

Фразеологический оборот *every cloud has its silver lining* употребляется, когда подразумевают, что во всяком плохом можно найти хорошую сторону. Однако в заголовке ‘Sport picture of the day: *silver lining* for Tom Daley and Daniel Goodfellow in Dubai’ (The Guardian, March 17, 2016) семантическая целостность фразеологизма нарушается. Выражение *silver lining* в данном контексте может быть истолковано и в переносном, и в прямом смысле, так как в статье говорится о том, что два спортсмена вышли на второе место и получили серебряную (*silver*) медаль.

Семантическая дефразеологизация заключается не только в двойной актуализации значения фразеологической единицы, но и в переосмыслении значения, экспликации внутренней формы фразеологической единицы. Например, в газетном заголовке ‘*Falling on deaf ears*, Indigenous Advisory Council members say’ фразеологизм *falling on deaf ears* — «пропустить мимо ушей» под воздействием контекста статьи приобретает новое значение — «не удастся сделать»: “People aren’t listening, not to the IAC, but to Aboriginal people in general,” said the chair of the Cape York Land Council, Richard Ah Mat. “Things are happening but at a snail’s pace” (The Guardian, March 18, 2015).

Таким образом, дефразеологизация в заголовках современных британских газет наблюдается во всех выше рассмотренных нами жанрах газетных статей, для создания особой экспрессивности заголовка, однако способы её реализации могут различаться в зависимости от конкретного жанра газетной статьи.

### **Литература**

1. Гуревич, С.М. Газета: Вчера, сегодня, завтра / С.М. Гуревич. М: Аспект Пресс, 2004. 288 с.

2. Гусейнова, Т.С. Трансформация фразеологических единиц как способ реализации газетной экспрессии: на материале центр. газет 1990-1996 гг.: автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук : 10.02.01 / Т.С. Гусейнова. Махачкала: изд-во Даг. гос. пед. ун-та, 1997. 23 с.

3. Лазарева, Э.А. Заголовки в газете Текст / Э.А. Лазарева. Свердловск: изд-во Урал. ун-та, 1989. 96с.

*Tesfamichael Getu,  
College of Social Sciences and Languages  
Mekelle University, Ethiopia*

## **TO TEACH OR NOT TEACH NON-STANDARD ENGLISH: A REFLECTION**

This reflection is a response to a debate on the issue of the kind of English we should teach in EFL classes. Many educators say it is Standard English (SE) that should be taught and only few others favor Non-standard English (NSE). Hence is sensible to ask why NSE has been neglected or undermined in the teaching of EFL in Ethiopian universities though review of research (e.g., Siegel 1999) revealed

conversely that it is vitally important. Is it not possible to teach SE while simultaneously making students aware of other NSEs?

First, it would be imperative to make clear what SE and NSE are and in what they are not as well. SE is a form of a language which is considered as acceptable and correct by most educated users of it. It is the one which passes through process of selection, codification and acceptance, and it is not an accent, a style or a register. What it actually refers to is a dialect—one variety of English among many (Trudgill, 1999). Standard English is thus not the English language but simply one variety of it. In contrast, NSE is any variety which differs in pronunciation, grammar, spelling, punctuation or vocabulary from standard variety. It includes regional dialects, social varieties and pidgins (Crystal, 2004).

Teaching SE (British English, General American, World Standard English whatever) is significant since mastery of it, indubitably, is an advantage in today's big world. Students who are learning EFL need some sort of structure so that they can build their speaking and writing around it and later they will be free to adapt their English according to their context. Standard rules are essential in education; it would be easy to imagine the chaos if there were no standard guideline for learning English. Hence, from pragmatic point of view, it is totally convincing to primarily depend on teaching SE for it is the only proper form and for reasons that nonstandard forms are usually varied. More importantly, SE has clear advantage in terms of mutual intelligibility. Particularly, its position as a dialect of English used in writing is unassailable. In addition, since it is highly codified by commercial publishers, there is a wealth of published materials using this dialect as a springboard for input and interaction in the classroom, and it is easy to describe and assess. As a result of all this pros, students who learn SE can improve their chance for success in education, social mobility and employment.

Albeit SE has strengths of practicality, it is, undeniably, minority dialect. It is the dialect of written language and the dialect of some elites (Crystal, 2004). In actual fact, it is still only a minority of the overall English language use in the world. There are more non-native speakers using NSE than native speakers using SE. Furthermore, everybody, even the most punctilious language users, will at some moment of the day slip into NSE, depending on context and company. The vast majority of the English language which we use today would certainly have been considered non-standard at some point during the evolution of the language, and today's non-standard may well become the standard of tomorrow. In addition, Non-standard varieties of English are not "wrong" at all. In fact, some of them might even be seen as more logical. Here come important questions: Why should we confine our teaching to SE which is a minority dialect? Why do not we entertain NSE as well?

Teaching of NSE has significant impact particularly on students' comprehension. As far as listening comprehension is concerned, for instance, it is absolutely essential expose students to as wide variety of NSE as possible. Nonetheless, it has lesser effect on production. One cannot produce all the varieties of English. More to the point, in review of research on the teaching of non-standard varieties, Siegel (1999) found clear evidence that the use of non-standard varieties

has a positive effect on the acquisition of the standard, participation, self-esteem, performance on standardized tests and overall academic achievement. In spite of these merits, the issue of whether or not to teach NSE is a complicated matter in practice rather than how it appears on the surface to be simple since there is too much variation which may create interference between or among non-standard varieties. However, if our objective of teaching English is to produce citizens who are able to encounter the English speaking world confidently, we have to include NSE to our language curriculum.

Paradigmatically, the teaching of NSE and/or SE despite is related to the age-old debate between prescriptivism and descriptivism. Therefore, in order to resolve the standard-nonstandard controversies, I believe, we should reconcile the two –isms first. Prescriptivism deals with how language “should be”, and it makes recommendation to use an ideal correct form (Standard English). On the other hand, descriptivism refers to how language “is” and makes no recommendation as there is no imagined ideal state. Descriptivists look at what can possibly be said in language and prescriptivist says that certain possible utterances are more conventional and proper than others (Justice, 2004). Though the gap between prescriptivism and descriptivism really exists, it does not mean there is no middle ground to occupy. Prescriptivism and descriptivism can be married as descriptive knowledge lists various linguistics options and prescriptive knowledge enables to decide between them. Hence, I believe the issue of teaching SE or NSE should be treated in light of this resolution.

To conclude, there is no absolute division between SE and NSE; there are only few points where they are different. Moreover, there is a growing trend to see non-standard forms being used in SE and vice versa and most rules are shared by most of the varieties. Therefore, it seems unnatural to avoid NSE from the teaching of SE: some sort of middle ground appears reasonable – We need to stick to some basic rules, but at the same time allow for variety. Thus, had better make our students aware of wide range of varieties in addition to what has been treated as SE and tolerate the ambiguity of language. Yet, we should not forget that, it is our responsibility as teacher to direct them when to use SE or NSE and it is acceptable.

Above all, we teachers should get away from negative habits of looking NSE as inferior, low quality, deficient and substandard so that I can help our students avoid such stereotypes since to look down on nonstandard dialects is to exercise a form of social and linguistic prejudice. Therefore, we should adopt egalitarian linguistic point of view that varieties are equally good and equally valid. However, questions like “Which NSE varieties must be taught?”, “To what extent NSEs should be treated in the classroom?” and “Which English is SE?” are still basic questions we need to further investigate.

### **References**

1. Crystal, D. (2004). *The stories of English*. London: Penguin.
2. Justice, P. W. (2004). *Relevant linguistics*. Stanford: CSLI.
3. Siegel, J. (1999). Creoles and minority dialects in education: an overview. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20(6), 508-31.