Introduction

All over the world people in ever-increasing numbers are using more and more varieties of English. English has now become the language of international communication. Perhaps the most remarkable fact behind this increasing use of English is that the majority of English speakers are now multilingual people who have learned English and who use English to communicate with fellow multilinguals. There are many more speakers of World Englishes and people who use English for international communication than there are native speakers of it. This book will consider the implications for international communication and English language teaching of this extraordinary growth in the varieties of English and in the numbers of English speakers.

Courses in World Englishes are becoming ever more popular and are seen, especially among ELT practitioners and professionals, as relevant for those who plan to become English language teachers. Indeed, one noted scholar has suggested that no TESOL development course should be without a course in World Englishes (Görlach, 1997). There are a number of excellent introductory texts to World Englishes, of which Kachru's *The Other Tongue* (1982/92) remains an outstanding example. McArthur's *The English Languages* (1998) and his *Oxford Guide to World Englishes* (2002) provide extremely valuable background and reference materials. Görlach (1991) and Schneider (1997) have both edited series on World Englishes. Melchers' and Shaw's (2003) book *World Englishes* offers a useful introduction, and Jenkins (2005) is an excellent resource that provides a summary of current developments and key debates. There are also a number of texts that focus on one variety of 'World English'. For example, Hong Kong University Press is currently publishing a series on Englishes in Asia (Adamson, 2004; Stanlaw, 2004; Kachru, 2006).

This book differs from all the above in that it aims to describe selected varieties of World Englishes and then discusses the implications of these varieties for English language learning and teaching in specific contexts. In this way, the text describes selected varieties of World Englishes for an audience of English language teachers and teacher trainers. It also considers and compares international contexts in which English is used as a *lingua franca*. In particular, the book hopes to be both relevant and useful to so-called non-native speaker teachers, who make up the overwhelming majority of English language teachers worldwide (Braine, 1999). It stresses the importance and validates the roles and contributions of multilingual and multicultural English language teachers who may be either speakers of a nativised model of English, such as Singaporean, or non-native speaker teachers who use English primarily as a *lingua franca* with fellow non-native speakers, as will the great

majority of their students. In this context it argues that native speaker and nativised varieties of English have developed in comparable ways.

The book is aimed primarily at ELT professionals and trainee teachers undertaking TESOL training throughout the world. It also aims to become an important text on World Englishes for undergraduate and postgraduate students of World Englishes.

The book is divided into three sections. Part A (Chapters 1–3) introduces readers to relevant key sociolinguistic and linguistic concepts, and provides a brief background history of the development of World Englishes. Part A thus offers readers an introduction to basic concepts that are developed throughout the book.

Part B (Chapters 4–11) provides a description of the linguistic features of selected varieties of World Englishes, including examples from phonology, lexis, syntax, discourse and pragmatic norms. Each chapter describes the socio-political features of the variety and typically includes the historical background leading to the development of that variety, its current status, the attitudes that speakers of the variety and 'outsiders' have to the variety under discussion, and its current roles and functions in the society *vis-à-vis* other languages spoken in the community. Each of the chapters in Part B also provides spoken and written examples of the relevant variety in real use, including, where appropriate, samples from literature written in the variety. Examples which are spoken or read by speakers of their respective varieties can be heard on the accompanying CD, allowing readers to listen to how these different varieties actually sound in real life. Transcripts of the recordings are provided in the appendix.

It would be impossible to include all the current varieties of English. I have chosen to start with a description of three so-called native speaker varieties – British, American and Australian – and then describe varieties from the Indian subcontinent, Africa and from East and South-East Asia. As the reader will discover, all these varieties themselves represent a range of different varieties, so that British English, for example, is actually a range of British Englishes. I have also included a description of English when it is used as a *lingua franca* and considered its role as a *lingua franca* in Europe.

Part C considers the controversies and debates associated with the emergence of new varieties of English and their existence alongside more established varieties. Issues that are covered here include the question of which model or variety of English is the most appropriate for which context. The relative roles of native and non-native speaker teachers are considered and the recognition of the importance of multilingual and multicultural ELT teachers is stressed.

Five key themes underpin the book:

(a) that variation is natural, normal and continuous – and that ELT professionals must establish a tolerance and understanding of variation;
(b) that, while prejudice against varieties is likely to occur, these prejudices are simply that – prejudices;
(c) that the differences between all varieties, both native and nativised, are similar and comparable;

(d) that the specific teaching and learning contexts and the specific needs of the learners in those contexts should determine the variety to be taught; and
(e) that multilingual non-native teachers represent ideal teachers in many ELT contexts.

On having read the book, readers will understand that English has several different varieties. They will know how these varieties differ linguistically and socio-culturally and how each variety reflects the cultures of its speakers. They will also understand the roles played by different varieties of English in different contexts and be aware of the tensions that can exist between 'Anglo' and nativised varieties of English. They will be familiar with the debates and controversies surrounding the spread of English and the development of Englishes, especially as they relate to language teaching and international communication.

Why is such a text important? The model of English that should be used in classrooms in outer (post-colonial) and expanding (EFL) circle countries (Kachru, 1992a) has been a subject of discussion for some time (Kachru, 1992b, 1995; Conrad, 1996; Widdowson, 1997; Seidlhofer, 2001; Kirkpatrick, 2002a, 2006a). This debate has taken place alongside the dramatic increase in the pace of globalisation and the expanding role of English as an International Language as well as the increased recognition of World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). By World Englishes I mean those indigenous, nativised varieties that have developed around the world and that reflect the cultural and pragmatic norms of their speakers. A second phenomenon connected with the global use of English has been the use of English as a *lingua franca* by people for whom English is not their first language. In the southeast Asian region, a good example of this is the acceptance by the Association of South-East Asian Nations that English is the *de facto lingua franca* of ASEAN. In *lingua franca* contexts such as these, the question of which model of English should be taught is one of heated debate. Issues of controversy that this book will consider include the relevance or otherwise of native speaker models and cultures for English language teaching in such contexts. As many learners of English worldwide are learning English to communicate with fellow non-native speakers, the appropriateness of native speaker models and the cultures associated with them needs to be questioned. In certain contexts, it may be that the local or *lingua franca* model should be used as a classroom model and regional cultures – at least the cultures of the learners – should constitute the curriculum. In short, the curriculum should comprise the cultures of the people using the language for cross-cultural communication rather than Anglo-American cultures. Of course, this is **not** to say that native speaker models should be abandoned. There may be contexts in which a native speaker model and culture is the most appropriate model for the learners. These issues are explored in depth in Part C of the book.

Part A: The Framework

1 Key sociolinguistic concepts

Part A comprises three chapters. It provides an introduction to the terms used in the book along with a brief discussion of any controversies that may surround the use of some of these terms. Chapter 1 focuses on what I have, for ease of reference, called 'sociolinguistic' concepts. I have chosen those concepts that I believe to be important to any debate about World Englishes. I have called them 'sociolinguistic' to distinguish them from the 'linguistic' terms that are covered in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the theories behind World Englishes.

The terms and issues that I shall discuss in Chapter 1 are:

1.1 Native varieties vs nativised varieties vs *lingua franca* Englishes
1.2 The native speaker vs the non-native speaker
1.3 The functions of language and the 'identity–communication continuum'
1.4 Pidgins vs creoles vs varieties of English
1.5 Linguistic prejudice

1.1 Native varieties vs nativised varieties vs *lingua franca* Englishes

It is customary to distinguish between native and nativised varieties of English (cf. McArthur, 1998). The 'traditional' varieties of British, American and Australian English are said to be native varieties and spoken by native speakers. Nativised varieties are newer varieties that have developed in places where English was not originally spoken and which have been influenced by local languages and cultures. Whether speakers of nativised varieties are native speakers or non-native speakers is debated and I discuss these terms below. Here I point out that the distinction between native and nativised varieties of English can

be questioned. After all, other languages preceded English in England and the British varieties of English have certainly been influenced by local languages and cultures. The same can be said of American and Australian varieties of English. Other languages were spoken in America and Australia before English arrived there and the Englishes that have developed in both places have been influenced by local languages and cultures. I shall give specific examples of the ways local cultures and languages have influenced their respective Englishes throughout Part B.

The two criteria often used for classifying a variety of English as 'native' rather than 'nativised' are (a) that the native variety has been around for a long time and (b) that it has influenced younger varieties of English in some way. Yet, it is not possible to find a sensible definition of 'a long time', and, as we shall see, all languages routinely influence each other. While it is quite true to say that British English has been around longer and has influenced the development of American English, does this mean that British English is native and that American is nativised? The two criteria identified above would suggest that American English is a nativised variety, but most people would call American English a native variety. We have the same argument for Australian English. This is younger than either British or American English and has been influenced by both. Does this mean Australian English is a nativised variety rather than a native variety? Once again, the criteria classify it as a nativised variety while most people think of it as a native variety. Why?

A third criterion may have something to do with prejudice, and later in this chapter I look at the concept of linguistic prejudice and give some examples of it. By 'native English' people usually mean a variety of English spoken by a native speaker of English and this speaker is usually thought of as being white. Thus British English and American English would be considered as being 'native' Englishes, Malaysian and Indian Englishes as being nativised. However, it is quite obvious that many people who are not white speak British and American English. As we shall see in Chapters 4 and 5, this is extremely complex: there are 'black' varieties of both British and American English and many people speak many varieties, both black and white. Firstly, all varieties of British and American English – whether these be Cornish, Glaswegian, Southern American or Urban Black – are varieties of English. Speakers cannot be disqualified from native speaker status simply on the grounds of the variety they speak. Secondly, it is normal for people to be able to speak more than one variety of English and many British and American people, whether they be black or white or anything else, are able to speak more than one variety of English.

A fourth criterion is also based on prejudice. This criterion suggests that a native variety of English is somehow superior to a nativised one. Some people feel that the older a variety is, the better it is. Native varieties are older and thought to be 'purer' than nativised varieties. The idea that varieties of British English are somehow purer than later varieties is very difficult to support, however. Is Cornish English purer than American East Coast English? In the context of varieties of English, age does not bring with it superiority. Nor can we say that the older a variety, the purer it is. Even the earliest form of English had mixed and many parents. Around the fifteenth century these parents produced a variety of

English that was a truly mongrel language, made up of a mixture of Latin, Greek, French, Germanic and Anglo-Saxon forms.

If it is difficult to find rational criteria for classifying varieties of English as native; it is easier to classify them as nativised. I suggest that the difference between varieties of English can be explained by the fact that they are all nativised. By a nativised variety I therefore mean a variety that has been influenced by the local cultures and languages of the people who have developed the particular variety. Other terms for this phenomenon include acculturation and indigenisation. A nativised, accultured or indigenised variety of English is thus one that has been influenced by the local cultures in which it has developed. By this definition all varieties of English that are spoken by an identifiable speech community are nativised. Thus, varieties of British English are as nativised as varieties of Philippino English.

The distinction between native and nativised varieties can become important, however, in contexts where a so-called native variety, such as British or English, is set against a so-called nativised variety, such as Malaysian English. In the context of English language teaching, some people may argue that British English provides a better model than Malaysian English because it represents 'proper' English. But it is important to remember that both these varieties are nativised in the sense that they reflect their own cultures. The Malaysian variety of English is different from the British variety precisely because it reflects local cultures. The British variety is different from the Malaysian variety because it reflects British culture. So, if people choose British English as the model, they are also, wittingly or unwittingly, allowing British culture to seep into their learning of English.

I shall consider the issues surrounding the question of which variety to choose for language teaching in specific contexts in Part C. But I want to stress here that there is no need to worry if you feel that you speak a nativised variety and therefore the variety you speak is somehow worse and less pure than the 'native' variety spoken by someone else. It isn't. All varieties are nativised. By the same token, there is no justification in assuming that the 'native' variety you speak is somehow better and purer than the nativised variety spoken by someone else. It isn't. By the definition adopted here, you also speak a nativised variety.

This leaves the definition of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). A *lingua franca* is the common language used by people of different language backgrounds to communicate with each other. *Lingua francas* can be used both within countries and internationally. In Indonesia, the national language, *Bahasa Indonesia*, is used as a national *lingua franca* to provide the many different peoples of Indonesia with a common language in which to communicate with each other. In China, Mandarin or *Putonghua*, the 'common language', is used as a *lingua franca* to allow speakers of different Chinese dialects to communicate with each other. In countries of East Africa, where many different languages are spoken, *Ki-Swahili* is used as the *lingua franca* or common language. In Part B of the book, I compare the international use of ELF within the European Community and within the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). In both cases, people who are not born as English speakers have learned English in order to be able to communicate with other people in these communities. In the ASEAN community, therefore, a Thai and an Indonesian may

choose to communicate with each other using English as their *lingua franca* or common language.

1.2 The native speaker vs the non-native speaker

Many scholars have attempted over many years to provide workable and rational distinctions between 'a native speaker' and 'a non-native speaker' and many others have argued that it is impossible to provide workable and rational distinctions between these two terms (Davies, 2003). Swales (1993) argues that it no longer makes any sense to differentiate between native and non-native speakers. White and Genesee (1996) have provided evidence to show that the linguistic ability of the near-native speaker is indistinguishable from the linguistic ability of the native speaker. Medgyes, on the other hand, insists that 'the native English speaker teacher and the non-native English speaker are two different species' (1994: 27).

In the contexts of World Englishes, the real problem is caused by many people believing that native speakers are necessarily better at speaking English than non-native speakers, and that native speakers are necessarily better at teaching English than non-native speakers. In this book, I shall argue that neither of these beliefs can be supported.

Other terms are also used to try and capture the distinction between a native and a non-native speaker. Examples include 'a mother tongue speaker', 'a first language speaker' vs 'a second language speaker' vs 'a foreign language speaker'. Bloomfield (1933) defines a native language as one learned on one's mother's knee, and claims that no one is perfectly sure in a language that is acquired later. 'The first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is a native speaker of this language' (1933: 43). This definition equates a native speaker with a mother tongue speaker. Bloomfield's definition also assumes that age is the critical factor in language learning and that native speakers provide the best models, although he does say that, in rare instances, it is possible for a foreigner to speak as well as a native. 'One learns to understand and speak a language by hearing and imitating native speakers' (quoted in Hockett, 1970: 430).

The assumptions behind all these terms are that a person will speak the language they learn first better than languages they learn later, and that a person who learns a language later cannot speak it as well as a person who has learned the language as their first language. But it is clearly not necessarily true that the language a person learns first is the one they will always be best at, as the examples below will show. The names given are pseudonyms.

Claire was born in Sicily and migrated to Australia when she was eight. As a child she learned Sicilian as her first language/mother tongue and standard Italian as a second language. When she arrived in Australia, she started to learn English. She is now 40 and has been in Australia for more than 30 years. The language that she learned third, from the age of eight, is the language that she is now best at. Her second-best language is Standard Italian and her third is Sicilian. In other words, what was her first language and mother tongue is now a language that she does not speak as well as the other languages she speaks. She is a so-called native speaker of Sicilian but one who does not speak it well. She is a so-called

non-native speaker of English, but speaks it fluently. The language she speaks best is a language that she only started to learn once she was eight. Claire is by no means an unusual example. There are many people who have what I shall call a 'shifting L1'. Indeed in immigrant communities it is common. It is also common in multilingual societies, as the following example from Nigeria shows.

A Nigerian couple are both Yoruba speakers. They have two children, both of whom are first language or mother tongue speakers of Yoruba. The family then moves to Northern Nigeria, where the dominant language is Hausa. Although the parents speak Yoruba at home, the children refuse to speak it, preferring to speak the Hausa that their school friends all speak. Like many children everywhere, they do not want to appear to be different, but want to fit in and identify with their peers at school. In addition, they learn to speak English at school, the language of education. The children then grow up speaking both Hausa and English better than they speak Yoruba. In describing their language level, does it make any sense to say that these children are native speakers of Yoruba? Does it make any sense to say they are non-native speakers of English?

Earlier I mentioned Indonesia as an example of a multilingual nation that has adopted the use of Bahasa Indonesia as its national language and *lingua franca*. There are literally millions of people in Indonesia who have grown up with a particular mother tongue, be it Bugis or Javanese or Balinese, and then learned Bahasa Indonesia at school. They have then travelled from their home villages into towns in different parts of Indonesia – for education, for marriage or, most commonly, in search of work – and Bahasa Indonesia has become the language that they are best at. They represent common examples of people with shifting L1s.

A reason why all these terms now appear unsatisfactory may be that they were coined by linguists who grew up in monolingual societies where both parents and the community as a whole all spoke the same language. They assumed that these societies represented the norm and that other languages were 'foreign' languages that you might need to learn if you travelled overseas. Indeed, Bloomfield's work on language teaching (see Hockett, 1970: 426–38) was aimed at the teaching of foreign languages to the American military where native speakers of these foreign languages, known as 'informants', were used alongside American instructors. Interestingly, this model still operates in Japan, where native-speaking Americans and others work with Japanese English language teachers in the classroom in an attempt to get Japanese learners to produce American English.

In fact, however, monolingual societies are less common than multilingual societies, where the concepts 'native' speaker and 'mother tongue' speaker make little sense as people find it very difficult to answer the apparently simple question, 'What is your mother tongue?' A good example of someone who found this question impossible to answer is Jane, who grew up in Brunei, the daughter of two Chinese migrants. As a child she learned two Chinese dialects (Hakka and Fuzhou, literally her mother tongue) from her parents, Mandarin from a special Chinese school and family friends, and English and Malay at school. She is now in her thirties and says that English is her best language, with Malay and Mandarin vying for second place. She has forgotten most of her Fuzhou and Hakka.

Another problem with the term 'native speaker' crops up with bilingual children. Can, for example, a bilingual child be a native speaker of two languages? Davies defines full bilingualism as the acquisition of 'linguistic and communicative competence in two or more languages' (1991: 98). But linguistic and communicative competence are both hard to define. As Davies says, a native-speaking speaker of English from England may lack communicative competence in Australia. I would add that a native speaker of English who had lived all his life in the south of England might lack communicative competence in the north of England. I would also add that these speakers may not possess the rules of linguistic competence in these situations either. English speakers brought up in London will not know the linguistic rules of the Australian variety of English. There is no reason why they should know the communicative and linguistic rules specific to the varieties of English that are not their own.

For the purposes of this book, the terms 'native speaker' or 'mother tongue speaker' are not precise enough to be helpful. Indeed, as they are often associated with relative competence, they can be prejudicial. For example, government officials, owners of language schools and students often say they want native speakers of English, as they feel these people are better teachers and provide better models. As a result, untrained people can potentially be employed as English language teachers ahead of well-trained and competent local teachers solely on the grounds that they are native speakers.

In the context of World Englishes, therefore, these terms should be avoided. A possible option is to use the term 'L1' or 'first language', but in the sense of the language that the speaker is most proficient in and not in the sense of the language that the speaker learned first. Rampton (1990) has suggested the term 'expert user'. This is a useful term in that expertise can be assigned to distinct categories. A person might be an expert speaker but a poor writer, for example. In the context of language teaching, Cook (1999) has proposed that we should use successful L2 learners rather than native speakers as models for the L2 learner. I shall return to these notions of native speakers, non-native speakers and expert users in Part C when I consider the implications of World Englishes for language teaching and international communication.

1.3 The functions of language and the 'identity–communication continuum'

A recurrent point that will be made in this book is that people are normally able to speak more than one variety of a language and will choose the variety they speak depending on the context in which they find themselves and the functions they want the variety to perform. Language has three major functions. The first is communication – people use language to communicate with one another. The second is identity – people use language to signal to other people who they are and what group(s) they belong to. The third, which is closely related to identity, is culture – people use language to express their culture.

Each of these functions may require a different variety or register and these functions may, at times, be at odds with each other. For example, the communicative function will often require the diminishing of the identity function. Conversely, when identity is the