and the perceived benefits of the innovation as well as the organizational, political, social and cultural context in which the change is being attempted (Richards: 2001: 41-42). This brings us to a discussion of global pressures on teacher development, in particular those that relate to changing socio-political trends surrounding English, and the ways in which developments of this kind can impact on teacher identity and role.
3.7.2.2. Global Pressures on Teacher Development

As with other areas of education, ELTE has been influenced by issues posed by critical pedagogic approaches in relation to the ideological underpinnings of educational practices. Critical linguists have argued that globalization and the spread of English have led to the need for teacher educators in the ELT field to engage practitioners in an exploration of the socio-political role and status of English in today’s world, and the types of inequality and privilege that have arisen from the supremacy of the native speaker and the native speaker model in ELT pedagogy historically (Pennycook 2000; Canagarajah 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b). Canagarajah (2002: 142), for instance, has maintained that language teachers play a particular role “because language, culture and identity are integrally related and language can serve both to empower and marginalize”. Therefore, the language classroom is a social and cultural domain which teachers can influence. Teachers also represent the values, beliefs and practices of the cultural groups with whom the new language is associated. From this perspective, language teachers are not simply teaching language as a vehicle for the expression of meanings and ideas, but should be engaged both in reflecting upon the ideological forces that underlie their classroom practices and empowering their learners with the language knowledge and skills they need to be able to function as moral agents in society (ibid: 142).

Hawkins and Norton (2009: 30-39) have identified three practices that are associated with critical language teacher education. These are: 1) critical awareness-raising activities of the way power relations are constructed and function in society and the extent to which historical, social, and political practices structure educational equality; 2) critical self-reflection activities that encourage teacher learners to critically reflect on their own identities and positioning in society; 3) activities that address critical pedagogical relations between educators and their teacher-learners, not only to model critical educational practices, but also to encourage teacher learners to consider ways in which their own teaching can enhance opportunities for language learners in their classrooms. The following section highlights the benefits of a teacher education approach in the EFL field that incorporates a strong language awareness and critical language awareness focus, in order to help prepare practitioners for the
more complex target English role and practices that lie ahead for them in their professional role.

3.7.3 Teacher Language Awareness (TLA)

Donmall has offered a broad interpretation of language awareness (LA) as “a person’s sensitivity to language use and its role in human life” (1985: 7). Language awareness assumes that some form or level of awareness about linguistic use, knowledge and learning is beneficial for learners, but there are varying opinions of how such awareness can be brought about (van Lier 1996: 11). LA approaches emerged in mainstream educational contexts in Britain in the 1970s, with the aim of promoting greater understanding of the ways in which language functions in society. Such approaches are associated with the work of Hawkins (1987) in British mainstream educational contexts in particular (Hawkins and Norton 2009). The approaches considered most relevant to the present study are those which seek to develop teacher language awareness (TLA) in relation to classroom interactional language use, and critical approaches which are concerned with the potential transformative role of teachers as agents for change.

3.7.3.1 Developing Awareness of Interactional L2 Classroom Language Use

Many of the earlier studies of language awareness in the field of L2 classroom language use focused on the professional knowledge base and language proficiency of the teacher, with Andrews (2002), for example, exploring the nature of the relationship between these two types of knowledge. The close connection between a teacher’s knowledge about language (i.e. subject-matter knowledge), knowledge of language (i.e. proficiency) and pedagogic practice are also areas discussed by several theorists (Andrews 1999, 2001; Wright and Bolitho 1993, 1997). The focus of this research was, in almost all cases, L2 teachers and was linked to the establishment and maintenance of professional standards (Andrews 2002: 23).

The growing focus on teacher–learning (Freeman and Johnson 1998) has led to the view that language awareness for language teachers must involve examining how the language use of
teachers in interaction with students affects intended learning outcomes. In this regard, Wright and Bolitho (1997: 163-4) proposed a methodological framework for language awareness activities based on an expanded view of language awareness for teachers. This focused on the interaction of the classroom context and covered a spectrum from the most predictable pedagogic events, ranging from where the teacher’s language could be prepared in advance to the entirely unpredictable (1997: 165). This expanded view of language awareness had much in common with ideas expressed by Andrews (1997, 2001). While the subject of studies by Wright and Bolitho (1997) and Andrews (1997, 2001) were, in all cases, NNESTs, all of the aforementioned analysts suggested that many of the same issues still remained to be explored with NESTs. Kumaravadivelu (1999: 28) has also stressed that it is necessary for teachers from all backgrounds to comprehend not only the basics, but also some of the finer nuances behind language use in the classroom, which is a view supported by Walsh (2003, 2006, 2011).

As highlighted previously, the work of Walsh (2006, 2011) has been instrumental in highlighting the importance of providing teachers with opportunities to explore and familiarize themselves with how language is used in the L2 classroom in order to develop a more comprehensive and effective range of classroom competencies. In particular, his comprehensive studies of L2 teacher classroom discourse have brought to the fore challenges and issues arising for novices from NEST backgrounds revealing that they struggle with many aspects of their target English performance as a result of poor language awareness (Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011). This is especially the case for inexperienced teachers from Inner Circle backgrounds where the varieties commonly used are other than the ‘prestige’ varieties they are expected to explicitly teach.

As the discussion in Chapter One highlighted, the academic literature has traditionally positioned NESTs as holding a privileged status in the ELT world by comparison with their NNEST counterparts due to a widespread belief that they hold innate intuitions and linguistic competencies in respect of their own language, which can be developed and refined through ‘on the job experience’ (Braine 1999; Davies 2003; Llurda 2005). As a result of this assumed native speaker supremacy, NNESTs have found themselves discriminated against in the ELT world in terms of their status and employment opportunities. This is despite the fact that a majority of the world’s language teachers, like their students, speak English as a second or
additional language. A shared knowledge of the L1 of learners has also been shown to bring its own range of competences (Llurda 2005). Moreover, NESTs often display a superior knowledge and insights of the formal workings of English than their NEST counterparts (Tsui 2001).

Walsh’s extensive classroom-based research (2003, 2006, 2011, 2012) has uncovered the poor target English performance of many inexperienced NESTs. For instance, they have been shown to use overly informal conversational styles featuring ‘non-standard’ grammar and highly idiomatic lexical expression even at stages of the lesson when key instructional functions are being expressed and the careful framing of language is essential, as for example, when teachers are giving instructions, when they are checking comprehension and during error feedback (ibid: 112-117). Walsh has attributed this to a lack of awareness on the part of inexperienced NESTs in relation to the nature of their own language use, and that of others. He has also linked their often poor target English performance to a lack of pedagogical insight concerning the key role played by teacher talk in the processes of SLA as a rich source of input for learners and a means by which learning is supported (ibid: 71-76). This leads to a failure on their part to appreciate both normative and pedagogical considerations surrounding teacher talk in this educational domain, which hampers their ability to control and modify their speech so as to ensure that it is comprehensible and accessible for learners at different levels of English language proficiency, and that it is targeted towards the needs and preferences of different learner groups.

This has been raised as a key area of professional concern by Walsh as such practices can frustrate and disadvantage learners, leading them to doubt the expertise and professionalism of the teacher (2006: 112-117). This is not least because they lead to a mismatch between teacher talk and the more formal varieties found in course books which practitioners are expected to explicitly teach to learners. His research has demonstrated that this problem is exacerbated when novices lack awareness that usages that feature in their everyday casual speech may have a limited usage outside the specific regional or social grouping to which they belong and, as such, may be of questionable value to others. From this, Walsh has argued that they must be provided with opportunities to become familiar with the norms governing the language use of teaching professionals in this field, the complex range of pedagogic functions that teacher talk performs and the ways in which it can be systematically
targeted to suit different learner groups and different classroom micro-contexts (ibid: 149-153). In this way, student teachers from NEST backgrounds can be helped to make their own target English use more accessible for those they teach in order to ensure that learners are supported throughout the lesson. In these ways, Walsh’s work has been instrumental in highlighting the specific challenges that arise for NESTs in their target English use. It has also supported the view that a person’s identity as a language teacher relates both to their language background and their language proficiency, and that L1 competence in English does not automatically confer advantages in terms of the requirements for teachers to develop specific communicative skills for teaching through that language, as argued by Pennington and Richards (2016: 8). Finally, it has provided evidence that NESTs often struggle to provide appropriate models of target English input for learners due to poor language awareness and that it is not uncommon for NESTs to enter pre-service programmes with only a limited formal understanding of English and a lack of awareness of the professional norms that operate in this educational sector.

From this, Walsh has pointed to the enhanced target English insights and expertise that NESTs will need to develop to be able to cope with the new challenges that lie ahead, which Matsuda has also highlighted in relation to EFL teachers from all backgrounds (2012: 66). Walsh has suggested that these initiatives can be carried out as part of action research projects on teacher education programmes, which are considered one of the most effective ways of enabling practitioners to solve professional problems and to continue to improve or develop professionally (Wallace 1998: 1). Such initiatives can therefore be of benefit for both novice and experienced NESTs and NNESTS as part of their on-going professional development in order to help them to gain the depth of critical language awareness and enhanced target English skills that will be required of them in their future practices if they are to respond effectively to the changing English language landscape as promotors of target model change.

3.7.3.2 EFL Teachers as Agents for Target Model Change

Critical linguists have argued that it is becoming increasingly important to integrate critical perspectives into ELT so as to bring about changes in attitudes towards language use,
particularly one’s own language variety (Pennycook 2000, 2007; Canagarajah 2006a; Matsuda 2012). Matsuda (2012: 43-46), for instance, has argued that to achieve this, teachers must be encouraged to develop skills used in sociolinguistic and ethnographic research in order to become proficient at observing, analysing and evaluating language use in the world around them, including linguistic diversity in their own speech communities. This is important not only for novices, but also for experienced teachers, as they may have studied only main ‘standard’ and formal versions of English and therefore have had fewer opportunities to explore other varieties. As a result, they may not value or feel confident about teaching a wider and more diverse range of Englishes, and they may be unreceptive in general to the new ways of thinking about English which are emerging in the ELT educational domain (ibid: 43-46). This is supported by research carried out in SLA which has found that experienced practitioners are more likely to view ‘non-standard’ grammatical usage as ‘incorrect’, to favour error suppression and correction, and to stress preparing students for tests (Greis 1985; Tang 1997, 2001; Tsui 2003). Moreover, as the review of the academic literature on target model attitudes undertaken previously in this chapter has revealed, prescriptive views persist concerning the varieties of English that can and should be taught on the part of teachers and learner alike. Hall et al (2013) have highlighted the need for practical initiatives that can help teachers to develop a new understanding of the nature of English and how this might impact on its global learning, teaching and testing to contest monolithic views of English, and the deficit model of teaching and learning associated with them. They have also argued that teachers must to be encouraged to identify strategies which they can use to change their own pedagogy. This suggests there is much to be gained, therefore, from a critical awareness-raising focus on ELTE programmes for EFL teachers at different stages of their professional careers, as a means to helping them develop a critically-informed and critically-oriented target English approach, for which corpus linguistics can play an essential role.

3.7.3.3 The Benefits of Corpus Linguistics for Awareness-raising in ELTE

The potential of corpus linguistics as an approach and resource for awareness-raising in L2 teacher education has been recognised for some time, as it provides a rich source of authentic
data for textual analysis (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003, 2011; Evison and McCarthy 2004; Farr 2010; O’Keeffe 2010; Chambers et al. 2011; O’Keeffe and Farr 2012; Riordan 2012; Murphy and Riordan 2016; Farr and Farrell 2017). This creates opportunities for practitioners to analyse discourse in context, to explore frequencies and grammatical and lexical patterning in different types of spoken and written texts and genres and to gain insight into the rules and underlying processes governing language use in different contexts through inductive reasoning. This can help to inform their linguistic practices and the judgements they make about language use with different learner groups. The development of language corpora and corpus applications, corpus data, corpus techniques and corpus-based materials and tasks can be used, therefore, to extend the linguistic knowledge base and practical pedagogic insights of teachers, and crucially, to raise their critical language awareness in relation to the plurilithic nature of English to enable teachers to value the diversity of English and to develop strategies they can use to change their own pedagogy.

The use of corpora for awareness-raising purposes amongst EFL teachers is particularly important in contexts where there is an absence of a codified standard, as is the case in the IE context. As O’Keeffe and Farr (2003: 389) have observed, prior to the availability of corpora of IE it was difficult for EFL teachers working in Ireland to gain an up-to-date and accurate understanding of the variability and nuances of language use in this setting. Kirk (2007: 121) has also highlighted the importance of the development of the ICE-Ireland corpus, which represents the speech of professionals from a wide range of backgrounds including broadcasting, business, law, parliament and education as “it may reasonably be assumed that what is spoken is done so in a standard or a standard-like way”. This allows the ICE-Ireland corpus to be viewed as the Irish version of international, ‘standard’ spoken English for the purpose of comparative linguistic analysis, which is the approach adopted in this study.

The development of student teacher and experienced teacher corpora of EFL classroom discourse in the IE context for the purposes of this study therefore creates new and exciting opportunities for the language use of teaching professionals at different stages of their careers to be explored on ELTE programmes in Ireland in various ways. These include investigating its nature and role, and key issues pertaining to its suitability for critical language awareness raising purposes, and for comparative linguistic analysis in relation to distinct EFL contexts worldwide. This offers the potential for valuable insights to be gained into the particular
linguistic, social, cultural and ideological discourses at play in the IE sociolinguistic setting to extend the scope of the suitable target Englishes debate. This will raise awareness of the particular challenges faced by NESTs from a non-main Inner circle background as a result of the prevailing target English status quo and help bring a more finely-nuanced theoretical understanding of the supposed NESTs/NNESTs dichotomy. In this way, classroom corpora, and classroom corpus analysis of this kind can contribute to a broader transformation of ELT professional practices for teachers working in this unique Inner Circle setting, and more widely.

3.7 Summary of Chapter

The discussion in this chapter has endeavoured to provide the theoretical and pedagogic rationale for the present study, highlighting the centrality of teacher talk in the contemporary EFL classroom. It has also critically reviewed the conflicting discourses which have arisen in the suitable target Englishes debate and the main theoretical and practical challenges posed by target model reform. This led to a critical appraisal of arguments made to support the development of a more finely-nuanced and critically-informed target English approach, highlighting the ways in which CL is facilitating its development and the pedagogical considerations involved. Finally, it reviewed the more complex educational needs of novice and experienced EFL teachers in the light of the changing English landscape, with arguments made for greater critical language awareness training and enhanced target English skills development on ELTE programmes, and for EFL teachers to play a role in promoting greater linguistic diversity and tolerance in this educational domain. In this way, the discussion in this chapter has also underscored the potential applications of the present research in terms of informing future directions in ELT and ELTE in the local teaching context, and more widely. The following chapter sets out the research approach and methodology that will be used to achieve these research goals.
Chapter Four

Research Approach and Design

The most exciting type of corpora that have been built so far are actually constructed in class. This [building one’s own corpus] is the most challenging example of the teacher as researcher with regard to observing the language in use. (McCarthy 2008:571)

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and rationalises the combined DA/CL approach and the mixed methodology drawn on in this study to address the research aims. The discussion begins by positioning the present research approach in relation to quantitative and qualitative traditions in linguistic research and historical trends in L2 classroom analysis in order to establish its merits. This is followed by a detailed account of the research methodology which featured classroom corpora, on-line questionnaires and semi-structured interviews, and the issues and considerations that arose in its design and implementation. A demographic profile is provided subsequently of the ten novice and ten experienced EFL teachers whose perspectives and classroom practices are investigated in this study, in order to help contextualize the data analysis in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. The discussion closes with a brief summary of the main areas covered in this chapter.

4.2 Research Approach and Rationale

This study is multidisciplinary in nature, drawing on theories and frameworks from sociolinguistics, pragmatics, SLA and ELTE. It combines quantitative and qualititative traditions in linguistic investigation within a CL/DA approach, which is considered suitable and compatible with the main aims of the research and the intended research applications. As the methodological discussion in this chapter will indicate, this approach is used in conjunction with a mixed methodology to ensure triangulation of the methods and the data. In
the following discussion, we provide a detailed rationale for the decisions taken in these regards, beginning with the benefits of combined quantitative and qualitative research.

### 4.2.1 Benefits of Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Traditions

Cohen and Mannion (2000: 17) have argued for the benefits of the use of a triangulated approach in both quantitative and qualitative studies in linguistic research, as such an approach enables the researcher to “map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behaviour by studying it from more than one standpoint”. Within the social sciences in general, a conventional paradigmatic differentiation between quantitative and qualitative research is commonly acknowledged (Lincoln and Guba 1985; Nunan 1992; Leedy 1997; Edge and Richards 1998; Holliday 2002). Quantitative research approaches set out to count things and use frequencies and percentages to describe language and to formulate hypotheses and theories. Qualitative approaches, on the other hand, make close analyses of, for example, individual texts or linguistic features using introspection or ethnographic techniques to arrive at theories about language by induction, or to test hypotheses which have been set up in advance (Lindquist 2009: 25). However, it is generally accepted that all quantitative studies must also include an element of qualitative method as researchers must first decide on categories, which must be based on qualitative analysis.

Prior to the advent of computer technology, quantitative studies within linguistics were less frequent and limited in scope. This was due to the impracticalities involved in gathering and analysing large-scale data manually (Walsh et al. 2011: 325-326). However, corpus linguistics has created opportunities for large masses of text to be gathered and processed/analysed, using computer technology and software. There has been a growing trend towards combined linguistic research that uses quantitative techniques to complement qualitative methods (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003; Adel and Reppen 2008; Murphy 2010; Thornbury 2010; Riordan 2012; Walsh et al. 2011). The combination of multiple methods in a single investigation is widely supported as it optimises the analysis by providing many instruments with which to cut through the data. This ensures that “a more detailed and balanced picture of the situation may emerge” (Altrichter, Feldman, Posch and Somekh 2008: 147). A further advantage of this approach is that it increases the credibility and validity of the research findings, as it enables researchers “to cross-check the data from multiple sources to search for regularities”
The following section describes the particular benefits to be gained from the use of a combined DA/CL approach for linguistic research.

### 4.2.2 Benefits of Combining CL and DA as Approaches

While CL and DA have been used by researchers as independent approaches, each has its limitations. For instance, CL has traditionally focused on words and word combinations in large scale analysis but has ignored context, whereas DA has offered detailed descriptions of spoken interactional features but has been unable to generalise to larger contexts (Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 36). McCarthy and Handford (2004: 110) have argued convincingly for the complementarity of quantitative approaches from CL and qualitative approaches from DA in order to achieve enhanced descriptions of language use that could not otherwise be found. This has been recognised for some time in a wide range of contexts and domains including forensic linguistics (Cotterill 2010), the workplace (Koester 2006), political discourse (Adel 2010), the media (O’Keeffe 2006; O’Sullivan 2015) and in academic contexts (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003; Tao 2003; Biber 2006; Walsh et al 2011; Riordan 2012; Evison 2013). This approach has also been successfully exploited for the analysis of EFL classroom discourse by Walsh (2003, 2006, 2011) and Nicaise (2015) drawing on corpora specifically compiled for this purpose in British (Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011) and Belgian (Nicaise 2015) contexts. Historical approaches to the analysis of L2 classroom are briefly reviewed in the following section in order to better gauge the benefits of a combined DA/CL approach in the present study.

### 4.2.3 Historical Approaches to the Analysis of L2 Classroom Discourse

Many different approaches to the study of classroom interaction have emerged over the past fifty years, with researchers often struggling to find an appropriate approach and methodology to suit their particular research aims and needs (Tsui 2001: 122). Earlier approaches were shaped by a ‘best methods’ evaluative concern, often with the aim of developing teacher competencies and raising awareness in teacher education contexts (Walsh 2006: 44-45). These were quantitative in nature and typically relied on systems-based
observation schedules. Their focus was on classroom language although they were originally intended for use in content classrooms. These schedules allowed researchers to record aspects of classroom behaviour in relation to discreet categories. Of these, the FIAC System (Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories) (Flanders 1970) is probably the best known. Research instruments were later developed specifically for the foreign language classroom, notably the Flint system (Moskowicz 1971) and the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching). These were directly linked to communicative methodology and were used to evaluate how instructional differences impact on learning outcomes (Allen, Frohlich and Spada 1984: 88-89). The COLT system also included a focus on teacher verbal instruction, with the quality of teacher questions regarded as a key area of related research interest (ibid 1984: 88-89).

Systems-based approaches had offered the potential for a more objective and scientific approach to the analysis of classroom discourse. However, it was increasingly recognised that they could provide only a partial picture of classroom processes as they tended to focus on what was observable or measurable in the classroom rather than ‘unobservable’ influences (Nunan 1989; Wallace 1998; Tsui 2001). Seedhouse (1996: 42) has highlighted as a major deficiency of these types of instruments, their failure to take account of context. Instead, they tended to evaluate all varieties of L2 classroom interaction from a single perspective and according to a single set of pre-fixed criteria that did not always match the patterns of interaction that were observed (ibid: 42). This led to the search for alternative means of recording and describing the interaction patterns of L2 classrooms that could take into account contextual factors and the complexity of the processes involved.

This endeavour coincided with a shift towards the development of more qualitative ethnographic approaches to research in education, reflecting changing trends in teacher education more widely (Tsui 2001: 122). From this, ad hoc ethnographic approaches to classroom interaction analysis emerged, alongside new types of instruments designed to enable researchers to explore specific pedagogic problems or areas of interest through up-close and finely-grained observation (Wallace 1991: 78). Walsh (2006: 44) has observed that by focusing on the detail of the interaction, ethnographic approaches and frameworks have allowed practitioners access to and understanding of complex phenomena which might otherwise take years of classroom experience to acquire. One such ad hoc approach is the
SETT (Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk) framework which was referred to in the review of the literature in Chapter Three. This was designed by Walsh (2003, 2006) with a view to enabling L2 teachers to develop awareness of the relationship between language use, interaction and opportunities for learning in the L2 context. This framework will be drawn on in the qualitative analysis in the present study to provide key contextual details relating to classroom modes and pedagogic goals and functions being performed when usages representing the specified varieties under investigation occur, to help gauge the suitability of their use by EFL teachers. Seedhouse (2004: 56) has pointed to the main advantage that ad hoc approaches bring, in general, which is that they make it possible for a detailed discourse analysis of the interactions between teachers and students, which systems based approaches could not provide. He has further argued that “the overwhelming majority of previous ethnographic approaches to L2 classroom interaction have implicitly or explicitly adopted what is fundamentally a discourse analysis approach” (ibid: 56). This brings us to a review of DA approaches to L2 classroom discourse and the specific benefits they bring for the analysis of EFL classroom discourse.

4.2.4 DA Approaches to L2 Classroom Analysis

DA approaches encompass a wide range of research paradigms which reflect one of two distinct research traditions: the first is the formalist/structuralist approach to DA. This focuses primarily on the way different units function in relation to each other, but generally disregards the functional relations within the discourse context (Schiffrin 2000: 8). The second is the functionalist approach, which is concerned with the description of linguistic forms in relation to the purpose they are designed to fulfil (Brown and Yule 1983: 1). This study adopts the latter approach, although at times it also makes reference to notions that originated within the former tradition but are now widely used. For instance, earlier DA approaches were guided by principles from structural-functional linguistics, with the descriptive system proposed by Sinclair and Coulthard (1975: 11-29) being the most well-known. This introduced the notion of an IRF or IRE structure as a feature of classroom communication in both content-based and L2 teaching contexts, with I corresponding to teacher Initiation, R to student Response and F/E to optional Feedback or teacher
Evaluation. This approach is now widely accepted and used in studies of classroom interaction in order to identify recurrent patterns of discourse and to organize them hierarchically (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Edwards and Westgate 1994).

However, limitations have also arisen with this approach, (see Mayher 1990; Wu 1998; Walsh 2006). For instance, the formal ritualized teacher/learner interactions that existed in mainstream educational contexts at the time of Sinclair and Coulthard’s original research have since been replaced by learner-initiated communication, more equal turn-taking and less reliance on teacher-fronted modes of learning, in many educational contexts (Walsh 2006: 45). Structural-functionalist approaches have also been criticised because they do not take into account the fact that utterances can perform any number of functions depending on crucial contextual cues (Stubbs 1983; Levinson 1983). As Walsh has further observed, this makes it impossible to explore subtle forces at work, such as role relationships, context and socio-cultural norms (2006: 45). These limitations led to the development of conversation analysis (CA) as a sub-field of DA, which brought an increased focus on the context of classroom interactions.

CA was influenced in its development by sociolinguistics, and stems from an increased interest in the function of language as a means for social interaction (Sacks et al 1974). CA methodologies are based on the underlying belief that social contexts are not static but are constantly being shaped by the participants through their use of language (Walsh et al 2011). This leads to an examination of classroom interactional processes in relation to meaning and context (Heritage 1997). A further related research paradigm is institutional conversation analysis (IDA), which explores the unique interactional patterning that occurs in different institutional contexts or discourse communities and sets them apart from others (Drew and Heritage 1992; Tao 2003; Evison 2013). An institutional discourse CA methodology is based on the premise of the centrality of talk to many work tasks, in the sense that all institutions have goals which result in a unique interactional patterning that differentiates them from other institutional contexts (Drew and Heritage 1992). By examining specific features such as turn-taking, lexical choice, asymmetry of roles and so on in the institutional interaction, an understanding can be gained of how the context is constantly shaped by these goals (Walsh 2006: 32).
Researchers who have applied this approach to the L2 classroom have sought to justify this position by proposing that classroom discourse can be described as ‘conversation’, as it is for the most part a two-way construct between teachers and learners and between learners and their peers. Similarly, it involves turn-taking, topic switches and many of the features of routine conversation such as false starts, hesitations, error, silence, back-channelling and so on (Edwards and Westgate 1994; Walsh 2006). From this, researchers have argued that a CA methodology is better equipped to interpret and account for the multi-layered structure of classroom interaction than traditional functional systemic approaches are. It is also considered suitable for accounting for the interaction patterns of a specific institutional setting, such as an L2 classroom, where goals are pre-determined (Walsh 2006: 45). However, this approach, when used in isolation, also has limitations in that it fails to take account of the functional and pragmatic dimensions of L2 classroom language use, as well as critical socio-linguistic and socio-political influences (ibid: 45).

Functional discourse approaches offer alternative frameworks to explore patterns of grammatical and lexical use when different pedagogic functions are being performed by teachers during the lesson, the socio-pragmatic and cultural motivations underlying the linguistic choices made and issues pertaining to appropriacy in relation to context and setting. This approach derives from the work of Speech Act theorists in the field of pragmatics (Austin 1962; Searle 1969), which proposed a typology of ‘actions’ that are performed by language. These fall into five broad categories: 1) ‘Assertives/representatives’, which are used to describe or assert something; 2) ‘Directives’, which are expressions of desires and include orders and requests; 3) Commissions, used to express intentions such as a promise; 4) Expressives, which reflect emotional responses to others as when apologising, giving thanks, and congratulating; 5) Declaratives, which are used to make statements (Austin 1962). This typology has since been adapted and extended as researchers have discovered that speech acts are infinitely more diverse and finely-grained than was originally proposed (see Marquez Reiter 2000; Tsui 1996). This approach has been influential in providing an analytical framework for the study of the functional purposes for which language is used, in both social and professional contexts. In this regard, language functions are viewed as the linguistic means and strategies for the realisation of speech acts (McCarthy 2008: 16).
The use of a functional discourse approach in this study makes it possible to explore the suitability of the language use of teachers at stages of the lesson when issues of ‘power’ and ‘face’ are likely to arise (Brown and Levinson 1987), as highlighted in the review of the literature in Chapter Three. From this, further understandings can be gained into the relationship between the nature of teacher talk, pedagogic goals and learning opportunities. Compatible with this approach are Vygotskyan perspectives and frameworks provided by socio-cultural approaches to teaching and learning from mainstream education and SLA, which provide the theoretical basis of this study alongside input and interactionist theories, as highlighted in Chapter Three. Researchers working within the socio-cultural tradition in the L2 classroom context have been concerned with exploring the type of supportive talk that teachers can use in their interactions with learners to facilitate comprehension, and thereby enhance opportunities for acquisition (Long 1983, 1996; Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011).

Critical linguists have argued that understanding the dynamics of the social interaction in the L2 classroom also requires that wider sociolinguistic and socio-political considerations are taken into account, as they shape the expectations, beliefs, identities, voices, anxieties and fears of the discourse participants (Kumaradivelu 1999; Pennycook 2000; Canagarajah 2006b). The current research also addresses the ideological underpinnings of ELT practice by exploring the question of the legitimacy of the use of spoken varieties that have been accorded ‘low prestige’ in the ELT world on ideological grounds. This includes usages found exclusively in IE as a variety, and others that are more widely used in the English-speaking world. The challenges posed for EFL teachers in terms of reconciling the use of these forms of expression with normative requirements and learner preferences are also addressed. Having set out and rationalised the DA approach drawn on in the present study to address the stated research objectives, arguments for the use of CL as an accompanying methodology to enhance this approach are presented in the next section.

4.2.5 Corpus Linguistics as an Approach

The advent of CL in the 1960s, and its subsequent development, has in many ways heralded a new era of the scientific study of language. This is not least because it has allowed
researchers to access large banks of language data in the form of language corpora, which can be analysed with statistical accuracy using the appropriate software (see Biber 1990; Leech 1991; Tognini-Bonelli 2001; Evison 2010). A corpus is therefore a collection of language data brought together for linguistic analysis, which is used to test hypotheses about language (Crystal 1995: 450). While there is a lack of consensus as to whether CL constitutes a theoretical approach or a methodology, in this study it is used as methodology in line with Biber et al (1999), Tognini–Bonelli (2001, 2012) and many others, (see O'Keeffe and Farr 2003; Carter and McCarthy 2006; Walsh et al (2011).

A further key distinction made in this field is between corpus-driven and corpus-based approaches, although Lindquist has pointed out that “there is a spectrum of research positions between these two poles” (2009: 10). Corpus-driven linguistics involves the researcher working with the data with as few preconceived ideas as possible and then arriving at an analysis inductively. Corpus-based approaches, on the other hand, test hypotheses based on already existing linguistic theories and frameworks (Tognini-Bonelli 2001). A related approach is where researchers draw on corpus data mainly to find illustrative examples, which is termed corpus-assisted or corpus-supported research (Lindquist 2009: 26). In this study, a corpus-based approach is used which draws on corpora designed by the researcher to test assumptions about the language use of EFL teachers, in conjunction with theories and frameworks from discipline-specific research paradigms within the broad field of DA.

The advantages of CL are now widely acknowledged, (see O'Keeffe and Farr 2003; McCarthy 2008; Evison 2010; Chambers, Farr and O’Riordan 2011; Murphy and Riordan 2016). For instance, it is empirically-based, thereby enabling actual patterns of naturally-occurring language to be analysed in both written and transcribed spoken texts through the effective use of computer assisted techniques and specialized tools such as concordancing. This application makes it possible to find every occurrence of a word or a phrase in a surrounding context, to identify grammatical and lexical patterning (O’Keeffe et al 2007). It can also measure frequencies, in order to establish the extent of usage of particular words and phrases and to provide statistical evidence of the likelihood of word associations. Software programmes that have been developed for these purposes include Wordsmith (Scott 1999, 2004), Monoconc (2000) and Antconc (2010) amongst many others, all of which are regularly up-dated.
Corpus linguists can now avail of a wide range of written and spoken corpora to suit different research goals (Evison and McCarthy 2004; Evison 2010; Murphy and Riordan 2016). These include large-scale corpora comprising hundreds of millions of words (such as the British National Corpus (BNC)) and smaller, domain specific corpora often designed for action research purposes with specific research questions and research applications in mind (Linquist 2009: 5-8), as is the case in this study. Corpus research has also been facilitated by the new generation of spoken corpora such as the spoken component of the BNC developed in the 1990s and comprising over ten million words. Similarly, the ICE corpus, which was initiated in the 1980s, now comprises sub-sets of national varieties including IE, as was highlighted in the review of the literature in Chapter Two.

Notwithstanding these advantages, corpus experts have stressed key considerations that arise in relation to the suitability and representativeness of corpora (Lindquist 2009; Walsh et al 2011). For instance, the purposes of the research must be considered when either selecting or compiling a corpus, and the proportion of texts included must be considered to ensure balance and representativeness (O’Keeffe and Farr 2003; McCarthy 2008; Murphy and Riordan 2016). The need for the design process to be documented so that the validity of the claims made in relation to the findings can be measured has also been emphasized by Clancy (2010: 12). Size of corpora is a further major consideration; larger corpora are generally seen to offer advantages when examining relatively infrequent words and the generality of their lexical use (Coxhead 2000). Smaller corpora, on the other hand, are beneficial when searching for high frequency items as the amount of data is more manageable. Biber (1990), for example, has shown how small samples can provide reliable results when focusing on grammatical items such as pronouns or tenses. The use of small, domain-specific corpora can also offer detailed insights into context-specific processes, which makes their use particularly suitable for classroom-based research that is conducted with local contexts and practices in mind (McCarthy 1991, 2008; Walsh 2003, 2006; Walsh et al 2011; Vaughan and Clancy 2013; Murphy and Riordan 2016). As the methodological discussion which follows will highlight, these considerations were taken into account in the corpus design in this study in order to ensure its compatibility with the research aims and purpose. The specific benefits that can be expected from the use of a combined DA/CL approach in the present research are appraised in the next section.
4.2.6 The Benefits and Rationale for a Corpus-assisted DA Approach in the Present Study

Numerous advantages can be expected from the corpus-assisted DA approach adopted in this study. First, it will make it possible to arrive at an accurate statistical account of the extent to which specific linguistic items, representing distinct types of spoken English, are used by the participating teachers. It will also facilitate the quantitative analysis of variants of these items in terms of establishing frequencies, and patterns of use of the specified items and their variants that are salient in this discourse context. This will be achieved through tools and applications from the Antconc (2010) software programme, including frequency counts, concordancing and key word searches, as described in greater detail in the corpus analysis. From this, more qualitative DA investigations can be undertaken to explore the socio-pragmatic and discourse functions performed by particular usages in the EFL discourse at specific points in the lesson and in relation to pedagogic goals, in order to determine their significance and suitability. In order to gain key contextual details, the SETT framework designed by Walsh (2006: 166-8) will be drawn on in the qualitative analysis, as referred to in the review of the literature in Chapter Three of this study, and revisited later in this chapter in some depth. The CL/DA analytic approach adopted is thereby multi-layered to take account of the complexities and multi-faceted nature of teacher talk in the EFL classroom context. This approach is considered compatible with the aims and intended applications of this research, as set out in Chapter One. At this stage, it is further worth highlighting that while this study is concerned with the global ideologies underpinning ELT practices, this aspect is explored as one of several factors influencing teachers’ perspectives and target model choices. Therefore, the present approach featuring computer-assisted discourse analysis is seen to be more compatible with the research aims than computer-assisted critical discourse analysis, as it allows for the multi-dimensional investigation and interpretation envisaged in this study rather than an exclusive focus on the ways in which English language ideologies play out in the ELT discourse context as would be more in keeping with the latter approach. Having presented and rationalized the research approach, the following section explores the methodology used to complement it.
4.3 Methodology

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, this study featured a triangulated methodology involving teacher classroom corpora, teacher surveys and teacher semi-structured interviews. This methodology was employed in order to explore the relationship between the participants’ language awareness, language attitudes and language use, and to enhance the validity and credibility of the findings in general. In the subsequent discussion, the research methodology is described and rationalised in relation to the research context, the primary data and the research instruments, the procedures and considerations which arose in its implementation, ethical questions and the role/s of the researcher.

4.3.1 Research Context

The context for this study was a one year full-time MA in TESOL course held at a third-level institution in Ireland. The programme was established in 2001 and comprises core modules in language pedagogy and language systems. They run in conjunction with a teaching practice (TP) elective, which is compulsory for all recruits with less than three years teaching experience. The language pedagogy module aims to provide student teachers with an understanding of the theoretical perspectives which underpin English language teaching; classroom management skills and strategies; vocabulary and grammar teaching; effective lesson planning and reflective practice. TP typically requires student teachers to teach a one-hour EFL lesson every week to Erasmus and international students studying at the university. EFL classes are taught at advanced, upper-intermediate and intermediate levels. TP begins in Week 5 of Semester 1 and a second module runs in Semester 2 from Week 2 to Week 12. Student teachers initially teach with experienced teachers, who assume a mentoring role during the first few weeks of TP. TP lessons are routinely recorded and observed by TP supervisors (for approximately 60% of an individual’s teaching practice). They are followed by an individual feedback session between TP supervisor and supervisee, usually conducted a day or so after the lesson.
4.3.2 The Primary Data and the Research Instruments

The primary data for the study was sourced from three research instruments, and comprised:

- Quantitative and qualitative data from a 60,000-word corpus of EFL teacher talk. This consisted of two 30,000 word sub-corpora compiled from recordings of EFL classes taught by student teachers and experienced teachers, labelled (STTIL), (student teacher talk at intermediate level), and (ETTIL), (experienced teacher talk at intermediate-level)

- Quantitative and qualitative data from on-line teacher questionnaires, in the area of language awareness and language attitudes

- Qualitative data from semi-dyadic structured interviews between the researcher and the teachers in the area of language awareness, and language attitudes

4.3.3 The Participating Teachers and the Criteria used for their Selection

A total of twenty EFL teachers participated in this study: that is, ten student teachers and ten experienced teachers. The student teachers were enrolled on the MA TESOL programme over two consecutive years between 2011 and 2013. The ten experienced teachers were employed by the institution to teach English to EFL learners on site. In line with the research aims, the following criteria were used for the selection of the teachers:

- All were native speakers of English (NES) and of Irish nationality

- The novices had no prior qualifications or teaching experience in the ELT field prior to entering the MA programme
• The experienced teachers held a post-graduate teaching qualification in TESOL and had a minimum of five years’ teaching experience

This established two distinct teacher groupings to allow for comparative analyses to be made in relation to the main areas of enquiry. A detailed demographic profile of the teachers is provided in Section 4.4 of this chapter.

4.3.4 The EFL Learners, and the Criteria used for their Selection

The selection of the EFL learners whose classes were recorded was based on the following criteria:

• They came either from Erasmus exchange programmes or international study programmes that were held at the third level institution between 2011 and 2012

• All were at the intermediate level of proficiency in English; that is, B1/B2 on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which is the lowest level that is taught at this institution. This decision was informed by the research literature in SLA which has indicated that comprehension difficulties arising from the use of informal grammar and lexis by teachers are likely to be greatest for learners at lower levels of proficiency (Long and Sato 1983, Pica 1991, 1994a, 1994b; Long 1996; Walsh 2003, 2006). This leads to the expectation that EFL teachers use speech modifications when teaching learners at lower levels of proficiency, in order to facilitate comprehension and acquisition. Selecting classes at the intermediate level therefore created greater opportunities to explore the teachers’ insights and expertise in this area

• The EFL classes recorded reflected a multicultural mix so that issues relating to the inter-cultural awareness and socio-pragmatic skills of teachers could be explored. Each group featured learners from European, Middle Eastern and Asian backgrounds. The class sizes were typically fifteen to twenty students, who in all cases were young
The lessons taught were based on a general English content, and used a main CLT course book, *New Inside Out Intermediate* (MacMillan 2009).

The teachers in both groupings had previously taught the EFL learners on at least two occasions. This ensured that they were familiar with the group and the teaching context.

### 4.3.5 Corpus Design and Key Considerations

The corpus was designed with the following considerations in mind:

- It was compiled from classroom recordings of EFL classes taught in Ireland by NESTs from an IE background, in order to enable an investigation of issues that are pertinent to the use of this variety in the local classroom context.

- It featured sub-corpora of novice and experienced teacher talk to allow for a comparative analysis, for teacher education purposes.

- The choice of a small corpus of 60,000 words was considered compatible with the linguistic focus of the research, given that previous studies have proven the reliability of small corpora for the analysis of linguistic usages where high frequencies are expected (such as pronouns, and pragmatic markers), as is the aim in this study (Biber 1990; O’Keeffe and Farr 2002; Vaughan and Clancy 2011; Clancy and Vaughan 2012).

- The use of a small corpus was also considered suitable for the investigation of linguistic items with low statistical saliency (such as grammatical usages at the level of tense/aspect), which are also investigated in this study. It also facilitates the intensive reading of transcripts in order to help identify, and interpret instances of use of individual and multiword items which are multifunctional in nature. This is consistent with McCarthy (1998), Promodrou (2003), Farrell (2004) and Murphy and Farr (2009, 2012).
4.3.6 Corpus Data and Procedures for the Compilation of ETTIL/STTIL

Primary data was collected from classroom recordings of EFL classes taught by the teachers in each grouping. This data was used to compile the two sub-corpora ETTIL and STTIL over two consecutive academic years. In each year, a cohort of five teachers in each grouping contributed fifty minutes each of spoken data from a lesson they had taught. The total recording time for the lessons for each cohort of teachers in each of the two academic years was therefore four hours and ten minutes, making a total of eight hours and twenty minutes. From this, data relating exclusively to interactions between the teacher and the learners in each lesson was used to compile each sub-corpus. This meant excluding all data relating to the interactions between learners in pairs or groups and data from recordings used for listening tasks.

An equal amount of data, that is three thousand words, was used for the compilation of each sub-corpus to ensure comparability (see section 4.3.7 below for further discussion of the comparability and representativeness of the data). This was achieved by including the first three thousand words generated of teacher talk in each fifty minute lesson. Accordingly, each sub-corpus comprised three thousand words of data from each teacher in each teacher grouping. This made a total of 30,000 words for the 10 teachers in each cohort, and 60,000 words in total for the entire corpus collected over the two-year period.

The recordings were made in classrooms designated for teaching purposes and followed a similar format, with each class taught for fifty minutes. As is customary for TP, a DVD recording camera was set up discreetly at the back of the classroom and each of the teaching practice sessions was recorded onto DVD for the novices to watch and reflect on before meeting their supervisor for feedback. For the purposes of this research an audio recorder was also used to record the classes. It was discreetly placed by the researcher on the teacher’s desk at the front of the classroom, with the full consent of the teacher, and was operated by the teacher involved. Recordings were carried out between weeks six and eight of the first fifteen-week academic semester in each year. No supervisor was present during the recording of the lessons.
4.3.7 Representativeness and Comparability of the Data

Labov (1972c: 181) identified concerns relating to validity in linguistic investigation in general when he referred to the ‘Observer’s Paradox’. This relates to the inherent problem that researchers face when trying to systematically observe and record users of the language, which is that the presence of an observer can influence the nature of the language produced by the research subjects in some way. In this study, there are several reasons to suggest that the observer’s presence has been reduced in relation to the corpus data:

- The presence and use of technology in the classroom is now commonplace and therefore not considered to act as a constraint or influence on the language use of the teachers and EFL learners involved

- All of the participants were used to being observed and video-recorded as part of their programme

- The recordings took place in a familiar context. This made the research process more natural for the participants, thereby reducing the types of barriers referred to originally by Labov (1972c: 110) in relation to interacting with strangers in one’s own culture

- Only the interactional language used between the teacher and the students throughout the duration of each fifty-minute lesson recorded was included in each sub-corpus

- Only the first three thousand words of teacher talk was included from each lesson taught by each teacher.
4.3.8 Transcription and Interpretation of the Corpus Data

Corpus analysts must anticipate difficulties when describing transcribed speech due to the problems associated with (re)capturing the authenticity of original context, which McCarthy (1998: 13) has identified as “as potentially infinite, to the extent that one could, theoretically, include in transcription any amount of contextual data […]”. The conventions used for the transcription of the classroom data in this study are those established originally by McCarthy in relation to the transcription of the CANCODE corpus. They were subsequently adapted by Farr, Murphy and O Keeffe (2004) for the purpose of compiling the LCIE, and have been used since for data analysis of this corpus and by members of the Inter-Varietal Applied Corpus Studies research group (IVACS). The benefits of a common transcription system for researchers working in related fields has been highlighted by Cooke (1990: 5) as it makes it possible for comparable research to be undertaken.

The system used in this study (http://www.ul.ie/~lcie/homepage.htm) is considered suitable for the research aims as it incorporates features such as pauses, silence and interruptions, and laughter, which are likely to be pertinent when investigating language use from SLA and pragmatic perspectives. A further advantage is that these conventions allowed for the text to be easily read for manual analysis as well as being machine-readable. This was considered to be essential, given the combined quantitative/qualitative approach used. The system selected also allowed for a transcription time of fifteen to twenty hours per one hour of recording, as advised by Farr (2005), using comparable data. This was considered reasonable for the amount of data involved in the present study (60,000 words).

The question of whether or not to tag the corpus was a further consideration that arose in the design process. Tagging refers to the process of labelling the parts of speech in a corpus according to word class by either manual, or electronic means, using classification systems developed by the researcher to suit the research goals (Lindquist 2009: 44). While this can be very useful, as it simplifies the analysis process in many ways, it was not used in the present study. This was mainly due to the nature of the linguistic items under investigation. For instance, they included complex verb constructions, multiword phrasal verb and slang expressions and pragmatic marker use that did not fit into pre-determined categories (Schiffrin 1987; Carter and McCarthy 2006). An acknowledged weakness of the transcription
system used in this study is that it omitted the phonemic features of the teachers’ speech whose tagging was not considered feasible. However, as the corpus was sourced from video recordings of classroom teaching, it was possible for the researcher to revisit the recordings to help with interpretation where needed.

A further, general point worth making is that qualitative analysis, by its very nature, involves moving away from the ‘data’ to the ‘comment’ (Holliday 2002: 120). This means making inferences from the words and actions of the participants, and trying to uncover their conscious and sub-conscious beliefs, which are difficult to interpret in a consistent or objective way (Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 36). Interpretive issues of this kind that arose in this study are further discussed, where relevant, in the analysis chapters. In this study, the corpus analysis was informed by the findings from the teacher questionnaires and interviews, which aided the interpretation of the participants’ linguistic practices in the classroom. This underscores the benefits of the triangulated methodology used in this study. To provide key contextual details to facilitate the analysis of the classroom data, an adapted version of the SETT framework designed by Walsh (2006: ) is also drawn on in this study, as discussed in detail in the following section.

4.3.9 Pedagogical Frameworks Used to Classify the Classroom Data: the SETT Model

The SETT model (Walsh (2006: ), as referred to earlier in the review of the literature in Chapter Three, was designed to enable up close analyses to be made by practitioners of the nature and role of their own L2 teacher talk in relation to key classroom micro-contexts, processes and goals, for awareness-raising purposes. It sets out four classroom modes which typically feature in an L2 lesson, as indicated in Table 4.1 below, alongside the related descriptors.
Table 4.1 SETT Model of Classroom Modes (Walsh 2006: 166-168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Mode</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Managerial</td>
<td>Setting up/finishing tasks/procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Materials</td>
<td>Focus on texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Classroom Context</td>
<td>Opinions and experiences being expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Skills &amp; Systems</td>
<td>Language content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, all occurrences of the specified items were classified in relation to the classroom micro-context in which they occurred, that is, the mode (Walsh 2008: 166), through up close searches of any concordance lines generated previously during the quantitative analysis. Transcripts of individual lessons and classroom recordings were also revisited where necessary to arrive at a more accurate identification and classification of the data. All instances of use were tabulated for each teacher where relevant, and the classroom mode in which it occurred (see Appendix F for sample of methods used). Following this, the pedagogic function associated with each occurrence of the item was identified using the adapted SETT model in order to establish trends and patterns of use where relevant, and for comparative analyses.

The rationale for adapting the original SETT model was to allow for a focus on teacher talk and functions performed by teachers. The adapted model therefore omitted all references to learner roles/features including two functions relating to student contributions that either echo or extend their turns. Reference to scaffolding was also omitted from the adapted model on the basis that this is a broad strategy that can be realised in conjunction with several of the specified functions, and by other means. This led to the inclusion of ten functions routinely performed by teacher talk in the L2 classroom instead of the range of thirteen set out in Walsh’s original model (2006: 166-168). The range of pedagogical functions explored included different types of questions, and directives that teachers use to manage the classroom and to check comprehension, confirmation and progress, as set out in Table 4.2 below alongside descriptors in each case, which again, are those provided by Walsh (ibid: 166-168). These functions were also selected on the basis that they provided opportunities to explore both the interactional and relational aspects of teacher talk. This included issues
pertaining to face management by teachers in micro-contexts where sensitivities and face threats arose for learners.

Table 4.2 Pedagogic functions of teacher talk in the L2 classroom (adapted from Walsh 2006: 166-168)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogic Functions</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehension check</td>
<td>Checking the students have understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confirmation check</td>
<td>Checking the teacher has correctly understood a learner contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content feedback</td>
<td>Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Direct repair</td>
<td>Correcting an error quickly and directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Directive</td>
<td>Instructions/navigating the learners from task to task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Display question</td>
<td>Asking questions to which teacher knows the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluative feedback</td>
<td>Giving feedback to the words rather than the message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Explanation</td>
<td>Explaining a point including a language point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Progress check</td>
<td>Checking learners have successfully completed a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Referential question</td>
<td>Genuine questions to which the answer is not known by teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having described and rationalised the approach and methodology used for the generation of the classroom data, and the pedagogical frameworks drawn on in this study to help identify, classify and interpret the classroom data in relation to key contextual influences, the design and rationale for the two complementary research instruments are discussed in the following two sections.

4.3.10 On-line Teacher Questionnaire

The second research instrument employed to collect primary data for the study was the on-line teacher questionnaire (Appendix C). As described by Murray and Brubaker “a questionnaire is a research instrument consisting of a series of questions people answer about their life conditions, beliefs or attitudes” (2000: 154). The on-line questionnaire used in this study was designed to gather additional primary data to explicitly explore the teachers’ awareness and attitudes in relation to different types of spoken English grammatical and lexical usage, in order to uncover possible correlations between these dimensions and the teachers’ target English use with learners. In so doing, it was also intended that opportunities
would be created to explore the participants’ awareness and attitudes towards ‘standard/non-standard’ English more widely.

The complexities involved in examining and measuring beliefs and attitudes are widely recognised (Baker 1992; Spolsky 2000). They stem in general from two main issues; the first is the ‘halo factor’, which is a term used to describe the tendency for participants to provide socially desirable responses to researcher’s questions in order to portray themselves in a more favourable light (Baker 1992: 19). The second difficulty is that participants’ responses may be influenced by the researcher, and the perceived purpose of the research. Spolsky (2000: 16) has advised that researchers must take account of these considerations in the design process as far as possible, in order to maintain the reliability and validity of the data.

4.3.10.1 Design of On-Line Teacher Questionnaire

The design of the questionnaire was influenced by similar methods used in the field of perceptual dialectology to investigate attitudes to different regional and social dialects (Preston 1999: 23-29). Researchers in this field have focused on exploring where non-linguists believe language variation exists, the factors they attribute in order to explain it and how they believe it functions. They have also considered the social attributes assigned to different regional or social forms of expression and the emotional responses generated as a result of the social, historical and cultural associations embedded in them, which in turn, may influence their use or rejection of these forms (ibid: 23-29). Accordingly, it was considered relevant and appropriate to use similar techniques to explore teachers’ language attitudes and the relationship between their attitudes and their linguistic choices in their professional practices. Preston (1999: 23-29), for instance, used surveys in which participants were asked to identify and make subjective evaluations about different regional and social dialects based on aspects of phonological, grammatical and lexical usage, such as how correct/pleasant/formal/polite/educated they are comparatively. The on-line survey designed for this study was based on a simplified version of this model, and similar to a more recent version used by Jenkins (2007) to explore the attitudes of EFL teachers towards different varieties of English, as highlighted in Table 4.3 below.
Table 4.3: Questions featuring in the on-line teacher questionnaire and focus areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Area of Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a) Have you ever heard this type of language used? Give details.</td>
<td>Passive familiarity/formal linguistic knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b) Have you ever used this type of language? Give details.</td>
<td>Reported everyday practices/macrosociolinguistic influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c) In which country/countries is this type of language commonly used? Give details.</td>
<td>Awareness of varieties/cross-varietal distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d) In which context/s is this type of language commonly used? Give details.</td>
<td>Awareness of situational influences/degree of informality/formality expressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a) Do you think this type of language is suitable for social contexts of use? Give reasons.</td>
<td>English language attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b) Do you think this type of language is suitable for English language teachers to use? Give reasons.</td>
<td>Awareness of target English norms in ELT/role of teacher talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c) Do you think this type of language is suitable to be taught as a target model for English language learners? Give reasons.</td>
<td>Attitudes towards target models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section One of the questionnaire initially gathered demographic information relating to the participants’ sociolinguistic backgrounds and their prior educational and language learning experiences, to help contextualise the data analysis (see Section 4.4 of this chapter). Following this, in Section Two, sets of questions were asked, designed to help investigate the teachers’ awareness, reported everyday practices and language attitudes in relation to the specified grammatical/pragmatic usages, representing the two types of spoken English under investigation. These are highlighted in Table 4.3 previously, alongside the area of focus of
enquiry in each case. The questions in the on-line questionnaires related to four locutions sourced from the STTIL transcripts after intensive reading, as presented in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.4: Sample locutions in the on-line teacher questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Locutions and Linguistic Items</th>
<th>Category of Spoken English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. I’m after forgetting the books.</td>
<td>1. Regionally-differentiated grammar (RDG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Would ye like to talk about it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>2. Socially-differentiated grammar (SDG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. What do you mean, like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each locution featured a usage that represented one of the two specified categories of spoken English under investigation, as set out in Chapter One, alongside the systems of classification used and the rationale. The teachers were also given opportunities to re-write any locutions they considered unacceptable, which created opportunities to explore their understandings in relation to ‘standard’/non-standard’ English more widely. The procedures used for the implementation of the on-line questionnaires are discussed in the next section, starting with the piloting process.

4.3.10.2 Procedures for the Collection of the On-Line Questionnaire Data

A pilot study is an important component of any research project (Cohen et al 2000: 206) and likely to be essential when the aim of the research is to explore the evaluations and behaviours of participants, given the complexities involved. Pilot studies are generally designed to test the design of a research instrument and the procedures for gathering data, prior to a larger study. This is done with a view to improving the quality and efficacy of the research, as they can reveal deficiencies in these areas and allow them to be addressed. In the present study, the on-line survey was piloted with the help of two student teachers and two experienced teachers who were involved in the MA TESOL programme, but who did not participate in the present research. This took place one month prior to their intended administration. The pilot study resulted in a number of adaptations to the questions that
featured in the survey in order to address ambiguities which might otherwise have reduced the quality of the responses from the participants.

To ensure comparability and minimise possible influences on the participants’ viewpoints, the survey was delivered in on-line mode and administered two weeks after the classroom recordings were made. The participants were given twenty-four hours to complete and return it, which was considered sufficient time to be able to answer the questions in some depth after time for reflection. To ensure the integrity of their answers, participants were requested not to consult with each other about the questions. All of the questionnaires were returned in the designated time allocated. The data was then explored manually using quantitative and qualitative methods and coded thematically in relation to the three main areas of language awareness, reported linguistic practices and language attitudes, and related sub-themes, as described in the analytical discussion in Chapter Five. Having established the role of the on-line teacher questionnaire in the present study and the related methods the semi-structured interviews, which featured as the third research instrument in this study, are analysed in the next section.

4.3.11 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews between the researcher and the teachers were also included in the research design, in order to explore their perceptions of current and future challenges in their target English role and practices. Cohen et al (2007) have provided a detailed account of the interview models available to researchers in the social sciences to generate data for mainly qualitative research, of which the semi-structured interview is consistent with those which are participatory and emancipatory in nature. That is, the interviews involved face-to-face interviewing between researcher and respondents and provided the opportunity for insights into participants’ perceptions and values to be explored, and to generate rich data for qualitative analysis. Unlike structured interviews (which are based on a rigorous set of questions from which interviewers do not divert) semi-structured interviews are usually based around a framework of themes allowing interviews to evolve more freely and flexibly. The format used for this purpose in this study was influenced by Farrell (2016: 81) and Tsui
(2011: 32), where individual dyadic interviews were successfully used to explore novice EFL teachers’ challenges in relation to different aspects of their classroom practices.

Punch (2001) has observed that the success and validity of an interview rests on the extent to which the respondents’ opinions are truly reflected. Thus, the types of questions used by the researcher must not be ‘leading’ in nature or otherwise influence the outcomes. For this reason, the semi-structured interviews comprised two open-ended questions designed to generate qualitative data in relation to the teachers’ critical understandings of their target English role and practices, and the ways in which they might be changing.

**Question 1:**
*What challenges do you currently face in your target English role and practices as an EFL teacher?*

**Question 2:**
*In what way is the changing English language landscape likely to impact on your future target English role and practices?*

The procedures used to generate the interview data and to guarantee its validity and integrity are set out in the next section.

**4.3.11.1 Procedures for the Collection of the Interview Data**

The semi-structured interviews took place two weeks after the questionnaires were collected. This allowed time for the researcher to examine the participants’ responses to the on-line questionnaires and to view the classroom recordings, which influenced the design of the interview questions. All of the participating teachers were invited to take part in the interviews, in order to ensure a maximum degree of participation and representativeness. However, only five teachers in each grouping responded to this request, due to work and study commitments. The interviews were conducted in a university common room over a
two-day period and lasted approximately fifteen minutes each. They were recorded and transcribed using similar recording and transcription conventions to those used for the classroom data. The data gathered was then explored manually using quantitative and qualitative methods. The process used to code the data thematically involved identifying all references made in the teachers’ verbalisations to challenges and changes in their target English practices. This further included related items that were close in meaning such as issues/difficulties/problems/uncertainties/concerns in the case of the former, and new/recent/emergent trends, developments or advances in the case of the latter, whether explicitly or implicitly expressed. These were then tabulated for the number of references made to specific challenges or changes, and categorised into five broad related themes that emerged in the data relating to both questions. These included: target models, different aspects of teacher talk, classroom management, classroom relationships and the teaching of grammar. The key findings in this area are discussed in Chapter Seven where they are drawn on and integrated into the final conclusions of the study. Samples of the data generated, and the coding process used in the analysis are also provided in Appendix G.

4.3.12 Summary of Data Generation Process and Timeframe

For the purpose of clarity, a summary is provided in Table 4.4 below of the data gathering process used in this study and the related timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Instrument</th>
<th>Data Sourced</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60,000 word corpus:</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative from EFL classes taught by ten novice and ten experienced teachers</td>
<td>Weeks 6-8, Semester 1</td>
<td>Weeks 6-8, Semester 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL: 30,000 sub-corpus</td>
<td>3000 words each from 5 teachers in each cohort</td>
<td>Total: 15,000 words</td>
<td>3000 words each from 5 teachers in each cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL: 30,000 sub-corpus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 15,000 words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Line Questionnaire</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative from ten novice and ten</td>
<td>Week 10, Semester 1</td>
<td>Week 10, Semester 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To complete the methodological discussion, the ethical issues that arose, the role/s ascribed to the researcher, the delimitations, and the secondary data drawn on are explored in the following section.

### 4.3.13 Ethical Considerations

All research involves issues of confidentiality and ethical considerations, particularly where opinions, beliefs and educational practices are concerned. In order to ensure that ethical considerations were attended to and respected in this study, the researcher took several measures to protect the rights and confidentiality of the subjects involved. First, the pre-written agreement of each of the participants was obtained and kept on record (Appendix A); second, all names were anonymised in the transcripts of the recordings; the participants were also informed of their right to view the transcripts of the recordings before they were computerised and to withdraw from the project at any stage (Appendix A); full ethical approval for the research was sought and obtained from the Ethics Board of the institution in question (Appendix B). To minimize any possible influence on the linguistic behaviour of the participants, neither the teachers nor the learners involved were given specific details of the nature of the research.

### 4.3.14 Researcher Role/s

The researcher designed and distributed the questionnaires, compiled the corpora, formulated the questions in the semi-structured interviews and interviewed the participants. Both emic and etic researcher roles were ascribed in the study (Pike 1967). To minimise any potential influences arising in relation to the Observers’ Paradox and to ensure greater objectivity
an on-line delivery mode was used for the questionnaires and the researcher was not present when the recordings were made. Meanwhile, for the semi-structured interviews, the researcher adopted a more participatory role as this created opportunities to explore aspects of the findings and data which had not previously been fully exploited. Therefore, while it can be argued that emic approaches in general lack objectivity (Morris 1999), in the case of action research it is vital to draw on the researcher’s insider awareness of the subtleties and intricacies of the practices involved to be able to interpret the thoughts and actions of the participants which are likely to be bound up with localised norms (ibid: 782).

One key concern which arose in relation to the researcher’s etic role is the fact that the researcher is a member of the teaching staff on the MA TESOL programme which provided the research context. This may have compromised the validity of the novice teacher questionnaires and interview data as they may have felt less willing to disclose information concerning their professional practices which they felt portrayed them in a negative light. It is hoped that this drawback was compensated for in the overall research design, which balanced both etic and emic researcher roles. In support of this approach, it is also worth highlighting that the pedagogic principles and ethos which underpin the programme are those which encourage open and critical discussion in a tolerant and non-judgemental learning environment. Finally, in compliance with the stringent ethical standards and provisions set out by the Ethics Committee in the institution in question, the teachers in this study were all made fully aware of the nature of their participatory role in the study and their right to withdraw at any stage should they so wish.

### 4.3.15 Delimitations

The data collected was limited to twenty teachers. While it was recognised that a larger sample would have supplied more representative empirical data, the logistics of acquiring such a sample for a study of this scope rendered it impracticable. A further limitation was that the corpus data was gathered from individual lessons taught by different teachers on different days. This meant that the collected samples were lesson-based rather than course-based. In this sense, they represented discontinuous one-off sessions rather than language use over a
full course. Accordingly, it was not possible to investigate whether the same language use was repeated by the same teacher throughout the course or whether the speech patterns of teachers changed over time. This also meant that it was not possible to measure the frequency with which the same language was used over time. These limitations were partially addressed by the complementary use of teacher questionnaires and interviews which provided qualitative data concerning the reported linguistic behaviour of the teachers in the classroom context and their related beliefs.

4.3.16 Secondary Data and Additional Corpus Data

The secondary data used in this study consisted of published and unpublished literature deemed relevant to the research. For comparative analytical purposes, a range of corpora representing distinct varieties and genres of spoken English (McCarthy 1998: 10) was drawn on, as set out in Table 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpora</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Variety/Genre represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>30,000 words</td>
<td>Experienced EFL teacher talk at the intermediate level (IE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>30,000 words</td>
<td>Student EFL teacher talk at the intermediate level (IE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>130,000 words</td>
<td>Experienced EFL teacher talk (beg. to adv. levels taught by NESTs from a range of Inner Circle backgrounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBEL</td>
<td>1.5 million words</td>
<td>Third level institutional talk in the IE setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>1 million words</td>
<td>Conversational English in the IE setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-IRELAND</td>
<td>0.75 million words</td>
<td>Formal and professional talk in the IE setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-GB</td>
<td>0.75 million words</td>
<td>Formal and professional talk in the BE setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-US</td>
<td>0.75 million words</td>
<td>Formal and professional talk in the AE setting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having provided a detailed description and rationalization of the research methodology, a demographic profile is presented next of the ten teachers in each professional grouping, drawing on the questionnaire data.

### 4.4 Demographic Profile of the Twenty Teacher Participants

Question 1a) to 1c) in Section One of the questionnaire canvassed information about the regional background, age and gender of the teachers. In the research design, an attempt was made to recruit an equal number of female/male participants and to ensure an even balance of teachers from all three provinces of the Republic of Ireland so that gender and regional background could be considered as underlying macro-sociolinguistic variables. The demographic data gathered from the on-line questionnaires is set out in Tables 4.7a) and b) below, and further discussed subsequently.

#### Tables 4.7a) and 4.7b): Demographic profile of teachers across age, gender, and regional background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>County/Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Tipperary/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Tipperary/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Limerick/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionnuala</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>Dublin/Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Dublin/Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Limerick/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Dublin/Leinster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cohort 2011 and 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>County/Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Louth/Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Laois/Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Dublin/Leinster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Kerry/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cormac</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Limerick/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Limerick/Munster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>Clare/Connaught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cohort 2011 and 2012)
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4.4.1 Teachers’ Gender, Age and Regional Background

As indicated, within each professional grouping of ten there were five females and five males. Teachers in each grouping came from counties in Connaught in the west of Ireland (3 participants), counties in Munster in the mid-west and south (4 participants) and counties in Leinster in the east (4 participants). The novices were all in the ‘twenty-something’ age category, while the ages of the experienced teachers ranged from the thirties to over sixty. Accordingly, there was an overlap between age and novice/experienced status. At this stage, it is important to highlight that there was little possibility to select novices from a wider age range, as would have been preferable so as to better gauge the influence of age as a variable due to the demographic trends on the MA TESOL programme during the two years in which the primary data was gathered. In the case of the experienced teachers, an attempt was made to include a wider age range. However, there were restrictions in terms of the limited number of teachers employed by the School of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics during the two years when the data was collected.

4.4.2 Teachers’ Educational Background

Question 2a) -2b) canvassed information relating to the participants’ educational backgrounds by asking them to specify any languages or language-related subjects they had studied at Leaving Certificate level in secondary school or in undergraduate or post-graduate university programmes. The findings were that all of the student teachers reported studying English and Irish to Leaving Certificate level, which was as expected as these are compulsory school subjects in mainstream schools in Ireland. Over half (60%) reported learning a modern foreign language, which was French in five cases and German in one. At degree level, four (40%) reported studying English literature and a further two studied pedagogy for primary education (20%), which included modules in education, cultural studies and the Irish language. Of the ten, less than half (40%) claimed not to have studied any language related subjects citing Geography, History, Politics or Construction as their main subject areas at degree level. Significantly, none of the student teachers reported studying modern foreign
languages or linguistics at degree level, which are subjects that would be expected to enhance language awareness.

By contrast, a majority of the experienced teachers (70%) reported having studied a foreign language to degree level, notably French or Spanish, and the remainder (30%) reported having studied Irish or English literature. Meanwhile, three in the cohort (30%) had studied linguistics or cultural studies on MA programmes. Therefore, without exception, all of the experienced teachers come from academic backgrounds where there were greater opportunities to develop language awareness and linguistics that would be useful for anyone entering the ELT profession. To explore this aspect further, information was canvassed in relation to the teachers’ knowledge and proficiency in Irish and foreign languages.

4.4.3 Teachers’ Knowledge and Proficiency in Additional Languages

Question 2a) - 2b) asked the teachers to report their knowledge of languages other than English and the degree of proficiency achieved in each. The findings were that only three of the novices (30%) reported a “very good knowledge” of Irish. Most (70%) described their proficiency in this language as either “fair” or “poor” despite having studied it to LC level. Similarly, while a majority (60%) had studied a modern foreign language to Leaving Certificate level, only two (20%) reported a “good” level of proficiency, with most describing their level as either “fair” or “poor”. This suggested that many of the novices had experienced difficulties learning other languages, possibly due to poor language learning aptitude and limited language awareness on their part. By contrast, a large majority of the experienced teachers (70%) claimed to have either a “good” or “very good” knowledge of at least one foreign language, mostly French and Spanish. Similarly, six (60%) claimed either a “good” or “very good” proficiency in Irish and only three reported a “fair” or “poor” knowledge of either Irish or a foreign language. Conversely, this suggested a stronger aptitude for language learning and good language awareness on their part.

The analysis has revealed obvious discrepancies in the backgrounds of the teachers within each cohort, which are likely to be of significance. It has indicated, for instance, that many of the novices entered the MA TESOL programme from non-language related university
programmes. This suggests that they may have done so for pragmatic reasons rather than as a first career choice, given the continuing expansion of the ELT industry, even during the recent global economic recession (Graddol *et al* 2007: 17). From this, we can expect that many will be challenged in the immediate context of TP on the MA programme, as they are likely to meet learners with a good formal knowledge of English and high levels of language awareness. By contrast, it can be assumed that many of the experienced teachers entered the profession with an understanding of the formal workings of English and good levels of language awareness, which are likely to have been enhanced by their years of teaching experience. However, the analysis has also suggested that there may be variability in the linguistic knowledge and insights of the individuals in each professional grouping.

**4.5 Summary of Chapter**

This chapter has provided a detailed description of the research approach and methodology used in this study, and it has presented arguments to support the decisions made. The discussion began by establishing the merits of a combined quantitative and qualitative approach in linguistic research before setting out the gains that a corpus-assisted discourse analytic approach could bring for the present study of EFL classroom discourse in relation to establishing current trends and patterns in the use by teachers of specified varieties of English as target models of English. This was followed by a thorough account of the triangulated methodology used featuring on-line teacher questionnaires, semi-structured dyadic interviews between the researcher and teachers and corpora of classroom data, together with the issues and considerations which arose in the design and implementation of the three research instruments. Finally, a demographic profile was provided of the ten novice and ten experienced EFL teachers participating in this study. From, this, we have gained an initial sense of their sociolinguistic identities in terms of regional background, gender and age, their prior education, and their likely language-related knowledge. This data will be drawn on further in the analysis in Chapters Five and Six which follow, in order to help contextualize and interpret the findings.
Chapter Five

Findings and Analysis: Awareness and Perspectives

“It’s what we say” (ST: Gary)

5.1 Introduction

This is the first of three chapters presenting the results and providing a discussion of the empirical research. The present analysis is concerned with the findings relating to language awareness, everyday language use and language attitudes, as reported in the teacher on-line questionnaires. This will provide a sense of the identities of the participants as English language users from the IE sociolinguistic background, and their relationship with varieties of spoken English that have traditionally carried a lack of ‘prestige’ in the ELT world. In this way, the discussion in this chapter aims to address the first three research objectives, as set out previously in Chapter One.

The analysis is undertaken for each of the specified varieties of spoken English in turn. It begins in each case with a summary in table form of the quantitative findings relating to the main areas of focus, followed by a discussion of the quantitative and qualitative outcomes. In line with the pedagogically-motivated aims of the study, an experienced teacher/student teacher focus is maintained throughout to provide a snapshot of trends and perspectives from the viewpoint of teachers at each stage of their professional careers. Individual teacher trends are also noted where relevant to achieve a greater depth of understanding. To facilitate the analysis, the abbreviations ET (experienced teacher) and ST (student teacher) are used to refer to the teachers in each grouping, together with the pseudonyms established in Chapter Four. Where relevant, the demographic data is also drawn on to contextualize the findings from both sociolinguistic and pedagogically-related perspectives, thereby bringing vital elements to the analysis. The findings for the two IE structures, representing regionally-differentiated grammar (RDG) are presented first. This is followed, in turn, by the outcomes
for the two socially-differentiated structures (SDG). The discussion closes with a summary of the main findings, which are also presented in table form.

5.2 Findings and Analysis

Questions 4a) to 5c) of the on-line questionnaire explored the teachers’ language awareness, language attitudes and everyday language use, with reference to the specified linguistic items representing the varieties of spoken English under investigation.

5.2.1 Findings and Analysis (RDG)

Table 5.1 below presents the quantitative findings for the two IE structures, representing regionally-differentiated grammar (RDG) in the order in which they are discussed in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Item</th>
<th>Q.4a) Familiarity with item</th>
<th>Q.4c) Awareness of countries where used</th>
<th>Q.4d) Awareness of contexts where used</th>
<th>Q.4b) Reported use</th>
<th>Q.5a) Acceptable for social contexts</th>
<th>Q.5b) Acceptable for teacher talk</th>
<th>Q.5c) Acceptable as target model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>ET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after perfect</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4a) was formulated to investigate the teachers’ familiarity with the specified usages in terms of their passive recognition, and to explore their related formal linguistic knowledge and insights. Thornbury (1996: 281) has specified that L2 teachers must develop awareness of pattern, contrast, systems, unit categories, rules of language in use and the ability to reflect upon them in order to be able to characterise their own language choices and the language of those around them objectively and analytically, as well as recognizing the potential of language to reflect variety. Given the assumed link between knowledge of formal aspects of language and teaching performance (including the ability of L2 teachers to modify their target English input to make it more suitable for learners) this was considered crucial and

5.2.1.1 Findings: Familiarity (RDG)

As expected, all ten of the teachers in each cohort reported being familiar with the two IE structures. This was consistent with corpus studies which have demonstrated their common use by IE speakers (O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Clarke 2012; Filppula 2012a, 2012b). When we explore their formal linguistic understandings in relation to these usages, as reflected in the qualitative comments typically expressed, we find that most of the ETs were well-informed, whereas the STs mostly lacked this kind of knowledge, as Tables 5.2 a) and 5.2 b) below illustrate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td><em>It's the Irish English after perfect tense used to expressed ‘hot’ news</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td><em>Irish English after perfect as opposed to the present perfect which is the Standard English version. It’s a calque from Gaelic.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>This is the Irish English after perfect as opposed to the Standard English present perfect which came about from contact with the Irish language. Functionally, it is similar to the recent past usage of the present perfect.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth</td>
<td><em>A hybrid tense structure with Gaelic roots roughly equivalent to standard present perfect for recent past events but used in this case to convey ‘hot news’ in the sense of it being recent and newsworthy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: George</td>
<td><em>This is something you hear a lot but not sure if it’s actually a tense or real grammar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>Pretty sure it’s a tense in grammar</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, eight of the ten ETs (80%) referred to the *after perfect* by name and recognised the variety represented, as in Graham’s case. Like Fionnuala, a majority in this cohort (60%) also specified the SE analogue. All of the ETs also displayed an understanding of the functionality of the item, as in Elizabeth’s response. Meanwhile, just under half (40%) were well-informed as to the origins and history of the *after perfect*, as in Brid’s case. The STs, on the other hand, all failed to specify the name of the construction, the variety represented, or the SE equivalent, as George’s comment exemplifies. However, a small minority (20%)
recognised that the *after perfect* operated at the level of tense/aspect, as in Aisling’s response. This provided an early indication that they might be more knowledgeable about English grammar than their peers.

As the comments in Table 5.2 b) below reveal, similar disparities were found in their awareness and knowledge relating to *ye*. In this case, interestingly, six of the ETs (60%) referred to the ‘handiness’ of *ye* by comparison with SE *you*, which indicated that they were insightful as to the communicative efficiencies gained from its use, whereas this aspect was not referred to by any of the STs.

**Table 5.2b: ETs'/STs’ linguistic knowledge: ye**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: John:</td>
<td><em>This is the Irish English second person plural which is the equivalent of Standard English ‘you’.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid:</td>
<td><em>Spoken Irish version of standard British You borrowed from Old English originally and retained throughout various periods of language shift</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala:</td>
<td><em>Its vernacular usage compared to ‘you’ in Standard English and a handy little structure for differentiating singular and plural in the second person</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth:</td>
<td><em>Ye is the Irish English ‘you’ that dates back hundreds of years to an earlier borrowing. It makes it easier to determine whether an individual or a pair/group is being addressed so it has obvious advantages</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>I’ve heard it but I don’t actually know what it’s called</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>This is what Irish people say for you</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the ETs (notably Fionnuala, Brid and Elizabeth) also revealed a detailed knowledge of the historical origins and trajectory of *ye* in IE, thereby confirming that they were well-informed in relation to their own variety. Accordingly, while these structures were known to all of the teachers in each cohort, only the ETs were well-informed about their formal linguistic properties and the metalanguage used by linguists to identify and classify them. The following section explores the teachers’ awareness of the limited cross-varietal distribution of these structures and their association with IE as a variety.
5.2.1.2 Findings: Awareness of Countries of Use (RDG)

Question 4 c) of the questionnaire asked the teachers to identify the country/ies in which the specified items were commonly found, in order to gauge their awareness of variation at the cross-varietal level. The quantitative findings for this question refer specifically to the number of teachers in each cohort who correctly identified the country/ies or the variety/ies of English associated with the usages in each category of spoken English. Critical linguists have stressed the importance of ELT teachers becoming aware of the origins and characteristics of their own language use and variety, and their place in the wider map of World Englishes, so as to help foster greater social harmonisation and tolerance of diversity (Pennycook 2000; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2007). This is also recognised as an essential pre-requisite for the development of a more suitable and effective target English approach by a growing number of teacher educators in the ELTE field (Walsh 2006; Matsuda 2012).

As Table 5.3 a) below indicates, there were marked discrepancies in the levels of awareness displayed by the teachers in each cohort in this area, with all of the ETs correctly positioning them as usages that were unique to IE, by comparison with only a minority of the STs (40%).

| Table 5.3a: ETs/STS identifying the varieties/countries of use of the after perfect / ye |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| ET       | after perfect | ye | ST      | after perfect | ye |
| 1. Brid  | ✓             | ✓  | 1. Aisling | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2. Ella   | ✓             | ✓  | 2. Deirdre | x | x |
| 3. Elizabeth | ✓ | ✓  | 3 Joanna | x | x |
| 4. Fionnula | ✓ | ✓  | 4. Mary | x | x |
| 5. Zara  | ✓             | ✓  | 5. Roseanna | ✓ | ✓ |
| 7. Graham | ✓             | ✓  | 7. Declan | ✓ | ✓ |
| 8. John  | ✓             | ✓  | 8. Gary | x | x |
| 9. Martin | ✓             | ✓  | 9. George | x | x |
| 10. Owen | ✓             | ✓  | 10. Sean | x | x |
| TOTAL    | 100%          | 100% | TOTAL  | 40% | 40% |

The teachers’ qualitative responses to this question as indicated in Tables 5.3 b) and c) below, confirmed the overall lack of awareness of the STs in this area by comparison with the well-informed insights of the ETs. For instance, like George, most of the STs expressed the belief
that the IE *after perfect* was used in several English speaking countries including Ireland, although their responses also often reflected an underlying uncertainty. By contrast, the ETs all recognised that the usage was unique to IE, and an emblematic feature of this variety, as in the cases of Fionnuala and Zara.

Similarly, only a minority of the STs recognised the limited cross-varietal distribution of *ye* by comparison with all of the ETs, as the comments in Table 5.3 c) below exemplify.

Accordingly, there were major discrepancies in the sociolinguistic knowledge of the teachers in each cohort, and also amongst the individual novices. These disparities were likely to have stemmed from the teachers’ distinct academic backgrounds. For instance, Aisling and Roseanna, who had previously studied foreign languages at university, displayed greater awareness of the two IE usages than others, such as Sean, Gary and George, who had joined the MA programme from university courses that were not language-related. Nevertheless, while not overtly stated, there was a sense of shared socio-cultural identity in their comments, as in Gary’s “[I]t’s what we say”, in relation to the *after perfect*, which is echoed in Sean’s

### Table 5.3b: ETs'/STs' perceptions of the countries/varieties of use of the *after perfect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnula</td>
<td><em>This is the after perfect, an Irish version of the Standard British present perfect</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Zara</td>
<td><em>IE version of the present perfect and unique to Irish English</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td><em>Its only in Ireland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: George</td>
<td><em>In Ireland and in US and UK although exactly sure where</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td><em>It's what we say</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.3c: ETs'/STs' perceptions of the countries/varieties of use of *ye*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Zara</td>
<td><em>Ye is an Irish English pronoun and not used in other World Englishes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td><em>Definitely Irish English only</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: George</td>
<td><em>I know it’s what we say but not sure about UK or US</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td><em>We say it</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“[W]e say it”, in relation to ye. This finding supports Hickey’s (2009: 87) claim that young IE speakers today have a stronger awareness and sense of allegiance to their own variety, which may have been absent or less openly expressed in the past. Having gained a better sense of the teachers’ perceptions on their own variety, the following section presents and discusses the findings for situational awareness.

5.2.1.3 Findings: Awareness of Situational Contexts of Use (RDG)

Question 4 d) of the questionnaire asked the teachers to identify the contexts in which the specified usages were typically found, so as to explore their perceptions of the degree of formality/informality reflected in their use. Variationist theorists (see Labov 1972a, 1972b; Bell 1984; Trudgill 1998) have highlighted styleshifting as a central explanatory factor in linguistic variation. However, it is generally accepted that the ability of speakers to styleshift from one type of language use to another depends on their language awareness and linguistic repertoire. Speech modifications are a key strategic skill that L2 teachers are expected to perform in order to provide learners at different proficiency levels with input that is intelligible and suitable for their needs. This being so, the findings in this area may offer early indications of the suitability of the teachers’ professional language use in terms of the degree of informality expressed. They can also provide wider insights into the phenomenon of vernacularization, whereby educated speakers may be moving away from the more formal types of English previously associated with professional and educational discourses, which has been only very partially exploited in the IE (Kirk 2007; Kelly-Holmes 2004; O’Sullivan 2014).

As Table 5.4 a) below indicates, there were clear discrepancies in the teachers’ perceptions, as all of the ETs viewed the after perfect as a feature of informal, rather than formal, speech, whereas less than half of the STs (40%) explicitly made this distinction. Similar trends were observed for ye, with a minority of STs (40%) associating the pronominal with informal contexts of use, whereas this was recognised by all of the ETs. This indicated that the two IE structures were viewed differently by the teachers in each cohort. It further suggested that only the ETs and a minority of the STs had a strong sense of the role of context in shaping language use at the situational level (McCarthy 1998: 10).
As indicated, the four STs who correctly positioned the after perfect and ye as features of informal speech, alongside the full cohort of ETs, were Aisling, Roseanna, Cormac and Declan. Accordingly, once again, a core group in the novice category displayed insights that were superior to those of their peers.

These trends were confirmed by the teachers’ qualitative comments, as represented in Tables 5.4 b) and c) below illustrate. They reveal, as a group, the ETs attached a higher degree of informality to the two IE structures than did the STs, who tended to view them in a more neutral light. For instance, like Fionnuala and Owen, most of the ETs described the after perfect as a feature of “casual”, “conversational” or “intimate” speech. While not overtly stated, a minority of the STs (40%) also alluded to factors such as familiarity and intimacy as important underlying influences, as in the cases of Aisling and Declan. By contrast, the remaining STs (60%) either shared Sean’s view that it was “pretty much used all the time”, or expressed uncertainty as to the degree of formality/informality involved.

**Table 5.4a: ETs/STs identifying contexts of use of the after perfect / ye**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Brid</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>1.Aisling</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ella</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>2.Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Elizabeth</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fionnuala</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>4.Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Zara</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>5.Roseanna</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Graham</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>7.Dean</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.John</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>8.Gary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Martin</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>9.George</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Owen</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>10.Sean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.4b: ETs’/STs’ perceptions on contexts of use of the after perfect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala:</td>
<td>Not normally used in formal speech contexts and used more in casual encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen:</td>
<td>Typical in informal conversations with people who are intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling:</td>
<td>How people speak with close associates and friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Declan:</td>
<td>I suppose it would be with people you know really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean:</td>
<td>Pretty much used all the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similarly, all of the ETs (100%), and just under half of the STs (40%) positioned ye as a feature of informal, rather than formal, spoken English. However, Zara raised the question of whether this might be changing with moves towards more informal language use in general, which Brid alluded to also, as in “it’s hard to pinpoint these days”. This suggested that there is currently some ambiguity surrounding the precise degree of formality/informality associated with the IE pronominal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td>Typical in conversational speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Zara:</td>
<td>I think it might have been used only informally in the past but it might be changing with moves towards more informal language use in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>It’s hard to pinpoint these days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td>I would think it's a more casual type of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>Not sure - everywhere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings broadly support Kirk and Kallen’s (2007: 298) claim of vernacularization in the IE context, which is more obvious in the case of some IE structures than others, a position shared by White (2006) and Hickey (2009). Having gauged the teachers’ level of awareness and their linguistic knowledge concerning the IE after perfect and ye, we turn next to the findings for reported use to shed further light on their relationship with these locally-used forms.

5.2.1.4 Reported Patterns of Use (RDG)

Question 4 b) of the questionnaire asked the teachers to indicate whether or not they used the specified linguistic items. This was with the intention of gaining crucial insight into their everyday linguistic practices, and thereby their sociolinguistic identities. The quantitative findings reported on for this question relate to the number of teachers in each cohort who associated with the use of each feature. As Table 5.5 a) below illustrates, in overall terms, the IE structures were identified with most by the STs. For instance, all but three in the cohort
(70%) reported using the *after perfect* by comparison with half of the ETs (50%). Meanwhile, an even higher number of STs (80%) associated with the use of *ye*, compared with just over half of the ETs (60%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6. Cormac</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60%</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>70%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five ETs who identified with the use of the *after perfect* were Brid, Ella, Elizabeth, Graham and Martin, while *ye* was associated with by all of these teachers and John. Accordingly, four ETs teachers disassociated from the use of both structures (namely, Fionnuala, Zara, Dermot and Owen), while ET John identified with the use of *ye* but not the *after perfect*. By comparison, Aisling and Deirdre were the only STs to disassociate from the use of both IE English structures, while ST Mary identified with the use of *ye* but not the *after perfect*. Accordingly, there were high rates for reported use of the IE forms (particularly *ye*), and the patterns reported for each structure were mostly consistent. These findings support previous studies which have shown that the *after perfect* and *ye* remain important features of IE, but that they are likely to be used more by speakers in some regional and social groupings than by others in Ireland (Filppula 1999, 2012b; Hickey 2007; Clarke 2012).

In order to gain a more complete understanding of the sociolinguistic relationship between the teachers and these IE usages, underlying macro-societal influences are explored next. These include: 1) regional background; 2) gender; 3) age, drawing on the demographic data, and frameworks from variationist sociolinguistics (Labov 1966a, 1966b, 1972a, 1972b).
Patterns of use by region: The link between the IE *after perfect* and *ye* and speakers from western and southern parts of Ireland is well-established in the research literature in the variationist field (Hickey 2007; Filppula 2012b). It was expected, therefore, that regional background would be a visible underlying influence on the teachers’ reported patterns of use/non-use of the two IE structures, which was confirmed by the findings. For instance, as Figure 5.1 a) below indicates, the five ETs and seven STs who identified with the *after perfect* came from only two provinces in Ireland: Connaught in the west/mid-west and Munster in the mid-west/south of the country. Accordingly, the usage was not identified with by any of the six teachers who came from Leinster, in the north-east of the country.

![Figure 5.1a) Regional background of ETs/STs reporting use of the after perfect](image)

![Figure 5.1b) Regional background of ETs/STs reporting use of the ye](image)

Similar trends were found for *ye*, as five of the six ETs who associated with the IE pronominal came from Connaught and Munster, while only one came from Leinster, as Figure 5.1b) above indicates. By comparison, of the eight STs involved, three came from Connaught, four from Munster and one from Leinster. Accordingly the two IE structures were identified with mostly by teachers from Connaught and Munster in the west/mid-west and south of Ireland, and *ye* had a slightly wider regional distribution than the *after perfect*. These findings were consistent with existing sociolinguistic accounts mapping the regional distribution of these usages in Ireland (Hickey 2007; Filppula 2012b).

Patterns of use by gender: It was also expected that there would be gender-differentiated patterns of use for the two IE structures, given that variationist researchers have postulated a
closer relationship between male speakers and ‘non-standard’ English use than females (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Beal 2004). As Figure 5.1 c) below indicates, a bias in favour of the males was found in the teachers’ overall patterns of use of the *after perfect*. However, opposing trends were observed for each grouping, with a female bias noted amongst the ETs and a male bias observed amongst the STs as illustrated in Figures 5.1 d) and e) below. Accordingly, while more males than females identified with the *after perfect* in overall terms, gender was a less obvious underlying influence than regional background.

By contrast, in the case of *ye*, an overall gender bias in favour of the females was observed, as Figure 5.1 f) below illustrates. However, as with the *after perfect*, disparate trends were found for each cohort, with no evidence of gender-differentiation in the case of the ETs and a male bias observed amongst the STs, as Figures 5.1g) and h) below illustrate.

Accordingly, for each IE structure there were distinct gender-differentiated patterns of use, with the *after perfect* favoured more by the males, and *ye* favoured more by the females.
These findings, therefore, only partially supported the claims made by variationist researchers in the IE context (Hickey 2007) and elsewhere (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Beal 2004) that male speakers are more likely to favour vernacular forms than females.

**Patterns of use by age:** It was expected that age would be a highly significant influence on the teachers’ patterns of use of the two IE structures and that it would overlap with gender to some extent, in the light of existing variationist research (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Beal 2004; Murphy 2010). This proved to be the case with the *after perfect*, as seven of the twelve teachers who identified with the usage were in the twenty-something age group whereas the remaining five were aged thirty plus. Similarly, eight of the fourteen teachers who associated with *ye* were in the twenty-something age group, with the remainder spread across the thirty, forty and fifty age categories. Accordingly, the age of the teachers was found to be a key variable influencing their use of the IE structures, as illustrated in Figures 5.1 i) and j) below.

These findings broadly support the claims made by sociolinguists working in the IE context that there is a shift towards vernacularization amongst younger IE speakers and that it is most noticeable amongst younger-aged adult male speakers (see Hickey 2007; Kirk and Kallen 2007). To explore this aspect further, we turn next to the teachers’ perceptions on the sociolinguistic profile of the two IE structures.
5.2.1.5 Perceptions on Sociolinguistic Profile (RDG)

The teachers were not directly asked to describe the distribution of the specified items. However many chose to do so, in order to justify their reported practices, as the comments in Tables 5.5 b) and c) exemplify. They suggest that each structure was viewed primarily in terms of its regional profile. For instance, there was a clear trend to associate the *after perfect* with “rural” and “traditional” speech communities in western and southern parts of Ireland, rather than with the more urbanized and populated counties along the eastern sea-board, as the responses of ET Fionnuala and STs Aisling and Sean demonstrate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>My children use this as they grew up in the west but as an East coast Irish English speaker from Dublin it is not in my linguistic repertoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td>Common in County Clare but not everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td>Very country, isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers’ perceptions were broadly in line with the previously mapped patterns of use of the *after perfect* by regional background and with existing sociolinguistic accounts. This suggests that the ETs and STs alike were intuitive towards grammatical use found in their own speech communities, as well as that used elsewhere in Ireland. However, their shared perceptions of *ye* as a “popular” and “universal” feature of language use in Ireland, as in Elizabeth and Sean’s comments below, were less accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth</td>
<td>I say it and it’s probably something most people would say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td>Everyone says it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, the *after perfect* was seen to hold stronger regional credentials than *ye* did, which tended to be viewed in a more neutral light, although the teachers’ reported practices linked both structures to speech communities in the west, mid-west and south of the country.
In order to gauge the types of social associations the teachers attached to the two IE usages, the attitudinal findings are explored in the following section.

5.2.1.6 Findings: Social Acceptability (RDG)

Question 5 a) of the questionnaire explored the teachers’ attitudes towards the social acceptability of each specified linguistic item and the type of spoken English represented, in order to gain a sense of their English language beliefs and the ideologies reflected therein. The quantitative findings reported for this question relate to the number of teachers in each cohort who approved of the specified usage in social contexts, as expressed in percentage terms, with individual teacher trends also highlighted. As indicated in Table 5.6 a) below, overall high levels of approval were recorded for the two IE structures, in terms of their use in social contexts, with ye tolerated slightly more than the after perfect. Specifically, 60% of the ETs accepted the use of the after perfect and (70%) approved of ye. This compared with acceptance rates of 70% for the after perfect and 80% for ye in the case of the STs. These findings support Hickey’s claim that Irish people generally find locally-used grammar perfectly acceptable for conversational purposes (2007: 38).

When correlations were explored between these rates and the teachers’ previously reported patterns of use of these structures, it was found that approval was slightly higher than reported use in the cases of both groupings. The four ETs who rejected the use of the after perfect in social contexts were Fionnuala, Zara, John and Owen. Similarly, all of these teachers except John found the use of ye unacceptable. Meanwhile, in the ST category, only Aisling and Deirdre rejected the use of both the after perfect and ye in social contexts, while Mary rejected the former and accepted the latter. A strong link was observed, therefore, between the teachers’ reported practices and the stance they adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Brid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ella</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2.Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.Joanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the teachers’ qualitative comments presented in Tables 5.6 b) and c) below reveal, the ETs typically used well-informed and balanced arguments to justify their stance, citing contextual factors such as the topic being discussed, the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors and the level of formality/informality required in a particular social situation, as Ella’s response in relation to the *after perfect* exemplifies. This is consistent with the earlier findings which revealed that they were sensitive to issues pertaining to the appropriateness of different types of language use in particular contexts of use, as expected of experienced L2 teachers. This led most (60%) to conclude, like Brid, that the *after perfect* was perfectly acceptable for social contexts. However, a minority (40%) shared John’s belief that it was “best avoided as it could sound uneducated in some social contexts”, as in his comment below.

**Table 5.6b: ETs’/STs’ attitudes towards social acceptability of the *after perfect***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Ella</td>
<td><em>It would depend on what was being discussed, who was involved and how well they knew each other so you would have to know what the contextual factors were</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: John</td>
<td><em>Best avoided as it could sound uneducated in some social contexts</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td><em>Perfectly acceptable in social contexts because they are there less formal and more relaxed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>It’s not a problem as we all say it</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>It’s bad English</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicated that they considered it stigmatised usage, a view shared by STs Aisling and Deirdre, who described it as “bad English”. Meanwhile, the comments of the majority (60%) of the STs suggested that they viewed it as common rather than stigmatised usage, as Cormac stated.
Similar types of arguments were expressed in the case of *ye*, as the comments in Table 5.6 c) below exemplify. However, several of the ETs (40%) also pointed to the functional usefulness of the IE pronominal in social situations, as in Brid’s comment “it’s a handy little structure when there’s more than one person involved”. This suggested that this was a key factor in influencing their more positive evaluation of this usage.

Table 5.6c: ETs’/STs’ attitudes towards social acceptability of *ye*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>It's a handy little structure when there's more than one person involved so I think it's perfectly acceptable in social situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth</td>
<td>This would be suitable in social contexts depending on the degree of formality and the relationships involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>It's an uneducated type of English can so for this reason some people might prefer not to use it at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td>Its incorrect English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>Ok to me as we all say it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to create opportunities to explore the teachers’ perceptions on the status of each specified usage and the type of spoken English represented, by comparison with ‘standard’ and more formal English, they were further asked to make revisions to any of the locutions they found unacceptable so as to make them more acceptable. In the analysis which follows, the modifications made by the minority in each cohort who viewed the *after perfect* and *ye* as unacceptable for social contexts of use are discussed, as well as alternative version/s they felt were more suitable, and the significance of these.

*Teacher Revisions: Social Acceptability (RDG):*

As indicated in Table 5.6 d) below the four ETs teachers who rejected the locution featuring the *after perfect* (40%) all rewrote it with the IE usage replaced by the SBE present perfect, which thereby indicated a preference for this variety. This was not unexpected, given that SBE has traditionally set the benchmark for what is considered good language use in social contexts in Ireland, and more widely in the English speaking world. Meanwhile, the two STs involved replaced the *after perfect* with the SBE *preterite* rather than the SE *present perfect*. This suggested that they lacked awareness of the standard equivalent in this case, despite their earlier criticisms of “uneducated” English. Accordingly, they found the IE *after perfect*
unacceptable but were more familiar with its use than SBE, which was the variety they aspired to.

Table 5.6d: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting the after perfect in social contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Locution:</th>
<th>I'm after forgetting the books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Version: (ET)</td>
<td>I've forgotten the books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised version (ST)</td>
<td>I forget the books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modifications made by the teachers who rejected the use of ye in social contexts also revealed some interesting discrepancies, as Table 5.6 e) below illustrates. For instance, the three ETs replaced ye with ‘you + all’, presumably in an attempt to make it more explicit that more than one person was being addressed, whereas the two STs replaced ye only with SBE you.

Table 5.6e: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting ye in social contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Locution:</th>
<th>Would ye like to talk about this for a few minutes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Version: (ET)</td>
<td>Would you all like to talk about this for a few minutes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised version: (ST)</td>
<td>Would you like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicated that the ETs were aware of the communicative efficiencies gained from the use of ye, which are absent in SBE/SAE, but that they chose to disregard this obvious functional advantage. This suggested that they were motivated more by issues of ‘prestige’ in language use than by pragmatic considerations. By comparison, the modifications made by the STs confirmed their lack of insight concerning the functional usefulness of ye. Accordingly, while most of the teachers found the two IE structures perfectly acceptable for social use, a minority sought to adhere to SE English norms even when they were cognisant of the communicative disadvantages this brought. This confirmed that they sought to adhere to traditional ‘standard’ English beliefs in their everyday linguistic practices and to avoid the use of the IE variety, even in social contexts in Ireland. It also suggested that they would be more likely to adhere to SBE in their professional practices, which is discussed in the next section.
5.2.1.7 Findings: Acceptability for Teacher Talk (RDG)

Question 5b) of the questionnaire explored the teachers’ attitudes towards what might constitute suitable spoken English when teaching English language learners. This created opportunities to clarify their understandings and experiences concerning the normative requirements in the ELT educational domain, and their pedagogic insights in relation to the role and use of teacher talk in the CLT classroom context. No reference was made in the question to any specific ELT contexts or settings, so as to make it possible for the participants to raise considerations of these kinds if they felt they were important and relevant. The quantitative findings reported on for this question are expressed in percentage terms. They relate specifically to the number of teachers in each cohort who approved of the use of the specified items in teacher talk in the ELT domain. The responses relating to the IE after perfect and ye revealed significant discrepancies in the attitudes expressed by the teachers in each grouping, as indicated in Table 5.7 a) below. For instance, only a small minority (30%) of ETs approved of the use of the after perfect by comparison with all but two of the STs (80%). Meanwhile, ye was accepted by half of the ETs (50%), which was slightly more than the rate reported for the after perfect, while the STs approved to a similar extent (80%). Accordingly, the ETs displayed less overall tolerance than the STs, and there were higher rates of approval for ye than for the after perfect. The findings further indicated that some of the ETs made distinctions between the acceptability of the IE forms in social, as opposed to educational, contexts, and between each specific usage, whereas the STs failed to do so.

Table 5.7a: ETs/STs accepting the after perfect / ye in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Brid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ella</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2.Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3.Joanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.Mary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.Cormac</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Graham</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7.Declan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9.George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10.Sean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated, the three ETs who tolerated the use of the *after perfect* in teacher talk were Brid, Ella and Elizabeth, which was consistent with their previously expressed beliefs concerning its social acceptability and their reported everyday practices. By contrast, Dermot, John and Owen rejected its use for teacher talk but found it acceptable for social contexts, while Graham and Martin tolerated the use of *ye* by teachers, but not the *after perfect*. Meanwhile, Aisling and Deirdre were the only STs to disapprove of the use of both IE structures in teacher talk, which was consistent with their previously expressed attitudes and their reported practices.

The qualitative viewpoints expressed in this area suggested a close link between the teachers’ language attitudes and their awareness of the normative constraints in the ELT domain. For instance, while several (30%) of the STs expressed the belief that “it [was] not a problem” for practitioners to use the *after perfect*, as Gary perceived, many of the ETs (60%) pointed to prevailing normative restrictions, as in John’s response. Two of the STs (20%) also expressed uncertainty as to whether teachers could use these forms of expression, as in Cormac’s case. He also questioned whether it would be possible for him to avoid this type of usage professionally, given that it was integral to his speech style. This suggested an awakening sense of awareness on his part of issues of appropriacy in language use. Teachers in both cohorts also expressed the belief that being familiar with the *after perfect* could be beneficial for learners of English in Ireland from a socio-cultural perspective. However, only the ETs specified what the precise advantages might be and the types of learners who had most to gain, as the responses of Graham and Sean exemplify in each case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td>Could be useful for learners in Ireland to get to know especially in ESL contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: John</td>
<td>We have to be careful what we say in terms of variety so this is out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td>Not sure but it would be hard not to use it as I say it all the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>It’s not a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td>It’s what people actually say so good for learners living in Ireland to know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7b: ETs/STs’ attitudes towards the *after perfect* in teacher talk
Similar trends were observed for *ye*, as the comments in Table 5.7 b) exemplify. However, in this case some of the ETs (40%) showed a willingness to critically explore whether the use of the IE pronominal was acceptable in some teaching contexts and how this could be realistically achieved, given the prevailing target English status quo. For instance, Brid argued that learners of English in Ireland should be given opportunities to become aware of common IE usages and IE as a variety so as to “promote diversity”, while Declan suggested that there might be “some wiggle room when teaching in Ireland”, but not elsewhere. Fionnuala also cautioned against the use of *ye* beyond the IE context, as “it doesn’t travel well”. This view was shared by several of the ETs (30%), including Owen and Elizabeth, who pointed to teaching contexts overseas where the use of IE was forbidden, which they found discriminatory and upsetting. These findings are consistent with Swan’s (2016) account of the constraints imposed on EFL teachers from Ireland as a result of prevailing target English norms, and the types of injustices this leads to (2016: 54). A further key issue raised by Fionnuala was whether the use of local varieties caused greater intelligibility problems for learners than main varieties did, which she believed to be the case. However, her peers mostly (60%) expressed the view that “it depends on the structure and the level”, as Graham argued.

Table 5.7c: ETs/STs attitudes towards *ye* in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td><em>We should make sure learners in Ireland get a chance to hear usages like ye which are common and useful and it promotes diversity.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth</td>
<td><em>When I was teaching in Spain, I had to use British English and they [employers] used to come in and listen to make sure I did, which I found upsetting.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>There may be a case for the use of ye, in some teaching contexts in Ireland but it doesn’t travel well.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Zara</td>
<td><em>Obviously, this is only an issue for teachers who use ye.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td><em>Teachers have to know what learners can cope with from a linguistic point of view and I think that dialectal grammar is often too complex for most learners but it depends on the structure and the level so ye is ok in ESL and EFL contexts in Ireland but not the after perfect as it’s too complex.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Dermot</td>
<td><em>There might be some wriggle room when teaching in Ireland.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td><em>I’ve found that anywhere in the world I’ve taught I’ve had to avoid Irish English which you could argue is discriminatory.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td><em>I think it’s ok but not really sure.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Gary</td>
<td><em>I think it’s good to teach it because it’s practical.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above findings show that a majority in the ET cohort held to the view that (60%) the use of *ye* was warranted in some ESL and EFL contexts in Ireland due to its socio-cultural usefulness. By contrast, they considered that the *after perfect* was “too complex for learners”. This suggested that while some of the ETs looked for opportunities to promote IE as a variety they were mostly guided by pragmatic rather than ideological considerations. ET Zara also made the key point that the issue of whether teachers should or should not use IE with learners was more relevant for those who habitually used this variety than for those who did not. This recalls ST Cormac’s previously expressed concern that he might not be able to control his use of local forms of expressions in his professional practices. In order to gain further insight into the teachers’ attitudes towards suitable target English/es, the following section explores the revisions made by those in each cohort who found the use of IE forms by ELT teachers generally unacceptable.

**Teachers’ Revisions: Acceptability for Teacher Talk (RDG)**

As Table 5.7 d) below illustrates, the modifications made by the ETs confirmed their preference for SBE, which was consistent with the earlier revisions made by these teachers in relation to social use. Specifically, all seven of the ETs involved replaced the IE *after perfect* with the SBE *present perfect*. However, as previously, the two STs involved opted for the preterite form. This confirmed that they were uncertain as to the ‘standard’ equivalent in this case, although they sought to adhere to this variety on prescriptive grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Location:</th>
<th>I’m after forgetting the books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Version: (ET)</td>
<td>I’ve forgotten the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Version: (ST)</td>
<td>I forgot the books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar discrepancies were found in the teachers’ modifications relating to *ye*, as Table 5.7 e) below illustrates. For instance, the five ETs who disapproved replaced the IE pronominal with SBE/SAE *you*, and they further added ‘all’ to the locution to make it explicit that more than one addressee was involved. This addition was absent, on the other hand, from the
revisions made by the two STs, which was thereby consistent with the earlier revisions they made in relation to social use.

### Table 5.7e: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting ye in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Location:</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ET)</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would ye like to talk about this for a few minutes?</td>
<td>Would you all like to talk about this for a few minutes?</td>
<td>Would you like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This confirmed that the ETs were critically aware of the functional efficiencies of ye but remained reluctant to exploit this interactional advantage, presumably to comply with normative requirements. By contrast, the STs’ revisions provided further evidence that they were unaware of this dimension. The aforementioned findings have provided some key insights into the teachers’ attitudes towards the use of IE in the EFL classroom context. In the following section, we turn to their perspectives on the much debated question of whether local varieties such as IE should be explicitly taught as target English models.

### 5.2.1.8 Findings: Acceptability as Target Model (RDG)

Question 5 c) explored the teachers’ attitudes towards the inclusion of the specified linguistic items, and the varieties/registers represented in each case, in the ELT curriculum. This also made it possible to uncover their insights, viewpoints and experiences in relation to the historic mono-centric SE approach and possible alternative models. It also offered opportunities to explore whether they made distinctions between the suitability of the use, and the explicit teaching of different types of spoken English by EFL teachers, and what this might mean in terms of their pedagogical understandings. The quantitative findings reported on relate specifically to the teachers’ positive responses when asked to evaluate the acceptability of the explicit teaching of the specified linguistic items as target models (as expressed in percentage terms) for each type of spoken English.

As Table 5.8 a) illustrates, opposing trends were found for the two IE structures, with the ETs overwhelmingly rejecting the overt teaching of the after perfect and ye while the STs almost all approved. Specifically, only one of the ETs (10%) tolerated the explicit teaching of the
former, whereas it was accepted by all but two of the STs (80%). The findings for *ye* mirrored these trends. Accordingly, the number of the ETs who accepted the explicit teaching of the IE forms as target models was less than the number who tolerated their use in teacher talk. This indicated that key distinctions were being made by some of the ETs, while similar rates of approval were recorded on the part of the STs. This was consistent with the previous findings, whereby only teachers in the ET grouping took account of the role of discourse context in their evaluations.

Brid was the only ET who accepted the overt teaching of the two IE structures, which was not unexpected, given her earlier expressed approval of their use by teachers. Conversely, Aisling and Deirdre were the only STs to disapprove. This was also consistent with the prescriptive views they had previously voiced.

The teachers’ qualitative comments in this area, as presented in Tables 5.8 b) and c) below, confirmed these trends. For instance, like Gary, most of the STs believed that the teaching of IE in the ELT domain was “not an issue”. All participants, apart from Aisling and Deirdre, also lacked a critical understanding of the varieties promoted in ELT course books and the implications this carried, as Sean’s response exemplified. Several of the STs (30%) also expressed uncertainty as to the types of English that teachers could and could not teach, as in Roseanna’s case. By contrast, the ETs were all acutely awareness of the varieties that have traditionally held ‘prestige’ amongst learners and employers, and those which have been

### Table 5.8a: ETs/STs approving of the *after perfect / ye* as target models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>after perfect</th>
<th>ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6. Cormac</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graham</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rejected on prescriptive grounds, with most (80%) reluctant to challenge the target English status quo. Their responses also revealed that their beliefs were influenced by their experiences of teaching in different ELT contexts and settings, as in the cases of Martin and Owen.

Table 5.8b: ETs'/STs’ attitudes towards teaching of the after perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Martin</td>
<td>I’ve worked a lot in Asia and it’s simply not allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td>From my experience it's not taught anywhere as it would be considered unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>It's not an issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td>If it came up in a listening and they [the learners] didn’t understand I would teach it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td>Not really sure what we can and can’t teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td>We’re not allowed to teach anything that’s not in the books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td>This would never be taught.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar trends were noted in the case of ye, with the ETs once again drawing on their wide and varied teaching experiences to support their views, as shown in Table 5.8 c) below. Their responses further highlighted the frustration felt by some (30%) as a result of existing target model practices, as in John’s case. Similarly, Dermot highlighted the “dilemma” of knowing “how far [teachers] could stray from what’s in the books” in terms of their target English choices, which suggested that he felt uncertainty in this regard.

Table 5.8c: ETs'/STs’ attitudes towards teaching of ye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>When they find out I’m Irish I usually get asked about how English is spoken in Ireland so I tell them the main similarities and the differences because I think it’s important that they don’t just know about British or American English even though they have to learn them - so yes I would actively teach ye and other Irish English forms in Ireland and abroad if I got the chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Dermot</td>
<td>Not acceptable with the course books and exams we currently work to. It’s quite a dilemma because there are schools and employers that wouldn’t like their students to be taught anything other than the varieties that are in the exams and course books but I accept they need to be taught real English too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These findings are consistent with the conclusions reached by White (2006: 243-4) and Murphy (2011:18) that EFL professionals from Ireland often feel constrained in their target English practices by the need to conform to the restricted models promoted in EFL course books, thereby supporting Jenkin’s claims concerning their ‘malign’ gatekeeping role (2007: 42). They add weight also to Timmis’ (2002: 248) claim concerning the uncertainty that many EFL teachers now feel in relation to the types of spoken grammar they teach as target models. Nevertheless, a small minority (20%) revealed that they actively sought opportunities to promote IE, alongside main varieties, highlighting similarities and differences, which suggested that they typically adopted a more critical, pedagogic stance, as in the cases of Brid and Graham.

The STs’ responses, by contrast, confirmed that the vast majority had yet to acquire a critical understanding of normative issues surrounding the varieties promoted in the ELT world, and the restrictions this placed on the teaching of IE forms. This supports Walsh’s (2006: 76) argument that inexperienced teachers from NS backgrounds often lack awareness of their own varieties and the ways in which they may differ from target English norms, and that this is likely to disadvantage them professionally.

5.2.1.9 Summary (RDG)

The previous quantitative and qualitative analysis explored the awareness, insights and patterns of reported use of the teachers in each professional grouping with specific reference to the after perfect and ye, representing regionally-differentiated grammar and IE as a variety more widely, gaining valuable insights into their sociolinguistic and professional identities. It also examined the teachers’ attitudes towards the use of IE by teachers of English, and the inclusion of IE grammatical forms as part of the ELT curriculum, as well as factors
influencing their judgements and decision-making. For comparative purposes, their understandings and attitudes in relation to *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like* representing socially-differentiated grammar (SDG) are analysed in the following section.

### 5.2.2 Findings and Analysis (SDG)

The quantitative findings relating to the structures in this category for each of the main areas of focus are summarised initially in Table 5.9 below.

**Table 5.9: ETs/STs recording positive responses in % terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Item</th>
<th>Q.4a) Familiarity with item</th>
<th>Q.4c) Awareness of countries where used</th>
<th>Q.4d) Awareness of contexts where used</th>
<th>Q.4b) Reported use</th>
<th>Q.5a) Acceptable for social contexts</th>
<th>Q.5b) Acceptable for teacher talk</th>
<th>Q.5c) Acceptable as target model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preterite seen</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>0 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic like</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>ET 100</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>10 20</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>0 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100</td>
<td>ST 80</td>
<td>ST 60</td>
<td>30 80</td>
<td>60 80</td>
<td>30 60</td>
<td>10 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2.2.1 Findings: Familiarity (SDG)

As was the case for the two IE structures previously mentioned, the entire teacher population reported a passive recognition of *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like*. This was expected, given that they are well-known features of spoken English in many Inner Circle countries including Ireland (Kortmann *et al* 2004; Beal 2004; Filppula 2012b; Schweinberger 2012). However, the teachers’ qualitative responses revealed both similarities and differences to the trends noted previously for the two IE usages. For instance, in the case of *preterite seen*, once again only the ETs displayed any formal linguistic understandings, while the STs mostly lacked this kind of insight, as the comments of Owen and Sean in Table 5.10 a) below exemplify. Similarly, only teachers in the ET cohort accurately described its functionality, as in Ella’s case. Nevertheless, there was a shared consensus that the usage was ‘ungrammatical’. This indicated that teachers in both groupings were aware of the distinction made historically between standard/non-standard English, although only the ETs explicitly used these terms.
ST Roseanna’s reference to “noticing [preterite seen] a lot more since starting the MA” merits attention, as it suggests an awakening sense of awareness on her part. This highlights the benefits of pre-service ELTE programmes of this kind which are designed to lead STs through the process of becoming language users, then language analysts and finally language teachers, through awareness-raising activities, as highlighted by O’Keeffe and Farr (2012).

In the case of **pragmatic like**, only the ETs (60%) showed an awareness of its formal linguistic properties, and that it was being used in a pragmatic capacity, as the comments of Martin and Deirdre in Table 5.10 b) below exemplify. The functional role performed by the marker was also only referred to by the ETs (60%), with some (30%) further pointing to its use as a hedge in the given locution, to downtone the directness of the question, which Brid described as “very Irish”. This suggested that only the ETs had developed insights into the pragmatic dimensions of language use. However, Fionnuala was the sole ET to mention an earlier pragmatic tradition in Ireland, involving the use of the marker as a hedge, which once again highlighted her superior linguistic knowledge. Despite their lack of formal knowledge, it was evident that the STs had acquired greater sensitivities towards the marker’s use than was the case previously for **preterite seen** and the two IE structures. For instance, they were as well-informed as the ETs concerning the innovative dimension of the marker, its American origins and its association with the speech style of their own generation, as the responses of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Ella</td>
<td><em>It's supposed to be the past simple tense for a finished past event but it's the non-standard version</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>You would certainly hear this kind of non-standard grammar a lot</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td><em>A commonly-used non-standard past tense as compared to the standard 'saw'</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Sean</td>
<td><em>Don’t know the name but it’s definitely incorrect</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>This is ungrammatical</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td><em>I’ve been noticing this a lot more since starting the MA</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10a: ETs/STs’ linguistic knowledge: **preterite seen**
Martin and Declan illustrate. However, only teachers in the ET grouping (30%) displayed an awareness of the linguistic processes involved in its evolution, as in Owen’s case.

Table 5.10 b: ETs'/STs’ linguistic knowledge: pragmatic like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Martin</td>
<td>Pragmatic marker rather than its traditional grammatical role which has become popular especially amongst younger age groups and from US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>This is pragmatic like used to downtown the directness which is very Irish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>Like in its pragmatic sense is used by young people these days due to cross-cultural influences from the US but there is an older tradition of this hedging ‘like’ in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td>This new like which is a pragmatic marker is the result of grammaticalisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td>Not sure what this actually is called but I hear more people saying it these days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Declan</td>
<td>This is a new way of speaking for young people that is everywhere from America originally but spreading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having highlighted key trends in the teachers’ formal linguistic understandings in relation to each of the socially-differentiated structures, their wider sociolinguistic knowledge in this area is explored in the following section.

5.2.2.2 Findings: Sociolinguistic Knowledge (SDG)

As Table 5.11 a) below reveals, there were discrepancies in the abilities of the teachers in each grouping to identify the cross-varietal distribution of each item in this category of spoken English. For instance, while all of the ETs recognised that *preterite seen* was widely used in the English speaking world, only a minority of the STs (40%) shared these insights, with most either associating its use uniquely with IE English speakers or expressing uncertainty as to where it was commonly found. By contrast, all of the ETs and most of the STs (80%) correctly positioned *pragmatic like* in terms of its international profile. Alongside all of the ETs, the four STs who displayed an awareness of the extensive cross-varietal distribution of *preterite seen* were Aisling, Roseanna, Mary and Declan. Conversely, in the
case of *pragmatic like* only STs Gary and Sean failed to recognise the international profile of *pragmatic like*.

Accordingly, most of the STs recognised the international profile of the marker but they failed to appreciate the widespread use of *preterite seen* and the limited use of the two IE structures in the English speaking world.

The qualitative responses to this question, as presented in Table 5.11 b) below, highlight the typical misconceptions and uncertainties expressed by the majority of the STs in relation to the cross-varietal distribution of *preterite seen*, by comparison with the well-informed insights of the ETs.

### Table 5.11a: ETs/STs identifying varieties/countries of use of *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th><em>preterite seen</em></th>
<th><em>pragmatic like</em></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th><em>preterite seen</em></th>
<th><em>pragmatic like</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionnuala</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6. Cormac</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. John</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Graham</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.11b: ETs’/STs’ perceptions on the varieties/countries of use of *preterite seen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td>You hear this type of non-standard English in lots of countries including the US, UK, Australia, New Zealand and in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>I’ve heard British people say this, Americans and also people here in Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td>Definitely only the Irish say it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Joanna</td>
<td>Not really sure but could be the UK and US as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>No idea where it’s used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By contrast, the responses expressed in relation to *pragmatic like* reveal the greater overall depth of knowledge in relation to the cross-varietal distribution of *pragmatic like*, as exemplified in Table 5.11 c) below. In the case of the STs, this seems likely to have stemmed from the fact that more than half (60%) viewed it as an integral feature of the speech style of their own generation, as Declan’s response exemplifies.

Accordingly, the STs had acquired more substantive sociolinguistic insights in the case of the marker than observed previously for *preterite seen* and the two IE structures, whereas the ETs were equally knowledgeable. The teachers’ understanding in relation to the degree of formality/informality expressed through the use of these structures is explored in the following section.

5.2.2.3 Findings: Awareness of Situational Contexts of Use (SDG)

As Table 5.12 a) below illustrates, there was an overall shared consensus concerning the positioning of *preterite seen* whereas the teachers’ perceptions on *pragmatic like* tended to diverge. For instance, all of the ETs (100%) described *preterite seen* as a feature of informal language use, and this was also either referred to directly (30%) or alluded to (50%) by the vast majority of the STs (80%). By contrast, all of the ETs teachers (100%) and just over half of the STs identified the marker as a usage typically found in informal contexts. As far as trends for individual teachers in each cohort are concerned, Gary and George were the only STs to display a lack of awareness of the informal status of *preterite seen*. They also failed to recognise the degree of informality expressed by *like*, alongside STs Declan and Sean. Once again, this suggested that a core group of the STs had overall poorer levels of language awareness than their peers.
Table 5.12a: ETs'/STs’ identifying contexts of use for preterite seen and pragmatic like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>Fionnuala</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>Deirdre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionnuala</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The qualitative data generated by this question confirmed that the structures in this category were positioned at different points on a formal/informal continuum of language use by the majority of the teachers, as the comments presented in Tables 5.12 b) and c) below reveal. For instance, preterite seen was often described as a structure that should be avoided in all contexts due to its lack of grammaticality, although, like George, a minority of the STs believed that it was a “normal” feature of speech.

Table 5.12b: ETs'/STs’ perceptions of contexts of use of preterite seen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>Highly informal because it’s non-standard grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td>It's ungrammatical English so you couldn’t say this in formal contexts or really at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: George</td>
<td>Normal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, pragmatic like was perceived as a feature of conversational speech by the majority of the ETs (60%) and half of the STs (50%), as the responses of ET Owen and ST Mary below exemplify. Accordingly, the teacher population as a whole viewed each of the structures in the second category of spoken English fundamentally differently, in terms of their typical contexts of use. In general, however, they accorded them a higher degree of informality than the two IE structures, which the STs had viewed in a more neutral light.
Table 5.12c: ETs'/STs’ perceptions of contexts of use of pragmatic like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td>It is found in social conversations but not in formal contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td>You definitely wouldn’t write it in an essay but it’s in everyday conversations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously, we turn next to the findings for reported use and underlying macro-sociolinguistic influences, with further comparative analyses made.

5.2.2.4 Findings: Reported Patterns of Use (SDG)

More obvious divergences were found in the teachers’ reported practices relating to the two socially-differentiated structures than were observed in the case of the IE after perfect and ye, as Table 5.13 a) below illustrates.

Table 5.13a: ETs/STs reporting use of preterite seen and pragmatic like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Brid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2.Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Elizabeth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3.Joanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.Cormac</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Graham</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.Declan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10.Sean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, only two teachers (Roseanna and Gary) identified with using preterite seen, and they were both in the ST cohort. Accordingly, all of the ETs and the vast majority of the novices (80%) disassociated from this usage, which was consistent with their previously expressed views in relation to its lack of grammaticality. Meanwhile, pragmatic like was associated with by all but two of the STs (80%), but only three of the ETs (30%). As illustrated, the three ETs involved were Brid, Elizabeth and Martin, while Gary and George were the only STs to disassociate from its use. The findings for preterite seen are consistent...
with variationist accounts, which have shown that speakers from educated and professional backgrounds are less likely to favour ‘non-standard’ grammar (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Trudgill 1999a; Kirk 2007; Filppula 2012b). Meanwhile, those recorded for *pragmatic like* confirm the younger-age profile of the marker in Ireland, as is the case in Inner Circle Englishes more widely (Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). In order to gain a more complete understanding of these reported patterns of use, the underlying influence of regional background, gender and age as macro-sociolinguistic variables are analysed in the following section.

*Patterns of use by region:* As Figure 5.2 a) below indicates, the two STs who reported using *preterite seen* both came from counties in Munster. This finding supports the claims of sociolinguists that this usage is common in several regional varieties of IE, as well as more widely in Inner Circle Englishes (Hickey 2007; Filppula 2012b). By comparison, the eleven teachers who identified with *pragmatic like* came from a wider range of regional backgrounds, as Figure 5.2 b) below illustrates. For instance, the three ETs were natives of Connaught and Munster, while the eight STs came from Connaught, Munster and Leinster. This is consistent with Schweinberger’s account which found that the marker was widely used throughout Ireland (2012: 196-197).

![Figure 5.2a: Regional background of ETs/STs reporting use of preterite seen](image1)

![Figure 5.2b: Regional background of ETs/STs reporting use of pragmatic like](image2)

*Patterns of use by gender:* Gender and age were expected to be overlapping influences in the case of both usages in this category, as is widely established in the existing research literature (Clancy 2000; Andersen 2001; Farrell 2004; O’Sullivan 2004; Schweinberger 2012). However, as Figure 5.2 c) indicates, in the case of *preterite seen* no evidence of gender bias
was found, as both a male and a female ST were involved. However, it must be recognised that the scope of the analysis was limited to only two participants.

Figure 5.2c: Gender of STs reporting use of *preterite seen*

In the case of *pragmatic like*, on the other hand, a clear gender bias was found in favour of the females, as four of the eleven teachers who identified with the marker were male and seven were female, as Figure 5.2 d) indicates. Similar gender-differentiated patterns of use were also found within each teacher category, as Figures 5.2 e) and f) further illustrate.

Figures 5.2 d-f: Gender of ETs/STs reporting use of *pragmatic like*

d) ETs and STs
e) ETs
f) STs

As all five of the females in the ST grouping associated with the marker, compared with only two females in the ET category, these findings are consistent with Schweinberger’s claim that the marker is more visible in the speech styles of female adults in the twenty-something age category in the IE context, as it is more widely (2012: 197). This also confirms that age and gender were overlapping sociolinguistic influences in this case.
**Patterns of use by age:** Age-differentiated patterns of use were also observed for both structures, as Figures 5.2 g) and h) illustrate. For instance, the two teachers who identified with *preterite seen* were both STs in the twenty-something age group, whereas the ETs in the thirty to sixty age groups disassociated from its use. These findings are consistent with variationist accounts which have demonstrated a close link between ‘non-standard’ grammar and the speech styles of younger-aged adults (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984), although the limited scope of the analysis must be taken into account here also. Meanwhile, as Figure 5.2 h) reveals, in the case of *pragmatic like* an obvious age bias was found in favour of the twenty-something age group, as eight of the eleven teachers who identified with the marker were novices. This compared with the three ETs in the older age categories.

To sum up these trends, the marker was favoured most by those in the younger age category who were female, and least by the males aged over thirty. Accordingly, as in the case of the two IE structures, *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like* were identified with more often by the younger-aged teachers. However, the *after perfect* and *ye* were more closely linked to the male novices. The next section analyses the teachers’ qualitative responses relating to their reported practices in order to gain insight into how these usages were viewed in terms of their sociolinguistic distribution and profile in Ireland.
5.2.2.5 Findings: Perceptions of Sociolinguistic Profile (SDG)

The comments presented in Tables 5.14 a) and b) below are typical of those generated when the participants were asked to justify their reported practices in relation to the two socially-differentiated structures. Those that relate to *preterite seen* leave no doubt that it was viewed primarily in terms of its unfavourable social associations, as ET Owen and ST Cormac perceive. This contrasts with the two IE structures, which were typically linked to regional rather than social groupings in Ireland. Meanwhile, Gary and Roseanna, who were the sole STs to associate with the usage, viewed it as an integral part of their own speech communities. However, while Roseanna was aware of its stigmatised status, Gary seemed oblivious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td><em>Not something I would say as most people would consider it uneducated.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Roseanna</td>
<td><em>I know it sounds bad but everyone says it where I come from.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>Like someone left school with no exams.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td><em>Everyone says it where I come from.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pragmatic like,* on the other hand, was viewed by the majority of the ETs and STs alike as a feature of the speech style of the younger generation, and females in this age group in particular, rather than being linked to any particular regional or social communities, as the responses of ET Brid and ST Mary exemplify. Moreover, those who disassociated from its use tended to do so on the grounds that it was ‘immature’ or ‘irritating’ rather than ‘ungrammatical’ or ‘uneducated’.
Table 5.14b: ETs'/STs’ perceptions on profile of *pragmatic like*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>It's common amongst young people nowadays, especially teenage girls but I find myself using it more and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>It's very teeny-bopperish, so I would never use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td>Can sound juvenile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td>It's what people my age say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>This is so annoying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Joanna</td>
<td>It used to irritate me but I've got used to it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments of ET Brid and ST Joanna suggest that there is also a sense that as these teachers became more aware of the marker’s use and spread their perceptions changed, which in turn influenced their linguistic practices. This finding supports the link made by variationist researchers between how individuals evaluate different types of language use and the linguistic choices they make (Labov 1972b; Trudgill 1987). This relationship is explored in the following section by drawing on the attitudinal data.

5.2.2.6 Findings: Acceptability for Social Contexts (SDG)

As previously, the findings presented and discussed in this section relate to the teachers’ attitudes towards the acceptability of the specified usages in social contexts of use. As Table 5.15 a) below indicates, the rates of acceptance for *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like* varied considerably for each grouping and each structure. Specifically, only one of the ETs (10%) and two of the STs (20%) approved of *preterite seen*, while *pragmatic like* was tolerated by just over half of the ETs (60%) and all but two of the STs (80%). This confirmed earlier indications that only *preterite seen* was perceived as stigmatised usage. Approval rates and reported practices thereby converged for *preterite seen* but diverged noticeably for *pragmatic like*, as it was tolerated by twice as many of the ETs than the number that associated with its use.
Table 5.15a: ETs'/STs' accepting *preterite seen*/*pragmatic like* for social contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th><em>preterite seen</em></th>
<th><em>pragmatic like</em></th>
<th>ST</th>
<th><em>preterite seen</em></th>
<th><em>pragmatic like</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1. Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2. Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elizabeth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3. Joanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fionuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4. Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5. Roseanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>6. Cormac</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Graham</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>7. Declan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>8. Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>9. George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10. Sean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This provided further evidence that the teachers viewed the two socially-differentiated usages very differently in terms of their social status. As indicated, Brid was the only ET to accept the use of *preterite seen* in social contexts, although it was a feature she had previously reported not using due to its lack of grammaticality. This suggested that while she was aware of, and influenced by, normative considerations in her own speech patterns, she remained tolerant of the language use of others, even when it deviated from these norms. Meanwhile, in the ST cohort, only Gary and George found the use of *preterite seen* acceptable socially. This confirmed Gary’s lack of awareness of the stigmatization surrounding this usage. However, the opposite was true in George’s case, as he had previously referred to its lack of grammaticality. Accordingly, like Brid, he displayed a tolerance of this kind of ‘non-standard’ grammar but chose to refrain from its use in his own speech style.

One further finding worth highlighting relates to the stance adopted by ST Roseanna. This was somewhat contradictory as she disapproved of *preterite seen* due to its inferior status, yet she had previously ‘owned up’ to using it in her own speech community. This finding is consistent with Lippi-Greene’s (1997: 17) observation that it is not uncommon for the language attitudes of individual speakers to be at odds with their linguistic practices. Meanwhile, all of the teachers who rejected the social acceptability of *pragmatic like* also disassociated from its use, while ETs Ella, Dermot and Graham expressed tolerance, but claimed not to use the marker in their own speech style.
The related qualitative data revealed that the arguments used by the teachers to justify their stance in relation to *preterite seen* typically reflected prescriptive views of standard/non-standard English. These views were expressed more strongly in some cases than in others, as the comments in Table 5.15 b) below exemplify. For instance, like ET Fionnuala and ST Cormac, the majority of the teachers in each cohort rejected the usage on the basis of its association with speakers from less educated and socially-disadvantaged backgrounds. As ST Aisling perceived, “[I]t’s a sort of inner city dialect that people from Tallaght say”. Given that Tallaght is a working-class district of Dublin, often linked with crime and poverty in media reports, this indicated that she shared commonly-held negative stereotypes about this kind of socially-differentiated grammatical use, as highlighted by critical linguists (Lippi-Green 1997; Milroy 2001). At times (30%) the responses of the STs also reflected strongly negative emotive reactions, as in Deirdre’s “[It’s] really terrible” and Cormac’s “[It’s] so bad”, whereas the ETs mostly (70%) relied on prescriptive linguistic arguments to rationalise their stance, as in Graham’s case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>This is highly stigmatized English so completely unacceptable.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td><em>From a linguistic perspective, this is non-standard and ungrammatical.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Owen</td>
<td><em>I know we hear this on TV with sports pundits and celebrities but it’s non-standard</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Elizabeth</td>
<td><em>Bertie Aherne speak! Not what educated speakers and politicians should say!</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td><em>We can’t deny it’s widely used by people from all sorts of backgrounds</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>So bad.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>It’s a sort of inner-city dialect that people from Tallaght say.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td><em>Really terrible</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: George</td>
<td><em>It’s how lots of people speak.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, the minority in each cohort who found it acceptable to use *preterite seen* in social contexts pointed to its widespread use as validation, as in ET Brid’s “we can’t deny it is widely used by people from all sorts of backgrounds”, which was a view shared by STs Gary and George. Like Owen, several of the ETs (30%) conceded that it was a usage that was
often heard in public forums. However, ET Elizabeth argued that its use by public figures, including former Taoiseach Bertie Aherne, stood out precisely because it was not the type of formal and ‘standard’ English expected of those who occupy positions of high public office and influence. This recalls Trudgill’s view of Standard English as “the language of the powerful” (1999a: 121). These comments suggested that many of the ETs were acutely aware of the contradictions that critical linguists have highlighted in relation to spoken English, whereby the everyday linguistic practices of millions of speakers are dismissed in favour of idealized norms which are at variance with what real speakers do (Pennycook 2000; Milroy 2001; Canagarajah 2006a; Jenkins 2007).

The comments relating to pragmatic like, on the other hand, as shown in Table 5.15 c) below, did not typically reflect either strongly negative emotional responses or references to stigmatised use, although ST Gary likened the spread of the marker to a “disease creeping everywhere”. Interestingly, several of the ETs (30%) observed that they had become more tolerant of the marker as its popularity had grown, as in Ella’s case, which indicated a shift in attitude on her part. Similarly, ST Mary used to view the marker as “foreign sounding”, but had come to accept it as a feature of IE. This suggests that these teachers were sensitive to on-going trends surrounding this usage and that their attitudes were influenced by these developments. However, Fionnuala expressed the view that, although she recognised that the marker was becoming more widely used, it was a type of usage that older speakers should avoid as they risked sounding “ridiculous”. These comments confirmed that the teachers viewed pragmatic like as a feature of the speech style of the younger generation rather than as a usage that was indexed to speakers from disadvantaged social backgrounds, as was their perception of preterite seen. Accordingly, the teachers in both cohorts made key distinctions between the acceptability of each usage, with social class serving as a key determinant. This also confirmed that the high levels of tolerance recorded for the two IE structures previously mentioned, in terms of their use in social contexts, were due to the fact that these local usages were not perceived as ‘lower-class’ or ‘uneducated’ forms of expression by the vast majority of the teachers in this study.
Table 5.15c: ETs'/STs/ attitudes towards *pragmatic like* for social contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Ella</td>
<td><em>I must admit I used to hate it but it doesn’t bother me anymore.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>We hear it more and more but I still think it's ridiculous for people my age to say it.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td><em>It's like a disease creeping into everywhere these days.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td><em>I used to think it was foreign sounding but I don’t mind it anymore because I’ve got used to it.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to complete the picture of the norms that the teachers sought to adhere to in their everyday language use, we turn next to the modifications made by those who rejected the two socially-differentiated usages for social contexts of use.

**Teachers’ Revisions: Social Acceptability** As Table 5.15 d) below indicates, the nine ETs and eight STs who rejected *preterite seen* opted to replace it with the SBE past simple form which they viewed as more suitable.

Table 5.15d: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting *preterite seen* for social contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Location:</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ET)</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I couldn’t believe it when I seen it</em></td>
<td><em>I couldn’t believe it when I saw it</em></td>
<td><em>I couldn’t believe it when I saw it</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, in this case, the STs involved were familiar with the SE equivalent of *preterite seen*, whereas they lacked this kind of insight in the case of the *after perfect*. This may have been due to the negative attention that forms of expression such as *preterite seen* often receive in public debates concerning ‘proper’ English in Ireland and more widely (Hickey 2009; Filppula 2012b). This suggests that the *after perfect* does not typically attract this type of comment.
By comparison, in the case of *pragmatic like*, all of the STs and half of the ETs simply chose to omit the marker in the revised locution (revised version 1), as in Table 5.15 e) below. The remaining ETs, on the other hand, made further syntactic modifications so as to take account of the pragmatic dimensions involved. They did this by changing the original direct question to an indirect one featuring the modal verb ‘could’ (revised version 2), presumably in an attempt to soften its directness. This confirmed that some of the ETs had developed greater insights in relation to the pragmatic dimensions of language use than the rest of their cohort and the STs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Locution:</th>
<th>Revised Version 1: (ET/ST)</th>
<th>Revised Version 2: (ET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you mean like?</td>
<td>What do you mean?</td>
<td>Could you tell me what you mean?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having established that the teachers viewed *pragmatic like* in a far more favourable light than *preterite seen* in terms of its acceptability in social contexts of use, the following section explores their viewpoints concerning whether this type of grammar should be used by teaching professionals in the ELT domain.

5.2.2.7 Findings: Acceptability for Teacher Talk (SDG)

The quantitative findings presented and discussed in this section relate to Question 5 a) of the questionnaire and the positive responses recorded by the teachers when asked to evaluate the suitability of the specified usages for teacher talk. As Table 5.16 a) below illustrates, once again the approval rates for *preterite seen* were comparably low amongst the ETs and STs alike, and they diverged in the case of the marker, but this was slightly less than previously. For instance, all of the ETs and all but two of the STs rejected the use of *preterite seen* in teacher talk, while just over half of the STs (60%) and three of the ETs (30%) tolerated the use of *pragmatic like*. Accordingly, acceptance rates for professional language use were lower overall for both usages, with teachers in both the ET and ST groupings differentiating between the two discourse contexts. As only the ETs had made distinctions of this kind in the case of the two IE usages, this indicated that some of the STs viewed the use of *pragmatic*
like as less acceptable in this professional context than the after perfect and ye. The ETs also approved less of the marker in teacher talk than in social contexts, and ET Brid also distinguished between the two discourse contexts in the case of preterite seem.

As indicated, the two STs who tolerated the use of preterite seen in teacher talk were Gary and George, which is consistent with their previously expressed views. By contrast, ET Brid found preterite seen unacceptable for teachers to use with learners, presumably due to normative considerations, although she tolerated its use from a social perspective. Meanwhile, only ETs Brid, Dermot and Graham tolerated the use of pragmatic like in teacher talk, which was consistent with their previously expressed approval for social contexts of use. Conversely, ETs Ella, Elizabeth and Martin approved of its use from a social, but not from a professional perspective. Finally, the four STs who rejected the use of the marker in teacher talk were George, Gary, Aisling and Deirdre. Accordingly, George and Gary approved of the use of preterite seen in both social and professional contexts, but rejected the use of pragmatic like in both, whereas Aisling and Deirdre accepted its use socially but not in teacher talk. These findings indicated that the ETs generally held more prescriptive attitudes than the STs in relation to the acceptability of the two socially-differentiated usages for teacher talk, presumably due to their greater awareness of the norms governing the language use of teachers in the ELT domain, although teachers in both cohorts made key distinctions between each usage.
The qualitative comments presented in Tables 5.16 b) below confirm that while the STs were aware of unfavourable attitudes towards highly stigmatized usages such as *preterite seen*, only the ETs and a minority of the STs had developed critical insights concerning the normative constraints governing this type of socially-differentiated grammar in the ELT world. The responses of ET Fionnuala and ST Aisling, and STs Gary and Cormac are striking in this regard.

### Table 5.16b: ETs'/STs' attitudes towards *preterite seen* in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td><em>Nowhere would this be considered completely unacceptable grammar for a teacher to use because it’s ungrammatical and stigmatize.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>Schools wouldn’t like students to hear this being used by teachers as it is bad English</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td><em>Commonly heard so I think its ok.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>It’s not ok - not sure why exactly.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, in the case of *pragmatic like* the ETs tended to express pedagogical rationalisations to justify their stance rather than ideological arguments, as shown in Table 5.16 c) below. For instance, a minority (30%) argued that the use of *pragmatic like* by ESL and EFL teachers was “useful on socio-cultural grounds”, given its widespread use in the English speaking world, as ET Brid maintained and ST Mary alluded to. However, the majority of the ETs felt that “[I]t would overburden learners”, as Zara argued, given the complex range of grammatical and pragmatic roles the structure can play. This suggested that, for most of the participants, the issue of intelligibility was a key criterion in determining its suitability rather than language ‘prestige’. Meanwhile, like John, several (40%) of the ETs, and STs Aisling and Deirdre found it “overly informal” for the professional context. Similarly, ST Gary found it “too slangy”, although he approved of *preterite seen*, which suggested that he struggled to position different types of spoken English. ST Cormac also viewed the use of the marker by teachers as “unprofessional”, as in the case of the two IE structures previously, and he reiterated his concern that he would have difficulties avoiding its use when teaching, given that he habitually used the expression.
Table 5.16c: Teachers’ attitudes towards pragmatic like for teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>Useful on socio-cultural grounds because it’s widely used worldwide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Zara</td>
<td>It would overburden learners as like has so many grammatical and pragmatic uses and they get confused enough as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: John</td>
<td>This sounds too informal for this context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td>It’s too unprofessional but I think it would be hard not to say it as I hear myself saying it all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Gary</td>
<td>Too slangy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td>Too informal for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Mary</td>
<td>It’s everywhere these days so learners need it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, once again this novice teacher implicitly recognised that a styleshift would be necessary in his teacher role and that this could pose a challenge. As previously, we turn next to the modifications made by those teachers who disapproved of the use of the two socially-differentiated usages in teacher talk to uncover the versions they considered more suitable for their professional language use with learners.

**Teachers’ Revisions: Acceptability for Teacher Talk** The ten ETs and eight STs who rejected the use of preterite seen all chose to replace it in the given locution with the SBE past simple form. This suggested that they sought to adhere to prevailing target English norms in their professional language use, as Table 5.16 d) below illustrates.

Table 5.16d: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting preterite seen in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Location</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ET)</th>
<th>Revised Version: (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>I couldn’t believe it when I saw it.</td>
<td>I couldn’t believe it when I saw it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meanwhile, the revisions made by the seven ETs and the four STs who found the use of pragmatic like in teacher talk unacceptable revealed similar discrepancies to those observed
previously, as Table 5.15 e) below illustrates. Accordingly, they again failed to recognise that by omitting the marker the question became unduly direct for the classroom context. This confirmed that they lacked a critical understanding of socio-pragmatic considerations in language use in this professional environment, unlike the remaining three ETs whose modifications took into account issues of politeness.

Table 5.16e: Revisions by ETs/STs rejecting pragmatic *like* in teacher talk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Locution:</th>
<th>Revised Version 1: (ET/ST)</th>
<th>Revised Version 2: (ET)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>What do you mean like?</em></td>
<td><em>What do you mean?</em></td>
<td><em>Could you tell me what you mean?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up these trends, the teachers’ attitudes converged in the case of *preterite seen* due to its obvious stigmatization, while there was an overall lack of consensus in the case of marker *like*. Once again, the findings revealed marked discrepancies in the critical language awareness of the teachers in each cohort in relation to issues of appropriacy in language use, as well as normative and pedagogic considerations surrounding suitable teacher talk in the ELT classroom. In order to complete the analysis for socially-differentiated grammar, the following section examines the teachers’ attitudes towards the explicit teaching of these usages.

5.2.2.8 Findings: Acceptability as Target Model (SDG)

The quantitative findings for *preterite seen* and pragmatic *like* presented in Table 5.17 a) below relate to the positive responses recorded by the teachers in each cohort when asked to evaluate the acceptability of the explicit teaching of the two socially-differentiated structures as target models in the ELT curriculum. As expected, the teachers overwhelmingly rejected the overt teaching of *preterite seen*, whereas ambivalence was expressed in the case of pragmatic *like*. For instance, all of the ETs and all but two of the STs disapproved of the inclusion of *preterite seen* in the ELT curriculum. By comparison, pragmatic *like* was accepted by one of the ETs (10%) and just over half of the STs (60%). This indicated that a
distinction was made by the ETs between the acceptability of the use of the marker in teacher talk and its explicit teaching, whereas the STs failed to distinguish between these aspects.

Table 5.17a: ETs/STs accepting *preterite seen / pragmatic like* as target models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ET</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>pragmatic like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Brid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>1.Aisling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Ella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2.Deirdre</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Elizabeth</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3 Joanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Fionnuala</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4.Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Zara</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5.Roseanna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Dermot</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6.Cormac</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.Graham</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>7.Declan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>8.Gary</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>9.George</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Owen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10.Sean</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated, only ET Brid approved of the overt teaching of *pragmatic like*, although Brid, Dermot and Graham had previously accepted its use in teacher talk. This confirmed that Brid’s language beliefs were often at odds with those of her peers. In the case of the STs, once again George and Gary were the only STs to accept that *preterite seen* should be taught, while all but Aisling, Deirdre, George and Gary disapproved of the teaching of the marker. This confirmed that the language attitudes expressed by STs Aisling and Deirdre were consistently more prescriptive than their peers, while those of Gary and George were often the most contradictory.

As the comments presented in Table 5.17 b) below exemplify, the teachers’ rationalisations revealed a general consensus expressed that it was “completely unacceptable” to teach grammatical usages such as *preterite seen* that carried such obvious social stigmatisation, as ET Dermot and ST Cormac maintained, while ET Fionnuala and ST Aisling claimed that to do so would be “irresponsible”. ET Graham and ST Deirdre also raised the question of whether learners anywhere would want to be taught this type of grammar, while ET Martin argued that changing attitudes towards language use did not extend to this type of grammatical use. On a more positive note, ET Brid stressed the importance of engaging in critical classroom discussions with learners to highlight this type of usage and the reasons for its stigmatization. Such discussions, which she claimed to routinely incorporate in her
classroom practices, would raise learners’ awareness of the critical issues involved. This confirmed that she actively adopted a critical pedagogic stance in the classroom, as advocated by critical linguists in the ELT field (see Pennycook 2000; Jenkins 2007; Canagarajah 2006a; Matsuda 2012), in order to raise awareness of the ideologies underlying existing target English practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td>Obviously, I wouldn’t teach it because I know from my own experience that learners just wouldn’t accept this but I think teachers should highlight it and explain that this type of grammar is stigmatized because I think we all need to understand the issues involved here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Fionnuala</td>
<td>I would consider it irresponsible if teachers taught this kind of stigmatized grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Dermot</td>
<td>This is completely unacceptable for teachers to teach to learners because of its negative social associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td>I can’t think of learners anywhere who would actually want to be taught this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Martin</td>
<td>Attitudes are changing but non-standard forms like this would still not be taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td>Obviously, teachers can’t teach this because it’s considered bad English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td>It would be irresponsible for teachers to teach this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Deirdre</td>
<td>Nobody would want to learn this, would they?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated below, many of the ETs (60%) also viewed the inclusion of pragmatic *like* in the ELT curriculum as problematic, but mainly due to the added comprehension difficulties it would lead to for learners. For instance, Graham observed that while he might use the marker with both ESL and EFL learners for its socio-cultural usefulness, he would not actually teach it because of the complexities involved in pragmatic language use. Brid, on the other hand, advocated the use of new technologies including corpora and concordancing to highlight the use of the marker with learners. She also pointed to the latest corpus-informed ELT course books, which had made it easier for her to teach *like* in its pragmatic usage alongside in its traditional grammatical role/s.
Table 5.17c: ETs'/STs’ attitudes towards teaching of *pragmatic like* as a target model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET: Graham</td>
<td><em>I might use this with ESL and EFL learners because it's useful but I wouldn't actually teach it because pragmatic English is just too complex for most learners.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET: Brid</td>
<td><em>This is in the newer corpus-informed course book so I use them and concordancing which is good for showing learners how it's used both grammatically and pragmatically</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Cormac</td>
<td><em>Not sure if we can teach this.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Aisling</td>
<td><em>I think it might be more acceptable to teach this these days than before but I prefer to stick to what's in the book for the moment as I'm just getting used to teaching.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings provided further evidence that as a group the ETs were sensitive to changing trends and developments surrounding spoken English. Furthermore, they recognised that there were increased opportunities to introduce more diverse types of English into the language content of the lesson in some teaching contexts. However, most felt the need to adopt a cautious and measured approach, mostly due to the added linguistic difficulties they envisaged for learners and to on-going normative constraints. By contrast, there was a general absence of critical insight of this kind amongst the STs, with the exception of Aisling, who was aware of changing norms and practices in the ELT classroom but felt the need to adhere to the prevailing SE norms found in ELT course books due to her inexperience as a language teacher. This reminds us that the limited levels of critical language awareness displayed by the STs and their uncertainties as to whether this type of spoken grammar can be taught, as in Cormac’s case, must be understood in terms of their lack of classroom experience.

5.2.2.9 Summary (SDG)

The analysis in the previous sub-section explored the teachers’ awareness and perspectives in relation to *preterite seen* and *pragmatic like* representing grammatical and pragmatic usages that are commonly used by NES in Ireland, as in Inner Circle countries more widely. In so doing, it revealed key trends and distinctions made with the *after perfect* and *ye* representing usages that are unique to IE as a variety, as are summarised in the following section.
5.3 Summary

The analysis in this chapter has endeavoured to shed light on the nature of the relationship between the novice and experienced EFL teachers participating in this study and two distinct types of spoken English across the dimensions of language awareness, language attitudes and their reported everyday patterns of use, and against the backdrop of changing trends and perspectives surrounding spoken English in Ireland and more widely. The main quantitative findings in the areas of language awareness, reported language use, and language attitudes for each category of usage, and the items in each, are summarised in table form below.

Table 5.18: Main Quantitative Findings for Awareness and Attitudes for all specified usages in %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Item</th>
<th>Q.4a) Familiarity with item</th>
<th>Q.4c) Awareness of countries where used</th>
<th>Q.4d) Awareness of contexts where used</th>
<th>Q.4b) Reported use</th>
<th>Q.5a) Acceptable for social contexts</th>
<th>Q.5b) Acceptable for teacher talk</th>
<th>Q.5c) Acceptable as target model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after perfect</td>
<td>ET 100 ST 100</td>
<td>ET 40 ST 40</td>
<td>ET 50 ST 70</td>
<td>ET 60 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 30 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ye</td>
<td>ET 100 ST 100</td>
<td>ET 40 ST 40</td>
<td>ET 60 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 70 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 50 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preterite seen</td>
<td>ET 100 ST 100</td>
<td>ET 40 ST 40</td>
<td>ET 0 ST 20</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 20</td>
<td>ET 0 ST 20</td>
<td>ET 0 ST 20</td>
<td>ET 0 ST 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pragmatic like</td>
<td>ET 100 ST 100</td>
<td>ET 80 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 30 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 60 ST 80</td>
<td>ET 30 ST 60</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 60</td>
<td>ET 10 ST 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis began by uncovering the teachers’ passive knowledge of the specified items and the varieties represented, and their formal linguistic understandings. From this, their wider sociolinguistic knowledge and perceptions were investigated, followed by their reported everyday practices which were mapped in relation to the key macro-sociolinguistic variables of regional background, gender and age. The analysis uncovered important differences in relation to the teachers’ affiliations with each category of usage, and the individual items featured within these thereby providing crucial insights into their sociolinguistic relationship with these usages, and their identities as English language users from the IE sociolinguistic background more widely.
In general, greater affiliations were reported with the two IE structures than the two socially-differentiated forms, with regional background acting as a key underlying sociolinguistic influence in the case of both the *after perfect* and *ye*. The influence of gender and age was also visible in the teachers’ patterns of use/non-use of the two IE usages, with a bias observed in favour of the male novices in both cases. Clear distinctions were also made by the teachers in both groupings between the two socially-differentiated usages with *pragmatic mark* identified with more often by the novices in the younger age category, and by the females in particular. By contrast, *preterite seen* was largely disassociated from except by two teachers, but where it was reported to be used, in both cases it was novices who were involved, a male and a female in each case.

While, the student teachers in the younger age category reported a closer relationship with all four linguistic items in terms of their own everyday practices, it was not possible to differentiate the role played by age as a determinant in this regard from the influence of the teachers either novice or experienced professional status as all of the student teachers were in the younger twenty something age category while the experienced teachers represented older age groupings. However, given the strong evidence in the existing academic literature that young adults undergo age-grading in relation to such items as ‘non-standard’ grammar and pragmatic usage, as the review of the literature in Chapter highlighted (Stenstrom *et al* 1996; Schelling-Ester 2004; Cheshire 2005; Murphy 2010; Schweinberger 2012), it seems plausible that age was a significant variable in influencing the reported affiliations of the teachers in each grouping. Nevertheless, Cheshire’s observation that speakers who spend much of their time speaking in formal situations may carry over the linguistic features and constructions typical of formal styles to their conversational speech styles, especially if they are treated with the same respect in their private lives that they command in their professional practices (1999: 146), also suggests that teaching professionals with many years of experience would be less likely to use ‘non-standard’ grammar and pragmatic usages of the kind explored in this study in their everyday linguistic practices than recruits to this profession who would be less familiar with the formal and professional speech styles traditionally favoured in the ELT classroom context. This thereby suggests that age and professional status were likely to have acted as overlapping variables in this study in terms of their combined influence on the patterns of everyday language use reported.
The second area of focus in the analysis related to English language attitudes of the teachers. These were explored by investigating their perspectives on the acceptability of the use of the specified items in social contexts, and in relation to what constitutes suitable language for teacher talk, and for target models explicitly taught in the ELT domain. This revealed a wealth of insights into their understandings of the normative dimensions of language use in Ireland, and in the wider English language world, the values they sought to adhere to in their social and professional practices, the factors influencing their preferences, and the ideologies this reflected. It also shed light on discrepancies in the insights acquired by those in each grouping in relation to the complex range of linguistic and pedagogic considerations shaping the target English choices and practices of teachers in the ELT educational domain, which was as expected given their distinct professional status and experience. In these ways, the analysis of the data in this chapter in the areas of language awareness and language attitudes has provided key indications of whether the teachers in each cohort would seem likely to adhere to or to challenge the existing mono-centric target English status quo in their classroom practices in terms of the target English choices made at the level of variety, whether consciously or otherwise, in anticipation of the corpus findings which are presented and discussed in Chapter Six which follows.
Chapter Six

Inside the Classroom: Regionally/ Socially-differentiated Grammatical and Pragmatic Expression

“Are ye done?” (ST: Sean)

6.1 Introduction

The present chapter presents and discusses the corpus findings relating to the target English use of the teachers in this study, drawing on the corpora of EFL teacher talk for this purpose. The aim is to provide an empirical account of the nature and extent of use of spoken English varieties that professionals in this educational domain have hitherto been expected to avoid on normative grounds, with an overall view to determining what this might mean for ELT and ELTE. In this way, it sets out to address the final two research objectives set out in Chapter One, drawing on an integrated CL/DA analytic approach for this purpose.

The analysis in this chapter relates specifically to grammatical and pragmatic language use at the level of language variety. The corpus data which forms the basis of the analysis comprises the two sub-corpora ETTIL (Experienced Teacher Talk at Intermediate Level) and STTIL (Student Teacher Talk at Intermediate Level). The analysis begins by measuring frequencies of the specified usages and related variants, including SE forms where relevant. These outcomes are then situated in relation to usage across the specified discourse genres and varieties in order to establish their significance. For the second layer of analysis, DA frameworks from pragmatics are utilised, so as to identify and interpret functionality at the socio-pragmatic and discourse levels. This leads to a critical pedagogically-oriented appraisal of whether their use in this educational context is warranted, and how best it can be mediated by teachers drawing on approaches from SLA. To facilitate the qualitative analysis, the SETT framework adapted from Walsh’s original model (2006: 166-168) is initially drawn on in order to uncover key contextual information in relation to L2 classroom micro-contexts, and pedagogic functions/goals at the time of use. This allows for a targeted focus on teacher roles and practices, according to the methods and the rationale set out in Chapter Four. Challenges
that arose in the analysis are also referred to in the discussion, where relevant, together with the steps taken to resolve them.

6.2 Analysis and Findings (RDG)

6.2.1 Quantitative Findings: Frequencies - the IE after perfect

Corpus researchers have demonstrated that the measurement of word frequency is more difficult to achieve in the case of complex constructions than in the case of individual items (Lindquist 2009: 17). Consequently, it was expected that the after perfect construction would be more challenging to identify and quantify than pronominal ye, which proved to be the case. For instance, the item after can potentially occur in a number of distinct grammatical patterns. This necessitated several searches so as to be able to distinguish and accurately measure frequencies for the specified usage. For this purpose, KWIC (Key Word In Context) searches were carried out of the pattern after + * ing in the chosen texts files, whereby * stands for verb to generate concordance lists of all instances of grammatical patterning in ETTIL and STTIL featuring the item after (Antconc 2014). From this, tokens and frequencies for the after perfect were measured in order to determine the overall extent of its use by the teachers in each cohort. This highlights the benefits of combining quantitative and qualitative analyses of corpus data when exploring multiword items, as observed by O’Keeffe et al (2012: 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus and Variety Represented</th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>wpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL (IE experienced teacher talk at int. level IE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL (IE student teacher talk at int. level IE)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT (Inner Circle experienced teachers beg. to int. level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBEL (third level institutional talk in Ireland IE)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-CIE (conversational IE)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-IRE (general/formal spoken IE)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-GB (general/formal spoken BE)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-US (general/formal spoken AE)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.1 Frequencies in ETTIL/STTIL

As indicated, only 1 token of the after perfect was found in ETTIL by comparison with 9 in STTIL, which represented 33 wpm and 300 wpm in either case. Accordingly, the after perfect was used only very negligibly by the ETs, whereas it was statistically salient in the teacher talk of the STs. These finding are consistent with the attitudinal data, whereby the ETs mostly disapproved of the use of the after perfect by ELT teachers on normative and linguistic grounds, whereas the STs overwhelmingly approved. Comparisons were made subsequently across formal and informal discourse genres, including the teacher talk of EFL teachers from a variety of Inner Circle backgrounds working in the Belgian EFL context as represented by CONNECT, and third level institutional discourse in the IE setting as represented by LIBEL, in order to establish the significance of the findings.

6.2.1.2 Comparative Frequencies across Corpora: the IE after perfect

Statistical comparisons made with CONNECT revealed no instances of the after perfect, while 4 tokens were found in LIBEL, representing 132 wpm. This was slightly more than in ETTIL, and less than half of the tokens found in STTIL. Meanwhile, in ICE-Ireland (representing formal and professional IE discourse contexts), comparable frequencies were found as in ETTIL; that is, 11 tokens representing 15 wpm. In his study based on ICE-Ireland, Kirk (2007: 32) concluded that the after perfect occurred with muted saliency in the speech of IE speakers in formal and professional contexts of use, which is supported by the findings for LIBEL in this study. This suggested that the higher frequencies for the after perfect in STTIL were inconsistent with the professional language use of IE speakers in general.

This was confirmed when comparisons were made with LCIE, representing conversational IE, as 108 cases were found, representing 108 wpm. The incidence was noticeably higher than in ETTIL, but lower than in STTIL. On the basis of their research, which drew on LCIE, O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009: 518) referred to the ‘robust use’ of the after perfect by IE speakers in their casual conversations. This underscores the statistical saliency of the STs’ use of the after perfect and suggests a high degree of informality in their target English.
speech in general. Finally, comparisons made with ICE-GB and ICE-US, representing main varieties, revealed 7 and 12 tokens respectively, representing 9 wpm and 16 wpm. As expected, the *after perfect* featured more saliently in the speech of the teachers in this study than amongst professionals and educated speakers from these Inner Circle backgrounds. This is consistent with corpus research that has demonstrated that the verb construction is unique to IE (Filppula 2012a; Kirk 2007; Kortmann *et al* 2004; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009). Distribution was explored next in relation to the individual teacher files in STTIL, with comparisons made with the one case of use found in ETTIL.

6.2.1.3 Distribution of the IE *after perfect* in ETTIL/STTIL

As Figure 6.1 below illustrates, the *after perfect* was used by five of the ten STs (50%) including Sean on four occasions, Gary twice, and Cormac, Declan and George in one case each.

![Figure 6.1: Distribution of the IE *after perfect* in ETTIL / STTIL](image)

This was slightly fewer than expected, given that seven of the ten had previously claimed to use the *after perfect* on an everyday basis and all but two had approved of its use by EFL teachers, including three of the females in the cohort. This suggested there were limited opportunities for the use of the IE verb construction in this discourse context in terms of functionality. Meanwhile in ETTIL, Brid was the only teacher found to use the *after perfect*, on just one occasion. This was consistent with her previously reported use of the verb construction and her tolerance of the use of IE by teachers in the local teaching context in order to enhance the communicative competency of learners and to promote linguistic diversity. The fact that Brid’s peers did not use the *after perfect* is also in line with their
previously expressed attitudes, as most had rejected its use on linguistic and normative
grounds, even though half of the cohort claimed that it was a feature of their everyday speech.
This suggested that they made a conscious effort not to use this type of local grammar with
learners.

6.2.1.4 Comparative Frequencies of IE perfective variants in ETTIL/ STTIL

The richness and complexity of IE at the level of tense/aspect has been highlighted by many
researchers (see Hickey 2007; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Clarke 2012; Filppula
2012a, 2012b). Clarke (2012: 101), for instance, states that the after perfect is but one of five
perfective variants that exist in IE in place of the SE present perfect, as set out in Table 6.2
below, which was adapted from Clarke’s framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE Variant</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>ETTIL Tokens</th>
<th>ETTIL wpm</th>
<th>STTIL Tokens</th>
<th>STTIL wpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After Perfect (after + V ing)</td>
<td><em>We’re after starting</em></td>
<td>We’ve started</td>
<td>Hot News/ Resultative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusive Perfect (has/have + past participle)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Perfect (am/are/is + past participle)</td>
<td><em>Are you done?</em></td>
<td>Have you finished?</td>
<td>Resultative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Now Perfect (am/are/is)</td>
<td><em>How long are you in Ireland?</em></td>
<td>How long have you been in Ireland?</td>
<td>Continued Situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Perfect (was/were +ever)</td>
<td><em>Were you ever in Kerry?</em></td>
<td>Have you ever been to Kerry?</td>
<td>Unspecified Past</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to gain a more accurate picture of IE perfective usage, further searches were carried out to establish whether any other variants were being used, and to what extent. This was achieved by carrying out key word searches of the auxiliary verb/s in each variant and examining the concordance lines generated (Appendix D). As indicated below, all of the variants except for the conclusive perfect were found in ETTIL and STTIL, to varying degrees. The be perfect occurred most frequently, with 4 tokens in ETTIL and 18 in STTIL, representing 132 wpm and 594 wpm respectively, which was noticeably more than the after perfect previously. This compared with 1 token of the extended now perfect in ETTIL and 4 in STTIL. Meanwhile, 1 instance of the experiential perfect was found in ETTIL and 2 in STTIL, representing 33 wpm and 132 wpm in either case. Accordingly, three additional IE perfective variants were used by the teachers in both cohorts alongside the after perfect, with all featuring more visibly in STTIL, as with the after perfect previously. In order to gain a more accurate picture of usage, the distribution of each variant was measured subsequently.

6.2.1.5 Distribution of the IE perfective variants in ETTIL/STTIL

IE Be Perfect:

As Figure 6.2 below illustrates, in the 4 instances in which the be perfect occurred in ETTIL, it was used by Graham and Martin on 2 occasions each. Accordingly, its distribution was limited to a small number of male teachers in the cohort.

![Figure 6.2: Distribution of the IE be perfect in ETTIL / STTIL](image)

By comparison, in STTIL it was used by eight of the ten novices, including George and Sean, on three occasions each, Cormac, Declan, and Gary twice each, and Joanna, Mary and Roseanna once each. Accordingly, it featured more extensively than the after perfect and
reflected a more balanced gender bias, although it was used most by males in the novice category, notably George and Sean.

**IE Extended Now Perfect**

Meanwhile, only 1 token of the extended now perfect was found in ETTL, where it was used by Martin. In STTL, it was used once each by Cormac, Gary, George and Sean, as Figure 6.3 below illustrates. Therefore, it had a more limited distribution than the IE be perfect, and a similar distribution and male gender bias as the IE after perfect. One further point worth highlighting is that all of the STs who used the extended now perfect also used the after perfect and the be perfect variants. Therefore, there was a propensity for a core group of the male novices to use the perfective structures in their target English use, which was generally consistent with the findings for reported use and the language attitudes expressed by these teachers.

![Figure 6.3: Distribution of the IE extended now perfect in ETTL / STTL](image)

**IE Experiential Perfect**

This was confirmed by the findings for the experiential perfect, as it was used in STTL by Cormac and Gary on one occasion each. In ETTL, it was also used only by a male teacher, Martin, on one occasion also. Accordingly, this variant featured in the target English use of only a limited number of teachers, who in all cases were male.
In order to gain an understanding of the extent to which the teachers were using the IE perfective variants by comparison with the SBE equivalent, frequencies for the SE present perfect were measured in terms of overall use. This was achieved by generating concordance lists of all instances of have/has which serve as auxiliary verbs in this verb construction (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 68), and by carrying out a subsequent, manual examination of the data (Appendix D).

6.2.1.6 Comparative Frequencies: SE present perfect in ETTIL / STTIL

As Table 6.3 below illustrates, 108 cases of the SE present perfect were found in ETTIL, compared with 46 in STTIL, representing 3564 wpm and 1518 wpm in either case, giving a combined total of 154 tokens. This compared with a combined total of 10 tokens for the after perfect in ETTIL and STTIL. This indicated that while the teachers in both cohorts used both versions in their classroom discourse, the SE version was opted for considerably more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>SE present perfect</th>
<th>IE after perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tokens</td>
<td>wpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.7 Summary of Quantitative Findings: IE *after perfect* + variants

The analysis has found that the IE *after perfect* and three further IE perfective variants were visible in the teacher talk of the ETS and STs alike, alongside the SE *present perfect*. The IE perfective usages were all used more by the STs than the ETs, and in particular by the males in the cohort, which suggested that age and gender were important underlying variables. This was consistent with the questionnaire findings relating to the teachers’ reported patterns of use of the *after perfect*. The SE *present perfect* was preferred by the ETs, with strong correlations thereby also found between their teacher talk and their expressed beliefs, as they had mainly sought to adhere to SE norms in this professional context. The IE *be perfect* occurred with greatest statistical saliency, which suggested that its use might be more central to classroom processes and pedagogic functions than the remaining variants. In order to gain a better understanding of these statistical trends, the contexts of use of the IE perfective usages are explored in the next section, with specific reference to the classroom modes in which they featured, and the pedagogic functions being performed at the time, drawing on the SETT model (Walsh 2006), which has been adapted for the purposes of this study according to the rationale set out in Chapter Four of this study.

6.2.2 Quantitative Findings: the IE *after perfect*

6.2.2.1 Classroom Contexts for IE *perfective variants* in ETTIL/ STTIL

Classroom modes were identified through up-close searches of the concordance lines generated previously for each perfective usage found in ETTIL/STTIL, with comparisons made with the SE *present perfect* subsequently. All occurrences of use by the teachers involved were then tabulated in relation to each of the four modes set out in the SETT model, (as highlighted in Appendix F). Where ambiguities arose in terms of classification, the video recordings of the lessons taught were revisited to facilitate the analysis. As Figure 6.5 a) indicates, the sole occurrence of the *after perfect* in ETTIL featured in managerial mode; that is, when teachers were typically engaged in setting up tasks or bringing them to a close. Meanwhile, in STTIL it was found in managerial mode in 2 cases, in materials mode in a further 2 instances; that is, when the focus was on texts, and in the remaining 5 cases in classroom context mode; that is, when opinions and experiences were being discussed. This
indicated that the *after perfect* was used by the ETs only in a procedural capacity, while it was used in both conversational-type exchanges and in the procedural talk of the STs.

**Figure 6.5a: Classroom modes for the IE *after perfect* in ETTIL / STTIL**

By comparison, the *be perfect* occurred in ETTIL in all 4 cases, in managerial and material modes on 2 occasions each. It was also only found in these two modes in STTIL, in 10 instances in the former, and 8 in the latter. This suggested that its role was linked more to the transactional business of the EFL classroom than to classroom conversations, as Figure 6.5 b) below illustrates.

**Figure 6.5b: Classroom modes for the IE *be perfect* in ETTIL / STTIL**

Meanwhile, the *extended now perfect* and the *experiential perfect* featured in both ETTIL and STTLL only in classroom context mode. The first occurred in 2 instances in ETTIL and 4 in STTIL; the second in 1 case in ETTIL and 2 in STTIL as Tables 6.5 c) and d) indicate. This suggested that their use was linked to conversational type interactions, rather than to classroom procedures.
Accordingly, these IE perfective variants were absent from both ETTIL and STTIL in skills and systems mode, when language content was the focus. Finally, comparisons made with the SE present perfect revealed that this version was used in all four classroom modes, in both ETTIL and STTIL, as shown in Figure 6.5 e) below.

In ETTIL, the SE present perfect featured in just over half of the total of 108 tokens in managerial and materials modes; that is, in 38 instances in the former and 36 in the latter. It also occurred in this sub-corpus in classroom context mode in 22 instances, and in skills and systems mode in 18. Accordingly, the SE present perfect was used by the ETs in a wider range of modes, including when the focus of the lesson was on language content, whereas the IE perfective variants were not used in this classroom mode.

Similarly, in the 46 cases found in STTIL it occurred in all four classroom modes to a similar degree in each; that is, in managerial mode in 14 cases, in materials mode in 13 and in classroom context and skills/systems modes in 11 and 9 cases respectively. This indicated that the SE present perfect played a more central role in the business of teaching and learning.
in the EFL context than in the IE perfective variants. The fact that the IE perfective variants were not used by either the ETs or the STs when the focus of the lesson was on language content suggested a possible style shift in teacher talk towards established target English norms at this stage, although most of the STs had shown a lack of awareness of this kind of strategic competence in the questionnaires. Having established the classroom contexts in which the IE *perfective* variants featured, the next section focuses upon the pedagogical functions being performed by the teachers at the time of use, drawing on the adapted SETT model, as set out and rationalised in Chapter Four.

**6.2.2.2 Pedagogical Functions of the IE *perfective* variants**

To accurately identify and classify each usage observed according to the specific pedagogical function and goal associated with its use, the concordance lines generated previously were revisited as well as the transcripts and the video recordings where necessary to ensure a more accurate identification and classification of the data. All usages observed by the teachers in each grouping were then tabulated in relation to the ten pedagogical functions/goals featuring in the adapted SETT model as representative of functions routinely performed by teachers in the L2 classroom which involved interactional and relational aspects of language use (Walsh 2006: 166-168).

As Figures 6.6 a)-d) below illustrate, the IE perfective variants were associated with a limited range of pedagogic functions. For instance, the *after perfect* was used in a directive in ET Til on the sole occasion that it featured, and it was also found in this capacity in ST Til in 4 instances and in content feedback in 5 cases, as shown in Figure 6.6 a) below. By comparison, as Figure 6.6 b) indicates, the IE *be perfect* occurred in all 4 instances in ET Til in directives and progress checks, in 2 counts in each case. In ST Til, on the other hand, it featured in three capacities on the 18 occasions of use; that is, in 8 instances in directives, 9 in progress checks and in 1 case in evaluative feedback.
Meanwhile, Figure 6.6 c) and d) below illustrate that the IE extended now perfect and the IE experiential perfect featured only in referential questions in ETTIL and STTIL. The former occurred in this capacity once in ETTIL and on 4 occasions in STTIL. The experiential perfect also featured once in this role in ETTIL and twice in STTIL.

Comparisons made subsequently with the SE present perfect revealed a wider range of functions associated with its use than for the IE perfective variants. This was consistent with the higher frequencies recorded for the standard version and the wider range of classroom modes in which it featured. As Figure 6.6 e) below indicates, it occurred most in ETTIL in directives; that is, in 48 cases. It also featured significantly in referential questions; that is, in 38 instances, in explanations in 20, in comprehension and confirmation checks in 10 and 5 cases each, in display questions in 10 cases and in direct repair on 1 occasion. In STTIL it featured most also in directives, but to a lesser degree; that is in 16 instances. It also featured
in comprehension checks in 12 cases, in referential questions in 7, in display questions in 6 and in explanations in 5 instances. Accordingly, the SE version was used most often in directives by the teachers in both groupings. This suggested that the SE version played a more central role in the business of teaching and learning in the EFL classroom context than the IE perfective variants did, and that the latter were likely to serve in alternative capacities.

Figure 6.6c: Pedagogic functions of the SE present perfect in ETTIL/STTIL

In the following discussion, frameworks from pragmatics and SLA are drawn on, in order to explore the socio-pragmatic role/s played by the after perfect and its variants in this discourse context, and the pedagogical issues and challenges arising from their use. This is with a view to critically appraising their suitability for this educational context.

6.2.2.3 Socio-Pragmatic Roles and Issues of Appropriacy: IE perfective variants

As the review of the literature in Chapter Three of this study has highlighted, the belief that stress can impact negatively on learner progress is now commonly held in the field of SLA. This is supported by empirical research which has revealed that it is not uncommon for learners to face debilitating insecurities and anxieties about their learning (Horwitz et al 1986) and to dread being asked questions out of fear of derision and making mistakes (Shamin 1996; Tsui 1996). These types of psychological difficulties are thought to be exacerbated by cultural differences, which means that there is a greater potential for stress, misunderstanding and conflict in the multicultural EFL classroom in Inner Circle environments (Walsh 2006: 37). As a result, there have been growing calls for teachers to
acquire a high level of pragmatic expertise across both social and linguistic dimensions so that they can deal efficiently and appropriately with sensitive pedagogic areas where issues of power and face are involved, such as in teacher questions, when giving directives and evaluative feedback to learners and in their questioning (Murray 2010; Walsh 2006). This type of socio-pragmatic expertise also helps practitioners to become better prepared psychologically for their role in the classroom in terms of attending to their own face needs, and learning to become more confident and comfortable with their position of authority (Farrell 2015: 97).

The analysis which follows explores whether this relational goal was met by the teachers in this study in their target English practices, and the role played by the IE after perfect and its variants in the processes involved. The first area of focus is ET Brid’s use of the after perfect in a directive to a latecomer to class, which clearly also served as a reprimand.

Extract 6.1: IE after perfect in a ‘scolding’ role in ETTIL.

Teacher (Brid): You're late and we're after starting so quickly find a seat.
Learner: I am sorry for arrive late.

O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009) have identified the ‘scolding capacity’ of the after perfect in conversational discourse (2009: 13), that is, where it acts in a pragmatic dimension so as to convey a tone of annoyance and censure. This type of ‘scolding’ seems somewhat stern and abrupt for the teaching context, given that it is a third level institution for adult EFL learners. It thereby indicates a failure on Brid’s part to take into account the face-saving needs of the learner involved. This is surprising, given that she is an experienced teacher and would be expected to have acquired greater tact and sensitivity when dealing with classroom protocols and discipline.

Similarly, in Extract 6.2 below, ST Cormac’s use of the after perfect conveys a sense of irritation at the learners’ failure to remember a grammar point they have recently focused on.
Given his novice status, in this case this suggests a lack of awareness on his part of the sensitivities involved for learners in evaluative exchanges of this kind and the need for him to adopt a more supportive approach.

There were also several instances where the STs used the IE after perfect when classroom procedure did not run according to plan, possibly in an attempt to address their own face needs. O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009) have argued that the IE after perfect can signal that unexpected or unintended events have occurred (2009: 13). The STs used it in this capacity on four occasions in teacher directives, when the lesson was in either in managerial or materials mode, as the following extracts illustrate. In the first extract, it is used by ST Sean as he informed the class that there was insufficient time left in the lesson to complete a reading task they had started, which clearly was not his intention when planning the lesson.

Extract 6.3: IE after perfect ‘to save face’ in STTIL

Teacher (Sean): We’re after running out of time so we won’t be able to correct it now.
Learner: It’s ok.

Similarly, it was used by ST Gary while announcing to the class that he was experiencing technical difficulties accessing a computer file, which again was an unexpected occurrence. These extracts suggest that the use of the after perfect was at times also bound up with unexpected events or ‘mistakes’ that in some way challenged the teacher, and that it may have been used to help meet their own face needs.
Extract 6.4: IE *after perfect* ‘to save face’ in STTIL

Teacher (Gary): *I’m after losing the link so just read the questions in your book.*
Learner: *We begin?*

Conversely, the remaining perfective variants were often found in exchanges where teachers sought to establish friendliness and a sense of solidarity with learners. This is demonstrated in the following extract when ET Martin used the *extended now perfect* as he enquired how long the learners had been living in Ireland, thereby expressing an interest in their lives and experiences. The repeated use of the vocative *you guys* can also be seen to reduce the social distance between teacher and learners, adding to the informality and good-naturedness of the exchange.

Extract 6.5: IE *extended now perfect* in empathic talk in ETTIL

Teacher: (Martin): *(Martin): So, I’ve taught you guys before haven’t I? So remind me how long are you guys here?*
Learner: *How long I am stay? One semester.*
Teacher: *But you came in September, yeah? Are you getting used to living here?*
Learner: *Yes, I like.*

The IE *extended now perfect* also featured in a similar type of empathic exchange, this time involving ST Sean, as shown in Extract 6.6 below.

Extract 6.6: IE *extended now perfect* in empathic talk in STTIL

Teacher: (Sean): *(Martin): So where are you from?*
Learner: *Spain.*
Teacher: *That’s nice, all that sunshine. And how are you getting on in Ireland? Are you here a while?*
Learner: *In the next year.*
Meanwhile, there were frequent occasions when the IE *be perfect* was used by the teachers in each cohort in order to reduce teacher authority and maintain good rapport as they checked progress and navigated the learners through the lesson. As in Extracts 6.7 and 6.8 below, it often occurred with the past participle ‘done’ instead of ‘finished’ and with inclusive ‘we’, which added to the informality of the exchange and gave a sense of a collaborative learning environment.

**Extract 6.7: IE *be perfect* to reduce teacher authority in ETTIL**

Teacher (Graham): *Ok, so are we done everyone? Ok, so I want you to check your answer with your partner.*

Learner: *No problem.*

This particular usage occurred on two occasions in ETTIL and in nine instances in STTIL, which was significant. It suggested that the STs typically favoured a less authoritative style, presumably because they were close to the learners in age. However, they may also have felt uncomfortable in their teacher role at this early stage of teaching practice.

**Extract 6.8: IE *be perfect* to reduce teacher authority in STTIL**

Teacher (Joanna): *So if you’re done, we can start the next exercise.*

Learner: *One minute.*

While the interactions between the novices and learners were typically relaxed and good-humoured, some in the cohort were at times overly frank in their disclosures. This suggested that they identified with the learners more as peers than as students whom they were teaching. In the following three extracts the use of the *after perfect* by the STs in referential questions is highlighted, as they elicited information about the students’ lives and shared their own local knowledge and experiences. O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno (2009) have referred to the
use of the *after perfect* so as to ‘foreground narrative’; that is, when speakers are exchanging anecdotes and experiences, as is common in social exchanges in Ireland (2009: 13).

For instance, in Extract 6.9 below it is used by ST Sean as he asks learners about their experiences of living in Limerick, which can be seen as an attempt on his part to establish rapport. He was also keen to share his local knowledge of the city, but, considering their lack of response, it is unlikely that the learners were able to follow his account of how the city had changed, given that it also reflected highly informal slang usage.

**Extract 6.9: IE *after perfect* in an intimate exchange in STTIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (Sean):</th>
<th>So how are you getting on living in Limerick?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>I prefer Galway … Limerick is not beautiful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Yeah. I get you ‘cos they’re after making it a pedestrian street ‘cos it used to be a right kip down there yeah it was way worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were further cases where the *after perfect* was used by the STs in frank disclosures, as in the following extract when George described the difficulties he had been experiencing finding somewhere affordable to rent. As he started the turn by asking the learners about their efforts to find accommodation locally, this can also be seen as an attempt on his part to establish common ground, although there is also a sense that he is ‘giving out’ about his own difficulties.

**Extract 6.10: IE *after perfect* in an intimate exchange in STTIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (George):</th>
<th>So how do you like living on campus? Good, yeah?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I’m after spending ages looking for something but it’s hard to find anything that’s like, decent that doesn’t cost a fortune nearby. So I reckon, yeah, you’re better off on campus if you can, like afford it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So it’s going ok, yeah, you’re getting used to it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Yes, I prefer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While these informal and frank disclosures may have been intended to establish rapport, they also tended to reflect a lack of professionalism on the part of the STs involved due to the degree of intimacy expressed. Farrell (2016: 12) reminds us that teacher identity is shaped over many years of classroom practice. As Sean and George had come directly from an undergraduate degree to the MA programme with no prior teaching experience, it was not surprising that they struggled to achieve the balance between being open and friendly, and maintaining the necessary professional distance. This finding supports the claims made by Pennington and Richards (1997, 2016) concerning the challenges faced by novices in developing teacher identity and an effective teacher role. Interestingly, the high degree of informality in the interactions of STs Sean and Gary also indicated that unlike most novices who take on a traditional or formal pedagogical role as their classroom ‘default identity’, these novices opted for a more personal and authentic identity. Their ‘laid-back’ teaching style and identity seems likely therefore to have been a reflection of several factors including their lack of experience, the personalities of the individuals concerned, their age (given that they were similar in age to the Erasmus students they were teaching), and cultural influences pertaining to the informal speech style of the Irish as a sociolinguistic group. However, as Zimmerman (1998: 91) has argued, this kind of informal orientation may be less effective for an inexperienced teacher who has not yet mastered instructional content and pedagogical skills. The highly informal nature of the novices’ speech style also suggests an obvious lack of awareness on their part of their teacher role, which raises the further the question of whether these novices would be able to adopt a more formal teacher identity in a traditional teaching environment where this would be expected, and deemed more appropriate. Nevertheless, as teacher identity is assumed to develop and evolve over time (Miller 2006:10), they would be expected to develop a more professional approach as they gained in experience and acquired greater awareness of the discourses and norms of the professional community they were entering.

Finally, these exchanges further demonstrated that in the EFL classroom context the use of the IE after perfect by teachers can deliver information which is unexpected, or convey a tone that seems overly informal or too intimate for this professional setting. This finding is consistent with the claims of linguists that the IE after perfect is a usage that is associated with social rather than professional contexts of use (Kirk and Kallen 2007; Amador-Moreno
Having established that some IE perfective usages led to more obvious affective gains than others, the next section explores the implications of their use for ELT and ELTE.

6.2.2.4 Pedagogical Implications: IE perfectives in EFL Teacher Talk

One of the key arguments traditionally made to justify the exclusion of locally-used grammar from the EFL classroom context, is that it leads to greater comprehension difficulties for learners (Long 1981, 1996; Adger 1997, 2000; Walsh 2003, 2006). This was a view that most of the ETs shared in their evaluative comments when responding to the questionnaire. On the basis of their classroom experiences, they cautioned that EFL learners at intermediate level still struggled to understand the SE present perfect across its various meanings and usages, citing reasons such as L1 negative transfer or the subtly nuanced meanings involved. This viewpoint is also widely held in applied linguistic circles, as a result of which the SE present perfect typically features in intermediate level ELT course books for revision and practice purposes.

On returning to the previous extracts where the after perfect was used, it is clear that there was no apparent confusion on the part of the learners as to the message being conveyed when it was used in teacher directives, as indicated by their responses. In these cases, it is likely that learner comprehension was facilitated by contextual cues and by the teacher’s use of familiar lexis. However, Sean’s use of the after perfect in a longer turn, in close syntactic proximity with the slangs terms “a right kip”, “I get you” and “way worse”, led to a target input level that was beyond their reach. This was due to the combined use of unfamiliar, locally-used grammar and colloquial lexis that lacked semantic transparency, as evidenced by the lack of any meaningful response on the part of the learners to his anecdote. This failure to modify his speech style so as to provide suitable target input can be linked to his poor language awareness, which was highlighted in the analysis in Chapter Five. This finding supports Walsh’s (2006: 86) observation that novices from NES backgrounds are often disadvantaged in their target English performance due to a lack of insight into the highly informal nature of their own language use.

Notwithstanding the difficulties posed for learners from the use by teachers of an additional perfective variant while they are still struggling to master the standard version, a strong
socio-cultural case can be made for learners studying in Ireland over an extended period or intending to make Ireland their home to be given opportunities to hear this type of usage in the classroom to help them to develop communicative competency, as Asian and McCullough (1998: 42), and White (2006: 229) have argued. This can be facilitated by teacher/learner interactions which are authentic and highly contextualized, and which are accompanied by an explicit awareness-raising focus in order to help them ‘notice’ when this type of English is being used, as well as providing them with the necessary contextual cues to ensure that they can decipher the meaning being conveyed. The analysis has revealed that opportunities for the introduction of this type of local expression seemed to arise more naturally in classroom context mode when opinions and experiences were being discussed, and when referential questions were being asked to elicit information from learners.

The use of referential questions by teachers to elicit opinions and experiences is a key strategy used to encourage a high level of learner participation and engagement. Such questions also create opportunities for more authentic exchanges in the EFL classroom context so as to establish common ground and solidarity (Walsh 2006). However, the use of the IE extended now perfect by ST Sean in a referential question, when the lesson was in classroom context mode, seems to have created comprehension difficulties for learners, as shown in Extract 6.3 which is revisited below.

Extract 6.3 (revisited): IE extended now perfect in empathic talk in STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: (Sean)</th>
<th>So where are you from?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Spain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>That’s nice, all that sunshine. And how are you getting on in Ireland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Are you here a while?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>In the next year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, the learners interpreted the teacher’s question to mean how long they were intending to stay in Ireland, rather than how long they had already been in the country. From the learners’ response, which referred to future, rather than past, time, it is reasonable to assume that their difficulty arose as a result of confusion with the SBE present continuous structure, which is also formed with the auxiliary verb are, but is used to express future
arrangements. This suggests that the use of the extended now perfect by teachers in conversational type exchanges can be problematic for learners of English at the intermediate level, and that their difficulties are likely to be exacerbated when referential questions are involved. This is due to the fact that they are less able to predict the nature of the content of teachers’ questions, as they might do when routine classroom transactions are being performed. The lack of any contextual cues provided by the teacher in order to help the learners to interpret the meaning being conveyed was also likely, in this case, to have hampered their ability to correctly process what they were being asked.

By contrast, in Extract 6.11 below the IE experiential perfect was used more successfully by ET Martin, as he asked learners about their experiences of travelling around Ireland in a lesson based on the theme of journeys. As indicated, he began by relating the topic to the learners’ experiences of getting to know Ireland as a country in order to encourage participation and, at the same time, establish rapport.

Extract 6.11: Supported use of the IE experiential perfect in ETTL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: (Martin)</th>
<th>So have you travelled much in Ireland? Were you ever in Kerry? You know, Kerry, in the south ...were you ever in Kerry before ...the ring of Kerry?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>No Kerry but we went to Galway last month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Cool, yeah, Galway’s great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Yes, I like a lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the learner’s response, there does not seem to have been any comprehension difficulties in this case, which may have been due to Martin’s repetition of the structure, the name Kerry, the use of the time reference ‘before’ and the additional contextual details he provided, presumably in order to help the learner decipher the message. Walsh (2006: 121) has observed that amongst the range of interactional strategies that teachers can draw on to help learners to process different aspects of language at a deeper level to facilitate learning are the use of emphasis and repetition, as evidenced in the previous extract. By contrast, ST Cormac’s use of the experiential perfect in a similar type of exchange, with very little
contextual support, or repetition provided, may explain why the learner failed to respond in any meaningful way.

Extract 6.12: Unsupported use of the IE *experiential perfect* in STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: (Cormac)</th>
<th>So how was your weekend? I was in the country. Were you ever in the country?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This illustrates the need for teachers to adopt a carefully mediated target English approach when introducing this type of spoken English grammar into the EFL classroom context for learners at this level.

6.2.2.5 Summary: Qualitative Findings IE *perfective* variants

The previous analysis explored the socio-pragmatic role/s played by the IE *after perfect* and three further IE perfective variants in novice and experienced teacher talk in the EFL classroom, establishing that some of these usages contributed more successfully to the affective realm of classroom communication than others. The analysis further explored the pedagogical implications of their use which revealed the need for a discerning and carefully mediated pedagogical approach, and the benefits of overt awareness-raising training in this area on ELTE programmes for teachers at both the novice and experienced stages of their careers, so as to enhance their target English performance. For comparative purposes, the following section explores the findings for IE *ye*, in order to gain insight into the extent of its use by EFL teachers in their classroom interactions, and the benefits and challenges arising thereof.
6.2.3 Quantitative Findings: Frequencies - IE ye + variants

As previously, the discussion begins with the quantitative findings for word rank, tokens and frequencies in ETTIL and STTIL, with comparisons made subsequently across the specified discourse genres and varieties.

6.2.3.1 Frequencies for IE ye in ETTIL/STTIL

As indicated in Table 6.6 below, 41 tokens of ye were found in ETTIL, representing 1367 wpm and a word rank of 126. This compared with 254 counts in STTIL, representing 8467 wpm and a word rank of 23. Accordingly, the IE pronominal featured in both sub-corpora, but with marked statistical saliency in STTIL. Frequencies were higher, therefore, for ye than for the after perfect and the remaining perfective variants in both ETTIL and STTIL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus and Variety Represented</th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>wpm</th>
<th>rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL (IE experienced teacher talk at int. level IE)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL (IE student teacher talk at int. level IE)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8467</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT (experienced NE teachers beg. to int. level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBEL (third level institutional talk in Ireland)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-CIE (conversational IE)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-IRE (general/formal spoken IE)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-GB (general/formal spoken British English)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-US (general/formal spoken American English)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was as expected, due to the high frequencies of pronominal use in spoken English in general (Biber et al 1999). A further influence was likely to be the high levels of teacher/learner interactivity in the CLT classroom context (Tsui 1996; Oxford 1998; Walsh 2006), which creates greater opportunities for second person pronominal use, as in conversational-type exchanges. These findings are consistent with the teachers’ previously reported language attitudes, as the novices had mostly approved of the use of IE ye in teacher
talk in the EFL classroom context. By contrast, most of the ETs had disapproved for normative reasons, although they recognised the interactional value of *ye* in terms of classroom management, as well as the communicative gains for learners from an understanding of its use.

6.2.3.2 Comparative Frequencies for IE *ye* across Corpora

As Table 6.6 further illustrates, no instances of IE *ye* were found in CONNECT. By comparison 174 tokens featured in LIBEL, representing 174 wpm and a word rank of 62, which is substantially more than in ETTIL, but less than in STTIL. Accordingly, *ye* was used noticeably less by the ETs than by the lecturers/tutors in the third level institutional context in Ireland, but was used more by the STs in the EFL context. This underscored the high frequencies for *ye* in the target English use of the STs, and its muted use by the ETs. This was again confirmed when comparisons were made with ICE-IRELAND, representing formal and professional discourse in the IE setting, as 145 tokens were found, representing 181 wpm and a word rank of 98. This was significantly higher than in ETTIL, but lower than in STTIL. Taking into account Kirk and Kallen’s (2007) claim that spoken forms such as *ye* are less likely to be used by IE speakers in their professional encounters than in informal exchanges, this finding suggested high levels of informality in the STs’ target English use. Comparisons made with LCIE also confirmed the statistical saliency of *ye* in STTIL, as 104 tokens were found, representing 104 wpm and a word rank of 156. Accordingly, *ye* was used more by the novices in this study than by IE speakers in conversational contexts, which, again, was significant.

Further comparative analyses at the level of variety revealed low frequencies for *ye* in ICE-GB and ICE-US, with 17 and 11 tokens found in either case, representing 23 wpm and a word rank of 1234 in ICE-GB, and 14 wpm and a word rank of 1056 in ICE-US. As expected, this was considerably less than in ETTIL and STTIL, given the limited cross-varietal distribution of the IE pronominal (Kortmann *et al* 2004; O’Keeffe and Amador-Moreno 2009; Filppula 2012a). Having established that *ye* was a highly visible feature of the target English use of the teachers, but that it was favoured considerably more by the novices, its distribution was explored subsequently in the individual teacher files.
6.2.3.3 Distribution of IE *ye* in ETTIL/STTIL

As Figure 6.7 below illustrates, *ye* was used by only two of the ETs, Brid and Martin, and to a similar degree, that is on 22 occasions by Brid, and in 19 instances by Martin. As both teachers had also used one or more of the IE perfective variants, this suggested that they routinely used IE grammar in their target English practices with learners, which was consistent with their previously expressed attitudes. By comparison, *ye* was used by eight of the ten novices, including all of the males and three of the females in the cohort, with only Aisling and Deirdre refraining from its use. Specifically, it was used by Mary on 28 occasions, by Roseanna in 20 instances, by Joanna in 18 instances, by Sean on 46 occasions, by Cormac, Gary and George in 38 cases each and by Declan on 18 occasions. These practices were also consistent with the attitudes expressed previously by these novices. Accordingly, it was an integral feature of the target English use of the vast majority of the STs and a small minority of the ETs, with strong correlations found between their previously expressed language attitudes and their actual classroom practices, as with the after perfect previously.

![Figure 6.7: Distribution of IE *ye* in ETTIL/STTIL](image)

To gain a more complete understanding of the teachers’ use of IE grammar at this level, further searches were carried out in order to identify any further variants they might be using and to what degree, given that IE speakers have several second person pronominal forms at their disposal. In addition to the variants listed in Table 6.7 below, which are well-documented in the sociolinguistic literature (Hickey 2007; Filppula 1999, 2012a, 2012b), the teachers’ use of reflective pronoun *yourselves* as a second person pronoun was also explored. This decision was influenced by anecdotal accounts of its routine use by experienced EFL
teachers when addressing learners, gained from classroom observations on the MA TESOL programme. This usage has not previously been explored empirically in this discourse context, although its use has been noted by sociolinguists in conversational IE (Filppula 1999, 2012a, 2012b; Hickey 2007).

6.2.3.4 Comparative Frequencies for IE ye + variants in ETTIL/STTIL

As Table 6.7 below indicates, yourselves and youse were the only further variants found in the classroom data, with 23 of the former in ETTIL, and 12 cases of the latter in STTIL, representing 759 wpm and 396 wpm in each case. This indicated that the teachers in each grouping were opting for either one variant or the other, but not for both. Accordingly, in addition to ye, yourselves was used as a second person pronominal by the ETs, while youse was the version opted for by the STs, but both were used only marginally by comparison with ye. For comparative purposes, the distribution of these further variants was investigated subsequently in terms of individual teacher trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE variant</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>ETTIL</th>
<th>STTIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ye</td>
<td>Can ye tell me what ye decided? (ETTIL)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>8382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youse</td>
<td>Youse can start the reading now. (STTIL)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y'all</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yez</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesuns</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourselves</td>
<td>What about yourselves over here? (ETTIL)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.3.5 Distribution of *yourselves/youse* in ETTIL/STTIL

As Figure 6.8a) below illustrates, *yourselves* was used by three of the female ETs to a fairly similar degree by each. This included Ella on 10 occasions, Elizabeth in 8 instances and Zara in 5 cases. Interestingly, it was not used by either ETs Brid or Martin, both of whom had used *ye*. This confirmed that there were two distinct trends, whereby some of the ETs were opting for *ye* and others for *yourselves*, with the latter favoured more in overall terms and used only by females in the cohort. Meanwhile, as Figure 6.8 b) indicates, *youse* was used by four of the ST, to a comparable degree; that is, by Joanna on 5 occasions, by Cormac on 3 occasions and by George and Sean twice each, which thereby indicated a male gender bias in this case. Significantly, *youse*, *ye* and the *be perfect* were used by these four male novices also, and Cormac, George and Sean also used the *after perfect*. This confirmed that a core group of STs were consistently using IE grammar in their classroom practices, and that in all but one case they were males. This was largely consistent with the teachers’ reported practices, and the attitudinal findings reported on in Chapter Five.

![Figure 6.8a: Distribution of *yourselves* in ETTIL](image1)

![Figure 6.8b: Distribution of *youse* in STTIL](image2)

Having provided a detailed statistical account of the extent of use of IE *ye* and its variants in ETTIL and STTIL, comparative analyses were made subsequently with SE *you*. However, it was recognised that this version is not a direct equivalent form, as it can serve as both a singular and plural second person pronominal.
6.2.3.6 Comparative Frequencies for SE you/IE ye in ETTIL/STTIL:

As Table 6.8 below illustrates, a total of 1,105 five tokens of you were found in ETTIL, representing 36,465 wpm and a word rank of 3. This compared with 41 tokens of ye in ETTIL, representing 1367 wpm and a word rank of 126. Accordingly, SE you was used significantly more by the ETs than ye, as expected, given their previously expressed preference for SE grammar in teacher talk. By comparison, in STTIL, 1089 tokens of you were found, representing 35,937 wpm and a word rank of 4, which was slightly less than in ETTIL. These findings suggested there might be some conscious style shifting, on the part of the ETs, from ye to you, so as to meet normative requirements when addressing pairs and groups. This is borne out by the fact that most had previously reported habitually using ye outside the classroom, which was also consistent with the attitudes that they had expressed in the teacher survey.

Table 6.6: Comparative Frequencies for SE you/IE ye in ETTIL and STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPUS</th>
<th>SE you</th>
<th>IE ye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tokens</td>
<td>wpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>36,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>35,937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One way to test these assumptions was to identify the types of lexical patterning associated with ye and you in each sub-corpora. This decision was influenced by the revisions made to the sample locution in the questionnaire by the five ETs rejecting ye for teacher talk, as they replaced the IE pronominal with SE you + all, presumably to make it explicitly clear that more than one person was being addressed. This prompted a search to find instances of this type of lexical patterning in ETTIL and STTIL.

6.2.3.7 Lexical Patterning with ye/you in ETTIL / STTIL:

As Table 6.9 below indicates, 59 tokens of you all were found in ETTIL, by comparison with 15 in STTIL. Therefore, as expected, it was a pattern that featured more in the classroom discourse of the ETs. Meanwhile, when further analyses were made so as to identify whether
the pattern *ye all* also featured, 2 tokens were found in ETTIL and 18 in STTIL. Accordingly, *ye all* was less salient than *you all*, which was as expected, given the obvious redundancy involved.

Table 6.7: Lexical patterning with *you all* and *ye all* in ETTIL and STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Tokens ETTIL</th>
<th>Tokens STTIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *You + all* | *I’d like you all to do this* (ETTIL)  
*I want you all to check…* (STTIL) | 59 | 15 |
| *Ye + all* | *Could ye all turn to…* (ETTIL)  
*Did ye all get that?* (STTIL) | 2 | 18 |

This supported the view that some of the ETs may have been opting for *you all* rather than *ye* when addressing pairs and groups, and that they were avoiding its use due to normative requirements, given that the use of *ye* would have brought obvious gains for classroom management.

6.2.3.8 Summary: Quantitative Findings: *Ye + variants*

The quantitative analysis has revealed that IE *ye* was a highly visible feature of the target English use of the teachers in both cohorts, alongside SE *you*, and that it was favoured most by the novice males. Therefore, age and gender were, once again, important underlying variables in this case, as with the *after perfect*, and its variants previously mentioned. Pronominal *youse* and *yourselves* were also observed in the classroom data, but to a lesser degree, with teachers in each cohort opting for one or the other, rather than for both versions. Finally, further searches also uncovered the use of *yourselves*, and *you + all* by the ETs as likely strategic alternatives to *ye* on normative grounds, with the possibility of some style shifting also between *ye* and *you* by the small minority of ETs who used the IE pronominal. In order to gain a better understanding of usage and contextual influences, the classroom modes in which *ye* occurred, and the pedagogic functions being performed at the time, are explored in the following section.
6.2.4 Qualitative Analysis: IE ye+ variants/SE you in ETTIL/STTIL

6.2.4.1 Classroom Modes for IE ye in ETTIL/STTIL

As Figure 6.9a) below illustrates, ye was found in a wider range of classroom modes in ETTIL than STTIL. The ETs used it, in 30 of the 41 instances found, in managerial mode. It also featured in 8 cases in materials mode and in 3 instances in classroom context mode. However, as with the after perfect and the further perfective variants explored, it was not used by the ETs when the lesson was in skills and systems mode. By contrast, in STTIL ye was found in all four classroom modes, to a comparable degree. For instance, of the 254 tokens found, 92 occurred in managerial mode, 78 in materials mode, 43 in classroom context mode and 41 when the lesson was in skills and systems mode. Accordingly, it was used most in managerial mode by the teachers in both groupings, but only in skills and systems mode by the STs. This suggested that the IE pronominal played a more central role in the business of teaching and learning English than the perfective usages, and that it was being used in a more targeted way by the ETs than by the STs.

Meanwhile, as Figure 6.9 b) below illustrates, comparisons made subsequently with a sample of 100 tokens of SE you from the concordance lists generated previously revealed that this version featured in ETTIL and STTIL in all four classroom modes to a fairly comparable degree. For instance, in ETTIL it occurred in 34 cases in skills and systems mode, in 28 cases in materials mode, in 22 cases in classroom context and in 16 cases in managerial mode.

Figure 6.9a: Classroom modes for IE ye in ETTIL/STTIL in %

Figure 6.9b: Classroom modes for SE you in ETTIL/STTIL in %
Therefore, it was used most by the ETs in skills and systems mode, and used least in managerial mode. By comparison, in STTIL it featured in materials mode in 28 cases, in skills and systems mode in 26 cases, in classroom context mode in 24 cases and in managerial mode in 22 instances. Accordingly, the novices favoured it most in materials mode and least in managerial mode. The fact that SE you was used least by the teachers in both cohorts in managerial mode suggested that there may have been some style shifting from SE you to IE ye at this stage of the lesson for the interactional efficiencies gained. The slightly higher frequencies for SE you in ETTIL at the skills and systems stage of the lesson also suggested that there might be some style shifting towards SE you on the part of the ETs involved, when language points were being taught. This was explored through further qualitative searches, which revealed clear evidence of style shifting between ye to you at particular stages of the lesson, and also cases where you all was preferred by the ETs for normative reasons, which is explored in the following section.

6.2.4.2 Interactional Roles of Ye/You in ETTIL

The ability to make speech modifications is considered a key pedagogic skill in the L2 classroom because it makes it possible for teachers to respond to changing learner needs as the lesson unfolds, as the review of the literature in Chapter Three highlighted. This can take various forms, including style shifting from locally forms of grammar to standard usage, as highlighted by Long (1981, 83, 1996) originally, and others since (Adger 1997, Jenkins 2007, 2009, 2012; Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011). The following extracts explore style shifting of this kind by ET Brid, in order to meet the distinct pedagogic goals that arose at different stages of the lesson. For instance, in the first occurrence Brid used you + all when the lesson was in skills and systems mode and she was explaining a grammar point to the class. This was presumably an attempt to align her target English use to SBE speech norms when explicitly teaching SBE grammar.
Extract 6.13: IE you all/you in skills and systems mode in ETTIL

Teacher (Brid): Could you all look at the first sentence on the slide. So, em, what do we call this form in the first example yes in the first? Can anyone tell me? What did you all write for this one?

Learner: Past simple.

Teacher: Perfect and is it a regular or an irregular verb?

Learner: Irregular.

By contrast, in Extract 6.14 below she switched to IE ye in a directive to signal that she was addressing the class, which better enabled her to guide the learners as a group from one task to another.

Extract 6.14: IE ye in management mode in ETTIL

Teacher (Brid): Ok so I’d like ye to go to the back of the book here to check the answers on page 60k everyone? So could ye read this part here first yes here at the top and compare your answers. Is that ok?

This suggested that ET Brid was selectively using the IE pronominal when giving instructions for the obvious communicative efficiencies, but that she consciously style shifted to SE you + all when the lesson moved to a focus on the teaching of target forms. By contrast, no evidence of styleshifting of this kind was observed in the case of the STs. For instance, in the following extract ST Gary’s use of IE ye in a teacher directive to the class when the lesson was in managerial mode is significant.

Extract 6.15: IE ye in management mode in STTIL

Teacher: (Gary) Could ye change places and ask them your questions?

Similarly, he used ye when explaining a grammar point when the lesson was at the skills and systems stage, as shown in Extract 6.16 below.
This indicated that Gary used the IE pronominal in a less controlled and targeted manner than ET Brid had. This finding is consistent with the attitudinal findings that revealed that the STs lacked awareness of the strategic role that *ye* can play in classroom interactions, which suggested that they would be unlikely to make discerning judgements concerning the suitability of its use in distinct classroom contexts and micro-contexts. Extract 6.17 below illustrates the use of SBE *you* and IE *ye* by ET teacher Martin, in order to make distinctions between one or more learners. He began by addressing a question to individual learners, one at a time, using *you*, then switched to *ye* to check whether the class as a whole agreed with the response provided.

Extract 6.17: *you* and *ye* in a directive in management mode in ETTIL

Teacher (Martin): Ok, so let’s correct number three. So what did you put, Thierry?
Learner: He made his son pay all in one year to punish.
Teacher: What about you, Sara? Did you put the same?
Learner: Yes, the same more or less.
Teacher: And how about the rest of ye?

This compared with ET teacher Fionnuala’s use of *you + all* when addressing the class, and *you* to signal she was addressing an individuals, as shown in Extract 6.18 below.

Extract 6.18: *you all* instead of *ye* in a directive in materials mode in ETTIL

Teacher: (Fionnuala) Now, I’d like you all to open your books on page 63 to where I’m pointing. Oh, do you need a book?
Learner: I don’t have.
Teacher: I can give you a photocopy for today until you buy one.
be more effective than SE. Having compared the strategic use of ye, you and you + all in the EFL classroom context, the following section analyses the pedagogical functions associated with the IE pronominal, as revealed by further up-close qualitative searches. Comparisons are then made with SBE you, drawing, as before, on Walsh’s (2006: 166-168) SETT framework.

6.2.4.3 Pedagogical Functions of IE ye/SE you in ETTIL / STTIL

As Figure 6.10 below illustrates, in overall terms ye was found to occur in teacher talk when six pedagogic functions were being performed; that is, in comprehension and progress checks; in directives and explanations; in display and referential questions. In ETTIL it featured in all six capacities, and most often in directives and progress checks, where it occurred in 13 cases each, which is over half of all tokens. It also featured on 8 occasions in display questions, in 5 instances in referential questions, and in one case each in explanations and comprehension checks respectively. In STTIL it was also associated with a similar range of pedagogic roles; for instance, it featured in directives in 84 instances, in progress checks in 68 cases, in referential questions on 45 occasions, in display questions in 35 cases, and in explanations and comprehension checks in 11 cases each. Accordingly, the ETs and STs alike used it most in teacher directives and progress checks. A key difference observed was that it was used considerably more by the STs than by the ETs in directives.

Comparisons with SE you revealed that this version featured more widely overall, as it was associated with eight pedagogic functions in ETTIL and six in STTIL. Amongst the ETs this
included content feedback and confirmation, progress checks, directives, evaluative feedback, explanations and display and referential questions, as Figure 6.11 below indicates. It was used most in ETTIL in explanations; that is, in 26% of cases, and in directives in 22%. It was also found in content feedback and comprehension checks in 14 and 12 cases respectively, in progress checks in 6 cases, in evaluative feedback on 8 occasions and in referential and display questions in 10 and 2 instances respectively. This supported the assumption that style shifting from ye to you might be taking place on the part of the two ETs who used the IE pronominal at the stage of the lesson when language points were being taught.

Figure 6.11: Pedagogic functions of SE you

By comparison, as indicated above, the distribution of SE you in STTIL was more evenly spread across a similar range of functions. For instance, it featured in directives in 18 cases, in progress checks in 16 cases, in referential questions on 20 occasions, in evaluative feedback in 14 instances and in explanations and display questions in 16 cases respectively. This supported the view that there might be less targeted use of SE you and IE ye on the part of the STs at different stages of the lesson. Thus far, it has been established that IE ye played a central role in the teacher talk of most of the STs and a small minority of the ETs, and that it was often used to facilitate teachers in their management of classroom interactions and participant roles. The following section explores the socio-pragmatic role of IE ye, and that of yourselves, in this discourse domain, with specific reference to their use in teacher directives and to issues of politeness and face management.
6.2.4.4 Socio-Pragmatic Role/s and Issues of Appropriacy: Ye/Yourselves

The ability to give clear and precise instructions is essential for effective classroom management, especially when the target language is used for this purpose (Walsh 2003, 2006, 2011). In order to establish good control and avoid confusing learners, a firm, directive manner is necessary. However, teachers must remain polite or they risk offending learners (Farrell 2015: 104). Achieving the correct balance can be difficult for novices who lack confidence in their authority and who may be unaware of the socio-pragmatic dimensions of language use in areas such as politeness, levels of formality/informality and power relationships in different social and cultural and professional contexts. For this reason, Walsh (2006:32) has called for teachers to be given opportunities to gain awareness and expertise in this area by exploring and discussing real classroom experiences and data, in order to enable them to develop good communication and management practices in the classroom.

With these practical applications in mind, Extract 6.19 below explores ET Brid’s use of ye in a teacher instruction, as she set up a task with the class. Her choice of modal verb “would” with ye immediately set a suitably polite tone to counterbalance the authoritative sounding “I”. Meanwhile, her further use of ye along with the phrase “if that’s ok” helped to reduce distance and convey an informal and supportive tone.

Extract 6.19: IE ye in a polite directive in ETIIL

Teacher: (Brid)  Ok, so what I’d like ye to do next is to try the rest of the exercise on your own, and ye can compare your answers to see if ye all understood, if that’s ok?

ET Ella, on the other hand opted to use yourselves as she directed learners to a reading text, as shown in Extract 6.20 below. As illustrated, this softened the directness of her instruction, presumably to attend to the face needs of the adult learners. This was reinforced by her use of “I think” to convey tentativeness and reduce teacher authority. Her use of inclusive we in the final question also signalled a desire to promote a collaborative learning environment.
In the following exchange, ST Cormac’s repeated use of ye in conjunction with modal verb “would” also had the effect of down-toning the directness of his question and signalling solidarity with the learners, whether this was a conscious move on his part, or otherwise.

Accordingly, yourselves and ye both performed what was essentially a hedging role in directives for socio-pragmatic purposes. They were often used in conjunction with additional politeness markers in order to maintain good rapport when issues of face were at the fore. This is consistent with Connington’s (2005: 60) claim that IE speakers tend to be less direct in giving instructions so as to allow for minimal face threat and Kallen’s observation (2005b: 17) that the need for indirectness amongst IE speakers typically leads to the blurring of the illocutionary force in speech. It also suggests that the overall orientation towards indirectness and politeness amongst IE speakers is carried into their professional practices. Having established that there are obvious interactional and affective gains to be made from the use of ye and yourselves in this discourse context, the next section examines the pedagogical issues and challenges that arise from their use.

6.2.4.5 Pedagogical Implications: Ye in EFL Teacher Talk

The first point worth highlighting is that, in addition to facilitating classroom processes and participant roles, the use of ye by teachers in the ELT classroom in Ireland provided learners
with exposure to an important interactional feature of IE. This served to enhance their communicative competency while living and studying in Ireland, given that it is commonly heard and used by IE speakers. It also afforded them opportunities to hear useful models of polite talk in Ireland, which could help to ease their social exchanges in this socio-cultural setting. However, the usefulness of *ye* to learners beyond this setting is less obvious, as was recognised by many of the ETs in the questionnaire. Meanwhile, when we consider whether the use of IE *ye* instead of SE *you* led to any challenges in terms of comprehension for the learners involved, their responses suggest that they experienced no obvious difficulties in interpreting the message being conveyed by the teacher in each case. This supports the view expressed by several of the ETs that variation in pronominal use at the level of variety is likely to cause fewer processing difficulties for EFL learners than variation at the level of the verb phrase.

The analysis further suggested that the avoidance of *ye* by all but two of the ETs was on normative rather than linguistic grounds, and that by opting to use *yourselves* rather than *ye* they were able to express politeness, while at the same time conforming to normative requirements. Meanwhile, while the STs’ use of *ye* reflected a similar desire on their part to downtone the directness of their directives, it also confirmed their lack of understanding of the constraints that surround the use of IE in the ELT domain, as indicated by the teacher surveys. This is also consistent with anecdotal accounts by TP supervisors on the MA TESOL programme, which indicated that normative issues relating to the use of *ye* are often raised in discussions between TP supervisors and novices. Given that high frequencies can be expected for second person pronominal use in the EFL classroom context, this creates an obvious need for awareness-raising and pedagogical guidance in relation to this aspect of language use on ELTE programmes in Ireland, and more widely, drawing on classroom corpora to explore authentic exemplars. This will enable practitioners to critically explore the choices available to them in this area, and critical issues surrounding their communicative efficiency, and suitability, with reference to specific pedagogic goals, classroom micro-contexts and teaching settings.
6.2.4.6 Summary of Findings: IE Ye

The previous analyses identified contextual factors influencing the high visibility of IE ye and related variants in teacher talk in the EFL classroom in Ireland and the interactional and affective benefits associated with their use. It then explored the controlled and targeted use of ye by the limited number of ETs who chose to use the IE pronominal, by comparison with its less discerning use by the STs. Finally, it critically appraised the pedagogical issues and challenges arising from the use of ye and related variants by teachers in the EFL educational context, and the implications for ELTE. Having established that IE grammar featured saliently in the teacher talk of EFL teachers from Ireland in the local classroom context, and that this brought important affective gains for classroom communication and relationships (although some usages were of more obvious benefit than others), the following section explores the findings for preterite seen and pragmatic like representing socially-differentiated spoken English.

6.3 Findings and Analysis: (SDG)

6.3.1 Quantitative Findings: preterite seen

As in the foregoing analyses, the quantitative findings are explored first. Given the highly stigmatized associations made with this type of grammatical usage, it was expected that its use in EFL teacher talk would be muted, with any occurrences considered significant. As the item seen can occur in a number of grammatical patterns (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 66-78), several searches were required to arrive at an accurate measurement of frequencies for preterite seen in ETTL and STTL, beginning with a KWIC search of this item. From a manual examination of the concordance lists generated, tokens for this specific grammatical pattern were measured, with comparisons made subsequently across the specified corpora so as to gauge their significance.

6.3.1.1 Frequencies for preterite seen in ETTL/STTL:

As Table 6.10 below illustrates, preterite seen did not feature in ETTL, whereas 3 instances were found in STTL, representing 99 wpm. Accordingly, as expected, and in line with the
attitudinal findings, this usage was absent from the teacher talk of the ETs and it occurred only very negligibly amongst the STs.

### Table 6.8: Comparative frequencies of preterite seen across corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus and Variety Represented</th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>wpm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL (IE experienced teacher talk at int. level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL (IE student teacher talk at int. level)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT (experienced NE teachers beg. to int. level)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBEL (third level institutional talk in Ireland)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-CIE (conversational Irish English)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-IRE (general/formal spoken Irish English)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-GB (general/formal spoken British English)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-US (general/formal spoken American English)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.1.2 Comparative Frequencies for preterite seen across corpora:

Similarly, no tokens of preterite seen were found either in CONNECT or LIBEL, representing EFL and third level institutional talk respectively, as Table 6.10 above further illustrates. This compared with 44 cases found in ICE-IRELAND, representing 58 wpm. Accordingly, the usage was either absent or featured negligibly in educational and professional contexts, as in ETTIL and STTIL. Further comparisons made with LCIE revealed 91 tokens in conversational IE, representing 91 wpm, which was comparable to frequencies in STTIL. Meanwhile, frequencies in ICE-GB and ICE-US were higher than in ETTIL, but less than in STTIL, with 51 and 63 tokens found, representing 67 and 83 wpm respectively. These largely muted frequencies suggested that this type of spoken grammar remains a highly stigmatized usage in educational and professional contexts of use in Ireland, as is the case in Inner Circle settings more widely, although it is a visible feature of conversational speech. This is consistent with the claims of critical linguists concerning the continued presence of prescriptive English language ideologies in the English language world (Lippi-Green 1997; Milroy 2001). From this perspective, the fact that preterite seen featured at all in the teacher talk of the STs can be seen as significant, and therefore worthy of further investigation.
6.3.1.3 Comparative Frequencies for SE saw in ETTIL/STTIL:

Comparative analyses made with SE saw revealed 6 tokens in ETTIL and 8 in STTIL, representing 200 wpm and 266 wpm respectively, as Table 6.11 below illustrates. This indicated that the ETs only used the ‘standard’ version, while the STs used both, but opted for SE saw substantially more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>preterite seen</th>
<th>SE saw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tokens</td>
<td>wpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution in STTIL was investigated next in order to gain a better understanding of the extent of the usage amongst the novices.

6.3.1.4 Distribution of preterite seen in STTIL

Further searches of the individual teacher files revealed that preterite seen was used in all three cases by only one of the STs, namely Sean. Therefore, it was a grammatical usage that was associated with the speech style of this individual, rather than with the group. The fact that it was used only by a male ST is consistent with the variationist view that ‘non-standard’ grammar is used more often by young adult males, for reasons pertaining to ‘covert prestige’ (Labov 1972b; Cheshire 1984; Beal 2004). This finding was also consistent with the attitudes expressed by the STs, as all but one had rejected the use of the structure by EFL teachers on prescriptive grounds. However, interestingly, this was not Sean, as he had previously expressed his strong disapproval of its use both in social contexts and in teacher talk, as it was “bad English”. This suggested that while Sean shared commonly-held prescriptive beliefs about ‘non-standard’ grammar, he lacked awareness of his own use of this type of English, which made it difficult for him to style shift towards the SE version in his
professional practices. This adds weight to the claim made by Lippi-Green (1997: 38) that it is not uncommon for speakers to hold highly negative views about language which they themselves habitually use, either due to a lack of language awareness, or in order to conform to societal pressures concerning what constitutes ‘proper English’.

In the light of this finding, a more extensive examination was carried out to establish the degree of ‘non-standardness’ of Sean’s target English use. This was achieved by conducting an intensive reading of the transcript of the lesson he taught. This revealed two further instances of the ‘non-standard’ preterite, featuring done rather than seen. Accordingly, within a fifty minute lesson, this usage occurred on five occasions, which suggested that it was a routine feature of Sean’s speech style, both outside and within the EFL classroom context. Meanwhile, further searches made to establish the extent of the use of preterite done amongst the novices recorded no instances of use. This confirmed that Sean’s target English use was striking for its ‘non-standardness’, by comparison with that of his peers and the ETs.

6.3.1.5 Summary of Quantitative Findings: preterite seen/SE saw

The quantitative analysis relating to preterite seen has revealed that this type of usage was found only very negligibly in STTIL, and that the SE version was preferred by teachers in both groupings. Accordingly, grammatical usages that are largely unique to IE were more visible in the target English use of the teachers than socially-marked usages that are found in Inner Circles Englishes more widely and typically associated with less educated speakers. This was consistent with the attitudinal findings, whereby the teachers in both cohorts viewed each type of usage fundamentally differently in terms of its grammaticality and status. Strong correlations were observed, therefore, between the teachers’ attitudes and their classroom practices, except in the case of ST Sean where a discrepancy arose. In the following analysis, Sean’s use of preterite seen/done is explored more qualitatively.
6.3.2 Qualitative Findings: *preterite seen*/SE *saw* in ETTIL / STTIL

As in the previously analyses, usage is situated in relation to classroom modes and pedagogic functions initially, so as to gain essential contextual details.

6.3.2.1 Classroom modes for *preterite seen*/ SE *saw* in ETTIL / STTIL

As Figure 6.12 a) below illustrates, in all 5 cases of the use of *preterite seen/done* by Sean, it featured in conversational-type exchanges when the lesson was in classroom context mode and opinions and experiences were being expressed. By comparison, *SE saw* featured in ETTIL and STTIL in all four classroom modes and to a fairly even degree in each, as Figure 6.12 b) illustrates. For instance, on the 6 occasions that it was used by the ETs, it was found in managerial and materials modes on 1 occasion each, and it featured twice in skills and systems and classroom context modes. This compared with 8 instances of use by the STs, which were spread evenly across the four classroom modes. Accordingly, the ‘non-standard’ preterite featured less centrally in this discourse context than did the SE version.

![Figure 6.12a: Classroom modes for *preterite seen/done* in STTIL](image1)

![Figure 6.12b: Classroom modes for SE *saw* in ETTIL / STTIL](image2)

6.3.2.2 Pedagogic Functions of *preterite seen*/SE *saw* in ETTIL/STTIL

Analyses made to identify the pedagogic functions associated with *preterite seen/done* in STTIL revealed that it was used by Sean in all 5 cases when he was providing content
feedback, as illustrated in Figure 6.13 a) below. The 6 instances of SE saw in ETTIL, on the other hand, featured in directives, evaluative feedback and in referential questions, on 2 occasions each, respectively. This compared with the 8 cases of the SE version in STTIL where it occurred evenly in directives and referential questions, as Figure 6.13 b) below illustrates.

Accordingly, Sean’s use of preterite seen was bound up with conversational-type exchanges whereas SE saw featured more widely, which suggested distinct functionality. This aspect is explored more qualitatively in the following section.

6.3.2.3 Socio-Pragmatic Role/s and Issues of Appropriacy: Preterite Seen

As the following extract exemplifies, Sean’s use of preterite seen featured in all instances in content feedback during exchanges that centred on the topic of the lesson. On the first occasion, he used preterite seen in conjunction with preterite done, as he enthusiastically shared his experiences with the learners in relation to the theme of a reading text, which was, ‘extreme sports’. As previously, this represented an attempt on his part to establish rapport and common ground. However, as he became more involved in his storyteller role, he failed to monitor the quality of the target input he was providing for learners.
Extract 6.22: *preterite seen/done* in a conversational type exchange in STTIL

**Teacher: (Sean): So what extreme sports do you know?**

**Learner:** Bungee jumping. I did before and I am very afraid (laughs).

**Teacher:** Yeah, exactly. I know what you mean cos I seen it in Australia, so yeah, it’s mad. Yeah, I done it in Sydney myself. Yeah, it was about 300 metres drop over a massive canyon, so scary stuff. Yeah. So what other extreme sports do you know?

**Learner:** Maybe the Formula One - but it is very dangerous.

Interestingly, Hickey (2009: 66-67) has referred to the use of *preterite seen/done* in dialogue between IE speakers in historic theatrical works and novels, where it is typically found in narratives when characters are recounting stories in the first person in a dramatic style, as was the case in Sean’s use. This suggests that this type of usage is well-established in Ireland and that it may be linked to the dramatic storytelling style of some IE speakers.

**6.3.2.4 Pedagogical Implications: Preterite Seen in EFL Teacher Talk**

While Sean’s use of ‘non-standard’ grammar may not in itself have caused comprehension problems for the learners, it would not have gone unnoticed as students at intermediate proficiency level are familiar with the SE past simple although they cannot be expected to use it proficiently. Interestingly, in the given exchange, we note the learner’s correct use of past simple *did*. This suggests that its use in teacher talk was likely to have caused confusion and may have led some of the learners to question Sean’s ability to teach. This may have been exacerbated by his use of highly informal lexis in close syntactic proximity, as in “it’s mad” “way worse”, and “scary stuff”. This finding supports Walsh’s (2006: 82) claims concerning the challenges faced by novices who come from backgrounds where this type of usage is habitual, and the professional disadvantages this can lead to.
6.3.2.5 Summary of Qualitative Findings: Preterite Seen

The previous analysis explored the functional use of *preterite seen/done* in EFL teacher talk, establishing that its use was largely peripheral to the business of teaching and learning by comparison with SE saw, which featured more prominently. Meanwhile, its functional use was linked to the highly informal and dramatic narrative style of one of the novices as he attempted to establish common ground and rapport with learners. The more pedagogically-focused discussion which followed suggested that the use of this type of ‘non-standard’ in teacher talk could lead learners to question the professionalism of the teacher, although it was unlikely to cause comprehension problems. For comparative purposes, the next section explores the teachers’ practices relating to *pragmatic like*. Here, greater variation was expected, given the age-differentiated sociolinguistic profile of the marker and the opposing attitudes expressed in the novice/experienced teacher surveys, in relation to its suitability for teacher talk.

6.3.3 Quantitative Findings: Pragmatic Like

As previously, the quantitative analysis began with the measurement of frequencies. Given that *like* can feature in both a grammatical and a pragmatic capacity, and that it can perform numerous pragmatic roles, as expected, difficulties arose in its identification and interpretation. Vaughan and Clancy (2013: 84), amongst others (see Ajmer 1984: Clancy 2000; Jucker et al 2003), have pointed to the highly complex nature of pragmatic markers as a linguistic class for analysis. Accordingly, interpreting their use is never straightforward because it involves making assumptions about what the speaker intended to communicate on the basis of a restricted set of linguistic features. This requires drawing on a variety of contextual means, where possible, such as information about the topic, previous and upcoming discourse and assumptions about speakers and hearers’ relationships that can be inferred from the interactional exchanges. It is also likely to require an appeal to extralingual information about the particular discourse setting, and underlying socio-cultural and psychological influences.
Schiffrin (1987: 17) has observed that greater difficulties of this kind arise if pragmatic markers are engaged in the process of grammaticalization, as is the case with *like*. The challenges in distinguishing *like* in its conventional, grammatical use from its numerous pragmatic roles have been highlighted by corpus researchers (see Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). Where ambiguities of this kind arose in the present analysis, the item was omitted. With these considerations in mind, the quantitative analysis began by measuring the overall extent of use of *like* in ETTIL and STTIL with comparisons made across discourse genres and varieties. Following this, instances of 1) grammatical and 2) pragmatic usage were distinguished by means of a manual examination of the concordance lines generated (see Appendix D).

6.3.3.1 Frequencies for *Like* in ETTIL/STTIL

As indicated in Table 6.12 below, frequencies for *like* are presented and discussed in percentage terms for overall use, and, subsequently, for grammatical and pragmatic use, in order to facilitate the comparative analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPUS</th>
<th>Overall <em>like</em> tokens and (wpm)</th>
<th>Grammatical <em>like</em> tokens and %</th>
<th>Pragmatic <em>like</em> in tokens and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>145/ 478</td>
<td>131/ 91%</td>
<td>14/ 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>221/ 729</td>
<td>154/ 70%</td>
<td>67/ 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>133/ 422</td>
<td>122/ 94%</td>
<td>9/ 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBEL</td>
<td>319/ 462</td>
<td>280/ 88%</td>
<td>39/ 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIE</td>
<td>489/ 734</td>
<td>342/ 70%</td>
<td>147/ 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-Ireland</td>
<td>319/ 425</td>
<td>267/ 84%</td>
<td>52/ 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-GB</td>
<td>346/ 449</td>
<td>280/ 81%</td>
<td>66/ 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICE-UK</td>
<td>312/ 405</td>
<td>243/ 78%</td>
<td>69/ 22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3.2 Comparative Frequencies for *Like* in ETTIL/STTIL

As illustrated, a total of 145 tokens of *like* were found in ETTIL, representing 483 wpm, while it featured on 221 occasions in STTIL, representing 736 wpm, which was noticeably higher. Accordingly, in overall terms, *like* was highly visible in the classroom data, but used
noticeably more by the novices. By comparison, in CONNECT, 130 tokens were found representing 422 wpm, which was less than in both ETTIL and STTIL, while the item featured on 309 occasions in LIBEL, that is, 462 in wpm, which was comparable to frequencies in ETTIL, and significantly less than those for STTIL. Meanwhile, it featured in 319 instances in ICE-IRELAND, in 346 in ICE-GB and on 312 occasions in ICE-US, representing 425, 449, and 405 wpm respectively, which was slightly less than in ETTIL and significantly less than in STTIL. The high visibility of *like* as an item in ETTIL and STTIL and across these corpora more widely was expected, given that it can perform multifunctional grammatical and pragmatic roles, as has been well-documented in the research literature in the sociolinguistic field (Romaine and Lange 1991; Andersen 2001; Schweinberger 2012). Qualitative searches of the concordance lines generated previously were carried out subsequently, in order to establish the extent of its use in each tradition in ETTIL and STTIL.

6.3.3.3 Frequencies for *Grammatical/Pragmatic Like* in ETTIL/STTIL

This revealed that, in both sub-corpora, *like* featured significantly less as a pragmatic marker than in its traditional grammatical role. For instance, it occurred in 91% of all cases of use in ETTIL in a grammatical capacity, and only in 9% as a pragmatic marker. This compared with a ratio of 70/30 in STTIL for each pattern. Therefore, the STs favoured *like* in its pragmatic use noticeably more than the ETs did.

6.3.3.4 Comparative Analyses: *Grammatical/Pragmatic Like* across Corpora

Comparative analyses across discourse genres and varieties were subsequently conducted. This was achieved by selecting a random sample of 100 tokens from the concordance lines generated previously, and carrying out manual searches so as to distinguish each pattern of use. This revealed a comparable percentage ratio for grammatical/pragmatic use in CONNECT and LIBEL, as previously found in ETTIL. By contrast, the ratio in LCIE was similar to that found in STTIL. This indicated that *like* in its pragmatic use featured to a similar extent in the teacher talk of the novices, as in conversational IE, thereby suggesting that it reflected a high level of informality. Meanwhile, comparisons made with ICE-Ireland
representing more formal discourse revealed a comparable grammatical/pragmatic use ratio as in ETTIL. This was also the case with ICE-GB and ICE-US representing more formal, main varieties. This confirmed that the pragmatic use of *like* by the STs was statistically salient. Distribution was explored next, in order to determine the extent of individual teacher use of the marker.

6.3.3.5 Distribution of *Pragmatic Like* in ETTIL and STTIL

As Figure 6.14 below illustrates, *like* was used in its pragmatic capacity by three of the ETs; that is, by Brid, Ella and Martin, on 6, 5 and 3 occasions respectively, which thereby indicated a slight female bias. This was consistent with the teachers’ previously expressed attitudes, as it was approved of only by these ETs for teacher talk. Meanwhile, in the 67 cases of use in STTIL, the marker was used by eight of the novices to varying degrees. This included Aisling, Deirdre, Mary, Joanna, Roseanna, Cormac, Gary and George, which also reflected a slight female gender bias. Specifically, Mary used the marker on 14 occasions, Aisling and Deirdre in 11 instances each, Joanna and Roseanna in 7 cases each, Cormac and Declan in 6 instances each, and Sean on 5 occasions.

![Figure 6.14: Distribution of *pragmatic like* in ETTIL/STTIL](image)

Accordingly, as expected, there was a wider distribution of *pragmatic like* in STTIL, representing the twenty-something age category and it was favoured most by the female novices. This was once again consistent with the STs’ reported patterns of use and the attitudinal data, as eight of the ten in the cohort had previously claimed to use the marker on an everyday basis, and all but two (in both cases males) had expressed their approval of its use in teacher talk. Following this, a further manual search of the concordance lists was
carried out, in order to distinguish syntactic patterns associated with its use. This was with a view to determining the extent of the teachers’ use of the older pragmatic tradition, by comparison with the more recent version, each of which has distinct syntactic patterns (Schweinberger 2012:184-188)

6.3.3.6 Comparative Frequencies for Traditional and Innovative Pragmatic Like in ETTIL/STTIL:

As Table 6.13 below illustrates, the marker occurred across five distinct syntactic patterns. This included four that are associated with innovative American like, that is: 1) in a clause medial position; 2) between propositions; 3) in ‘It’s like’; 4) in ‘Be like’. It was also found in a clause final position which reflects the older IE tradition. In ETTIL, it occurred in three patterns; that is, in a clause medial position in 7 cases, between propositions in 6, and in 1 case in a clause final position. By comparison, it was used in STTIL in all five syntactic patterns, and to a fairly similar degree; that is, in a clause medial position on 18 occasions, between propositions in a further 18, in Its like in 14, in Be like in 8 cases and in a clause final position in 9 instances. Accordingly, pragmatic like was used in both the traditional and the innovative patterns of use by the teachers in both cohorts, and in a wider range of syntactic positions in STTIL. It is also worth mentioning that it was used significantly more in the IE clause final position by the STs than the ETs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic patterns for Pragmatic Like</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Tokens ETTIL</th>
<th>Tokens STTIL</th>
<th>Pragmatic Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clause medial/prior to an item focused on</td>
<td>You have to like fill in the blanks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Between propositions</td>
<td>Yeah, I know like but it isn’t right</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It’s like</td>
<td>It’s like a pain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be like</td>
<td>I’m like yeah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clause final</td>
<td>What do you mean like?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: Syntactic patterns for pragmatic like in ETTIL/STTIL and related frequencies
6.3.3.7 Summary of Quantitative Findings for Pragmatic Like

The analysis has revealed that pragmatic like featured with marked statistical saliency in ETTIL and STTIL, and that, as expected, it was favoured more by the novices. However, it featured less in ETTIL and STTIL than grammatical like did. The marker occurred in each sub-corpora in both the traditional IE pattern of pragmatic use, where it occurs in a clause final position, and in the more recent and innovative AE pattern, where a wider range of syntactic patterns exist. The higher frequencies found for innovative like in STTIL were consistent with Schweinberger’s 2012 account, which demonstrated that AE like was the most frequently used pattern amongst IE speakers in their twenties, by comparison with its use by older age categories (ibid: 196-198). However, the greater statistical saliency of the IE pragmatic pattern amongst the novices, where it occurred in a clause final position, was inconsistent with the conclusions reached (ibid: 196-198) whereby this pattern was more often associated with IE speakers over the age of thirty. These statistical trends led to the expectation that there would be similar, and distinct, patterns of functional use of the marker in the target English use of the teachers in each grouping, which is the area explored in the next section, using more qualitative methods.

6.3.4 Qualitative Findings for Pragmatic Like in ETTIL/STTIL

As in the previous analyses, contextual details relating to classroom modes and pedagogic functions were explored first, drawing on the adapted SETT model for identification and classification purposes (Walsh 2006: 166-168).

6.3.4.1 Classroom Modes for Pragmatic Like in ETTIL/STTIL

As Figure 6.15 below reveals, in overall terms the marker was used in all four classroom modes. It occurred in ETTIL in three modes, featuring most in skill and systems and in classroom context modes; that is, in 4 cases respectively, and it was also found in 1 instance in managerial mode. By comparison, in STTIL usage was more evenly spread across all four modes in STTIL; for instance, it occurred in 20 cases in managerial mode, 19 in materials
mode, and 14 instances each in skills and systems and in classroom context modes. This suggested that the marker was being used in a more targeted way by the ETs than by the STs.

6.3.4.2 Pedagogic Functions for Pragmatic Like in ETTIL / STTIL

As Figure 6.16 below illustrates, the marker occurred in ETTIL in explanations in 4 instances, in a further 4 cases in referential questions and on 1 occasion in a directive. By comparison, it featured in STTIL in a slightly wider range of pedagogic functions; that is, in directives and explanations in 20 and 19 instances respectively, in referential questions and in evaluative feedback in 15 and 13 cases respectively.

This led to the expectation that the marker was being used in both shared and distinct functional capacities by the teachers in each grouping, which is the area examined in the next section, using more up-close analyses of the data.
6.3.4.3 Socio-Pragmatic/Discourse Roles, and Issues of Appropriacy: Pragmatic Like

As the marker is typically associated with conversational English, the pragmatic roles associated with its use by the teachers were explored using the system of classification proposed by Andersen (2001: 67) which sets out six distinct roles that it typically performs in spoken English in its pragmatic capacity. These are as: a hesitational filler, a focuser, an approximator, a reportative verb, an exemplifier and as a hedge.

Like as a Hesitational Filler

Fillers are words that are used to fill gaps in conversations; they can mark hesitation or a shift in topic, or they can indicate the speaker’s on-going process of thinking and planning (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 214). Andersen (2001: 67) has highlighted that like is one of many fillers that feature in spoken English, which is often characterized by dysfluencies. The marker was found to play an important hesitational role in the teacher talk of the novices, in connection with false starts, self-repairs, cut of utterances and generally serving as Meehan observed ‘to bridge gaps in spoken sentences’ (1991: 48). For instance, in the following extract, it is used by ST Mary when the lesson was in skills and systems mode, and a grammar point was being explained. The use of like on two occasions in the turn, together with “em” as a further discourse link, suggested that she was struggling with her role as a language teacher.

Extract 6.23: pragmatic like as hesitational filler in STTIL

Teacher: (Mary): So, *em, what, like*, em, this part here is the subject of the sentence, *em, in a normal sentence it’s at the start. Then we put, *em like*, the object here, but in this one it moves to here and it’s got an extra verb here

Farr and Farrell (2017), amongst others (Tsui 2001; Farrell 2015; Farrell 2016), have highlighted that it is not uncommon for inexperienced NESTs to lack confidence when teaching grammar. This often stems from a limited formal understanding of the workings of English, and the fact that that this type of knowledge is, in fact, accumulated over many years. The marker was not found to be used in in this capacity in ETNIL when language
points were being explicitly taught, probably due to the superior levels of formal linguistic knowledge that the experienced teachers has acquired, as the analysis in Chapter Five revealed, which would lead to greater confidence in their ability to teach grammar.

**Like as a Focuser in ETTIL/STTIL**

*Pragmatic like* was also frequently used by the teachers in both cohorts as a focuser. Underhill (1988: 236) and others since (see Andersen 2001: 42; Schweinberger 2012: 183-185) have suggested that in this role the marker highlights the newsworthiness or high information value of concepts that may be familiar or unfamiliar. Moreover, it can serve as a metalinguistic cue to signal that the speaker is using a term they are unused to or uncomfortable with, as it is not fully understood or perceived as part of their linguistic repertoire. This is evident in Extract 6.24, which pertains to ST George, where he used ‘It’s like’ before the term ‘auxiliary verb’, as it suggested that he was not yet confident in his use of the metalanguage that language teachers are expected to know and use with learners.

**Extract 6.24: pragmatic like as a focuser in STTIL**

| Teacher: (George): | So, it's em like the verb is here in this part of the sentence, ok? |

This compares with ET Ella’s repeated use of marker *like* as a focuser in the following extract, which seemed intended to help learners to ‘notice’ a key aspect of English grammar. The importance of helping learners to ‘notice’ aspects of language use (Schmitt 2001) in order to facilitate the processes of SLA is now widely accepted by applied linguists, as highlighted in the review of the literature in Chapter Three.

**Extract 6.25: pragmatic like as a focuser in ETTIL**

| Teacher: (Ella): | So can you see there is only ‘to’ with an infinitive with like normal verbs, but not when we use like modal verbs. So what do we need to use with this verb? |
| Learner: | It's not necessary because ‘could’ is modal verb. |
Accordingly, in this instance, the use of the marker by Ella seemed intentional, in order to draw the learner’s attention to a particular aspect of language use for scaffolding purposes.

**Like as an Approximator**

The use of the marker *like* as an approximator was also noted in the teacher talk of the STs, where it served a hyperbolic role. For instance, in the following exchange, it is used by ST Gary before the word *tons*. Andersen (2001: 101) has highlighted that the use of AE *like* as an approximator is often associated with exaggerated accounts of numerical quantities, and that this type of usage is favoured more by younger aged speakers. This calls to mind the fact that the STs are in their early twenties, and thus are likely to be less familiar with the more restrained and precise type of language use that is expected in formal and professional contexts. However, in this case it is possible that Gary’s exaggerated speech style may have also served to help the learners to ‘notice’, and thereby process, the message being conveyed.

**Extract 6.26: pragmatic *like* as an approximator in STTIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (Gary):</th>
<th>Yeah, so you’ve probably got, <em>like</em> tons of assignments to do, right?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Yes, too much work at this moment …is very difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**‘Be Like’ as a Reportative Verb**

*Pragmatic like* was also used in its quotative capacity by the STs, occurring in the construction ‘be like’ in place of traditional reporting verbs such as ‘say’ or ‘tell’, which learners would be more familiar with, as they feature in the ELT curriculum. Andersen (2001: 103) has pointed out that the marker can be used in a quotative capacity in several usages, including introducing a thought, in direct speech, or in a reaction. It typically signals vague language use, and that the utterance or thought is a loose interpretation of what is being represented, rather than an exact report. In the following extract, it is used by ST Mary in a lesson based on the theme of weather, as she expressed her obvious delight at the news that a heatwave was on the way.
Extract 6.27: *pragmatic like* as a reportative verb in STTIL

Teacher: (Mary)  
*So you all know the word ‘heatwave’, yeah? When I heard we were getting a heatwave in Ireland I was like, yeaah.*

Learner:  
*Yes, we need sun.*

From the learner’s response, it is likely that the unspecified feeling Mary is conveying was interpreted correctly, probably due to accompanying facial expressions and raised intonation on her part. In the following extract, the further use of *be like* is noted. In this instance it is used by ST Cormac to introduce direct speech, rather than an expressed attitude as in Mary’s case previously.

Extract 6.28: *pragmatic like* as a reportative verb in STTIL

Teacher: (Cormac)  
*Yeah, I saw it on U-tube clip and he was like ok, I did it.*

Learner:  
*He is very bad sportsman.*

Teacher:  
*I know. I mean he’s only owning up now cos he got caught.*

In this case, the marker clearly signalled a loose interpretation of the original utterance, presumably because Cormac was confident that the learners were familiar with the subject of the discussion, which was the ‘confession’ by cyclist Lance Armstrong that he had been using performance-enhancing drugs. In this way, *be like* was used for economy of expression, which also had the effect of making the meaning more accessible for the learners.

*Like as a Hedge*

The final analysis focuses on the teachers’ use of the marker as a hedge in teacher questions and directives, when socio-pragmatic sensitivities arose, in order to further explore issues of directness/indirectness and politeness in teacher talk. The first example of use features ST Mary, as she attempted to elicit an answer from learners. She started with the phrase “I
want”, which can sound overly direct rather than encouraging in this context. This could explain why the question failed to generate a response from learners.

**Extract 6.29: pragmatic like as a hedge in STTIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (Mary):</th>
<th>So, I want someone to tell me the difference between the two sentences on the board… Alberto?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Alberto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Well? Paolo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ok, Claire?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>Maybe the time?.... em I am not sure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>What about the rest of you? Do you understand, like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher’s follow-up comprehension check was also brusque, despite the addition of clause final *like*, as this failed to sufficiently downtone the level of directness so as to make the directive less face threatening. This confirms that *like* functions as a marker of minimal politeness, and as such is a usage that is more suitable amongst peers or familiars in social environments, where the face threat involved is likely to be less than in the L2 classroom context (Andersen 2001: 72; Farrell 2004: 66).

Similarly, Extract 6.31 below suggests a growing atmosphere of tension in the classroom, as ST Declan becomes increasingly frustrated and impatient with the learners’ lack of response while eliciting answers to a course book task. Due to the obvious face threat involved for learners when their work is being evaluated in front of peers, a high level of socio-pragmatic sensitivity and skill is required on the part of teachers, especially when the learners are adults from different cultural backgrounds, as they were in this case. This provides further evidence that the use of the marker by the teacher in an evaluative-type question failed to provide the sufficient level of hedging needed to meet the face needs of learners and to encourage their participation.
Extract 6.30: *pragmatic like* as a marker of minimum politeness in STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher: (Declan):</th>
<th>Can anyone tell me the answer to number three?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Can anyone tell me what they wrote? Well? Does anyone know, <em>like</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Maybe she will want to go to another country?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Did anyone put anything different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>(silence)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, ET Ella’s use of modal verb *would* + *like* (in its grammatical use) in the following extract is more successful as a politeness strategy, and it is reinforced by her more inclusive and supportive classroom manner in general.

Extract 6.31: *would* + *like* as a hedge in ETTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (Ella):</th>
<th>So I’d like you to tell me if the verb is should or must in this example.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>I think must maybe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Ok, so have the rest of you written this, because I know it can be tricky?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner:</td>
<td>Ok, (laughs) should maybe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td>Exactly. You have it now so it’s should for advice here in this example ok, everyone?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous extracts have provided evidence that the use of *like* in teacher directives and questioning failed to sufficiently reduce the face threat involved for learners, as it acts as a marker of minimum politeness. By contrast, the use of the modal verb would + grammatical *like* provided the sufficient level of politeness to meet the face needs of learners and to encourage their participation. This finding is consistent with the claims of Farr and O’Keeffe (2002), based on institutional classroom data, that IE speakers typically use *would* as a hedge in more formal contexts for this purpose.
6.3.4.4 Pedagogical Implications: Pragmatic Like in Teacher Talk

The analysis has revealed that the teachers in this study used *pragmatic like* in a range of pragmatic/socio-pragmatic capacities in their teacher talk. Many of the examples highlighted reflect precisely the type of usage that EFL learners in Ireland are likely to hear in their social exchanges in Ireland, especially amongst peers their own age (Schweinberger 2012: 195-197). Accordingly, a strong case can be made for their use by teachers in the L2 classroom context, in order to help learners develop passive awareness of their use. For instance, given the widespread use of ‘It’s like’ as a new reportative verb amongst younger-aged speakers in many Inner Circle countries, the use and explicit highlighting of this form to EFL learners in Ireland and elsewhere (alongside the traditional reporting verbs ‘say’ and ‘tell’ which feature in the ELT curriculum), can be especially useful for young adult learners. However, this would require teachers to overtly distinguish *like* in its pragmatic use from its traditional grammatical role and the types of speech contexts in which its use may and may not be suitable. Providing the necessary contextual support is also crucial if learners are to successfully interpret the subtle range of meanings that the structure can convey. Understanding the ways in which the marker functions in a hedging capacity and the degree of politeness reflected, can also be of socio-cultural value to learners, given its widespread use in this capacity in social contexts in Ireland and elsewhere. The analysis has revealed that the novices often failed to appreciate that the use of the marker in teacher questions and directives failed to provide the necessary level of politeness required for successful face management. These findings suggest this is also an area where there is much to be gained from awareness-raising activities on ELTE programmes drawing on classroom data, so as to help teachers to acquire critical insights into the ways in which their linguistic choices at these stages of the lesson can either contribute to or hinder good communication practices in the classroom.

6.4 Summary of Chapter

The corpus analysis in this chapter has attempted to characterise the classroom discourse of novice and experienced EFL teachers from the IE background, with specific reference to
regionally-differentiated and socially-differentiated spoken English usages whose historic exclusion from the ELT educational domain is now subject to increased questioning and uncertainty. It has also uncovered the primary socio-pragmatic and discourse roles played by the specified usages and explored the pedagogical implications of their use to gauge whether it can be warranted on socio-pragmatic and socio-cultural grounds. The analysis has revealed an overall closer relationship between the novices and the spoken varieties represented than the experienced teachers. This thereby indicated a higher level of informality in the target English use of the former, which was as expected given the questionnaire findings in the area of language awareness and languages attitudes. The more informal nature of their teacher talk seems also likely to have stemmed from their limited understandings of the normative dimensions surrounding language use in this educational context, and the role played by teacher talk in the processes of SLA, as revealed also in the questionnaire data. Meanwhile the qualitative analysis provided evidence that the inclusion of regionally and socially-differentiated grammatical expressions, particularly their own local variety, can bring important communicative and affective gains in this discourse context. However, it also indicated that some usages have a more limited value, and that others remain yet undesirable. The more pedagogically-oriented analysis further revealed that the measured use of some of these usages could be warranted, so as to introduce greater authenticity and linguistic diversity in the EFL classroom. However, it indicated the need for a carefully mediated approach, and for conscious decision-making in this area on the part of teachers.

While the teachers in both cohorts often engaged in authentic exchanges with learners that were valuable from a socio-cultural perspective, many of the novices and some of the experienced teachers struggled to achieve the correct balance between establishing their authority, and maintaining good classroom relationships. This could be linked to a lack of awareness on their part of their own language use at the socio-pragmatic level, and the type of strategies that teachers can draw on so as to more successfully support learners and learning. In the case of the novices, it also seems likely to have stemmed from their less developed sense of teacher identity at this early stage of their professional careers, and to be reflective of this professional stage. In these ways, the analysis in this chapter has provided empirical evidence of the benefits to be gained from overt awareness-raising on ELTE programmes in relation to the pragmatic/socio-pragmatic dimensions of teacher talk with
reference to these specific grammatical/pragmatic usages, and the varieties of spoken
represented more widely, to add to the knowledge base and skills of EFL teachers at different
stages of their careers, and to help in the formation of teacher identity. This has once again
underscored the obvious benefits that can be gained for teachers from critical awareness-
raising at this level on ELTE programmes, which must start with an investigation of their
own related practices and speech styles, for which classroom corpora can play a vital role.
Having gained a wealth of practical insights into the teachers’ target English use at the level
of variety, we proceed to the main conclusions reached in this study across the three areas of
language awareness, language attitudes and classroom language use, drawing on the
interview data as support. The significance and implications of the findings are also critically
appraised in the discussion that follows, with recommendations made for future related
research.
Chapter Seven

Conclusions and Future Directions

“I think there’s been a big change in the way teachers think in the last few years and that we’re moving towards something alternative which I would support because the present system is unjust in lots of ways but just what this is exactly is still up in the air” (ET: Elizabeth)

7.1 Aims and Research Questions Revisited

The present study was situated in Chapter One of this thesis in relation to on-going ideological and linguistic challenges to the mono-centric target English status quo in the ELT world, based hitherto on idealised Anglo-American native speaker norms, due to the global phenomenon of ELF and the shift towards a World Englishes position amongst a growing number of linguists. It also highlighted the lively academic debate this has inspired amongst theorists concerning suitable target Englishes for EL pedagogy, and key-related studies within the World Englishes research paradigm which have started to critically address what this might mean for teaching and learning in this educational sector. In so doing, it highlighted the new target English demands and opportunities that have arisen for all practitioners in the EFL field in the light of the changing English language landscape, focusing on the position of native speaker teachers, and that of teachers from the IE sociolinguistic background in particular. In this regard, it has explored and shed light on the current status of this previously ‘disfavoured’ professional group in the ELT world as English language users from a non-main variety Inner Circle background, which is an area that has been largely overlooked to date in the suitable target Englishes debate and in the related research literature.

The study addressed this research gap by exploring their awareness, attitudes and use of spoken English varieties that have traditionally been excluded from the ELT curriculum, and which teachers have been expected to avoid in teacher talk, on account of their lack of ‘prestige’, and what this might mean for their professional practices in the local classroom context, and for ELTE in this context, and more widely. In this regard, it set out to extend the
current scope and focus of the theoretical discussions in the suitable target Englishes debate, and the existing academic literature, by undertaking empirically-research that could shed light on the target English models that teachers use in teacher talk with learners, the cognitive, and affective factors influencing their decision-making in this area, and the role played by macro-sociolinguistic influences pertaining to their sociolinguistic identity, in order to provide a more complete picture and critical understanding of the target English choices made at the ‘chalk face’.

The methodology triangulated quantitative and qualitative analyses from questionnaires, interviews and corpora and it drew on frameworks from sociolinguistics, pragmatics, DA and SLA so as to provide a detailed and multi-layered account of current trends and perspectives in these areas from the viewpoint of the ten novice and ten experienced EFL teachers who participated in the study. In this regard, it was both descriptive and pedagogically-motivated in its approach. In this final chapter, the five research questions that guided the focus of the study are revisited drawing on the data analysis. The research objectives were to investigate:

1. The nature and extent of the language awareness of novice and experienced EFL teachers, with specific reference to varieties of spoken English that have historically been excluded from the EFL classroom on account of their lack of ‘prestige’, by comparison with ‘standard’ and more formal varieties

2. The relationship between the teachers in each grouping and the specified varieties in terms of their reported everyday linguistic practices, and the role played by regional background, age and gender as underlying macro-sociolinguistic variables

3. The teachers’ English language attitudes in relation to the suitability of the specified varieties in relation to:
   i) social contexts of use
   ii) EFL teacher talk
   iii) explicit target models to be taught
4. The nature and extent of the teachers’ use of the specified varieties in teacher talk in the local teaching context, with learners of English at the intermediate level of English language proficiency

5. The implications of the findings for ELT and ELTE in Ireland, and more widely.

7.1.1 EFL Teacher Language Awareness

Language awareness was explored in the teacher on-line surveys across four related sub-themes. The first was concerned with the teachers’ passive awareness and formal linguistic understandings in relation to each specified item and type of usage represented. It revealed that all of the teachers were familiar with all four linguistic items and that they had developed sensitivities to their use. However, only the experienced practitioners and a small minority of the novices were well-informed as to their formal linguistic properties, in terms of the metalanguage and classification systems used by linguists to describe them and the functionality, and meaning/s conveyed in each case. In general, and as expected given their early recruit status, the novices displayed poor levels of language awareness, although a minority in the cohort were noticeably more insightful than their peers. Similarly, the experienced teachers displayed varying degrees of linguistic insight, although there was no doubt as to their superior levels of language awareness and knowledge overall. A key related finding was that the novices tended to be better informed about usages that they identified as features of the speech style of their own generation, most notably \textit{pragmatic like}.

The analysis also uncovered marked discrepancies in the wider sociolinguistic knowledge of the teachers in each grouping at the level of variety. Hence, the novices mostly lacked awareness of the extent of the cross-varietal distribution of the specified grammatical and lexical usages, with almost all failing to recognise the limited distribution of the two IE structures or that \textit{preterite seen} had a wider profile. They also demonstrated a limited understanding of their own variety and its relationship with SBE/SAE although at times their responses evoked a growing sense of awareness of the features of their own speech community and their place within it. The experienced teachers, on the other hand, were well-
informed in relation to the grammatical features of IE as a variety, and its similarities and differences with main varieties. Interestingly, as with their experienced teacher counterparts, the novices were insightful as to the international profile of pragmatic like, which confirmed there was a strong link between their awareness of, and identification with this pragmatic usage.

The teachers’ understandings in relation to variation of the situational kind revealed similar trends and discrepancies. For instance, the experienced teachers positioned the two IE usages towards the informal end of the formal/informal continuum whereas the novices tended to view them in a more neutral light. A further key finding was that a minority of the experienced teachers expressed uncertainty as to the degree of informality currently surrounding IE these usages, particularly ye, due to ongoing vernacularization, which they alluded to. This suggested that they were well-informed as to changing trends in spoken English, and the processes involved.

As far as individual teacher trends were concerned, a key finding was that a core group of teachers in each cohort displayed superior linguistic knowledge and intuitions than their peers, notably Fionnuala and Brid, in the experienced teacher grouping, and Aisling and Deirdre amongst the novices. By contrast, a small number of novices, mostly males, consistently revealed more limited levels of language awareness, and a lack of insight into issues of appropriacy in language use. This was attributed to their former lack of language-related education, which clearly disadvantaged them. Conversely, the superior knowledge and insights of the experienced teachers could be linked to their more substantive language-related education, English language teacher qualifications and teaching experience. Accordingly, the findings in the area of language awareness were in many ways reflective of the professional status and career stage of those in each grouping, as well as their educational backgrounds and their varying degrees of innate language awareness as individuals.
7.1.2 EFL Teachers’ Reported Everyday Linguistic Practices

As far as the teachers’ reported practices are concerned, clear distinctions were made between usages they viewed as integral to their speech styles, and those they sought to avoid. In this regard, their decision-making (whether conscious or otherwise) was often seen to be influenced by the sociolinguistic profile they associated particular items, as well as underlying macro-societal influences, particularly age and regional background. Overall, a closer relationship was observed between the novices and the specified usages. This indicated that age was a key underlying influence in all cases, although it is likely to have overlapped with professional status as a variable in terms of influencing the patterns of use reported as the novices were all in the lower age category while the experienced teachers were all in the older age groupings. In general, a greater affinity was shown for the two IE structures than the two socially-differentiated forms, with regional background also seen to act as an important sociolinguistic variable in the case of both the after perfect and ye. The influence of gender was also visible in the teachers’ patterns of use/non-use of the two IE usages with a bias observed in favour of the males but it was a less obvious than regional background and age.

More significant disparities arose concerning the teachers’ affiliations with the two socially-marked structures. In this regard, preterite seen was largely disassociated with by the teachers in both cohorts due to its unfavourable social profile, while the marker like was associated with to a greater extent by the novices, with age-differentiation again clearly visible in their reported patterns of use of the item. Conversely, the experienced teachers mostly failed to identify with the use of the marker due to its younger age profile which all referred to as a key determinant. This indicated that for the teachers in each cohort the marker carried no adverse social connotations by contrast to preterite seen. Accordingly, as expected, the novices identified more closely with the use of all four linguistic items than the experienced teachers did. This led to the expectation that these types of spoken English were likely to feature more visibly in the teacher talk of the student teachers, and amongst the males in the cohort in particular, but that this would depend on the extent of their awareness of normative requirements surrounding teacher talk in this educational domain, and the extent to which they sought to adhere to these values.
7.1.3 EFL Teacher Language Attitudes

The teachers’ English language perspectives were subsequently uncovered through the analysis of the attitudinal data in the teacher questionnaires. The viewpoints expressed in relation to the social acceptability of the specified usages varied between high levels of approval accorded to their use by the vast majority of the novices and many of the experienced teachers, and the outright rejection expressed by a small minority in each grouping. However, as seen previously, distinctions were made in relation to each category of spoken English and particular usages. In overall terms, greater tolerance was displayed by the novices and the experienced teachers alike towards the two regionally-differentiated structures, as represented by the IE after perfect and ye, to which most attached no social stigmatisation.

This compared with the very low levels of approval accorded to preterite seen on the grounds of its indexation with speakers from socially-disadvantaged and less educated backgrounds. Pragmatic like, on the other hand, was tolerated to a greater degree than preterite seen by the experienced teachers and novices alike, as it was not seen to carry any overtly negative social associations. A further key finding was that a minority of the teachers in each cohort were found to be more prescriptive in their views than their peers and that they were more often females. Conversely, those found to be most consistently tolerant in their attitudes were a female experienced teacher, and the male novices. Finally, the analysis revealed that most of the experienced teachers and a minority of the novices had acquired sensitivities towards changing trends and practices in language use. It also indicated that some were influenced in their language beliefs by these developments, and that this led to greater tolerance towards particular usages, as in the case of the marker like.

Although the teachers in each cohort tended to share similar viewpoints concerning suitable types of spoken English for social use, their viewpoints diverged on the question of what might constitute appropriate varieties for teacher talk. In overall terms, the experienced teachers tended to disapprove of the use by teachers of all of the specified grammatical usages, on both linguistic and normative grounds, whereas the novices rejected only preterite seen due to its obvious stigmatisation. Nevertheless, a key finding was that some of the
experienced practitioners made a distinction between the acceptability of IE usages such as *ye* which brought an obvious communicative gain in the L2 classroom, and those they perceived as less functionally useful and more complex for learners to process, such as the *after perfect*. However, in this case, most tended to view *ye* as suitable only for use in the local classroom context, and in general English language classes rather than exam preparation classes.

The further findings to emerge were that the experienced teachers’ tended to take a pragmatic, rather than an ideologically-motivated, target English approach. Hence, many recognised the need for a wider range of spoken English to be introduced into their target English practices for the communicative benefits this would bring for learners. However, they were mindful of on-going normative restrictions and the additional processing difficulties this might pose, particularly for learners at lower proficiency levels. This led some of the teachers to feel increasingly challenged and frustrated professionally, and to express the need for greater pedagogic guidance in this area, particularly as to whether they could use their own variety in the local classroom context, with *ye* often referred to as a case in point.

This was confirmed by the interview data (see Appendix G), as when asked to identify current challenges they were experiencing in their target English practices, three of the five ETs who participated either alluded to or explicitly mentioned ‘uncertainties’ they felt concerning whether they could use IE with learners of English in Ireland, as the following comments made by Brid and Graham illustrate:

**Extract 7.1: ET Brid**

I think knowing whether we can use Irish English more in the classroom these days because of World Englishes and to have more authentic language use in general which I would support because I don’t think we can justify teachers not being able to use their own variety and in any case learners lose out if they only ever hear English that matches the neat textbook version but as things stand it’s not clear what we can actually say.

**Extract 7.2: ET Graham**

I think we are definitely challenged by the uncertainties about whether its ok or not to use Irish English because we just don’t talk about it but it’s there all the time and I’m sure lots of us do actually say ‘ye’ which makes sense in this context.
Conversely, Fionnuala and Owen felt challenged precisely because the status quo which they sought to adhere to, was becoming more difficult to defend, that is that teachers should only use only the existing mono-centric standard.

**Extract 7.3: ET Fionnuala**

*I know it’s becoming unfashionable to say this but I maintain there is a need for an international standard and we already have one that is widely-used, but I feel we are beginning to lose this, which is creating problems.*

**Extract 7.4: ET Owen**

*It would make it harder for us to have to teach different standards in different places so I think we should stick to what we know.*

The interview data also confirmed that the overall more tolerant stance adopted by the novices was linked to an obvious lack of awareness on their part of the normative requirements surrounding language use in this educational domain, and their limited insights concerning the central role played by teachers and teacher talk in the promotion of particular models of English. For instance, of the five in the cohort who participated in the semi-structured interviews, three referred initially only to target English problems or challenges in the area of phonological aspects of teacher talk (such as difficulties controlling the pace of their speech). Meanwhile, the remaining two raised a range of issues relating to classroom management and their ability to teach in general but again, failed to mention any concerns they might have concerning the models of English they were expected to use or to explicitly teach to learners (see Appendix G). Nevertheless, when asked to comment specifically on the types of spoken English they felt they should use with learners, two of the five novices involved, in both cases males, raised the issue of the use of IE *ye*, which they had become more aware of as a result of discussions with TP supervisors on the MA TESOL programme, as the following comments by Gary and Cormac illustrate:

**Extract: 7.5 ST Gary**

*I never really thought about it until my TP supervisor told me that I use ‘ye’ a lot in my lessons and that I needed to become more aware of this as it might confuse some learners or they might not want to hear this.*
This suggested an awakening sense of critical language awareness on their part, in relation to their own variety and the types of issues and challenges that could arise from its use by EFL teachers with learners of English.

The attitudes expressed in relation to the question of the explicit teaching of the specified usages also confirmed that only the experienced teachers, and a small minority of novices, were aware of the restrictive target English models that practitioners in the ELT field have been expected to adhere to historically in their target English practices with learners. This led to opposing viewpoints, with the novices mostly approving of the overt teaching of all of the specified usages except *preterite seen*, while all but a small minority of the experienced teachers disapproved. On a related note, several of the experienced teachers displayed an acute awareness of the types of discriminatory practices that arise from the existing monocentric target English approach, which some had experienced first-hand in different ELT contexts and settings. A further key finding was that some in the cohort showed a willingness to embrace a more inclusive, target English approach that was more pluricentric in nature, but that they felt unsure as to what exactly this might mean in practice. This view was reflected in Elizabeth’s comment in the interview data, as shown in Extract 7.7 below.

*Extract: 7.7 ET Elizabeth*

*I think there’s been a big change in the way teachers think in the last few years and that we’re moving towards something alternative which I would support because the present system is unjust in lots of way - but just what this is exactly is still up in the air.*

These findings suggested a close link between the teachers’ awareness of the normative requirements surrounding the models of English that teachers explicitly promote, the target English beliefs they expressed and the types of grammar that could be expected in their classroom practices at the level of language variety which was the third area of enquiry explored in this study through corpus-assisted analysis.
The use of a corpus-assisted approach in this study has made it possible to present an accurate picture of trends in current usage of the specified items and the varieties represented, to extend the scope of current research and discussions in the suitable target Englishes debate, which was a key objective of this study. It has revealed that spoken English varieties other than those prescribed in course books featured in the teacher talk of EFL practitioners from the IE background in the local classroom context. It also established that they were used alongside 'standard' and more formal forms of grammatical expression, and that they featured less saliently than the latter. Overall, the corpus analysis has provided clear indications of a closer relationship between the novice teachers and the specified usages than their experienced teacher counterparts, with the latter group tending to adopt a more measured approach to their use.

At the level of regionally-differentiated grammar represented by the *after perfect* and *ye* and related variants, a total of four IE perfective usages was found, all of which featured with muted saliency by comparison with the SE *present perfect* although differences in the extent of use of each variant were observed. In terms of overall frequencies and distribution within each teacher sub-corpus, the IE perfective usages were favoured most by a core group of male novices, but they were also observed in the teacher talk of a small minority of the experienced teachers, with the IE *be perfect* featuring most saliently. By comparison, IE pronominal *ye* featured more visibly in both sub-corpora, but particularly in STTIL. It also occurred in a far wider distribution in STTIL than ETTIL, and a male gender bias was observed also in both cases. Alongside *ye* two further second person plural pronominals were found in the corpus data, albeit to a more muted degree; that is, *yourselves*, which featured only in ETTIL, and *youse*, found exclusively in STTIL. However, in overall terms, the IE pronominals featured substantially less than SE *you*. Accordingly, the quantitative analysis at the level of regionally-differentiated grammar revealed the muted use of grammatical expressions that are unique to IE as a variety in the teacher talk of the experienced teachers, by comparison with their more salient use in the teacher talk of the novices, which was
largely consistent with the teachers’ reported practices and the attitudinal data, and therefore in line with expectations.

More disparate trends in usage were observed in the case of the two socially-differentiated structures, as preterite seen featured only in the teacher talk of one of the novices, whereas pragmatic like was visible in ETTIL and STTIL but more so in the latter. However, in both, it was found to occur less than like in its traditional grammatical capacity. Accordingly, in line with the teachers’ reported practices and the attitudinal findings, socially-marked grammar that carries more obvious stigmatisation was largely absent from the teachers’ target English use. Meanwhile, as expected, pragmatic language use that is associated with younger-aged speakers was favoured more by the novices representing the younger age category both in terms of frequencies and distribution. Moreover, it was found to be used more by the novices both in its traditional IE pattern, where it occurs in a clause final position and features as a hedge, and in its innovative use, where it features in several syntactic patterns and performs a range of pragmatic functions. Again these findings were largely consistent with the attitudes expressed by the teachers in each grouping, and they confirmed that teachers in both groups made distinctions between the suitability of different usages for their target English use with learners on the basis of either social norms, or according to what they considered appropriate language use for their life stage.

The qualitative analysis at the level of discourse function began by uncovering essential contextual details relating to each of the four usages, and in some cases their related variants, in terms of the micro-contexts of the lesson in which they occurred, and the types of pedagogical functions being performed at the time of use, drawing on the adapted SETT framework for this purpose. This provided indications that some of the specified items played a more central role in the EFL classroom context than others did. Further up-close searches of the data explored the primary socio-pragmatic and discourse role/s performed by the specified items, and related variants. This established that some of the usages carried a higher communicative and strategic value than others in the EFL discourse context. However, overall, they were found to contribute most to the affective realm of classroom communication, serving to establish rapport and collaboration, to create an informal and
supportive learning environment and for the purpose of face management at times of the lesson when sensitivities arose for learners.

In this regard, pronominal items such as ye and yourselves, were found to bring both interactional and affective advantages in the area of classroom management and politeness. At the level of tense/aspect, the use of the IE be perfect was also found to reduce the level of informality of teacher/leaner interactions and thereby to reduce social distance and power relationships. This was often reinforced by the use of the vocative guys and inclusive we, which acted as markers of expressed solidarity and collaboration on the part of the teachers in both groupings. However, some of the further perfective usages found such as the extended now perfect and the experiential perfect proved less effective due to the confusion their use created for learners in terms of the precise time meanings reflected. Moreover, at times their use led to a level of intimacy and informality that seemed more akin to conversational exchanges in social contexts than to teacher/learner interactions in the formal L2 classroom context, which compromised the professionalism of the teachers involved.

As these usages were favoured considerably more by the novices that the experienced teachers, their use further suggested that many in the former grouping had yet to develop a clear sense of their teacher role and identity at this early stage of their professional development. In particular, the highly informal nature of the interactions between novice Sean and learners suggested that he struggled to separate his social identity from his teacher identity, which was not surprising given that he was similar in age to those he taught and lacked prior teaching experience. This supports the consensus view in teacher education in general that teacher identity evolves over time and that it can be shaped by many factors including personal attributes and biography, gender, age and culture (Miller 2009). It also supports Zimmerman’s observation that an informal teaching orientation may be less suitable for an inexperienced teacher.
The main conclusion from the corpus analysis reached was that the discerning use of *ye/yourselves* and some of the IE *perfective* variants could be warranted in teacher talk in the local EFL classroom context due to the communicative and affective gains they led to, but that they should be used consciously by teachers, signalled overtly to learners, and introduced as part of a carefully mediated pedagogical approach. By contrast, usages such as *pragmatic like* were found to be less useful in this discourse context, particularly when serving in its hedging capacity as it failed to provide the required level of politeness needed for face management at sensitive stages of the lesson. Despite this obvious failure, the use of the marker in some of its alternatives role was seen to bring some communicative value, as when it served as a focuser and as a reportative verb, in terms of signalling key information to learners, and thereby scaffolding the learning process. Finally, the use of *preterite seen* was found to be largely peripheral in this discourse context and to remain as yet undesirable due to its strongly stigmatised usage. Having set out the main research findings, the following section outlines the implications arising thereof for ELT and ELTE.

### 7.1.5 Implications and Applications of the Findings for ELT and ELTE

The analysis has brought to light a wealth of insights concerning the model of English used by EFL teachers in an IE context. In this regard, it has provided clear evidence of their use of varieties of English other than those prescribed in ELT philosophies in their teacher talk with learners in the local classroom context, and pedagogical issues and considerations arising thereof. For instance, it has highlighted the classroom micro-contexts where particular usages and patterns of use by teachers are more likely to occur in the lesson, and the types of pedagogical functions that are associated with their use. Crucially, it has also identified the types of socio-pragmatic and socio-cultural benefits that can be gained from their use by teachers in the EFL discourse context at particular stages of the lesson, and where their use should be avoided, due to the linguistic challenges and confusion this might pose for learners at the intermediate level, or in some cases on the basis of the high degree of informality and ‘non-standardness’ reflected. In cases where particular usage were found to be warranted, the analysis also critically explored the kind of mediation that would be required on the part of teachers in order to ensure that their use was accessible and, therefore, beneficial to learners.
In this way, it has also provided important insights into the types of strategic interventions that teachers can use to support the use of non-main grammatical expressions, including the nature of the contextual cues that might be needed to help learners to ‘notice’, and successfully interpret their intended meaning and use.

One of the further key findings of the study is the strong link made between the linguistic choices made by the teachers’ at the level of variety, and their language awareness and language attitudes. For instance, the experienced teachers mostly advocated the need for caution and discernment by practitioners in relation to the use of these types of spoken English as target models in the EFL classroom context. This was due to a greater awareness on their part of the normative requirements surrounding teacher talk in this educational context, and their more enhanced pedagogical insights concerning the linguistic challenges that this would pose for learners at different proficiency levels. This led to their more muted use of the specified items and the varieties represented, which also suggested an ability on their part to control their target English use strategically. By contrast, the novices tended to show less restraint in their use of these items, presumably due to a failure on their part to recognise the normative restrictions that exist, and also due to a lack of awareness and control of their own target English use.

The close relationship between language awareness and professional language use was also evidenced by the distinction made by the experienced teachers between what constitutes suitable language use in social, as opposed to professional, contexts. This suggested that most in the cohort refrained from their habitual, speech style that reflected local grammatical usages, and a higher degree of informality towards a professional speech style that was more ‘standard’ and formal. The indications of style shifting between *you* and *ye* at different stages of the lesson on the part of a limited number in the cohort also confirmed the close link between the superior language awareness of the teachers involved and their enhanced target English skills and performance. Meanwhile, the interview data further confirmed that the experienced teachers were insightful concerning the importance of their target English use in terms of the key role it played as a rich source of target English input for learners, as well as its strategic value. Conversely, it confirmed the lack of language awareness of the novices concerning the target English role of teachers and teacher talk, which led to an inability on
their part to control the nature of their target English input with learners and to target their interactional language use effectively.

The analysis also revealed that novices from NE backgrounds often lack awareness of their own variety and the ways in which it relates to versions used elsewhere, in terms of status and use, as well as the implications this carries for EFL teachers in their professional practices. This was also confirmed by the interview data, which indicated that at the early stage of TP novices tend to focus on micro-level concerns relating to classroom management and their teaching ability in general, rather than macro-level issues pertaining to trends in language use and their impact on the models of English used and taught. Conversely, while many of the experienced teachers were knowledgeable about socio-political and linguistic developments surrounding spoken English, they expressed uncertainty as to what this might mean for their own target English practices at the micro-level in terms of the varieties they could use with different learner groups as a target model. In these ways, the study has provided evidence to support the close link between teacher language awareness and the target models of English they use with learners at the level of variety.

It has thereby underscored the importance of, and the need for overt and focused language awareness training for both recruits to ELTE programmes at the novice level, and for experienced practitioners engaged in professional development initiatives, in areas including: the nature of the English language as it is used globally today, with an emphasis on ELF, World Englishes, and variation in spoken English at the level of variety; the features and role of their own variety/ies and its relationship with main Inner Circle varieties and local varieties found elsewhere; the nature of their own speech style and factors influencing their own everyday linguistic practices that are linked to their sociolinguistic identity; critical issues pertaining to ‘standard/non-standard’ and formal/informal English; historic and changing target English models in the ELT educational domain; and, crucially, the central role that EFL teachers can play in the promotion of particular varieties as target models through the linguistic choices they make, as reflected in their own target English use with learners.

Awareness-raising initiatives of this kind can be facilitated by the empirical findings from this study. For instance, they can be used as the basis for critical classroom discussions and to
inform the content of MA programmes with a view to enabling teachers to develop practical knowledge and skills to enhance their target English performance and their professional practices more widely. For instance, the corpus data can be drawn on in language systems modules in order to explore particular grammatical and pragmatic usages that featured in ETTIL and STTIL and their functionality in this discourse context, so as to raise awareness of variation in spoken English at the level of variety. Exploring the trends, patterns and examples of language use uncovered in this study, can also be useful for TP preparation modules and in TP feedback, with both novice and experienced teachers, as it creates opportunities to critically appraise issues surrounding the acceptability and efficacy of the use of particular grammatical and pragmatic expressions in the EFL discourse context with learners at different proficiency levels. The data can also be used to explore alternative approaches and linguistic choices that might be more suitable in different teaching contexts and settings, with a view to enhancing the critical language awareness and the strategic target English skills of teachers. In this way, the corpus data from this study and the further insights gained in the area of language awareness and language attitudes can provide a valuable framework of reference for EFL teachers, where none has existed before, as to the types of grammatical and pragmatic usages that are suitable and useful for teacher talk, and the contexts in which their use can be warranted, and those in which they should be avoided. It can also offer practical guidelines as to the ways in which a wider range of spoken English varieties can be introduced and successfully mediated for learners, so as to enable teachers to make more finely-nuanced critical judgements of this kind, so as to improve their target English performance, and thereby respond more effectively to the more diverse and complex needs of EFL learners today.

In addition to the practical pedagogical insights gained, the analysis has also provided empirical evidence that can potentially lead to more finely-nuanced theoretical understandings in several key related areas to help expand the body of knowledge in the teacher education field. For instance, the corpus findings from this study have shed light on the nature and role of L2 teacher talk in the IE context, and the ways in which teachers and teacher talk can scaffold learners and learning in the EFL classroom context for learners at the intermediate level thereby contributing to pedagogic theory in this area in SLA. In this way, they have also provided evidence to support the theoretical view that teacher talk is
complex and multifaceted, and that teachers play a central role in the relationship between language use and language learning in the L2 classroom (Walsh 2006: 2). In these ways, the findings from this study have important applications for ELTE in Ireland, for both novice and experienced teachers alike, in terms of developing their theoretical understandings in relation to key areas of L2 pedagogy.

The study has also brought new insights in the area of language teacher identity that can further inform our theoretical understandings of the complex processes involved in teacher identity formation. For instance, it has shown how individuals integrate their own personal characteristics, and their unique socio-cultural backgrounds and experiences into their developing professional knowledge and identity. It has also provided evidence to support the view that novices often struggle to develop a clear sense of teacher identity in their early teaching practice (Farrell 2016). Moreover, it has indicated that this can lead them to ‘slip’ from their teacher identity to their social identity, which leads them to adopt a teaching style that is overly informal and inappropriate for the teaching context. By providing exemplars of specific instances and contexts where this has occurred, this study can be used to raise awareness in this area on ELTE programmes, creating opportunities for guided classroom discussions of the complex issues involved, including the ways in which L2 teacher identity is shaped and manifested, and issues pertaining to teacher professionalism and appropriacy in this educational domain.

The present research has also provided evidence to support the theoretical position that EFL teachers must begin to act as agents for target model change as part of a broader transformation of ELT professional practice, as advocated by critical applied linguists. This is not least because it has highlighted the types of constraints and discrimination that are routinely faced by EFL practitioners from the IE background in their professional practices on account of the lack of ‘prestige’ accorded historically to IE in the ELT world. In this regard, the findings of this study can be drawn on as the basis for critical classroom discussions on ELTE programmes with a view to highlighting the ‘disfavoured’ status of Irish EFL teachers and IE in the ELT world. This will also create opportunities for teachers to critically explore the complex range of issues and challenges that are shared by all practitioners in this educational domain, and those that arise for teaching professionals from particular backgrounds, and the reasons involved. In this way, practitioners can be
encouraged to look beyond the assumptions made about native speaker supremacy, and the ‘prestige’ accorded to native speaker varieties in the ELT world in order to achieve a more finely-nuanced understanding of the supposed NEST/NNEST dichotomy.

By providing empirical evidence of the use of IE in the EFL classroom in Ireland, and attitudes towards its use in social and educational contexts amongst educated speakers of this variety, this study can also provide greater theoretical understandings in relation to the historic status of IE as a World English, the ways in which this may be changing, and the factors and processes involved, to add to the understandings of teachers from this background, and elsewhere in relation to critical issues of power and ideology surrounding language use in society. This endeavour could serve to enhance awareness and appreciation of all versions of English, including amongst those who use them. The findings of this research are therefore considered of significance in terms of their potential to add to the theoretical knowledge base of ELTE in the areas specified, in Ireland and more widely, thereby enabling teacher educators to offer greater pedagogic guidance for practitioners, novice and experienced alike, at this time of increased diversity and change in the ELT world.

When we consider the contribution of this study to the existing research literature in the World Englishes ELT research paradigm, we find that as envisaged, it has built on, and expanded the pioneering work of White (2006) and Murphy (2011) by shedding light on both the target English perspectives, and the target Englishes used by Irish EFL teachers in the local classroom context. In so doing, the present research has also extended, and brought a new dimension to the suitable target Englishes debate more widely (Timmis 2002; Jenkins 2007; Young and Walsh 2010). Finally, it has provided ample empirical evidence to support the arguments made by a growing number of applied linguists working in the ELT field that a wider range of varieties can and should be introduced into the EFL classroom (Pennycook 2000; Promodrou 2003, O’Keeffe et al 2007), and that teachers and teacher talk can and should play a vital role in this development.
7.1.6 Limitations and Future Research

It must also be acknowledged that a number of limitations arose in this study. For instance, it focused exclusively on the target English use of the participants when teaching EFL learners at intermediate level, which meant that a comparative analysis of the varieties used in teacher talk across different levels could not be explored. This is an area that merits further research, in order to investigate the nature and extent of use at different levels, the factors influencing the practices observed and the pedagogical considerations which arise, such as the level and types of mediation that are required by teachers to support learning and learners. This would involve the compilation of corpora sourced from recordings of classes taught at two or more proficiency levels.

A further limitation was that this study was synchronic in nature, which meant that it could provide only a snapshot of current trends and practices at the time the research was undertaken. There is scope for a more long-term, diachronic analysis of the ways in which the teachers’ use of the specified varieties changed over time. This research could take several forms; for instance, it could focus exclusively on the perspectives and classroom practices of novice teachers from their early initial TP over a period of years to a later stage in their careers. Alternatively, it could explore whether teachers’ target English perspectives and practices change as they gain experience in different ELT contexts and settings.

This study also focused only on the teaching of EFL in the third level context rather than on different EFL and ESL contexts in Ireland, which would have given it greater depth. It would also have provided a more accurate picture of the models of English that are currently being used by teachers from the IE background in the plurality of ELT contexts that now exist in Ireland and the particular influences and constraints that featured in each, which could have also served as the basis for comparative investigations.

A further related area for future research could involve a corpus analysis of the target English models used by Irish EFL teachers in the local classroom context by comparison with their related practices abroad, which would be of particular value for teacher education purposes. The creation of the ETTIL/STTIL corpora has made it possible for further empirically-based studies to be undertaken in order to comparatively explore the target English model choices and related practices of Irish EFL teachers in comparison with those of their counterparts in
different World English settings. The underlying aim of such a study could be to further help inform ELTE programmes and to bring new insights to the suitable target Englishes academic debate. The availability of this resource can also facilitate further corpus research in the area of teacher talk so as to explore a wider range of linguistic usages and types of spoken English that are used by practitioners in the EFL context. In this way, this study can serve as a springboard for further corpus-based research that will add to the practical and theoretical knowledge base that novice and experienced EFL teachers and teacher educators in this field can draw on to further enhance their pedagogical understandings and strategic skills in relation to the implications of their target English choices and practices in the contemporary EFL classroom.
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APPENDIX A

Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form

FACULTY OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

The aim of this study is to investigate the language use of student teachers and experienced teachers in the EFL classroom at the intermediate level of English language proficiency. For this purpose, recordings of the classroom teaching of student teachers and of experienced teachers will be used to compile corpora of teacher classroom talk for later analysis. The research will also explore student teacher language awareness through a questionnaire and a follow-up semi-structured individual interview, the latter of which will be recorded. The findings from the study will be written in the researcher’s PhD dissertation and may be published in academic journals and used in conference papers in the future.

Research role of teachers participating in this study:

- Provide recordings of classroom discourse of EFL classes they have taught (The recordings are those made in the classes which are always recorded as part of the MA ELT programme).
- Provide personal details (age, gender, educational background).
- Provide opinions about language use.
- Provide other related and applicable information.
- The questionnaire will be administered on-line and will take approximately thirty minutes to complete.
- The follow-up individual interview will be conducted by the researcher at the University of Limerick and will take approximately thirty minutes to complete.

Research role of English language students participating in this study:

- Participate as usual in language classes which are always recorded as part of the English language programme at the University of Limerick but no further involvement is required.
It is important for you to note that your personal identity will remain anonymous at all times and that you will have the right not to participate in the study if you so wish. You also have the right to view the transcripts of the recordings before they are computerized and you may also withdraw from participation at any time in the course of the study. It is important also that you are fully aware that your participation in this study will have no influence on the grades you receive for course work or examinations for any programmes of study you undertake at the University of Limerick.

Contact details of the researcher, Angela Farrell and the research supervisors, Dr. Fiona Farr and Prof. Angela Chambers are provided below.

Details are also provided of the chairperson of the University of Limerick’s Research Ethics Committee (ULREG) whom you have the right to contact if you have any concerns about participating in the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Researcher:</th>
<th>Name of Supervisor: Dr. Fiona Farr (on leave semester 1, 2011)</th>
<th>Chairperson of ULREG:</th>
<th>Email: Angola Farrell</th>
<th>Email: <a href="mailto:fiona.farr@ul.ie">fiona.farr@ul.ie</a></th>
<th>Email: Anne.O'<a href="mailto:Dwyer@ul.ie">Dwyer@ul.ie</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angela Farrell</td>
<td>Prof. Angela Chambers</td>
<td>Anne O'Dwyer,</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Angola.farrell@ul.ie">Angola.farrell@ul.ie</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:angela.chambers@ul.ie">angela.chambers@ul.ie</a></td>
<td>Anne.O'<a href="mailto:Dwyer@ul.ie">Dwyer@ul.ie</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Angola.farrell@ul.ie">Angola.farrell@ul.ie</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 061 202 2244</td>
<td>Address: Castletroy, Limerick.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: 061 202 2424</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Angola.farrell@ul.ie">Angola.farrell@ul.ie</a></td>
<td>Telephone: 061 202 672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSENT SECTION:

I, the undersigned, declare that I am willing to take part in research for the project entitled ‘TESOL Teacher Talk: a corpus based analysis of student teacher versus experienced teacher TESOL classroom discourse.’

- I declare that I have been fully briefed on the nature of this study and my role in it and have been given the opportunity to ask questions before agreeing to participate.
• The nature of my participation has been explained to me and I have full knowledge of how the information collected will be used.

• I am also aware that my participation in this study will be recorded (video/audio) and I agree to this. However, should I feel uncomfortable at any time I can request that the recording equipment be switched off. I am entitled to copies of all recordings made and am fully informed as to what will happen to these recordings once the study is completed.

• I fully understand that there is no obligation on me to participate in this study.

• I fully understand that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without having to explain or give a reason.

• I am also entitled to full confidentiality in terms of my participation and personal details.

• I fully understand that my participation in this study will have no influence on the grades I receive for course work or examinations in relation to any programmes of study which I follow at the University of Limerick.

______________________________________         __________________________
Signature of participant                                               Date
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Ethics Approval

FACULTY OF ARTS, HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

From: Neil [mailto:neil.robinson@ul.ie]
Sent: 11 October 2011 10:31
To: Angela.Farrell; Carol.Noonan
Subject: Re: Ethics application FAHSS REC464-

Dear Angela,

Thank you for your comprehensive reply, I am happy to confirm approval of your project based on the assurances that you have given.

Regards,
Neil

Neil Robinson
Department of Politics and Public Administration University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland
Polaitiochta agus Riarcháin Poiblí, Ollscoil Luimni e-mail neil.robinson@ul.ie
APPENDIX C

Teacher Questionnaire

ON-LINE QUESTIONNAIRE TO EVALUATE NOVICE/EXPERIENCED NATIVE EFL TEACHER
TARGET ENGLISH PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES IN THE CLASSROOM

This questionnaire consists of two sections:

**Section 1** asks 3 sets of questions to establish a participant profile

**Section 2** asks 3 sets of questions, based on 6 sample sentences, to evaluate perceptions and awareness of aspects of language variation generally.

For some questions, you are asked to answer by placing a tick in the appropriate box. For other questions, you are asked to write your answer.
SECTION 1: PARTICIPANT PROFILE

1. Personal Information
Please provide the following information by ticking below where appropriate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a) Gender</th>
<th>1b) Age Group</th>
<th>1c) Home County and Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>□ 20–29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ 30–39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>□ 40–49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ 50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Educational Background
Tick to indicate which of the following subjects you studied and the level (e.g. Leaving Cert/School Leaving Exam (LC), Degree (D), Post-graduate degree (PG)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2a) Subject Studied</th>
<th>2b) Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics/Applied</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Studies</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Knowledge of Languages other than English

Indicate if you have studied any languages (including Irish), the length of time studied and the level achieved for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3a) Language/s Studied</th>
<th>3b) No. of years studied</th>
<th>3c) Level of Proficiency Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION TWO: AWARENESS OF ASPECTS OF VARIATION IN LANGUAGE USE

4a)-d) Read the following 6 sample sentences and answer the questions as indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence</th>
<th>4a) Have you ever <strong>heard</strong> this type of language?</th>
<th>4b) Have you ever <strong>used</strong> this type of language?</th>
<th>4c) State in what <strong>country/ies</strong> this type of language is used. Give details.</th>
<th>4d) State in what <strong>context/s</strong> this type of language is used. Give details.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) I’m after forgetting the books.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Would ye like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) What do you mean, like?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) You all look wrecked today.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Were you thrown off by the accent?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5a) Read the 6 sample sentences again and answer the questions as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence</th>
<th>5a) Do you think this type of language use is <strong>suitable for everyday social use?</strong></th>
<th>5a) If possible give reason(s) for your answer and any additional information you think is relevant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) I’m after forgetting the books.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Would ye like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) What do you mean, like?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) You all look wrecked today.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Were you thrown off thrown off by the accent?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rewrite any sentences from question 5a) which you think are not acceptable to make them acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence Number</th>
<th>Acceptable version for everyday social use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5b) Read the 6 sample sentences again and answer the questions as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence</th>
<th>5b) Do you think this type of language is suitable for ELT teachers to use in their classroom practices with learners?</th>
<th>5b) If possible give reason(s) for your answer or add any additional information you think is relevant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) I’m after forgetting the books.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Would ye like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) What do you mean like?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) You all look wrecked today</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Were you thrown off by the accent?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rewrite any sentences from questions 5b) which you think are not acceptable for ELT teachers to use in their classroom practices to make them acceptable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence Number</th>
<th>Acceptable version for ELT teachers to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5c) Read the 6 sample sentences again and answer the questions as indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Sentence</th>
<th>5c) Do you think this type of language is suitable to be explicitly taught as a target model of English in the ELT classroom context?</th>
<th>5c) If possible give reason(s) for your answer or add any additional information you think is relevant.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) I’m after forgetting the books</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Would ye like to talk about it for a few minutes?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) I couldn’t believe it when I seen it.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) What do you mean like?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) You all look wrecked today</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Were you thrown off by the accent?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should you wish to add any further information relating to any of the areas explored in this questionnaire, please do so in the box below:
Appendix D

Sample Concordance Lines

Sample Concordance: ETILL

after + ing

Sample Concordance: STTIL

after + ing

Sample Concordance: ETILL

be perfect

Sample Concordance: STTIL

be perfect

Sample Concordance: ETILL

extended now perfect
Sample Concordance: STTIL  

extended now perfect

Sample Concordance: ETILL  

experiential perfect

Sample Concordance: STTIL  

experiential perfect

Sample Concordance: ETILL  

ye

Sample Concordance: STTIL  

ye
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Sample Concordance: ETILL yourselves

- support <$S$> is yes and what else how about yourselves <$S$> yes do you go as far as us do you remember how about yourselves <$S$> yes the day in the zoo <$S$> work it out is that ok guys how about yourselves <$S$> yes no problem <$S$> well something about another student's weekend how about yourselves <$S$> yes did David went to Galaxy to the number ten what was it from here how about yourselves <$S$> yes yes ok thanks can you tell me did you find that yes how about yourselves <$S$> yes yes yes ok so how was it from here how about yourselves <$S$> yes y
ye all

the books have you read? <ST> $5- <ST> exactly, did ye all get that? <ST> $5- yes <ST> <ST> oh and the <ST> $5- Dingle, ok did ye see Funghi? Guys do ye all know who Funghi is? The dophin? Do ye the different countries on the way up, and are ye all going on the trip? <ST> $5- maybe <ST> can't <ST> <ST> is <ST> ok so did ye all manage to find someone who read the other that <ST> right said it didn't right did ye all some across that word before <ST> $5- $5- or word for the Earth getting really hot? Think ye all know it but maybe 350 or not planes are called the North and the South Pole. ye all know the word POLAR? <ST> $5- can we have to say what they want to do. ye all know what extreme sport they'd like to try? <ST> $5- still not sure. It is one here ok we begin now <ST> $5- Do ye all have a book on hands if you ever sick with a high temperature? or so ye all know what that means and did ye all so ye all know what that means and did ye all get that ok so we'll cut it in half he tells the truth for the first time. Do ye all know what we are talking about? <ST> <ST> $5- $4- Yes, I prefer <ST> $4- ok so are ye all ready to correct it now have ye finished? * Will we correct the rest of them as we are ye all ready? What about the third one can we.

like

cu getting used to liking here? <ST> $1- $1- I like <ST> $5- sorry could you just turn around om. 'kno or vodka and I don't like; this one <ST> so everyone I am going you go back a tone is good it sounds like you have not a grumpy on it. So lets <ST> $5- Cool yeah galway's great <ST> $4- yes I like <ST> $4- ok everyone so are ye don test. Its written on your outline. So would ye like to do some more work on this area next act speech is it doing on the verb structures like he did today so remember the noun revisued page each, this is em the homework I would like ye to do just pass it around and for examples witches and wizards with all hats like this (draws on board) or other funny costumes hot ward <ST> $5- Harry Potter is a wizard, like witch for the man <ST> $5- exactly that hour <ST> $5- $5- $5- not sure not was. Now for children a treat would be something like sweets so something they don't get every day so <ST> em. have the money to do this anymore like before, so am so going to a restaurant yes! I think my daughter has done something well like at school I might decide to buy her something might decide to buy her something as a treat like a new pair of shoes or a new CD <ST> so here the children are asking for a treat like sweets or chocolate and if you don't like us. So what that in mind you'd like to show a clip of a very well think is suitable for him, you'd like gonna think is amazing. So as ye are watching <ST> $1- so wanna <ST> $5- maybe Spao <ST> $5- ok so what I'd like ye to do next is to try the rest nine o'clock there is light but not bright <ST> $5- yes what did they say did
Sample Concordance: ETILL *preterite seen* – no examples found

Sample Concordance: STTIL *preterite seen*

but I suppose they/you//he used to it... I *seen* em with wetsuits. you know the black suits

> $\langle ST \rangle$ Yeah exactly I know what you mean cos I *seen* it in Australia so yeah its mad yeah

ok before! $\langle SS \rangle$ - $\langle ST \rangle$ yeah I know what you mean I *seen* it a lot in Australia when I was...

Sample Concordance: ETILL *thrown off*

sounds good and what about you Sara. Were you *thrown off*? $\langle ST \rangle$ - $\langle SS \rangle$ No I think they mistrusted

Sample Concordance: STTIL *thrown off*

$\langle ST \rangle$ - $\langle SS \rangle$ - No its very fast $\langle ST \rangle$ - $\langle ST \rangle$ We're ya *thrown off* by the accent? No skids from Pakistan

Sample Concordance: ETILL *wrecked* – no examples found

Sample Concordance: STTIL *wrecked*

$\langle SS \rangle$ - $\langle ST \rangle$ you all look *wrecked* so were ya out last night? $\langle SS \rangle$ - $\langle ST \rangle$ - Son
Appendix E (CD)

ETTIL and STTIL (Individual Teacher Files)
Appendix F

Sample of Methods Used to Identify and Classify Classroom Modes and Functions Using SETT

After Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Brid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Managerial (1)</td>
<td>Directive (1)</td>
<td>You’re late and we’re after starting so quickly find a seat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Materials (1)</td>
<td>Directive (1)</td>
<td>I’m after losing the link so just read the questions in your book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Content Feedback (1)</td>
<td>So yeah they’re after finding out more about it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Managerial (2)</td>
<td>Progress check (2)</td>
<td>Ok so are we done everyone? Ok, so I want you to check your answer with your partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Managerial (1)</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>So if you’re done, we can start the next exercise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Extended Now Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Referential question</td>
<td>Ok so are we done everyone? Ok, so I want you to check your answer with your partner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Referential question</td>
<td>And how are you getting on in Ireland? Are you here a while?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experiential Perfect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Referential question</td>
<td>Were you ever in Kerry?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Cormac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Referential question</td>
<td>Were you ever in the country?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Brid</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Managerial (16)</td>
<td>Comprehension check (1)</td>
<td>Did ye get that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials (5)</td>
<td>Progress check (7)</td>
<td>How are ye getting on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Directives (6)</td>
<td>I'd like ye to go the back of the book...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explanations (1)</td>
<td>Yeah, they So they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display questions (4)</td>
<td>How many did ye find?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Referential questions (3)</td>
<td>Where have ye been in Ireland?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STTIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Managerial (17)</td>
<td>Directives (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials (8)</td>
<td>Progress checks (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom context (3)</td>
<td>Referential (3) questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills and systems (1)</td>
<td>Explanation (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Preterite Seen/Done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Classroom context</td>
<td>Content feedback</td>
<td>Yeah, I know exactly what you mean cos I seen it in Australia...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pragmatic Like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode and occurrences</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETTIL</td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Managerial mode (1)</td>
<td>Directive (1)</td>
<td>Can you like change partners like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom contexts (2)</td>
<td>Referential question (2)</td>
<td>Where will you go like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills and systems (2)</td>
<td>Explanation (2)</td>
<td>So can you see there is only 'to' with an infinitive with like normal verbs,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>No. of occurrences</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Example of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STTIL</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Managerial (4)</td>
<td>Directives (9)</td>
<td>Can you read page 38 like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Materials (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>So you all know the word heatwave ’ yeah? When I heard we were getting a heatwave in Ireland, I was like yeaah!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom context (1)</td>
<td>Referential (3) question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills and systems (2)</td>
<td>Explanation (2)</td>
<td>So, em what like em this part here is the subject..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

337
Appendix G

Sample of Thematic Analysis of the Interview Data

ST SEAN

<1$> <Q1> Hi Sean, thanks for coming in so today I’d like to ask you a few questions related to your experience of teaching English. So can you tell me what challenges or difficulties, if any, have you experienced in your target English use with learners of English on teaching practice? </Q1> </1$>

<1$> Ok so I suppose em do you mean like when I’m teaching like what em when I’m speaking to the learners? Yeah well I knew I spoke fast (laughs) but I didn’t really kind of think about it that much before because I never really em came into contact with that many foreigners so it didn’t really matter that much really like crop up like you know so it’s hard to slow down the pace ... sometimes I forget but I am getting better at it so I em like suppose knowing about slowing down you know em yeah what else I’m a lot more aware of different accents so I don’t know maybe my accent has a bit changed but I don’t think I go in and speak completely differently but I should try to be a bit clearer with the way I speak so yeah I need to slow it down and speak em a bit more clearly ... anyway you can kind of see it on their faces if you’re going too fast for the them and they’re getting em getting lost and its over their heads if you know what I mean. </1$>

<1$> <Q2> In what ways, if any, do you think the existing EFL target English approach is changing? </Q2> </1$>

<2$> Well I suppose EFL teachers em these days would be better trained like you’re expected to know a lot about teaching not em like before you could just roll up in the past I know it’s a cliché but loads of my friends are like are you serious you’re doing a masters in TEFL ! And I’m like there’s actually a lot more to it than you em think but I know where they’re coming from cos I thought I would be a lot easier especially the grammar which is hard but I think it’s really good the way we teach everything through English because I didn’t learn French like that at school so it’s definitely cutting edge the way we teach so I think it’s leading the field </2$>

ST CORMAC :

<1$> <Q1> Hi Cormac so I’m going to ask you a few questions related to your experience of teaching English. What challenges, if any, have you experienced in your target English use with learners? </Q1> </1$>
Where do I start? (laughs) So I don’t know if you know but em I hadn’t taught before I did the MA and to be honest I didn’t really know what was ahead because you just kind of assume it’ll be easy because English is our native language so so it was only a few weeks into it that I even realised that we were doing the teaching part alone, I mean that you’d have to manage the classroom so that was a bit scary I mean getting the balance right between being the teacher and being nice to them...and em I was really really nervous starting off and I know when I get nervous I speak really really fast so I found it a challenge to remember to slow it down to help them understand and a lot of the comments in TP were about slowing down and thinking about the level of the students. And I actually had no clue like about grammar at all and how to explain it so it’s only really now that I’m em starting to know what intermediate or advanced is and em get a proper sense of what they know at the different levels and another thing I cringe about it now is em that definitely spoke to them like they were children that em it was hard not to do that but I know I am a lot more aware now and when I’m observing the other MA’s I notice it when they say things that are not really ok like for the learners we’re teaching I mean that we shouldn’t really say. 

ET GRAHAM:

I$> Q1> So Graham, can you tell me about the challenges we face in terms of the target English approach we use as teachers? </Q1> </I$

Yes so the books have em a lot more spoken English like than before and em it’s a better balanced like they would hear what people actually use so it’s improved a lot ... cos they’re actually learning what people say and what’s useful and I suppose it’s to give them a better balance because before it was mostly more formal English but I suppose they have been getting lots of different input from different areas ... so they can actually understand people from different countries now that there’s globalisation and you could be working somewhere like an international company where you’d be expected to have a really good level of em English so it’s a lot of pressure like on them ... the em the learners. In the listenings they definitely get to hear different accents which I think is good because not everyone speaks with a British accent and I think it was unfair in the past like me the way everyone had to learn to speak English like RP with that type of accent but it’s a bit more varied today. 

I$> Q1> So, what types of challenges do you think this might be creating for teachers today? </Q1> </I$

I suppose you’d have to know more about all the em types ... the em the different types like what’s formal and what’s informal and the different varieties we can teach so if you were teaching in Asia you would probably have to teach American English so you’d have to know what they wanted and adapt ... and in Australia you’d have to teach that ... so ...
em maybe even changing your accent ... like knowing that you can’t have a completely
different way of saying something to what they are learning ... so knowing what varieties to
teach this would be harder and you’d have to be em ... to em prepare more to be sure you
really knew how to teach that variety so yeah we could be teaching different varieties in
different countries depending on where we’d be working so thats why it's good for trainees
to ... to learn more than just British English cos definitely lots of places teach American
English ... so it means we have to know much more than before as teachers and about
what’s appropriate. And I think we are definitely challenged by the uncertainties about
whether its ok or not to use Irish English because we just don’t just talk about it but it’s
there all the time and I’m sure lots of us actually say ‘ye’ which makes sense in this context.

Thanks Graham for coming in .It was very interesting to hear your view.

ST: Aisling

Hi Aisling so I’m going to ask you a few questions related to your experience of
teaching English. What challenges, if any do teachers face in their target English use in the
classroom?

Ok so there’s a lot really em like its difficult to know how fast it should be because you
don’t want to be dumbing down but you have to make sure they can understand you know
follow what you’re em saying as it’s all in English that’s em one thing we find hard to
appreciate you know that it’s it’s all coming at them in English and that is a full hour of them
hearing it and trying to stay focused to follow what’s going on I learned Spanish in Spain like
this so I got to experience what it’s like myself this way of teaching where it’s all in the
target language ... yeah so you have to beware of the speed and the level of the grammar
because it's supposed to be at the right proficiency level you know just a bit above what
they can say themselves so you would see that from the observations of the experienced
teachers I mean its hard to pitch it at the right level for the students ..we all find this hard ...
and em knowing when it should be a lower level like when you’re giving instructions
that’s something we forget when we’re giving the instructions that we need to make sure
the level is lower then or otherwise the task might be done wrong.

So Owen, in what ways might the target English approach be changing and
what are the reasons for this?

So when we’re teaching English with the CLT approach which is how we teach here ... so it’s  more complex with more spoken English and more authentic ways of speaking and
the language more what you’d really hear more real speech so ... they get to hear more real examples so it’s more like they would hear outside and not only formal English and that’s good to get more of a balance and like they get exposure to different you know em varieties so different versions so American and British English and maybe some other Englishes as there’s so many more that exist nowadays with English expanding all over the world so that is changing things people learning more about other Englishes but we’re still concentrating on the main ones which em I think is good because you have to have standards it's important because it would be too confusing to be teaching and learning lots of ways of saying something and not knowing what is considered a better way . It would make it harder for us to have to teach different standards in different places so I think we should stick to what we know... they’re just not able to cope with that and I don’t think the students want that I mean most just want to be able to get a level that gets them into college so we shouldn’t be overcomplicating it for them ... so yeah it’s definitely changing which puts more pressure on the learners and on us too cos we’re expected to teach them so many different types of Em English these days and they don’t know if something is slang or ok to say in some contexts so it’s really important to make sure they know this when we’re teaching it you know where it's ok and not ok to say it or it could be embarrassing for them </$3>.

ET Fionnuala:

<$4> <Q2> In what ways, if any, do you think the EFL target English approach is changing? </Q2> </I$>

<$4> Well of course there are more influences from corpus linguistics especially in the teaching of vocabulary ... what’s included so there is a wider range and ... em more informal and a focus on collocations and generally a much bigger lexical focus I find getting used to the new course books a challenge because they have changed quite a lot in terms of content. For instance, we’re using New Inside Out now and there’s a lot more emphasis on lexis and collocations but I find the grammar parts a bit scrappy really ... compared with Headway ... the approach is not as systematic . We are also definitely seeing more of a focus on less formal English and multiword expressions so more em phrasal verb expressions, more everyday English and em more idiomatic expressions at the lower level which wouldn’t have featured til later in course books previously. I have to say I’m being asked a lot more about Irish English than before by the Erasmus students and I find em the em students asking me about expressions they’ve heard around the campus and in the Stables which I like and then we have a lively focus on the board and talk about the meanings and who uses this type of language because that is the key thing they need to understand that’s just em where it might be suitable and em for who ... for instance, sometimes they remark on how much swearing they hear and I like to put that into perspective and get them to make comparisons with people their age in their countries or they just assume we all do it so there’s definitely an interest in Irish English and slang and
local expressions but I find they want to know what it means so that they can understand what they are hearing around them so em not em ... not to be actually taught it as target models ... as ... so they can understand it when they’re out and about. I do think we have a responsibility as teachers to make sure they understand about propriety because they cannot gauge this themselves and they can end up sounding vulgar and inappropriate through no fault of their own. I wouldn’t feel happy about highlighting these expressions unless I made sure they understood they em had a full sense what they meant and any connotations and issues around their use, if it’s standard or non-standard English or vulgar especially if it’s an un educated type of English we em should not forget these key considerations but as far as we teach ... there must be a standard version that they understand and know how to use well before we introduce other varieties so that is becoming a challenge because the notion of standard is changing and ... we need to know about these developments but as things stand we focus on the standard first and foremost and this is what teachers should be using in the classroom and what is expected still. I know it’s becoming unfashionable to say this but I maintain that there is a need for an international standard and we already have one that is widely used, but I feel we are beginning to lose this</$4>

**QI: AREAS OF TARGET ENGLISH CHALLENGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Main Areas of Challenge Identified</th>
<th>ETs and individual challenge/s identified</th>
<th>STs and individual challenge/s identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) Target Models (6 sub-themes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) uncertainty as to which model is suitable in different contexts/settings</td>
<td>ET Brid (a)(b)(c)(e)(f) ET Elizabeth (1)(5) ET Fionnuala (b)(c)(f) ET Graham (b)(d)(f) ET Owen (b) (f)</td>
<td>None of these aspects mentioned by STs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) greater variation in target models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) greater knowledge required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Whether IE can be used a model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Discrimination due to existing approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Maintaining the existing target model approach and standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which is desired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Different aspects of teacher talk (3 sub-themes)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) controlling speed of speech</td>
<td>Not mentioned by ETs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) achieving correct pitch for proficiency level/age/function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) diction/clarity of speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Aisling (a)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roscanna (a) (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Cormac (a)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Sean(a)(b)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Gary(a)(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Classroom management (2 sub-themes)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Giving instructions</td>
<td>ST Cormac (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Elicitation</td>
<td>Not mentioned by ETs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Gary (a) (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Classroom relationships (1 sub-theme)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Getting the balance right between authority and friendliness</td>
<td>Not mentioned by ETs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST: Cormac ST Sean (a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Teaching language systems (1 sub-theme)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Grammar</td>
<td>Not mentioned by ETs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Cormac (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Aisling (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST Sean (a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>