

Theorising English and globalisation: semiodiversity and linguistic structure in Global English, World Englishes and Lingua Franca English

Allan James, University of Klagenfurt

Linguistic and applied linguistic approaches to English in a globalising/globalised world have rarely made connection with theories of language and globalisation in general (Jacquemet 2005; Bruthiaux 2008; Mufwene 2008) and least of all to the mainstream theories of globalisation of the economic, political and social sciences and cultural studies (Held, McGrew et al. 1999). By contrast, it is argued in the present article that a closer look at the globalising development of English in terms of the 'semiodiversity' (Halliday 2002) it expresses through the major varieties of 'register' (use), 'dialect' (user) and 'genre' (using) which are directly expounded by lexicosemantic, lexicophonological and lexicogrammatical levels of structure, respectively, allows us to see how these linguistic function-structure complexes themselves define a typology of globalising Englishes of Global English, World Englishes and Lingua Franca English, again respectively. In turn these Englishes manifest the 'global', 'local' and 'glocal' dimensions of the economic, political, social and cultural processes associated with the 'hyperglobalizers', 'sceptics' and 'transformationalists' of mainstream globalisation thinking, also respectively. As such, it is argued that this multiple set of co-defined core concepts of a mutually informing globalisation theory and linguistic theory lends itself well as the foundation of a more comprehensive and adequate sociolinguistic understanding of English in the world of the new millennium, one which can inform applied linguistic practices worldwide more substantially than has been hitherto the case.

Author's email: allan.james@uni-klu.ac.at

ISSN: 1457-9863

Publisher: Centre for Applied Language Studies, University of Jyväskylä

© 2009: The author

<http://apples.jyu.fi>

'If we then turn to linguistics and related fields....we find that the majority of scholars have been, until recently, quite unwilling to find zones of engagement with globalization theory' (Jacquemet 2005: 259–260)

Introduction

There has been a great deal written in recent years on English in its global context in the (socio-)linguistics literature, and diverse accounts and general models have been put forward to capture its spread, change and use worldwide (cf., for very different, if not contradictory analyses, e.g. Phillipson 1992; Crystal 1997; Brutt-Griffler 2002). There has equally been specifically geolinguistic (e.g. McArthur 2002), educational linguistic (e.g. Kirkpatrick 2007) and critical applied linguistic (Pennycook 2007) research produced addressing the situation of English worldwide within their own particular frameworks of reference. Common to all these approaches to understanding English as a worldwide (socio-)linguistic phenomenon, however, is the assumption or recognition, variously tacit or explicit, that contemporary processes of English are closely associated with those of globalisation generally. At the same time, and independent and parallel to this research, there has been a serious concern with languages in general and the phenomenon of globalisation, for example from a critical discourse analysis viewpoint (Fairclough 2006), a political sociological perspective (de Swaan 2001) and an ecological standpoint (Mühlhäusler 1996). Yet other studies have concerned themselves with the futurology of English against the background of a generally globalising world (Graddol 1997; 2006).

On the other hand, globalisation theories as developed in the economic, political and social sciences are seldom concerned with issues of language or linguistics, let alone the specifics of English, not even in the context of 'cultural globalisation'. Instead, greater attention is paid to economic, political, sociological, ideological, ecological and military dimensions of globalisation (cf., as representative, Held et al. 1999). Where cultural globalisation is addressed in such theories it is often consumer culture and the media that form the foci of interest (Held et al. 1999; Steger 2003), whereas those globalisation theories emanating from a cultural studies perspective only touch linguistic issues tangentially (e.g. Appadurai's 1996 theory of cultural globalisation makes reference to 'ethnoscapes', 'mediascapes', 'technoscapes', 'financescapes' and 'ideoscapes', but significantly not 'linguascapes'). Exceptionally, Steger (2003) offers a brief consideration of 'the globalization of languages' in terms of the key factors 'number of languages', 'movements of people', 'foreign language learning and tourism', 'internet languages' and 'international scientific publications' (2003: 82–84).

These various research paradigms have thus co-existed side by side for some time, and there has so far been no attempt at reconciling such theories of English language development worldwide, of language and globalisation in general or theories of globalisation (of languages) itself for the purpose of refining our appreciation of the issues and processes involved. By contrast, it is the purpose of the present study to show ways in which an understanding of the globalisation of English can be significantly furthered by relating the sociolinguistic meaning diversity expressible by languages, i.e. their 'semiodiversity' (Halliday 2007)¹, directly to a typology of language varieties

and these in turn to elements of their linguistic structure and, crucially, relating these structural-functional complexes to compatible conceptual complexes of mainstream globalisation theories.

Perspectives: global, local, 'glocal'

Much discussion on the worldwide expansion of English, of language and globalisation, and of globalisation itself employs - explicitly or implicitly - a conceptual trichotomy of global, local and 'glocal' (Robertson 1992) to capture the spatio-locational correlates of particular processes of change. In the most general terms, whereas the global stands for forces of homogenisation and the local those of heterogenisation, the glocal represents the forces of hybridisation, more often than not as a product of the interplay between the encompassing - i.e. global - and particularizing - i.e. local - processes of change.

For instance, in the language-focussed studies referred to above, whereas Phillipson, Brutt-Griffler, Fairclough and Mühlhäusler concern themselves mainly with the global, homogenising aspects of the language internationally, Crystal, McArthur and de Swaan focus more on also the linguistic heterogenising effects of English expansion. Kirkpatrick and Pennycook in turn also highlight linguistic and cultural hybridising processes set in motion by the impact of the global on the local and vice versa. More concretely, whereas 'globalists' paint a negative and pessimistic picture of the future 'glossodiversity' (Halliday 2007) of the world because of the hegemonic influence of English which is leading to widescale (threat of) language death in various parts of the globe, 'localists' instead concentrate optimistically on the positive effects of English expansion by pointing to the widely diverse forms of the language anchored worldwide that have been developing since colonial times. 'Glocalists' typically celebrate the linguistic and cultural dynamics of English use emerging from the meeting of global and local influences as seen in the general context of translingual and transcultural flows worldwide. Paradigm exemplars of the three strands of research would be the 'globalist' model of Phillipson (1992) regarding the 'linguistic imperialism' of English worldwide, the 'localist' model of Schneider (2006) treating the development of 'postcolonial Englishes' around the world and the 'glocalist' model of Pennycook (2007) analysing transcultural flows between the global and the local especially with respect to Anglophone hip-hop subculture.

However, interestingly, and in close parallel to these lines of thinking are conceptualisations in 'mainstream' globalisation theories which equally evidence the trichotomy of global, local and glocal. Whereas a consensus definition of 'globalisation' might be 'a multidimensional set of processes that create, multiply, stretch, and intensify worldwide social interdependencies and exchanges while at the same fostering in people a growing awareness of deepening connections between local and the distant' (Steger 2003: 13), in practice, as Held et al. (1999) make very clear, globalisation theorists can be seen to belong to three different schools of thought. They are, respectively, the 'hyperglobalizers', the 'sceptics' and the 'transformationalists' and 'each of the perspectives reflects a general set of arguments and conclusions about globalization with respect to its

- conceptualization
- causal dynamics
- socio-economic consequences
- implications for state power and governance
- and historical trajectory. ' (Held et al. 1999: 3)

As a general characterisation, while for the 'hyperglobalizers', 'contemporary globalization defines a new era in which peoples everywhere are increasingly subject to the disciplines of the global marketplace', the 'sceptics' 'argue that globalization is essentially a myth which conceals the reality of an international economy increasingly segmented into three major regional blocs in which national governments remain very powerful', whereas for the 'transformationalists' 'contemporary patterns of globalization are conceived as historically unprecedented such that states and societies across the globe are experiencing a process of profound change as they try to adapt to a more interconnected but highly uncertain world' (Held et al. 1999: 2). 'Hyperglobalizers' see globalisation as primarily an economic phenomenon (e.g. Ohmae 1990), but secondarily also of sociological interest (e.g. Albrow 1996); 'sceptics' such as Hirst and Thompson (1996) offer an 'economistic' interpretation of globalisation only; and 'transformationalists' view globalisation as a set of far-reaching general social processes (e.g. Giddens 1990; Rosenau 1997).

All three schools of thought also interpret cultural globalisation in their own specific ways. As Held et al. summarise: 'hyperglobalizers' 'describe or predict the homogenization of the world under the auspices of American popular culture or Western consumerism in general'; 'sceptics' 'point to the thinness and ersatz quality of global cultures by comparison with national cultures and to the persistent, indeed increasing, importance of cultural differences and conflicts along the geopolitical faultlines of the world's major civilizations'; and 'transformationalists' 'describe the intermingling of cultures and peoples as generating cultural hybrids and new global cultural networks' (1999: 327).

At the latest at this point it should now be clear that the argumentation and conceptualisation of globalisation from a linguistic point of view of the 'globalists', 'localists' and 'glocalists' referred to would seem to be paralleled in that, respectively, of the 'hyperglobalizers', 'sceptics' and 'transformationalists' of the social sciences. The following table should serve to summarise this:

<i>linguistics theories:</i>	globalists	localists	glocalists
<i>social sciences theories:</i>	hyperglobalizers	skeptics	transformationalists
<i>globalisation as:</i>	homogenisation	heterogenisation	hybridization

Sociolinguistic and socio-political consequences of globalisation

The sociolinguistic consequences of globalisation as variously homogenisation, heterogenisation and hybridisation have been widely commented on in the discussion of English worldwide as indicated above, employing, depending on perspective, a diverse array of terminology to designate the emerging language(s) as, e.g. more generally, 'International English(es)', 'New English(es)'

or, more specifically, 'Global English(es)', 'World English(es)', 'Lingua Franca English(es)', etc. With regard to heterogenisation and hybridisation, the sociolinguistic processes of 'indigenization' / 'nativization', and 'creolisation' have been invoked to capture the dynamics of structural change in the language, respectively. Furthermore, long established geolinguistically based models of English(es) worldwide such as that of the Three Circles - 'Inner', 'Outer' and 'Expanding' - of Kachru (1985) have been seriously questioned as no longer reflecting the new sociolinguistic realities brought about by the globalising language (cf., e.g. Modiano 1999; Bruthiaux 2003).

In viewing English as a globalising language as a language 'always in translation', Pennycook (2008) draws attention to the some of the more obvious sociolinguistic consequences which come about via homogenisation, heterogenisation and hybridisation (while not actually employing these particular terms). He points to the establishment of what he terms 'language fortresses' by way of protecting linguistic diversity (in Europe) against centripetal linguistic forces - and by implication, the hegemonic and homogenising effects - of English, as also advocated by Phillipson (2003); he makes reference to the 'local foci' of regional and national, largely postcolonial Englishes worldwide which are cultivated to uphold and celebrate the centrifugal - and heterogenising - forces of anglophone linguistic diversity e.g. Kachru and Nelson 2006); and thirdly he addresses the concept of 'English as a lingua franca' as promoted in the work of Jenkins (e.g. 2006) and Seidlhofer (e.g. 2001) - which in fact comes about via and realises a particular kind of glocal hybridisation (2008: 36-40). The sociolinguistic consequences of anglophone globalisation may then be listed thus (Pennycook 2008):

<i>sociolinguistic</i>				
<i>and sociopolitical :</i>	language fortresses	local foci	lingua franca	
<i>consequences</i>				

In each case, however, Pennycook warns against the ultimately centripetal effects of this cultivated diversity: 'All three [ways of approaching diversity in the face of the global spread of English] focus largely on form rather than meaning, and all three posit a core to English that is more or less stable' (2008: 39). He concludes further, and significantly for the present argument, that '[N]either a defence of national languages and cultures, nor a description of a core of English as a lingua franca, nor even a focus on plural Englishes adequately addresses the questions of a diversity of meanings' (2008: 40). This central issue of the diversity of meanings, i.e. the 'semiodiversity' as already mentioned above, will be returned to shortly further below.

Globalising Englishes: Global English, World Englishes, Lingua Franca English

At the risk of adding to terminological confusion by defining a set of familiar designations for types of international English in a particular way, there is nonetheless a strong case for aligning a trichotomy of globalised - and globalising - Englishes with the trichotomies developed above of understandings of globalisation from linguistic and social science perspectives.

As there are – at least – three conceptualisations of the processes and effects of globalisation, there are also three manifestations of the language involved which clearly evidence these same dimensions of the ‘multidimensional set of processes’ underlying the ‘worldwide social interdependencies and exchanges’ (of Steger above). Linking to Pennycook’s scheme just discussed, whereas his ‘local foci’ can be termed World Englishes, as he does himself, and the ‘lingua franca’ can be adopted as Lingua Franca English, the homogenised and homogenising English which leads to the construction of his ‘language fortresses’ may be termed Global English.

Global English

The kind of globalising/globalised form of English that is often primarily envisaged in – predominantly negatively loaded – discussions of the influence of the language worldwide is indeed the kind of dominant English as a threat to glossodiversity registered by the linguistics ‘globalists’ referred to above (perhaps foremost by Phillipson 1992), seen as the spread and infiltration of American English throughout the world via the political-ideological-military domination of the US and transmitted via global US-originating media and communication systems, coupled with the ‘hyperglobalizers’ cultural ‘homogenization of the world under the auspices of American popular culture or Western consumerism in general’, variously popularly formulated as e.g. Madonna-isation or CocaCola-isation, respectively. This English can be justifiably termed ‘Global English’, although its exact linguistic specification is still open to debate (e.g. is it totally US-English-based? is there not evidence of truly ‘international’ structural influences? etc.).

However, there is another, related sense in which the term Global English may be used and that is to refer to the (anglophone) discourse of neo-liberal economics, ‘which claims amongst other things that markets are ‘self-regulating’, and presents the role of states and governments as ‘facilitating’ the working of markets but not seeking to ‘interfere’ with them’ (Fairclough 2006: 3–4). In a social sciences dimension, here a distinction needs to be made between ‘globalism’ (Beck 2000; Steger 2003, 2005) ‘an ideology that endows the concept of globalization with neoliberal values and meanings’ and globalisation itself (‘social processes of intensifying global interdependence’) (Steger 2003: 94). The neoliberal discourse of globalism ‘is disseminated worldwide by a powerful phalanx of social forces located chiefly in the global North, consisting of corporate managers, executives of large transnational corporations, corporate lobbyists, journalists and public-relations specialists, intellectuals writing to a large public audience, state bureaucrats, and politicians’ (Steger 2003: 94–95). Linguistically, the discourse of globalism, as a vehicle of globalisation, would seem to go hand in hand with the general commodification of language, the economisation of public – not just political – talk and with an increased conversationalisation of language use (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 2006).

A third sense in which the term Global English may be employed concerns English as a ‘virtual language’ which ‘has spread as an international language: through the development of autonomous registers which guarantee specialist communication with global expert communities’ (Widdowson 1997: 144); in this

way 'English as an international language is English for specific purposes' (1997: 144).

In fact, on closer inspection the three interpretations of Global English have much in common from a sociolinguistic point of view. The globalising language transports and realises new discourses, with new meanings being expressed and new vocabulary being used (or existing vocabulary with new meanings), i.e. new representations of the world are created and semantic gaps filled. Whether interpreted as conveying US (sub-)cultural values, a business and economic view of personal relations and public and social life or as specialist subject talk, the language is characterised by semiotic repertoires which express primarily the significance of the texts or messages being produced within the discourse worlds created.

World Englishes

The term 'World Englishes' is conventionally employed in the sociolinguistic literature for those Englishes which have developed via British (and American) colonialism of the past centuries, often excluding the Englishes of the white settler colonies such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand (and South Africa). They are conceived of as geographically specified national ('Indian English') or regional ('South Asian English') languages undergoing varying degrees of institutionalisation and/or codification locally (and inhabit the 'Outer Circle' of Kachru's three circle model). The term may or may not designate the English-derived pidgins and creoles of the world. By extension, 'World Englishes' are also understood to include those Englishes which may be located locally around the world but which have not developed out of the classical age of British (or American) colonialism - e.g. 'China English', 'Korean English', 'Japanese English' etc. which inhabit Kachru's 'Expanding Circle'. The existence and development of both the 'old' and these 'new' World Englishes has been brought about and compounded by processes of globalisation (for a comprehensive account of such World Englishes cf. McArthur 2002). The existence of World Englishes reflects the generally positively viewed globalisation process of - Anglophone - heterogenisation favoured by the linguistics 'localists' and in the spirit of the social sciences 'sceptics' above. They are seen as locally 'appropriated', 'indigenised' or 'nativised' Englishes, are celebrated for the structural and semiotic diversity they show and in practice are described linguistically much as the geographic varieties of British English and American English are. They are testimony to a healthy - Anglophone - glossodiversity and are seen functionally as languages in their own right. They are languages which allow the signalling of national (and/or regional) affiliation, constituting semiotic repositories for the expression of user identity.

Lingua Franca English

It has been noted repeatedly in recent accounts of English worldwide that the number of users who do not have the language as their 'native language' or 'L1', i.e. the 'non-native speakers', now far outnumber the conventional 'native speakers' of the UK, the US, Australia, etc. and that the percentage of interchanges in English between such non-natives far outnumber those between

natives – or between non-natives and natives (see, e.g. Graddol 1997). These well-known facts alone have stimulated a burgeoning of recent research into Lingua Franca English as the language of users who have to or choose to employ English as a ‘common denominator’ means of verbal expression (for a summary cf. Seidlhofer, Breiteneder and Pitzl 2006). Although by convention, attention is focussed in this research on the use of English among non-native speakers, linguistic interest in the phenomenon does not necessarily preclude analysing the language employed between non-native and native speakers. From a globalising/globalisation perspective, the phenomenon of Lingua Franca English links conceptually well with the ‘transformationalist’ standpoint above (Dewey 2007), embodying a particular manifestation of linguistic ‘glocalism’, which involves resolving the meeting of the global expressive potential of the language with the local expressive desiderata via the language but over and above the geographically local ‘appropriation’ of the global language as in the World Englishes scenario. The local is constituted variously and ad hoc by the multifarious contexts of such lingua franca use and is not associated with particular geographic locations. Nonetheless, such contexts and the language in use manifest a form of cultural ‘hybridisation’, which itself ‘is a useful way of describing a substantive aspect of the process of deterritorialization’ (Tomlinson 1999: 147), as ‘a general cultural condition which proceeds from the spread of global modernity’ (Tomlinson 1999: 148). Indeed such deterritorialized or ‘post-geographic’ Englishes, as English in lingua franca use, have been analysed elsewhere with reference to the sociological framework of late modernity (James 2008). Lingua Franca English then, as the linguistic manifestation of a myriad of set of contexts of using, can also be seen as a –globalised and globalising – linguistic resource for intercultural communication and transcultural flows.

This trichotomy of Englishes may now be represented thus:

globalising Englishes: Global English World Englishes Lingua Franca English

Semiodiversity: register, dialect, genre

With regard to these Englishes, which seem to naturally align with the other relevant trichotomies of globalisation as presented above, it is perhaps now incumbent from a (socio-)linguistic point of view to explore further their actual structural properties and in turn to examine how these might relate to the concepts established so far.

Taking up the challenge formulated as:

The fact that English is used today to cover an unprecedented range of domains and functions worldwide is so new in the history of language contacts that new theoretical and descriptive perspectives are needed to adequately handle the phenomenon (House 2006: 87),

it has been argued extensively elsewhere (James 2005; 2006 ; 2008) that, given this situation, it is possible at a general level of description to distinguish between three types of language ‘variety’ which provide three sets of semiotic potential for anglophone expression worldwide. Extending the original Halliday

(1978) dichotomy of 'register' (=variety 'according to the use') and 'dialect' (=variety 'according to user') to include 'genre' as variety 'according to using', it has been claimed, with evidence from the empirical analysis of English employed in a lingua franca function, that the international language may be seen as typically expressing predominantly one or other of these semiotic sets but as the norm, constituting a mix of all three (e.g. James 2008).

At the level of linguistic structure, it has been demonstrated that 'register' manifests itself primarily via lexicosemantics, 'dialect' via lexicophonology and 'genre' via lexicogrammar. In terms of communities, 'register' can be said to be the expression of a 'discourse community', 'dialect' that of a 'speech community' (as traditionally understood) and 'genre' that of an 'actional community' (James 2006). The 'discourse community' would come closest conceptually to the concept of 'community of practice' as adopted in the sociolinguistics literature (from Lave and Wenger 1991).

This trichotomy may be summarised thus:

<i>variety:</i>	register	dialect	genre
<i>primarily defining:</i>	use	user	using
<i>main structural manifestation:</i>	lexicosemantics	lexicophonology	lexicogrammar
<i>community:</i>	discourse	'speech'	actional

In the context of the present discussion of globalisation, the Global English of above typically shows register characteristics in that in each of its interpretations it is lexicosemantic features of linguistic structure that are at the forefront of the spread of English as US (sub-)cultures, business talk or as English for Specific Purposes (designated by Widdowson 1997 himself as 'register'), as indeed has already been intimated by noting that new representations (vocabulary-meaning complexes) are thereby being created. The language is one for 'use' within specific discourse communities - (sub-)cultures, business, professional - at least originally.

With World Englishes, it is clearly dialect characteristics that dominate: World Englishes are varieties according to users, since they function as nationality markers, and convey the geographical identity of the members of the speech communities they define. They function as identification, structurally manifesting defining vocabulary and phonological features.

As for Lingua Franca English, here genre features predominate. Genre captures the using of the language for actional purposes, for functional communication in the cause of inter- and transaction, i.e. for getting things done. Here vocabulary and grammatical choices are crucial to the purpose.

However, it must be stressed that any manifestation of English in an international function is likely to show evidence of all three varieties and sets of structural choices/semiotic potential at one time (James 2005, 2008). It is just the case that each of the three structural-functional complexes tends to be fundamentally associated with each one of the globalising Englishes, respectively.

With regard to the way in which the globalising Englishes may be perceived as a fund for linguistic expression, the concepts 'repertoire', 'repository' and 'resource' have been mentioned already in passing above. Global English as register(s) offers a repertoire for text-oriented expression, World Englishes as dialect(s) offers different repositories (i.e. quasi-established codes) for speaker-

oriented expression, and Lingua Franca English as genre(s) offers a direct resource for listener-oriented expression. This may now be summarised thus:

<i>globalising Englishes as:</i>	repertoire	repository	resource
<i>communication:</i>	text-oriented	speaker-oriented	listener-oriented

Significantly, substantial support for the present three-way division of language varieties/semiotic potential is found with Fairclough (2003, 2006). In his theory of language as ‘social structure’, ‘social practice’ and ‘social event’, he distinguishes within ‘social practice’ between ‘discourses’ as ‘ways of representing’, ‘styles’ as ‘ways of being’ and ‘genres’ as ‘ways of acting’ (2003: 26). At the level of ‘social event’, he refers, respectively, to ‘identification’, ‘representation’ and ‘actions’, which themselves can be given a similar interpretation as elements of text meaning. It will be evident that his ‘discourses’ are equivalent to the present ‘register’, ‘styles’ to the present ‘dialect’ and ‘genres’ indeed to ‘genre’. Fairclough also discusses what he terms the ‘interdiscursivity’ of texts, i.e. the present variety/structural choice/semiotic mix, concluding that ‘we can generally identify particular discourses, genres and styles in particular texts’ (2006: 31).² His categories of description may be summarised thus (Fairclough 2003, 2006):

<i>language as social practice:</i>	‘discourses’	‘styles’	‘genres’
<i>language as social event/ text meaning:</i>	‘representation’	‘identification’	‘action’

Globalisation and English: typology and beyond

The main essence of the argument has been to show that it is possible to draw together parallel conceptualisations of the nature of globalisation as sets of economic, political, social and cultural processes and as sets of (socio-)linguistic processes, which it is hoped then elucidate the current position of English worldwide as an active and passive component of such processes. Specifically, it has been argued that an interpretive typology of globalisation finds direct and regular expression in the semiodiversity of English, characterisable as the structure-function complexes of the language as variety for user, use and using. As such, these arguments are a clear response to Blommaert’s call that in a sociolinguistic understanding of globalisation ‘we need to move from languages to language variants and repertoires’ (2003: 608). Continuing in the same vein, he notes: ‘What is globalized is not an abstract Language, but specific speech forms, genres, styles, and forms of literacy practice’ (2003: 608). Again, the present discussion takes up this analytical challenge.

Other critical sociolinguists warn against an excessive reification of English or indeed languages in general in the context of globalisation discussion (e.g. Makoni and Pennycook 2007), preferring rather to employ notions such as ‘communicative practice’ (after Hanks 1996) to capture the expression of semiodiversity via linguistic codes, focussing thereby on the ‘socially defined relation between agents and the field that ‘produces’ speech forms’ (Hanks 1996: 230). Here, the present analysis addresses such ‘practice’ as effectively the semiotic mix and variation which the English-employing agent produces via choices of register, dialect and genre as respectively linguistic ‘repertoire’,

'repository' and 'resource' pertaining to the social fields of 'representation', 'identification' and 'action' in turn. As such, agency and structure are mutually defining, thus directly manifesting 'structuration' as a dialectic relation between 'linguistic-communicative events' and 'larger social processes and structures' (Giddens 1984).

Also in a critical vein, Jacquemet (2005) calls for studies of 'the progressive globalization of communicative practices and social formations that result from the increasing mobility of people, languages, and texts' (2005: 261), introducing the notion of 'transidiomatic practice' 'to describe the communicative practices of transnational groups that interact using different languages and communicative codes simultaneously present in a range of communicative channels, both local and distant' (2005: 264-265).³ Whereas the present discussion of linguistic globalisation makes sole reference to English, its position in the dynamics of globalisation clearly cannot be understood fully without reference to the multilinguality of its contexts of use. In Pennycook's (2008) terms already mentioned above, indeed 'English as a language is always in translation'. It reconstitutes itself continually in a field of glossodiversity, but equally, if not more significantly, in a field of semiodiversity, as has been shown in the present analysis.⁴

Endnotes

1. Halliday (2007) introduces the terms 'semiodiversity' and 'glossodiversity' in a discussion of the analogies between biological diversity and linguistic diversity in an ecological framework. He poses the question: 'how do we reason from diversity of species – biodiversity – to diversity of languages – glossodiversity, let us say? And then, is it glossodiversity we should be concerned with, or semiodiversity: diversity of forms as well as meanings, or just diversity of meanings? And exactly what is the value that attaches to such diversity, for the human race as a whole?' (2007: 14).

2. On the connection between discourse(s) and deterritorialisation, Fairclough states: 'Yet deterritorialization (including the impact of television) surely changes what we might call the 'repertoire' of discursive resources available to people in local contexts – the range of discourses (people experience new ways of representing aspects of the world, including aspects of their own experience of it), genres (new ways of interacting and communication, some of which – telephone conversation conversations, emailing, text messaging, etc. – may become routine), and styles (new forms of identity and ways of communicating identity).' (2006: 24–25).

3. It has been valuably pointed out by an referee that an increasingly important type of globalised English, which is not in the first instance locatable within the present trichotomy of Global English – World Englishes – Lingua Franca English, is that used in originally non-Anglophone contexts such as the Nordic countries in youth language or virtual communication, for example. In these societal domains it is present as a fund for intranational communication, usually mixed and alternating with the local language for the purpose of the stylisation of self, in-group solidarity and cultural production (for example, Leppänen 2007 analyses such data). With reference to the present discussion, I would argue that these are exemplars of Jacquemet's (2005) 'transidiomatic practice', albeit translocally situated. The reviewer generously suggests that the present 'register', 'dialect' and 'genre' would indeed provide a useful heuristics to identify constellations of linguistic preference at different levels of language with different primary semiotic potential in each case. In conclusion one may argue that in such situations of mixed language use (the local language and English as register, dialect and genre), whereas glossodiversity characterises the surface form of the discursal code, from a semiodiversity perspective one might speak of a contextually unitary discursal code (as mode) with regard to the consistent meaning(s) expressed – in much the same way as discourse-oriented analyses of code-switching in bilingual speech in general speak of 'code convergence' and 'fused lects' (Auer 2007, 1999, respectively).

4. A fitting conclusion from a critical language-ecological point of view might be couched in Pennycook's (2004) words that such a view 'would mean not that languages as entities exist in relation to each other, nor that languages adopt to physical environments, nor that languages are causally related to diversity; rather it would mean that language (not languages) is a set of semiotic relations dynamically interpreted across physical, social, mental and moral worlds....Diversity can then be seen in terms of semiodiversity (rather than glossodiversity), opening up not only new perspectives on language policy but also pedagogical possibilities' (2004: 236).

References

- Albrow, M. 1996. *The Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Auer, P. 1999. From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: towards a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 6, 309–332.
- Auer, P. 2007. The monolingual bias in bilingualism research, or: why bilingual talk is (still) a challenge for linguistics. In M. Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 319–339.
- Beck, U. 2000. *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blommaert, J. 2003. Commentary: A sociolinguistics of globalization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 607–623.
- Bruthiaux, P. 2003. Squaring the Circles: issues in modelling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 159–177.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. 2002. *World English. A Study of its Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Crystal, D. 1997. *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Swaan, A. 2001. *Words of the World. The Global Language System*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dewey, M. 2007. English as a lingua franca and globalization: an interconnected perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 332–354.
- Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. 2006. *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Graddol, D. 1997. *The Future of English?* London: The British Council.
- Graddol, D. 2006. *English Next*. London: The British Council.
- Halliday, M. 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. 2007. Applied linguistics as an evolving theme. In J. Webster (ed.) *Language and Education: Collected Works of M.A.K. Halliday*. London: Continuum, 1–19.
- Hanks, W. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices*. Boulder: Westview.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. 1999. *Global Transformations. Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hirst, P. & Thompson, G. 1996. *Globalization in Question. The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity.
- House, J. 2006. Unity in diversity: English as a lingua franca for Europe. In C. Leung & J. Jenkins (eds.), *Reconfiguring Europe. The Contribution of Applied Linguistics*. London: Equinox, 87–103.
- Jacquemet, M. 2005. Transidiomatic practices: Language and power in the age of globalization. *Language & Communication*, 25, 257–277.
- James, A. 2005. English in the world and types of variety. In C. Gnutzmann & F. Intemann (eds.), *The Globalisation of English and the English Language Classroom*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 133–144.
- James, A. 2006. Lingua Franca English as chimera: sociocultural and sociolinguistic perspectives. In W. Delanoy & L. Volkman (eds.), *Cultural Studies in the EFL Classroom*. Heidelberg: Winter, 221–232.
- James, A. 2008. New Englishes as post-geographic Englishes in lingua franca use: genre, interdiscursivity and late modernity. *European Journal of English Studies*, 12, 97–112.
- Jenkins, J. 2006. Global intelligibility and local diversity: possibility or paradox? In R. Rubdy & M. Saraceni (eds.), *English in the World. Global Rules, Global Roles*. London: Continuum, 32–29.
- Kachru, B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (eds.) *English in the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–30.

- Kachru, Y. & Nelson, C. 2006. *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes. Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. 1991. *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leppänen, S. 2007. Youth language in media contexts: insights into the functions of English in Finland. *World Englishes*, 26, 149–169.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. 2007. Disinventing and reconstituting languages. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–61.
- McArthur, T. 2002. *The Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Modiano, M. 1999. Standard English(es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, 4, 3–13.
- Mühlhäusler, P. 1996. *Linguistic Ecology. Language Changes and Language Imperialism in the Pacific Region*. London: Routledge.
- Ohmae, K. 1990. *The Borderless World*. London: Collins.
- Pennycook, A. 2004. Language policy and the ecological turn. *Language Policy*, 3, 21–239.
- Pennycook, A. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. 2008. English as a language always in translation. *European Journal of English Studies*, 12, 33–47.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. 2003. *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.
- Rosenau, J. 1997. *Along the Domestic-Foreign Frontier*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. 2006. *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seidlhofer, B. 2001. Closing a conceptual gap: the case for a description of English as a lingua franca. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 133–158.
- Seidlhofer, B., Breiteneder, A. & Pitzl, M.-L. 2006. English as lingua franca in Europe. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 1–34.
- Steger, M. 2003. *Globalization. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Steger, M. 2005. *Globalism. Market Ideology Meets Terrorism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tomlinson, J. 1999. *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Widdowson, H. 1997. EIL, ESL, EFL: Global issues and local interests. *World Englishes*, 16, 135–146.