Global Englishes and their Impact on Teaching

Gobinda Puri

Abstract

English, a means of global communication for international diplomacy, trade, work, media, and academics, has been inclusively recognized as Global Englishes (GE). This paper reviews the wider spread of English throughout the world from GE perspective and examines its impacts on the teaching of English. Moreover, it argues for the significance of GE informed pedagogy, which incorporates codeswitching, polylanguaging or translanguaging, with due respect to the diversity of English in Nepal's context. By reviewing and analyzing related literature, it reports that GE perspective, as a paradigm that also includes World Englishes, English as Lingua Franca, English as an International Language and translanguaging, provides a new perspective for teaching English against the monolingual 'Standard English Model' pedagogy. Researchers have developed the teaching strategies incorporating the major themes of GE and reported positive as well as negative attitudes of the stakeholders in various contexts. This article has research and pedagogic implications as it provides useful insights for teachers and researchers for further research in this area.

Keywords: *global English, diversity, GE perspective, GE informed pedagogy, intercultural communication*

Global Englishes and their Impact on Teaching

Globalization of English in various statuses such as English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an International Language (EIL) has created multiple versions which have also created dilemmas and confusions for its teaching. For example, many students and teachers often get confused about whether to follow Standard English or its local varieties, traditional monolingual approach or Global Englishes Language Teaching (GELT) or postmethod pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 2001), and English for international communication or global intercultural communication. To address these issues, this paper critically reviews the wider spread of English and its impacts on teaching from the Global Englishes (GE) perspective, and the attitudes of the stakeholders towards the integration of GE in pedagogy. It also argues for the effective implementation of GELT pedagogy in Nepal it since enhances intercultural communication, awareness of language variations and functions, and analytical and multidialectal competence (Fang & Ren, 2018).

As English language is the property of no one, it was even not of the British until the fifth century because the original inhabitants of ancient Britons spoke a Celtic language (Galloway & Rose, 2015). As mentioned by Galloway and Rose, English came to Britain only after the Anglo-Saxon invasion from the northern part of Germany and Jutland in Denmark that were the homes of Saxons, the Jutes, and the Angles. New settlers and invaders contributed to establish English in Britain which was known as Old English that

was reflected in 'Beowulf' too. Later, Norman-French domination influenced English and changed it into Middle English which was nearly endangered. Influential French language of that time contributed more than 10000 words to English. English became standardized only after the Chaucery English version was chosen as the language of administration in the early 1400s. As it was connected with political, social, religious, economic, and educational spheres, it emerged as a standard language. However, it underwent several modifications to arrive at the modern form since the 1600s which is understandable for today's English speakers (Galloway & Rose, 2015). These historical facts reveal that English is not confined to a particular geography and group of people. It has spread throughout the world as common property.

Then English extended to other territories with multiple variations such as American English, Australian English, and Canadian English. In this regard, Jenkins (2009) mentioned two Diasporas. One of them was the large-scale migration of English speakers from Britain to North America, Australia, and New Zealand in the seventeenth and eighteenth century which caused the development of new varieties of English in these regions. The next was the spread of English as a contact language to new communities with British colonizers in West Africa and Asia. However, the British entered India in the 1600s before English had spread in other parts of the world (McCrum et al., 1992, p. 256). Similarly, Galloway and Rose (2015) also examined the spread of English through four channels: settler colonization, slavery, trade and exploitation colonies, and globalization. According to them, English made its way to the Americas, Africa, and the Pacific regions through settlers' colonization whereas it reached West Africa, Singapore, and Hong Kong through trade and colonization. They further stated that the spread of English through globalization was concerned with the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) which is still spoken in Japan, Denmark, Thailand, and many other countries.

Regarding the spread of English, Kachru (1992) introduced the concept of inner, outer and expanding concentric circles. The countries such as the UK, the USA, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia where English is spoken as native language belong to the inner circle whereas countries such as India, Malaysia, Pakistan, and Singapore which were once colonized by British belong to the outer circle. In these countries, English is often used as second language. Similarly, countries such as Nepal, China, Japan, Korea, and Indonesia where English is spoken as foreign language or lingua franca belong to the expanding circle. Jenkins (2015), in this regard, compared Kachru's three circles with the first diaspora for norms providing, the second diaspora for norms developing, and the third diaspora for norms dependent respectively.

Kachru's (1992) study reveals that the countries which fall into the inner and outer circles provide and develop the norms of English language for their speakers whereas the countries in the so-called expanding circles are dependent on the norms developed by inner and outer circles. It is evident from the various studies (Coulmas, 2005; Gray, 2010; Jenkins, 2015) and the observations that Kachru's model of decades ago might not be applicable in the time of rapid globalization. The countries which were supposed to fall in the expanding circles might have already come out of the circle because there is no clear-cut basis for the divisions. The changing perceptions of English as a Lingua Franca, rapid spread of multiple variations, and advancements in communication technology reveal that Kachru's concentric circles might have already been outdated.

English as a Global Language

The spread of English as a global language has undoubtedly caused multiple variations. It has acquired official status in more than 88 countries in the world (Galloway & Rose, 2015) and has been

functioning as the language of international diplomacy, workplaces, and media. Crystal (2003) stated that more than 150 million people listened to English radio programs in more than 120 countries, and among them, more than 100 million people listened to these programs from the BBC radio alone. Moreover; English still dominates popular culture and the entertainment industry. More than 75 percent of the world's mail and information is recorded in English (McArthur, 2002). Similarly, English functions as a common language in many sectors such as international trade and business, tourism, civil aviation and education. It has been indispensable in many academic disciplines, global communications, and publications too. Furthermore, it is widely used elsewhere as a foreign language and language of global scholarship (Coulmas, 2005). However, the status of English is different in different contexts. For example, Crystal (2003, p. 61) states that it is spoken as first language by 320-380 million , as a second language by 300-500 million people, as foreign language or lingua franca by nearly one million people around the world. Galloway and Rose (2015) also mentioned that more than a billion people are learning English worldwide, 750 million of which are English as foreign language learners.

In Nepal's context, English entered as business lingua franca when Malla King traded with Tibet and Northeast India during seventeenth century (Giri, 2020) although British missionaries introduced it earlier in 1661 (Giri, 2015). However, in teaching, it started formally only after the establishment of Durbar High School in 1854. Now, it is taught from pre-primary to university as an EFL as the most widely sought language after Nepali although 2011census identified 2032 English speakers as the first language in Nepal (Pandey, 2020). Several studies indicate that English has developed as a global language with multiple variations where non-native speakers outnumber native speakers. Moreover, all the variations of English have inclusively emerged as a GE perspective for pedagogical purposes. For example, Fang (2018) reported the Chinese language teachers' positive attitudes towards the integration of multilingualism into curriculum and pedagogy. He further stated that language policies and practices should multilingually be oriented rather than monolingually oriented. The expansion and use of English in multiple sectors worldwide have recognized it as a global language and eventually emerged into language education as global Englishes perspective.

The Global Englishes Perspective and its Underpinnings

The Global Englishes perspective, as a paradigm covers the diverse and interconnected fields of Kachru's (1992) World Englishes (WE), Seidlhofer's (2011) English as Lingua Franca (ELF), Matsuda's (2012) English as an international language (EIL), and Canagarajah's (2011) trasnlanguaging (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020) which commonly highlight the diversity of English and how it functions in the globalized world with global ownership. Similarly, more hybrid concepts have recently emerged in teaching such as polylanguaging (Jørgensen et al., 2015), plurilingualism (Dooly & Vallejo, 2019), contemporary urban vernaculars (Rampton, 2011), translingualism (Canagarajah, 2013), metrolingualism (Otsuji & Pennycook, 2010), and multilingualism (Makoni & Pennycook, 2012). Despite having different orientations, these terminologies, collectively under the single umbrella term Global Englishes, have more or less the same pedagogical implication, that is to enable the English language learners understand linguistic realities of worldwide English use (Galloway & Numajiri, 2020). Pennycook (2007) earlier suggested 'to locate the spread and use of English within critical theories of globalization' (p.5). Presenting the complex vision of globalization in the forms of 'resistance, change, appropriation, and identity', he emphasized the heterogenization of English (p.6). He further argued that GE supports a critical understanding of globalization and language. As he argued, GE might suggest a 'blend of critical theories of globalization which is seen as inherently destructive force homogenizing the world and GE which is seen as a pluralized entity' (p.18). This indicates that GE adopts the multiple variations of English language against native speakerism.

The following underpinnings of GE as also stated by Galloway and Rose (2015) elucidate what Global Englishes entails and how it functions according to the specific contexts.

- English has a changing nature.

- Englishes are in contact with one another.

- The ownership of English is viewed as global.

- English is adaptable, fluid, and ever-changing.

- Its code gets appropriated and adapted in varied contexts of use.

- Many users of English might have a multilingual repertoire that they utilize to successfully communicate in English.

- Knowledge of another language is a help, not a hindrance.

- Meaning is achieved through communication and negotiation, not through adherence to a native speaking –norms.

GE particularly addresses issues related to English uses in education, language policy, and planning. It also challenges the monolingual and native speakerism ideology in language teaching. For example, Fang (2018) in China and Prabjandee (2020) reported that even non-native speakers of English are also perceived as good English language teachers. Further, they reported that teachers had been trained in the GE perspectives in teaching and teachers' professional development. The evidence reveals that GE has been recognized in the field of teaching as an emerging perspective.

Global Englishes and English Language Teaching

GE has a connection with teaching particularly English language teaching (Lu & Buripakdi, 2020) since it challenges the traditional norms of native speakers dominated English language teaching (Cogo, 2012) and informs for a new pedagogy with the inclusion of diversities. Many researchers have recommended GE-informed pedagogy to integrate it into the classroom materials and teaching as it contains a complete package of knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Fang & Ren, 2018; Rose & Galloway, 2017). GE-informed pedagogy seems to impart the knowledge of English expansion, its varieties, nature of diversification, and changes. It may also raise awareness of the significance of linguistic, cultural and socio-political diversities and their impacts on other languages. Moreover, it might develop positive attitudes towards the unprecedented expansion and diversification of English recognizing the legitimacy and co-existence of other varieties with the acceptance of diverse cultures as stated by Fang (2018). Likewise, it might foster the skills of interpersonal communication, mutual support and respect, multidialectal competence, and analytical skills.

Many researchers applied GELT pedagogy and highlighted the significance of it in teaching. For example, Kohn (2015) found a positive impact of GELT and argued for the inclusion of non-native speakers' own English version in classroom pedagogy to encourage learning activities and creativity against Standard English orientation. Similarly, Rose and Galloway (2017) reported that an independent awareness raising activity like 'Speak Good English Movement' was conducted on the issue of the acceptability and legitimacy of their own English versions like Singlish (Singaporean English) and the diversity of English with critical reflection although most of the participants adhered to Standard English at the end. They suggested such a pedagogical task to challenge the already established ideology in the

Singaprean and Japanese classrooms. Likewise, Fang and Ren (2018) introduced GE oriented course in China that developed students' deeper understanding of cultural-linguistic landscapes. They also suggested GELT for large-sized tertiary classes to raise awareness on the diversity of language and particularity. While adopting GE in ELT, Norton and Toohey (2004) also made a critique that critical assessment of the effectiveness should be made to challenge the deep-rooted 'standard language ideology'. Similarly, Bayyurt and Sifakis (2017) proposed EIL pedagogy to incorporate in the curriculum, teacher training, and teacher professional development programs. However, Cogo (2012) reported that integration of GE-informed pedagogy in materials development is scarce. Similarly, Gray (2010) found that textbooks at local levels are still inclined to native-oriented for promoting the values and practices of the new capitalism. These trends indicate that global Englishes perspectives need to be adopted in English language teaching elsewhere because it is supposed to enhance the learners' interpersonal communication, mutual support and respect, multidialectal competence, and analytical skills.

Global Englishes has invited alternative pedagogy in language teaching since it embeds global perspectives into the local for effective learning. For example, some studies (Fang & Ren, 2018; Lu and Buripakdi, 2020) have also focused on mutual intelligibility for international communication and suggested to adopt various interactive strategies, adjustment skills and translanguaging to support language learning. GELT may inform the stakeholders such as teachers, curriculum designers, and materials producers to understand local creativity as resources. Moreover, it can highlight communicative effectiveness rather than accuracy and promotes authentic communication in English as argued by Fang and Ren (2018). So, GE informed pedagogy seems to be effective not only to challenge the stereotypes in teaching but also to critically evaluate the materials presented in the textbooks and classroom.

Attitudes towards Global Englishes

GELT is a new orientation in teaching English along with a complete set of content knowledge, required skills, and attitudes against the preoccupied traditional approach. Naturally, the stakeholders in education such as policymakers, curriculum designers, teachers, and students may not easily adopt it because they might be oriented by that traditional approach. So, how it is perceived by the stakeholders requires to be explored. Some studies in various contexts such as China, Japan, Germany, and Australia have reported mixed types of attitudes of the learners and teachers. For example, Rose and Galloway's (2017) presentation strategy raised awareness and found students' positive attitudes towards different varieties of English in Japan. However, Galloway's (2013) study found positive attitudes towards native versions of English, particularly Americans because they preferred to sound like native speakers. This indicates that the notion of Standard English still dominates ELT in many parts of the world. For avoiding such domination, Galloway (2013) suggested raising awareness through interaction strategies. Similarly, Galloway and Numajiri (2020) explored students' attitudes towards the GELT curriculum in the UK where the majority of the students were Chinese and found that GELT curricular innovation is complex due to the conceptual transition. They strongly suggested that classroom context should be explored before taking any pedagogical intervention. On the other side, the study of Sadeghpour and Sharifian (2017) in Australia reported that teachers' perceptions of GELT were affected more by their traditional education because they seemed reluctant to adopt alternative varieties. The study shows that stakeholders' attitudes towards GELT play an important role for successfully implementing GE perspective in teaching.

In Nepal's context, there are very limited studies on students, teachers, curriculum designers and policy makers' attitudes or perceptions regarding GE informed language teaching. For example, Sah (2017) explored the university teachers' and students' views on the use of the first language in language teaching and indicated their positive attitudes towards code-switching. Moreover, Pandey (2020) analyzed

the sociocultural status and functions of English in Nepal and reported the positive attitudes of the English language teachers towards the global variations of English. He further suggested adopting the more improvised and suitable language pedagogies. These pieces of evidence reveal that the students, teachers, school administrators and curriculum designers need to have positive attitudes towards global Englishes for effective implementation of GE informed pedagogy.

Impact of Global Englishes on Teaching English in Nepal

Nepal cannot be an exception to the impact of GE, particularly GELT in teaching since it has long-term historical relation with English. For a long time, the Standard English perspective reigned in teaching and it still remains dominant. For example, in Nepal's education system particularly in English language curriculum, British English was recommended as Standard English. It was also evident from the literature and practices that Received Pronunciation, Standard Vocabulary and Structures were highlighted. However, nowadays, the impact of GE can be realized in teaching to some extent. For example, researchers have argued that English in Nepal should be recognized as a distinct variant with unique names such as Nenglish, Nepali English, Neplish, Nepanlish, and Nepalese English (Giri, 2020). This suggests that while teaching the English language in Nepal's context, we need to be aware of such diversities and respect them in practice.

Nepal is a multilingual country since 129 languages are identified and most of them are spoken as mother tongues (Language Commission, 2019). Despite the multilingual situation of Nepal, the studies (Giri, 2014: Sah, 2017) reported that the language policy of the government had not addressed such multilingualism and language diversities by incorporating them in the textbooks and pedagogy for a long time now. However, the constitution of Nepal, 2015 along with the Education Act and Regulations has recognized Nepal as a multilingual and multiethnic country articulating that all languages spoken in Nepal are national languages. Moreover, the goal of English teaching has also been changed recognizing the need to learn for instrumental and practical purposes. These changes in language teaching can be attributed to the impacts of Global Enlishes.

In teaching practices too, some minor impacts of GELT can be observed. For example, traditional Standard English ideology has been changed to some extent because the new generation of English teachers seems to have shifted their focus on communication rather than accuracy. Moreover, the school-level textbooks have been prepared realizing the multicultural, multilingual and multiethnic background of the learners without adhering to the standard native writers' texts alone. Regarding the impact of GE, Giri (2020) argued that "there is large scale code-mixing and code-switching between Nepali and English, transliteration of English words into Nepali is common and standard English rules are modified at the lexis, grammar, and writing levels" (p. 329). These changes can also be realized in classroom discourses where code-switching, translangauging, and polylanguaging (Valdés, 2019) are allowed to practice. Moreover, a few of the reading texts written by Nepali writers have been incorporated into the courses.

The implications of global Englishes perspectives in teaching and learning can exert both negative as well as positive effects. The positive effects, for example, in the context of Nepal are the acceptance of Nepalese variation of English, the focus of teaching English as a means of communication, shifts from native-like pronunciation to comprehensible pronunciation and incorporation of English texts written by local authors. On the negative side, it might equally make our learners' English incomprehensible to the international communities. However, more GELT interventions and researches seem to be required in English language teaching in Nepal.

Conclusion

Global Englishes perspectives on language teaching have emerged inevitably due to the rapid spread, dynamism, and multiple functions of English throughout the world. Moreover, non-native English speakers have outnumbered the native speakers. In this context, GE has provided its own perspective for language teaching with the set of knowledge, skills, and attitude to be included in the pedagogy. Many scholars have promoted GELT in multilingual contexts of their own challenging the traditional monolingual model and emphasizing local varieties of English. In doing so, GELT shapes the local identity by employing recent methods like translanaguging and polylanguing in the classroom. Furthermore, it enhances the learners with interpersonal communication, mutual support and respect, multidialectal competence, and analytical skills. However, GE, as a vehicle for international communication requires speakers to consciously care for intelligibility, comprehensibility, and interpretability. So, GELT raises awareness in the students about the diversity of English for intercultural communication. It enables the students to understand English variations, its specificities, dynamic nature and acquire as they are required for specific purposes. The studies have shown that stakeholders not only need to learn a particular variety of English but also differentiate and negotiate other varieties of English through discursive practices in the classroom so that they become able to prepare themselves for competitive job markets. Sometimes, students might not perceive the GELT pedagogy positively as shown in Japan. In such situations, teachers can adopt variability, negotiability, and adaptability of GE with innovative interventions such as debate, presentations, comparison, and contrast, as suggested in the earlier studies. In the context of Nepal too, GELT pedagogy has influenced teaching strategies, materials, curriculum, policy, and even ideology to some extent. However, the attitudes of stakeholders towards GELT and its classroom practices are yet to be explored. This paper may encourage teachers to adopt GELT pedagogy in the classroom and researchers to investigate further in the Nepali classroom contexts whether awareness and respect for multilingualism, cultural diversity and identity exists.

The Author:

Gobinda Puri, an MPhil scholar at Nepal Open University, is a lecturer of English at Janta Multiple Campus, Itahari, Sunsari. His research focus is on teacher education, action research, critical thinking, ICT and English as foreign language. He has presented papers at IATEFL-UK, TESOL-USA, JALT-Japan and NELTA International Conferences and published articles in journal and online forums. He is also the vice-chair in NELTA Sunsari branch and the executive member in Provincial committee, Province No. 1.

References

Bayyurt, Y., & Sifakis, N. (2017). Foundations of an EIL-aware teacher education. In A. Matsuda (Ed.), *Preparing teachers to teach English as an international language* (Vol. 53, pp. 3-18). Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English,* 40-67.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 1-28.

Cogo, A. (2012). English as a lingua franca: Concepts, use, and implications. *ELT Journal, 66*(1), 97-105.

Coulmas, F. (2005). Changing language regimes in globalizing environments. *International Journal of the*

Sociology of Language, 5(175-176), 3-15.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language.* Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Dooly, M., & Vallejo, C. (2019). Bringing plurilingualism into teaching practice: a quixotic quest? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(1), 81-97.

Fang, F. (2018). Native-speakerism revisited: Global Englishes, ELT and intercultural communication. *Indonesian JELT, 13*(2), 115-129.

Fang, F., & Ren, W. (2018). Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes. *ELT Journal, 72*(4), 384-394.

Galloway, N. (2013). Global Englishes and English Language Teaching (ELT)–Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context. *System, 41*(3), 786-803.

Galloway, N., & Numajiri, T. (2020). Global Englishes Language Teaching: Bottom-up Curriculum Implementation. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(1), 118-145.

Galloway, N., & Rose, H. (2015). Introducing Global Englishes. Routledge.

Giri, R. A. (2015). The many faces of English in Nepal. *Asian Englishes, 17*(2), 94-115.

Giri, R. A. (2020). *Nepali English.* In K. Bolton, W. Botha & A. Kirkpatrick (Eds) The Handbook of Asian Englishes, 317-336.

Gray, J. (2010). The construction of English: Culture, consumerism and promotion in the ELT global coursebook. Springer.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200-207.

Jenkins, J. (2015). Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca. *Englishes in Practice, 2*(3), 49-85.

Jørgensen, J. N., Karrebæk, M. S., Madsen, L. M., & Møller, J. S. (2015). Polylanguaging in superdiversity. *In Language and superdiversity* (pp. 147-164). Routledge.

Kachru, B. B. (1992). *Teaching world Englishes.* The other tongue: English across cultures, 2, 355-366.

Kohn, A. (2015). Progressive education: Why it's hard to beat, but also hard to find. *Bank Street College of Education.* https://educate.bankstreet.edu/progressive/2

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 537-560.

Language Commission. (2019). *Annual report* 2018/19

Lu, H., & Buripakdi, A. (2020). Effects of Global Englishes-Informed pedagogy in raising Chinese university students' Global Englishes awareness. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand, 60*, 97-133.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2012). Disinventing multilingualism: From monological multilingualism to multilingua francas. *In The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 451-465). Routledge.

Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language* (Vol. 25). Multilingual Matters.

McArthur, T. (2002). *The Oxford guide to world English.* Citeseer.

McCrum, R., Cran, W., & MacNeil, R. (1992). The story of English. Faber Faber Inc.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2004). Critical pedagogies and language learning. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International journal of multilingualism, 7*(3), 240-254.

Pandey, S. B. (2020). English in Nepal. *World Englishes, 39*(3), 500-513.

Pennycook, A. (2007). Language, localization, and the real: Hip-hop and the global spread of authenticity. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 6*(2), 101-115.

Prabjandee, D. (2020). Teacher professional development to implement Global Englishes language teaching. *Asian Englishes, 22*(1), 52-67.

Rampton, B. (2011). From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication, 31*(4), 276-294.

Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2017). Debating standard language ideology in the classroom: Using the 'Speak Good English Movement' to raise awareness of global Englishes. *RELC Journal 48*(3), 294-301.

Sadeghpour, M., & Sharifian, F. (2017). English language teachers' perceptions of world Englishes: The elephants in the room. *Asian Englishes, 19*(3), 242-258.

Sah, P. K. (2017). Using the first language (L1) as a resource in EFL classrooms: Nepalese university teachers' and students' perspectives. *Journal of NELTA, 22*(1-2), 26-38.

Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a lingua franca.* Oxford University Press.

Valdés, G. (2019). Sandwitching, polyganguaging, translanguaging and codeswitching in the classroom: Critical perspectives on teaching, learning, policy, and ideology Routledge