Chapter Four: The Paradigm Shift

4.1. Preliminaries

Changes and variations are inevitable in every field, including language. Ideas and beliefs have been challenged and questioned in every age. Many onetime infallible positions have been shaken and brought to the ground. Hierarchies have been found to be social constructs and hence worthy of modifications and even rejections. Change has remained, as if, a necessity of human life. No society, therefore, can make a perpetual constitution, or even a perpetual law, to use Jefferson’s remark (as cited in Krishnaswamy, Verma, and Nagrajan, 1992, p.27).

When usually accepted ways of doing or thinking about something change, it is called a paradigm shift. There have been such paradigm shifts in many areas. For example, social systems have moved from Primitive Communism to Slavery and then to Feudalism and Capitalism. Supporters of Socialism are waiting for the golden days of the next phase of social evolution. In the midst of all disputes, there is one commonly accepted truth, i.e. change. The Marxists say that everything changes except change. The Buddhists believe that everything is in a constant state of flux. When Virginia Wolf (1966) declared that human nature has changed since 1910, she was only hinting at the changes in perceptions, though it invited the fury of many. There have been inversions in values. If we can borrow the words of the witches in Macbeth, fair has become foul and foul has become fair. What was unacceptable at one point of time has become the select choice of today. Taboos have dwindled away. The wind of change has blown across the continents uprooting, destroying and deconstructing styles and patterns. Depictions of certain cultures in certain ways have been analyzed and found to be intentional and politically motivated (Said, 1978). Colonial
tricks and tactics are unmasked as never before. The virtues of obedience and acceptance have given way to critical thinking and questioning. There is answering back and writing back in every field. All the social, political, economic and cultural changes have also affected the way languages are looked upon. Paradigm shifts have become not exceptions but the norm of the day.

With the spread of globalization, the political and economic dimensions of which are questioned by many, there have been greater democratization and accommodation in the case of the English language. It is a story of how the onetime colonial weapon has become a powerful tool in the hands of the onetime subjugated. There have been clear moves away from the monolithic perception of English. The deviant variations in the nativized varieties are no more looked down upon as deficiencies but as intentional attempts to chisel out the language to suit the demands of individual cultures and to be distinctive. As Mac Arthur (1998) argues, “A monolithic view of English as a language is no longer sufficient to cope with the reality we meet from people all around the world who say that they speak English” (as cited in Bauer, 2002, p.101).

This chapter takes into consideration the above-mentioned paradigm shift - from English to Englishes. It attempts to elaborate on the development of this process. It also throws some light on why and how the varieties emerged from rejection to glorification through a process of acceptance and codification. In addition, the chapter also discusses the impact of this paradigm shift on pragmatics and the growth of endonormativism.
4.2. Non-native Varieties: From Rejection to Legitimization

As said earlier, when there is a noticeable change in any set of established patterns of belief or practice, there is said to be a paradigm shift. Such paradigm shifts usually come out as a result of some social, cultural, political, linguistic and scientific developments. The present status of English as an international language and the emergence of what is called Global English, which tries to embrace the varieties of English worldwide, are examples of a paradigm shift in linguistics.

There was a time when the deviant varieties of English were looked down upon as deficient and far from the standard language. Even the users of these varieties refused to take pride in their own varieties. Some linguistic schizophrenics, to use Kachru’s (2005) term, claimed to be using British or American English while they betrayed themselves in speech and writing and revealed their inseparable link to their first language and culture (p.29). Some others condescended to accept that theirs was a deviant variety but could not muster up courage to claim that to be good English. In a study conducted by Kachru in 1976, 55.64% Indian graduate students affirmed their variety of English as Indian English. However, only 0.6% assessed themselves as users of good English (as cited in Kachru, 2005, p.56). By implication, majority of the Indian graduate students did not consider the Indian variety of English as good English. Students were not an exception. Most English educational programmes in India aimed at achieving native-like proficiency even while only a very minute percentage of the population needed to interact with the native speakers of English or another (foreign) language speaker intra-nationally. The goals were unrealistic and un-pragmatic. Scholars like Nemade (1985) and Patke (1986) considered Indian English as no English. They strongly advocated that Indians should not write in English. They felt that it
was impossible for a writer to express his/her ideas perfectly through a foreign medium. Keeping aside the Indian variety, English as a whole did not have a pan Indian acceptance. There were protests in many parts of the country against the use of English, which, it was feared, would keep the common man away from the corridors of power. In short, English as a whole and the Indian variety of English in particular did not enjoy much favour in the subcontinent. It was almost in a state of rejection. As Kachru (2005) observes, there were controversies and agonies in India with regard to what should be the role of English in India in general and its role in education in particular (p.66).

Historically speaking, South Asians were exposed to Southern English. They came in contact with the southern spoken form of English through BBC, a few English colonial administrators and a few teachers of English. The written text appeared through English literature and newspapers. Naturally, Southern English became the norm for them. However, as Kachru (2005) observes, there was a wide gulf between the linguistic norm and the linguistic behaviour. They claimed to be speakers of British English and continued to speak South Asian English. It was considered a matter of shame to say that one spoke a deviant variety of English. Identification markers such as ‘Indian English’, ‘Sri Lankan English’ and ‘Pakistani English’ carried derogatory connotations (p.55). English was viewed as a language in Asia but not of Asia.

Such a situation existed even in the second diaspora inner circle countries except the USA. After the Declaration of American Independence in 1776 and the colonies’ fight against the motherland (Britain), it was only natural for the Americans to feel different from the British. Americans wanted to break away from the home variety. Even before the passing of a decade
after the Declaration of Independence, Noah Webster advocated a national language for America in 1783. American language had earlier meant the language of the native North Americans. But later, it came to mean the English spoken in America. Even today, many American universities run American language programmes where they teach American English. As history proved later, American English became an accepted variety with its own standards and norms. As Bauer (2002) observes, the American tongue could reach this position because it was codified much before the other second diaspora varieties’ codification. If the acceptance of a variety is closely linked to the attitude towards it, the recognition of a variety as a standard language begins with codification. Put the other way, if a variety is to rise to the status of a standard language, it needs to be described in grammar books, style manuals, dictionaries, pronunciation guides, and so on (p. 94). The most favourable element in the case of American English was its early codification. Codification in published materials is an indication that the particular variety in question is perceived and taken to be a standard variety.

However, the situation in the other second diaspora inner circle countries such as Australia and New Zealand was quite contrary to the American situation. Not only that they did not reject the British norms, but also looked down upon their own varieties as substandard and inferior to the British prestige variety. It does not mean that there were no local varieties but they were not accepted as standard ones. The second diaspora varieties, with the exception of American English were viewed as “corrupted versions of British English” (Bauer, 2002, p.99).
This attitude of rejection and condescension remained for a very long time in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. Such views were openly expressed until the 1970s and they find occasional expressions to date. Bauer quotes the New Zealand author Dame Ngaio Marsh in this regard. He called New Zealand English “the ugliest dialect in the world”. Some others ridiculed the New Zealand accent saying that it sounded like ‘a linen draper’s assistant tearing a sheet of unbleached calico’. A letter to the editor of the New Zealand Listener reads the following:

The fact is that American English has evolved into a form that is different from British English both in vocabulary and pronunciation, but which is perfectly acceptable. There is, however, precious little New Zealand English worth recording. Most of it is sheer misuse and mispronunciation of British English (as cited in Bauer, 2002, p.102).

However, there has been a marked attitudinal shift in New Zealand. Today, even radio stations say that they like New Zealanders who are speaking to New Zealanders to sound like New Zealanders (as cited in Blundell, 2001 and recited in Bauer, 2002, p.99).

What it reveals is that even the native speaker varieties had to undergo a period of rejection and unacceptance. However, as the people started to come out of the colonial hangovers due to social, political and economic changes, their language also gained greater prestige and acceptance. What more, this happened even before the varieties had fully codified grammars and pronunciation lists (Bauer, 2002, p.100).

In the case of the third diaspora non-native countries, it took a longer time for the varieties to emerge to recognition and glorification. In the postcolonial India, English continued to be
used as the primary *de facto* official national language. It is also widely used among the Indians for intranational communication. Now, as Jenkins (2003) observes, Indian English has developed itself into a variety with its own identity. It finds expression in a linguistic variety with its own grammatical, lexical, phonological and discoursal norms (p.133).

Besides the social, political, economic and cultural reasons, literary production also leads to the standardization and glorification of a variety. As in the case of every language, writing has to precede codification from which standards and norms evolve and establish. Moreover, once the language is manifest in writing, people look at it as a standard to be imitated. This attitudinal change is imperative before any variety is glorified. The wealth of literature published in Indian English and the many international awards they have bagged have been a strengthening factor in the establishment of the Indian variety. In addition, the extensive use of English both in the print and in the electronic media also has added to the growth and establishment of the variety as a standard variety.

The German scholar Heinz Kloss (1952) puts forward two conditions for a dialect to become a standard language. The first is *Abstand*, and the second is *Ausbau*. The former refers to the magnitude of distance the dialect develops in structures. That is to say, if there are no great structural differences between the dialect and the language of which it is considered as a dialect, it will not be treated as a separate language. *Ausbau* means ‘building out’. It refers to the amount of literary production carried out in a particular dialect. There should be considerable literary developments in the dialect in order to maximize its differences from the mother tongue (as cited in Joseph, 2006, p.25).
Joseph (2006) maintains that what matters more than Abstand is Ausbau. Even if the structural differences are marginal, literary production can increase the apparent distance between the dialect and the perceived standard tongue (p.26). Language is certainly much more than a set of structures.

It is true that literary developments extend and sometimes even create distances. They build up the language in its own way and make it distinctive. Nevertheless, as Joseph (2006) observes, Ausbau alone cannot determine what is or is not a language. It is only a symptom signalling the desire of a community to be linguistically distinctive. However, real distinctiveness can emerge only from the belief of the people. A dialect becomes a distinct language only when people believe that “their way of speaking constitutes a language in its own right” (p.27). This can be viewed as a vicious circle. The more people believe to be speaking a distinct language, the more will be the production of literature in that language. This production, in turn, contributes to the production of dictionaries and grammar books thereby enhancing more linguistic distinctiveness. The present day paradigm shift of the emergence of world Englishes is a result of this distinctiveness.

As Joseph (2006) observes, the varieties of English emerging around the globe are closely knit to identity and nationalism. They reveal the desire to express one’s thoughts in one’s own way. There may be what some may call ‘falling of standards’ (p.36). However, the paradigm shift is that such falling of standards is viewed as resistance grounded in the mother tongue. What is falling of standards to some is the same as the emergence of a variety to others.
When it is proved that knowledge can be created and transmitted in a given variety, it becomes the standard. When scientists, political leaders of eminence, academicians, philosophers and creative writers stick to a variety, the status of that variety is preserved and secured. This is often an intentional process as Buddha did with Pali and many other social reformers with the local dialects. When prophets speak the language of the people, the language is elevated. When such linguistic acts are performed, the one-time rejected variety moves from the periphery to the centre. The marginalized becomes the core and is glorified.

The present situation of a paradigm shift in English also challenges the ownership of English. The emergence of the varieties into limelight has given birth to the concept of English as an International Language. This also raises the question about the ownership of English. According to Brumfit (2000), the ownership of a language implies the power to adapt and change the language. This power rests with the users of the language whether they are monolingual or multilingual. In the case of English, this power now rests with people in all the continents and of which the non-natives are the majority (as cited in Seidhlofer, 2003, p.7). This is a historically unprecedented and unique situation.

Today, English has come to take different names. All these names such as English as a lingua franca, English as a global language, English as a world language, English as a medium of intercultural communication, world Englishes, English as a twice-born language, etc. refer to a reversed situation. That is to say, from a ‘top down’ prescriptive approach, there has been a shift to a ‘bottom up’ descriptive approach. As Seidlofer (2003) comments, this is a clear indication of a difference from the default conception of a language (p.9), which is an open
declaration of linguistic freedom that permits and glorifies the adoption of local codes and conventions.

The concept of international English is a result of the above-mentioned paradigm shift from descriptivism. It emerges from what Saussure (1922) termed ‘the force of intercourse’. Saussure noted a tension where language is concerned. On the one hand, there is the necessity to communicate and on the other hand, there is the *esprit de clocher* - the feeling of local belonging. The conflict between these two makes one’s language distinctive and at the same time minimizes the differences between languages lest communication should be affected (as cited in Joseph, 2006, p.36). If applied to international English, it would mean that International English is English that communicates globally without moving away from the local identity. It accommodates both the communicative aspect and the uniqueness of one’s language arising from local identity.

Thus, International English is not a single variety of English. It is also not a coalescence of cores taken from different varieties. Such an all-inclusive variety is yet to emerge. It would be a mistake to view International English as a clearly distinguishable distinct variety of English. Kachru (2006), therefore, avoids the term *international language* with English. According to him:

The term ‘international’ used with ‘English’ is misleading in more than one sense: it signals an *international* English in terms of acceptance, proficiency, functions, norms, pragmatic utility, and creativity. That actually is far from true - that is not the current international profile of the English language and it never was (p.449).
The paradigm shift in English, then, is not an invention. It is only a rediscovery and a glorified acceptance of the plurality, the multi identities and the cross-cultural reincarnations of the English language. It is the revolutionary movement of the one-time rejected varieties from the margin to the centre.

Having discussed the paradigm shift in English from English to Englishes, the discussion now moves on to see how this altered perception of English accommodates and addresses the notion of universal pragmatics for English.

4.3. The Inadequacy of Universal Pragmatics

Pragmatics refers to those aspects of meaning that cannot be predicted by linguistic knowledge alone and takes into account knowledge about the physical and social world. That is, the way language is used to express an intended meaning. Universal pragmatics tries to identify possible conditions of universal understanding of meaning. In other words, it is an attempt to see whether every language use means the same thing in all the languages. Questions such as the following are core to the issue of universal pragmatics: Is language use related to culture? If yes, do all the languages share the same culture? Can one and the same language, for example English, be used to express different cultures? Are speech acts such as apologizing, praising, inviting, etc. performed in the same way in all the languages? Do they share the same assumptions? How far are speech actions norm-driven? Does English follow the same norm all over the world? Are there all-embracing linguistic norms, which can be equally applied to all speech communities? If there are indigenized norms, how far do they affect communication?
What follows next is a discussion of the above questions that reveals the inadequacy of a universal pragmatics for the world Englishes.

As discussed in the previous chapters, languages are closely bound to cultures. As Pennycook (1994) maintains, every language carries the weight of a civilization. In the days of cultural imperialism, language learning also meant following the culture represented by that language. The decision to use a certain language was an approval of the superiority of its culture as well. However, at the present stage of the socio-cultural evolution, attempts are to alienate culture from language when it is learned as a foreign language. No inherent virtues are attributed to any language. Language learning is a pragmatic affair. That is why English is nativized to suit the culture it is used in. This has led to English being used in different ways to perform different speech acts. Thus, with each variety having its own ways of doing things with language, English cannot claim to possess a universal pragmatic framework.

Languages are used differently to express ideas and intentions. Thus, the pragmatics of one language cannot be successfully applied to another language. The adoption of the varieties of English into the fold of legitimacy has raised many questions about the validity of a single universally accepted pragmatics for English. As discussed in chapter two, these varieties have been nativized to be suitable to carry the messages of various cultures. Even hardcore upholders of monolithic views on English have to accept the fact that English represents different cultures today. Moreover, as Bauer (2002) remarks, it is difficult to say what is not standard in a particular variety of English (p.110). Thus, there shall be many Englishes with each having its own pragmatics.
In a world of globalization and democracy, the movement is towards a more inclusive position and accommodation of variations. As Holliday (2005) observes, there is a narrowing of the divide between ‘us’ and ‘them’ (p.17). It is not a situation where the distinctive varieties volunteer to conform to a ‘standard prestige variety’. Rather each variety maintains its own distinctiveness and identity today.

There have been varying views on the issue of pragmatics to explain the varieties of English. For example, Levinson (1983) talks of a universal pragmatics and a language-specific pragmatics. Thumboo (1991) suggests a variety-specific pragmatics and a comparative pragmatics. Each variety of English has a different setting as each one is intertwined with a different local culture. They are part of bilingual or multilingual cultures. Most of these cultures are neither European nor English. Thus, they cannot be explained and analyzed using the pragmatics of native varieties. As Thumboo remarks, there is a need for a broader pragmatics. By implication, we need to study the lexis, grammar, speech acts, and discourse patterns of each variety independently. An all-inclusive approach can only be a fallacious one leading to chaos and misinterpretation.

As Kachru (2005) advises, the concepts of nativeness and non-nativeness need not be accepted on the face value. As he suggests, nativeness is not merely genetic but also functional. Therefore, they stand in need of a redefinition and reconstruction. Englishes in Asia should be viewed within the dynamic sociolinguistic contexts of Asia. Other parameters cannot measure them properly. The focus should be on their Asianness and Asian identities (pp.11-2). Yet another strong voice in this regard is that of Seidlhofer (2003). According to him:
...in the use of EIL, conditions hold which are different from situations when a language is clearly associated to native speakers and its place of origin, whether it is spoken by those native speakers or by people who have learnt it as a foreign language: different attitudes and expectations (should) prevail, and different norms (should) apply (p.9).

All these pleas echo nothing other than the inadequacy of a universal pragmatics for English. As people such as the Danish Minister of Education claim that English is no more their first foreign language but their second mother tongue, such pleas cannot be given a deaf ear. The new status of the non-native speakers as the agents of safeguarding English and shaping ideologies and beliefs associated with it has strengthened their right to be listened to. The non-native speaker is no longer at the receiving end. They contribute to the language and the ways in which it functions. This perception has considerable implications. When a variety functions differently, it has to be studied differently (Seidlhofer, 2003, pp.7-11). There is the need for a different pragmatics.

The main reason for this need is that language is not used the same way in all cultures. It varies in conducting speech acts such as congratulating, inviting, requesting, refusing, thanking, etc. As cultures vary, the felicity conditions of the speech acts also vary, i.e. the way they are performed successfully also differs. Thus, listeners falter if they fail to understand the pragmatics of each language or language variety. What utterances mean should be distinguished from what speakers mean in using them. Put the other way, there may not be a one-to-one correspondence between linguistic expressions and the speaker’s intended meaning. As Devitt and Hanley (2003) suggest, speech acts are not just acts
producing certain sounds (p.3). Even when the sounds are the same, the meaning they convey can be different according to the culture of the respective speech community.

As there are no universal norms for the non-defective performance of speech acts, there can be many misinterpretations. This is intensified in the context of global spread of English where cultural norms are transferred to English. Similarly, native speakers of English may fail to make themselves clear if they use culturally bound expressions and idioms. What works in English may not work in second language or foreign language cultures. For example, if a native speaker says, “I couldn’t agree with you more”. A Chinese listener may take it as a negative comment. She may think that the speaker did not like her idea (adapted from *What Is Speech Act?*).

Yet another example of potential misunderstanding can be in the way guests in Japan thank their host or hostess. Japanese guests, in thanking the host, apologize a number of times for the invitation and the meal. They apologize for the intrusion into the host’s privacy, all the troubles such as the commotion created in the house, having to cook so much and do the dishes after they are gone. Though, at the surface level, all these sound apologies, they are thanks at the level of intended meaning in the Japanese culture. However, this may look rude and inappropriate to an American guest (adapted from *What is Speech Act?*). The American way of thanking a host is different from the Japanese way. Both cannot be judged by the same pragmatics, though they use the same language in performing the speech acts.

If the Japanese guests apologize instead of giving thanks, the Brazilians will not apologize where they are expected to. An American professor teaching at a Brazilian university was
annoyed to find his students walking into his class much later than he started the class. They did not show any sign of regret. They simply greeted the teacher and occupied their seats in the class. The professor found out later that the Brazilian concept of punctuality was different from his. Brazilians do not apologize if they are not late by more than twenty minutes. In the Brazilian culture, lateness is always more than twenty minutes. In an American university, classes begin and finish at the scheduled time. But, the Brazilians would come late and leave late. Brazilian students believe that students who come late to the class are probably more successful than those who are on time. They also expect people with prestige to arrive late (Smith and Mare, 2004, pp.3-4). What can be the cause of offence and anger in one culture turns to be the appropriate norm of behaviour in another culture. Hence, no need of an apology.

The inadequacy of universal pragmatics is reflected not only in speech acts. It also fails to explain the use of different lexical items in the way they are used in different varieties. As Halliday (2006) maintains acculturation of English has added to the meaning potential of many words and expressions. The potential meanings of words lie behind many of the cultural beliefs and practices. He talks of how the concept of hierarchies in different societies can add meaning to conversations. In the British context, Latinized expressions in English were held in high esteem. But, it was unexpected of a layman to resort to such expressions at any context (p.355). Any such attempt meant pomposity whereas it was a sign of scholarliness if used by the elite. Similarly, traditional Indian culture does not approve of women and children taking part in discussions in front of men, especially in serious affairs. It is described as strong-headedness and carries negative connotations. The situation may not be akin to other cultures because, as Halliday (2006) observes, power distribution and the use of
language hierarchies are different in different cultures and “whenever one language is used to
describe settings that are primarily construed in another language, it is bound to take on new
meanings” (p.355). Thus, power distribution affects not only the choice of words but also
turn taking in speech. As Tannen (1984) puts it, everything in communication is culturally
relative. Culture decides all the aspects of what to say and how to say it (p.189).

Halliday (2006) tries to examine whether a language used internationally creates new
functions for the language and thereby engender new meanings. He finds that as a language
extends its field of operation it also “entails some expansion of its meaning potential”
(p.365). He illustrates this further by giving Kachru’s example of ‘flower bed’ from Indian
English and the Chinese translation of zou gou into lackey and running dogs. The expression
‘flower bed’ is not alien to the inner circle variety users of English. For them, it is a portion
of a garden where flowers are grown and is distinct from lawns. However, in the Indian
context it appeared in a text to mean ‘marriage bed’. Similarly, when Mao Zedong’s works
were translated into English, the Chinese translators wanted an English equivalent for
zougou. They sometimes translated it as lackey and sometimes as running dogs. What it
shows is that languages enlarge their meanings when they are used to talk about cultural
contexts they do not represent (p.357). There cannot be a universal pragmatics to understand
such words expanded in their meanings.

Grammar has also gone beyond the dictates of universal pragmatics. The cultural contexts of
the varieties of English have had their effect on grammar and have gone astray from the inner
circle norms. When viewed from the point of view of Inter Language Theory, it is due to the
ignorance in grammar. The Inter Language Theory of Selinker (1972, 1992) looks at the
competence of a second language learner based on a continuum between the first language and his/her second language. If the second language learner does not conform to the standard native variety, it is an error. If such errors are repeated, then it is a case of fossilization. But Kachru (2005) outrightly rejected such concepts. He highlighted the socio-cultural realities of multilingual outer circle societies. He argued that the deviations were neither errors nor fossilizations rather deviant expressions demanded by the socio-cultural contexts (as cited in Kilickaya, 2009, p.35).

Bhatt (2005) gives a few examples to prove how such deviations are governed by cultural norms. He analyzes the rationale behind the unindifferentiated tag questions in Indian English. He finds that they are neither errors nor fossilizations but linguistic forms governed by cultural constraints of politeness (as cited in Kilickaya, 2009, p.36). In British and American varieties, tag questions are formed by inserting the pronoun of the subject in the tag, e.g., you broke the window, didn’t you? But, in the Indian variety of English, this is not suitable as there is some aspect of imposition in such usages. Therefore, in Indian English tag questions are unindifferentiated with the use of ‘isn’t it?’ There is no imposition.

Bhatt’s (2005) another example from Indian English is the use of ‘may’. Here too, the politeness principle of non-imposition governs the usage. In the sentence, ‘These mistakes may please be corrected’, an obligation is expressed very politely. But, in standard native variety, the same will be used as, ‘These mistakes must be corrected’ or ‘These mistakes are to be corrected’. However, as Kilikaya (2009) comments, both these examples are unacceptable in Indian English because of their positional tone (p. 36). A native speaker may
look at such variations as the violation of grammar rules. However, they are the most suitable and acceptable forms in their local cultural contexts.

What emerges from the above discussion is the lacuna in traditional linguistics. It fails to consider the multilingual contexts in the outer and expanding circle countries that are not mere users of the language but also are contributors and producers. A single universal pragmatics cannot account for and explain the way they use English.

As English has been used for multifarious purposes including education and literary activities, the outer circle countries have a sense of ownership over English. This, in turn, has encouraged them to develop independent norms for their varieties instead of depending on imported norms. The next section discusses this move from exonormativism to endonormativism.

4.4. Exonormativism to Endonormativism

Exonormativism refers to the acceptance of foreign norms. In the context of English and English language teaching, it means the acceptance of native varieties as the right models to be pursued and mastered. Endonormativism, on the contrary, is the acceptance of the educated indigenized varieties as standard ones and hence worthy of emulation. Both exonormativism and endonormativism have their own implications in the field of English language teaching. This section analyzes some of the underlying currents of these two opposing concepts and tries to highlight the need for greater endonormative moves in the context of indigenization and internationalization of English.
One major implication of the exonormative views, as Phillipson (1992) points out, is the choice of native speaker as the ideal teacher of English. They propagate the idea that a native speaker is in a better position to explain the intricate cultural elements and the structures of the language. Phillipson considers this as one of the fallacies in ELT and says that it dates back from a time when language teaching was inseparable from culture teaching. In the colonial period, learning language also meant becoming familiar with the culture of that language (pp.195-96). Those were the days when language was related to power. Accepting the language of the colonizer was symbolic of accepting his superiority and the superiority of his culture. As Pennycook (1994) maintains, languages cannot be easily separated from cultures, and the decision to use a certain language shows a certain appreciation of the existence of a given cultural matrix. Lack of technological support also added to the dependence on native speaker. Again, as Phillipson (1992) observes, they were also days when there were no CDs or tape recorders to expose the learners to varieties of English. It was always a mouth to ear business. Above all, Kachru’s concept of nativization whereby a language is indigenized to suit different cultural norms had not gained much acceptance. The native variety was the model and the native speaker occupied the centre (pp.195-96).

The exonormative view placed the outer and the expanding circle countries at the receiving end. The native speaker countries in the centre were the sole dealers in the business of English and ELT. That is to say, they were the producers and the marketers. The countries in the periphery were to depend on them for all ideological matters regarding English. They included not only teaching materials but also teaching methodologies. Quirk was one of the ardent supporters of the exonormative model. He was of the conviction that world’s ELT
problems could be best handled by native speaker teachers. He believed that the best teachers of English could come only from native speaker countries (Phillipson, 1992, p.197).

Quirk (1990) had his reasons for rejecting the endonormative views. He was afraid that liberation linguistics represented by endonormativism would split up English into mutually unintelligible varieties and thus defeat the very status of English as an international language. Once mutually unintelligible, they would be no better than different languages. Therefore, Quirk could not approve of the varieties, which tended to deviate from standard native speaker varieties. He considered them only as interference varieties and suggested that they focus on native norms and native-like performance both in written and spoken language (as cited in Kilickaya, p.36).

Exonormativism not only rejects indigenized local norms but also devalues the indigenized variety speakers as perpetual learners. As Rubdy, Mackay, Alsagoff and Heng (2008) observe, when the nativized varieties continue to be devalued as interference, deviations, absence of proficiency and so on, it is a clear indication of sidelining the genuine endonormative usages and users (p.49). This protects and serves the interests of the inner circle countries in the ELT market.

There are also periphery countries that approve of exonormativism. Singapore, for example, has adopted an exonormative model for English. Their focus is on achieving international intelligibility mainly for economic reasons. In Singapore, the exonormative attitudes and ideologies are clearly reflected in the Singlish/Good English debates. Singapore’s national goal in teaching English is communicative competence. They find it a must for further
economic development (Rubdy, et al., 2008, pp.44-8). But, how far the emulation of a native variety guarantees intelligibility is another question. As discussed in chapter three, it is sometimes difficult even for one native variety speaker to understand another native variety speaker.

The major effect of the acceptance of the exonormative model is the perpetuation of the native/non-native speaker division. It ignores the sociolinguistic realities of multilingual societies and accepts to the fold only those who are born into the language. The born again are kept in the periphery. There are insiders and outsiders. However, as discussed in section two of this chapter, there have been powerful moves from the periphery to the centre. Many have come forward to uphold endonormative ideologies proudly.

Exonormativism also has political and economic implications. It accepts and promotes ideologies of dependence as periphery countries are expected to rely on the native speaker models. The models are theirs and the outer and expanding circle countries need to emulate them. In language teaching, it overemphasizes the role of native speakers and imported materials from the native speaker countries. As Phillipson (1992) maintains, “prescriptivism and cultural specificity associated with it is taken as the norm” (pp.198-99). Exonormativism fails to consider bilingual and multilingual sociolinguistic realities. Again, Phillipson (1992) points out that the tenets of native speaker ideal teacher and monolingualism are the offshoots of exonormative views. Exonormativism prescribes the approach, the method, the material and the teacher.
Decades of dependence on the inner circle countries has dampened the spirits of many local educationists. As many expanding circle countries happened to internalize the native speaker ideal, it has become difficult for them to take practical pedagogical initiatives. The inability to achieve the unattainable native speaker style and competence in speech has made them rather diffident. Local voices are seldom appreciated. As Phillipson (1992) points out, there is a resistance to local voices. He gives the example of Ghana and Nigeria where, there is an opposition to using Ghanaian and Nigerian voices as models on tapes that accompany textbooks.

Endonormativism, on the other hand, is the declaration of linguistic independence. It believes in the dignity of the indigenized local varieties and rejects the need to depend on imported norms. It is a result of the realization that deviations from the native speaker norms are not just accidents or errors but a necessity. The most articulate champion of endonormativism, as Phillipson points out, is Kachru (1991). He bases his arguments on linguistics, sociolinguistics and education. He highlights the sociolinguistic realities of multilingual societies and emphasizes the need for realistic goals. Based on his extensive research into the forms and functions of Indian English, Kachru is convinced that a breakaway from the norms of the inner circle countries is a necessity. With regard to the cline of intelligibility among non-native speakers, he points out that a very similar situation also exists among native speaker communities (as cited in Phillipson, 1992, p.198). Kachru (1985) also argued that acknowledging a variety of norms would not lead to unintelligibility. Widdowson (1994) also supported Kachru saying that in the outer circle countries, English is learned in educational contexts with emphasis on standard. He argues that this would ensure some uniformity and would help maintain intelligibility. Kachru (1985) went to the extreme of saying that the
outer circle users of English are not interested in the inner circle norms, as their norms do not fit into the outer circle socio-cultural contexts (as cited in Kilickaya, 2009, p.36).

Kachru (1996) argues that the goal of teaching English should not be achieving native-like proficiency. Such goals and claims are only fallacies and have no empirical validity. Such attitudes existed in the colonial periods. However, the local varieties are institutionalized now and administrators, national leaders, educators, legal experts, journalists, etc. use the educated variety models. There are schizophrenic attitudes towards the perceived model and the linguistic reality. However, global use of English no more smacks of native speaker model (p.358). In addition, the native speaker models have no functional validity at least in intra-national contexts. Only a very small percentage of the population interacts with native speakers or even speakers of other variety. For the rest, the educated local varieties should suffice.

Endonormativism also proposes the local educated teachers as the ideal teachers. As the indigenized varieties are rooted in the culture of the soil, the local teachers are in a better position to explain the local varieties. Language teaching and culture teaching are two different things today. As Kachru (1996) says, the internationalization of the language has expanded its contours to represent different cultures and literatures. There is an expansion of the cultural identity. It no longer represents the Judeo-Christian assumptions alone. The history, culture and literature of South Asia, South East Asia and West Africa are also now represented in English (pp.357-58). The native speakers are alien to these cultures and hence not in a position to explain them properly. The situation demands non-native speaker teachers.
4.5. Conclusion

As discussed in this chapter, the emergence of Global English has drastically changed many traditional linguistic concepts. It has forced the acceptance of the indigenized varieties of English as legitimate variations from the inner circle norms of the native speakers. It has also highlighted the differing socio-linguistic contexts in bilingual and multilingual communities, which force English to change accordingly. Thus, the one-time rejected varieties are now legitimized and even glorified varieties. As a result, there have been paradigm shifts in perceptions and practices. Universal norms are found to be inadequate in explaining the varieties. Outer circle countries are developing their own norms in an attempt to become linguistically independent. There are clear moves from exonormativism to endonormativism.

If there have been changes in the linguistic perceptions on English, there should also be changes in the teaching of the language. The present socio-politico-economic milieu is very different from that of a few decades ago. There have been changes in the power centres resulting in multifarious implications. It is now apt to conclude these discussions with a look at the educational implications of these paradigm shifts.

The next chapter, which is the concluding chapter, focuses on various implications of globalization of the English language, nativization of varieties of English, and the issues related to intelligibility and paradigm shifts on the teaching of English.