Opinion Article

Global Englishes: Formation, Development and Implications for English Language Education

Duy Khiem Tran [1],* **, Khanh Linh Tran [1]** **, and Nguyen Thu Huynh [1]**

[1]   University of Finance – Marketing, Hochiminh City, Vietnam

*   Correspondence: tdkhiem@ufm.edu.vn

Abstract: This paper examines the complexities of English as a global language, challenging the idea of its uniformity. It argues that English is dynamic, shaped by socio-political contexts and historical forces such as colonialism. The discussion highlights the implications of dominance of English for linguistic diversity and social equity, advocating for recognition of its varied forms - referred to as "Englishes" - that reflect unique cultural identities. The study calls for a rethinking of English language education to promote inclusivity and address inherent inequalities.

Keywords: education model; English language teaching curriculum; teaching methods; English language education

1. Introduction

It is often stated that English has become a global language and its status in the global linguistic landscape is currently not challenged by any rivals and that its significant presence in every aspect of the contemporary world cannot be ignored. These statements seem quite right when they are taken as face value. But with a closer look, these assertions are sure to provoke some concerns. With English as a global language, does English here refer to a single universal language spoken and understood by everybody in the world? Is it true that status of English is unchallenged and if so, what is the driving force behind it? Does global omnipresence of English entail all merits? Does the rise of English offer any implications for the world? As mindful of the questions, this conceptual paper is constructed on the basis of compilation of main themes discussed in the current literature, in order to support the stances (1) that English is not a language that remains intact, testifying the test of time and space, (2) that English is not neutral and free from the influence of social-political forces, and (3) that the dynamic natural development of English is the driving force behind the paradigm shifting in the domain of English study and English education.

2. Trajectory of English in the Changing World: Paradox, Unpredictability and Controversy

2.1. Paradoxical Rise of English

English language satisfies the criteria for determining whether or not a language is a global language. Contrary to the common belief that the language should be used as first language by the vast majority of people around the world in order to be deemed as a global language, Crystal (2003) pointed out that the enormous number of mother-tongue speakers cannot decide its global status, and thus he came up with the reasoning that language is deemed a global language (1) when it is assigned an official role to function as a complementary to the first language in discourse of different domains (e.g., education, government, and mass media) of the speech communities apart from the ones where it is used as the mother tongue, and (2) when the language is acknowledged as dominating the second language education of the countries where it lacks the official status. In reference to the two criteria, English is not only the medium via which written and spoken discourse of policy making, court proceedings, national media and education are presented in more than 70 countries (Aghazaki, 2020; Crystal, 2003), but it is also the main focus of foreign language

education across most of the countries of the world (Melitz, 2016). English status in South East Asia can be a satisfactory example to illustrate what has been mentioned. In Singapore, Malaysia and Brunei, and the Philippines, English is the official code for business transaction, policy making, public media and education while it is currently promoted as a preferred foreign language for global integration and economic development in countries like Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar and Indonesia (Low, 2019).

The rise of English as a global language can be explained through the lens of relativity of economic, political, and scientific-technological forces. Throughout the history of the English language, the position of English was reinforced by the military might of the British Empire, the economic powerhouse of the USA, as well as the exponential dominance in scientific technological advancement of the English-speaking countries (Horobin, 2016). In the cases of former British colonies, such as Hong Kong, Singapore, India, and Jamaica, even though the history of colonialism is of the past, English cannot be completely annihilated, but still remains as an essential means for being competitive in global social-political-economic arena shaped by America's supremacy (Kandiah, 2001). The block of English-speaking countries led by America has undisputedly dominated the educational field, possessing more technological patents and scientific breakthroughs than any other single countries. Also, this subsequently bolsters the eminent role of English global academia (Alogali, 2018).

English can fulfill the need for a global language. Due to globalization, there is a dire need for communications across countries, which can help bring mutual understanding, economic benefits, political advantage, and technological advancement. Pidgins as lingua franca can be the solution, but it takes time to develop and is not always conducive to successful communication (Romaine, 2017); thus, the availability of the English language seems hard to resist. Besides, as the world has become more decentralized, a myriad of world governing bodies were founded in order to help orchestrate economic or scientific cooperation, cultural cohesion and social-political harmony. This results in the problem in opting for which language to adopt as the main codes used in these international organizations without disrupting mutual understanding, or demoting the international status of any single country. Multilingual translation and interpretation services may be beneficial but when it comes to the hefty cost incurred from these services, the advantage of having a common language as English cannot be more significant.

Even though being able to accommodate the demand for a universal global language, the stake of English becoming the global language is quite high, for it is perceived to exacerbate the issues of social hegemony, dismissal of language diversity and linguicide. With English being widely used, speakers using it as mother tongue find themselves at the advantage in all aspects of life (such as in economic competition, research, education and even recreation) as it is believed that speakers being competent in the language can position themselves at the top of hierarchy which allows them the opportunities to dominate any communication, and subsequently establish linguistic conventions, communication protocols, worldviews and ideologies for non-English-mother-tongue speakers to comply with (Kandiah, 2001). Besides, when the English language is spoken internationally, native English speakers tend to be unwilling to learn a new language since they find it irrelevant and unnecessary to speak any other languages. This matter was consistently reported in different research investigating native English speakers' attitude toward learning foreign languages (Gayton, 2014; Looney & Lusin, 2018; Araújo & da Costa, 2013; Macaro, 2008). In addition to the complacency it may lead to, the emergence of English as a global language is commonly associated with the disappearance of other indigenous languages; however, this line of thinking is argued to be problematic. As the demise of minority languages happens naturally as the result of the minority groups being pressured into being assimilated with the local society which is superior in terms of economic and political power, English as a global language cannot be considered as the sole culprit. Furthermore, English as a global language is believed to be an indispensible medium to usher in the global effort to decelerate the course of extinction of minority languages. Additionally, language reflects identity of a country in the globalized world, so countries may maintain the compatibility between English and local languages in order to foster their global presence, and at the same time, to index their distinct identities (Albury, 2016; Albury & Aye, 2016; Bulajeva & Hogan-Brun, 2014; How et al., 2015; Soler-Carbonell et al., 2017).

2.2. English as a Global Language Imbued with Controversy

Even though the rise of English is imminent regardless of its pros and cons, there are

still some controversial points deserving further consideration. Firstly, the existence of a single "English" as a global language is questionable (Pennycook, 2007). English as a language is a tool for social construction and thus it evolves out of the needs of its speakers to have the complete description of the world in which they are living. While English is so widespread, and it is no longer a possession of any single nation, the notion of the homogenous global English is inapt as it fails to acknowledge the intrinsic complexities of English varieties, and unambiguously accentuates the promotion of "monolingualism as norm, ideological globalization and internationalization, transnationalization, the Americanization and homogenization of world culture, linguistic, culture and media imperialism" (Phillipson, 1999, p. 274).

Secondly, when English comes into contact with local languages and is influenced by these indigenous languages and cultures, the prospect of universal intelligible English for all is unlikely. As a result, it is imperative that English should not be simplistically treated as a single entity on the ground of homogeneity, but as a collective of varieties on the basis of complexity and pluralism (Kubota, 2016), and so as to be congruent with such paradigm shifting, the term Englishes seems to be more appropriate (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

Thirdly, English is heralded as the key to social development, economic prosperity and political empowerment, yet paradoxically, the rise of English as an international language adversely engenders the issue of division and inequality (Ives, 2015). Whilst at one end, competent English users are able to reap the most advantages out of educational, economic and career opportunities brought by English, at the other end, the ones whose English abilities are limited are confronted with English proficiency barrier, which impedes their access to high-quality education, employment opportunities and thus upward social mobility (Tsui & Tollefson, 2017). Besides, the propagation of monolithic English language fueled by English language teaching industry monopolized by English-speaking powerhouses (e.g., the USA, the UK, and Australia) has resulted in the stratification of the haves and the have-nots, the disproportionate and wasteful investment in English language education, and even social distress (Kirkpatrick & Bui, 2016). Vietnam can be a typical example. As Vietnam has been intensively engaged in the flow of the global economy, the demand for a skillful workforce with good command of English has increased exponentially. This demand has conditioned the issuance of the National Foreign Language Project 2008-2020 (Vietnam Government, 2008), which subsequently led to an array of changes in the English language education in Vietnam. They can be reiterated as (1) the revision of English language teaching curriculum, (2) the adoption of teaching and learning materials from world-renowned publishers (such as Oxford, Cambridge, and MacMillan), (3) the pivot from traditional grammar-translation method to CLT approach, (4) the adoption of standardized language testing systems (such as IELTS powered by Cambridge University and TOEFL iBT developed by ETS USA), (5) the expansion of private English language centers modeled on the bias toward "traditional" native English variety. These changes have resulted in the minority gaining the benefits and the other majority enduring the loss. For the former, it is the dominant ELT publishers, the native English teachers, the standardized test makers, and the well-off students who can afford the high-quality of English education from very young age, while the latter is the tax-payer whose contributions are profusely spent on experimental English teaching initiatives, the local teachers who are competent but are often be discriminated against, the frustrated students who spend so much but gain too little, and laymen whose command of English cannot overcome the hurdle of expensive norm-referenced proficiency tests.

By and large, from the three aforementioned issues, it is implied that the notion of English as a global language and the roles of such a language in the contemporary world are nuanced enough to be open to further multifaceted examination

2.3. Unpredictable Future of English

No matter how prominent the status of English is in the international linguistic landscape, the future of English as a global language is analogous to an uncharted terrain. As history proves that the dominance of a language relied upon the economic and political power of its speakers, the position of English can be challenged when the rises of new super powerhouses (where English is not used as mother tongue) are significant enough to bring about the revolutionary change to the global order (Bruthiaux, 2002). However, as the interdependence among nations is more and more pronounced, whether or not such revolution in global governance materializes is perplexing and thus the future of English – a global language is beyond predictions. In a different vein, thanks to breakthroughs in machine learning and artificial intelligence, multilingual translation devices are anticipated to render

English as a global language obsolete; nonetheless, given the fact that the accuracy of such devices is still questionable and that commercial versions of these gadgets are still far from reality, "that position [of English] will very likely have become impregnable" (Crystal, 2003, p. 27).

3. English embracing variations: Linguistic evidences

Contrary to the uncertainty about the future of English, it is clear that English is no longer a homogeneous language used by a monolingual speech community, but it has come to embrace the new entity which has been constituted by different varieties with distinct linguistic features. Evidence for how varied English has become can be found through the comparison and contrast between English varieties in terms of linguistic aspects (i.e., phonology, lexicon, morpho-syntax, and pragmatics and discourse).

English pronunciation, in its purest sense, is perplexing as there is no correspondence between spellings of words and the way they are pronounced. One letter can have different sound realizations, as in the case of the letter "c', it can be /k/ in cat, but /s/ in mice. This matter is way more complicated when it comes to the contrasts of pronunciations of English varieties. Words with the same spellings across English varieties, can have dissimilar pronunciations. For example, poor can be sounded as /po/ in Scotish English, or /pur/ in ideal received pronunciation, or even as /pur/ in American English, while "hay" is realized in actual speech as either /hei/ in RP, or /hæl/ in Australian English (Cox, 2006). From these examples, it can be unambiguous that it is unrealistic to come up with a universal set of pronunciation principles for all varieties of English and that the learners' efforts to master the pronunciation of one variety seem trivial.

The discrepancy among English varieties is not limited to pronunciation, it also manifests in the lexical domain. Words in a particular variety can convey complete unrelated meanings in the other one, or one variety can feature a collection of words that are genuinely unidentifiable in the other varieties. The word "damper" as a noun means damage or spoil in British English, but it is used to refer to bread in Australian variety. Likewise, despite its original meaning in British English being to deal with problems, "action" as a verb picks up a different meaning – show off – in Singaporean English. Apart from that, South African English, thanks to contacts with local language, has many new words – that make no sense to speakers of other English varieties – incorporated into its lexis system; they can be roughly listed as "lekker" (to mean "cute", or "cool"), "Springbok" (to refer to a local species of antelope), "yebo" (to express "yes, I agree") or "veld" (to mean a flat, open country) (Trudgill & Hannah, 2017).

Exploring the way in which words, phrases and sentences are formed and combined, as well as how contextual-cultural conventions determine the realizations of linguistic forms in real situations, can reveal much about differences among English varieties. Some contrasts between British English and General American English can be used to highlight this point. Regarding the difference in morphological level, while in British English irregular past tense morphemes are applicable to "burn", "learn", "spill" and "spoil", in General American English {-ed} past tense morpheme is used for past forms of these verbs (Trudgill & Hannah, 2017). In terms of variations at syntactic level, verb phrases preceded by "come" can be "to infinitive" as in "I'll come to meet you soon" in British English, or "bare infinitive" as in "I'll come meet you soon" in General American English. In the respect of dissimilarity in cultural norms, in American English, it is common to hear "You're welcome" as a response to "Thank you", but "That's okay" is widely accepted as the equivalent of British English (Schneider, 2005). Based on these examples, it is obvious that although variations in English are significant and sometimes may compromise communication, the embrace of these variations among English varieties helps ensure robust evolution of English.

4. Development of English: Formation Processes of English Varieties

Besides the analysis of evidence of differences among the varieties of English, an explanation for the mechanism through which a variety became distinguished from the others is highly important in the way that it sheds light on the natural language development and thus results in the appreciation of variations. Realizing this, Kachru (1992), Moag (1992) and Schneider (2003) offered their theories about the cycle of development of English varieties.

According to Kachru (1992), the formation of a variety of English undergoes 3 stages

(i.e., non-recognition, co-existence, and recognition). Through 3 stages, a variety goes through the process of being rejected at first, then being acknowledged as being compatible with the imported variety and finally being considered as the norm of the speech community.

At the same time, Moag (1992) proposed the 5-stage process. In this process, firstly, English is transported to the place where its existence has not been registered before; secondly, the transported English becomes localized or indigenized due to its contact with the local languages, and at this stage, the difference between the original variety and the indigenized is quite noticeable; thirdly, the localized variety's role in the society is more significant due to its increasing presence in myriad domains of life, and during this phase, it is witnessed that there is a marked increase in variations within the local variety; fourthly, the local variety become the socially-accepted standard language thanks to the institutionalization; lastly, the use of the variety is in downturn due to the revival of interest in promoting the cultural identity via local languages.

Schneider (2003) explained how the development of a variety unfolds through a 5-step sequence. In the first stage named as "foundation", English use starts to take root in places where English previously was unknown. Transiting to the second stage – "exonormative stabilization", the variety spoken by the locals (also known as IDG) is still heavily influenced by the imported variety or STL; however, it is noticeable that there is a gradual deviation from STL toward IDG, which marking the start of expansion of IDG. Following this, the local variety undergoes the third phase of nativisation in which the dynamic fusion of the IDG and STL is witnessed; due to this active coupling of the 2 varieties, the restructuring of English in the respect of lexis and grammar happens at a very significant level. Such reconfiguring of English in IDG is substantial to the extent that IDG becomes accepted as the language norm of the speech community in various situations; this acceptance of the local variety indexes stage 4 of the development cycle of the new variety – endonormative stabilization phase. Subsequently, in the last stage, the IDG emerges as a distinct variety of English that reflect the unique culture and identity of the speech community; however, during this stage, sub-varieties start to come to the surface as well.

Striking a quite different note on the view of English development, Widdowson (1997) at one point agreed that English variations are inevitable thanks to English coming into contact with different languages from different parts of the world, but at the other point, he argued that the developmental process some supposed English varieties (such as Ghanaian and Nigerian English) passed through is dissimilar to the one experienced by other regional varieties existing within England, in reference to the idea that these varieties have morphed into new languages whose difference from English is significant to the extreme of mutual unintelligibility. However, this argument is contested by A. Kirkpatrick (2007). He stated that intelligibility is a slippery criterion for differentiating English varieties from autonomous languages, based on the reason that people can adapt their language uses either to match their purposes of either fulfilling the priority of mutual intelligibility, or marking their identities.

In general, all the views mentioned above highlight that the cross-linguistic influences brought by language contact sequentially lead to the development of English variations. As English has been globally disseminated, the emergence of new varieties of English is a normal natural phenomenon, and their mutual intelligibility is determined by the speaker's purpose within the identity-communication continuum.

5. Development of English: The Call for Recalibration of Terminology

As English expansion is so significant that omnipresence of English can be found in different corners of the world, English is not what it was supposed to be, and hence this exposes the needs to disentangle the complexity pertaining to terminologies employed to define concepts essential to the discourse of world Englishes. To accommodate such needs, Kirkpatrick (2007) suggested (i) the revision of the criteria for categorization of English varieties, (ii) the re-characterization of native and nonnative speakers of English, (iii) the consideration of functions of English and how these functions shape English use, (iv) the repositioning of status of pidgins and creoles within the mosaic of Englishes, and (v) the acknowledgement of prejudice held for or against English varieties.

To begin with, the classification of English varieties into "native" and "nativised" groups based on 4 criteria is not unquestionable. As for the first criterion, the consideration of when the varieties emerged and the extent to which the older varieties exerts influences on the newer ones is argued to be insufficient for "native or nativised" groupings. Australian English

appeared later and was characterized by some features that were originated from British English, yet it is obviously impossible to treat the former as a nativized variety, but the latter as a native one. Moreover, the criterion relying on who speaks the variety to justify the categorization is blatantly flawed. It is commonly assumed that native English varieties are the ones that are used by native speakers who mostly happen to be white, but such unfounded association is undermined by the reality that native speakers of English can be of diverse ethnicities and not all Caucasian are capable of English. Therefore, the criterion for determining whether a particular English variety is native or nativised based on such naïve assumption is misleading. Furthermore, the act of classifying English varieties on the ground of superiority and purity attributes is up for debate as well. In terms of superiority, seniority has nothing to do with the power one variety has over the others as American English, for instance, has proved that despite its new establishment, American English cannot be evaluated as inferior to British variety that has endured a longer history of formation. In the respect of purity, since all varieties of English evolve under the influence of local contexts in which they exist, the idea that one variety is more original and way purer than the other one is hard to be empirically supported. If such premises were proved otherwise, would British English be addressed as nativised – given its current form being shaped by the confluence of features characterizing Latin, Greek, French and German? Considering the controversy related to the way English varieties are classified, it is appropriate to consider all as nativised and when it is important that such distinction should be made, context-bound justifications are needed.

Secondly, the conventional distinction between native speakers and non-native speakers of English has been obsolete. Someone whose first language acquired is English are by default regarded as native speakers of English as they are believed to be able to use the language proficiently, while the ones who learned English subsequent to the acquisition of their first language are considered as non-native speaker on the rationale that their commands of English are no matching to English-as-first-language speakers'. However, such differentiation characterized by these misconceptions is disproved by the mounting documented cases which make it evident that there is no discrepancy between linguistic competence of native and near-native speakers of English (Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, 2008; Bongaerts et al., 2000; Bylund et al., 2012; Hopp & Schmid, 2013). Besides, in view of the fact that globalization has fueled the staggering increase of multilingual societies and driven the exponential growth of multilingual education across the nations, the use of two terms – native and non-native – to make distinctions between English speakers is archaic and imprecise as it simply reflects the conservative monolingual perspective that fails to acknowledge the integral complexity of the changing global linguistic landscape.

Thirdly, English varieties should not oftentimes be treated as discrete homogeneous entities for the reason that they can exist in a complementary relationship to fulfill three basic functions of language – namely, communication, identity and culture. Since language is used for different purposes and in different contexts, it is impossible for one variety or one register of that language to be applicable to all types of discourse. Therefore, Kirkpatrick (2007) suggested that interlocutor's choice of language variety falls within the continuum of identity and communication, and thus is determined by what specific context the speaker is in and what purpose he wants to achieve with his language. An example of an African American high-schooler living in Texas using English in two different contexts can illustrate this. At one end of the continuum, when being among his classmates he opts to use African American vernacular English in order to indicate that he is included, not a complete outsider, but at the other end of the continuum, within the constraint of formal interview for admission to Harvard university, he resorts to a more standard variety for the sake of intelligibility that is likely to maximize his competitiveness.

Fourthly, even though it may seem that English pidgins and creoles are not English varieties due to their marked distinction from other varieties of English, through the lens of natural restructuring processes theory, pidgins and creoles are argued not to be completely distant from other varieties of English. Like any variety of English, pidgins and creoles are established via the same developmental process which is under the direct impact of local languages and English lexifier. At the same time, pidgins and creoles are not different from varieties of English when they are used in order to indicate cultural identity of the speakers. One thing that differentiates pidgins and creoles from varieties of English is negative judgments underpinned by irrational linguistic prejudices.

Lastly, it is advisable that serious consideration should be paid to how prejudice has shaped judgments about English varieties. Linguistic prejudices can be positive or negative

preconceptions people attach to a particular variety of the language. Insignificant as it may seem, in fact it is the underlying force that forms people's judgments regarding language use. It is also the answer to why people express preferences for particular varieties simply based on how prestigious and intelligent they sound to them, yet show complete disdain for the others due to negative associations those evokes (Bourhis & Maass, 2005). Even though it is quite conclusive that people more or less are biased against or toward language varieties (Baratta, 2017; Rubin, 2011; Webb, 2018), it is recommended that any intuitive preconceptions be pinpointed and rationalized before any judgment about language varieties being made.

6. Development of English: The Search for an Ideal Model

As the profile of English has been transformed significantly since its birth, there is a constant search for an appropriate explanatory framework to delineate the development of English language. Following this, an array of models was established to accommodate the complexity of development of English pluralism. Standing out and receiving much attention are the 4 models, namely traditional ENL – ESL – EFL, World English Model of McArthur (1987), wheel model of International English (Görlach, 1988), and tripartite circular model of World Englishes by Kachru (Kachru, 1988).

The common framework that is frequently used to categorize English varieties is ENL – ESL – EFL. In this model, ENL is referred to the English that is used as the primary language by a large majority of the population in the traditional block of English speaking countries (e.g., the USA, the UK, and Canada) while ESL addresses the English whose role, in former colonies of British Empire and the USA (e.g., Singapore, Nigeria, and Malaysia), is significant enough to attain the official status, but still cannot supersede the primary languages'. In contrast to the importance English holds in ENL and ESL societies, in EFL societies, English is simply a foreign language whose use is confined to the context of formal English classrooms in countries like China, Japan, and Vietnam. The simplistic differentiation among English based on this model is quite handy for the discourse of English language teaching and learning. However, the value of the model is undermined by its monolithic stance. Through this view, the model turns oblivious to the immense variation within English varieties (McArthur, 1998), perpetuating the discriminations against varieties that are deemed as inferior to ideal standard English, and overlooking the changing dynamics of English in "traditional" non-English-speaking countries like China and Japan (Kirkpatrick, 2007).

Acknowledging variations of the English language, McArthur (1987) proposed an explanatory framework named "A circle of World English". Via his model, McArthur demonstrated that at the hub of the circular model is the standard global English while the surrounding outer layer is occupied the main varieties of English (e.g. American Standard English, or Canadian Standard English) and their sub-varieties (e.g. Northern American English, or Quebec English). Adopting a quite similar design, the model of Görlach (1988) model was formed to illustrate the development of English varieties and how such development is related to other documented languages of the world. In this model, placed at its core is the International English. Circumventing the core is the second circle of regional standard varieties (e.g. African English, Antipodean English, or American English), which is further enclosed by the third circle of standard sub-varieties. Surrounding the third circle, the fourth one represents the substandard variants (e.g., Native Indian English, or Aboriginal English), and lying beyond the fourth circle is English pidgins and creoles, such as Tok Pisin and Krio. Quite radically different from McArthur (1987) and Görlach (1988), to break away from unitary monolithic view of English development and to highlight the meta-sociolinguistic aspects of English development, Kachru (1988) has emphasized the recognition of "World Englishes", thanks to his proposal of tripartite circular model of World Englishes. Through this model, English varieties fall into 3 types used in 3 different groups of regions that were addressed as Inner Circle, Outer Circle and Expanding Circle. Three categories refer respectively to native English-speaking countries (e.g., the UK, Canada, and Australia), post-colonial English speaking territories (e.g., Kenya, Singapore, India), and the remaining part of the world. By and large, on the positive side, the three aforementioned models have not only accentuated multicultural identity of English, but also somewhat obliterated the discrimination against particular varieties of English. However, the shortcoming of these models is that they naïvely accept the premise that English varieties and their complexities are neutral and distant from social-political forces (Pennycook, 2003).

The development of these models demonstrates the paradigm shifting within the domain

of English studies, pivoting from monolithic stance which views English as a single entity progressing through time to pluralistic view which comes to term with complex development of English pluralism (Bolton, 2005). Despite their helpfulness in some particular contexts, it is argued by McArthur (1998) (1) that the mounting of frameworks, instead of offering a comprehensive understanding of how English has become, further compounds the matter with their complexity, and (2) that these models are just imagined metaphor, not representing the ultimate truth. In view of such critics, it is suggested that the divergence of models should be understood as a diversified approach to understanding the multi-identity of English.

7. Conclusion and Implications for English Teaching and Learning

Considering all the points mentioned in the above, there are mains themes that can be summarized as (1) that English variation is absolutely natural, normal, dynamic and steady; (2) English varieties undergo the same developmental process; (3) discrimination against English varieties is originated from unfounded prejudice; (4) variety use and intelligibility of such use are determined by contexts and speakers' purpose; (5) the neutrality of English doesn't exist; and (6) approaches to classification of English varieties are metaphorical, and to some extent are not able to represent the full complexity of English development. Based on these themes, some implications for English learning and teaching in Vietnam can be offered.

There should be a thorough review of adopting the Exonormative Native Speaker model. As English has become the common language widely spoken by non-native speakers, English is no longer the property of any single country. This means that most of the conversations English learners will encounter outside the classroom context will be between them and other non-native speakers of English. Therefore, the model based on English variety spoken by traditional native speakers seems to be inappropriate. Besides, even though it is hard to resist the benefits this model can offer (e.g., prestige, economic advantage, availability of standardized learning materials), the setbacks cannot be overlooked. To begin, the pursuit of prestige brought by the model can result in wasteful investment in English education as well as creating inequality in access to English education for the vast majority of learners. Likewise, being compliant with native speaker norms helps maintain the hegemony which allows native speakers of the language to have more power over the non-native speaker of the language in all aspects of life. Additionally, the preference for incompetent native English teachers over local skillful English-proficient teachers can result in discrimination, perpetuating linguistic prejudice against English varieties, and negative attitudes towards language learning among students.

Considering the aforementioned point, what model should be chosen for Vietnam. The answer is quite complex. However, it is suggested that stakeholders should adopt a pragmatic approach to this matter. Policy makers need to identify the current status of English pluralism in relation to socio-political forces of the world, as well as opinions, attitudes and motivations of English teachers and learners, in order to come up with informed policies of English language education. Apart from that, being mindful of the nature of English variation, the functions of English as well as the specific needs of their students, teachers need to make appropriate decision regarding learning materials, teaching methods and techniques, so that they can help students raise the awareness of natural differences of World Englishes, appreciate the multicultural identity of English speakers and be successful in cross-cultural communication. What's more, learners of English in Vietnam need to acknowledge the inherent variation of English and the inclusive cultural identity of English, so as to be more tolerant toward variation among varieties of English, and to be able to use English skillfully for the purposes of communication and cultural identity marking.

References

Abrahamsson, N., & Hyltenstam, K. (2008). The robustness of aptitude effects in near-native seconnd language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 30*(4), 481–509. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310808073X

Aghazaki, A. S. (2020). English as a global language. In *Proceedings of 55th International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development* (pp. 518–520), vol. 3. Baku.

Albury, N. J. (2016). National language policy theory: Exploring Spolsky's model in the case of Iceland. *Language Policy, 15*(4), 355–372. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-015-9357-z

Albury, N. J., & Aye, K. K. (2016). Malaysia's national language policy in international theoretical context. *Journal of Nusantara Studies, 1*(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol1iss1pp71-84

Alogali, A. (2018). World Englishes: Changing the paradigm of linguistic diversity in global academia. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology, 3*(1), 54–73. https://doi.org/10.46303/ressat.03.01.4

Araújo, L., & da Costa, P. D. (2013). *The European survey on language competences: School-internal and external factors in language learning.* European Commission, Joint Research Centre, Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen. DOI:10.2788/92926

Baratta, A. (2017). Accent and linguistic prejudice within British teacher training. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(6), 416–423. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1359608

Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: Approaches, issues, and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes, 24*(1), 69–83. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0883-2919.2005.00388.x

Bongaerts, T., Mennen, S., & Slik, F. van der. (2000). Authenticity of pronunciation in naturalistic second language acquisition: The case of very advanced late learners of Dutch as a second language. *Studia Linguistica, 54*(2), 298–308. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00069

Bourhis, R. Y., & Maass, A. (2005). Linguistic prejudice and stereotypes. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society* (pp. 1587–1601). Berlin and New York: Walter De Gruyter.

Bruthiaux, P. (2002). Predicting challenges to English as a global language in the 21st century. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 26*(2), 129–157. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.26.2.03bru

Bulajeva, T., & Hogan-Brun, G. (2014). Internationalisation of higher education and nation building: Resolving language policy dilemmas in Lithuania. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(4), 318–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.874431

Bylund, E., Abrahamsson, N., & Hyltenstam, K. (2012). Does first language maintenance hamper nativelikeness in a second language? A study of ultimate attainment in early bilinguals. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*(2), 215–241. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000034

Cox, F. (2006). Australian English pronunciation into the 21st century. *Prospect, 21*(1), 3-21. http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_21_no_1/21_1_1_Cox.pdf

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Gayton, A. M. (2014). Native English speakers' investment in foreign language learning – what role do gender and socioeconomic status play? [Doctoral thesis, The University of Edinburgh]. Edinburgh Research Archive. http://hdl.handle.net/1842/9765

Görlach, M. (1988). English as a world language - The state of the art. *English World-Wide, 9*(1), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.9.1.02gor

Hopp, H., & Schmid, M. S. (2013). Perceived foreign accent in first language attrition and second language acquisition: The impact of age of acquisition and bilingualism. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 34*(2), 361–394. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716411000737

Horobin, S. (2016). *How English Became English: A short history of a global language.* Oxford University Press.

How, S. Y., Heng, C. S., & Abdullah, A. N. (2015). Language vitality of Malaysian languages and its relation to identity. *GEMA Online® Journal of Language Studies, 15*(2). https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2015-1502-08

Ives, P. (2015). Global English and inequality: The contested ground of linguistic power. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes* (pp. 74–91). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137461223_5

Kachru, B. B. (1988). The sacred cows of English. *English Today, 4*(4), 3–8. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400000973

Kachru, B. B. (1992). Models for non-native Englishes. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 48–74), vol. 2. University of Illinois Press.

Kandiah, T. (2001). Whose meanings? Probing the dialectics of English as a global language. In C. K. Tong, A. Pakir, B. K. Choon, & R. B. H. Goh (Eds.), *Ariels–Departures and Returns: A Festschrift for Edwin Thumboo* (pp. 102–121). Singapore: Oxford University Press

Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Kirkpatrick, R., & Bui, T. T. N. (2016). Introduction: The challenges for English education policies in Asia. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 1–23). Springer.

Kubota, R. (2016). The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics, 37*(4), 474–494. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu045

Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2018). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education.* Modern Language Association.

Low, E. L. (2019). English in Southeast Asia. In C. L. Nelson, Z. G. Proshina, & D. R. Davis (Eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes* (pp. 135–158). Wiley Online Library. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119147282.ch8

Macaro, E. (2008). The decline in language learning in England: getting the facts right and getting real. *The Language Learning Journal, 36*(1), 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730801988595

McArthur, T. (1987). The English languages? *English Today, 3*(3), 9–13. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400013511

McArthur, T. (Ed.). (1998). *Models of English. In The English Languages* (pp. 78–101). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9780511621048.005

Melitz, J. (2016). English as a global language. In V. Ginsburgh & S. Weber (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language* (pp. 583–615). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-32505-1_21

Moag, R. F. (1992). The life cycle of non-native Englishes: A case study. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (pp. 233–253). University of Illinois Press.

Pennycook, A. (2003). Global Englishes, rip slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(4), 513–533. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2003.00240.x

Pennycook, A. (2006). Chapter 4. The Myth of English as an International Language. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Ed.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 90-115). Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599255-006

Phillipson, R. (1999). Voice in global English: Unheard chords in crystal loud and clear. David Crystal. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(2), 265–276. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.2.265

Romaine, S. (2017). *Pidgin and creole languages*. Routledge.

Rubin, D. (2011). The power of prejudice in accent perception: Reverse linguistic stereotyping and its impact on listener judgments and decisions. *Proceedings of the Confluence of Social Factors and Pronunciation: Accent, Identity, Irritation and Discrimination* (pp. 11–17). Iowa State University.

Schneider, E. W. (2003). The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language, 79*(2), 233–281. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2003.0136

Schneider, K. (2005). No problem, you're welcome, anytime: Responding to thanks in Ireland, England, and the USA. In A. Barron & K. Schneider (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Irish English* (pp. 101-140). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110898934.101

Soler-Carbonell, J., Saarinen, T., & Kibbermann, K. (2017). Multilayered perspectives on language policy in higher education: Finland, Estonia, and Latvia in comparison. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 38*(4), 301–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2016.1198356

Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2017). *International English: A guide to varieties of English around the world* (6th ed.). Taylor & Francis.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Tollefson, J. W. (2017). Language policy and the construction of national cultural identity. In A. B. M. Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.

Vietnam Government. (2008). Quyết định số 1400/QĐ-TTg của Thủ tướng chính phủ: Về việc phê duyệt đề án "Dạy và học ngoại ngữ trong hệ thống giáo dục quốc dân giai đoạn 2008-2020." Chinh Phu Hanoi.

Webb, P. (2018). A potential case of linguistic prejudice: The expression of identity in 'Black and White.' The Urban Review, 50(3), 478–492.

Widdowson, H. G. (1997). EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes, 16*(1), 135–146. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00054