

**STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
CANTON, NEW YORK**



COURSE OUTLINE

ENGL 302: Global Englishes

Prepared By: Melissa Elliott Lee

**SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND LIBERAL ARTS
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND HUMANITIES
OCTOBER 2015**

- A. **TITLE:** Global Englishes
- B. **COURSE NUMBER:** ENGL 302
- C. **CREDIT HOURS:** 3
- D. **WRITING INTENSIVE COURSE:** Yes
- E. **COURSE LENGTH:** 15 weeks
- F. **SEMESTER(S) OFFERED:** Fall
- G. **HOURS OF LECTURE, LABORATORY, RECITATION, TUTORIAL, ACTIVITY:** 3 lecture hours per week
- H. **CATALOG DESCRIPTION:**
 This course provides opportunities for students to deepen their understanding of the English language: its history, its status and functions in different areas of the world, and its variations. Promoting an inclusive and pluralistic concept of Englishes rather than the inaccurate notion of a singular English, students develop explicit knowledge about how language works, and how people learn and use language not only as a tool for communication but as a component of social and cultural identity. Students emerge from this course better equipped to navigate situations requiring crosscultural communication at the university and beyond.
- I. **PRE-REQUISITES/CO-REQUISITES:**
 a. Pre-requisite(s): ENGL 101: Composition and the Spoken Word and 45 credit hours
 b. Co-requisite(s): none
- J. **GOALS (STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES):**

By the end of this course, the student will be able to:

| <u>Course Objective</u> | <u>Institutional SLO</u> |
|---|--|
| a. <i>Define</i> key terms from linguistics and English language research | 1. Communication |
| b. <i>Describe</i> key factors in the development of Englishes worldwide | 1. Communication |
| c. <i>Analyze</i> cultural texts to discern connections between language, social and cultural identity, and power | 1. Communication 2. Critical Thinking |

K. TEXTS:
(Representative texts, chosen by instructor)

Articles

- Bolton, K., Graddol, D., & Meierkord, C. (2011). Toward developmental world Englishes. *World Englishes* 30(4), 459-480. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2011.01735.x
- Kachru, B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language Teaching* 25, 1-14. DOI: [dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800006583)
- Proshina, Z. (2014). Language revolution behind the cultural curtain. *World Englishes* 33(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://www.readcube.com/articles/10.1111%2Fweng.12051>

Books

- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands: The New Mestiza = La Frontera*. San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.
- Jenkins, J. (2009). *World Englishes: A resource book for students* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kachru, Y. & Smith, L. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and World Englishes*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- MacNeil, R. & Cran, W. (2005). *Do you speak American?* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Book chapters/essays

- Tan, A. (2007). Mother tongue. In L. Williford & M. Martone (Eds.), *The Touchstone Anthology of Contemporary Creative Nonfiction* (pp. 514-519). New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Young, V. A. (2011). Should writers use they own English? In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change* (pp. 61-72). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Multimedia

- Alvarez, L. & Kolker, A. (Directors). (1988). *American tongues* [Motion picture]. United States: Center for New American Media (CNAM).
- Barnette, M. & Barrett, G. (Hosts). *A way with words: A public radio program about language examined through history, culture, and family* [Weekly radio program with podcasts]. United States: National Public Radio/Wayword, Inc. Retrieved from <http://video.pbs.org/video/2365391566/>
- Holman, B. (Producer). (2015, January 19). *Language matters*. [Motion picture]. Retrieved from <http://video.pbs.org/video/2365391566/>

L. REFERENCES:

(Representative references, chosen by instructor)

Articles

- Canaragajah, A. S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication* 57(4), 586-619. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/20456910
- Connors, R. J. & Lunsford, A. A. (1988). Frequency of formal errors in current college writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle do research. *College Composition and Communication* 39, 395-409. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/357695
- Horner, B. (2001). "Students' right," English only, and re-imagining the politics of language. *College English*, 63(6), 741-757. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/1350100
- Horner, B. & Trimbur, J. (2002). English only and U.S. college composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 53(4), 594-630. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1512118>.
- Lee, M. (2014). Shifting to the World Englishes paradigm by way of the translingual approach: Code-meshing as a necessary means of transforming composition pedagogy. *TESOL Journal* 5(2), 312-329. DOI: 10.1002/tesj.121
- Lu, M. (2004). An essay on the work of composition: Composing English against the order of fast capitalism. *College Composition and Communication* 56(1), 16-50. Retrieved from <http://www.english.illinois.edu/-people-/faculty/schaffner/teaching/fall2010/505/readings/Lu.Work%20of%20Composition.pdf>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The myth of linguistic homogeneity in U.S. college composition. *College English* 68(6), 637-651. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/25472180
- Seidlhofer, B. (2001). Closing a conceptual gap: The case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(2), 133-158. Retrieved from www.univie.ac.net
- Seidlhofer, B. (2009). Common ground and different realities: World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *World Englishes* 28(2), 236-245. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01592.x
- Wetzl, A. (2013). World Englishes in the mainstream composition course: Undergraduate students respond to WE writing. *Research in the Teaching of English* 48(2), 204-224. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/journals/rte/issues/v48-2>
- Widdowson, H.G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes* 16(1), 135-146. DOI: 10.1111/1467-971X.00054

Books

- Adger, C. T., Wolfram, W., & Christian, D. (2007). *Dialects in schools and communities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Alim, H. S. & Smitherman, G. (2012). *Articulate while black: Barack Obama, language, and race in the U.S.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Bolton, K. & Kachru, B. (2006). *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elbow, P. (2012). *Vernacular eloquence: What speech can bring to writing*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Graff, G. & Birkenstein, C. (2014). *They say, I say: The moves that matter in academic writing* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Horner, B., Lu, M., & Matsuda, P. (Eds.). (2010). *Cross-language relations in composition* (pp. 21-41). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kachru, B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. (Eds.). (2009). *The handbook of World Englishes*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Parker, F. & Riley, K. (2010). *Linguistics for non-linguists: A primer with exercises* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn-Bacon.
- Smitherman, G. (2000). *Black talk: Words and phrases from the hood to the amen corner*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Wintergerst, A.C. & McVeigh, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Tips for teaching culture: Practical approaches to intercultural communication*. White Plains, NY: Pearson.
- Young, V. A., Barrett, R., Young-Rivera, Y., & Lovejoy, K. (2013). *Other people's English: Code-meshing, code-switching, and African American literacy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Young, V.A. & Martinez, A.Y. (Eds.). (2011). *Code-meshing as world English*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Book chapters

- Ball, A. F. & Muhammad, R. J. (2003). Language diversity in teacher education and in the classroom. In G. Smitherman and V. Villanueva (Eds.), *Language diversity in the classroom: From intention to practice* (pp. 76-88). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bolton, K. (2009). World Englishes today. In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (Eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 240-269). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cliett, V. (2003). The expanding frontier of World Englishes: A new perspective for teachers of English. In G. Smitherman and V. Villanueva (Eds.), *Language Diversity in the Classroom: From Intention to Practice* (pp. 67-75). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Greenfield, L. (2011). The "standard English" fairy tale. In L. Greenfield & K. Rowan (Eds.), *Writing Centers and the New Racism: A Call for Sustainable Dialogue and Change* (pp. 33-60). Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Moss, B. & Walters, K. (1993). Rethinking diversity: Axes of difference in the writing classroom. In C. Glenn and M. Goldthwaite (Eds.), *The St. Martin's Guide to Teaching Writing* (6th ed.). (pp. 417-440). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Wolfram, W. (2008). Language diversity and the public interest. In K. King, N. Schilling-Estes, J. J. Lou, & B. Souku (Eds.), *Sustaining Linguistic Diversity:*

Endangered and Minority Language and Language Varieties (pp. 187-202).
Washington, DC: Georgetown UP.

M. **EQUIPMENT:** technology enhanced classroom

N. **GRADING METHOD:** A-F

O. **MEASUREMENT CRITERIA/METHODS**

- Quizzes
- Papers and projects
- Participation

P. **DETAILED COURSE OUTLINE:**

I. Introduction

A. Dispelling the assumption of one English

II. The History of English

A. Dispersals/diasporas of English

- a. Pidgins and creoles
- b. Codification
- c. Spoken vs. written English

B. The status and functions of English in different areas of the world (an introduction)

C. Key terms and concepts (not a complete listing)

- a. L1/L2, etc.
- b. English as a Native Language (ENL)
- c. English as a Second Language (ESL)
- d. English as a Foreign Language (EFL)
- e. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)
- f. Acrolect vs. basilect

III. The Variation in English(es)

A. Theoretical models and descriptions of the spread of English

- a. World map of English (Strevens, 1980)
- b. Three circle model of World Englishes (Kachru, 1985/1988)
- c. Circle of World English (McArthur, 1987)
- d. Circle model of English (Görlach, 1988)

B. Concrete examples of different Englishes

- a. American varieties
- b. International varieties

C. The intelligibility question

- a. Intelligibility vs. comprehensibility vs. interpretability
- b. Rhetorical listening

- IV. Developing Language Awareness
 - A. The relationship between language and cultural identity
 - B. Accents vs. varieties/dialects vs. languages
 - C. The “linguistic facts of life” (Lippi-Green, 2012)
 - D. The myth of (any) “standard” English
 - a. Standard language ideology
 - b. The history of “error”
 - c. Prescriptivism vs. descriptivism
 - E. Code-switching vs. code-meshing

- V. Social Justice Issues
 - A. The status and functions of English in different areas of the world
(expansion on initial introduction to topic)
 - B. Language prejudice
 - a. History of language prejudice in the U.S.
 - b. Contemporary manifestations of language prejudice in the U.S.

- VI. English(es) in American Culture
 - A. The history of “vernacular language” in American literature
 - a. Short stories
 - b. Novels
 - c. Poems
 - d. Drama
 - B. Media representations of different Englishes

Q. **LABORATORY OUTLINE:** None

GER 7 Humanities

Students will demonstrate:

- knowledge of the conventions and methods of at least one of the humanities in addition to those encompassed by other knowledge areas required by the General Education program.

Method:

Classes will be chosen by the Director of Institutional Research BY THE FOURTH WEEK OF THE SEMESTER IN WHICH THE ASSESSMENT IS NEEDED. A minimum 50% sampling rate will be used. Classes approved for GER 7 that are being taught that are not encompassed in another knowledge area will be assessed.

Instructors will develop and assign one of the following:

1. An essay question which allows students to demonstrate their capabilities in all course objectives

OR

2. A short-answer exam with separate questions, each of which will be designed to gauge the students' capabilities in a single course objective

OR

3. a multiple choice exam with questions that address each course objective.

Students will submit their responses electronically via a designated digital assignment location on Blackboard. To ensure the submissions remain anonymous, instructors must copy and paste student responses into a separate word document before submitting to their second reader. The instructor and another Humanities faculty member will individually assess students' answers using the Humanities Assessment Rubric. The first and second readers will provide their assessment to the Humanities assessment coordinator. The coordinator will be responsible to average the readers' results for each student. The Humanities assessment coordinator will then average the scores of all the students by section and as a whole for completion of the *Humanities Assessment Report Form*.

HUMANITIES ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

| COURSE OBJECTIVE (input each course objective from course outline and syllabus in the spaces below) | Exceeds Standards (Score between 4.0—3.01) | Meets Standards (Score between 3.0—2.01) | Approaches Standards (Score between 2.0—1.01) | Does Not Meet Standards (Score between 1.0—0.0) |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |
| | Student performance exceeds requirements of course objectives | Student performance meets requirements of course objectives | Student performance approaches requirements of course objectives | Student performance does not meet requirements of course objectives |

GENERAL ASSESSMENT EXPLANATION

INFORMATION FOR INSTRUCTOR:

General Education Assessment is a method used by SUNY colleges throughout New York State to collect information on how well the students are learning what the faculty believes the students are being taught. The purpose of assessment is to provide faculty and students with information and insights needed to improve teaching effectiveness and learning quality.

Although the immediate focus of assessment is the improvement of teaching and learning, it also results in additional statistical information that can be used for multiple purposes. Therefore, assessment must be done conscientiously and the results reported as accurately as possible.

Knowing this, it may be helpful for you to read the following statement to your students before assessment:

INFORMATION FOR THE STUDENTS:

General Education Assessment is a method used by SUNY colleges throughout New York State to collect information on how well the students are learning what the faculty believes the students are being taught.

The purpose of assessment is to provide faculty and students with information and insights needed to improve teaching effectiveness and learning quality; they are not meant to measure individual student learning, but rather what the group, as a whole, has learned.

As a university, we take our assessment very seriously, and we would appreciate it if you would do the same. Assessment must be done conscientiously and the results reported as accurately as possible.

{Inform students of the 'how' and 'when' assessment will be completed for your individual courses.}

Humanities Assessment

DIRECTIONS

NOTE: NAME OF HUMANITIES ASSESSMENT PERSON IS: _____

GENERAL DIRECTIONS:

Your course has been chosen as part of the General Education Assessment for Humanities. Within this packet of information you will find the necessary form for reporting assessment and other essential information.

Please read through this document so that you are familiar with the process and are prepared to perform assessment for your selected section. There is a special note regarding assessment at the end of this packet.

=====

DIRECTIONS: HUMANITIES OBJECTIVE: Students will demonstrate: knowledge of the conventions and methods of at least one of the humanities in addition to those encompassed by other knowledge areas required by the General Education program.

Instructors whose sections are being assessed:

1. Be prepared to assign your essay question or short answer exam to your students, due by the last day of your class **[Date]**;
2. Student responses will be submitted electronically via a designated Angel drop box.
3. After collecting the completed assignment via digital drop box, copy and paste the responses into a single word document. **Number each paper (1—all)**;
4. Save the numbered student responses, without comments/markings/grading, for second reader;
5. Send the numbered student responses as an attachment via e-mail with CRN of the course section being evaluated to your assigned second reader. [list given below/see list below], no later than **[Date]**;
6. Instructors may also provide a list of the appropriate terminology taught during the semester, as well as a copy of any supplementary instructions given regarding his/her individual course for use with the assigned essay question;
7. Read original responses and assess based on given rubric, recording scores on the Humanities General Education Assessment form [below];
8. Turn in the completed Humanities General Education form to the Humanities Assessment person (Kirk Jones) no later than **[Date]**.

Second Readers (Assigned by Humanities Department Chair):

Once you have received your manila folder with the photocopies of the student papers please follow steps 7 and 8 above. For Step 8, you should also give the Humanities Assessment person the attachment with student responses.

=====

NOTE: If you do not understand any portion of this assessment plan, please see Humanities Assessment person [Kirk Jones] or the Humanities Chair [Nadine Jennings].