# 3 Models of World Englishes

In this chapter I shall first describe and discuss the classifications or models of World Englishes that have been proposed by certain scholars. These classifications attempt to explain the differences in the ways English is used in different countries. I shall then summarise the stages through which a new variety may proceed on its way to becoming an established variety. These stages or developmental cycles are frequently linked to classifications and models and it is sometimes hard to separate them. Finally, I shall consider the ideological and political standpoints taken by different scholars, with a particular emphasis on the debate over whether the speakers themselves choose to use English or whether they have that choice thrust upon them.

## 3.1 Models

Perhaps the most common classification of Englishes, especially in the language teaching world, has been to distinguish between English as a native language (ENL), English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL).

In this classification, ENL is spoken in countries where English is the primary language of the great majority of the population. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States are countries in which English is said to be spoken and used as a native language.

In contrast, ESL is spoken in countries where English is an important and usually official language, but not the main language of the country. These countries are typically ex-colonies of the United Kingdom or the United States. Nigeria, India, Malaysia and the Philippines are examples of countries in which English is said to be spoken and used as a second language.

The final classification of this model is EFL. EFL occurs in countries where English is not actually used or spoken very much in the normal course of daily life. In these countries, English is typically learned at school, but students have little opportunity to use English outside the classroom and therefore little motivation to learn English. China, Indonesia, Japan and many countries in the Middle East are countries in which English is said to operate as an EFL.

This ENL/ESL/EFL distinction has been helpful in certain contexts. There is no doubt, for example, that the motivation to learn English is likely to be far greater in countries where English plays an institutional or official role than in countries where students are

unlikely to hear any English outside the classroom or ever need to use it. This classification, however, has shortcomings. One is that the term 'native language' is open to misunderstanding. As speakers in ENL countries are described as native speakers, people feel that the variety used is a standard variety that is spoken by **all** of the people. People then feel that ENL is innately superior to ESL and EFL varieties and that it therefore represents a good model of English for people in ESL and EFL countries to follow. In actual fact, however, many different varieties of English are spoken in ENL countries. The idea that everyone speaks the same 'standard model' is simply incorrect. Second, the suggestion to use ENL as 'the model' ignores the fact that such a model might be inappropriate in ESL countries where the local variety would be a more acceptable model, as there are many fluent speakers and expert users of that particular variety.

A second shortcoming of the classification is that the spread of English also means that it is more difficult to find countries that can be accurately classified as EFL countries. As we shall see, English is playing an increasing role in EFL countries such as China and Japan. The ESL vs EFL distinction appears to be more valid when applied to the contrast between city and countryside. City dwellers in both ESL and EFL countries have far more opportunity and need to use English than their rural counterparts. Furthermore, ESL varieties are said to operate in countries that were once colonies of Britain or America, but, as I shall show below, the type of colony has influenced the current roles of English in such countries.

An alternative and influential classification has been put forward by Kachru (1985). This is the 'three circles' model. You will note from the following quote that Kachru refers to the ESL/EFL classification.

> The current sociolinguistic profile of English may be viewed in terms of three concentric circles . . . The Inner Circle refers to the traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English. The Outer Circle represents the institutionalised non-native varieties (ESL) in the regions that have passed through extended periods of colonisation . . . The Expanding Circle includes the regions where the performance varieties of the language are used essentially in EFL contexts.
>
> (Kachru, 1985: 366–7)

Countries in the Inner Circle include the USA and the UK. Countries in the Outer Circle include Bangladesh, Ghana and the Philippines. Countries listed as being in the Expanding Circle include China, Egypt and Korea.

The great advantages of this model over the ENL/ESL/EFL one are, first, that it makes English plural so that **one** English becomes **many** Englishes. Second, the model does not suggest that one variety is any better, linguistically speaking, than any other. The spread of English has resulted in the development of many Englishes and not the transplanting of one model to other countries: '. . . English now has multicultural identities' (Kachru, 1985: 357).

Kachru first proposed this classification in 1985 and it has occasioned great debate. I shall consider the debate and the implications of the 'three circles' model for language teaching and international communication in more detail in Part C. Here I shall just make two

observations about the model. The first observation is about the use of the term 'colony' and the second is about how expanding circle countries are increasing their use of English.

First, as Mufwene (2001) has elegantly argued, the **type** of colony a nation was has influenced the way English developed there, although the developmental processes that each variety went through were similar. Mufwene distinguishes between 'trade colonies', 'exploitation colonies' and 'settlement colonies' (2001: 8–9). Contact in trade colonies started with European traders and local people. This contact typically led to the development of pidgins. The language varieties that the European traders spoke would have been non-standard varieties. As these trade colonies became exploitation colonies, they came under the administrative and political control of the respective European nation. Contact between local and imported languages increased. In the case of many British colonies, for example, the colonisers needed people who could speak English to help administer the colony. They recruited these administrators from three main sources. First, they sent their own people to act in senior positions. Second, they imported administrators from other colonies. Much of the Burmese civil service of the time was staffed by Indian clerks, for example – indeed the Burmese word for chair is '*kalathain*' and this literally means 'foreigner-sit'. Foreigners to the Burmese were Indians. Third, the colonisers trained locals as administrators and this necessitated the establishment of special schools where English became the medium of instruction. In such contexts, the variety of English developed through contact with local and other languages and through contact with non-standard and 'school' varieties of English.

In settlement colonies, on the other hand, there was less need to import administrators from other colonies, as the colonisers provided the great majority of the settlers. These settlers, however, brought with them a wide range of varieties. A difference between the Englishes which developed in settlement as opposed to exploitation colonies is the relatively small influence local languages had on the Englishes of the settlers. This is not to say that there was no contact and no influence. In the settlement colony of Australia, for example, local languages provided a wide range of culturally and geographically specific vocabulary items. The comparative lack of contact with local languages, however, meant that there was relatively little influence on the grammar and schemas of the variety as it developed. Interestingly, as I shall show in Part B, the grammatical and schematic influences of local languages are reflected in the variety spoken by the indigenous people, Australian Aboriginal English.

In short, in exploitation colonies such as India and Malaysia, the influence of local languages and cultures was greater in the development of the local English varieties. In settlement colonies such as Australia and New Zealand, the same influences were seen in the development of the local variety of English, but to a lesser extent. The difference was in the degree of influence rather than in the type of influence.

The second observation about Kachru's 'three circles' model is that it underestimated the roles that English would come to play in Expanding Circle countries, although the term 'expanding circle' suggests that the roles of English would develop in these countries. If we take China as an example of an expanding circle country, the increasing roles of English are

remarkable. Here I shall mention just three. First, it is now being used in education. The number of people learning English in China is now greater than the combined populations of the inner circle countries. In other words, there are more people learning English in China than the combined populations of countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. Startling as this figure is, it is not as significant as the role English is beginning to play in formal education. Several Chinese schools and universities now offer courses through the medium of English. In other words, Chinese students are now beginning to be able to study **in** English.

A second area in which English is playing an increasing role within China is as a *lingua franca*. China's increase in international trade and contact means that English is becoming the *lingua franca* of business and trade in China itself. Businessmen from Asia conduct business meetings in China in English. Third, the increased use of computer technology has increased the use of English in computer mediated communication. This is not restricted to international communication. Some Chinese are now choosing to use English when sending emails to each other. I shall argue in Part B that the increased role of English in this Expanding Circle country is leading to the development of a local Chinese variety of English.

To return to the discussion of models, Gupta (1997: 147–58) has proposed a classification system that divides English use into five different categories: 'monolingual ancestral', such as in Britain and the USA; 'monolingual contact', such as in Jamaica; 'monolingual scholastic', such as in India; 'multilingual contact', such as in Singapore; and 'multilingual ancestral', such as in South Africa.

Other scholars, including Görlach and Strevens have suggested other models. These are well summarised in McArthur (1998), where he also describes his own 'Circle Model of World English' (1998: 97). A particularly useful summary of approaches to the study of World Englishes is provided by Bolton (2003: 42–3).

There is a close link between these models of English and the developmental cycles of these Englishes and I now turn to considering these.

## 3.2    Developmental cycles

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, there is a close relationship between the development of pidgins and creoles and varieties of English. Here I shall focus solely on developmental cycles as applied to varieties of English, although it should be stressed that these cycles are often comparable to pidgin and creole developmental cycles.

Many scholars have suggested the phases or processes through which varieties of English go. I shall not review all of these here, but consider three main proposals and refer to others. The reader will note that scholars agree in many areas and that many of the phases identified by one scholar mirror those of another. There are also a number of different terms that refer to the same idea. For example the terms 'exonormative model', 'transported variety' and 'imported variety' refer to the English spoken by the settlers that arrived in a particular country. It is called 'exonormative' because the model originates from outside

the place where it is spoken. This is contrasted with an 'endonormative model', that is, a locally grown variety. 'Transported' or 'imported' varieties obviously refer to the varieties spoken by the settlers, as opposed to the varieties spoken by the locals, which are referred to as 'nativised' or 'indigenised' or 'acculturated'. I have argued in Chapter 1 that all varieties are actually nativised in the sense that they all reflect the local cultures of their speakers. This term is also used, however, to distinguish the local variety from the transported variety. The process through which an imported variety goes on its way to becoming a local variety is variously referred to as 'nativisation', 'indigenisation', or a combination of 'deculturation' (of the imported variety, as it loses its original cultural roots) and 'acculturation' (of the local variety, as it grows new cultural roots).

Kachru has suggested three phases through which 'non-native institutionalised varieties of English seem to pass' (1992b: 56). The first phase is characterised by 'non-recognition' of the local variety. At this stage the speakers of the local variety are prejudiced against it and believe that some imported native speaker variety is superior and should be the model for language learning in schools. They themselves will strive to speak the imported, exonormative variety and sound like native speakers, while looking down upon those who speak only the local variety.

The second phase sees the existence of the local and imported variety existing side by side. The local variety is now used in a wide number of situations and for a wide range of purposes but is still considered inferior to the imported model.

During the third phase, the local variety becomes recognised as the norm and becomes socially accepted. The local variety becomes the model for language learning in schools. In places where the local variety has become accepted, local people who continue to speak the imported variety can be seen as outsiders or as behaving unnaturally in some way.

Moag (1992: 233–52) studied the development of a particular variety – Fijian English – and proposed a 'life cycle of non-native Englishes'. He identified five processes, four of which are undergone by all varieties, and a fifth which may only be experienced by some. The first process he called 'transportation'. This is when English arrives in a place where it has not been spoken before and remains to stay. The second process, 'indigenisation', is a relatively long phase during which the new variety of English starts to reflect the local culture and becomes different from the transported variety. The third process, the 'expansion in use' phase, sees the new variety being used in an increasing number of situations and for more and more purposes. This process is also marked by an increase in variation within the local variety. The local variety becomes the local varieties. The fourth phase is marked by the use of the local variety as a language learning model in school. During this phase, local literature in the new variety will be written. Moag calls this fourth phase 'institutionalisation'. The fifth and final phase sees a decline in use. He suggests that the Philippines and Malaysia are examples of countries where the increased official promotion of a local language – Tagalog in the Philippines and Malay in Malaysia – results in a decline in the use of the local variety of English. He wonders whether this decline in use might lead to the eventual death of English in these countries, but there is no evidence of that happening. In

fact, in the Malaysian context, there has recently been an officially approved and promoted increase in the uses of English.

A more recent and detailed theory for the development of new Englishes comes from Schneider (2003a: 233–81). I call it a theory as Schneider hopes, albeit cautiously, that, 'in principle, it should be possible to apply the model to most, ideally all of the Englishes around the globe' (2003a: 256).

He agrees with Mufwene (2001) in arguing that 'postcolonial Englishes follow a fundamentally uniform developmental process' (2003a: 233). He identifies five phases in this developmental cycle. The first phase he calls the 'foundation' phase. This is when English begins to be used in a country where, previously, English was not spoken. This is typically because English speakers settle in the country.

The second phase he calls 'exonormative stabilisation'. This means that the variety spoken is closely modelled on the variety imported by the settlers. Schneider does distinguish, however, between the variety spoken by the settlers – which he calls the STL strand – and the variety spoken by the local or indigenous people – which he calls the IDG strand. Schneider argues that this phase sees the slow movement of the STL variety towards the local variety and the beginning of the expansion of the IDG variety. He argues that 'what happens during this phase may not be unlike the early stages of some routes leading to creolisation' (2003a: 246).

The third phase is the 'nativisation' phase and Schneider considers this to be the most important and dynamic phase. It sees the establishment of a new identity with the coupling of the imported STL and local IDG varieties. This phase 'results in the heaviest effects on the restructuring of the English language itself' (2003a: 248), although the restructuring occurs mostly at the level of vocabulary and grammar.

Phase four is the phase of 'endonormative stabilisation', which is when the new variety becomes gradually accepted as the local norm or model. At this stage the local variety is used in a range of formal situations.

Schneider calls the fifth and final phase 'differentiation'. At this stage the new variety has emerged and this new variety reflects local identity and culture. It is also at this stage that more local varieties develop. For example, Schneider suggests that differences between STL and IDG varieties resurface as markers of ethnic identity.

All three scholars have suggested developmental cycles that have their similarities. These can be seen in Figure 2. Basically, the variety spoken by the settlers becomes changed over time through contact with local languages and cultures. The new indigenous variety is initially considered inferior to the original imported one, but gradually it becomes accepted and the institutionalised. Once it is accepted and institutionalised, it then develops new varieties.

All three scholars are really addressing the processes that occur in postcolonial societies. But it is possible that new varieties are also developing in what Kachru termed 'expanding circle' countries, where, by definition, there has been no significant settlement of English speakers. It would appear that, in certain circumstances, expanding circle countries can develop their own Englishes without going through the first 'transportation' or 'foundation' phases.

Figure 2: Developmental cycles of new varieties of English

| Scholar | Phases | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kachru | 1 non-recognition | 2 co-existence of local and imported varieties | 3 recognition | | |
| Moag | 1 transportation | 2 indigenisation | 3 expansion in use | 4 institutionalisation | 5 (decline) |
| *Schneider* | 1 foundation | 2 exonormative stabilisation | 3 nativisation | 4 endonormative stabilisation | 5 differentiation |

The great majority of non-Chinese English speakers in China, for example, are people from the Asian region for whom English is not a first language but who use English in China as a *lingua franca*. And, while an exonormative variety is promoted as a model by the Ministry of Education, the sheer scale of the English language learning enterprise means that speakers of exonormative inner-circle models are heard only by the tiniest fraction of Chinese learners of English. The overwhelming majority of learners are being taught by Chinese teachers; and those Chinese learners who are interacting in English with non-Chinese are, in the main, interacting with people from other expanding-circle countries. As I shall argue in Part C, the increasingly common phenomenon of local teachers + intranational *lingua franca* use is providing an alternative process for the development of new varieties of English.

A slightly different way of looking at the development of Englishes has been proposed by Widdowson (1997, 2003). While agreeing that 'the very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it' (2003: 43), Widdowson makes an important distinction between the spread of English and the distribution of English. He argues that English is not so much *distributed* as a set of established encoded forms, unchanged into different domains of use, but rather that it is *spread,* as a virtual language. He sees the two processes as being quite different. 'Distribution implies adoption and conformity. Spread implies adaptation and non-conformity' (1997: 140). Ghanaian and Nigerian Englishes are examples that have resulted from the spread of English. What Ghanaians and Nigerians speak 'is another English, not a variant but a different language' (1997: 141), and he argues that such varieties 'evolve into autonomous languages ultimately to the point of mutual unintelligibility' (1997: 142). He also argues that their developmental processes are different from the development of regional varieties of English within England which are, he claims, 'variants of the same language, alternative actualisations' (1997: 140). In contrast, varieties found in 'far flung regions . . . have sprung up in a relatively extempore and expedient way in response to the immediate communicative needs of people in different communities with quite different ancestors' (1997: 141).

Widdowson makes a clear distinction between the developmental processes in indigenised Englishes and other Englishes, and his position moves us to a debate on the nature of the new varieties of English and whether they can rightfully be called Englishes or whether they are, as is Widdowson's view, 'autonomous languages'.

Widdowson's position is broadly representative of the views of those who argue that the development of different intranational varieties of English will necessarily result in a range of mutually unintelligible languages, as, for example, French and Italian developed from Latin. Following the distinction between a dialect and a register (Halliday *et al.*, 1964), Widdowson (2003) suggests that nativised local varieties of English can be considered as dialects in that they are primarily concerned with distinct communities. These dialects are 'likely . . . to evolve into separate species of language . . ., gradually becoming mutually unintelligible' (2003: 53). In contrast, Widdowson argues that the varieties of English used for specific purposes such as banking or commerce can be seen more as registers, that is varieties of language that have developed to 'serve uses *for* language rather than users *of* it' (2003: 54) (italics in original). Universally agreed *registers* of English will thus be used for international communication and *dialects* will be used for local communication and the expression of identity. As suggested by the 'identity–communication continuum', however, I do not see the need to draw a distinction in this way. Rather, I agree with Mufwene and Schneider that all varieties of English develop from similar stimuli and through similar processes. All varieties must, on the one hand, reflect the cultural realities of their speakers and, on the other, be adaptable enough to allow international communication. This is as true of Nigerian English(es) as it is of Liverpudlian English.

In Chapter 4 I shall try and show that varieties of British English have developed, following exactly the same type of stimuli as have the new varieties in Ghana, Nigeria or Singapore. An 'English' base has been influenced by contact with several other languages. Kandiah has argued that, in a process he calls 'fulguration', new varieties of English create a new system based on 'elements, structures and rules drawn from both English and from one or more languages used in the environment' (1998: 99). I shall show in Chapter 4 that this is precisely how English developed in England. Whether these varieties are mutually intelligible or not depends more on the motivations of the speaker (the identity–communication continuum) and the listener's familiarity with the variety than it does on the linguistic features of the variety itself. These differ, but they differ from each other in the same ways, and familiarity with them brings quick understanding.

As pointed out by Kachru, Moag and Schneider, once a new variety of English is established, internal or local variation begins to appear. Each variety of English is represented by a continuum of styles. Thus, as we saw earlier, Australian English has been classified into three styles: cultivated, general and broad. Singaporean English has also been classified into three comparable styles: acrolectal, mesolectal and basilectal. The use of style depends on a particular motivation. And, as I argued in Chapter 1, these motivations can be placed along the identity–intelligibility continuum. In contexts where identity is considered important to the speaker, such as in informal situations with peers, s/he is likely to adopt a broader, more colloquial (or more basilectal) style. When the contexts require

intelligibility across more than one speech community, however, the identity motivation will take second place to the intelligibility motivation. Speakers, whether they be Nigerian or Liverpudlian, will choose the style to suit the occasion. In other words, all speakers of English are capable of being intelligible (or uinintellgible) to speakers of other varieties if they are so motivated.

Intelligibility is thus not a useful criterion for determining whether a variety has become a different language. As I pointed out in Chapter 1, many varieties of British English can be mutually unintelligible. This is especially the case if the motivation of the speaker is to highlight his or her identity. I shall consider the issue of intelligibility in more depth in Part C but here will quote Smith (1992). Smith has long argued that different varieties do not necessarily equate with unintelligibility. In a well-known study conducted in response to the frequently voiced concern over 'the possibility that speakers of different varieties of English will soon become unintelligible to one another' (1992: 75), he argued that this is a natural phenomenon and nothing to worry about. 'Our speech or writing in English needs to be intelligible only to those with whom we wish to communicate in English' (1992: 75). To this I would add that, following the 'identity–communication continuum', our speech or writing in English can be made intelligible to speakers of other varieties of English.

In the final part of this chapter I shall briefly outline the main arguments for and against the proposition that the spread of English is the result of a deliberate imperialist policy, one that Phillipson in a well-known book of the same title (1992) has termed linguistic imperialism or 'linguicism':

> Linguicism can be intralingual and interlingual. It exists among and between speakers of a language when one dialect is privileged as standard. Linguicism exists between speakers of different languages in processes of resource allocation, vindication or vilification in discourse of one language rather than another – English as the language of modernity and progress, Cantonese as a mere dialect unsuited for a range of literate and societal functions – (. . .)
>
> (Phillipson, 1997: 239)

This is relevant to the concept of World Englishes, as the linguistic imperialism argument would seem to imply that a native-speaking model of English that reflected an Anglo-cultural framework would supplant not only local varieties of English, but also other local languages.

## 3.3   English as an International Language or World Englishes?

The political debate over the spread of English centres around two questions: (1) is it due to imperialism or linguicism; or (2) is it due to a genuine desire of people to learn English because it has become so useful and because it can be adapted to suit the cultural norms of the people who speak it? I return to this debate in more depth in Part C and here simply provide an introduction to it. In a way, this is a debate about one English and many

Englishes. Those who see imperialism as the cause argue that it is British and, to an increasingly greater extent, American English, that is being spread across the world. They argue that British and American English necessarily bring with them Anglo-cultural norms and that to learn this English means adopting British and American culture. As Rahman (1999) has argued in the case of Pakistan, English 'acts by distancing people from most indigenous cultural norms' (cited in Phillipson, 2002: 17).

There is little doubt that there are people and institutions who see the spread of English as being both commercially and politically extremely important for their own interests. An example of such an institution could be said to be the British Council. A major task of the British Council is to give access to British culture across the world. What better way to do this than to offer access to British English? Hence British Councils across the world have established English language schools. These schools promote a British or native speaker model and language teaching materials published by British publishing houses. However, it is noteworthy that the British Council sees these schools as operating with an overall purpose of building mutually beneficial relationships between people in the UK and other countries.

There is also little doubt that the British government sees great advantage in the spread of English, especially British English and especially in post-communist countries of Eastern Europe and in countries such as China. A senior British politician, Gordon Brown, was extolling the virtues of English in a trip to China he made in 2005.

There is also little doubt that certain varieties of English are considered superior in a range of international contexts. Academic publications in the United States and Britain favour articles written in Anglo varieties and which follow Anglo rhetorical styles. This has led to scholars such as Swales (1997), Ammon (2000) and Kandiah (2001) to consider how any possible prejudice against scholars who are either speakers of different varieties of English or who are second language speakers of English can be addressed.

Phillipson's (1992) elegant argument for the linguistic imperialism thesis has won many followers. Needless to say, however, there are many who disagree with his analysis and who argue that, far from being forced upon people unwillingly, English has been actively sought out by people throughout the world (Conrad, 1996; Davies, 1996; Li, 2002b; Brutt-Griffler, 2002). In their view, people are making sensible and pragmatic choices; they are not being coerced into learning English. And, far from English being a purveyor of Anglo-cultural norms, the development of new varieties of English shows how English can be adapted by its speakers to reflect their cultural norms.

Kandiah (2001) sees both motivations in action and feels that there is an inherent contradiction for people in postcolonial countries. On the one hand, people realise they need to learn English as it is the international language. On the other, they fear that the need to use English in so many situations and for so many functions will threaten their own languages, cultures and ways of thinking. Yet, as Kachru and others have argued, local Englishes reflect local cultures and ways of thinking. Second, many non-Anglo or non-Western ways of thinking have received international attention through English. To take just three examples from Chinese culture, traditional Chinese medicine, the writings on the

Art of War by Sun Zi and the tenets of Confucianism are now much better known in the West than in the past, precisely because this Chinese cultural knowledge and these Chinese ways of thinking have been disseminated through English. As Jacques (2005) has argued, with the rise in power of India and China, American and Western values will be contested as never before. It is highly likely that they will be contested through the medium of English.

In closing this chapter, I want to introduce a conundrum that we face in an attempt to standardise and classify World Englishes. We like models and norms. The conundrum that we have to solve is that we are faced with many models all of which are characterised by internal variation. This has been pointed out by Kachru in his call for a 'polymodel' approach to replace a 'monomodel' approach (1992a: 66). A monomodel approach supposes that English is homogenous, a single variety, it is 'English as an international language'. In Kachru's view, this approach ignores the incontrovertible fact that English is actually characterised by variety and variation. A polymodel approach, on the other hand, supposes variability. Kachru lists three types: 'variability related to acquisition; variability related to function; and variability related to the context of situation' (1992a: 66).

By examining the linguistic features of a range of Englishes and the sociocultural contexts in which they operate, I hope to show how the real situation is characterised by variation and variety and that we need to study 'global' English in specific places (Sonntag, 2003). While varieties of English go through similar linguistic and developmental processes, the current status and functions of those Englishes can differ markedly. For example, the roles and functions of English differ markedly today even in Malaysia and Singapore, two countries whose historical backgrounds are so closely related that one was actually part of the other at one stage in the past. I now turn to the description and discussion of individual varieties of English.