**Models of World Englishes**

The most common classification of Englishes, especially in the language teaching world, has been to distinguish between English as a native language (ENL), English as a second language (ESL), and English as a foreign language (EFL). In contrast, ESL is spoken in countries where English is an important and usually official language, but not the main language of the country. Second, the suggestion to use ENL as ‘the model’ ignores the fact that such a model might be inappropriate in ESL countries where the local variety would be a more acceptable model, as there are many fluent speakers and expert users of that particular variety. There is no doubt, for example, that the motivation to learn English is likely to be far greater in countries where English plays an institutional or official role than in countries where students are unlikely to hear any English outside the classroom or ever need to use it. A second shortcoming of the classification is that the spread of English also means that it is more difficult to find countries that can be accurately classified as EFL countries.

The second observation about Kachru’s ‘three circles’ model is that it underestimated the roles that English would come to play in Expanding Circle countries, although the term ‘expanding circle’ suggests that the roles of English would develop in these countries. First, as Mufwene (2001) has elegantly argued, the type of colony a nation was has influenced the way English developed there, although the developmental processes that each variety went through were similar. Mufwene distinguishes between ‘trade colonies’, ‘exploitation colonies’, and ‘settlement colonies’ (2001: 8-9). In such contexts, the variety of English developed through contact with local and other languages and contact with non-standard and ‘school’ varieties of English. In short, in exploitation colonies such as India and Malaysia, the influence of local languages and cultures was greater in the development of the local English varieties. Much of the Burmese civil service of the time was staffed by Indian clerks, for example – indeed the Burmese word for chair is ‘kalathain’ and this means ‘foreigner-sit’.

The process through which an imported variety goes on its way to becoming a local variety is variously referred to as ‘nativisation’, ‘indigenization’, or a combination of ‘deculturation’ (of the imported variety, as it loses its original cultural roots) and ‘acculturation’ (of the local variety, as it grows new cultural roots). ‘Transported’ or ‘imported’ varieties refer to the varieties spoken by the settlers, as opposed to the varieties spoken by the locals, which are referred to as ‘nativised’ or ‘indigenized’ or ‘acculturated’. For example, the terms ‘exonormative model’, ‘transported variety’, and ‘imported variety’ refer to the English spoken by the settlers that arrived in a particular country. They will strive to speak the imported, exonormative variety and sound like native speakers while looking down upon those who speak only the local variety. The second phase sees the existence of the local and imported variety existing side by side. He suggests that the Philippines and Malaysia are examples of countries where the increased official promotion of a local language – Tagalog in the Philippines and Malay in Malaysia – results in a decline in the use of the local variety of English.

 He also argues that their developmental processes are different from the development of regional varieties of English within England which are, he claims, ‘variants of the same language, alternative actualizations’ (1997: 140). What Ghanaians and Nigerians speak ‘is another English, not a variant but a different language’ (1997: 141), and he argues that such varieties ‘evolve into autonomous languages ultimately to the point of mutual unintelligibility’ (1997: 142). And, while an exonormative variety is promoted as a model by the Ministry of Education, the sheer scale of the English language learning enterprise means that speakers of exonormative inner-circle models are heard only by the tiniest fraction of Chinese learners of English. Schneider does distinguish, however, between the variety spoken by the settlers – which he calls the STL strand – and the variety spoken by the local or indigenous people – which he calls the IDG strand. The third phase is the ‘nativisation’ phase and Schneider considers this to be the most important and dynamic phase. This phase ‘results in the heaviest effects on the restructuring of the English language itself’ (2003a: 248), although the restructuring occurs mostly at the level of vocabulary and grammar.

Widdowson’s position is broadly representative of the views of those who argue that the development of different intra-national varieties of English will necessarily result in a range of mutually unintelligible languages, as, for example, French and Italian developed from Latin. Kandiah has argued that in a process he calls ‘fulguration’, new varieties of English create a new system based on ‘elements, structures, and rules drawn from both English and one or more languages used in the environment’ (1998: 99). In contrast, Widdowson argues that the varieties of English used for specific purposes such as banking or commerce can be seen more as registers, that is varieties of language that have developed to ‘serve uses for language rather than users of it’ (2003: 54) (italics in original). In a well-known study conducted in response to the frequently voiced concern over ‘the possibility that speakers of different varieties of English will soon become unintelligible to one another (1992: 75), he argued that this is a natural phenomenon and nothing to worry about. In the final part of this chapter, I shall briefly outline the main arguments for and against the proposition that the spread of English is the result of a deliberate imperialist policy, one that Phillipson in a well-known book of the same title (1992) has termed linguistic imperialism or ‘linguicism’.

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

**English as an International Language or World Englishes?**

The political debate over the spread of English centers around two questions: (1) is it due to imperialism or linguicism; or(2) is it due to a genuine desire of people to learn English because it has become so useful and because it can be adapted to suit the cultural norms of the people who speak it?

There is also little doubt that the British government sees great advantage in the spread of English, especially British English and especially in post-communist countries of Eastern Europe and countries such as China. This has led scholars such as Swales (1997), Ammon (2000), and Kandiah (2001) to consider how any possible prejudice against scholars who are either speakers of different varieties of English or who are second-language speakers of English can be addressed. To take just three examples from Chinese culture, traditional Chinese medicine, the writings on the Art of War by Sun Zi, and the tenets of Confucianism are now much better known in the West than in the past, precisely because this Chinese cultural knowledge and these Chinese ways of thinking have been disseminated through English. However, it is noteworthy that the British Council sees these schools as operating with an overall purpose of building mutually beneficial relationships between people in the UK and other countries. For example, the roles and functions of English differ markedly today even in Malaysia and Singapore, two countries whose historical backgrounds are so closely related that one was part of the other at one stage in the past.