

Theoretical Overview

'COOPERATIVE AND TERRITORIAL IMPERATIVES': WHAT CAN THEY TELL US ABOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH IN ASEAN?

J.A. Foley

The Graduate School of English, Assumption University
jfoley@au.edu

Abstract

English as a lingua franca has been the working language of governmental agencies within ASEAN since 1967. The proposed extension of the domains of usage after 2012 would seem to involve two imperatives: the 'cooperative' and the 'territorial'.

In one case, the cooperative imperative is seen as a need to continually modify the language in order to communicate with people within new contexts and cultures. On the other hand, the territorial imperative seeks to secure and protect a separate and social identity.

This article briefly touches upon what changes might occur linguistically with the widening of English within ASEAN while at the same time seeing these changes as 'normal' by looking at the language and attitudes towards change in the history of English in England, its country of origin, in terms of these dual imperatives.

Keywords: Lingua Franca, ASEAN, cooperative imperative, territorial imperative, history

ความร่วมมือและดินแดน

'imperatives': บอกอะไรเราเกี่ยวกับการพัฒนาภาษาอังกฤษในอาเซียน

บทคัดย่อ

ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษากลางที่ใช้ในหน่วยงานราชการต่างๆ ในอาเซียนและใช้เป็นภาษาราชการมาตั้งแต่ปี 1967 การใช้ภาษาอังกฤษในด้านต่างๆ หลังจากปี 2012 จะเกี่ยวข้องกับความเป็นสองอย่างคือ: 'ความร่วมมือ' และ 'ดินแดน'

ความเป็นเรื่องความร่วมมือเป็นความต้องการที่จะปรับเปลี่ยนภาษาอย่างต่อเนื่องเพื่อสื่อสารกับคนในบริบทและวัฒนธรรมใหม่ๆ ส่วน ความเป็นเรื่องดินแดนคือความพยายามที่จะรักษาความปลอดภัยและปกป้องเอกลักษณ์ ทางสังคมของตน

บทความนี้กล่าวอย่างสั้นๆ ถึงสิ่งที่อาจเกิดขึ้นและการเปลี่ยนแปลงทางภาษา ภาษาอังกฤษในอาเซียน ในขณะที่การมองการเปลี่ยนแปลงเหล่านี้ว่าเป็นสิ่งปกติ โดยดูที่การเปลี่ยนแปลงของภาษาและทัศนคติต่อการเปลี่ยนแปลงในประวัติศาสตร์ของภาษาอังกฤษในประเทศอังกฤษซึ่งเป็นประเทศต้นกำเนิดของภาษาอังกฤษ ในแง่ของความเป็นทั้งสองนี้

คำสำคัญ: ภาษากลาง อาเซียน ความเป็นเรื่องความร่วมมือ ความเป็นเรื่องดินแดน ประวัติศาสตร์

Every existing form of human speech is a body of arbitrary and conventional signs...handed down by tradition...change is the fundamental fact upon which rests the whole method of linguistic study.

William Dwight Whitney (1867:48).

Introduction

The science of 'futurology' is a dangerous exercise, as predictions can often go wrong. Indeed history is littered with failures of prediction and there is no reason to believe that attempts to predict what will happen to English as a lingua franca in ASEAN after 2015 will fare any better.

English in ASEAN has been a *de facto lingua franca*. Although this obviously privileged Brunei, Malaysia, Singapore and the Philippines because of their earlier colonial status, the decision to adopt English as a lingua franca was not really debated when ASEAN was established in Bangkok in 1967 (Okudaira, 1999). However, what is proposed post 2015 is the use of

English as a lingua franca at levels beyond official governmental involvement and therefore much more wide-spread with the ASEAN community. Although ASEAN has embedded English as the working language of its inter-governmental organisations, what seems to be important is whether the focus is on language within the social, cultural and political contexts of the region (English in ASEAN) or a pan-Asian variety of English as a lingua franca (Asian English) or the development of regional varieties of English that may reflect the diversity rather than the commonality (Asian Englishes) (Pennycook 2009:195).

The proposed use of English as an inter-regional lingua franca raises the question of mutual intelligibility. If ASEAN is characterised by different varieties of English (Asian Englishes) that include a number of new varieties and a range of 'expanding circle' Englishes, to what extent do people who use it as a lingua franca within ASEAN understand each other?

It is possible to understand something of the way in which English as a lingua franca might evolve within ASEAN and how speakers adapt their patterns of language use by looking at the development of English from a historical point of view even within a native speaker context. This can give us some indicators of the conditions under which change occurs and which changes are likely and which are unlikely.

English changes according to the users. First, although different speakers or communities may be affected differently, there will be changes in the language itself. Certainly these will occur in pronunciation, but to a lesser extent in vocabulary and grammar. Second, there will be changes in status. English may acquire and does acquire different meaning and pattern of usage among non-native speakers. Third, English will be affected by qualitative change simply because more people will be using English within the ASEAN community than before and for a variety of purposes.

Some changes happen quickly and others slowly but in general any development of English as a lingua franca is a process that may take several generations of users. It is also important to note that individuals act as agents of change as do governments and institutions. An individual's personal ambition can be a highly motivating factor in learning English as can a government's policy decisions on the use of English in the education system. To this we have to add, the growth of urbanization within ASEAN as this will lead to many kinds of social change, including new patterns of language.

Mobility post-2015 within ASEAN will cause social and geographical change and this means that the more mobile a society is, the more open it will be to change. Historically languages in contact with each other cause change. The increasing use of English with ASEAN will affect both local languages and English as it gives rise to new hybrid language varieties. There is nothing unusual about the processes of variation and change. However, languages do not just vary and change proactively by themselves, they vary and change reactively in response to certain social forces.

Seidlhofer and Widdowson (2006:27) identified two forces the ‘cooperative and territorial imperatives’. That is to say that language change is brought about by the ‘cooperative imperative’ in that we need to continually modify our language in order to communicate with other people. However, at the same time, there is this tendency to have an element of compliance in our language that is the ‘territorial imperative’ in order to secure and protect our own space and sustain our separate social and individual identity. One imperative urges us to lower our defences and reduce our differences in the interests of wider communication with ‘other’ people, while the territorial urges us to close ranks to keep ‘others’ out.

‘The cooperative imperative’

Teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL), as we know it today, tends to highlight a *common core* in terms of grammar and vocabulary and to a lesser extent pronunciation based on the native speaker. A ‘core’ is sustained by the textbooks and other materials used wherever English is taught. Such an approach positions the learner as one who struggles to attain acceptance by the target community. The target language is someone else’s mother tongue and therefore underlines the superiority of the native speaker. When measured against the standard of the native speaker, few EFL learners can achieve native speaker level of competence (Graddol, 2006).

Today, the trend is more towards the use of global English in that a greater number of interactions are between non-native speakers of English (NNS). In other words English has become a ‘lingua franca’ (ELF). That is to say that ELF, in essence, is a means of communication in English between speakers who have different first languages. Most researchers would agree with this. However, where they start to disagree is whether a native speaker (NS) can participate in ELF communication.

Both Seidlhofer 2004 and Jenkins, 2007 believe that NSs can participate in ELF, but that when they do so, the situation is very different from EFL in that NSs no longer set the linguistic agenda and should not expect the non-native participants in the interaction to defer to NS norms.

The 'Cooperative Imperative' and ELF.

For EFL approaches, Standard British or American English are very often the only acceptable norms to serve as targets for foreign language learners of English. Any 'item' that falls short of these norms is by definition considered an error. While in ELF, non-native forms are considered as evidence of the emergence of modifications to these norms through recently accelerated language contact that is leading in turn to accelerated language change.

The current focus on ELF research is directed at identifying precisely what these new ELF norms consist of. In other words, what sort of forms do competent ELF speakers systematically, and frequently produce that are both communicatively effective and different from the norms of NS users of 'standard' English.

Understanding how NNS use English with NNSs and NSs is being studied in various projects, for example the *VOICE Corpus* (The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English), is creating a computer corpus of lingua franca interactions which is intended to help researchers and teachers understand ELF better and also provide support for the recognition of ELF users in the way English is taught (albeit from an essentially Euro-English perspective). More locally there is the ELF*iA* corpus of Asian ELF (Kirkpatrick, 2010). So far both of these developing corpora are based on spoken data.

The question is can we establish a Lingua Franca Core (LFC) which provides guiding principles as to what these forms might be? Unlike traditional EFL, ELF focuses also on pragmatic strategies required in intercultural communication. The target model of English within the ELF framework is not the NS but a fluent bilingual (Successful User of English [SUE]), who retains a national identity in terms of accent and who also has the special skills required to negotiate understanding with other NNSs.

However, any discussion about 'core' areas of ELF is about areas that have norms that need to be conformed to. The non-core features will make up NNS regional variations, marking speakers 'identities', while ensuring intelligibility within the local community context. Consequently, ELF is not

offering alternatives to the prescriptive (NS-based) rules. ELF is by nature descriptive; that is to say, it focusses on what is actually in use within a given community (local or regional). This means that there is not a single variety called ELF, and that while common features are appearing from the corpus data, there is plenty of evidence of local variation.

Mufwene (2001) has pointed out that it is a commonly held belief that the English of NSs has a single indentifiable ‘parent’ and has a linear development from Old English to the present day without being ‘contaminated’ by other languages along the way. Historically, there has certainly been a tendency to downplay the role of contact with other languages in the case of ‘native Englishes’ while on the contrary it has been emphasized in the case ‘indigenized Englishes’.

However, the ‘Cooperative Imperative’ in terms of English as a Lingua Franca would demand more than an automatic transmission from a sociolinguistic description to a pedagogic prescription. Indeed it may not be possible to teach ELF given the present knowledge base. But that does not mean that there should be no change in researchers and educators mindsets. It should be clear to all those who communicate internationally that ELF exists, and that its speakers can no longer be assumed to be deficient where their English departs from English as a Native Language (ENL). A consequent change in mindset would certainly involve an overhaul of English language testing procedures. Even without a definitive description of ELF, examination boards could still make their practices more relevant to the ways in which most English is used in the expanding circle. This could be done by prioritizing accommodation skills and not penalizing forms that are already emerging as frequent, systematic and intelligible among proficient ELF speakers, regardless of the fact that they differ from the way NSs of English use the language.

In grammatical terms such features as the following would need to be recognized as acceptable in an ELF context.

- Dropping the 3rd person present tense-*s*
- Confusing the relative pronoun *who* and *which*
- Omitting the definite and indefinite article where they are obligatory in English as a Native Language (ENL), and inserting them where they do not occur in ENL.

- Restricting the use of the question tag to *is it?/ isn't it?*
- Inserting redundant prepositions, as in *We have to study about...*
- Overusing certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*
- Replacing infinitive-constructions with *that*-clauses, as in *I want that* rather than *I want to*
- Overdoing explicitness as in *black color* rather than just *black*.

(Features of ELF from the VOICE corpus).

Perhaps it is more important that these same grammatical features were found by Platt and Weber (1980) in Singapore/Malaysian English and by Foley (1984) in child language in Singapore. In fact many of these features can also be found in immigrant English and foreigner talk. What this might be telling us is more about the learning strategies in general and the natural process of how language adjusts to new contexts.

Jenkins (2002) has also identified the following features of ELF in terms of variations in local pronunciation that can be generalized.

	ELF target
	Lingua Franca Core
The consonantal inventory	All sounds except /θ/, /ð/ but approximations of all others acceptable.
	Rhotic /r/ only
	Intervocalic [ɾ] only
Phonetic requirements	Apiration after /p/, /t/, /k/
	Appropriate vowel length before 'fortis' (strong degree of muscular effort) and 'lenis' (less forceful) consonants
Consonant clusters	Word initially
	Word medially
Vowel quantity	Long –short contrast
Tonic (nuclear) stress	Critical

(adapted from Jenkins 2002:99)

The History of English: Cooperative and Territorial Imperatives.

If we now turn to a well-documented history of English, in England, we see that language is more of a transcript of history, not an immutable edifice. In other words digging in the past can often prompt thoughts about language as it is today.

English has always been an evolving language. First from Celtic and Latin, later from the invasion by Germanic tribes in c.449, later settlements from Scandinavia (The Vikings), and in 1066 with Norman French, and more recently from other languages spoken in the British former colonies. It may well be that this hybridity and permeability of English is a defining feature, allowing it to expand into new domains and explain to some extent its success as a lingua franca (Graddol, 2000). After the Norman Conquest many linguistic changes came into the language. French became the official language in England and this affected English vocabulary and spelling. The grammar was also transformed. Whereas Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian languages expressed grammatical relations through inflections of the word endings, in particular the nouns. English after 1066 lost many of these inflections and used word order to mark the grammatical functions. The political status of English also changed, Henry IV in 1399 was the first English King since 1066 to have English as his mother tongue. Written documents became important in English but with a variety of dialects still prevailing, the inconsistencies of English spelling became a source of anxiety. For example the word *knight* could be spelt *knyght*, *knyht*, *knict*, *knith* or *cnihht*. A movement towards some form of uniformity had already begun when Caxton set up his printing press in 1476. Caxton was a transmitter rather than an innovator. What he did recognize was that unless English as a language was better governed, it would not be adequate as an important access to knowledge at that period.

Caxton and the next generation of printers had also to face the problem of English pronunciation. Around 1400 there was a significant change is what is termed *The Great Vowel Shift*. This occurred over a period of about 300 years. It was not clear why this happened but there was a general raising of 'long vowels'. If we go back to Middle English an 'a' sounded like in *father* today, an 'e' like the first vowel sound in *bacon*. What was happening was that printers were attempting to freeze spelling at a time of phonological change. The correspondence between the grapheme and the phoneme began to move further apart. However, what was important was that a language that was printed could be transported and preserved.

The increasing publication of religious texts encouraged the use of the vernacular. The high point being in 1611 with the publication of *The King James version of the Bible*. The language of prayer had also been changing with the publication of the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549. In the 1550s during Queen Elizabeth Ist reign, literature became the instrument of political authority. The monarch was glorified and so was the language used for this purpose. Shakespeare became by the 18th century the ideal, the national poet and was used to embody ideas about the greatness of English. This was a significant change, for throughout the 16th century English writers disputed over the inferiority of English. This was in comparison with Latin and Greek rather than French. Around about 1570, writers started to worry that their works might not last because of the impermanence of English vocabulary. The increased use of these new words and coinages also brought about considerable opposition, Richard Rowland Verstegen who in 1605 published *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence* set out to remind people of their true origins in Germany and the integrity of their language. He claimed that English had become the ‘scum of many languages’. Anxieties about the roots of English and the language’s new directions led scholars to puzzle over the relationships between languages. In 1513 William Lily published a grammar based on Latin but provided a template for thinking about English grammar. Its authority endured for two hundred years and it was reprinted 350 times. Nevertheless, scholarly interest in English grammars increased and one of the most successful was Wallis’s *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1653) despite being in Latin argued that English should not follow Latin. In 1550 Thomas Wilson in *The Arte of Rhetorique* complained that well-travelled gentlemen had lately started to ‘power’ their conversation with confusing ‘overseas language’ (Hitchings, 2011). However, it took another three hundred years, for Ferdinand de Saussure (1916, English translation, 1974) theory of language to have something like a systematic foundation. Saussure saw it as a system of relationships that needed to be studied not through its historical development (a diachronic approach) but at a particular moment in time (a synchronic approach).

‘Territorial Imperatives’

Most of us practice linguistic hygiene, washing away pollutants such as jargon, vulgarisms, bad grammar and mis-pronunciations. All of us, besides using language, comment on it and complain about others’ usage.

This kind of appraisal allows us to tidy up reality. It reveals our aversion to disorder. On one hand, we fear not being able to make ourselves understood but on the other hand we feel that our language is coming under attack. If we can arrest language change, the thinking goes, we can hold off not just changes in the language but other changes as well.

Many people think that certain rules about English are immutable, the violation of which shows symptoms of low intelligence or social class. In Quirk et al. *A Grammar of Contemporary English* (1972) there are 3,500 distinct points of grammar and these are changing over time, although obviously the majority make up the 'code' of English as a language. However, 'rules' are really only conventions. At different times, and in different places, different conventions are the norm. We generally adhere to conventions because it is practical to do so, as it is 'our' language. In other words whatever form our language takes is determined by the community in which we grow up. Languages are culturally created and there is a naturally tendency to protect our territory.

However, as we have argued English is not monolithic. There are numerous different Englishes. Arguments about English have always been coloured by feelings about tradition, the distribution of power, freedom, the law, identity. Many are related to education: any statement about methods of teaching and learning is grounded in politics and it is very often an ideological programme. Chomsky said in *Language and Responsibility* that 'Questions of language are basically questions of power' (1979:191).

However, whatever the language, we normally appeal to some authority... Ministries of Education, universities as well as geographical criteria (UK, USA,). Typically we feel that there are certain environments in which language is decently used, and we tend to favour these usages. The problem here is that language is seen as an 'object' rather than what it 'signifies'.

'Territorial Imperatives' seem to be a basic tenet in the formal teaching of English, at least in schools, and schools go back to around 1586 in the United Kingdom (Michael, 1987). For example, Mather published *The Young Man's Companion*, in 1685, although it dealt with more than language (for example, how to cure madness). As far back as we can see, grammatical failings have been associated with moral ones and those whose grammar has been publically found faulty have been ridiculed. In 1883 Oliver Bell Bunce published a little book called *A Manual of Mistakes and*

Improprieties more or less prevalent in Conduct and Speech. It was full of instructions such as 'Don't say lady when you mean wife'. 'Don't fail to exercise tact'. (the first three words are redundant). 'Don't speak ungrammatically', (the double negative) (Hitchings, 2011).

With the publication of Johnson's Dictionary of 1755 English became a 'national' language. The guide to grammar that Johnson included in his dictionary relied to a great deal on Lily's grammar of an earlier period. The dictionary's chief contribution to grammar was that it forced others into examining English more carefully. Johnson also became conscious of the necessary mutability of English, the need for a lexicographer to see how things *are* rather than how they *should be*. There was a battle even within himself between prescriptivism and descriptivists. As Johnson describe in his preface, he did not want it to be reduce to 'a babble of a dialect of France'.

In fact, Johnson is often identified with the prescriptive tradition that dominated English in the 18th century, until almost to the modern day. But it was Robert Lowth in 1762 in his *Short Introduction to English Grammar* who emphasized the usefulness of Latin as a means of categorizing and stabilizing English at this period. Lowth worked from what he called 'our best authors' and identified times when English was used poorly. He provided examples of what he considered as mistakes in usage. Lowth did draw a distinction between what one can say and what one can write. In written English he claimed that it was unacceptable to end a sentence with a preposition, but accepted the practice in 'familiar' use. This *Short Introduction* represents, however, the general condition of English grammar up until the 20th century. However, it has been lexicographers who have become the language's border guards. Even recently, Burchfield the editor of the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) from 1957-1986 deliberately closed the door on words that were not considered as belong to native English speakers. He avoided variants of English spoken in parts of Africa and South-east Asia for instance and preferred to emphasise the speech of the United Kingdom's former 'settler' colonies such as Canada, or Australia (Ogilvie, 2012).

American English: Cooperative and Territorial Imperatives at work?

The revolution that achieved American independence in 1776 was a challenge to the English of the United Kingdom as well as to the British

government. Until that challenge emerged there was no notion of British English; there was just English.

The fiercest exponent of American 'territorial imperative' was Thomas Paine who emigrated to America in 1774. His book *Common Sense* which was a demand for American independence sold in excess of 150,000 copies within three months. 15 years later in his *Rights of Man*, Paine could reflect on the events of war that brought about American independence, 'The American Constitutions were to liberty what a grammar is to language' (Paine 1995: 147). A politically independent United States needed to claim its linguistic independence and this process dated back at least to 1774 with a proposal for the foundation of an *American Society of Language*. Many people who sailed to America saw their journey as an opportunity to forge a distinct identity. They brought with them the pronunciations and vocabulary of their day. The result was a form of English that was shaped by contact with native American Indians, French, Dutch, Germans and Spaniards.

Amid the expansion of the Union of the American States, English was never accorded an official status. Instead it fell to individuals to reinforce its position. Noah Webster was one of the main campaigners for a national language, a 'cooperative'. Webster's *The American Spelling Book* in 1787 sold in 40 years about ten million copies. He wanted to clarify pronunciation by amending the spelling, and many of his suggestions were taken up in his *American Dictionary of the English Language* (1828).

The Purists and the Territorial Imperative.

Noah Webster's influence in America was seen by many as encouraging the territorial imperative. This was matched in Britain by Lindley Murray with his *English Grammar* in 1795. There was also John Walker's *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary* that went through hundreds of editions between 1791 and 1904. Its 547 'principles of English pronunciation' ruled among others that 'l' in gigantic is always long, that 's' is sharp and hissing at the end of monosyllables, yes, this, us etc. (Walker 1791: 18 and 51)

Murray's *English Grammar* was translated into many languages including Russian, Spanish, French and Japanese. However it was not particularly original in that it relied to a great extent on Robert Lowth. What Murray did was to popularize spelling rules such as words ending with a 'y' in the plural form changed to 'i' as in spy, spies. Words that end in a double 'l' and

take 'ness', 'less', 'ly' a, omit one 'l' after them as in 'skilful'. Words that end in a silent 'e' almost always cut it off 'cure' 'curable' and so on.

In general 'Purists' are possessive not only about the correctness of what they say, but also about the examples they have collected of other people's mistakes. They are also resistant to change not because they have an understanding of the relationship between language and time, but because they are heavily invested in the status quo. A dislike for borrowing words can be presented as a preference for simplicity. But purists in their hostility to imported terms fail to keep pace with the changing realities of the world around them. In 1926 Fowler published *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* and it became simply known as 'Fowler'. Since then it has influenced British ideas of English usage more than any other book (Hitchings, 2011).

Fowler tended to be a prescriptivist but as Kingsley Amis pointed out in *The King's English: A Guide to Modern Usage* (1997) his compliment to Fowler was that often people who wrote about grammar have no actual knowledge of grammar. But they like the idea of grammar because they see in its structures a model of how they would like society to be organized and orderly, governed by rules and a strict hierarchy.

In other words, Standard English as we know it is a construct. In the 19th century it was promoted by educators and to some extent the civil service not in the public interest at large but in the interest of those of a small authoritarian group who enthroned their English as the best English yet. The idea of a standard form of the language really being a prestige form was not new even in the 19th century. Henry Sweet (1900) wanted to focus on educated colloquial speech as he wrote: 'most present English dialects are so isolated in their development that they throw little light on the development of English' (Sweet 1971:14). Standardization always involves passing judgement on the value of variant forms and mostly these judgements are negative. One can speak standard English without a standard accent. RP or Received pronunciation has tended to be associated with public schools, called in the US, private schools and Daniel Jones' *Pronouncing Dictionary* became the ultimate guide to pronunciation and to some extent this holds true today. With the creation of the BBC in 1922, radio became an important medium for the diffusion of RP. It was only in the 1960s both on radio and tv that the BBC began to feature many presenters who did not use RP. Since the 1960s a new kind of standard has emerged. In 1984 David Rosewarne labelled it 'Estuary English' (the estuary of the River Thames in

Essex and Kent). This involved the shift of working class and middle class accents slightly in the direction of RP, while RP and accents close to it such as 'Sloan Square' accents have levelled downwards. Example: the intrusive linking 'r' sound one hears between *idea* and *of* in '*the idea of going*'.

However, for now RP rather than Estuary English or some variant is taught to non-native speakers but there is a move to change that. Given the paucity of RP speakers it makes more sense among other reasons to teach foreign learners a different accent.

Learners of English are encouraged to think that the closer they get to native speaker English the better. Now that corpus linguistics can provide a detailed description of this behaviour, teachers have been urged to teach this 'authentic' or 'real' English in their classrooms. But the notion that real English is reflected in corpora that are based on British or American usage denies the reality of actual use. For millions of people around the world trying to learn this language are for the most part doing so to use it as a lingua franca (ELF), as a means of international communication not to identify with native speakers. (Seidlhofer, 2004). Such NNs would probably not want to recognise the territorial rights of the native speakers as a condition on their learning and using the language.

Conclusion

Description of ELF is still at the early stages and more work will be necessary before its salient features can be specified with any certainty. Looking at the future development of ELF within the ASEAN community, one question will be how far stabilization will occur in different groups within the community, in different domains and background languages. ELF as a form of English exists because it reflects the needs and aspirations of the ever-growing number of NNS who use English to communicate with other NNSs. ELF also has to focus on pragmatic strategies required in intercultural communication. The target model should be a fluent bilingual user of English, retaining a national identity in terms of accent and some lexico-grammatical features (the Territorial Imperative). As well as being an effective communicator in terms of other NNSs and NSs (the Cooperative Imperative). One must also be aware that any 'core' and its 'rules' are political and social constructs. As the political and social reality changes, will ELF become simply a new 'construct'?

References

- Amis, K. 1997. *The King's English: A Guide to Modern Usage*, London: HarperCollins.
- Chomsky, N. 1979. *Language and Responsibility*. London: Harvester.
- Foley, J.A. 1984. A Study of the Development of Language Among Pre-School Children in Singapore with Particular Reference To English. P. Larson, E.L. Judd and D.S. Messerschmitt (eds.) *A Brave New World For TESOL*. Washington D.C. TESOL.
- Fowler, H.W. 2009. *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, ed. David Crystal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graddol, D 2000. *The Future of English*, London, British Council
- Graddol, D 2002, *English Next*, London British Council
- Hitchings, H 2011. *The Language Wars*, London, John Murray
- Jenkins, J. 2002. A sociolinguistically based, empirically researched pronunciation syllabus for English as an International Language. *Applied Linguistics* 23/1:83-103
- Jenkins, J. 2007. *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. 2010. World Englishes Across cultures: Arguments for the Multilingual model and pedagogy. Paper given at *LIA International Conference*, Bali, Indonesia 28-30 April.
- Lowth, R. 1762. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*, London : Millar, Dodsley & Dodsley
- Michael, I. 1987. *The Teaching of English: From the Sixteenth Century to 1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mufwene, S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogilvie S. 2012. *Words of the World: A Global History of the Oxford English Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Okundaira, A. 1999. A Study of international communication in regional organizations: The use of English as the 'official' language of ASEAN, *Asian Englishes*, 2(1):91
- Paine, T. 1995. *Rights of Man, Common Sense, and Other Political Writings*, ed. Mark Philp, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Pennycook, A. 2009. Plurilithic Englishes: Towards a 3D Model. K. Murata and J.Jenkins (eds.) *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts: Current and Future Debates* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Platt, J.T. and Weber, H. K. 1980. *English in Singapore and Malaysia: Status, Features, Functions*. Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. Leech, G.,and Svartvik, J. 1972 *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman.
- Saussure, F.de. 1974. *Course in General Linguistics*. London Fontana. (English translation)
- Seidlhofer, B. 2004. Research Perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24: 209-39.
- Seidlhofer, B. and Widdowson, H. 2009. Accommodation and the Idiom Principle in English as a Lingua Franca, K. Murata and J.Jenkins (eds.) *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts: Current and Future Debates*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Sweet, H. 1971. *The Indispensible Foundation: A Selection of the Writings of Henry Sweet*, ed. E. J. A. Henderson. London: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, J. 1791. *A Critical Pronouncing Dictionary and Expositor of the English Language*, London: Robinson, Robinson & Cadwell.
- Webster, N. 1828. *An American Dictionary of the English Language*, 2 vols. New York: S. Converse.
- Witney, W.D. 1867. *Language and the Study of Language*, London: Trübner