

Russian English: Status, Attitudes, Problems

Zoya G. Proshina

Far Eastern National University, Russia

Today there is no doubt about the pluricentricity of the English language. Kachru's (1988) theory of concentric circles, with the division of English functions into three types – English as a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) – has become axiomatic. However, attitudes to the status of EFL in Russia are complex and even confusing. Most Russian linguists and educators, though admitting the existence of World Englishes as regional varieties of English, deny the existence of Russian English among them. When asked what kind of English they speak, most Russians will say that they use British or American English. The reasons for this are to be found in education traditions which saw the British model dominating Russian school textbooks. This article discusses the results of a sociolinguistic survey of both teachers and students of English in the Russian Far East. The aim of the survey was to investigate Russian communicators' attitudes to the English language they learn / teach, their preferences in communication through English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), and their name of their variety of English they speak. The results of the research are compared with those obtained by Campbell, Eknuyom, Haque, and Smith (1983) and Kachru (1982) in other countries of the Outer and Expanding Circles.

English in Russia is a school subject included in the curricula of almost every secondary school, *de facto* rather than *de jure*. Its study is not mandatory, though a foreign language is compulsory in every school curriculum. Nevertheless, although not imposed by law or regulation, English is the most

commonly taught of all foreign languages. Whereas the majority of schools begin English classes at the middle school stage (5th grade and on), there is a developing tendency to reduce the age at which learners begin, and more and more schools have been introducing optional (and sometimes mandatory) English courses as early as first grade. Even kindergartens, if they wish to be considered prestigious and high-ranking, hire English teachers to conduct 20 or 30-minute classes or games in English. Many well-to-do parents are eager to have their children enrolled in schools with an intensive English program (normally, education in Russia is free, but these schools are highly-competitive and parents are ready to pay considerable sums of money for their child to be admitted).

Though English is not an obligatory entrance exam for every university, school or college, it is this Western language and not German, French or Spanish, also studied at tertiary level, that is predominant in university curricula. For example, at the Far Eastern National University, the first “classical” university in the Russian Far East, English is studied by 98% of full-time non-majors. At the Institute of Foreign Languages of the same university, the English course is taken by all students, with about 75% of full-time students majoring in English and 25% studying it as a second foreign language. English language programs for part-time students who are certified as specialists in a particular sphere but need a better knowledge of English for their career are also very popular – thus doctors, engineers, economists and lawyers take evening courses in the English department.

So the situation in Russia’s education system clearly reveals an English language boom: “an unquenchable thirst for knowledge of English” (Ter-Minasova, 2005, p. 451). Taking into consideration the spread of the theory of World Englishes (WE), it is quite natural to ask what model of English dominates in Russian education and how open-minded Russian educators are concerning their own regional variety of English.

STATUS

Though the WE theory is often novel for Russian teachers, for many of them the pluricentric character of the English language, as reflected in Kachru's model of concentric circles, meets no objections. Russian speakers of English, like Chinese, Japanese, Korean speakers and those from many other Asian and European countries, belong to the Expanding Circle where, as compared with the countries of the Outer Circle:

- the functional spread of English is more limited - mostly to international functions, with English serving as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Jenkins, 2000, 2004-2005); intranationally English is used mainly in education as a school discipline rather than a tool of education; being a prestigious language, it is also sometimes used in domestic advertising (Ustinova & Bhatia, 2005) – however, as compared with other countries of the Expanding Circle, e.g., Japan or Korea, Russia is on the remote periphery of the Expanding Circle continuum, for the range of English in Russian society is quite narrow, with the domains of functions being much smaller than in Japan or Korea;
- English is not an official language used by governmental and administrative institutions;
- the English language model is exo-normative, i.e., oriented towards British English (mainly in the European part of Russia) or American English (primarily in the Asian part of Russia);
- the regional variety, Russia English¹, is not unanimously accepted within the country.

¹ The discrimination between the terms *China English* and *Chinese English* was suggested by Zhang Ailing (1997) and seems to be quite reasonable: China English (analogously, Russia English) is a neutral term referring to the local variety used in China to express Chinese culture and mentality, while Chinese English (analogously, Russian English) has a somewhat derogatory meaning of a pidginized variety. However, in Russian linguistics this discrimination has not been fixed.

This last item of comparison needs more detailed consideration.

ATTITUDE

To gain the status of a regional variety in the Expanding Circle, Russia English, with its cross-linguistic and cross-cultural peculiarities, must be approved of by both its speakers and international communicators (Crystal, 1998). However, in Russia the attitude to the status of English used by Russians is complex and difficult.

To investigate this question, I carried out a sociolinguistic survey which echoed many parameters of the research conducted by Willard Shaw, Donald Campbell, Peansiri Ekniyom, Anjum Haque, Larry Smith, and Braj Kachru in Singapore, India, Thailand and other countries (Campbell, Ekniyom, Haque & Smith, 1983; Kachru, 1982; Shaw, 1983). The aim was to discover the attitude of Russian speakers to the idea of Russia English as a regional variety of ELF. The survey was conducted from autumn 2004 to spring 2005.

The questionnaire was given to 39 faculty members at the Far Eastern National University (Vladivostok), Sakhalin State University (Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk), Amur State University (Blagoveschensk) and 232 students at the same universities (the students participating in the survey are planning to use English professionally in their future careers as translators, interpreters, teachers, and specialists in regional studies and international economics). When lecturing at those universities, I gave the respondents a questionnaire, which is described below, with written questions and multiple choice answers. It was explained to the respondents that the goal of the survey was to find out their attitude to the varieties of English studied, taught, and used in Russia.

Faculty Questionnaire

The faculty members were asked two questions expressed in English (see Appendix A) about varieties of English:

- 1) Which variety of English do you think it necessary to teach your students?
- 2) Which variety of English do you speak?

When answering the first question, the teachers were to choose from the following:

- American English,
- British English,
- Australian English,
- East Asian English,
- Russia English,
- I don't know.

The second question implied the choice of one of the following answers:

- American English,
- British English,
- Russia English,
- a mixture (specify),
- 'I don't know'.

The respondents were allowed to choose more than one answer to the first question. The second question implied only one answer; however, some respondents, while choosing 'a mixture,' wanted to emphasize the priority of the components in the mixture and thus ticked two answers, e.g., 'American English' and 'a mixture'.

The answers to the first question (Table 1) gave preference to American English - 69%; 56% of the respondents thought it necessary to teach British English; 8% selected Australian English, 21% considered it necessary to teach their students East Asian English; 3% (i.e., 1 person) said that Russian English is to be taught, and the same percentage (3%) chose the "I don't know" response.

The choice of answers seems to be quite understandable. The relations of the Russian Far East with the USA are much more intensive than those with Great Britain. And although in general British English prevails in Russian education (with textbooks for secondary and tertiary schools designed mostly for studying British English), practical needs of our region make the teachers concentrate on American English rather than the "classical" British variety.

TABLE 1
Faculty Preference for Varieties of English to be Taught

Variety of English	Percentage
American English	69
British English	56
Australian English	8
East Asian English	21
Russia English	3
I do not know	3

Interest in East Asian Englishes is also being raised by practical needs to communicate with our geographical neighbors; however, the idea of studying a non-native variety of English is quite new in Russia – it appeared with the rise of interest in cross-cultural communication studies. That is why the percentage of East Asian English is low comparatively with that of American and British Englishes.

As for Australian English, interest in this variety is just starting to appear due to some growth in migration, which is observed in two directions, from Russia to Australia and from Australia to Russia, the first direction prevailing.

As far as Russia English is concerned, its choice might be accounted for by the fact that the teacher (only 1 respondent) who made this choice implied the necessity to express Russian culture via English. On the questionnaires some teachers went as far as to annotate this option with the word “why?” and an exclamation mark. Evidently, in this case Russia English was understood derogatorily, as an interference variety, typical of people speaking broken English.

The answers about the self-identification of the variety of English used by our teachers revealed the following (Table 2): 13% of the teachers believe that they speak only American English; 31% consider themselves to be speakers of only British English; 13% identified the variety they use as a mixture of British and American English, and only 5% said they speak Russia English, though 44% are aware that they speak a mixture including English influenced by their native Russian.

TABLE 2
Faculty's Self-labeling of the Variety of their English

Variety of English	Percentage
American English	13
British English	31
Russia English	5
A mixture (AmE + BrE)	13
A mixture (influenced by Russian)	44
I do not know	0

Student Questionnaire

The questionnaire given to students included three questions written in Russian (in order to avoid ambiguity due to different lectal² levels of student English):

- 1) Speakers of which variety of English would you prefer to communicate with?
 - American English
 - British English
 - Australian English
 - East Asian Englishes
 - I do not care
- 2) Which varieties of English would you like to study most of all and least of all? (the students were to rank their preferences from 1, maximum, to 6, minimum)
 - American English

² Lectal levels (basilect, mesolect, and acrolect) are developmental stages of language acquisition continuum, with basilect being a low stage of language competence, or a variety of English outstandingly marked by a set of transfer features from local languages; acrolect being an advanced stage, a variety almost indistinguishable from the standard English in the area of syntax but not in the area of phonology and vocabulary; and mesolect being in between acrolect and basilect (Bickerton, 1975; Honna, 2005).

- British English
 - Australian English
 - East Asian Englishes
 - Russia English
 - I do not care
- 3) What variety of English do you use when communicating with foreigners?
- British English
 - American English
 - Russia English
 - A mixture
 - I do not know

The answers for the first question allowed multiple choice, while the third question implied only one answer from each respondent.

When answering the first question about their preference of a variety of English for communication (Table 3), 56% of the students preferred to communicate with speakers of American English; 46% chose speakers of British English; only 9% of the respondents said that they would like first and foremost to speak English with speakers of Australian English, and only 2% said they would like to communicate with speakers of the Englishes of our Asian neighbors, which is not unexpected because for ordinary Russians to understand Chinese, Japanese, and Korean speakers of English is not easy and our students have no special training for that (a course on the translation and interpretation of Asian Englishes is offered in one only department of the Far Eastern National University).

TABLE 3
Students' Preference of their Communicant's Variety of English

Variety of English	Percentage
American English	56
British English	46
Australian English	9
East Asian Englishes	2
I do not care	9

In their comments on the answers, some students explained their choice by the following reasons:

- American English is more widespread in the world; there are more Americans than Britons in our region; our region is closer to America; we know American culture better;
- American English is more diverse; Americans easily understand immigrants and foreigners;
- American English is 'easier' and 'simpler' than British English;
- Americans are more communicative and friendly; they 'always smile'; they are easy to make contact with; they are 'easier than Britons to socialize with';
- British English is a classical standard variety; 'the British speak correctly, distinctly, and not very quickly'; British English is 'clearer' phonetically, which makes communication easier;
- We are more accustomed to British English because we study it at school; British English is more similar to the variety we studied at school;
- British culture is more interesting;
- Australian English is the least known in Russia; I have never had a chance to communicate with an Australian;
- Australian accent is not clear, sounds are often different from those we are accustomed to;
- Australians tend to articulate sounds more distinctly; their variety of language is 'purer';
- Australian culture-loaded words are difficult to understand but they are very interesting and exotic;
- It is better to communicate with native speakers since we are imitating their language and speech;
- Speakers of East Asian Englishes are too difficult to understand because of the strong accent and deviations (mistakes), though we often need to understand them and communicate with them due to geographical proximity and economic activities;
- To practice one's English, it is better to communicate with speakers of different varieties of English;
- There were also mentioned subjective preferences ("I just like this variety").

As we see, many of these comments are influenced by stereotypes (Americans always smile), some are economically and sociologically reasoned, some are just naïve, some are contradictory to others. Traditions of Russian EFL education also influence choice of a communicator. There is a definite tendency of depending on the models of native speakers from economically powerful countries.

The answers to the second question about the preferred English variety to study (Table 4) revealed approximately the same picture. 63% of the respondents prefer to study American English, 48% would like to study British English, 10% give preference to Australian English; 6% are aware of the need to study specific features of East Asian Englishes, 5% choose Russia English, 3% of the respondents prove to be indifferent (the percentage was counted by the maximal rating number).

TABLE 4
Students' Preference of the Variety of English to Study

Variety of English	Percentage
American English	63
British English	48
Australian English	10
East Asian English	6
Russia English	5
I do not care	3

Comments on these answers often repeat those on the answers to the first question. The main ideas were expressed as follows:

- It is necessary to study only native speakers' varieties of English; only native speakers can provide a norm for studying English; American and British Englishes are providing norms;
- American and British Englishes are international varieties;
- It is necessary to study the most functional and widespread varieties; American English is more widespread now and more popular; most foreigners speak American English;

- American English is more beneficial because the USA is a leading economy country;
- American English will be necessary for my future profession;
- British English is a classical variety; knowing it makes it easier to learn other varieties;
- British English is a universal variety; it will be understood by everybody;
- Australian English is exotic and, therefore, more interesting to study;
- I am interested in East Asian Englishes because my second foreign language is Chinese (Japanese, Korean);
- It is necessary to know the variety our geographical neighbors use (East Asian Englishes); we contact with these varieties more often;
- China's tempo of development is very high – it is necessary to study their variety of English;
- It is difficult to conceive what is Russian English;
- It is interesting to study Russian English, but for us it is of no use;
- Instead of studying varieties at Russian school, it is better to go to those countries and live there for some time to acquire the varieties naturally;
- I'd like to know all the varieties of English; each variety is interesting in its own way; a language expert must know all the varieties.

These comments present interesting data for sociological analysis. They stress the dependence on native speakers' models. They reveal pragmatism of the students who are aware of their needs to communicate in English in their future careers, which are most likely to be related to American or Chinese economies. At the same time the students' conception of British English is very much idealized and stereotyped. For most students Russian English is somewhat scholastic and non-practical. Some answers seem to be in accord with the Jennifer Jenkins' (2006) ideas that English teachers and learners need to learn more "about Englishes, their similarities and differences" (p. 173).

By way of comparison, a similar study done by Shaw (1983) revealed that students from Singapore and India (the Outer Circle) showed a preference for speaking in their ethnic variety of English ("their own way") used by educated Singaporeans and Asian Indians, though Singapore students divided their preferences almost equally between British English and Singaporean

English (38.3% and 38.9% respectively, the difference being only 0.6%). 47.4% of the Indian respondents chose to learn Indian English and only 28.5% preferred to study British English (it is important to remember that the WE theory started with the work of the outstanding Indian linguist B. Kachru). However, in Thailand (Shaw, 1983) (like Russia, referring to the Expanding Circle) students prefer learning British English (49.1% vs. 3.5% for Thai English) (see Table 5).

TABLE 5
Asian Students' Preference of the Variety of English to Speak

Students	Their Ethnic Variety of English	British English
Singapore	38.9%	38.3%
India	47.4%	28.5%
Thailand	3.5%	49.1%

This comparison leads us to the conclusion that the attitude of speakers to their regional variety of English is quite positive in the Outer Circle countries but rather problematic in the Expanding Circle countries. While the Outer Circle speakers take pride in being identified as users of their peculiar variety of English, speakers in the Expanding Circle are oriented towards Inner Circle norms and tend to perfect their English by imitating native speakers.

The answers to the third question (which variety do you use for communicating with foreigners?) revealed the following (Table 6): 20% of the students believe that when communicating with foreigners they speak American English, 7% think they use British English; 6% are aware that they speak Russian English; 59% acknowledge that their English is a mixture, and 8% find it difficult to give a definite answer. The last option can be accounted for by the students' theoretical unawareness of the differences in the varieties of English (though this question did not presuppose comments, some students wrote their explanations, "I simply cannot differentiate between the varieties since I do not know the theory of difference. I automatically use both British and American words without noticing it and I suppose I have strong Russian accent." Today it is difficult to suggest that students from big Russian cities,

majoring in English or studying it for their future careers, have no experience of communicating with foreigners in English, so this reason is a hardly probable explanation.

TABLE 6
Students' Opinions of the Varieties of English they Use
for Communicating with Foreigners

Variety	Percentage
American English	20
British English	7
Russia English	6
A mixture	59
I do not know	8

We see that most students are aware of the influence of their native Russian on the variety of English they use. However, few students claim that their variety of English is Russian English. Since at school they are geared to American or British norms they believe that they rely on these norms and speak American or British English (especially regarding grammatical structures and lexical uses) with a Russian phonetic accent. Predominance of American English over British English is typical of the Russian Far East; in the European part of Russia the picture might be reverse.

Results

What can be inferred from this survey? First, the status of Russia English as a regional variety, one of the World Englishes, is not strong in Russia. Neither teachers nor students are fully aware of the fact that we are using Russia English as a lingua franca. However, the majority of the respondents understand that their English is a mixture of Standard American, British norms (Queen's English), and elements formed under the influence of their native Russian language and culture. They are just not accustomed to the notion of Russia English.

Second, the attitude towards Russian English is mainly negative. It is associated with broken English rather than with a lingua franca able to convey Russian culture and Russian mentality to other nations. We need an “attitudinal readjustment” (Kachru, 1982, p. 85) about Russia English. Reasons for the negative attitude towards the Russian variety of English are as follows:

- 1) Russian education traditions make the British English model dominant in Russian school textbooks; today little attention is given to expressing Russian culture via English; there is no obvious attention paid to the learning goal of communicating with non-native speakers of English;
- 2) Insufficient development of some postulates of World Englishes theory gives raise to linguistic doubts. The notion of a regional variety of the language is not clearly defined. According to Kachru (1982), “the non-native Englishes... are linguistic orphans in search of their parents” (p. 84). One of the most urgent problems is connected with language norms and their speech realization.

The negative attitude towards Russian English is caused by the confusion of the notions of “theoretical language norm” and “practical speech use.” Regional varieties of the Expanding Circle have no norms of their own - they are geared to the norms of the Inner Circle. However, they can have deviations that can be distinguished from mistakes by two criteria: they are typical (1st criterion) of the speech of educated people (2nd criterion) (Kachru, 1982).

FEATURES OF RUSSIA ENGLISH

Although the status of the English used in Russia is still a subject for domestic debate, it is quite evident that Russia English, as it is spoken and written by educated Russians, can be characterized by certain features

deviating from the British or American standards.³ These deviations are noticeable at all language levels: phonetic, morphological, syntactical, and semantic.

For example, on the phonetic level Russia English is characterized by lack of the intonation stepping scale; rising tone of special and alternative questions (*why did you say that? Is his name Mike or Andrew?*); lack of aspiration (Sheviakova, 1968; Selesnev, 1979); confusion of long and short vowels (*sheet of paper*) (Selesnev, 1979; Sheviakova, 1968); devoicing of final consonants and regressive assimilation of middle consonants (*bag - back; absorption*) (Selesnev, 1979; Sheviakova, 1968).

Morphological deviations are numerous, the most important being as follows:

- Substituting the present perfect with the past simple (Such words **had** different spelling in their history < have had) or by the present simple (It means that the proper noun **loses** its lingual status; Since 1958 an official alphabet of China **is** Pinyin.)
- Lack of articles (efforts for **understanding** and interpretation of information; **metonymic model** PLACE FOR INSTITUTION is quite common; in most countries **typical EFL curriculum** includes...)

Syntactical deviations are manifested in the following ways:

- Avoiding attributive clusters, preferring *of*-phrases (*the form of the 19th century* < *the 19th century form*) (the Russian sentence places noun attributes to the right of the key noun)
- Wrong word order in attributive clusters (*the problem "generation gap"* < *the generation gap problem*) (the reason is similar to that mentioned

³ Features of Russia English have not yet been the subject of special linguistic study. Some features (phonetic, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic) are mentioned in Proshina (2005), Rivlina (2005), and Leontovich (2005), published in the special issue of *World Englishes* devoted to Russian Englishes. Certain linguistic features can be inferred from textbooks aimed to correct typical errors (Selesnev, 1979; Sheviakova, 1968; Visson, 2003).

above)

- Lack of link verbs, especially in the present tense form (*At the moment the main subject I'm responsible for American Culture*), which is accounted for by the lack of a link-verb in a Russian sentence describing a situation in the present
- Adverbial attributes (PR **in business and particularly in mining business** have some peculiarities)
- Gerundial phrases (*birth giving < giving birth*) – there is no gerund in the Russian verb system, which is why this form is so problematic for Russians.

Semantic deviations are various and numerous. The most typical ones might be categorized as follows:

- Prepositions (*differences **among** cognate languages < between; interest **to** what they like < in*). To some degree, these deviations can also be accounted for by Russian language interference: *among* and *between* both correspond to the same preposition in Russian; the Russian noun *interes* (very much similar to the English one) is used with the preposition *k* + dative case, which usually corresponds to the English *to*.
- Full-meaning words, cognate to Russian ones. In this case, “inner translation” (Kabakchi, 2002a, p. 81) from Russian into English is a reason for the deviation: e.g., using the verb *realize* in the meaning “to achieve” (*...its acquisition may be **realized** only through active communication*), “to make use of” (*make it possible for the students to **realize** their own cognitive skills*) – the Russian word *realizovat'* is polysemantic and is able to express both these meanings.
- Gender-species relations between corresponding English and Russian words are sometimes not taken into account: for instance, the words *science*, *scientific*, *scientist* are often applied by Russians to the humanities instead of “research”, “academic”, “scholar”, etc. because the Russian word *nauka* can be applied to either field of studies (Visson, 2003; Palazhchenko, 2003).

Pragmatic deviations are most stable, for they are related to the source (Russian, in our case) culture:

- Masculine oriented language (*The lexical units involved in our study concern **man** as social being, **his** activities...*) – there is still no movement for so-called “politically correct” language in Russian culture.
- Over-verbalization (the issue **concerned** in both cultures; it becomes **the result** of an elaborate fraud; My **major specialized interest** within this field is...).
- Preference for negative expressions (There is **no secret** to anyone that... instead of Everyone knows / It is an open secret ...; I think I **cannot do** that instead of I don’t think I can do it.) (Visson, 2003)

These are only some of the deviations I can mention from my teaching and editing experience. I also used some of the materials from the Proceedings of the 4th FEELTA conference (Rassokha, 2003), comparing the teachers’ papers with those proofread and edited by S. Ryan, Professor at Eichi (Sapientia) University, Hyogo, Japan. Since these deviations do not break down communication, can be understood by any speaker of English, both native and non-native, and are typical of the use of educated speakers, we suggest differentiating these deviations from mistakes. This study is to be continued.

PROBLEMS

Is there anything being in done in Russia to raise WE awareness? We may speak of two schools deeply involved in WE studies. The FENU school of linguistics, for one, teaches English as a lingua franca as spoken and written by our Asian neighbors. We believe that to know Asian Englishes is of the utmost importance for our would-be translators and interpreters, businesspeople, art professionals and many others. This research has two main strands: studying oral speech, its syllabic structure, rhythm and accent (research guided by Prof. L. Bondarenko) and the written expression of Asian cultures (through loanwords), as well as grammatical features of Chinese, Japanese, Korean Englishes (research guided by Prof. Z. Proshina). Knowing other Englishes will encourage us to accept our own “rights to be linguistic

deviants” (Berns, 2005, p. 92) and accept Russia English.

The other school of Russia English is headed by Prof. V. Kabakchi (1993, 2002b) (St. Petersburg). He and his disciples (for example, N. Yuzefovich (2000, 2003, 2005) from Khabarovsk University of the Humanities), as well as linguists from Moscow State University (the Institute of Foreign Languages) are studying the transmission of Russian culture through English, i.e., the “acculturation of English” (Kachru, 2005, p. 13) in Russia.

Indeed, Russian English is a vehicle for conveying Russian culture. I cannot but agree with Smith (1983) when he argues that:

Although they [our students] will want to know a great deal about other people and other cultures, they should remember that they can only be themselves. English is a means to communicate to the rest of the world their identity, culture, politics, religion, and ‘way of life’. (p. 9)

When talking of the need to incorporate Russian culture into English language textbooks, I should note the two extremes of Russian education. While the iron curtain was in place, most Russian textbooks designed for learning English abounded with Soviet era topics which today are looked upon as politicized “propaganda” (McCaughy, 2005, p. 456). Today there is another tendency: trying to use authentic resources. Russian teachers of English are determined to teach mostly British and American cultures as if their students were going to speak English only with native speakers and only about London and Washington sightseeing or surviving in Great Britain or the USA. Compiling English textbooks that will help students communicate with both native and non-native speakers is quite challenging; this task will include incorporating Russian culture, as well as neighboring cultures with whom contact can be made, into the content of the textbook.

CONCLUSION

Russia English is still unrecognized in Russian linguistics as a variety. Its

status is vague and requires in-depth research. The attitude to this regional variety of English, belonging to the Expanding Circle, is mostly negative – people feel ashamed if they are said to be speaking it. For them Russian English is stigmatized as mistaken English. The recognition of Russia English as a regional variety of English that mirrors Russian culture and Russian mentality and that is fluently used by educated Russian speakers will, I believe, help overcome the barrier of “embarrassment” in speaking English and facilitate the adoption of communicative methods of teaching English in Russia in all schools, even those where grammar translation method might still be found alive.

Though we have achieved some results in studying WE, we still have a lot to do in future in order to describe Russia English as a *lingua franca* and establish its status. However, it is difficult to see a beam in our own eye while it is pretty easy to see a mote in our brother’s eye. So we need cooperation with linguists from other countries to make our research results more valid and effective. For foreign scholars and teachers, investigating Russia English, like for us research into Asian Englishes, will make it possible to know our deviations, forecast language problems in communicating with Russians and, finally, will ease training translators and interpreters working with Russians.

THE AUTHOR

Zoya Proshina works as Professor and Chair of Translation and Interpretation in the Institute of Foreign Languages, Far Eastern National University, Vladivostok, Russia. She also works as an educator, translator, and editor of a number of Russian and foreign journals. She is an author of over 100 articles, textbooks, a monograph and an English-Russian dictionary of East Asian cultures.

REFERENCES

- Berns, M. (2005). Expanding on the expanding circle: Where do WE go from here? *World Englishes*, 24(1), 85-94.
- Bickerton, D. (1975) *Dynamic of a creole system*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, D., Ekniyom, P., Haque, A., & Smith, L. (1983). English in international settings: Problems and their causes. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 35-47). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Crystal, D. (1998). Moving towards an English family of languages? In O. Alexandrova & M. Konurbayev (Eds.), *World Englishes: A festschrift for Olga S. Akhmanova from her disciples, friends and colleagues* (p. 86). Moscow: Dialog-MGU.
- Honna, N. (2005). *English as an international language*. Tokyo: ALC Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 157-181.
- Jenkins, J. (2004-2005). The ABC of ELT... "EFL". *IATEFL Issues*, 182, 9.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kabakchi, V. (1993). *Angliyskiy yazyk mezhdokulturnogo obscheniya*. [English for intercultural communication]. St. Petersburg: Obrazovanie.
- Kabakchi, V. (2002a). Linguorevolutsia kontsa XX veka i izmenenie lingvisticheskoi paradigmy [= Linguistic revolution of the late 20th century and the change of linguistic paradigm]. In *Anglistika v XXI veke [English Studies in the 21st century]*. Conference proceedings. St. Petersburg State University. November 22-24, 2001 (pp. 80-86). St. Petersburg: SPSGU Press.
- Kabakchi, V. (2002b). *The dictionary of Russia: 2500 cultural terms*. St. Petersburg: Soyuz.
- Kachru, B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, B. (1982, 1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue* (2nd ed.) (pp. 48-74). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today*, 16(4), 3-8.
- Leontovich, O. (2005). American English as a medium of intercultural communication. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 523-532.
- McCaughey, K. (2005). The *kasha* syndrome: English language teaching in Russia.

- World Englishes*, 24(4), 455-459.
- Palazhchenko, P. (2003). *Moi nesistemicheskiy slovar. [My asystemic dictionary]*. Moscow: R. Valent.
- Proshina, Z. (2005). Introduction to Special issue on Russian Englishes. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 437-438.
- Rassokha, M. (Ed.). (2003). *Quality in language teaching: Book of proceedings: FEELTA 2002 International Conference*: Blagoveschensk, June 24-26, 2002. Vladivostok: Far Eastern National University Press.
- Rivlina, A. (2005). "Threats and challenges": English-Russian interaction today. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 477-485.
- Selesnev, V. (1979). *Pronunciation training for advanced learners*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- Shaw, W. (1983). Asian student attitudes towards English. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 21-34). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Sheviakova, V. (1968). *Korrektivnyi foneticheskii kurs angliiskogo yazyka [Corrective phonetic course of English]*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Smith, L. (1983). English as an international auxiliary language: No room for linguistic chauvinism. In L. Smith (Ed.), *Readings in English as an international language* (pp. 7-11). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Ter-Minasova, S. (2005). Traditions and innovations: English language teaching in Russia. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 445-454.
- Ustinova, I., & Bhatia, T. (2005). Convergence of English in Russian TV commercials. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 495-508.
- Visson, L. (2003). Where Russians go wrong in spoken English: Words and expressions in the context of two cultures [in Russian]. Moscow: R.Valent.
- Yuzefovich, N. (2000). *Russko-angliiskie kontakty v yazyke i kul'ture. [Russian-English contacts in language and culture]: Dictionary*. Khabarovsk: St. Petersburg Institute of Foreign Economic Relations, Economics, and Law. Khabarovsk Branch.
- Yuzefovich, N. (2003). *Soviet cultural terminology: English dictionary of Soviet political terms*. Khabarovsk: St. Petersburg Institute of Foreign Economic Relations, Economics, and Law. Khabarovsk Branch.
- Yuzefovich, N. (2005). English in Russian cultural content. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 509-516.
- Zhang, A. (1997). China English and Chinese English. *English Today*, 52, 39-41.

APPENDIX 1
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE FACULTY

Type of institution _____
Department _____

1. Which variety of English do you consider it necessary to teach your students?

American English _____
British English _____
Australian English _____
East Asian English _____
Russia English _____
I do not know _____

2. Which variety of English do you consider yourself to be a speaker of?

American English _____
British English _____
Russia English _____
A mixture (specify) _____
I do not know _____

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS (in Russian)

Your major _____
How long have you been studying English? _____

1. Rate your preferences to communicate with speakers of the following varieties of English (1 – maximal preference, 5 – minimal preference)

American English _____
British English _____
Australian English _____
East Asian English _____
I don't care _____

Comments (if you will) _____

2. Rank the varieties of English, marking which variety you would like to study best of all (1) and least of all (6)

American English _____
British English _____
Australian English _____
East Asian English _____
Russia English _____
I don't care _____

Comments (if you will) _____

3. Which variety of English do you use when communicating with foreigners?