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Abstract: This article surveys current approaches to world Englishes (WE), provides a review of recent critiques of the world Englishes paradigm, and considers the ways in which the theorisation of world Englishes faces new challenges related to the effects of globalisation, as well as possible responses to such changes. This it does specifically by examining the sociolinguistic backgrounds and experiences of two groups of young people in Hong Kong and Guangzhou, and the complicated multilingual realities of their language worlds, in two cities geographically adjacent, but separated by a political border. Following Blommaert’s (2010) discussion of the sociolinguistics of globalisation, the article then moves on to speculate whether the notion of ‘language world’ has the theoretical potential to extend the WE paradigm to accommodate transnational perspectives on world Englishes.
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1 Introduction

Over the last three or four decades, the term ‘world Englishes’ (WE) has been widely used to refer to localised forms of English found throughout the world, particularly in the Caribbean, parts of Africa, and many societies in Asia. Today, it is generally accepted that promotion and acceptance of the world Englishes paradigm has fundamentally changed the study of English linguistics, particularly from a sociolinguistic perspective. This article sets out to review current approaches to world Englishes, and to discuss the ways in which the world Englishes paradigm has recently begun to shift, in order to accommodate the new realities of English in a globalising world, as well as academic and intellectual responses to such changes.1 This it does specifically by examining the sociolinguistic backgrounds and experiences of two groups of young people in South China, and the complicated multilingual

---

1 This article is presented to this volume in recognition of the contribution of Professor Philip Shaw to research on world Englishes through his important publications in this field and through his careful and insightful teaching of this subject to several generations of students in the Department of English at Stockholm University.
realities of their language worlds. Following this, the article finally moves on
to speculate whether the notion of language world has the theoretical poten­
tial to extend the WE paradigm to accommodate transnational perspectives
on world Englishes.

2 Approaches to world Englishes

Prior to the 1980s, discussions of English worldwide typically employed a
normative lexicon that rested on the distinction between ‘native speaker’ and
‘non-native speaker’, resulting in such categories of description as English as
a Native Language (ENL), English as a Second Language (ESL), English as
a Foreign Language (EFL), and English as an International Language (EIL).
Current debates about the status, functions, and features of varieties of Eng­
lish around the world date back to the mid-nineteen sixties, and, most fa­
mously, to the work of Halliday, MacIntosh and Strevens, who at that time
were given to assert 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 an increasingly large number of different varieties” (Halliday, MacIntosh
& Strevens 1964: 293). Twelve years later, Larry Smith described English as
“an international auxiliary language”, and asserted that it was “time to stop
calling it a foreign language or second language”, suggesting instead the
term “EIAL” (English as an International Auxiliary Language), which, he
asserted, “more accurately reflects the present state of English language
usage around the globe” (Smith 1976: 39). From the early 1980s onwards,
the work of Braj Kachru, Larry Smith and others argued for the recognition
of ‘Englishes’ in the plural, as in ‘varieties of English’, ‘international Eng­
lishes’, ‘new Englishes’, ‘English languages’ and ‘world Englishes’. Follow­
ing this, the last three decades have seen the rise of this area as a site for
scholarly research and publication, with three major academic journals—
*English Today*, *English Worldwide*, and *World Englishes*—specialising in
such studies, as well as numerous book-length studies dealing with research
in this area, including Melchers & Shaw (2003, 2011), entitled *World Eng­
lishes*.

The term ‘world Englishes’ may be understood as having both a narrower
and wider application. The narrow application of the term refers to schools
of thought closely associated with the approach to the study of English
worldwide pioneered by Professor Braj B. Kachru and a group of closely­
related scholars. The wider application of the concept subsumes many dif­
ferent approaches to the study of English worldwide (including varieties­
based studies) ranging from the Celtic Englishes of Britain, through diverse
varieties in the USA, Australia, New Zealand, and Africa to English in Eu­
rope and Asia, as well as the study of discourse and genre in those contexts
Table 1. Approaches to world Englishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English studies</strong></td>
<td>The analysis of varieties of English from a synchronic and historical perspective, against a tradition of English Studies (Anglistik), dating from the late 19th century.</td>
<td>1960s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English corpus linguistics</strong></td>
<td>The detailed linguistic description of world Englishes from a features perspective, typically using corpus data to investigate grammatical variation.</td>
<td>1990s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociology of language</strong></td>
<td>Research on English in relation to such issues as language maintenance/shift, and ethnolinguistic identity.</td>
<td>1960s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Features-based’ approaches</strong></td>
<td>The description of English through dialectological and variationist methodologies. Situated against the long tradition of British and European dialectology.</td>
<td>1980s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kachruvian studies</strong></td>
<td>The promotion of a pluricentric approach to world Englishes, highlighting both the ‘sociolinguistic realities’ and ‘bilingual creativity’ of Outer Circle (and Expanding Circle) societies.</td>
<td>1980s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pidgin and creole studies</strong></td>
<td>The description and analysis of ‘mixed’ languages and the dynamics of linguistic hybridisation (beginning with the early work of Hugo Schuchardt 1842–1927).</td>
<td>1930s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applied linguistics</strong></td>
<td>The exploration of the implications of world Englishes for language learning and teaching.</td>
<td>1960s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lexicography</strong></td>
<td>The codification of vocabularies of English worldwide, linked to particular post-colonial societies and issues of linguistic autonomy.</td>
<td>1980s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularisers</strong></td>
<td>The publication of books on English worldwide aimed at a wider reading public.</td>
<td>1980s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical linguistics</strong></td>
<td>The expression of resistance to the linguistic imperialism and cultural hegemony of English, in tandem with resistance to Anglo-American political power.</td>
<td>1990s–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic futurology</strong></td>
<td>The discussion of future scenarios for the spread of English and English language teaching worldwide.</td>
<td>1997–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English as lingua franca (ELF)</strong></td>
<td>An approach to international English focusing on those contexts, e.g. universities and international businesses, where English is used as a common language by speakers of many different nationalities.</td>
<td>Late 1990s–present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where English is regarded as a second or foreign language. Elsewhere, I have pointed out that research on world Englishes in the widest sense includes at least a dozen distinct approaches including those of English studies, corpus linguistics, the sociology of language, features-based and dialectological studies, pidgin and creole research, ‘Kachruvian’ linguistics, lexicographical approaches, popular accounts, critical linguistics, and futurological approaches (Bolton 2004, 2006). To this list, we might now add current work on English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), a recently-emergent approach to English as an international language, which is now proving particularly popular in Europe (Bolton 2011). These approaches are illustrated in Table 1 above.

Although Table 1 is somewhat reductive and simplified in its description of various approaches, it is hoped that it at least shows the wide diversity of approaches now associated with research, publications and teaching concerned with ‘world Englishes’ in its widest sense (see Bolton 2003, 2004 for a more detailed discussion of such approaches).

3 Recent debates on world Englishes

Since the 1980s, a pluricentric and pluralistic approach to the Englishes or English languages of the world has become so well-established that this now constitutes something of an orthodoxy in contemporary English language studies and sociolinguistics. To such an extent, perhaps, that various linguists have begun to question or at least problematise various aspects of the world Englishes approach to English language studies and applied linguistics. One continuing source of debate in this area comes from scholars committed to the analysis of ‘linguistic imperialism’, an area of discussion of key concern to many concerned with the continuing spread of English, and its potential as a ‘killer language’ threatening cultural and linguistic diversity. The founding document in this arena, Robert Phillipson’s (1992) Linguistic Imperialism was a landmark publication, which subsequently politicised the debate on world Englishes and related issues. At the centre of Phillipson’s theoretical approach to “linguistic imperialism” are a series of arguments about the political relations between 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 former colonies of European powers, contributing to “English linguistic imperialism”, where “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained
by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (1992: 47, original emphasis).

Phillipson’s voice in the early 1990s was original and persuasive and influenced the work of many others, including, notably, Canagarajah (1999), Pennycook (1994, 2001), as well as numerous others. However, while Phillipson’s perspective was uncritical of the world Englishes approach at first, his attitude seems to have changed somewhat in recent years. By 2009, Phillipson was maintaining that “global English” was a “capitalist neoimperial language that serves the interests of the corporate world and the governments that it influences”, and was asserting that, in this context, “[t]here are serious theoretical and empirical weaknesses in the way world Englishes are classified and analyzed” (Phillipson 2009: 132, 164–165). In the same year, in an interview, Phillipson further commented that “[m]ost work on World Englishes in the Kachruvian sense is purely descriptive, and an oversimplification of the complexity of the sociolinguistics of English in multilingual settings” (Phillipson 2010). Comments in similar vein have also been voiced by Pennycook (2001), charging that the world Englishes paradigm has been politically naïve in its application (see also Bolton 2005). Other criticisms of the WE approach have been penned by such linguists as Bruthiaux (2003) and Saraceni (2010). The criticisms of both these authors have largely focused on the ‘circles of English’ model of the Kachruvian approach, with Bruthiaux describing this as “largely monolithic and standardized”, and also questioning the validity of the Expanding Circle concept, as “it is not always clear whether the concept is meant to cover countries, country-based varieties, speakers, or non- (or barely-) speaking learners” (Bruthiaux 2003: 167).

In Saraceni’s recent 2010 book on Relocating English, a similar set of criticisms is voiced, with the author arguing that the world Englishes approach inadvertently replicates “a theoretically flawed and ideologically Eurocentric conceptualisation of language” not least through the use of the term ‘Inner Circle’ to refer to societies such as the UK, US, etc. where English has historically been the dominant language (Saraceni 2010: 81). Saraceni notes pointedly that, attitudinally, the WE paradigm shift has largely taken place within certain fields of academia, but that the move to decentralise the ‘English language’ has achieved only limited success outside the narrow confines of universities. One major strand of his argument here is that the WE-paradigm (both in the Kachruvian and other ‘features-based’ approaches) has been too heavily invested in the linguistic description of geographically-distributed ‘varieties’ of English, associated with studies of particular societies, where, for example, descriptions of ‘Ghanaian English’, ‘Kenyan English’, ‘Malaysian English’, or ‘Singapore English’ are neatly packaged in terms of their distinctive lexis, phonology, or grammatical features. In many ‘Outer Circle’ societies such as India, Malaysia, the Philip-
pines, moreover, the move to describe and valorise such local varieties as 'Indian English', 'Malaysian English', etc., has met with only very limited success. Instead, many people in such societies (including businessmen and policy-makers) frequently associate local varieties of the language with a 'sub-standard' or 'inferior' command of English. It is therefore ironic, Saraceni notes, that a features-based approach to varieties of English often undermines a central aspiration of the WE approach to acknowledge and respect regional variations, and may instead facilitate the stigmatisation of localised varieties of English, commenting that: “Non-Inner-Circle varieties of English are described according to parameters that have been set in the Inner Circle, for the Inner Circle and by the Inner Circle” (Saraceni 2010: 81).

Saraceni’s argument on the disjuncture between academic and lay discourses on world Englishes is directly relevant to a number of Asian societies, including most Asian settings, including Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines, the major Asian Outer-Circle societies. The valorisation of regional varieties of English that now achieves prominence through many academic studies of English worldwide is visibly at odds with public debates on language in many Outer Circle societies, even in such well-established contexts as India or Singapore, where it might be assumed that there was by now a general acceptance of 'Indian English' or 'Singaporean English' in the community. Not untypically, the well-intentioned linguist (arriving from abroad) embarking on research in New Delhi may be told by his hosts that the notion of Indian English is ill-conceived, and informed that educated Indians continue to strive for a command of the 'Queen’s English'. Similarly, the sociolinguist arriving in Singapore soon has to come to terms with the diverse issues attendant on the “Speak Good English Movement”, and with the official or semi-official disavowal of ‘Singlish’ as ‘broken’ or ‘poor’ English (Goh 2011). At another level, across Asia, Europe, and elsewhere, the traditional dichotomy between ESL and EFL (or Outer versus Expanding Circle) contexts, is becoming somewhat blurred, partly because of patterns of migration and mobility, associated with globalisation. As a result, the somewhat traditional geographical (and dialectal) approach to international varieties of English, where each regional variety is associated with a distinct set of distinctive phonological, lexical and grammatical features, may now need re-examination, and re-conceptualisation.
4 World Englishes and the sociolinguistics of globalisation

The world Englishes paradigm in its initial and classic form arguably influenced English studies most powerfully in the 1980s and early 1990s. In its challenges to traditional approaches to English linguistics (in, for example, the Kachru-Quirk debate of 1990–91), it represented a fresh, new, innovative and pluralistic vision of English studies, at a time when English was dramatically spreading through educational systems, the mass media, and public life in many very different societies across the world. From the mid-1990s onwards, this spread of the English language became increasingly associated with the complex of forces associated with ‘globalisation’. While this is itself a contentious term capable of multiple definitions, for many it is broadly understood, in the contemporary context, as that form of capitalism associated with ‘post-industrialism’ and ‘post-modernity’, associated with global flows of capital, goods, and people across international borders (Beynon & Dunkerley 2000).

As Mufwene (2010) has pointed out, however, despite the well-attested spread of English globally, in both Outer and Expanding contexts, “multilingualism has been the norm” and “the fear that it will drive indigenous languages out to extinction remains an unsubstantiated myth” (2010: 48). Given this one important challenge for WE research as it moves forward is to investigate the interaction between English and multilingual language ecologies in finer-grained detail than in the past, which may involve new frameworks accommodating code alternation, hybridisation and fresh perspectives on linguistic contact. One important response to such a challenge, I would suggest, is provided by the framework set out in Blommaert’s (2010) volume on The Sociolinguistics of Globalization. Here, in considering the effects of contemporary globalisation on language and linguistics, Blommaert stresses the importance of mobility, at a number of levels, affirming that globalization forces sociolinguistics to unthink its classic distinctions and biases and to rethink itself as a sociolinguistics of mobile resources, framed in terms of trans-contextual networks, flows and movements. This unthinking and rethinking is long overdue [...] and sociolinguistics still bears many marks of its own peculiar history, as it has focused on static variation, on local distribution of varieties, on stratified language contact, and so on. (Blommaert 2010: 1)

Elsewhere Blommaert argues that the reconceptualisation of the object of study involves a shift from “a language” as a static system to language as a mobile resource, and a shift away from the traditional notion of a “speech community”, to a perspective where “language exists in and for mobility across space and time” (181). Mobility in Blommaert’s framework not only refers to horizontal, geographical mobility, but also to social and economic
mobility. Thus the deployment of a new language or code may reflect a shift of physical location, or a change (or attempted change) in social identity, orientation, or status. At the core of this theorisation is an appeal for a re-imagining of research protocols, to fully accommodate the shifting boundaries of the world and its languages, involving a critique of traditional language studies:

It is a critique of the Saussurean synchrony—a view of sociolinguistic reality in which language is undressed, so to speak, and robbed of the spatial and temporal features that define its occurrence, meaning and function in real social life. [...] We need to replace it with a view of language as something intrinsically and perpetually mobile, through space as well as time, and made for mobility. The finality of language is mobility, not immobility. [...] Now that times have changed and we are looking at a world that can no longer be neatly divided into clear and transparent categories, the theoretical paradigms need to be revised as well. (Blommaert 2010: xiv).

Blommaert draws evidence to support his arguments from a diverse range of multilingual and heteroglossic contexts, including a Tokyo department store, London’s Chinatown, Swahili fiction, South African schools, golf advertisements from Belgium and China, and an asylum application submitted to the UK government from a Rwandan refugee. Many of his insights may also be applicable, however, to other settings, including the often multilingually-complex sites of world Englishes research.

5 Hong Kong, Guangzhou and the ‘language worlds’ of young people

One highly complex sociolinguistic area which has been directly affected by various waves of changes—economic, political and social—directly linked to globalisation is the Pearl River Delta of Guangdong province in southern China. This area has been at the heart of China’s industrial modernisation and economic growth for the last thirty years, and is home to two of China’s most important cities, Hong Kong and Guangzhou (historically known as “Canton”), separated by some 119 kilometres.

Although both cities are now officially subject to Chinese rule, the sociopolitical and sociolinguistic realities of these two metropolises, separated by a network of fortified borders, are very different. The city of Guangzhou dates from 200 BC, while the urban development of Hong Kong dates from its annexation by the British in 1842. Hong Kong remained a British crown colony from that date until 1997. Its current population is around seven million, compared with Guangzhou’s approximate thirteen million. Guangzhou is subject to the full force of Chinese law (and the rule of the Communist Party), including its language law, while Hong Kong still enjoys a high de-
gree of autonomy under the principle of ‘one country, two systems’, which was formulated prior to the resumption of Chinese sovereignty. In Hong Kong, the government’s official language policy is that of ‘trilingualism’ (spoken Cantonese, English, Putonghua), and ‘biliteracy’ (written Chinese and English). China’s official national policy, as applied across the border, centres on the promotion of spoken Putonghua and simplified characters, and, very understandably, accords no special recognition to English.

Another important difference between the two societies from a linguistic perspective is the simple fact that, in Hong Kong, a great deal more is known about the languages of the community than in Guangzhou. Partly this is due to the fact that a great deal of sociolinguistic research has been carried out in Hong Kong, particularly over the last three decades or so. It is also an artifact of colonialism, however, as the colonial government first began to ask questions about language in its household censuses as early as 1911. In Guangzhou, official data concerning the linguistic ecology of the city is not readily available, and instead sociolinguists largely rely on anecdotal observations of the situation. Today, such observations suggest that Cantonese is now perceived as endangered in its traditional citadel, both as a result of the promotion of Putonghua (Mandarin) in schools throughout the city, and because of massive in-migration to Guangzhou from many other parts of China. In Hong Kong, by contrast, the 2011 census indicated that around 90% of the population claim Cantonese as their ‘usual language’, compared with 3.5% for English, 1.4% for Putonghua, and smaller percentages for
minority Chinese dialects, such as Chiu Chau, Fukien, Hakka, Shanghainese, and such minority languages as Filipino, Indonesian, and Japanese. In broad terms, then, Hong Kong may be regarded as the Cantonese-speaking capital of China, and, by extension, the world.

5.1 Interviews with Guangzhou and Hong Kong university students

In order to investigate the shifting linguistic terrain in both Hong Kong (HK) and Guangzhou (GZ), in November 2012 I interviewed two groups of young university students; one from City University in Hong Kong, and the other from Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, both groups of students majoring in English. The ages of the HK students ranged from 20 to 23, while the GZ students ranged from 19 to 22. Each group was composed of four students, although the gender balance differed, with two males and two females in the Hong Kong group, and only one male student in the Guangzhou group. The four HK students all claimed to be trilingual, with three of the four reporting a working knowledge of Cantonese, English and Putonghua, while the fourth (female) student claimed a knowledge of English, Cantonese, and French. Three GZ students were born in Guangdong province and all claimed to know Cantonese, English and Putonghua, whereas the fourth—from Henan province—reported a knowledge of English, Putonghua, and Henan dialect. In addition, two of the four students claimed a working knowledge of French, and one a knowledge of German.

One assumption underlying this research was that the linguistic experiences of these two groups of students would be markedly different, especially with regard to English. The Hong Kong students, after all, were based in a society where English had official status, thus indicating an Outer Circle situation, compared with Guangzhou, which clearly corresponded more closely to an Expanding Circle context. It was thus anticipated that the Hong Kong students would have had a greater exposure to English, both at home and in the wider society. In addition, as noted, there were obvious differences in the balance of Chinese languages in the two cities, as in Hong Kong it was clear that Cantonese still retained a great deal of prestige and was much more widely used in such public domains as government, education, and the mass media, whereas, across the border, in Guangzhou, use of the regional language was now increasingly limited to the home domain and vernacular settings.

To a large degree, such assumptions were generally confirmed by the results of the interviews, as the interviewees’ responses often recorded quite different experiences and attitudes from the two groups. In the case of English, the Hong Kong students (John, Michael, June and Maria) all mentioned varying degrees of use of the language within the home setting, and also
exposure to international education from an early age. For example, one of the male students had received his primary education in Hong Kong, while the other had received elementary education in the US. One of female students also had a history of education in Canada, and had then completed her education in international schools in Beijing and Hong Kong. The fourth HK student came from a bi-racial background, with an English father and Macanese (Macau) mother. The individual histories of all these students attested to the language history of South China throughout recent history, with patterns of mobility across Greater China, combined with extensive overseas travel. In notable contrast, the Guangzhou students all reported having learnt English primarily through education, and had had much less opportunity to travel overseas.

5.2 The interviews transcribed

For the purposes of the interview, the two groups were given similar questions relating to the ‘most important languages’ in their communities, the ‘importance of English’, and the ‘language worlds’ of themselves and their parents. The students were asked to discuss and debate these issues amongst themselves. Both sets of interviews (conducted separately in Hong Kong and Guangzhou) took place in a very relaxed setting, where a conscious attempt was made to put students at ease, through the provision of refreshments and casual conversation, before the recording took place. The discussions were then video-recorded, and transcribed. In answer to the first question, on the most important languages in their community, the GZ students reported, predictably, that English had only a limited reach in Guangzhou society, as the extracts in 5.2.1 below indicate.

5.2.1 Guangzhou students on the ‘most important languages’ of their city

Patricia: I think the language well, in Guangzhou is mainly the combination of Putonghua and Cantonese, and if you know either language, you can live really well in the city. But I think English, it's not really necessary if you just want to live in the city. Because most of the people [...] they will not speak English in their daily life. (GZ)

Peter: And actually as a English major. I feel very comfortable speaking English during the class but once I was out of the class, I feel a little bit awkward and a little embarrassed to speak English, I always have this feeling like people will look at you and think you are being pretentious; you know how to speak Mandarin and Cantonese, why you use English instead. So I don’t think English is very necessary in Guangdong, also in Guangzhou. (GZ)

Mandy: I think in Guangzhou, even if you just speak Mandarin, it's totally okay. Because Guangzhou now, it's a very. I don't know how to put it, but, publicly speaking Cantonese is but very rare, because there are too many im-
migrants. But knowing how to speak Cantonese can give you a sense of belonging, makes you more effective for the city. [...] Sense of belonging. But English is not very useful. (GZ)

**Peter:** Yeah, [...] English is not very necessary. (GZ)

As is clear from the above, in terms of everyday experience, in the minds of these young Guangzhou students, English is only of limited utility in the city, and as Mandy indicates, the most important language in the city for many is now Mandarin (Putonghua). The extracts from the discussion of the HK students, however, indicate a very different balance of languages in Hong Kong.

### 5.2.2 Hong Kong students on the ‘most important languages’ of their city

**Michael:** Basically, I think that in Hong Kong, the most commonly spoken language is Cantonese, which is a dialect of Chinese, the mother language. But apart from that, English is also very common, when spoke, when used in Hong Kong, especially in business context. (HK)

**John:** Well, I’ll agree with you that there’s in business context, English is used a lot [...] but we definitely we have to acknowledge that there is a trend of increasing more and more Putonghua in the city because of the tourists and because of the people who are actually coming and investing in Hong Kong and they well, they sort of rely Hong Kong people to speak Putonghua to them and not Cantonese or English. [...] I don’t know how many of you experience this, going into a shopping mall, and then the sales will be actually speaking to you in Putonghua. And you’ll be thinking, I speak perfect Cantonese and perfect English and you speak Putonghua to me. (HK)

In the above, Michael’s comments clearly attest to the importance of both Cantonese and English, while John’s remarks reflect the recent impact of the millions of mainland tourists recently permitted to visit Hong Kong (since the SARS epidemic of 2003), and who spend a substantial amount of their time shopping for clothes, food, milk powder, and other items.

### 5.2.3 Guangzhou students on the ‘importance of English’

The question about the importance of English drew a range of responses from the Guangzhou (GZ) students. Interestingly, two of the female students interpreted the question in intellectual and aesthetic terms, with Jennifer referring to the ‘beauty’ of English literature:

**Jennifer:** I think if I don’t know English, I can’t feel the beauty of some English literature, even they are have been translated in Chinese, in different versions. For example, I am studying the Shakespeare [...] And when I really did plays, [and] studied the language of Shakespeare, I suddenly found his language is so beautiful. But when I’m reading the Chinese version, I cannot understand what he’s talking about. (GZ)
Mandy saw the question in cultural terms, and argued that her world view would be directly affected, and that the absence of a command of English would change her perception of the world substantially:

**Mandy:** I think if I imagine I don't know English at all, I almost couldn't imagine it. Because language is not just about language, it's about a culture and your way of thing, it's about all the things. [...] Maybe if I don't know English, my daily life will not change, I would eat, I would sleep, I would walk, I would talk, just not in English but what I thought will be different and how I perceive the world would be totally different. (GZ)

For Peter, the importance of English was directly related to his future career plans, as well as his image of himself as a specialist in English studies.

**Peter:** Well I think English is very important to me [...] I think English makes who I am now cos I'm picturing myself as a people who are good at English. So, without English, I don't know how to distinguish me and other people. [...] Because maybe I still want to be an interpreter in the future so if I don't know English, then I don't know, I may change my whole plan for my life. (GZ)

The mention of career plans by Peter then prompted similar responses from the other students, including Patricia who was planning a career as an English teacher, and Jennifer who had recently finished an internship, where she had used her English skills. Mandy, in response, conceded the practical benefits of knowing English, but also noted that the importance of the language went beyond career prospects.

**Mandy:** Yeah, I agree with Patricia, just for realistic reason, English is very important and useful in our career. Even if you want to go into government where you don’t need English at all, they still require you to be very proficient in English. I think English, to me, the significance, is beyond career aspects. It’s a new world that it brings me. (GZ)

5.2.4 Hong Kong students on the ‘importance of English’

In fairly dramatic contrast, the views of the Hong Kong students focused almost exclusively on the utility of English for their intended future careers in teaching, law, and public relations, in clear instrumental terms.

**Maria:** For me, I'm currently teaching English to children so of course English is really important. I haven't thought of a dream career, but if I don’t think of anything else, I’m thinking of becoming a primary school teacher in English. So of course English would be really really important, especially because my Chinese isn’t that good. (HK)

**Michael:** Well, to me, [I’m] not trying to exaggerate. I think, if I didn’t know English or English wasn't available to me, that would be catastrophic cause because [...] I’m planning to take another two year law degree in Hong Kong,
which [...] they offer in English. If I didn’t know English, let alone my future career, just my studies, I’ll probably have to end up somewhere in probably a fast-food shop, serving MacDonalds. (HK)

June: I think in the industry I want to be in, English publishing, most of the people I will communicate with probably speak in English. Without English, how can it benefit or anything? My plan B would be PR, what Maria said, a lot of PR would require both of English and Chinese. But there are some who actually have two different people. (HK)

The fourth Hong Kong student, John, even asserted the dominance of English in his personal life, including his choice of friends.

John: Career wise, English is crucial. [...] And in terms of my personal life, I also can’t imagine without English what will my life looks like. 90% of media, or TV shows I actually watch nowadays are in English, songs are as well in English, books I read, I only read English books nowadays. [...] Anyway, I like my friends to know good English [...] cos I sometimes I can’t find [friends who know good English]

Perhaps the most interesting comments of all, from both groups, came in response to one question which asked them to compare the ‘language world’ that they inhabited with the language world(s) of their parents.

The notion of ‘language world’ itself was a notion that emerged, in pre-theoretical and programmatic fashion, after I returned to Hong Kong in 2009, after a six-year hiatus from teaching in the territory. Previously, my own experience of teaching Hong Kong university students had been largely gained over two decades from the early 1980s until the very early 2000s. During this period, the vast majority of students I came into contact with had been born in Hong Kong, came from Cantonese-speaking homes, and had overwhelmingly been educated in local schools. The educational world I encountered on returning to Hong Kong in 2009 was noticeably different from that of the 1990s or even early noughties. First, the Hong Kong undergraduate students that I encountered on my return came from noticeably more diverse backgrounds than had earlier been the case, with a greater number of internationally-educated and ‘returned’ students than earlier. Second, by 2009, there were many more mainland students now studying at universities and colleges across the territory, which was certainly the case at the institution to which I returned. These students were a now-visible and enthusiastic minority at the undergraduate level, but were also present in very large numbers in taught Master’s and PhD programmes. For many teachers at the university, these newly-arrived students seemed noticeably different from local students, and many of the faculty routinely commented on the diligence, enthusiasm, and intelligence of these in-migrated students. Personal contact with these young people also confirmed the impression that they were highly motivated, and that they were determined to make the best
use of the opportunity of studying outside mainland China. Conversations with these students also revealed that they had come from many parts of China, and were typically from backgrounds where their parents spoke no English and spoke local dialects at home.

It soon became clear that, because of the educational opportunities offered to them, the ‘language worlds’ of these students were typically very different to those of their parents, as they often arrived in Hong Kong with good Putonghua and at least a reasonable working knowledge of English. Their motivation for mastering these two languages was usually linked to their desire to gain educational qualifications and to embark on a career, but also, in some cases, to somewhat less tangible aims of exploring the world, and establishing an identity as an internationally-minded (i.e. English-knowing) person. It was these encounters and exchanges with mainland students that later prompted me to include questions related to ‘language worlds’ in the interviews with both groups of students, and, in the interviews, all the students appeared to intuitively understand the notion of ‘language world’ with little or no explanation, suggesting that the term actually corresponded to the psychological reality of the students’ own perceptions in authentic and concrete fashion. More specifically, in the interviews, students were asked to describe how their language worlds differed from those of their parents.

5.2.5 Hong Kong students on their ‘language worlds’

**Michael:** I grew up with my mum, and my mum is also bilingual which is which she’s fluent in English and also Chinese with Putonghua and also Cantonese. So for me [...] she may be let’s say more fluent in Putonghua, much more fluent than I am in Putonghua, due to the context that she has worked in China mainland China but I haven’t and I haven’t been there much. I guess that’s the main difference between our language worlds.

In similar vein, John noted that his (and his brother’s) proficiency in English was much greater than that of their parents.

**John:** So, my parents also are mostly using Cantonese and English. They have a functional English, so they can get around with English without much of a problem. But if you tell them to watch a movie, and ask them how much they can hear from the content of the movie, they wouldn’t say too much [...] me and my brother are a bit different because both me and my brother learn our English overseas, so our English proficiency will be higher than them [...] so we watch English movie, read English books, listen English songs, which my parents don’t.

For her part, June’s account of her own family revealed highly complex patterns of multilingualism (“it’s complicated”) that included Spanish, Portuguese, Cantonese, English, and Tagalog.
June: My grandparents speak Portuguese and Spanish so my mum grew up in a Portuguese slash Spanish slash English slash Cantonese household. [...] when it came to our generation, my grandparents told them demanded that they teach us English and Cantonese and forget about Portuguese and Spanish. [...] cos most of my family members including my mum [...] were musicians slash singers, so a lot of people in [...] their industry were Filipinos, so they had to learn Tagalog, which is a dialect, so my mum knows how to speak Tagalog, Cantonese, English and Portuguese. [...] I’ll say my Mum’s generation, they’re more multilingual than I am, because [for me] it’s just English and Cantonese.

June’s observation that the older generation were “more multilingual” than theirs was echoed by a number of the others, including Michael who mentioned that his grandfather had been a Hakka dialect speaker, and Maria who noted that her grandparents were fluent in the “Fujianese” (or Fukien) dialect. However, what was also noticeable here was that there was arguably a degree of continuity across generations. In all four cases, these students came from homes where Chinese-English bilingualism among parents was common, and that this was also the case with the younger generation. June’s own story however spoke even more strongly to the multilingual history of South China, resonating historically with the very early interactions between Portuguese, Chinese, and English speakers in southern China (Bolton 2003).

5.2.6 Guangzhou students on their ‘language worlds’

In counterpoint to the Hong Kong students, the discussion of the Guangzhou students clearly indicated that their own fluency in English clearly set them apart from their parents, and that, in addition, there were also some differences in the repertoires of varieties of Chinese between the two generations. However, while the HK students had largely talked about the utility of English within Hong Kong, for some of the GZ students English also resonated with access to ‘the world’ at large, as in the excerpt from Jennifer below:

Jennifer: I think education is very important reason, because we’ve got the chance to get higher education so we need to learn English because we need to get close to the world. But, back to the time when our parents had get education, I think at that time, the best condition of their language is somebody who can speaks very standard Mandarin, that is their purpose but right now, I think the purpose is to speak fluent English. (GZ)

In fact, students from Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, like many other students from China’s leading universities, often have the opportunity to study overseas on completing their undergraduate programme, as witnessed by Mandy in the following extract:

Mandy: Like right now, I am preparing to apply for grad school in France and [...] my parents they kind of couldn’t catch up with my thoughts. I have to
explain everything to them, about schools, etc. [...] That's one of the things that I felt that my world is, my linguistic world, is different from theirs. Not just the language but also some cultures, and some way of thinking. (GZ)

For Peter, however, contact with 'the world' did not simply mean overseas travel or overseas study but also access to information from the world, via the Internet:

**Peter:** I think you're right on saying that because we know English and from most of our parents' generation, they do not know much about English. But do you think it's also because that we're exposed in the times where the information can be easily exchanged whereas in our parents' generation, the information is relatively not so convenient to be exchanged. Like cos back in the days, the information are usually being blocked by the government or by because the internet is not so common. (GZ)

At the same time, the four Guangzhou students were also aware that the knowledge and use of Chinese dialects had also shifted between generations, which was one point raised and commented on by Patricia:

**Patricia:** Do you really think that our linguistic world is more enriched or we have more information in our linguistic world than our parents? Because [...] I think that if you you're talking about dialects, for example [...] I speak Cantonese, my father speaks Cantonese. I think he knows a lot of slang words or other things and also he can talk with my grandparents in their dialects [...] where I really have a lot of things that [I] would miss out and mess up and don't understand. (GZ)

The stories of the Guangzhou students thus speak to a language ecology that has been subject to rapid and profound change, over the last three decades in particular. Indeed, since the end of the Cultural Revolution in the late 1970s, the school system has been rebuilt and the government has promoted the national language in all schools of the nation. In addition, English has also been promoted very widely through the nation's schools, on a scale that is simply astonishing. Wei & Su (2012) recently reported on the national survey of languages held from 1999 to 2001, which interviewed 165,000 households. In this report, Wei and Su highlight that, in the national survey, an estimated 49% (c. 416 million) of the population had studied one or more foreign languages, and, of these, around 94% had studied English, although of these only 7% reported that they 'often' used the language. From this, and other accounts, it now appears that—despite the very widespread learning of the language in schools—the actual use of English in China is restricted to a small number of domains. The main domain of contemporary use is education, although with a role for English on a smaller scale in international business and trade, hotels and tourism, and such communications as the
English language media in China including the China Daily, Beijing Review, China Central Television Station (CCTV) broadcasts, etc.

Although we now have a good deal of information about the spread of English in education, we have very little about the role of English in the everyday lives of Chinese people in China. Talking to students and other young people in China, it now seems evident that the language worlds of millions of young people are very different from those of their parents and grandparents. On the one hand, there is the rapidly-changing multilingual ecology of China itself, where regional languages and local dialects are giving way to the spread of Putonghua, while, on the other, young people are now able to bilingually negotiate entertainment and information through DVDs, the Internet, and all the electronic gadgetry of post-modern China. In discussing their own language histories, a number of the Guangzhou students mentioned the media, which they had consciously accessed when learning the language. Mandy, for example, mentioned US television series, and the popular singer Avril Lavigne.

**Mandy:** I think those electronic media really help me a lot. I remembered that back in middle school, I started watching some American TV series like the Orange County and some Desperate Housewives [...] And I also remembered that in middle school Grade 1, I was a huge fan of Avril Lavigne, I read every lyrics of her songs, and I actually looked up the dictionary for the vocabulary and these things. (GZ)

Patricia reported watching Disney cartoons at an early age, and consciously using these to practise her English.

**Patricia:** I really think that how I started to really learn speaking English when I’m I was watching the Disney cartoon. [...] I know that when I was in primary school and then I think when I was watching the English TV series and I pay attention to those sound, I couldn’t help but I will pay attention how they speak and how their pronunciation [...] Maybe I really pay attention to that and I think that helped a lot. (GZ)

Similarly, Peter and Jennifer also reported using English media for various purposes, in the case of Peter for video gaming (“Yeah, it really helped me a lot”), and with Jennifer in order to access fan sites for Harry Potter (“there are many stories written by the audience and even some pictures and some interviews that had no Chinese captions”). But at a more adult level, access to the international English-language media was now also important for other reasons, as, in the words of one of the interviewees, “if something really big, some big event happen, say in China [...] I will probably turn to some foreign website to see what really happen in China because Chinese media often give me this feeling of they are not telling the truth or they’re not telling the whole truth, they’re just partly true”, explaining that “if I
didn’t know English, I will be forced to believe what the Chinese media try to tell us”.

6 Language worlds and world Englishes

6.1 The theoretical status of ‘language world’

Following Blommaert (2010), there can be little doubt the impact of contemporary globalisation with its transmission of capital, communications, cultural products, and people across national borders presents a challenge for sociolinguistics, and, by extension, perhaps, world Englishes, with its central concern with the sociolinguistic realities of English-using societies worldwide. The notion of mobility is at the heart of this issue, in a variety of senses, including the physical movement of people, and there can be little doubt that the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century has been an important era of mass migration in a number of key localities in the world.

In the USA, for example, it was not until the mid-nineteen sixties that the immigration laws were altered to allow Asians and others to apply for immigration to the United States on an equal basis with European migrants, a reform that was also adopted around the same time in Australia and New Zealand (Reimers 1983). In Europe, the ethnic balance of many societies also began to shift substantially, as former colonial societies such as Belgium, France, Germany, Holland, the UK, Spain, and others accepted migrants from former colonies as well as other societies outside Europe. Today, it is estimated that some 9.4% of citizens of the European Union are ‘foreign born’, with the highest numbers of non-EU foreigners settling in France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom (Eurostat 2011). Today, mobility is not only confined to various forms of economic or political migration (in the case of refugees, for example), but it is also taking other forms as well, with patterns of educational migration, with Asian students increasingly moving to Europe or North America, or European students moving across borders, for studies in higher education. In the group of OECD societies, which includes 34 of the richest countries in the world, it is now estimated that the number of such educational migrants has reached three million (OECD 2012).

Sociolinguistic theory as it developed from the 1960s to the present has arguably focused almost exclusively on language stratification and variation within discrete speech communities. For example, Chambers’ (2003) survey of sociolinguistic theory highlights such constructs as ‘age’, ‘class’, ‘gender’, and ‘network’ as major social variables, and the discussion of mobility is confined mainly to research on the issue within societies. In the context of
globalisation, however, Blommaert’s key argument is that there is now a need to reconceptualise the field:

The established paradigm is the sociolinguistics of distribution as sketched above, in which movement of language resources is seen as movement in a horizontal and stable space and in chronological time; within such spaces, vertical stratification can occur along lines of class, gender, age, social status etc. [...] The second paradigm can be called a sociolinguistics of mobility, and it focuses not on language-in-place but on language-in-motion, with various spatiotemporal frames interacting with one another. [...] And while a sociolinguistics of distribution is by and large concerned with ‘language’ – linguistically defined objects – a sociolinguistics of mobility is concerned with concrete resources. Put more concisely, it is a sociolinguistics of ‘speech’, of actual language resources deployed in real sociocultural, historical and political contexts. (Blommaert 2010: 5, original emphasis)

He then goes on to explain that, in the second paradigm, which may be seen, metaphorically, “as a vertical space, as layered and stratified space”, so that “[e]very horizontal space (e.g. a neighbourhood, a region, or a country) is also a vertical space, in which all sorts of socially, culturally and politically salient distinctions occur”, which in turn may serve as “indexical distinctions, which project minute linguistic differences onto stratified patterns of social, cultural and political value-attribution” (ibid.). Space, then, is not simply geographical in nature, as its vertical axis contributes to “orders of indexicality” that signify the distinctions between “good” versus “bad”, or “normal” versus “deviant”, language use, and ultimately to one’s identity and role in the world (Blommaert 2010: 6).

In establishing this line of argument, Blommaert moves away from the language system as the object of study to focus on the individual’s deployment of language resources in a given setting, or given ‘context of situation’, to use the classic Firthian phrase. This argument also recalls Le Page and Tabouret-Keller’s assertion (a sociolinguistic generation earlier) that linguistic behaviour is most accurately viewed “as a series of acts of identity in which people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social roles” (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 14), where individuals project themselves into multidimensional social and cultural space through their speech:

Within this general theory we see speech acts as acts of projection: the speaker is projecting his inner universe, implicitly with the invitation to others to share in it, at least insofar as they recognize his language as an accurate symbolization of the world, and to share his attitude towards it. By verbalizing as he does, he is seeking to reinforce his models of the world, and hopes for acts of solidarity from those with whom he wishes to identify. (Le Page & Tabouret-Keller 1985: 181)
Thus for LePage and Tabouret-Keller, the locus of all linguistic activity is the individual language user, projecting themselves into social space through their acquisition and use of language. As Le Page himself explained elsewhere:

The form of our general hypothesis now is that people create their linguistic systems (and we all have more than one) so as to resemble those of the groups with which from time to time they wish to identify. Both the groups, and their linguistic attributes, exist solely in the mind of each individual. When we talk we project the universe as we see it on to others as on to a cinema screen in our own images, expressed in the language we consider appropriate at that moment, and we invite others by these acts to share our universe. (Le Page 1986:23)

Although LePage’s arguments were initially framed some thirty years earlier, they share with Blommaert a focus not on a particular ‘language’, ‘dialect’, or ‘variety’, but on the linguistic behaviour of particular individuals, often in negotiation with ‘diffuse’ forms of language.

Against this theoretical background, we might now attempt to conceptualise the notion of ‘language world’, as it applies to the two groups of students from Guangzhou and Hong Kong, and as it may be generalisable to other language learners/users worldwide. As we noted above, the linguistic experiences of the two groups were rather different. The students from Hong Kong were from bilingual family backgrounds, all intended to use their bilingual skills in careers in Hong Kong, and saw their knowledge of English as having a high instrumental value for such purposes. By contrast, the language world of the Guangzhou students was dramatically different from that of their parents. The fact that they had acquired English opened for them the door to ‘the world’, for cultural enrichment, for information, for entertainment, and for study abroad. Indeed, over the last two decades, hundreds of thousands of Chinese students have gone to the United States, Britain, and Australia to study at university, with around 160,000 Chinese students in the US, and 120,000 in the EU (Bolton & Graddol 2012). Such figures point to the immense changes currently occurring in China in relation to English, and also to the sudden and radical nature of such change, strikingly at odds with the “uniformitarian principle” that has underpinned mainstream sociolinguistics (Labov 1994: 21–23). So, for our mainland Chinese students from Guangzhou, what was involved in acquiring English was not simply acquiring another language, but also acquiring another world, into which they might consider projecting themselves, both imaginatively through media and communication, but also physically, through educational migration for further study abroad. Following this, the notion of language world thus connects to the ways in which the user of a language imagines their ‘inner universe’ in linguistic terms, which inextricably connects to their language behaviour in the social settings available to them, as they move through their
lives. Indeed, mobility, physical or social, was a priority for both groups of interviewees.

6.2 World Englishes and language worlds

As was noted in Section 2 of this article, current approaches to world Englishes in the widest sense now include a large range of diverse perspectives and objectives, ranging from English studies to creolistics, and from corpora to critical linguistics. As I have argued elsewhere, it is possible to see this catholicism as dynamic and inclusive (Bolton 2005), although approaches to the field that have focused on discrete geographical varieties, i.e. localized ‘varieties of English’ have been problematized in recent critiques from Bruthiaux (2003) and Saraceni (2010), as earlier discussed.

One essential reason for this may be linked to the descriptive framework associated with a ‘varieties-based’ approach to language variation itself. Although the term ‘variety’ is widely-used as a neutral, technical term for language description in sociolinguistics, the label is somewhat indeterminately applied in practice. Hudson, for example, notes that, from a linguistic perspective, non-technical labels such as ‘languages’, ‘dialects’ or ‘styles’ have little consistency, noting that this leaves us only with the label of variety to refer to “a set of linguistic items with similar social distribution” (Hudson 1996: 20–21). As a result, in many branches of variation study constructs such as dialects and varieties are often eschewed in favour of “item-based approaches”, where the object of study is defined as a particular linguistic item, or set of items, at the level of phonology and syntax (Chambers, Trudgill & Schilling-Estes 2002). From another perspective, Harris (1998) has argued that the notion of ‘dialect’ itself rests on an idealization (or ‘myth’) that crucially discounts or ignores individual variation, so that “[a] dialect, whether it be of a region, or a locality, or a single village, represents, as it were, the basic level at which, in practice, linguistic diversity is reduced to zero” (Harris 1998: 92). At yet another level, Algeo (1991) has also argued that all language varieties are idealisations or “fictions”, but that such idealizations are also useful:

The concepts of a language, dialect, and even idiolect are fictions, ordered abstractions from the unsuppressible flux of change that alone is real. And yet fictions are useful, and linguistic fictions are especially useful to speakers [...] So we usefully talk about idiolects; about local, regional, social, and national varieties; and about an English language. Fictions all, but useful ones. Without such fictions there can be no linguistics, nor any science. To describe, to explain, and to predict requires that we suppose there are stable things behind our discourse. (Algeo 1991: 4)

One possible argument here is that research on world Englishes, and its theorisation, is still at a relatively early stage. Transported Inner Circle varieties
of English, including US, Australian, and New Zealand Englishes have often been regarded (explicitly or implicitly) as branches of a ‘Greater British’ family of English dialects organically and naturalistically related to each other and to the wider Germanic family. The ‘new’ Outer Circle Englishes of Asia and Africa have fitted less easily into the family tree, as such varieties are used by speakers of non-Germanic ethnicities in complex multilingual settings and have often had contentious colonial histories. A major achievement of world Englishes in the last thirty years or so has been to accord an important degree of recognition to such Outer Circle varieties of the language. Bruthiaux thus notes that the Kachruvian model “broke new ground in raising the awareness of dynamic varieties of English with growing populations of speakers and increasingly vibrant media, literatures and popular cultures”, adding that “the very act of pluralizing ‘English’ and encouraging serious debate regarding the nature and role of ‘New Englishes’ denoted both imagination and courage” (Bruthiaux 2003: 160).

Nevertheless, given the rapid sociolinguistic changes currently occurring in many societies worldwide as a result of various forms and effects of globalisation, Blommaert’s advocacy of a reconceptualisation of the sociolinguistics of globalisation seems timely and well-founded. In this context, it would be unfortunate if the world Englishes paradigm remained static, at a time when new patterns of language contact and linguistic flow are emerging and gaining recognition. One aspect of this is the way in which immigration is affecting the balance of languages in the US as well as European societies, which have become increasingly multilingual. This has also had its effects in a number of smaller European societies including Sweden, where today the school authorities in Stockholm recognise more than 150 home languages (Bolton & Meierkord 2013). Around the world, the effects of globalisation are being felt in other ways. In societies such as China, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, and Singapore increasing numbers of young people may now receive part of their education in their country of birth, but then move overseas for high school and university education abroad, in such study destinations as Australia, the UK, and the US. Such young people are invariably multilingual, and move routinely between western and Asian societies, typically sampling and mixing multiple worlds and cultures as they go. The most visible representatives of such groups include the middle- and upper middle-class children of well-to-do Asian families who acquire an elite education in the best European and US schools, but increasingly parents of modest means now also struggle to give their children an overseas education. At the same time, young people in many countries around the world not only acquire English at school, but also, outside the classroom, through the Internet, pop music and computer games. In many of these contexts such processes may take unpredictable turns, given that each of these learners or users of the language carry with them their own personal histories of language acquisition and use, and negotiate their own linguistic worlds, often in contexts of
rapid change and increasing mobility. In this context, one might suggest that, in order to fully understand the often rapidly-shifting linguistic ecologies of societies like Hong Kong and Guangzhou—as well as other similar contexts in an era of globalisation—our research needs to keep pace with the changing linguistic worlds of the societies and people around us, not least with the often complex multilingual language worlds of our own students.
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