1 Introduction

The expression "world Englishes" is capable of a range of meanings and interpretations. In the first sense, perhaps, the term functions as an umbrella label referring to a wide range of differing approaches to the description and analysis of English(es) worldwide. Some scholars, for example, favor a discussion of "world English" in the singular, and also employ terms such as "global English" and "international English," while others adopt the same terms in their plural forms. Indeed, in recent years, a plethora of terminology has come into use, including: English as an international (auxiliary) language, global English(es), international English(es), localized varieties of English, new varieties of English, non-native varieties of English, second-language varieties of English, world English(es), new Englishes, alongside such more traditional terms as ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language).

In a second, narrower sense, the term is used to specifically refer to the "new Englishes" found in the Caribbean and in West African and East African societies such as Nigeria and Kenya, and to such Asian Englishes as Hong Kong English, Indian English, Malaysian English, Singaporean English, and Philippine English. Typically studies of this kind focus on the areal characteristics of national or regional Englishes, with an emphasis on the linguistic description of autonomous varieties of Englishes. In a third sense, world Englishes refers to the wide-ranging approach to the study of the English language worldwide particularly associated with Braj B. Kachru and other scholars working in a "world Englishes paradigm." The Kachruvian approach has been characterized by an underlying philosophy that has argued for the importance of inclusivity and pluricentricity in approaches to the linguistics of English worldwide, and involves not merely the description of national and regional varieties, but many other related topics as well, including contact linguistics, creative writing, critical linguistics, discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, lexicography, pedagogy, pidgin and creole studies, and the sociology of language (Bolton, 2002a).

Underlying each of these three broad approaches is an evident concern with monocentrism versus pluricentrism, i.e., one English (with all its geographical and social varieties), or multifarious Englishes (deserving consideration and recognition as autonomous or semi-autonomous varieties of the language). This tension between the centrifugal and centripetal dynamics of international English(es) also finds expression in discussions of "world English" versus "world Englishes." Butler (1997), for example, writing as lexicographer, claims that in most contexts where English is establishing itself as a "localized" or "new" English "[t]here are two major forces operating at the moment ... The first is an outside pressure - the sweep of American English through the English-speaking world/" which Butler regards as synonymous with world English, because "[t]his force provides the words which are present globally in international English and which are usually conveyed around the world by the media" (Butler, 1997: 107). The other dynamic, at the level of world Englishes, is "the purely local-
wellspring of local culture and a sense of identity" (p. 109). Thus at the level of lexis, items like cable TV, cyberpunk, high five, and political correctness might be identified with "world English" whereas items like bamboo snake, outstation, adobo, and sari-sari store would be items found in "world Englishes" more specifically" Asian Englishes."

When Kachru and Smith took over the editorship of the journal World Language English in 1985, it was retitled as World Englishes, and Kachru and Smith's explanation for this was that World Englishes embodies "a new idea, a new credo" for which the plural "Englishes" was significant:

"Englishes" symbolizes the functional and formal variation in the language, and its international acculturation, for example, in West Africa, in Southern Africa, in East Africa, in South Asia, in Southeast Asia, in the West Indies, in the Philippines, and in the traditional English-using countries: the USA, the UK, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. The language now belongs to those who use it as their first language, and to those who use it as an additional language, whether in its standard form or in its localized forms. (Kachru and Smith, 1985: 210)

In an early article on this topic, McArthur (1987) postulates a core variety of "World Standard English" which he then contrasts with the wide range of geographical Englishes used worldwide. This contrast between a common core of international "English" and geographically distinctive "Englishes" is currently maintained by a number of other commentator (notably Crystal, 1997).

In the last two decades, there has been a substantial change in approaches to English studies; a paradigm shift that began in the early 1980s. At that time, various branches of linguistics, including English studies, sociolinguistics, and applied linguistics, began to recognize and describe the remarkable spread of English worldwide which was then in progress. Early scholarship in this area included Kachru's The Other Tongue (1982) and The Alchemy of English (1986), Pride's New Englishes (1982), Noss's Varieties of English in Southeast Asia (1983), and Platt, Weber, and Ho's The New Englishes (1984). The volume edited by Noss included a number of position papers, including one by Llamzon on the "Essential features of new varieties of English." According to Llamzon, new varieties of English are identifiable with reference to four essential sets of features: ecological, historical, sociolinguistic, and cultural (Llamzon, 1983: 100-4). In the last context, Llamzon discusses cultural features with reference to creative writing and a local literature in English, arguing that "works by novelists, poets and playwrights have demonstrated that the English language can ... be used as a vehicle for the transmission of the cultural heritage of Third World countries. The appearance of this body of literary works signals that the transplanted tree has finally reached maturity, and is now beginning to blossom and fructify" (p. 104). The horticultural metaphor also finds expression in his conclusion, where he argues that a "new variety of English may likened ... to a transplanted tree," which, if properly nurtured "will grow into a healthy and vigorous plant and contribute to the beauty of the international landscape not only by virtue of its lush verdant branches and leaves, but more importantly by its fruits- the literary masterpieces of novels, short stories, poems, dramas and songs of its speakers and writers" (pp. 105-6).

Llamzon's reference to the importance of creative writing and literatures in this context is significant. In many Asian societies, including India, Singapore, and the Philippines, there is a body of creative writing in English that reaches back to the colonial era, and since the early 1980s Commonwealth and postcolonial writers from a range of developing societies have increasingly won acclaim from the international literary world. The emergence of "new Englishes" in the early 1980s thus overlapped with and was influenced by the "new literatures"
that were then gaining recognition (see, for example, Hosillos, 1982; King, 1980; Lim, 1984). In the 1980s, such postcolonial creative writing began to attract the interest of both the reading public and academics, and the end of the decade saw the publication of *The Empire Writes Back* (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 1989). By 1993, the title of their book had been appropriated for a *Time* magazine cover story and feature article, which detailed the successes of the Booker nominees and prize-winners, such as Salman Rushdie and Vikram Seth (both of Indian parentage), as well as Kazuo Ishiguro (of Japanese descent), Timothy Mo (Anglo-Chinese), Michael Ondaatje (Sri Lankan), Ben Okri (Nigerian), and Nobel Prize-winner Derek Walcott (Caribbean). In this article Pico Iyer describes such writers as "transcultural," because "they are addressing an audience as mixed up and eclectic and uprooted as themselves." Iyer argues for "a new postimperial order in which English is the lingua franca," and quotes Robert McCrum to the effect that "There is not one English language anymore, but there are many English languages ... each of these Englishes is creating its own very special literature, which, because it doesn't feel oppressed by the immensely influential literary tradition in English, is somehow freer" (Iyer, 1993: 53).

The last three decades have seen a rapid growth of interest in the study of the "world Englishes" as well as a number of related fields, however these are glossed: English as an international language, global English(es), international English(es), localized varieties of English, new varieties of English, non-native English, and world English(es), etc. At present there are at least three international academic journals devoted primarily to this branch of linguistics (*English Today*, *English World-Wide*, and *World Englishes*), which have been supplemented by a substantial number of books on the subject. Currently, a number of distinct, albeit overlapping, approaches to research (and publications) in the field of "world English(es)," "new Englishes," and "new varieties of English" may be identified. These include the following (1) the English Studies approach, (2) sociolinguistic approaches (sociology of language, feature-based, Kachruvian, pidgin and creole studies), (3) applied linguistics approaches, (4) lexicographical approaches, (5) the popularizers' approach, (6) critical approaches, and (7) the futurology approach. These are discussed in some detail in the following sections of this chapter.

2 The English Studies Approach

The "English Studies" approach to world Englishes has developed historically from the description of English tradition, which dates back at least to the late nineteenth century and the work of scholars such as Henry Bradley (1845-1923), Otto Jespersen (1860-1943), Daniel Jones (1881-1967), Charles Talbut Onions (1873-1965), Henry Sweet (1845-1912), and Henry Wyld (1870-1945). More recently, this approach may be exemplified by the work of contemporary British linguists, such as Robert Burchfield, David Crystal, Sidney Greenbaum, Tom McArthur, Randolph Quirk, and John Wells.

Randolph Quirk was one of the first in the contemporary period to discuss varieties of English and the notion of "standards" of world English in his 1962 book, *The Use of English*. His *Grammar of Contemporary English* (Quirk et al., 1972) also surveyed varieties of English, although here the aim was to differentiate the "common core" of the language from such classes of variety as "regional," "educational," "social," as well as varieties according to "subject matter," "medium," "attitude," and "interference" (pp. 13-32). Quirk later (1990) assumed the role of a guardian of international "standards" of English and was drawn into a celebrated debate
with Braj Kachru on "liberation linguistics," but one obvious irony here is that Quirk seems to have begun his academic life as a "linguistic liberal," with his 1962 essay arguing for tolerance and noting that:

> English is not the prerogative or "possession" of the English ... Acknowledging this must- as a corollary- involve our questioning the propriety of claiming that the English of one area is more "correct" than the English of another. Certainly, we must realize that there is no single "correct" English, and no single standard of correctness. (Quirk, 1962: 17-18)

Some 20 years on, his 1990 paper was to see him arguing a rather different case, urging overseas teachers of English to keep in constant touch with "native-speaker" norms, and praising the merits of a world "Standard English."

In the mid-1980s, a number of books on world English(es) in the "English studies" tradition were published, including Burchfield's influential *The English Language* (1985), Greenbaum's *The English Language Today* (1985), and Quirk and Widdowson's *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures* (1985). Each of these attempted to address issues related to the learning and use of English from a global perspective. Burchfield (1985) attracted much attention when he discusses the possible fragmentation of English along the lines earlier seen with Latin:

> The most powerful model of all is the dispersal of speakers of popular forms of Latin in various parts of western Europe and the emergence in the early Middle Ages of languages now known as French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and of subdivision (like Catalan) within these languages, none easily comprehensible to the others ... English, when first recorded in the eighth century, was already a fissiparous language. It will continue to divide and subdivide, and to exhibit a thousand different faces in the centuries ahead ... The multifarious forms of English spoken within the British Isles and by native speakers abroad will continue to reshape and restyle themselves in the future. And they will become more and more at variance with the emerging Englishes of Europe and of the rest of the world. (Burchfield, 1985: 160, 173)

Burchfield's comparison of the dispersal of Latin in the Middle Ages with English in the 1980s provides the starting-point for Quirk's (1985) discussion of "The English language in a global context," in which Quirk argues the case for normativity, declaiming at one point that "the fashion of undermining belief in standard English had wrought educational damage in the ENL (English as a native language) countries" and that there is no justification for such an attitude to be "exported" to societies where English has the status of a second or foreign language: "The relatively narrow range of purposes for which the non-native needs to use English (even in ESL countries) is arguably well catered for by a single monochrome standard form that looks as good on paper as it sounds in speech" (Quirk, 1985: 6). By the mid-1980s, it seems that Quirk had transcended the linguistic radicalism of his youth, and that he was anxious to join battle on behalf of both "Standard English" and "standards" of English. His 1985 paper also represents a rehearsal for a later engagement against the forces of "liberation linguistics," an engagement that would pit Quirk in debate against Kachru some five years later in the pages of *English Today*.

Another significant figure in this field since the 1980s has been Tom McArthur, the founding and current editor of *English Today* (from 1985), and the editor of *The Oxford Companion to. the English Language* (1992). McArthur's (1987) paper on "The English languages?" sets out part of his theoretical agenda for the study of world Englishes. As the title of the article suggests, the notion of plural Englishes is foregrounded in the discussion, and
McArthur asks "If there are by now 'English literatures' can the 'English languages' be far behind?" (McArthur, 1987: 9). Over the two decades, *English Today* has had a substantial impact on the discussion and debate about "English languages" around the world with many articles having a geographical focus (Africa, the Americas, Asia, Europe, etc.), while others have dealt with such issues as corpus linguistics, grammar and usage, history of English, language and gender, and English lexicography worldwide, etc. McArthur has also influenced scholarship on world English(es) greatly with his editorship of *The Oxford Companion to the English Language* (1992), a volume entitled *The English Languages* (1998), and the recently-published *Oxford Guide to World English* (2002).

A third influential figure in the 1980s and 1990s was Manfred Gorlach, whose orientation has been described as "the study of varieties of English in a world-wide context" (Schneider, 1997a: 3). Gorlach's intellectual lineage was derived of "Anglistik" in the German academic tradition, and he rose to prominence in the field as the founding editor of *English World-Wide*, which began publication in 1980 and publishes a wide range of articles on dialectology, pidgins and creoles, and the sociolinguistics of English throughout the world. Gorlach himself has identified his approach as part of "English studies," commenting that: "As a sub-discipline of English Studies, a consideration of English as a world language would provide an ideal opportunity to expand the social, historical and geographical aspects of English Studies and ... might well serve to enhance the appeal of a traditional and somewhat ageing discipline" (Gorlach, 1988: 37-8). Since Gorlach's retirement as general editor of *English World-Wide* in 1998, he has been succeeded by Edgar W. Schneider, who has also published widely in this field (e.g., Schneider, 1997a, 1997b).

Others following similar approaches include Quirk's former colleagues on the Survey of English Usage, David Crystal and Sidney Greenbaum. Crystal's early work centered on academically-oriented English studies (e.g., Crystal and Quirk, 1964; Crystal, 1969, 1975), but by the mid-1980s Crystal was moving away from detailed empirical research and embarking on his present career of academic entrepreneur, encyclopedist, broadcaster, and "popularizer" (see section 6 below). Greenbaum's (1985) volume on *The English Language Today* was an important work at the time, and from 1990 until his death in 1996, Greenbaum also directed the International Corpus of English (ICE) research project, which is being run in around 15 countries worldwide (Greenbaum, 1996; Nelson, Wallis, and Aarts, 2002). Other British-based scholars include Wells (1982), Burchfield (1985, 1994), Graddol, Leith, and Swann (1996), and Goodman (Goodman and Graddol, 1996). From the United States, further contributions to the study of varieties of English worldwide have also come from John Algeo (1991), Richard W. Bailey (1991), and Frederic Cassidy (1985).

3 Sociolinguistic Approaches to World Englishes

Sociolinguistic approaches to world English(es) may be regarded as subsuming four types of studies: (1) the sociology of language (Fishman, Cooper, and Conrad, 1977; Fishman, Conrad, and Rubal-Lopez, 1996); (2) "feature-based" approaches to world English(es) (Cheshire, 1991a; Trudgill and Hannah, 2002, etc.); (3) Kachruvian studies (Kachru, 1992, etc.); and (4) pidgin and creole studies (Todd, 1984, etc.).
3.1 The sociology of language

Two books by Joshua A. Fishman and his associates (Fishman, Cooper, and Conrad, 1977 and Fishman, Conrad, and Rubal-Lopez, 1996) have provided sociologically-detailed treatments of "the spread of English" and "postimperial English" respectively. These studies were published 20 years apart, and the data cited and commentaries given chart a number of developments in the spread of English in the world. The 1977 volume addressed a number of topics, and also attempted to identify the relevant sociopolitical predictors of the use of English in postcolonial societies (former Anglophone colonial status, linguistic diversity, religious composition, and educational and economic development). Fishman also noted that the "international sociolinguistic balance" at that time rested on three factors: (1) the spread of English; (2) the control of English; and (3) the fostering of vernacular languages (Fishman, 1977: 335).

Twenty years later in *Post-Imperial English* Fishman and his colleagues (Fishman et al., 1996) returned to a consideration of some of the same issues. In the first chapter ("Introduction: Some empirical and theoretical issues"), Fishman (1996a) poses three questions: is English "still spreading in the non-English mother tongue world?" (yes); is that continued spread in any way directly orchestrated by, fostered by, or exploitatively beneficial to the English mother tongue world? (to be judged); and, third, are there forces or processes that transcend the English mother tongue world itself and which also contribute to the continued spread and entrenchment of English in non-English mother tongue countries (ditto). Fishman suggests that English is now less "an imperialist tool" and more "a multinational tool":

> Multinationals are pro-multinational rather than pro one or another imperial or national metropolitan center, and English may well be the lingua franca of capitalist exploitation without being the vehicle of imperialism or even neoimperialism per se. Perhaps, just as neo-colonialism has become merely a form of the world capitalist system rather than a form of imperialism itself, so English may need to be re-examined precisely from the point of view of being postimperial ... not directly serving purely Anglo-American territorial, economic, or cultural expansion without being post-capitalist in any way? (Fishman, 1996a: 8)

Fishman then goes on to claim that there is evidence to support the view that the world economy has entered a new capitalist phase, which has led to increased living standards globally; that in this new order the growth of English may be not necessarily at the expense of local languages; and that one effect of Anglophone imperialism has been "the rise of local elites and counter-elites who became interested in both English and their local vernaculars in order to communicate with different constituencies." With the end of the cold war, Fishman suggests, our thinking on English should also be "de-ideologized," as it is possible that "the impact of English on cultures and societies throughout the world has been a variable one," not one that can be summarized in "simple moralistic terms" (pp. 9-10).

Partly in response to Phillipson's *Linguistic Imperialism* (1992) (see section 6 below), Fishman also discusses English in the context of economic globalization:

> Economically unifying and homogenizing corporate and multinational forces are increasingly creating a single market into which all societies - former colonial and non-colonial states alike - can be and, indeed, for their own self-interests' sake, usually seek to be integrated. The language of these forces is now most frequently English ... On the other hand, a similarly powerful trend is occurring in the opposite direction, in the direction of asserting, recognizing, and protecting more local languages,
traditions, and identities - even at the state level- than ever before in world history. (Fishman, 1996b: 639)

The former British and American colonies that Fishman surveys are, he asserts, "participating in both trends, in various degrees and with differing priorities"; to characterize the former trend as "the imperialism of English" is both "antiquated" and "erroneous" (p. 639).

3.2 "Feature-based" approaches

In contrast to the sociology of language approach to world Englishes, a "feature-based" approach has typically involved the linguist in identifying and marking statements about the distinctive features of varieties in terms of pronunciation or "accent" (phonology), vocabulary (lexis), or grammar (morphology and syntax). One leading example of this approach is Trudgill and Hannah's *International English* (2002, first edition published 1982) which describes "standard varieties" of English in terms of "differences at the level of phonetics, phonology, grammar and vocabulary" (p. 3). *International English* uses tape-recordings of English speech from Australia, India, Ireland, New Zealand, North America, Scotland, South Africa, Wales, West Africa, and the West Indies. The third edition added an expanded section on creoles, as well as descriptions of Singapore and Philippine English.

However, the merits of an approach based on a notional "standard" have been queried by linguists such as Cheshire, who asserts that:

> Current descriptions, whether of a non-standard dialect, a "new" variety or even of a hypothetical international standard variety, are all too often given as lists of assorted departures from southern British standard English or from American standard English, with no attempt at determining the extent to which the local linguistic features function as part of an autonomous system. (Cheshire, 1991b: 7)

In the introduction to her own book on world Englishes, *English Around the World* (1991a), Cheshire advocates an approach based on empirical sociolinguistic research. The case studies included in this volume usually focus on the analysis of sociolinguistic variation and many might be more accurately described as "variation studies" (in the Labovian paradigm) rather than studies of linguistic features per se. Cheshire argues that in the case of "second-language" varieties of English, sociolinguistic analysis can answer the question of where errors stop and where "legitimate features of a local variety" start (p. 11).

3.3 The Kachruvian approach

The work of Braj B. Kachru in this field is of central and enduring importance, and the influence of the Kachruvian approach to world Englishes (WE) extends across a range of subdisciplines including applied linguistics, critical linguistics, descriptive linguistics, discourse analysis, and educational linguistics. Indeed, the coining and promotion of the term "world Englishes" is chiefly associated with Braj Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, Larry Smith, and a sizable number of other academics who have adopted a world Englishes approach to research and teaching in this field. Kachru himself has had an enormous influence on such work. In addition to his many books and articles and his editorship of *World Englishes*, Kachru is also responsible for
anchoring the annual conferences on world Englishes held by the *International Association for World Englishes* (IA WE), which provide a forum for research, discussion, and debate.

Historically, there is general agreement that the study of world Englishes can be dated from the two conferences on English as a world language that took place in 1978, one in April at the East-West Center in Hawai'i, and the second in June-July at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Braj Kachru played a major role in both conferences (Kachru, 1982; see Smith, 1981). These conferences discussed the sociopolitical contexts of English in the world; the use of English in former Anglophone colonies; the processes of "nativization" and "acculturation" in such societies; and the description of varieties of English (Kachru, 1992: 1). Throughout the 1980s, other conferences were organized through the auspices of such organizations as IATEFL (International Association for the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language), TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), the Georgetown University Round Table, and the East-West Center, and by the mid-1980s the term "world Englishes" was gaining currency (Kachru, 1992: 2; Kachru, 1985; Kachru and Smith, 1988). The justification for the adoption of this term, Kachru argues, is that:

> The term symbolizes the functional and formal variations, divergent sociolinguistic contexts, ranges and varieties of English in creativity, and various types of acculturation in parts of the Western and non-Western world. This concept emphasizes "WE-ness" and not the dichotomy between *us* and *them* (the native and non-native users). (Kachru, 1992: 2)

In Kachru's (1992) survey of "World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources," he summarizes the study of world Englishes in terms of 11 related and overlapping issues, identified as: the spread and stratification of English; characteristics of the stratification; interactional contexts of world Englishes; implications of the spread; descriptive and prescriptive concerns; the bilingual's creativity and the literary canon; multi-canons of English; the two faces of English: nativization and Englishization; fallacies concerning users and uses; the power and politics of English; and teaching world Englishes (Kachru, 1992: 2). In his discussion of the first issue, "the spread and stratification of English," Kachru argues in favor of the strength of his model of the spread of English in terms of "three concentric circles," the Inner Circle (ENL societies), the Outer Circle (ESL societies), and the Expanding Circle (EFL societies). In the second section on the "characteristics of stratification," Kachru critically examines such sociolinguistic metalanguage as "led" and "cline," before proceeding to a discussion of the "interactional contexts of world Englishes" and the "implications of the spread" of world Englishes for the Outer and Expanding Circles in linguistic, cultural terms.

The notion of "descriptive and prescriptive concerns" for Kachru involves a critical evaluation of such "sacred cows" of theoretical and applied linguistics as "interference," "interlanguage/ error," "speech community," the "native speaker/" and the "ideal speaker-hearer" of English. In addition there are issues linked to questions of the models, norms, and standards for English in the Outer and Expanding Circles. In this context, Kachru distinguishes three types of varieties: First, the *norm-providing* varieties of the Inner Circle, including American English, British English, and the less-preferred varieties of Australian and New Zealand English. Second, the *norm-developing* varieties of the Outer Circle, where the localized (or "endocentric") norm has a well-established linguistic and cultural identity, as in, e.g., Singapore English, Nigerian English, and Indian English. And third, the *norm-dependent* varieties of the Expanding Circle, e.g., as in Korea, Iran, Saudi Arabia, where the norms are external (or "exocentric/" i.e., American or British). Two other concerns relate to the identification of "errors" (as opposed to "innovations"),
as well as the "variables of intelligibility" in world Englishes. The issue of "the bilingual's creativity and the literary canon" refers to the existence and development of the "new literatures in English" of Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean, and the extent to which these "contact literatures in English" have undergone nativization and acculturation. Kachru argues that in South Asia, West Africa, and Southeast Asia, these literatures are thus "both nativised and acculturated" as instanced by the work of the 1986 Nobel Prize winner Wole Soyinka from Nigeria, and Raja Rao of India, and that the issue of the bilingual's creativity is an important area for linguistic, literary, and pedagogical research. The notion of "multi-canons" attempts to accommodate the current sociolinguistic reality in world English where speakers of a wide range of first languages communicate with one another through English, so that, "a speaker of a Bantu language may interact with a speaker of Japanese, a Taiwanese, an Indian, and so on" (Kachru, 1992: 7). As a result English has become acculturated in many "un-English" sociolinguistic contexts, in many African and Asian societies where there is no shared Judea-Christian or European cultural heritage, or shared literary canon. English then becomes multi-canonical English.

The issue concerning "the two faces of English: nativization and Englishization" focuses on the reciprocal effects of language context: i.e., the effect on English in a localized context (nativization), and the effect on local languages in the same situation (Englishization).Instances of the borrowing of English vocabulary into local languages include Hong Kong, Japan, the Philippines, and many other societies around the world, but Englishization also extends to the level of grammar, as in the adoption of impersonal constructions in Indian languages; or the use of the passive constructions with a "by" equivalent in Korean, both of which have been traced to English. Finally, in the 1992 article, Kachru notes the pedagogical importance of world Englishes to the teaching of language, literature, and teaching methodology, emphasizing the need for a two-fold paradigm shift:

First, a paradigm shift in research, teaching, and application of sociolinguistic realities to the functions of English. Second, a shift from frameworks and theories which are essentially appropriate only to monolingual countries. It is indeed essential to recognize that World Englishes represent certain linguistic, cultural and pragmatic realities and pluralism, and that pluralism is now an integral part of World Englishes and literatures written in Englishes. The pluralism of English must be reflected in the approaches, both theoretical and applied, we adopt for understanding this unprecedented linguistic phenomenon. (Kachru, 1992: 11)

Kachru's enthusiasm for the teaching of world Englishes was not shared by everyone in the early 1990s. In a landmark paper, Randolph Quirk, by then Vice-Chancellor of London University, was becoming increasingly worried by what he termed the "half-baked quackery" of English teachers preaching the gospel of "varieties of English," and published a polemical paper taking issue with those he thought to be undermining the importance of Standard English (Quirk, 1990). This involved an attack on the growing study and teaching of "varieties," and was to lead him into a celebrated debate against Kachru.

Central to Quirk's (1990) paper, "Language varieties and standard language" was the distinction between non-institutionalized varieties and those varieties that are institutionalized (i.e., being fully described and with defined standards). Here he claims that: "Of the latter, there are two: American English and British English; and there are one or two others with standards rather informally established, notably Australian English" (Quirk, 1990: 6). Quirk then argues strongly that the distinction between a "native" variety and a "nonnative" variety is crucial, or in his own words "the one that seems to be of the greatest importance educationally and
linguistically" (p. 6). He also excludes the possibility that any non-native variety can be institutionalized, asserting that: "I exclude the possibility only because I am not aware of there being any institutionalized non-native varieties." Quirk asserts that "[t]he implications for foreign language teaching are clear: the need for native teacher support and the need for non-native teachers to be in constant touch with the native language," commenting that the research suggested that the "internalizations" of natives were radically different from those of non-natives. He later concludes that "the mass of ordinary native-English speakers have never lost their respect for Standard English, and it needs to be understood abroad too ... that Standard English is alive and well, its existence and its value alike clearly recognized" (p. 10).

Kachru's (1991) riposte to Quirk, "Liberation linguistics and the Quirk concern," sets out to challenge a number of Quirk's "concerns," arguing (1) "that the recognition of a range of variation for English is a linguistic manifestation of underlying ideological positions"; (2) "that there is confusion of types of linguistic variety"; (3) "that the use of the term 'institutionalized variety' with the non-native varieties of English is inappropriate"; (4) "that there is a recognition of variation within a non-native variety"; (5) "that there is a widely recognized and justified sociolinguistic and pedagogical distinction between ESL and EFL"; (6) "that there is recognition of the 'desirability of non-native norms'" (p. 5). Kachru also questions a number of Quirk's other arguments which are seen as grounded in a rejection of "sociolinguistic realities," and the adoption of a perspective based on monolingual contexts. The actual realities of multilingual societies, Kachru argues, are linguistic realities, sociolinguistic realities, and educational realities that are quite distinct from those in Britain or North America, and here the core of his arguments is that Quirk ignores the central issue of "sociolinguistic realities" in Outer-Circle societies and fails to specify how he might produce a "pragmatically viable proposal" for the "international codification" of English (pp. 11-12).

3.4 Pidgin and creole studies

There have been periodic discussions in the last 20 years in the field of world Englishes about the relationship between such new Englishes and the study of English-based pidgins and creoles. As the study of world English(es) took off in the 1980s, the specialist journals in the field had to decide on how to deal with pidgin and creole varieties. Gorlach (1980: 6) argues that because of the continua that exist in many societies linking pidgins and creoles with standard languages, their study "can therefore with some justification be regarded as being part of English or French or Portuguese studies, as is the study of the respective dialects," citing Krio, Tok Pisin, and Sranan as cases in point. Over the years, Gorlach published many such papers on English-based pidgins and creoles, and McArthur's English Today has opted for a similar editorial policy, as has the journal World Englishes, with at least one special issue devoted to the topic (Mufwene, 1997). Other work in this field includes Todd (1984, 1995) who has commented on the indeterminacy of varieties in pidgin and creole context, noting, for example, in the case of Nigeria that:

The unidealised truth seems to be ... that for many speakers in Nigeria it is now extremely difficult, if not impossible, to separate Nigerian English Pidgin from pidginised Nigerian English or anglicized Nigerian Pidgin. Today, in the spoken medium and in the writings of Aik-Imoukhuede, Oyekunle and Saro-Wiwa, we find not compartmentalized English and Pidgin, not even a continuum from basilectal through mesolectal to acrolectal, but a linguistic amalgam where the interinfluencing is so complete
that even articulate linguists are not always certain which varieties they are using or why. (Todd, 1995: 37)

It seems clear that "creolistics" overlaps to an extent with the study of world Englishes, although even commentators such as Gorlach remain ambivalent on the issue. In a 1996 paper entitled "And is it English?" Gorlach discusses the existence of varieties such as code switching, pidgins, creoles, cants, and mixed languages. In the case of pidgins and creoles, Gorlach asserts that these are "independent languages on all counts," noting that varieties which are "marginally English" may persist as "one of the more messy facts of life" (p. 171).

4 Applied Linguistics Approaches

One of the first "applied linguistic approaches" to varieties of world Englishes began in the 1960s with the work of Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (1964), who sought to apply insights derived from "the linguistic sciences" to the newly-emergent field of applied linguistics, which in Britain and the USA was broadly concerned with theories of language learning, language teaching, and language pedagogy. In section 6 of the book the authors discussed the use of varieties of English around the world, noting that "during the period of colonial rule it seemed totally obvious and immutable that the form of English used by professional people in England was the only conceivable model for use in education overseas" (1964: 292). By the 1960s, they argued, things were very different, and now there was choice available between American, British, Australian, and other regional variants. Thus, they argue (and this has a very contemporary ring) that:

English is no longer the possession of the British, or even the British and the Americans, but an international language which increasing numbers of people adopt for at least some of their purposes ... In West Africa, in the West Indies, and in Pakistan and India ... it is no longer accepted by the majority that the English of England, with RP as its accent, are [sic] the only possible models of English to be set before the young. (p. 293)

The publication of the Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens' book, and the expression of similar viewpoints in other academic papers, prompted Clifford Prator to publish a spirited yet historically misplaced attack on what he called "The British heresy in TESL" (Prator, 1968). This paper is of interest because it pre-dates the Kachru-Quirk debate (see above) by some 20 years; and also because of the fact that some of the issues it raises are still discussed today (see Romaine, 1997). Prator's central argument is that "in a country where English is not spoken natively but is widely used as the medium of instruction, to set up the local variety of English as the ultimate model to be imitated by those learning the language" is "unjustifiable intellectually and not conducive to the best possible results" (Prator, 1968: 459). He identifies seven fallacies associated with the British heresy: (1) that second-language varieties of English can legitimately be equated with mother-tongue varieties; (2) that second-language varieties of English really exist as coherent, homogeneous linguistic systems, describable in the usual way as the speech of an identifiable social group; (3) that a few minor concessions in the type of English taught in schools would tend to or suffice to stabilize the language; (4) that one level of a language, its phonology, can be allowed to change without entailing corresponding changes at other levels; (5) that it would be a simple matter to establish a second language variety of English as an effective instructional model once it had been clearly identified and described; (6) that students would
long be content to study English in a situation in which, as a matter of policy, they were denied access to a native-speaker model; and that (7) granting a second language variety of English official status in a country's schools would lead to its widespread adoption as a mother tongue.

Peter Strevens was one of those singled out for opprobrium by Prator; and it is evidently true that Strevens consistently argued for a varieties-based approach to TESL and TEFL during his academic career (see Strevens, 1977, 1980, 1985). Both his 1977 book *New Orientations in the Teaching of English* and his 1980 volume *Teaching English as an International Language* gave substantial coverage to what he glossed as "localized forms of English" (LFEs), arguing that:

In ESL areas where local L2 forms have developed and where they command public approval it is these forms which constitute the most suitable models for use in schools, certainly more suitable than a British or American LI model ... the native speaker of English must accept that English is no longer his possession alone: it belongs to the world, and new forms of English, born of new countries with new communicative needs, should be accepted into the marvelously flexible and adaptable galaxy of "Englishes" which constitute the English language. (Strevens, 1980: 90)

High heresy indeed, but over the next two decades the influence of such heresy was to change the way that many applied linguists would approach their subject, particularly at the level of theory. Thus, throughout the 1980s and 1990s, issues related to world Englishes began to be communicated regularly to an applied linguistics audience through such publications as *The Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Applied Linguistics, English Language Teaching Journal, TESOL Quarterly*, and other journals in the field.

5 The Lexicographical Approach

The domestic English dictionary traditions as exemplified by Samuel Johnson's (1755) *A Dictionary of the English Language* and J. A. H. Murray's *Oxford English Dictionary* (1884-1928) embodied two principles: (1) the potential of dictionaries for "fixing" and standardizing the language (however unrealistic this might turn out to be); and (2) the identification of a "nucleus" or core of the language, defined according to "Anglicity."

Arguably, the first dictionaries of world Englishes were glossaries produced in the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century. These included Pickering (1816), Bartlett (1848), etc. Noah Webster, by contrast, was concerned to produce a national dictionary, for reasons partly if not wholly political, because "As an independent nation, our honor requires us to have a system of our own, in language as well as government." Webster further predicted that: "These causes will produce, in a course of time, a language in North America, as different from the future language of England, as the modern Dutch, Danish and Swedish are from the German, or from one another" (1789: 220-3).

His first dictionary appeared early in the nineteenth century (1806), but it was not until 1828 that his major work, *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, was published. In the twentieth century, Webster's was complemented by a number of other works on American English including Craigie and Hultberg (1938-44), Mathews (1951), and a number of dialect dictionaries including Cassidy (1985). Earlier dictionaries of Canadian English include Avis (1967), which has recently been superseded by *The Canadian Oxford Dictionary* (Barber, 1999). Australian lexicography can be traced back to Morris (1898), which was intended as a supplement to the *OED*, and to the list that Lake compiled as a supplement to Webster's (Lake, 1898, cited in Gorlach, 1995). It is only in recent years that Australia has had its own "inclusive"

India developed its own tradition of glossaries and wordlists, including Whitworth's *An Anglo-Indian Dictionary* (1885) and Yule and Burnell's *Hobson Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases* (1886, 1969). Later works have included Rao (1954) and Hawkins (1984), but as yet no fully autonomous national dictionary for India or other South Asian societies has appeared. In West Africa, there have been plans for a number of years to complete a *Dictionary of West African English*, but so far this project remains incomplete (Banjo and Young, 1982). For the Caribbean, there is Cassidy and LePage's *Dictionary of Jamaican English* (1967), and Holm and Shilling's *Dictionary of Bahamian English* (1982), as well as the recent *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage* (Allsopp, 1996).

Dictionaries are profoundly important for the recognition of world Englishes. As Quirk (1990) has pointed out, it is only when a world variety of English is supported by codification (chiefly expressed through national dictionaries) that one can make a strong claim that such a variety is "institutionalized." Perhaps the best example of this in recent times has been the case of Australia where the *Macquarie Dictionary* has been largely accepted as a "national dictionary" or, in their own words, as "Australia's own." By the 1990s the editors of *Macquarie* had also become activists for the promotion of world Englishes in Asia, and are now planning a dictionary focusing on English in the Asian region with extensive coverage of the vocabularies of the new Englishes of Southeast Asia, particularly those of Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines. Susan Butler, *Macquarie*'s editor, argues that: this dictionary will shift attitudes in the region to English. Rather than being seen as an alien language, and a conduit of Western culture, it will be evident that English can also express Asian culture. The flexibility of English, its ability to serve as a vehicle for the expression of local culture, has been one of its great characteristics since it left English shores. (Butler, 1997: 123)

6 The Popularizers

During the 1980s, at the same time as interest in the study of international varieties of English was quickly growing within universities in the West, a number of popular accounts of the spread of English were being published in Britain and North America. The best-known of these was perhaps McCrum, Cran, and MacNeil's *The Story of English* (1986), which was accompanied by the worldwide broadcast of a nine-part BBC documentary on the history of the English language. Although the series and the book were a popular success in both Europe and North America, they provoked a strong reaction from both linguists intolerant of descriptive inaccuracies, and from cultural critics resentful of the perceived triumphalism.

That the charges of triumphalism were somewhat justified seems hard to deny. The first part of the television series, "An English-speaking world," contained such cliches in Robert MacNeil's commentary as "World War II was the finest hour for British English"; "The sun set on the Union Jack, but not on the English language"; and "English, the language of the skies, is now becoming the language of the seven seas"; with the American newspaper pundit William Safire declaring:
"I think it's a glorious language ... it's growing, it's getting more expressive, it's getting more global, getting more accepted around the world." The book, largely authored by McCrum, fiction editor at Faber and Faber and a novelist in his own right, was somewhat more restrained, and McCrum, Cran, and McNeil do at times temper their celebration of English with mention of "[t]he darker, aggressive side of the spread of global English," which includes the elimination of linguistic diversity and "the attack on deep cultural roots" (p. 44), as in Quebec. Later they are moved to explain the "peculiar genius" of English which, it emerges, is essentially democratic and freedom-loving:

Its genius was, and still is, essentially democratic. It has given expression to the voice of freedom from Wat Tyler, to Tom Paine, to Thomas Jefferson, to Edmund Burke, to the Chartists, to Abraham Lincoln, to the Suffragettes, to Winston Churchill, to Martin Luther King. It is well equipped to be a world language, to give voice to the aspirations of the Third World as much as the inter-communication of the First World. (pp. 47-8)

Another eminent popularizer from the late 1980s to the present, has been David Crystal, whose first work in a popular vein was the 1988 Penguin paperback, The English Language. This was followed by The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language (1995), and English as a Global Language (1997), and it was this last work which probably attracted the most criticism. As Crystal himself explains in his introduction, the book was originally prompted by the suggestion of Mauro Mujica, one of the leaders of the US English campaign in the United States. Its aim was to "explain to members of his organization [US English], in a succinct and factual way, and without political bias, why English has achieved such a worldwide status" (1997: ix). Crystal also explains that the report was intended originally for private circulation, but he later decided to rework and expand it into a book for wider circulation. In spite of the fact that the suggestion for the study came from Mujica, Crystal claims that "this book has not been written according to any political agenda," and that he was chiefly concerned to present an account of "the relevant facts and actors" relating to the description of a "world language," the place of English, and the future of English as a global language (1997: x). This slim book is distinguished by a number of arguments, including his assertion that the "remarkable growth" of English is, simply stated, explicable largely in terms of the fact that "it is a language which has repeatedly found itself in the right place at the right time" (1997: 110). In a similar vein, most arguments in Crystal's analysis of the future of "global English" are reducible to the evocative slogan of "having your cake and eating it," a phrase for which Crystal qua popularizer appears to have a particular fondness (1997: 138).

The book drew particular flak from Robert Phillipson, who took Crystal to task in a lengthy review in the journal Applied Linguistics, charging that the work was "Eurocentric" and "triumphantist," accusations that Crystal countered in a response in the same journal (Phillipson, 1999; Crystal, 2000). By this time, Phillipson had already established himself as one of the leading critical linguists in this field.

7 Critical Linguists

In fact, the discourse on world English(es) changed gear dramatically in 1992 with the publication of Phillipson's book Linguistic Imperialism. Whereas the 1980s saw relatively restrained arguments from Kachru and other enthusiasts in the world English(es) "movement" on the need for a paradigm shift in the study of English as an international language, this discourse
was formulated according to the game-rules of an essentially Western liberal perspective. Phillipson's arguments, however, represent a harder-edged Marxian, if not Marxist, response to the subject.

At the core of Phillipson's theoretical approach to "linguistic imperialism" are a series of arguments about the political relations between what Phillipson characterizes as the "core English-speaking countries" (Britain, the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand) and the "periphery-English countries" where English either has the status of a second language (e.g., Nigeria, India, Singapore) or is a foreign and "international link language" (e.g., Scandinavia, Japan) (1992: 17). The nature of this relationship, Phillipson argues, is one of structural and systemic inequality, in which the political and economic hegemony of Western Anglophone powers is established or maintained over scores of developing nations, particularly those formerly colonies of European powers. The political and economic power of such nations in the Third World is, moreover, accompanied by "English linguistic imperialism," defined by Phillipson in the following terms:

A working definition of English linguistic imperialism is that the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages. .. English linguistic imperialism is seen as a subtype of linguicism. (1992: 47, original emphasis)

Finally, Phillipson asks whether ELT can help create "greater linguistic and social equality," and whether "a critical ELT" can help fight linguicism (p. 319). In the final chapter on "Linguistic imperialism and ELT," Phillipson asks who has been responsible for the global spread of English in recent decades, and for the "monolingual and anglocentric" professionalism that has accompanied its teaching worldwide. The "allies in the international promotion of English" were Britain and the USA, but they, or their political leaders and cultural agencies (such as the British Council and United States Information Service (USIS) ), have only been partly responsible, as the main force, Phillipson claims, has been structural and he charges that: "The ELT policymakers themselves, in Center and Periphery, in Ministries of Education, universities, curriculum development centers and the like are part of a hegemonic structure" and that "The structure of academic imperialism has ensured that Center training and expertise have been disseminated worldwide, with change and innovative professionalism tending to be generated by the Center" (p. 305).

Phillipson's book attracted an immense response from applied linguists and sociolinguists. Fishman and Spolsky, two heavyweights active in both disciplines, gave favorable reviews, and World Englishes even devoted a special issue to a symposium on the book (Kachru, 1993). Less favorable reviews varied from the "mixed" (McArthur, 1993: 50, "painstaking, fascinating, informative, frustrating but patently well-meant book") to the dismissive (Conrad, 1996: 27, "a kind of toothless Marxism"). Another important theorist and commentator from a critical perspective has been Alastair Pennycook. Pennycook's (1994) The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language endorses Phillipson's critique of the role of applied linguistics and ELT in "helping to legitimate the contemporary capitalist order" (1994: 24), and seconds his view that Anglophone countries (Britain and America) have promoted English throughout the world "for economic and political purposes" and "to protect and promote capitalist interests" (p. 22). The final chapter calls for a radical pedagogy, concerned with the creation of "counter-discourses," "insurgent know ledges," "common counterarticulations" so that "critical English language educators" (formerly known as English teachers) join the struggle for "a critical,
transformative and listening critical pedagogy through English" (p. 326). Throughout his other writings, Pennycook has sought to advance and refine a critical perspective on both world Englishes and applied linguistics. In his latest book, *Critical Applied Linguistics* (2001), he explains that:

> Critical applied linguistics ... is more than just a critical dimension added on top of applied linguistics: It involves a constant skepticism, a constant questioning of the normative assumptions of applied linguistics and presents a way of doing applied linguistics that seeks to connect it to questions of gender, class, sexuality, race, ethnicity, culture, identity, politics, ideology and discourse. (Pennycook, 2001: 10)

Both Phillipson and Pennycook have been influential in establishing the agenda for the critical discussion of world English(es) in the last ten years or so. Related work by other authors includes Tollefson (1995, 2002), Eggington and Wren (1997), Holborow (1999), Ricento (2000), and Skutnabb-Kangas (2000).

### 8 Futurology

Two fairly recent works that have attempted to discuss the future prospects for English in the world are Crystal (1997) and Graddol (1997). Crystal, in the final chapter of *English as a Global Language*, highlights a number of issues related to the "future of global English." The issues he discusses include the anxiety about the mother tongue in societies such as India, the debate about the official English movement in the USA, and the existence and growth of the new Englishes. The first issue he addresses is that of "ownership," noting that "when even the largest English speaking nation, the USA, turns out to have only about 20 percent of the world's English speakers ... it is plain that no one can now claim sole ownership" of English, and that "[t]his is probably the best way of defining a genuinely global language" (Crystal, 1997: 130). There are those, he continues, especially in Britain, who are "uncomfortable" about this, but they have no alternative:

> Within ten years, there will certainly be more L2 speakers than L1 speakers. Within fifty years, there could be up to 50 percent more. By that time, the only possible concept of ownership will be a global one ... An inevitable consequence of this development is that the language will become open to the winds of linguistic change in totally unpredictable ways. The spread of English around the world has already demonstrated this, in the emergence of new varieties of English in the different territories where the language has taken root. The change has become a major talking point only since the 1960s, hence the term by which these varieties are often known: "new Englishes." (pp. 130-1)

Instead of fragmented, unintelligible varieties, however, Crystal identifies a new, unifying dialect, that of "World Standard Spoken English" (WSSE), which he now sees developing worldwide:

> People would still have dialects for use within their own country, but when the need came to communicate with people from other countries they would slip into WSSE ... People who attend international conferences, or who write scripts for an international audience, or who are "talking" on the Internet have probably already felt the pull of this new variety. It takes the form, for example, of consciously avoiding a word or phrase which you know is not going to be understood outside your
own country, and of finding an alternative form of expression ... it is too early to be definite about the way this variety will develop. WSSE is still in its infancy. Indeed, it has hardly yet been born. (pp. 137-8)

Graddol's (1997) *The Future of English?* was commissioned and published by the British Council's English 2000 project, the final section of which is devoted to "English in the future." Graddol identifies two major issues linked to the notion of "world standard English": (1) whether English will fragment into many different languages (the Quirk-Kachru debate); and (2) whether US and British English will continue to serve as models of correctness, or whether a "new world standard" will emerge. In contrast to Crystal, Graddol rejects world standard English and predicts a "polycentric" future for English standards in the future, presenting a number of analyses of economic and sociopolitical effects of the spread of English. Graddol's "state-of-the-art" report on English also illustrates the rapid shift in the last 30 years from a focus on "the linguistic" (as in early studies of varieties of English) to an increasing preoccupation with "the extra-linguistic," e.g., the socio-economics of globalization in Graddol, and the Marxism, dependency theory, and postcolonial theorizing of Phillipson and Pennycook.

9 Conclusion

The review of the literature in the preceding section demonstrates just how far the debates and discourses on world English(es) and new Englishes have come since the identification of this topic in sociolinguistics and applied linguistics in the late 1970s and early 1980s. As is indicated above, there are currently a number of overlapping and intersecting approaches to this field of inquiry. What also emerges from this survey, however, is a changing disciplinary and discoursal map, marked by a series of paradigm shifts in the last 20 years. In this final section, we might now pause to consider the implications of such approaches for applied linguistics. The kinds of responses that are possible in this context will depend on a range of factors, including different understandings of the field of "applied linguistics."

For some, applied linguistics has the status of an independent discipline associated with its own body of theory and methodologies, while, for others, it is seen as "mediating" between such parent disciplines as education, linguistics, psychology, sociology, etc. and various forms of problem-solving activities, especially those associated with language learning and language teaching. In this latter context, for example, Widdowson has commented that applied linguistics is "an activity which seeks to identify, within the disciplines concerned with language and learning, those insights and procedures and their effective actualization in practice" (1990: 6, cited in Cook and Seidlhofer, 1995: 8). For the purposes of this short conclusion, I will assume that the term is capable of two broad definitions: in the first sense, as a wide ranging area of interdisciplinary theory and activity of relevance to such fields as linguistics, psycholinguistics, and sociolinguistics; and in a second sense, as a rather narrower field of activity mainly concerned, following Widdowson, with pedagogic principles and practices.

The significance of world Englishes for applied linguistics in the first and wider sense is profound, challenging the discipline to come to terms with a wide range of issues, descriptive and theoretical, linked to the unprecedented impact of English throughout the world. Current studies suggest that there are now an estimated 375 million users of English in Inner-Circle societies, 375 million in Outer-Circle (ESL) societies, and around 750-1,000 million in the Expanding (EFL) Circle (McArthur, 2001). Other statistics suggest that in Asia alone the number
of English users now totals over 600 million people, including over 300 million in India, and over 200 million in China. Virtually every Asian city has an English language newspaper, and many societies in the region also provide English language programs on radio and television. English is also an important pan-Asian lingua franca in the business world, so that, for example, when a factory manager from Vietnam sells garments to a Singaporean merchandiser, the language of choice is usually English. The dominant trend over recent decades is that more and more Asian people are speaking more and more English, and they are speaking it mainly to other Asians (Kachru, 1997b).

The vast majority of teachers of English as a second and foreign language in the world today are "non-native" teachers working in a wide range of settings in Outer-Circle and Expanding-Circle societies. The number of secondary school teachers of English in China alone now totals around 500,000 (Bolton, 2003). In Outer-Circle Asian societies such as Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines (as well as a host of African societies), such teachers operate in sociolinguistic contexts where English has established de facto international norms, often at variance with the exonormative targets of traditional teaching materials. In situations such as these, the maintenance of traditional target norms of English proficiency may not only lack realism but may also contribute to the stigmatization of the norms of local users (including teachers and learners), contributing to a "culture of complaint" rather than "a culture of confidence" (Bolton, 2002b).

In addition, the "nativization" of English in many such societies has been accompanied by the "Englishization" of many indigenous languages, leading to complex patterns of contact linguistics, including lexical transfer, code switching and code mixing, and discoursal and syntactic change and accommodation. The interface of English with both local languages and national vernaculars throughout many parts of the world presents applied linguistics (in "sense 1") with a series of challenges: linguistic (the description and analysis of language systems), sociolinguistic (providing adequate accounts of context and language use), and psycholinguistic (in assessing or reformulating extant models of first and second-language acquisition). In this latter context, the notion of "native speaker" has come under increasing scrutiny (Davies, 1991; Singh, 1998). At the same time, despite the greater recognition accorded to the Englishes of Africa and Asia in the area in recent years, considerable problems for applied linguistics still exist in the area of pedagogic principles and practices (applied linguistics in "sense 2" terms). In many Outer-Circle societies, questions linked to norms and codification are typically unresolved. For example, even though some educationalists in societies such as Hong Kong and the Philippines have started to recognize local norms of educated speech, official attitudes frequently remain ambivalent at best. Attitudes vary considerably from one society to the next, with Filipino teachers often rejecting the imposition of American norms, while Hong Kong teachers continue to express deference to the norms of the "native speaker." Nor is it clear that the official endorsement of "local standards" would necessarily further the world Englishes cause, especially when one considers that varieties are typically caught not taught, and questions of norms and standards are invariably embedded in the particular language cultures and traditions of such societies. One possible innovation that might be considered here, however, is a much-increased provision of courses on "language awareness" (dealing with issues related to world Englishes) for teachers, teacher trainers, and other educators not only in Outer- or Expanding-Circle societies, but also for comparable groups in such Inner-Circle societies as the USA, UK, Australia, Canada, etc. The expanded accessibility of programs of this kind may help to clear
the space for new and creative approaches to language education and the teaching of English, in a range of contexts worldwide.

Kachru himself discusses these and related issues in a 1990 paper entitled "World Englishes and applied linguistics" where he notes the limitations of traditional applied linguistics perspectives on world Englishes, suggesting that these had been skewed by the ethnocentrism of Inner-Circle practitioners, reliance on interlanguage and error analysis frameworks, and misconceptions concerning the sociolinguistic realities of multilingual Outer-Circle societies (Kachru, 1990). A later paper by Kachru and Nelson (1996) goes on to explore the ways in which the world Englishes approach might be adopted within the language classroom, suggesting a number of imaginative strategies that might be employed in teaching Englishes across a variety of educational settings, including multicultural education, the teaching of discourse pragmatics, and the teaching of new literatures in English (see also Kachru, 1997a).

Brown (2000) surveys the resources for research and teaching in the field, and suggests a range of research and applied agendas for world Englishes. At the level of applied linguistics research, these include longitudinal studies of values and attitudes, textual studies in multicultural communities, empirical studies of attitude development and change, and world Englishes-based research on second-language acquisition. Related educational research might then involve comparative classroom-based studies across the three circles (what have elsewhere been dubbed ENL, ESL, and EFL contexts), and the evaluation of learning/teaching materials. Brown also suggests an activist role for world Englishes scholars in organizing conferences, publishing, designing texts and curricular, and playing a leadership role in professional communities worldwide (see also Kachru, 1997a; and Matsuda, 2002).

In the last ten years or so, there has been a growing awareness of the world Englishes paradigm among applied linguists and others in Outer-Circle English-using African and Asian societies. There has also been an evident response to the world Englishes paradigm in many academic circles in the USA, partly in resonance, one speculates, to the relatively high levels of immigration to the United States from Asian societies in recent years, and a nascent awareness of world Englishes in an immigrant context (Lippi-Green, 1997). In other educational settings, such as Europe, with its own crowded ecology of former colonial languages such as French, German, and Spanish, the academic response to the world Englishes paradigm has been mixed.

One particularly acute problem at present remains the center-periphery domination in what has been called "English language industry" (McArthur, 2001) throughout the world. Academic publishing and textbook publishing in both applied linguistics and English language teaching is largely controlled by a small number of publishing houses based in the UK and USA, who rely on a relatively small number of experts for their expertise and professionalism. Historically, however, applied linguistics in both these societies did not arise in a sociopolitical vacuum, but came out of two rather different sets of experiences. In the case of Britain, applied linguistics emerged as a discipline during the 1960s and 1970s when significant numbers of English language specialists were recruited to assist in various educational projects in decolonizing Commonwealth societies. In the USA, in recent decades, the greatest impetus to applied linguistics and TESOL has come from immigrant education and ESL programs in the college and university context. Both approaches seem now to have coalesced around a body of shared practices, professionalism, and theory (see, for example, Candlin and Mercer, 2001; Carter and Nunan, 2001; Kaplan, 2002). Despite what may be the best intentions of Western practitioners to develop an unbiased or at least politically neutral applied linguistics at the level of theory as well as pedagogic principles, it is difficult to ignore the imbalance between the developed and
developing world in many of the contexts of English language teaching today. English language teachers in many of the Outer-Circle and Expanding-Circle contexts face difficulties in terms of conditions, facilities, and resources undreamed of in comparable Western institutions. Academics from these societies have parallel difficulties in finding a voice in major journals in the field (although notable exceptions include *English Today* and *World Englishes*), as well as in book production.

In this context, the Kachruvian approach offers a politics that is balanced between the pragmatic recognition of the spread of English(es) and the critical scrutiny of native-speaker ideologies from the Inner Circle. It also affirms the pluricentricity and inclusivity signposted by Kachru and Smith in their first editorial statement for the *World Englishes* journal: "The editorial board considers the native and non-native users of English as equal partners in deliberations on uses of English and its teaching internationally ... The acronym WE therefore aptly symbolizes the underlying philosophy of the journal and the aspirations of the Editorial Board" (Kachru and Smith, 1985: 210). Whether that vision is realizable depends partly on the flow of ideas and insights in at least two directions. A consideration of world Englishes is important to applied linguistics for a range of reasons. Not least because researchers and teachers from Europe and North America may have much to learn from the experiences of the Outer and Expanding Circles, both at levels of theory and description, and in the consideration of pedagogic "principles" and "practice." At an individual level, the English language now plays an important role in the lives of a rapidly increasing proportion of the world's population. From a global perspective, the sociolinguistically complex sites of English-using African and Asian societies are no mere exotic sideshow, but important sites of contact, negotiation, and linguistic and literary creativity. From the perspective of applied linguistics, perhaps the major challenge from world Englishes is how the center-periphery balance might be best redressed, or "re-centered" and "pluricentered." This, however, is likely to be no easy task, given the continuing tendency at present, within both academia and publishing, toward the apparent commodification and homogenization of much of the work in this field, both theoretical and pedagogical.
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