DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 817 FL 027 616

AUTHOR	Rausch, Anthony S.
TITLE	Alternatives to "English as an International Language" and the Necessity for Collaborative Codification of Englishes.
PUB DATE	2000-03-00
NOTE	15p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT	Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University; n83 p107-19 Mar 2000
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Codification; Cooperative Planning; Cultural Awareness; Culturally Relevant Education; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; Sociolinguistics
IDENTIFIERS	*World English

ABSTRACT

This paper highlights recent discourses about English as an international language that justify two recent reconceptions of English: Pennycook's (1994) "worldliness of English" and Kachru's (1997) "world Englishes," noting that at the heart of these two reconceptions are prescriptive versus descriptive notions of the diversification of language. It stresses the need for collaborative codification of these alternatives. Pennycook suggests that while teaching English within the discourse of English as an international language means maintaining faith in the possibility of merely teaching the language, teaching from the standpoint of the worldliness of English means understanding that possible meanings occur within local and global contexts. He asserts the impossibility of separating English from its many localized contexts or merely teaching English. In planning an English curriculum that includes precepts of the world Englishes concept, Kachru contends there must be a paradigm shift which will generate awareness of: sociolinguistic profile, variety exposure, attitudinal neutrality, range of uses, contrastive pragmatics, multidimensionality, expansion of the canons, and cross-cultural intelligibility. The paper concludes that collaborative codification can address both the need for introducing a standard English in teaching and learning and the element of voice and innovation for addressing the multiple identities and creative communication needs of learners prioritized in the worldliness of English and the world Englishes concepts. (Contains 26 references.) (SM)

Alternatives to 'English as an International Language' and the Necessity for Collaborative Codification of Englishes

「English as an International Language」への代案と多様な英語の認知に向けての協力体制

Anthony S. RAUSCH

Reprinted from

Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University

No.83, March 2000

弘前大学教育学部紀要　第83号（平成12年３月）別刷

弘前大学教育学部紀要　第83号：107～119（2000年３月）
Bull. Fac. Educ. Hirosaki Univ. 83：107～119(Mar. 2000)

Alternatives to 'English as an International Language' and the Necessity for Collaborative Codification of Englishes

「English as an International Language」への代案と多様な英語の認知に向けての協力体制

Anthony S. RAUSCH*

Abstract

In this paper I will briefly highlight recent thinking on the discourses concerning English as an International Language. These discourses justify two recent reconceptions of English, first, in the notion of "the worldliness of English" by Pennycook and second, in the 'world Englishes' concept by Kachru. After considering the pedagogical implications I will consider the necessity for collaborative codification of Englishes as the key to addressing the important question of standardization.

Keyword: English as an Internatinal Language, World Englishes, Codification

Introduction

There is an inherent and often paradoxical tension in the conception of 'language' between conventions of correctness and possibilities for innovation. The former is represented by the notion of purism, which advocates the deyelopment of a prestige variety of a language within a speech community and places value in providing an institutionalized linguistic norm for such purposes as the media and language teaching. Language purists are prescriptive, insisting on standardization and asserting the authority of dictionaries and grammars to ensure the correct use of language in society. Purists also see language as needing preservation from external processes that cause a deterioration of standards.

Language innovators, on the other hand, accept the notion of language change as both a universal and unstoppable process, particularly in the areas of pronunciation and vocabulary, where change is most frequent and highly noticeable. The innovators, coming from the schools of comparative philology, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics, look to descriptive grammars, those which provide a precise account of actual usage, without regard to correctness or incorrectness, as their guide and explain language change as arising on the basis of language contact and contact vernaculars.

In this paper, a preliminary consideration of alternatives to 'English as an International Language' and the necessity for collaborative codification of those alternatives, I will briefly highlight recent thinking on the respective dimensions of the discourse concerning English as an International Language. This discourse, in a sense reflecting the tension described above, provides the justification for two recent reconceptions of

＊弘前大学教育学部英語教育教室
Department of English, Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University

English, first, in the notion of 'the worldliness of English' by Pennycook (1994) and second, in the 'world Englishes' concept by Kachru (1997b). After introducing these two reconceptions of English, I will consider their pedagogical implications, an important element for their viability at both local and global levels. Finally, I will consider the necessity for collaborative codification of the so-called 'Englishes' allowed by these reconceptions as the key to addressing the important question of standardization.

I. The Dimensions of 'English as an International Language'

As Pennycook (1994) points out in contextualizing his book *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language*, the dominant discourse on English as an International Language considers the global spread of English to be natural, neutral, and beneficial, and thus the discourse is more concerned with questions of linguistic description than of questions of language, culture and politics. Alatis and Straehle (1997) point out that there is little evidence for any sort of an explicit policy aimed at the global spread of English in the manner of linguistic imperialism. Rather, they argue that English, simply by virtue of its status as the most widely spoken language in the world, has taken on a life of its own, and indeed, in so doing has undergone linguistic diversification and change, certainly not the agenda of any form of linguistic imperialism. Pakir (1997) elaborates the theme of beneficiality by employing the metaphor of 'language as money' when she compares English to a thriving money plant which has been transplanted many times over in many settings around the world. Pointing out the benefits of economization on the basis of English use (while ignoring the social cost of disenfranchising the majority of citizens who do not speak English), de Kadt (1993) pointed out that using English in South Africa would be cheaper than providing for multilingualism. Even Lummis (1976), in outlining an argument opposing the notion of the native speaker as the ideal language teacher, points out that the term 'native speaker' itself has been for the most part, exploited by business-oriented English language schools in Japan as a means of capitalizing on this notion, rather than born as a function of any imperialistic aims by Western powers.

By contrast, Pennycook (1994) points out that a review of the critical work on the theme of English as an International Language has shown how English is linked to social, economic and political power both within and between nations, and to the global diffusion of particular forms of culture and knowledge. Taking the case of Hong Kong English, Pennycook asserts that English in this setting does not enjoy the mantle of neutrality, nor can its presence be seen as natural. In terms of the benefits bestowed by English, he points out that these are more a function of the social and economic advantages that provide the opportunities for extensive English education rather than with the language itself. Furthermore, (from Pennycook, 1994),

> Beyond the issues outlined above . . . a number of writers have pointed to a far broader range of cultural and political effects of the spread of English: its widespread use threatens other languages; it has become the language of power and prestige in many countries, thus acting as a crucial gatekeeper to social and economic progress; its use in particular domains, especially professional, may exacerbate different power relationships and may render these domains more inaccessible to many people; its position in the world gives it a role also as an international gatekeeper, regulating the international flow of people; it is closely linked to national and increasingly non-national forms of culture and knowledge that are dominant in the world; and it is also bound up with aspects of global relations, such as the spread of capitalism, development aid and the dominance of North American media (p. 13).

Romaine (1997) states that the fact that language is symbolic of the social and moral order implies that debates about language ultimately reflect issues organized on the basis of race, gender, class, and culture. This calls into question the role of language in historical processes such as colonialism and feminism and means that any calls for language reform are often perceived as an attack on the primarily male-defined, Western-centered moral and social order.

Tsuda (1997), in his description of the adverse effects of the hegemony of English, points out the existence of a hidden ideology resulting in communicative inequality in international communication. This ideology is seen in that fact that in most international communication, there is a 'take-for-grantedness' regarding the use of English as the sole mode of communication. This 'take-for-grantedness' is legitimized to the degree that seemingly transparent positions characterized by common-sense power relationships, such as that in the case of seller and buyer, take on a new dimension in the international context when one party is a native English speaker and the other is not. Tsuda argues that this legitimization is the result of the reality of recent historical Anglo-American political hegemony, resulting in unequal power relationships predicated on the basis of English ability alone. This hegemony has spread into the cultural domain as well, the result being cultural domination by members of the English-speaking culture and colonization of the minds of individuals outside the English-speaking culture. Evidence of these phenomenon can be seen in the so-called 'Coca Colonization' and 'McDonaldization' of local cultures. As this cultural hegemonization proceeds, local consciousness erodes, eventually being replaced by a global consciousness, albeit one which has an English linguistic base at its core.

This domination extends to the educational realm as well. Giroux (1983) suggests that the predominant 'culture of positivism' in pedagogy allows for analysis on the basis of efficiency in teaching and learning alone, and not for questions such as the extent to which "schools acted as agents of social and cultural reproduction in a society marked by significant inequities in wealth, power, and privilege" (p. 170). Pennycook (1994) concurs, pointing out that the positivist and structuralist basis of the pedagogical discourse for teaching of English mirrors the dominant discourse for English as an International Language in stressing the neutrality, beneficiality and normalcy of the spread of English. English language teachers have for the most part been obliged to draw solely on a specialist body of knowledge in applied linguistics, a body of knowledge which has a very limited view of the world. As a result, English language educators have neglected looking at the real world context in which they teach as well as the social, cultural and political effects of their teaching efforts. Furthermore, by virtue of its connection to development and more recently marketplace orientations, English education has adopted a pedagogical orientation which is described as being, first, based on the promotion of English as 'cultural propaganda' (see Coombs, 1988; Donaldson, 1984), 'development aid' (see Phillipson, 1986), and a 'global commodity' (see McCallen, 1989), second, oriented with a viewpoint of Western superiority, and third, undertaken solely from a perspective of communication, i.e. recursively supporting the discourse of English as an International Language itself.

The pedagogical questions related to English education as 'communication' also relate to specific teaching models, teaching methods, and curriculum design. Pennycook (1994) points out various linguistic and cultural biases inherent in the now-popular communicative approach to language teaching. First, the communicative approach, in stressing monolingualism, tends to view multilingualism as a problem rather than a resource. Moreover, the normative rules of appropriacy of communicative competence are oriented with

reference to the native English speaker's values rather than those of the learner. Finally, the communicative approach has been seen by some to trivialize language, even to diminish the ultimate level of learning which could occur (see Brumfit, 1985; Tomlinson, 1986).

This communication perspective legitimizes the notion an English Conversation Ideology, perhaps best represented by the case in Japan. According to Kachru (1997a), the English Conversation (*Eikawa*) Ideology is a complex attitude which inculcates in Japanese:

> the notion that true English speaking competence can be addressed through 'English conversation' skill; an emotional attachment to and obsessive infatuation with Western, especially American culture (Tsuda, 1992); the notion that the ideal speaking partner is a 'white, middle-class American' (Lummis, 1976); that such an ideal speaking partner is elevated to a position of cultural superiority; and altered images of Japanese 'self' and 'society' (p. 72).

Kachru (1997a) argues that the English conversation ideology in practice restricts the language by virtue of prescribed and controlled use, thereby freezing the medium and depriving the communicative activity of its energy and vitality as well as its potential to generate new meanings. For the learner, the *eikawa* ideology takes the elements of innovation and creativity away from the learner and makes the user suspicious of his or her linguistic independence.

II. The "Worldliness of English" and "World Englishes"

Both the notion of the 'worldliness of English' (see Pennycook, 1994), and the 'world Englishes' concept (see Kachru, 1997b) seek to come to terms with the implications of the global spread of English briefly outlined above.

Pennycook's notion of the 'worldliness of English' concept is an attempt "to find ways to think about how to understand language and its connections to its many contexts" (p. 26) and "to find a space between, on the one hand, a structuralist view of language as an idealized, abstract system disconnected to its surroundings, and on the other hand, a materialist view of language that reduces it to its contexts and therefore sees language use as determined by worldly circumstance" (p. 26). The first important question Pennycook raises in detailing the worldliness of English notion concerns the very notion of a language itself. Lyons (1981) suggests there is a question concerning the fiction of whole, homogenous languages and that in the end, "we should have to admit that everyone has his (or her) own individual dialect" (p. 27). Reconstituting the notion of language then, leaves us with Corder's (1973) idea that "a speech community is made up of people who regard themselves as speaking the same language" (p. 53). Questions of unintelligibility aside, speakers speak the same language because they accept the same norm, whatever varieties may be manifested in the actual use of the language. The tie to the worldly circumstance comes with the positioning of the language within the notion of discourse in a discursively mediated social action rather than in terms of a fixed system for analysis.

Such a deconstruction of the notion of language replaces a top-down definition of language, even a description of any one language, with a "bottom-up way of understanding language" (Pennycook, 1994, p. 28) and a way of looking at the creation of meaning through language. Language is located in social action and anything we might want to call a language is not a pregiven system but rather a reflection of the will of a given people in a particular community. Language, according to Weedon (1987) "is the place where

actual and possible forms of social organization and their likely social and political consequences are defined and contested. Yet it is also the place where our sense of ourselves, our subjectivity, is constructed" (p. 21).

A second key question is how meaning is constructed and understood. From a structuralist point of view, meanings are a series of relationships within a linguistic system, and thus for transformational-generative linguists, saying things is as easy as generating sentences from an internal language machine. A representationalist view of language by contrast, posits a real world that exists prior to language and which can be represented by language. 'Saying something' in this view is a question of finding appropriate ways to represent local realities. The worldliness of English concept takes meaning as something produced in localized social and personal activity, with language being as much constitutive as reflective of social reality. Language, therefore, produces realities as well as reflecting them.

The key, as shall be considered in greater depth later, is to find ways to think about how we come to use language and make sense with language in a manner that does not leave individuals as free and random actors on the one hand, but does not also fix them to a deterministic and abstract linguistic system on the other. Pennycook (1994) sees this in the complex interveaving of language acts which are based on both global and local discourses. There is a reciprocal relationship which is both historical and contemporary. English, the linguistic product of global, historical processes can be used for discourse at the local level; however, it is the 'local' extent of the discourse which demands linguistic contemporality. This historical and geographical pervasiveness which characterizes English is precisely what provides it its sense of worldliness.

Kachru (1997b), in his summary article closing the book *World Englishes 2000*, outlines the 'world Englishes' concept by describing it on the basis of a number of sociolinguistic points which led to its development. He describes the spread and stratification of English, noting that the earlier distinction based on English as a native language (ENL), English as a second language (ESL), and English as a foreign language (EFL) has been replaced by the notion of an Inner Circle of English, an Outer Circle of English, and an Expanding Circle of English. These three circles are defined with references to the historical, sociolinguistic, and literary contexts of speech communities, organized for simplicity, as nation-states. The Inner Circle represents the traditional bases of English, those dominated by the 'mother tongue' varieties of the language. Representative of the Inner Circle are the USA, the UK, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. The Outer Circle comprises locations where English has been institutionalized as an additional language, represented by the cases for, among others, India, South Africa, Singapore, and the Philippines. Finally, the Expanding Circle includes the rest of the world, in which English is used as the primary foreign language. Representative of Expanding Circle settings are China, Korea, Taiwan, Israel, Egypt, much of South America, and notably for this paper, Japan.

The conceptualization of world Englishes within a sociolinguistic framework actually goes back to the early 1960s (Kachru, 1965). The term 'world Englishes' was coined to recognize the functions of the language in diverse pluralistic contexts and is intended to characterize the global functions of English more succinctly than do concepts such as English as a *lingua franca* , world language English, or English as an International Language. The world Englishes concept is seen as more accurately reflecting the contexts in which respective varieties of English are used in the English-using speech communities around the world. As examples of English-using speech communities which have developed and exist across cultures, Kachru

gives the examples of distinct English language policies, extended English-based literature traditions, processes of unintentional social penetration of English, Englishization of the local language, functional applications of English in local settings, and acculturation of English for articulating local social, cultural, and religious identities.

While pedagogy was the original concern of the World Englishes concept, the scholarly interests have expanded to include acquisitional, sociolinguistic, theoretical, and ideological topics. The acquisitional questions relate to the relevance of such topics as interference, interlanguage, error analysis, and fossilization. The sociolinguistic questions relate to, for example, the pluricentricity of English, its ideological connotations, the new ideologies represented by Englishes in the Outer Circle, and the expansion of literary and cultural canons of English. The theoretical issues surrounding world Englishes concern three vital concepts: the speech community, the native speaker, and the ideal speaker-hearer of English (Kachru, 1988).

While both the notion of the worldliness of English and world Englishes both see 'worldly circumstances' and 'local cultural context' as important, at the heart of these two reconceptions of English are prescriptive versus descriptive notions regarding diversification of the language. The main issue, according to Pennycook, is whether efforts should be made to maintain a central standard of English - a 'one standard' ideology, or whether the different varieties of English should be acknowledged as legitimate forms in their own rights - a 'multiple standards' ideology. If we assume a multiple standard *defacto reality*, then the most debated question, according to Kachru, concerns the models, norms, and standards for English in the Outer Circle. The Inner Circle is seen as being norm-providing, based on the dominant American and British varieties of English, while the Expanding Circle is seen as being norm-dependent, in which the norms are totally external (American or British). The Outer Circle is seen as a site of normdevelopment, in which users do not have identical attitudes about an endocentric, or locally defined, norm and thus are ambivalent about linguistic norms and performance norms. Explicitly stated, the questions germane to English in the Outer Circle are: (1) Who and what determines the difference between an error and an innovation? and (2) What are the variables of intelligibility for English across languages and cultures?

The first question, at its essential level a question of deficiency versus difference, concerns the difference between identifying and describing lexical, grammatical or phonological divergences from the central standards of the language versus focusing on the location of language within its diverse contexts and considering the particular meanings that can be expressed using the language. According to Kachru (1997b), an error is considered to be an acquisitional deficiency in phonology, grammar, pragmatics and so on; a deviation has a comparative and a contrastive implication - it is generally explained with reference to another variety of English; and an innovation entails a contextual and formal explanation. The range of such innovations is not restricted to lexical items, but includes various variety-specific speech acts, genres, and registers.

The question of intelligibility, simply the degree to which a message can be understood, is seen at a mechanical level as being dependent on accent and intonation, the listener's predictive ability, the location of pauses in the utterance, the grammatical complexity of the sentence or sentences, and the speed with which the utterances are produced. Smith and Nelson (1985) however, make a distinction between a) intelligibility, seen as recognition of the word/utterance itself; b) comprehensibility, seen as recognition of the word/utterance meaning (locutionary force); and c) interpretability, seen as recognition of the meaning behind the

word/utterance (illocutionary force). Smith and Nelson suggest that other important factors contributing to intelligibility are the attitudes of speaker and listener toward varieties of spoken English and the effort of speaker and listener to bring about communicative success.

III. The Pedagogical Implications

To teach is to be caught up in an array of questions concerning curriculum (the source of knowledge and credibility), educational system (reproduction of social and cultural inequality) and classroom practices (the pedagogical assumptions we inevitably make). Pennycook (1994) states that to teach English within the discourse of English as an International Language is to maintain a faith in the possibility of 'just teaching the language,' and a belief in the existence of firmly established and shared meanings which need to be taught in order for one's students to be able to communicate within a global community. To teach from the standpoint of the worldliness of English, however, is to understand that possible meanings occur at the level of local context as well as in the global context. The notion of the worldliness of English asserts the impossibility of separating English from its many localized contexts as well as the accordant impossibility of 'just teaching the language.'

Pennycook cites Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (1989) as suggesting two crucial strategies in the process of teaching someone how to 'say something,' the means of finding appropriate ways to represent local realities. The first is abrogation, a denial and refusal of the colonial and metropolitan (i.e. Inner Circle) categories, their standards of normative or 'correct' usage and their claims to fixed meanings inscribed in words. The second is appropriation, a process whereby language is seized and re-placed in a specific cultural location. In other words, abrogation and appropriation are the strategies by which errors are reinterpreted as innovations. A key notion in this process, according to Pennycook (1994), is the idea of voice, which according to Giroux (1988) refers to "the means at our disposal - the discourses available to use - to make ourselves understood and listened to and to define ourselves as active participants in the world" (p. 199).

Pennycook sees voice as the primary educational strategy in the notion of a critical pedagogy, one which is described as education grounded in a desire for social change (see, for example, Giroux, 1988; Mclaren, 1989; Simon, 1992; Weiler, 1988). Giroux (1991) suggested nine principal features of critical pedagogy:

1. Education which plays an important role in the construction of student subjectivities;

2. Inclusion of ethics in education, in addition to knowledge and truth;

3. Maintenance of an understanding of differences, both in terms of how student and teacher identities are formed and how differences between groups are maintained;

4. Acceptance of questions and challenge to the accepted canons of knowledge and recognition of learning not as discovery of universal and inevitable truths but rather as a process of knowledge formation and truth defenses:

5. Organized not only to critique forms of knowledge but to work towards the creation of new forms of knowledge;

6. Rejection of claims to objectivity in favor of acceptance of partial and particular versions of knowledge, truth and reason;

7. Inclusion of a vision of a better world;

8. Undertaken by teachers who view themselves as 'transformative intellectuals,' reducing the notion of

the teacher as a technician who passes on a body of knowledge and stressing a version in which teachers work toward social transformation;

9. Inclusion of the notion of 'voice,' emphasizing the student as subject and searching for ways in which students can develop critical explorations rather than individualized narratives.

Taking voice as perhaps the most important element of a critical pedagogy, Pennycook (1994) sees the notion of voice as suggesting a pedagogy which

> starts with the concerns of the student, not in some vapid, humanist 'student-centered' approach that requires students to express their 'inner feelings', but rather through an exploration of students' histories and cultural locations, of the limitations and possibilities presented by languages and discourses. The issue of teaching critically, then, is one of working with students to come to terms with the continuing struggles over language, knowledge and culture, over what is constituted as knowledge, and how one is represented and how one can come to represent oneself in the world. Voice is not just a non-silence, a mouthing of words, or a mastery of lexis, pronunciation or syntax; it is a place of struggle in the space between language, discourse and subjectivity (p. 311).

The construction of voice through language, discourse and subjectivity suggests three important domains of action: the discursive, the linguistic, and the subjective. Discursive action addresses the discursive construction of reality, how our lives are made and regulated within different discourses and how certain discourses intersect with English. This domain might better be termed discursive intervention, as it is an attempt to make central to English teaching the connections between the language and significant discourses. Several domain that are immediately clear are, for example, the relationship between English and popular culture, international relations, education, global capitalism, modernity, fundamentalism, or local development.

If the abrogative and appropriative processes introduced above are accepted as legitimate, then the pedagogy must locate a position relative to the central norms of the language use, first, to ensure that students have access to the standard forms, and second, so that students are encouraged to use the language in their own way and for their own needs. In order to achieve the second of these, we need to encourage what MacCabe (1988) calls, in a positive sense, 'broken English', where 'breaking' is seen as an attempt to recreate alternative possibilities with the language. There is thus a need for a balance between ensuring that students meet the criteria for success as defined within particular institutional contexts and discovering ways to allow students to understand their individual potential with the language.

Subjective action considers the subjectivities of the students, their histories, memories, lives, and cultural locations. It is in this domain that the notion of voice, understood as putting to language the different discourses and subjective positions, can present a useful strategy for a critical pedagogy. Voice implies a sense of agency and ways of making ourselves understood and defining ourselves as active participants in the world.

The critical pedagogy described by the notion of the worldliness of English is based on constructing pedagogies that take up the discursive domains particularly related to English and to the students, that explore linguistically how students can come to make meanings for themselves, and that seek to incorporate student subjectivities.

In planning an English curriculum which includes the precepts dictated by the world Englishes concept,

Kachru (1997b) contends that there must be a paradigm shift which will generate among professionals and students awareness of the following aspects:

1. Sociolinguistic profile: An overview of world Englishes in their respective world contexts, making distinctions between major varieties of English and examining the use of English in a monolingual societies as opposed the that in a complex, multilingual societies.

2. Variety exposure: A discussion of the repertoire within major native and non-native varieties of English, the varieties within a variety, and the specific texts related to different interactional contexts, the mixing and switching of varieties and the implications of such, and the features shared and not shared among varieties at various linguistic levels.

3. Attitudinal neutrality: Demonstration of both the formal and functional reasons for distinctiveness of a variety of English as well as consideration as to why attitudinal neutrality is essential to capturing the true nature of the varieties introduced.

4. Range of uses: Introduction of the functional and pragmatic appropriateness of the lectal range of English in private and public discourses and the reasons for use of varieties in specific contexts as related to the concept cline with reference to a) the participants in a speech event, b) intelligibility within the speech community, and c) the roles in which English is used.

5. Contrastive pragmatics: Introduction of the rationale for the use of distinct discoursal and stylistic innovations and their appropriateness to the local conventions of culture.

6. Multidimensionality: Introduction of the linguistic implications of the functional ranges of English in the media, literary creativity, administration, government, and the legal system.

7. Expansion of the canons: Introduction of the literary, linguistic and cultural implications of multiple Western and non-Western canons of English.

8. Cross-cultural intelligibility: Introduction of the implications of the diffusion and multilinguistic and literary identities of English on international and intranational intelligibility. (p. 235)

Furthermore, the world Englishes pedagogical approach must be cross-cultural and crosslinguistic and must involve diverse cultures, languages, and literatures in contact with English. Kachru identifies the following themes as important for generating the attitudinal and methodological paradigm shift necessary to incorporate world Englishes into any English language curriculum:

1. Allowing for bilingual creativity;
2. Allowing for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic contact and convergence;
3. Generating true cross-cultural discourse;
4. Allowing for textual competence and interpretation;
5. Ensuring true language acquisition;
6. Engendering language attitudes accepting of diversity;
7. Examining language function in society;
8. Addressing standardization and lexicography (p. 233)

IV. The Necessity for Collaborative Codification

While the pedagogical considerations outlined above do address broad theoretical issues concerning the teaching of varieties of English, they do little to respond to the criticism - prevalent in the ELT circles - that

the worldliness notion and the world Englishes concept imply that in each variety of English there is an 'anything goes' mentality. While standardization and codificiation do present a means of addressing this criticism, Kachru (1997b) points out that the traditionally held views concerning the criteria for codification and authentication of English have only recently come under scrutiny and much work needs to be done to legitimize the process for both the purist and the innovator.

Pakir (1997), in arguing for standardization in the abstract, takes pains to point out that standardization per se is based on the notion of a 'standard,' on recognition of a prestige variety of a language used within a speech community which provides an institutionalized norm for such purposes as the media and language teaching. As such, standardization of English is hampered by the question of which English should be taken as the standard, for example, American English or British English, or in the case of Southeast Asia, Australian English. Furthermore, standardization comes with its own set of concerns. Standardization does not tolerate linguistic variability and is motivated by social, political, and commercial needs. Standardization is, in essence, an ideology which is often promoted by a particular institutional body. Finally, standardization is an abstract idea of the mind rather than a concrete and attainable reality (Pakir, 1997).

Countering the problems of standardization is the possibility for codification of so-called Institutionalized Varieties of English, those of the Outer Circle. Codification is a systematic account of a language, especially its grammar and vocabulary, a process by which the many Englishes which exist are given recognition. Codification is often undertaken when a language is written down for the first time, but is can also be used to describe the process of a language developing a standard form or can be used to describe a language after a period of considerable creativity and change. A language can be said to be 'codified' when it is embodied in dictionaries and in a set of rules to be taught to learners.

Pakir (1997) admits that codification resembles standardization, but points out that codification can be undertaken on a procedural basis, rather than an ideological or political one and outlines how the following ideological problems can be recast in procedural terms:

1. Prescriptivism versus descriptivism: From Pakir,

> codification is part of corpus planning, including graphization (deciding on a written form for the spoken language), modernization (bring a language up to date in terms of contemporary concepts, injecting the new rhetoric of discourse, new speech acts) and standardization (modifying, emphasizing, regulating or discouraging certain tendencies within a variety, and giving recognition and status to that particular variety). Codification is the process of standardizing the language along with rules and models, putting up frames of reference for prescriptive purposes, such as pedagogical ones. Codification is the establishment of uniform norms of usage. With such a view, codification has the quality to stabilize an English by its influence on correctness for that particular English. . . . Codification efforts are neither prescriptive nor descriptive but capture a totality of the experiences of World Englishes. The shift is to content (p. 175).

2. Participatory versus exclusionary functions: If the objective of codification is for purposes of mutual collaboration and international communication, clearly a participatory function, then the process must serve to make the English acceptable and understood by English speakers all over the world. However, the exclusionary (or separatist) function of an English must also be addressed in a manner which will ensure the usage of the English within the national boundaries. Both are equally justifiable and both must be incorporat-

ed in the procedure; however, they are dictated by focus on different features of the particular variety of English.

3. Choice, content and acceptance of standards: Questions regarding the choice and content of standards is an issue only as far as standardization on the basis of a single standard is called for. In the purely exonormative case, there exist a vast array of codified material in the way of dictionaries, reference books, and grammar and usage books. However, endonormative standards are equally justifiable and their incorporation is key to codification on the basis of the worldliness notion or the world Englishes concept. The burden of endonormative codification lies in assessing the distinctive cultural identity of the territorial population as it relates to English. The task is to balance the two cases, exonormative and endonormative. Regarding acceptance of standards, attitudes towards these standards need the expressed and observable approval and support of professionals, institutions and the population.

Pakir (1997) presents the objections to codifying identified in a case study of Singapore, a nation described as undergoing rapidly changing linguistic developments on both a macro-level, that of official language use, as well as a micro-level, that of intergenerational patterns of language use. These included: poor modeling for children; poor impression of Singaporeans; exaggerated, rather than authentic English; refusal to recognize that standards already exist elsewhere. However, she contends that these are not valid objections in light of the justifications for codifying under a new paradigm. The reasons for codification include: provision of models of good and correct usage with impact on schools, curricula, syllabuses, dictionaries and reference books; facilitation of learning among school children who are speaking to each other in English; prevention of degeneration of Singapore English to a level too far below the internationally accepted norm; and increasing international visibility by giving Singapore English a status.

The new paradigm for codification which Pakir champions rests on the recognition that the issues for codification for the Outer Circle countries are the same as those which have historically been issues for the Inner Circle countries, specifically the universal concerns of intelligibility, pride, prestige and status. However, the features of codification must also incorporate recognition of the fact that innovation is an essential characteristic of both the notion of the worldliness of English and the world Englishes concept and that processes of borrowing, loanword formation, development of new compounds and derivatives and derivation of new meanings for familiar words, as well as establishment of new collocations of both grammar and phraseology are inescapable. Addressing this element of innovation, Pakir (1997) dictates that any innovations must have the following features in order that some sense of order is maintained:

1. Depth: a reflection of the specific social and cultural histories of the multilingual and multiethnic speech communities;

2. Breadth: a reflection of the necessity for encompassing the language as used in contact situations at all levels and recognizing that distinct varieties can coexist;

3. Rigidity: a reflection of the necessity of maintaining the separatist function to ensure local identity;

4. Flexibility: a reflection of the necessity of allowing for the participatory function to ensure communicative relevance;

5. Opacity: a reflection of the necessity of inclusion of new forms that cannot be traced back to the original language but instead arise from spontaneous processes of interaction;

6. Transparency: a reflection of the necessity of recording of the transfers arising from a high degree of

contact among speakers who transfer words from other languages or invent and create new compounds.

Pakir points out that depth, rigidity, and opacity lie on one end of an imaginary spectrum of any variety of English, while breadth, flexibility, and transparency lie on the opposite end. Although seemingly contradictory, even paradoxical, these features address the paradoxical nature of language as described as the opening of this paper, the characteristics of correctness and innovation. These features will ensure both "codification efforts that are solidly built on the foundation that is language" (p. 180) as well as "vital, volatile, and vibrant new Englishes with unique expressions" (p. 179).

Finally, these features and the notion of the spectrum are also important in contextualizing the necessity for collaboration in codification. The features of breadth, flexibility, and transparency point to the importance of input from members of the Inner Circle of English. Collaboration ensures that codification does not occur in isolation, undertaken only with the input of those with a vested interest in codifying their particular variety of English. Collaboration is also the necessary response to objections to the 'multiple standards' notion of English on the basis of relativism, the notion that there is no distinction between good and bad as everything is relative. Given collaborative codification, there is a means to measure internal standards of any one English against some external standard, be it the English of the Inner Circle or that of any other Outer Circle (or even the Expanding Circle) setting. While codification generates self-awareness, participation by representatives of various Englishes in collaborative codification brings selfawareness together with other-awareness.

Placing collaborative codification in the context of the learning environment, we must recognize the importance of the process of collaborative codification as a means of addressing Pennycook's call for a critical pedagogy and Kachru's call for a paradigm shift. Collaborative codification can address both the needs for introducing a standard English in teaching and learning as well as the element of voice and innovation, so important in addressing the multiple identities and creative communication needs of learners prioritized in the worldliness of English and the world Englishes concepts. In order to deal with the expressiveness of varieties possible in the worlds of English, the speakers who tread the space between respective forms of English should be considered, according to Pakir (1997), as "translanguage" speakers, with our intelligibility strategies based on "flexibilization" and "creative understanding and analysis" (Pakir, 1997). Collaborative codification represents the means by which multiple Englishes can be recognized as both locally representative and communicatively legitimate.

WORKS CITED

Alatis, J. and Straehle, C. A. (1997) The universe of English: Imperialism, chauvinism, and paranoia. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 1-20.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., and Tiffin, H. (1989) *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London & New York: Routledge.

Brumfit, C. (1985) Creativity and constraint in the language classroom. In *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Edited by R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 148-57.

Coombs, D. (1988) *Spreading the word: The literary work of the British Council*. London and New York:

Mansell Publishing.

de Kadt, E. (1993) Language, power and emancipation in South Africa. *World Englishes*. 12.2, 157-168.

Donaldson, F. (1984) *The British Council: The first fifty years*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Giroux, H. A. (1988) *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1991) Modernism, postmodernism and feminism: Rethinking the boundaries of educational discourse. In *Postmodernism, feminism and cultural politics: Redrawing educational boundaries*. Edited by H. Giroux. New York: SUNY Press, pp. 1-59.

Kachru, B. B. (1965) The *Indianness* in Indian English. *Word*, 21, 391-410.

Kachru, B. B. (1988) The spread of English and sacred linguistic cows. In Lowenberg ed. 1988: 207-228.

Kachru, B. B. (1997a) Past imperfect: The other side of English in Asia. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 68-89.

Kachru, B. B. (1997b) World Englishes 2000: resources for research and teaching. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 209-251.

Lummis, D. (1973) English conversation as ideology. In *Essays on Language*. Edited by Yasuo Kurokawa. Tokyo: Kirihara Shoten.

Lyons, J. (1981) *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacCabe, C. (Ed.) (1988) *Futures for English*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McCallen, B. (1989) *English: A world commodity. The international market for training in English as a foreign language*. London: The Economist.

Mclaren, P. (1989) *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.

Pakir, A. (1997) Standards and codification for world Englishes. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 169181.

Pennycook A. (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. New York: Longman.

Phillipson, R. (1986) English rules: A study of language pedagogy and imperialism. In *Linguicism rules in education*. Edited by R. Phillipson and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. Denmark: Roskilde University Centre, pp. 124-343.

Romaine, S. (1997) World Englishes: Standards and the new world order. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. ix-xvi.

Simon, R. (1992) *Teaching against the grain: Essays towards a pedagogy of possibility*. Boston: Bergin & Garvey.

Smith, L. and Nelson, L. (1985) International intelligibility of English: Directions and resources. *World Englishes*, 4.3, 333-342.

Tomlinson, B. (1986) Using poetry with mixed ability language classes. *ELT Journal* 40 .1, 3441.

Tsuda, Y. (1997) Hegemony of English vs ecology of language: Building equality in international communication. In *World Englishes 2000*. Edited by L. E. Smith and M. L. Forman. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, pp. 21-31.

Weiler, K. (1988) *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

(Accepted January 11, 2000)

FL027616

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Alternatives to 'English as an International Language' and the Necessity for Collaborative Codification of Englishes	
Author(s): Anthony S. Rausch	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 03. 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Anthony S. Rausch	Printed Name/Position/Title: Foreign Lecturer Hirosaki Univ.
Organization/Address: Hirosaki University Faculty of Education	Telephone: for 172 39-3447 / FAX: +81 172 39-3447
	E-Mail Address: asrausch@cc.hirosaki-u.ac.jp / Date: 03.10.2003

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
4646 40TH St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20016-1859

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)