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ABSTRACT: It is not easy to look at the current momentum of the worldwide diffusion of English and imagine what the future trends will be by mid-century or even in the next two or three decades. A prudent undertaking is to review briefly the present situation and project what the coming decades hold in view of several developments that are shaping our world. The story of the spread of English and the factors responsible for its diffusion are complex. The spread and functions of world Englishes are still growing; simultaneously, the domains of use of other contenders or languages of wider communication, such as French and Spanish in Africa, Southeast Asia and other parts of the world, are shrinking. As far as various other languages of wider communication are concerned (e.g., Arabic, Chinese, Hindi-Urdu, Spanish), although they are spreading at a fast pace beyond their borders, they are as yet providing no serious challenge to world Englishes. This paper presents a bird's-eye view of the factors responsible for the spread of English, and discusses briefly its impact on local languages. The major focus is on the consequences of the worldwide diffusion of English in terms of nativization and acculturation of the language and emergence of world Englishes. The concern that the global spread of English is hastening language ‘decay’ and ‘death’, and the proposals to combat this process by developing world, global, or lingua franca English, are addressed briefly. The contemporary status of world Englishes and the world's major languages are considered in some detail in terms of plausible futuristic constructs.1

INTRODUCTION

The late Charles Ferguson, the distinguished socially committed linguist, observed in 1982:2

We cannot know what the future will bring. At some point the spread of English may be halted, and some other language may spread to take its place. . . . But for the present the spread of English continues, with no sign of diminishing (although the use may contract in some areas), and two trends are gaining strength. English is less and less regarded as a European language, and its development is less and less determined by the usage of its native speakers. (Emphasis added.)

What Ferguson said a quarter of a century ago is still true. The functions of world Englishes are expanding; simultaneously, the domains of use of other contenders or languages of wider communication seem to be shrinking. This is especially true of such languages of wider communication as French and Spanish in Africa and Southeast Asia, if we look at the favored language choice for a range of domains in these regions. The same is true of other languages, such as German, in certain domains in Europe. As far as various other languages of wider communication are concerned (e.g. Arabic, Chinese and Hindi-Urdu), they are as yet providing no serious challenge to world Englishes even though they are no
doubt spreading beyond their borders. Let us look at one candidate out of the three mentioned above, Mandarin Chinese: Graddol’s estimate and projected estimate of students of Mandarin worldwide (2006: 63) does not come even close to the projected estimate of learners of English in the next decade or two (100 million vs. 2 billion; Graddol 2006: 100).³

In view of these facts, a reasonable projection is to suggest that the depth and range of use of world Englishes all over the planet will continue to grow at least for the foreseeable future, with serious challenges to our current ideas in several domains of life, including those of national and cultural identity, and practices in English language teaching.

In order to establish the reasonableness of our projection, we propose to touch upon the following topics briefly: the continued spread of English in the latter half of the twentieth century and its continuation in the present century; the impact of this spread on the English language and other languages English came in contact with; acculturation and nativization or indigenization of English and emergence of world Englishes; implications of world Englishes for linguistic theory; why non-pluralistic concepts such as global or world or lingua franca English, as opposed to the pluralistic and inclusive concept of world Englishes, are misleading and have little sociolinguistic validity; and what future scenario one can imagine on the basis of what the situation is at present.

**SPREAD OF ENGLISH**

The earlier history of the spread of English in various parts of the world is well documented, as volumes have been written on the role of imperial power, missionary zeal, and concerted efforts at ‘civilizing the savages’ in the diffusion of the language.⁴ The more recent history of explosion of demand for English, contrary to all predictions of waning power of English as the sun set on the colonial empires, is still being written. The factors are primarily political and economic, though pragmatic considerations in ex-colonies play a role in the retention and further promotion of English in the countries of South and Southeast Asia and Africa.⁵ The pragmatic considerations referred to here have to do with the multilingual and pluralistic settings of Africa, South and Southeast Asia, and other regions, and the rapidity with which modern scientific and technological advances are being adopted and adapted in traditional societies in these parts of the world. The globalization of business, commerce and finance, of course, are playing their own significant roles, too.

In East Asia, e.g., China, Japan, and Korea, the motivation has been economic – the need for the expansion of international trade requires the populations to become more proficient in English as it is the language of international business, commerce and finance. In South and Southeast Asia, as mentioned before, in addition to these motivations, the overwhelming reason for maintaining English is to diffuse language rivalry and language conflicts (Ferguson 1996; Shah 1968). The example of Sri Lanka is testimony to the fact that elevating any one indigenous language in a multilingual society may lead to explosive unrest, violence, and division along ethnolinguistic boundaries.

**IMPACT OF TRANSPLANTED ENGLISHES**

There are two aspects to the impact of English in the world. First, English has been acculturated and nativized in different linguistic, cultural, and regional contexts; second, world languages have undergone perceivable changes as a result of contact and convergence.
with English. The latter area of research, that of Englishization of world’s languages, has been explored in its various dimensions, and a large body of scholarly work is available on this topic by linguists and literary scholars. Englishization of languages is a vast area of research which cannot be dealt with in any detail here. We will, therefore, turn our attention to the other aspect of the phenomenon: the acculturation and nativization of English in various parts of the world and the emergence of world Englishes as perceived currently.

ACCULTURATION AND NATIVIZATION

That languages adapt to new environments and change to reflect their fresh realities is well known to historical linguists. The histories of Arabic, Latin, Persian, and Sanskrit, for example, are testimony to this process. The reason that Egyptian and Moroccan Arabic are different from Saudi and Kuwaiti Arabic is not a mystery, and neither is the emergence of Afghan and Indian Persian as compared to Iranian Persian. Those aware of the historical facts do not find the developments of American and Australian English, separate from English English, a cause for alarm. To linguists, therefore, there is nothing startling in the development of various world Englishes such as Indian, Nigerian, or Singaporean. In fact, it is a matter of both theoretical and descriptive interest to look at various Englishes to see if their developments as a result of the processes of nativization and acculturation signify both systemic and structural changes in Hallidayan terms. A useful way of looking at the development of world Englishes is to investigate the ways in which ‘the meaning potential is . . . being opened up, . . . adding further dimensions to the language’s semantic space’ (Halliday 2006: 354).

Although few comprehensive descriptions of Englishes in Asia and Africa, comparable to the descriptions of American or British English, are available as yet, partial descriptions suggest systematic differences between American or British English and, say, Indian, Nigerian or Singaporean English. We will illustrate some such differences in the grammar of Indian English, the variety with the longest history in the Outer Circle (B. Kachru 1985).

At the clause level, Indian English makes systematic choices in terms of volitionality, therefore, the following is perfectly grammatical: *We went to a Thanksgiving party yesterday and I enjoyed very much.* The mental state of how going to a party affects one is not a voluntary act; it is a non-volitional event, hence *enjoy* is non-volitional and does not have to be used as a transitive verb. Most transitive verbs usually signal volitional acts. This is true of *like* also; it is often used as an intransitive verb in Indian English, e.g., *I hear what he is saying and I am not liking.*

In tense-aspect the choice is not between present, past, and future, and imperfect and perfect, but between realis and irrealis on the one hand and between imperfect, durative and perfect aspects on the other. Tense distinctions in terms of present, past, and future are also made, but they are secondary. This system of choices justifies characteristic uses such as *you must be knowing her* and *I was not liking the movie, so we left early.* All aspects participate in realis and irrealis constructions, therefore, all the following sentences are grammatical in Indian English: *you must know him* (imperfect), *you must be knowing him* (durative), and *you must have known him* (perfect).

Additionally, the reference point for choice of tense forms in most major Indian languages, unlike in Inner Circle Englishes, usually coincides with the time of speaking.
Hence, it is grammatical to use the present perfect with a definite past time adverb, e.g. the sentence *I have written to my mother yesterday* is perfectly grammatical.

Lexical innovations are, of course, much more obvious than grammatical ones. However, not all new lexical features are due to geographical context (such as *butte* bluff in American English, or *ghat* ‘steps going down to the river’ in Indian English); many are due to sociocultural context (*caste* in Indian English, *bone* in Maori English, as in the title of Kerri Hulme’s novel *The Bone People*).

In addition, world Englishes have extended the meaning potential of lexical items, from items referring to concrete objects (e.g. *pancake* to refer to *dosa* ‘a dish made with soaked and subsequently ground rice and lentils’) to abstract entities (e.g. *religion* to capture the notion of *dharma*, or *God* to translate *Brahman* and *Allah* in the Indian context). These features of Indianization of English have been termed the ‘Indianness’ in Indian English (B. Kachru 1965). What is true of Indian English is equally applicable to various African Englishes, and to Englishes used in the Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Philippine and Singapore-Malaysian contexts as well.

Sociocultural contexts are reflected in the organization of discourse just as much as in grammar and lexis (see e.g. B. Kachru 1986b; 2005a; Smith 1987; Smith and Forman 1997; Stubbe and Holmes 1999; Tsang and Wong 2004). We will discuss some studies on performance of speech acts and argumentative texts to illustrate the processes of acculturation and nativization at this level.

Performing speech acts is more than enunciating an utterance. Making a request, rendering an apology, paying a compliment, criticizing a performance – all such acts involve awareness of sociocultural conventions and utmost sensitivity to all components of ‘context of situation’ (Firth 1957). It is no wonder that every part of the English-using world has evolved its own ‘interaction rituals’, to use Goffman’s term (1967). The available research suggests that notions of politeness and formulas of specific speech acts vary as cultures and contexts vary. To cite one example, whereas in Inner Circle Englishes indirect requests are considered more polite, in Indian and Brazilian Englishes the direct request is the preferred strategy, since there are other devices to indicate politeness that soften the direct request. In Indian (or South Asian) English, such devices include the use of honorific and kinship terms as forms of address.

Similarly, conventions of writing differ considerably across Englishes. This is illustrated by citing studies that have looked at conventions of business and technical writing and argumentative texts across cultural contexts. For example, St. Amant (1999: 298–9), concerned with business and technical writing, observes that there is no single universal rhetorical standard; rhetorical expectations and preferences vary from culture to culture, and these differences can occur on a variety of levels. At the sentence level, many American writers are taught that effective writing style involves getting directly to the specific subject of the sentence, keeping the sentence short and concise. Many Southern Europeans, on the other hand, prefer longer sentences which include more details in technical writing.

At the next level, the preferred way of organizing a paragraph is culture-dependent. In American English, the common practice is to introduce the major idea first, which is then built upon in the following paragraphs. Japanese and Latin cultures, however, often begin professional documents with a paragraph or section containing polite, solicitous comments that do not seem to relate to the logical development of the greater written presentation. St. Amant observes (1999: 299): ‘Without such an introduction, a Japanese
reader might perceive these documents as disrespectful or unconcerned with building long-term relationships (two key cultural concepts in Japan).’ In addition, Japanese writers prefer an organization where presentation of the data or evidence precedes the conclusion, with no introductory indication of topic.

Kamimura and Oi (1988: 311) analyzed American and Japanese college students’ writing of argumentative prose, and presented in detail a number of cultural values displayed in the two groups of essays. While it is not possible to discuss all their findings here, we will mention two in order to demonstrate the relevance of sociocultural context to argumentation. Kamimura and Oi observed that the American student writers generally offered a thesis statement at the beginning of their essays, supported it with details, and summarized their position and support at the end. Thus, they followed a general-to-specific pattern, the one typically taught in US rhetoric textbooks. The Japanese writers typically used one of two other patterns: either specific-to-general, with a thesis statement at the end of the essay, or an ‘omission’ style, with no thesis offered. The US writers took a position and ‘stuck with it’, while the Japanese writers tended to ‘try to incorporate both sides...’, with their position fluctuating throughout the essay’.

Furthermore, on the controversial topic of capital punishment the Japanese writers made use of more affective appeals than rational appeals in order to strengthen their position. The researchers concluded that the Japanese writers showed a stronger tendency to ‘evoke empathy in the reader’s mind,’ in contrast to the American writers’ ‘assertive stance’ and use of ‘reasoning’. This reflects the transference of the relative cultural value attached to empathy in Japanese English writing rather than suggesting a lack of ‘critical thinking’ ability in Japanese student writers.11

Most of the studies cited here are from the context of language education, which is one area where the interrelationship of culture and language behavior is being explored intensively at present. The entire range and depth of verbal interaction among all users of world Englishes in various domains of social life are still awaiting research. The corpora of world Englishes and their analyses may shed more light on all the dimensions of the shared medium and differing messages of world Englishes in the future, provided corpus linguistics can resolve all the problems of analyzing discourse.

We have not mentioned the entire areas of genre studies or literary creativity in Englishes due to space limitations. B. Kachru (2005a) and other sources listed in note 11 are valuable sources for information on these areas of study.12

**IMPLICATIONS FOR LINGUISTIC THEORY**

The implications of world Englishes for linguistic theory are many, as has been discussed since the 1960s. First, ways have to be found to build in variation instead of idealization of a linguistic system. Related to this, the whole idea of ‘native speaker’ has to undergo drastic revision – linguists have to be able to think not in terms of native and non-native speakers of English, but of native users of different world Englishes. The notion of one standard language – the Queen’s English, or American English – has to change: there are now multiple standard Englishes (Australian, Canadian, Caribbean, New Zealand, Indian, Nigerian, Philippine, Singaporean, and others). Some of these have grammars and dictionaries; others are developing them. It is worth remembering that language is not dependent on grammars and dictionaries; English English existed long before it was codified in a dictionary or a grammar.
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IS THERE A WORLD (GLOBAL, LINGUA FRANCA) ENGLISH?

The last two points bring us to another concern. To rephrase Tom McArthur’s question, which is the title of his Georgetown Roundtable paper, ‘World or International or Global English – and what is it anyway?’ (1999: 396), we raise the question: ‘Is there a world (or global or lingua franca) English?’ In view of the developments of world Englishes and their vibrancy, it is difficult to understand the fascination with the concepts of world English, or global English, or English as lingua franca.13 There is no single entity such as these terms signify (see McArthur 2001). Even if we discount the Outer and Expanding Circles, Americans, Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders speak their own varieties of English, with their dialect differences intact, when they interact, whether for diplomatic negotiations, business transactions or scholarly exchanges.14 So do speakers of Hong Kong, Japanese, Nigerian, or Singaporean English, if we include the Outer and Expanding Circles. The three labels preceding ‘English’ in the singular (‘global’, ‘world’, ‘lingua franca’) perpetuate a myth; they have no sociolinguistic or functional validity. A socially realistic approach to language has to recognize that variation exists within a national variety, whether American, Australian or British – and the same is true of Englishes in the Outer and Expanding Circles.

The argument that such standard varieties as world English, global English, or lingua franca English are to be cultivated for assuring intelligibility in international communication and writing is spurious. The Inner Circle varieties are not always mutually intelligible. For at least the last two centuries or more there have been native speakers of Inner Circle English of one national variety who have been unintelligible to other speakers of another national variety. An example of this is the dictionary which was specially compiled for American visitors to Britain (see Grote 1992). Furthermore, research has shown that the native speaker is not always the most intelligible communicator: one of the first empirical studies on this topic, by Smith and Rafiqzad (1983), concludes (p. 375), ‘[T]he native speaker was always found to be among the least intelligible speakers, scoring [an average of 55%].’ The speakers from India and Japan scored much higher in their study (1983: 375). Secondly, research has also established that intelligibility is not just a matter of accent and grammar. To a large extent, it is reflective of attitudes (Rubin, Ainsworth, Cho, Turk, and Winn 1999). What matters most for intelligibility is a familiarity with as many Englishes as possible, as Smith (1992: 8) concludes: ‘Being a native speaker does not seem to be as important [for Intelligibility, Comprehensibility and Interpretability] as being fluent in English and familiar with several different national varieties.’ Globalization of media and international travel are providing greater opportunities for variety exposure. Internet and television, especially live news reports from all parts of the world, are good sources of introduction to many different world Englishes.

In this connection, let us consider the case of international faculty members of Chinese, Czech, Indian, Japanese, Korean, Nigerian, Russian, and other varieties of English in institutions of higher learning in the Inner Circle. There does not seem to be a huge problem of intelligibility when they lecture or direct research. However, there is a great deal of discussion of intelligibility of international teaching assistants in the same contexts, and it is not always because of the lack of competence in the medium on the part of the teaching assistants. Attitudes and grade expectations play a large, if not the major, part in the ratings of international teaching assistants by their students (Rubin et al. 1999). It is,
of course, a fact that teaching assistants are much lower in academic status as compared to faculty with professorial ranks.

Additionally, the discussion on the relevance of cultural context to speaking and writing shows the futility of any claim of native speaker superiority. The increasing body of detailed investigation of corpora also explodes the myths of a monolithic British or American or Australian English (see e.g. Biber, Conrad, and Reppen 1994; 1998; Collins 1991; 2007; Eisikovits 1981; 1989).

Unitary labels such as ‘global English’ seem to be attempts at standardization and futile gatekeeping. The motivations of big publishing houses and agencies with mandates to propagate English and British culture are understandable, but there is no academic or linguistic justification for such attempts. The Inner Circle varieties do not have a ‘core’ phonology or syntax or conventions, as is clear from the corpus-based studies of these varieties; it is not clear what makes advocates of world/global/lingua franca English believe that users of Outer and Expanding Circle varieties will be willing to adopt whatever ‘core’ is proposed (see e.g. Jenkins 2000 for one such proposal on core lingua franca phonology for international users of English). These attempts, we suggest, will meet the same fate as the past attempts at BASIC (British American Scientific International Commercial) developed by C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards in the 1930s (Ogden 1934), or Nuclear English (see Quirk 1981), or the proposed world languages such as Esperanto.

THE FUTURE OF ENGLISHES

There will no doubt come a time when Englishes will not be the most frequently used medium across national and cultural boundaries. All languages of wider communication, such as Greek, Latin, Persian, Sanskrit, have come and gone and one must expect that world Englishes will eventually meet the same fate. We simply do not know when, and we do not know what will replace world Englishes. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, however, some trends are clear and need to be looked at closely. But, before we look at the future of world Englishes, it may be useful to think about some alternatives. Based on the current situation and trends, other scenarios involving the major languages of the world as serious contenders may be worth considering. The following facts are worthy of note in this context.

Arabic, as a sacred language of Islam, has no doubt a worldwide presence. It is, and will remain, according to all indications, the only holy language of Islam. Whether it will ever become a language of day-to-day communication, print and audiovisual media, business and commerce, diplomacy, financial institutions, and institutions of higher learning in science and technology outside the present Arabic-speaking world is questionable. This has not happened in regions adjacent to the Arabic-speaking world, e.g. Iran, Afghanistan, Northern and Eastern Africa, in the past several centuries of contact. It is unlikely that Arabic will present a serious challenge to world Englishes anytime soon.

Mandarin Chinese has a worldwide presence due to population migrations. The recent concerted effort of the Confucius Institute no doubt is making an impact, as is the People’s Republic of China’s increasing political and economic status in world contexts (Graddol 2006). We have already mentioned the projection of the expected number of learners of Mandarin Chinese in the next few years. Regions with large Chinese-speaking populations and cultural proximity to the Chinese culture, such as the nations of East and Southeast Asia,
may even make greater use of Mandarin Chinese in their mutual contacts. However, it is not clear that Mandarin Chinese as a regional (Asian) language of wider communication will achieve the range and depth that Englishes now have in, say, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Korea, the Philippines, Singapore, or Thailand. And it is worth keeping in mind that while attempts are being made to spread Mandarin Chinese across the world, a major push for the learning of English by Chinese nationals continues in the People’s Republic of China.

Among European languages, French, German, and Russian had great prestige and were considered languages of science and technology until the later part of the twentieth century. Machine translation projects for rapid translation of scientific-technological documents were set up in Europe and across the Atlantic in Canada and the USA in the 1950s–60s (Hutchins 2005). In the post-Sputnik era, large machine translation projects were instituted for instant translation of Russian scientific publications into English in the USA. By now, however, English has taken over this domain. In fact, English is the language of the majority of academic publications in scientific-technological fields. The official policy of the European Union is to conduct its official business in English, French, and German, but English is by far the most widely spoken and used language in the administrative domain in European Union. As regards their geographical spread, both French and Russian are shrinking in Africa and Eastern Europe, respectively, and yielding ground to English. One might add that there continues to be opposition to what is perceived as an imposition of English in Europe (see e.g. Phillipson 2003), and the official policy of the European Union is to encourage multilingualism in Europe.

Spanish and Portuguese are used by large populations in the Americas, and smaller populations in Africa and Europe.\textsuperscript{16} Spanish had a large presence in the Philippines, but has now been replaced by a variety of Philippine Englishes. Spanish perhaps will remain and even gather strength as a language of wider communication in the Latin American countries, including Portuguese-speaking Brazil, but it is difficult to see it replacing English in all domains of international use. Spanish is emerging as an important language within the United States also, but there are no indications that it will achieve the same status as General American English.

Hindi-Urdu is a major language of wider communication in South Asia, and has a world-wide presence as a result of population shift. It is in complementary distribution with South Asian Englishes and there are no serious indications of any change in this situation in the foreseeable future.

We would like to go back at this point to the quote from Ferguson (1982), cited at the beginning of this paper. The development of Englishes in various parts of the world will continue in the foreseeable future, with the course of development increasingly determined by Outer and Expanding Circle users. According to one estimate (Graddol 2006: 100), within the next few decades there will be more than two billion people learning English across the world. This number includes children who start learning English in primary schools, if the policies being instituted in almost all the nations of the world take effect as planned.

The predicted number of learners across languages and cultures means that world Englishes will continue to be a highly valued medium of wider communication in major parts of the world in the foreseeable future. But the Englishes will manifest themselves in a variety of avatars, and the newer incarnations will show increasing localization of the medium with acculturization of messages. The functional ranges will also be localized, that is, every variety will probably have its own functional range determined by its
sociocultural and linguistic context. There will be further blending and fusion of different Englishes, and various Englishes with other languages, in many major domains. These will include the influence of African-American English in hip-hop and other genres of popular music, and that of American English in several domains, including those of academia, business, commerce and finance, and creative writing, and developments of varieties such as Hinglish, Singlish, and Spanglish.17 The influence of American English on other Englishes is already felt, in Britain and other nations of Europe as well as in South and Southeast Asia, the Caribbean, China, Japan, Korea and Latin America (see e.g. Modiano (1996) on Europe).

One important observation is that as the major languages of wider communication discussed above spread and consolidate their position, the spread of English will also continue simultaneously. Learners in Africa, Asia, Europe, and the USA may learn Mandarin Chinese, but they will also continue to learn and use English, at least as long as the current status of English remains undisturbed, ensuring multilingualism and more contact and convergence of languages. The world economic system and technological advantages of English ensure its continued usefulness for all regions. Additionally, nativization and acculturation have led to a situation where national or regional Englishes are no longer felt to be alien in many parts of the world. They are used for literary creativity just as frequently in Asia and Africa as the indigenous languages. In contrast, it does not seem likely that any of the languages discussed above will become a language of literary creativity in large parts of Asia and Africa in the near future. Note that Singapore and Hong Kong have established a literary tradition in their respective Englishes even as they remain within the domain of Mandarin Chinese-using regions.18

All these developments will create heightened concerns about intelligibility across varieties, but, as was said above, familiarity with more Englishes is the solution. As has been demonstrated by researchers in accommodation theory, those who interact with each other ultimately understand each other, provided there is an expectation of successful communication on all sides.19

CONCLUSION

In futuristic terms, judging from the current trends, one could conclude that world Englishes will continue to flourish and that innovations and creative impulses will come more from the Outer and Expanding Circles than from the Inner Circle. The range of functions and the depth of societal penetration that Englishes have acquired all across the world seem to ensure their continued presence for several decades, if not centuries. To repeat Ferguson, ‘[A]t some point the spread of English may be halted, and some other language may spread to take its place. . . . But for the present the spread of English continues, with no sign of diminishing. . . .’

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented as an invited plenary at the first International Conference on ‘Becoming a World Language: Chinese, English and Spanish’, held at the M. A. K. Halliday Center for the Intelligent Application of the Linguistic Sciences, City University of Hong Kong in Hong Kong, December 5–7, 2007 under the title ‘World Englishes and world’s languages: a futuristic construct’.

We are grateful to the participants in the conference for the discussion that followed, and to Braj B. Kachru and Cecil Nelson for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.
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2. Ferguson (1982: xvi); emphasis added.
3. Learners currently enrolled in Chinese classes worldwide (primarily in the UK and the USA) number 30 million. The likely number of students enrolled in Chinese classes in the world in the next few years will be 100 million. Learners of English in the world in the next decade or two will number an estimated 2 billion or more. The number includes mostly children in their primary classrooms, but also extends to all users of English (see Graddol 2006: 63 and 100, respectively).

4. See e.g. the six volumes of Bolton and Kachru (2006a) and five volumes of Bolton and Kachru (2006b); the latter is restricted to the Asian context.
6. See e.g. Baik (2001) and Jung (2001) for Korea, B. Kachru (1979; 1994b) for South Asia, Kishe (1994) for East Africa, Zhang (2003) for China; see also *World Englishes* (2005) for other linguistic contexts of the world. See Bolton and Kachru (2006a; 2006b) for references to scholarly works that discuss the impact of English on literary creativity in major languages of the world.
8. B. Kachru (1985: 12–13) proposes the concept of Three Concentric Circles of English to capture the origin, historical diffusion, and current profile of the English language in the world. In this conceptualization, the Inner Circle constitutes the ‘mother country’ – England and the British Isles – and the areas where the speakers from Britain took the language with them as they migrated – Australia, New Zealand, and North America. The Outer Circle comprises the countries where the language was transplanted by successive waves of businessmen, colonial administrators, educators, and missionaries, and is now nurtured by the vast majority of indigenous multilingual users, e.g., India, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Singapore. They use English as an additional language for their own purposes, which include many national and international domains. The Expanding Circle represents the countries where the language is still spreading, mainly for serving the need for an international medium in business and commerce, diplomacy, finance, higher education in science and technology, and other such spheres, e.g. the People’s Republic of China, Japan, Korea, Thailand, and the countries of Europe, the Middle East, and Latin America. English in this circle, however, is also finding increased use in intranational domains of academia, media, and professions such as medicine, engineering, etc.

9. For the descriptions and histories of dictionaries in world Englishes, see e.g. Allsopp and Allsopp (1996) for the Caribbean; Avis et al. (1967) for Canada; Bhatta (1997), Bhatta and Butler (2000), and Cruz and Bhatta (1995) for the Philippines; Branford (1978) and Silva et al. (1996) for South Africa; Cassidy and Le Page (1080) for Jamaica; Holm and Shilling (1982) for Bahama; the references in B. Kachru (2005b) for Indian English; Orsman (1997) for New Zealand; Pakir (1992) for Singapore.


11. See Atkinson (1997) for the assertion that Asian students lack critical thinking abilities; see Egge and Kutieleh (2004) and Holgladaram (2006) for the controversies surrounding cultural differences in critical thinking; see Stapleton (2001) for a refutation of the claim in Atkinson (1997). Stapleton’s study establishes the fact that the Japanese students exhibit just as much critical thinking ability in writing tasks as their American counterparts do given topics with which they are familiar.


14. For dialect differences within and among American, Australian, and British Englishes, see e.g. Evisikovits (1981; 1989), Horvath (1985) for Australia, Hughes and Trudgill (1992) for Britain, Wolfam (1981) for the USA.

15. The Confucius Institute is a non-profit institute, set up with the aim of promoting Chinese language and culture and supporting local Chinese teaching internationally through affiliated Confucius Institutes. Currently, there are more than 140 Confucius Institutes in more than 50 countries and regions.

16. Spanish is used in Mexico in North America; in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, and others in Central America; island nations such as Cuba and the Dominican Republic; and Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and others in South America; in island nations such as Cuba and the Dominican Republic; and Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, and others in South America.
America. Portuguese is the language of Brazil in South America. Since Spain is interested in promoting Spanish as an international language, it is conceivable that all the Latin American nations will adopt Spanish as a language of wider communication at least in some domains.

17. See e.g. Moody (2001), Moody and Matsumoto (2003), Thompson (2002), and World Englishes 25.2 (2006). The National Public Radio (USA) in its program All Things Considered reported the following on September 26, 2000: ‘With the growing acceptance in academia of different kinds of slang as legitimate forms of expression, it should come as no surprise that Amherst College is offering the first university-level course in Spanglish, a combination of Spanish and English. Ilan Stavans, the Amherst professor who’s teaching the course, is also preparing a Spanglish dictionary. . . .’
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