

Contact Englishes

Christina Higgins, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

Gavin Furukawa, University of Tokyo

1. INTRODUCTION: FROM LANGUAGE CONTACT TO LINGUISTIC HETEROGLOSSIA

Language contact is a sub-field of sociolinguistics which conventionally refers to what happens when new languages are introduced into speech communities. Researchers typically focus on linguistic outcomes of language change, including lexical borrowings and codeswitching, as well as broader effects such as language shift and language death. English is arguably the consummate contact language as it has affected nearly every language around the world in some manner. Moreover, present day English is very much the result of a great deal of contact with other languages and their speakers. The word *English* is itself the result of contact with the Romans and the widespread utility of Latin as a written language. It apparently takes an outsider perspective to name a people and a language, and the language used to name the English language was Latin. The Englishman Saint Bede the Venerable is usually the person identified as popularizing the term *Englisc* in his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*. As a result of contact between Romans and the people living at the angular intersection of Denmark and Germany, that land became known as *Anglaland* (literally, ‘land forming a large angle’), and the people living there became known as speakers of *Anglish*. While *ish* is indeed a Germanic suffix, the first part of *English* originates from Latin, and from the Romans. Over the centuries, English has continually been influenced by other languages at the phonological, lexical, and grammatical levels, and in turn, English has changed other languages, particularly with regard to vocabulary.

All languages undergo change as a result of language contact, but English provides a special case since it has produced a number of novel linguistic forms, including Englishized languages, localized Englishes, pidgins, creoles, and lingua franca Englishes. In this chapter, we describe various types of contact Englishes while drawing attention to the way that English is adapted for local contexts. Contact Englishes raise interesting questions regarding the linguistic boundaries between languages and the social meanings that result when speakers use a little or a lot of English. Through using an English word or a variety of English associated with a particular place or group of speakers, people style themselves as certain kinds of people. To illustrate these ideas, we first survey several areas that have historically formed the focus of scholarship on linguistic aspects of language contact involving English, which include borrowing, codeswitching, and codemixing. A common ground shared by these conventional aspects is that they treat languages as separate and compartmentalizable entities that undergo change as a result of contact with other separate and compartmentalizable languages. We then turn our focus to illustrating how language contact involving English has shifted in the past several decades in a way that we describe as *heteroglossic Englishes*, a Bakhtinian term that refers to the range of linguistic practices that make use of English to exploit its global and local meanings, including stylizations of English that produce both clever double-meanings and linguistic mockery. Heteroglossia refers to the disunity of speech and to the multiplicity of meanings produced in and through language. As Bakhtin writes, “For any individual consciousness living in it, language is not an abstract system of normative forms but rather a concrete heteroglot conception of the world” (1981: 293). Often,

these Englishes are *transglossic language practices* (Sultana, Dovchin and Pennycook, 2013) since they offer transgressive points of view and rely on transtextuality, transmodality, and translation for their full effect. By virtue of their multi-voiced nature, these heteroglossic Englishes challenge the borders around languages and show how speakers come into contact with English, often using it consciously in order to construct and contest social identities and social meanings.

An important distinction between conventional forms of language contact and heteroglossic Englishes is to be made with regard to how English is encountered. While language contact conventionally focuses on the linguistic consequences of face-to-face contact with native speakers of English who do not have linguistic proficiency in the languages in contact, heteroglossic Englishes are often born in global contact zones, where linguistic forms from English and other languages intermingle to produce new kinds of communication. In many cases, heteroglossic Englishes are produced with no face-to-face human interaction at all, as media, advertising, and technology play key roles in producing the 'input' that yields these new forms. Thus, our use of the term heteroglossic Englishes signifies a paradigmatic shift in regard to the nature of language boundaries and the means by which English comes into contact with language users.

2. CURRENT CRITICAL ISSUES AND TOPICS

Conventionally, contact Englishes result when speakers of English interact with speakers of another language in a context where English had previously not been used. Historically, language contact came about due to increased social interaction between people, for political or economic reasons, as in the case of colonial enterprises in Asia and Africa, or as illustrated by the development of plantations and international shipping. More recently, language contact with English has resulted from institutions that choose to privilege English, including governments, corporations, media enterprises, and schools, either in the form of mandated language policies (e.g., Choi, 2015) or as the language of global capital and a resource for cosmopolitan identities (e.g., Park, 2011). Contact with English is not necessarily a top-down process, of course, as individuals living in countries where English is not commonly spoken also demonstrate their own agency in bringing English into their lives through investing in private English education (e.g., Kim, 2015) and through their consumption of English-dominant global media (Appadurai, 1996).

Conventional language contact situations involve a variety of linguistic phenomena and classifications that are often used interchangeably, leading to considerable confusion when researching multilingual practices involving English. Some of these phenomena include: *borrowing*, *pidginization*, *creolization*, *codeswitching*, and *language mixing*. Although many researchers have chosen to focus on the subtle differences that exist between these various terms, others have problematized their uses with attention to the question of boundaries between languages and the challenges that the localization of English brings to these typologies of language contact.

2.1 Borrowing

One of the most common phenomena that occurs in language contact situations is lexical *borrowing*. English is well known as a language that has benefited tremendously from borrowing, as its lexicon is heavily derived from French, Latin, and Greek, and new borrowings are noted four times a year by the Oxford English Dictionary (OED). In March of 2016, among the 500 newly added words were Japanese-originated *enjo kosai*, a noun that refers to paid escort work provided by a young woman to an older man in exchange for money or luxury items, Sanskrit-originated *anudatta*, a noun that refers to the low tone of unaccented syllables, and *kaifong*, a Cantonese-originated word referring to a neighborhood association. As these three examples show, borrowing occurs when words and their associated concepts or ideas are adopted from one language or dialect into another. Borrowing of lexical items can occur in many forms including *loanwords*, *loan shifts*, and *calques* (Hoffer, 2005).

When words and their related concepts are borrowed directly into another language, they are referred to as *loanwords*. A simple example of this might be the use of the word *painappuru* ('pineapple') in Japanese. When such borrowings occur, the recipient language makes the loanword fit into its phonological system, hence the shift from *pineapple* (/paɪnæpəl/) in the source language, English to *painappuru* (/paɪnappuru/) in the recipient language, Japanese. Another example is *supageti* ('spaghetti') in Swahili, which, similar to Japanese, requires a consonant-vowel syllable structure that reorganizes the phonology of the words, though the meaning stays the same.

Occasionally, when words are borrowed from one language to another there are shifts in meaning resulting in the phenomenon of *loan shifts*. The semantics of the English word *meeting* became more narrow in "Konglish," or Koreanized English, as the word refers to a very specific type of meeting: a group date. Conversely, when Koreans borrowed *engineer*, its meaning widened to refer to a larger class of person who fixes and repairs things, including technicians, whereas in center Englishes, it only refers to professionally trained, white-collar individuals. In other cases, the shift does not involve broadening or narrowing, but simply indexes a culturally distinct concept. The Konglish word *mind control* is a good example, as it refers to the ability to be calm and keep one's mind clear even in stressful contexts, whereas it refers to the negative idea of brainwashing in center varieties of English. Loan shifts can also involve morphological modification, as illustrated by *konsento* in Japan ('concentric plug'), a clipping of the original English phrase that refers to an electrical outlet, and the more complex case of *hai*, a clipped form of *highball* used in Japan to refer to mixed drinks, which is also used in combination with other morphemes to refer to specific cocktails such as *uuronhai* ('oolong tea highball'). Another morphological phenomenon often found in loanwords is reduplication. In Hawai'i Creole, the word *tarantaran* is a reduplicated borrowing from the Japanese *taran* ('lacking') that was often used to refer to people acting silly. Over time, the meaning of this word has shifted to also mean someone who is acting conceited, but this additional meaning is not present in the source language use of *taran*.

Sometimes a concept is borrowed from a source language to a recipient language, and rather than importing the original term into the phonology of the recipient language, the term is directly translated, resulting in a *calque*. The English term *blue-blood*, referring to someone who is of noble birth is a calque from the Spanish *sangre azul*, which may have formed as an allusion to the visibility of veins in fair-skinned people. The meaning from the original Spanish remains the same but the term has been directly translated into English. Another example is *flea market*, which is a calque from French *marché aux puces* ('market of fleas') a term that references the old furniture sold at such markets that is likely to be flea-infested.

Research on lexical borrowing has often focused on categorizing linguistic items as belonging to one of the previously mentioned categories, but this focus ignores the complex ways that borrowed words get used in new, heteroglossic ways that construct identities and indicate affiliations. For example, the Japanese word *konpurekkusu* ('complex') is used to mean inferiority complex, but it co-exists alongside the non-loan word *rettoukan*; Some Japanese feel using the English-originated term makes them seem more sophisticated (Daulton, 2008: 39). Similarly, French-originated loanwords are often utilized to display a sense of fashionable chic for businesses in the food industry in Japan (Tiersten, 2001). One example of this can be seen in the naming of a chocolate specialty store Nina's Derrière in Tokyo (Blommaert, 2010: 29). It is clear from the use of the grave accent in the word *derrière* that this is meant to be French, but as Blommaert points out, it is not being used in a literal way, as few people would be interested in eating an expensive chocolate that comes from someone's rear-end. Such examples are neither errors nor borrowings, but rather are localized and highly meaningful uses of language that have been transformed for their new environments.

2.2 Pidginization and Creolization

When languages come into contact with each other, there is the possibility of new languages being formed under the right circumstances. One such language type is a *pidgin*. Pidgins are usually described as a type of "reduced language" that is formed when two groups of people that do not share a common language are in contact with each other for an extended length of time, but who also use their home language as their main source of communication (Holm, 2010: 253). When this new language first forms, it takes the majority of the words in its new lexicon from one of the languages in contact; that language is referred to as either the *lexifier* language or *superstrate* language. In this early stage, the language is usually referred to as a *jargon*, but once the grammar becomes stabilized, it is then identified as a pidgin. At this stage, the language still has a quite small vocabulary and often no morphology (Siegel, 2008: 3). The following example is from an English lexified pidgin from the Solomon Islands.

(1) *White man allsame woman, he no savee fight, suppose woman plenty cross she make plenty noise, suppose man-of-war he come fight me, he make plenty noise, but he allsame woman –he no savee fight.* (Coote 1882: 206)

White men are just like women, they don't know how to fight. If a woman is really mad she'll just make a lot of noise. If a white soldier comes to fight me, he'll also make a lot of noise, but just like a woman, he doesn't know how to fight. (translated by the authors).

Other well-known pidgins include Pidgin Fijian, Nigerian Pidgin, Kisitla (Kenya), and Pidgin Hawaiian (spoken in the nineteenth century). Pidgins are used as a means for communication between different groups of people but they are not anyone's native language.

If there is extensive interaction among the next generations of pidgin speakers, a pidgin can become a *creole*, thereby increasing its grammatical complexity, stability and gaining native speakers. Because creoles start off as pidgins, they may still be understood as and referred to as pidgins by their speakers, which is one reason why many people are confused about the distinctions between these two terms. This is the case in Hawai'i, where the language known by linguists as Hawai'i Creole is simply known as "Pidgin" in everyday communication, even though this term actually refers to the language that first developed on sugar plantations at the

turn of the 20th century. The linguistic status of the language known as “Pidgin” in Nigeria depends on the speaker; among its 40 million speakers, the language is a creole for those who speak it natively, and for others, it reflects a pidgin status since some speakers use it as a link language in a much more simplified fashion (Faraclas, 1996). Confusingly, both ways of speaking are called “Pidgin.”

Creoles most often are created in situations where people of different cultures and languages are transported far away to work as slaves or indentured servants often on plantations (Siegel, 2012: 530). The following samples are in Hawai‘i Creole, which is an English lexified creole language.

(2) a. *I no like do dat –da garbage yo kuleana!* (Simonson et al. 2010: 22)

I don’t want to do that—the garbage is your job!

b. *You wen spahk da guy?* (Simonson et al. 2010: 34)

Did you see that guy?

c. *Eh, no cockroach my job!*

‘hey, don’t steal my job’ (Higgins 2015: 155)

The creole in these samples has a developed grammatical system as seen by the use of both negative and past tense markers. Other well-researched creoles include Fitzroy Kriol (Australia), Tok Pisin (Papua New Guinea), Jamaican Creole, and Gullah (U.S.).

The categorizations of pidgin and creole are not always quite so simple. Examining the grammatical complexity and the existence of native speakers, several language varieties exist that bring this traditional dichotomy into question. Languages such as Singlish (Singapore) or Pitkern (Pitcairn Islands) have been often referred to as *creoloids*, given that they did not emerge from pidgins but have many continuum-like features that many creoles share (Platt, 1975; 1977). Also, language varieties such as African American English, which is believed by some to have its origins in the creole Gullah, has qualities that make it difficult to distinguish (Mufwene, 2001: 25).

Another topic of heated discussion in this area of linguistics is the idea of decreolization, the phenomenon where a creole’s features such as syntax or phonology begin to change over time further resembling the lexifier language. The existence of a post-creole continuum is often given as evidence for this phenomenon where various *mesolects* - an intermediate variety on the continuum - exist between the *basilect* (the variety least similar to the lexifier language) version of the creole and the *acrolect* (the variety most similar to the lexifier language) (Sato, 1993). On the other side of this issue, many creolists have argued that creoles may move in both directions towards or away from the *acrolect* (Mufwene, 2004: 49-50). Additionally, there is evidence that the various *lects* have always co-existed with the *acrolect* and *basilect* (Winford, 2000) and so the basic idea of decreolization, where a creole language changes becoming gradually more similar to the lexifier language, is called into question. In Hawai‘i, as in other creole contexts, it is the case that people who speak Hawai‘i Creole often mix and shift between this language and English, indicating that there is a co-existence of *lects* not only among speakers, but also within the linguistic repertoires of individuals.

3. CODESWITCHING, CODEMIXING, AND TRANSLANGUAGING

When speakers have access to two or more languages, it is common to shift between the languages in different ways. The multilingual practices that result have been described using a range of terms, including *codeswitching*, *codemixing*, and *translanguaging*. While codeswitching and codemixing are longstanding terms that became widely used in the 1970s, translanguaging is a term that has only gained traction in the past decade after scholars began to more regularly question the separability of languages as used by multilingual people (García & Li Wei 2013).

3.1 Codeswitching

Codeswitching has been of great interest to many linguists in terms of syntactic structure and pragmatic purposes. Codeswitching is usually defined as “the use of two (or more) languages by a single speaker in the same conversation” (Thomason 2001: 132). This broad definition has often led many linguists who specialize in bilingual communication to try to separate codeswitching into several distinct phenomena. Auer (1999) gives a typology of different types of bilingual speech found in these situations moving along from *codeswitching* to *language mixing* to *fused lects*. These three terms present a cline of pragmatic uses of languages in codeswitching to a grammaticalization of two or more languages in the form of fused lects, with codemixing in the middle. While codeswitching always implies a pragmatic effect, codemixing is seen to be a form of free variation of mixed languages. While any two or more languages can be involved in codeswitching and codemixing, fused lects are created in contexts where speakers have formed a fixed way of using their languages. One case is Texas German (Salmons, 1990), in which speakers have replaced the German system of discourse markers and conjunctions with English discourse markers and conjunctions in their otherwise German conversations.

A key distinction in codeswitching types was made by Blom and Gumperz (2000 [1972]), who distinguished *situational* and *metaphorical* codeswitching (CS) in their research on two varieties of language used in northern Norway, Ranamål, a regional variety, and Bokmål, the standardized variety used in education. Situational CS coincides with the context of the situation, such as location and participants. Many children in English as a foreign language classrooms switch from their English to their first language when doing pair work, for example. Auer (1999) refers to this as *participant-oriented codeswitching*, as it treats the participants’ linguistic proficiencies and preferences as mitigating the language choice. On the other hand, *metaphorical* CS (Blom and Gumperz, 2000 [1972]: 116) is a form of discourse-related codeswitching that accomplishes a shift in footing or which projects a particular stance in conversation. A speaker may use codeswitching to disagree, or to take on the voice of another person, as in the case of reported speech (Gumperz, 1982). Such CS is metaphorical because it exploits associations between languages and their social functions to produce a metalinguistic communicative effect even though the situation itself is unchanged. In Blom and Gumperz’s research in the context of northern Norway, a Ranamål phrase might be occasionally inserted into an otherwise Bokmål sentence to give the words a sense of secrecy (2000 [1972]: 118). In research on codeswitching among journalists in Dar es Salaam, Higgins (2009) found that switches from Swahili to English were often used to mitigate face-threatening acts, such as rejecting a suggestion or disagreeing with an assessment. In addition, the journalists also used English frequently for greetings in an apparent effort to create an atmosphere of conviviality and efficiency.

More recent research has called into question static distinctions between metaphorical and situational codeswitching. Scholars have made the argument that all contexts are constructed or ratified in the moment, and hence language alternation can best be analyzed in its microcontext, in interaction, with attention to the wider ethnographic context. This allows

researchers to interpret the meanings that speakers bring with them to the interaction as well as those that are created in the act of codeswitching. These two types of meaning are often referred to as those that are “brought along” and those that are “brought about” (Auer 1999; Li Wei 1998; Rampton 1998). As more scholars frame their work in *translanguaging* frameworks, the relevancy of codeswitching as a concept remains somewhat murky, as we discuss below.

3.2 Codemixing

The second key term, *codemixing*, refers to the non-systematic use of more than one language in communication (Kachru, 1978). Many examples of codemixing come from situations where English mixes with other languages, resulting in Contact Englishes such as Spanglish, Hinglish, Japlish, Konglish, and Germlish. In codemixing, the choice of the English morphemes or words is not rule-governed or obligatory; in the next instance or the next day, the same speaker who asks “Hungry kya” (‘are you hungry?’) may well articulate the same question only using Hindi.

- (3) a. *Hungry kya?*
(‘Are you hungry?’) (Hinglish, Bhatia, 2009: 159)
- b. *Konai eisei wo tugyazaa* (‘together’) *shiyou ze!*
(‘Let’s take care of our oral health together!’) (Japlish, Takahata 2010)
- c. *binil-bongtu*
(‘vinyl envelope’) (Konglish, McDonald 2010: 138)
- d. *¿Piensas que mañana we could go to the beach after returning from la casa de mi abuelita?*
(‘Do you think that tomorrow we could go to the beach after returning from my grandmother’s house?’) (Spanglish, Ardila 2005: 70)

The act of codemixing is more significant on the macrolevel than at the level of interaction. While codeswitching can be used for pragmatic effects such as upgrading one’s stance or disagreeing more politely, codemixing itself does not yield pragmatic effects in interaction. Nonetheless, codemixing helps to construct a range of identities related to national identity, gender, ethnicity, and class. An example of (trans)national identity is presented in DeFina’s (2013) study of Spanish radio broadcasts in the Washington D.C. area, where codemixing often occurred at the level of pronunciation. When radio hosts pronounced local place names such as Kensington, Maryland with an English phonological system in an otherwise Spanish sentence, they were playfully admonished by their co-hosts and corrected to use a more Spanish accent, as in [‘kenzinton]. Such gentle rebukes point to an underlying ideology of Spanish as located in a nationalist paradigm associated with Central and South America, rather than with the realities of multilingualism based on codemixing in the Washington D.C. area in which many Spanish speakers mix phonological systems on a regular basis. Gender identities are also produced in relation to codemixing, as Higgins (2009) illustrated in her analysis of beauty pageant contestants’ speech in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. Young women who accidentally mixed their English self-introductions with Swahili, or who simply pronounced English words with a Swahili-influenced accent were interrupted by the audience with loud boos and dismissive clapping. At the same time, the hosts of the pageants and the young male rappers who entertained the audiences between segments of the pageants freely mixed their languages with no adverse responses. As representatives of Tanzania, the young women were being held to a different standard of language that does not occur outside of beauty pageants, as codemixing is

the default way of speaking among those living in large cities. Codemixing with English in written forms can also construct cosmopolitan identities, particularly in advertising (e.g., Curtin, 2014) and in social media (Sharma, 2012). While codemixing lacks discernable pragmatic effects in speech and writing, Contact Englishes with *-lish* suffixes such as Hinglish, Spanglish, and Japlish signify that the language users are (or are aspiring to be) highly educated, upper class individuals with a global orientation and a relatively privileged position in society.

One interesting example of English language mixing leading to negative perceptions is the case of “Conyo talk” in the Philippines, a way of speaking that mixes Spanish and English with Tagalog and which is a type of discourse that differentiates people of privilege from the rest of the population (Garvida, 2013). Conyo talk is seen as emulating how English and Spanish native speakers talked to Filipinos, and hence, despite being a marker of socioeconomic power, it is widely disparaged due to its strong associations with colonizers and forms of imperial arrogance. Presently, it has become associated with the middle class in the Philippines. It is distinct from other forms of language mixing such as Taglish in that grammatical elements like plurals come from English or Spanish (e.g., *yayas* ‘nannies’) rather than Tagalog, and the English verb *make* is productively used with Tagalog verbs (e.g., *make pila* ‘to queue’) (Garvida, 2013: 30).

3.3 Translanguaging

The term *translanguaging* encompasses all of the above concepts with reference to language contact phenomena, but it offers a framework that is not concerned with identifying typological differences in the forms of language contact. Instead of beginning with the view that languages are bounded by structures and then using those structures to analyze people’s language use, translanguaging takes a practice-based orientation to language. As a fluid and dynamic phenomenon, translanguaging is what happens when multilingual people use their various linguistic resources to engage in activities and to engage in social worlds. Translanguaging has a liberatory quality in that it is “the enaction of language practices that use different features that had previously moved independently constrained by different histories, but that now are experienced against each other in speakers’ interactions as one *new* whole” (García and Li Wei, 2013: 21). In other words, even though translanguaging involves more than one language from an outsider perspective, translanguaging is experienced more holistically by its users. In terms of language contact with English, researchers have investigated how translanguaging is part of how multilingual students engage in various academic practices such as participating in group work and demonstrating academic knowledge. For teachers, translanguaging allows them to encourage students, to raise questions, to convey content matter, and to develop pluriliteracies involving English and other languages (Canagarajah, 2011; García and Li Wei 2013). In the same vein, Pennycook and Otsuji (2015) have investigated similar phenomena in workplace contexts such as restaurants and markets, where multilingual people’s practices are at the center of commerce and customer service, and where their “metrolingual” repertoires are drawn upon to support these mundane activities.

The idea of translanguaging is important because it problematizes conventional language contact concepts by focusing on the active and original use of multilingual speakers’ linguistic resources as more of an integrated system rather than separate codes that are alternated for effect, or as separate codes with different lexifier languages. With translanguaging, the focus becomes less on describing the language itself and more on what the language use is being used to accomplish socially. One example of this can be seen in the use of stylized native speaker

English (NSE) in Japan (Furukawa, 2015). While conventional approaches might view such usage as borrowing, a more heteroglossic framing treats speakers' usage of stylized NSE as constructing identities for themselves and others by drawing upon the ideological connections that exist in Japanese society between English, Japanese, and the cultural capital of "social cool." When Japanese celebrities on television use hypercorrect pronunciations of English in their Japanese (such as overly aspirated voiceless consonants or unreduced vowels, akin to the audio tracks that accompany language textbooks), it is a form of careful manipulation of these symbolic connections.

Similar cases are documented in Sultana, Dovchin, and Pennycook (2013), who found that youth in Mongolia and Bangladesh often used translanguaging as means of creating a shared youth identity by transgressing and creatively appropriating linguistic and cultural boundaries. In one example from a Facebook conversation, Sabbir uses Bangla and English (in italics) in his post "Ajke ami amar 4 *hoobies* khuje pelam...*Women, Girls, Chicks and Babes...lol*" ('Today I have found my four hoobies [hobbies] ... Women, Girls, Chicks and Babes...lol'). In response to his self-aggrandizing statement, Bonya, a female friend, posts in Bangla: "mohila, meye, murgi r bachcha... :-/'" ('Woman, girl, chicken and baby...:-/'). (2013: 4). Rather than an act of codeswitching, Bonya's post in Bangla makes meaning through the metapragmatic frame produced by the translation. The interaction continues in a mix of English and Bangla with Bonya and other female friends teasing Sabbir by comparing him to popular culture icons Johnny Bravo (a hunky ladies' man in an animated American television show) and Johnny Gaddar (the protagonist of a 2007 Hindi film about a drug-dealing criminal) in an effort to reject his proposition and maintain a friendly relationship through parody and emoticons. Such complex heteroglossic uses of language cannot be sufficiently explained by only examining the interactional positioning of languages that individual linguistic items belong to; rather, they require the understanding that both languages may be drawn upon as complex social resources tied to intertextual meanings.

As more scholars use a translanguaging framework for the analysis of language contact, the relevance of terms such as *borrowing*, *codeswitching* and *codemixing* becomes rather murky. While some scholars continue to describe language practices involving pragmatic uses of language alternation as codeswitching or language practices involving the importation of English words as borrowing, the framework of translanguaging requires aligning with a constant critique toward the enumeration and compartmentalization of languages. Hence, most translanguaging work avoids these terms. Though García and Li Wei (2013) have argued that translanguaging is an umbrella term inclusive of these other language contact phenomena, they largely avoid integrating these terms into their discussion since they are embedded in an understanding of multilingualism as a system of multiple monolingualisms.

4. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As explained earlier in this chapter, the complexity of most language contact situations has led many researchers to question conventional approaches to this topic. Rather than treating languages as separate codes, practice-based approaches can more fully highlight the complex uses of language that speakers draw upon in everyday interaction. Seeing language as a practice means that it is not an abstract system which can easily be distinguished from other similar systems, but rather a social activity that speakers engage in together (Pennycook, 2010: 13). Viewing language as a practice draws attention to the fact that language is a key element in how

society and everyday life is structured and therefore focuses less on the structure of language or typologies of language contact.

In addition to studying the ways that practice-based understandings of language create opportunities to express identities and to challenge linguistic and social borders, practice-based approaches also present excellent opportunities for educators since they offer students of all disciplines the chance to critically engage with their own knowledge and experiences related to heteroglossic language contact situations and identity. As applied linguists with an interest in relating research on Contact Englishes to contexts beyond the research academy, we value current trends in the study of heteroglossic Englishes in which language researchers are seeking ways to invite students, teachers, and other professionals to engage in learning more about heteroglossic Englishes in real-life contexts. Below, we discuss two approaches that are relevant to a range of pedagogical contexts.

4.1 Critical Language Awareness

Critical language awareness (CLA) involves the development of the collective linguistic abilities of an oppressed or dominated group (Clark, Fairclough, Ivanic and Martin-Jones, 1991: 47-48). CLA is accomplished through activities that lead students, often speakers of Contact Englishes, to develop critical ideas and opinions about language ideologies that draw upon the experiences and knowledge that they bring with them to the classroom, leading to their own empowerment. Through CLA, students have the potential to be empowered through relating their personal experiences to language ideologies that exist in society, through using their own voices in their educational process, and through having their own knowledge valued and respected in the domain of education (Siegel, 2006: 169-170).

One way critical language awareness can be brought into the classroom is through the use of literacy narratives. Through a combination of classroom activities, peer commentary, interviews, and stimulated recall, Canagarajah (2011) was able to create an environment where university-level students could challenge dominant language ideologies regarding code-switching. Through the act of *codemeshing*, or using their full linguistic repertoires in writing, they were able to increase their creativity and daring. Importantly, Canagarajah points out that teachers need to create a safe environment for students to feel free to codemesh and experiment in class. Since they are used to treating languages as compartmentalized, codemeshing is an unfamiliar academic practice. In his study, the teacher helped to create this safe environment by sharing his own examples of codemeshing in writing.

CLA can also be achieved through student ethnography. One example of this can be seen in the 'Real Talk' Project (Alim, 2010) where secondary students' understandings of 'real talk' or 'straight talk' were utilized in class by first having them transcribe an interview with a well-known hip hop artist. The theme of 'real talk' continued as students continued to use hip hop themed data for expanding their critical thinking and understanding by developing their own ethnographies of speaking (Hymes, 1972) and by doing linguistic profiling exercises. Another ethnographic approach can be seen in Higgins, Nettell, Furukawa and Sakoda (2012) where young student filmmakers in Hawai'i were asked to create a documentary about Hawai'i Creole in a media program at a secondary school. In the end, the film contained a great many examples of borrowing, codemixing, and translanguaging involving English, Hawaiian, and Hawai'i Creole. The project was accompanied by interviews, community viewings and discussions that provided a space in which students could respond to hegemonic language ideologies as enshrined by policies established by the state department of education. Such projects lead to high

investment of energy from the students as well as allowing students to become teachers by sharing their knowledge with others.

4.2 Linguistic Landscape Research and ELT

Another practice-based approach which has classroom applications is the exploration of linguistic landscapes. Linguistic landscapes refer to the use of language in public spaces, with attention to both official and unofficial signage, but also increasingly to mobile signs such as t-shirts and bumper stickers, the role of sounds in the production of public spaces, and even the contribution of aromas in the form of “scentscapes” (Pennycook and Otsuji, 2016). By inviting students to analyze the surrounding linguistic landscapes, they have an opportunity to examine the range of Contact Englishes that are used for everyday purposes. Explorations of linguistic landscapes are relatively new but have been reported on with various student populations, including primary students in multicultural urban settings such as Vancouver, Canada (Dagenais, Moore, Sabatier, Lamarre and Armand, 2008), young indigenous students in Finland (Pietikaanan, 2012), and adult learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Japan.

A great deal of linguistic landscape research has investigated how English is used in heteroglossic ways in countries such as Japan, Mexico or Taiwan. Sayer (2010) used this approach to examine the use of English on signs in Oaxaca, Mexico and to develop some guidelines for language teachers to use with English learners in similar settings. By taking pictures of written English around the area locally, Sayer demonstrated that English has romantic and sexual associations in Oaxaca, and that it can be used as a subversive code. Importantly, his analysis drew attention to the many ways that English is used for intracultural (i.e., Mexican) purposes, as it is often presumed that English is a ‘foreign’ language in nations like Mexico. Although this project was not actually used in a classroom environment, Sayer provides useful suggestions for teachers so that they can make connections between classroom lessons and the outside world as well as leading students to think creatively and analytically about language.

Following up on Sayer’s (2010) ideas, Rowland (2013; 2016) has tried similar approaches in adult EFL classes in Japan. By having students use basic qualitative analysis and motive analysis on the English on Japanese signs, Rowland (2013) discovered several benefits for using linguistic landscape activities. The activities were found to help with both multimodal and critical literacy skills while giving opportunities for incidental language learning and increasing pragmatic competency. Finally, students were also able to understand the symbolic uses of English and developed personal connections between their English and Japanese knowledge.

Finally, using a literacy walk activity, Chern and Dooley (2014) also found that such activities are also beneficial for beginning learners of English. By taking adult students on a walk in Taipei and instructing them take pictures with their phones of the English in their environment, teachers were able to help increase the learners’ awareness of orthography and local social uses of English. Chern and Dooley suggest the use of pre and post activities to help focus the students’ awareness. These approaches can help with language learning as well as helping students to understand the interactive and ideological uses of English in their daily lives.

Both CLA and linguistic landscape projects provide an opportunity for language learners, teachers, and users to come to grips with the heteroglossic meanings of English in their societies. CLA can easily be combined with linguistic landscape projects as a means of interrogating language ideologies that perpetuate static understandings of English as a language attached to western culture, international cosmopolitanism, and academic purposes. Rather than seeing

English as constantly attached to or associated with its historical locations or its institutionalized purposes, these approaches invite people to explore how English has become highly localized, and fragmented, as it has become part of the fabric of their social lives in their own local contexts.

5. FURTHER READING

- Auer, P. (ed.), 1998. *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*, Routledge, London and New York.
This edited volume provides a framework for studying language alternation from a highly empirical, interaction-based approach drawing on conversation analysis and interactional sociolinguistics.
- Canagarajah, S., 2012. *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*, Routledge, London and New York.
Drawing on ideas from new literacy studies and applied linguistics, this book critically examines English within a global context to argue that multilinguals map their own languages and values onto English, thereby constructing new sociolinguistic norms.
- García, O. and Wei, L., 2013. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
This state-of-the-art book is the first volume to provide a definitive description of *translanguaging*, an approach to multilingualism that places social practices as the center of multilingual analysis.
- Pennycook, A. and Otsuji, E., 2015. *Metrolingualism: Language in the city*, Routledge, London and New York.
This book takes a practice-based approach to the use of language in cities by examining the translingual practices in restaurants, shops, and markets in Sydney and Tokyo.

6. RELATED TOPICS

Chapter 1. English as idea (Seargeant); Chapter 4. English and globalization (Juffermans); Chapter 5. World Englishes (Bolton); Chapter 21. Media English (Neary and Ringrow); Chapter 25. Sociolinguistics: studying English and its social relations (Deumert); Chapter 31. English and multilingualism (García and Lin)

References

- Alim, H. S., 2010. 'Critical language awareness,' in N. H. Hornberger and S. L. McKay (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Education*, Multilingual Matters, Bristol, pp. 205-231.
- Appadurai, A., 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Ardila, A., 2005. 'Spanglish: An anglicized Spanish dialect,' *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 27, no.1, pp. 60-81.

- Auer, P., 1999. 'From codeswitching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a dynamic typology of bilingual speech,' *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 309-332.
- Bakhtin, M.M., 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by MM Bakhtin* (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.), University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bhatia, T. K., 2009. 'English in Asian advertising and the teaching of world Englishes,' in K. Murata and J. Jenkins (eds.), *Global Englishes in Asian Contexts*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 154-171.
- Blom, J. P. & Gumperz, J. J., 2000 [1972]. 'Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway,' in Li wei (ed.), *The Bilingualism Reader*, Routledge: London, pp. 102-126.
- Blommaert, J., 2010. *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Canagarajah, S., 2011. 'Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging,' *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 95, no. 3, pp. 401-417.
- Chern, C. and Dooley, K., 2014. 'Learning English by walking down the street,' *ELT Journal*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 113-123.
- Choi, T.H., 2015. 'The impact of the 'Teaching English through English' policy on teachers and teaching in South Korea,' *Current Issues in Language Planning*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp.201-220.
- Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanic, R. & Martin-Jones, M., 1991. 'Critical language awareness part II: Towards critical alternatives,' *Language and Education*, vol. 5, no.1, 5(1), pp. 41-54.
- Coote, W., 1882. *Wanderings, South and East*. Sampson, Low, Marston: London.
- Curtin, M., 2014. 'Mapping cosmopolitanisms in Taipei: toward a theorisation of cosmopolitanism in linguistic landscape research,' *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, vol. 228, pp.153-177.
- Dagenais, D., Moore, D. Sabatier, C., Lamarre, P., and Armand, F. 2008. 'Linguistic landscape and language awareness,' in E. Shohamy and D. Gorter (eds.), *Linguistic landscape: Expanding the scenery*, Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, New York, pp. 253-269.
- Daulton, F.E., 2008. *Japan's built-in lexicon of English-based loanwords*. Multilingual Matters: Bristol.
- DeFina, A., 2013. 'Top-down and bottom-up strategies of identity construction in ethnic media,' *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 554-573.
- Faraclas, N. G. 1996. *Nigerian Pidgin*. Routledge, London.
- Furukawa, G., 2015. "'Cool' English: Stylized native speaker English in Japanese television shows,' *Multilingua*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 265-291.
- García, O. and Wei, L., 2013. *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Garvida, M.M., 2013. "'Conyo talk": the affirmation of hybrid identity and power in contemporary Philippine discourse,' *Lingue e Linguaggi*, vol. 8, pp.23-34.
- Gumperz, J.J., 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, U.K.
- Higgins, C., 2009. *English as a local language*. Multilingual Matters, Bristol.
- Higgins, C., 2015. 'Earning capital in Hawai'i's linguistic landscape,' in R. Tupas, (ed.), *Unequal Englishes: The Politics of Englishes Today*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 145-162.

- Higgins, C., Nettell, R., Furukawa, G. and Sakoda, K., 2012. 'Beyond contrastive analysis and codeswitching: Student documentary filmmaking as a challenge to linguisticism in Hawai'i,' *Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 49-61.
- Hoffer, B. L., 2005. 'Language borrowing and the indices of adaptability and receptivity,' *Intercultural Communication Studies*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 53-72.
- Holm, J., 2010. 'Contact and change: Pidgins and creoles,' in R. Hickey, (ed.) *The Handbook of Language Contact*, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 252-261.
- Hymes, D., 1972. 'Models of interaction of language and social life,' in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, pp. 35-71.
- Kachru, B. B., 1978. 'Toward structuring code-mixing: An Indian perspective,' *Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 16, pp. 27-46.
- Kim, Heejin. 2015. 'Private education as de facto language policy in South Korea,' *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* vol. 30, no. 1, 87-104.
- Li, Wei. 1998. 'The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching,' in P. Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge, London and New York, pp. 156-179.
- McDonald, C., 2010. 'A pre-trial collection and investigation of what perceptions and attitudes of Konglish exist amongst foreign and Korean English language teachers in terms of English education in Korea,' *Asian EFL Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 134-164.
- Mufwene, S. S., 2001. 'What is African American English?,' in S. L. Lanehart (ed.), *Sociocultural and historical contexts of African American English*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 21-51.
- Mufwene, S. S., 2004. *The Ecology of language evolution*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Park, J.S.Y., 2011. 'The promise of English: Linguistic capital and the neoliberal worker in the South Korean job market,' *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp.443-455.
- Pennycook, A., 2010. *Language as a local practice*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Pennycook, A. and Otsuji, E., 2016. 'Making scents of the landscape,' *Linguistic Landscape: An International Journal*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp.191-212.
- Pietikäinen, S. (2012). 'Experiences and expressions of multilingualism: Visual ethnography and discourse analysis in research with Sámi children,' in S. Gardner and M. M. Jones (eds.) *Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 163-178.
- Platt, J. T., 1975. 'The Singapore English speech continuum and its basilect 'Singlish' as a 'creoloid',' *Anthropological Linguistics*, vol. 17, no. 7, pp. 363-374.
- Platt, J. T., 1977. 'The 'creoloid' as a special type of interlanguage,' *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 22-38.
- Rampton, B., 1998. 'Language crossing and the redefinition of reality,' in P. Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity*. Routledge, London and New York, pp. 290-320.
- Rowland, L., 2013. 'The pedagogical benefits of a linguistic landscape project in Japan,' *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 16., no. 4, pp. 494-505.

- Rowland, L., 2016. 'English in the Japanese linguistic landscape: A motive analysis,' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 40-55.
- Salmons, J., 1990. 'Bilingual discourse marking: Code switching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects,' *Linguistics*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp.453-480.
- Sato, C. J., 1993. 'Language change in a creole continuum: Decreolization?,' in K. Hyltenstam and A. Viberg (eds.), *Progression & regression in language: Sociocultural, neurophysical, & linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 122-144.
- Sayer, P., 2010. 'Using the linguistic landscape as a pedagogical resource,' *ELT Journal*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 143-153.
- Sharma, B.K., 2012. 'Beyond social networking: Performing global Englishes in Facebook by college youth in Nepal,' *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 483-509.
- Siegel, J., 2006. 'Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach,' *Linguistics and Education*, Vol. 17, pp. 157-174.
- Siegel, J., 2008. *The Emergence of Pidgin and Creole Languages*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Siegel, J., 2012. 'Multilingualism, indigenization, and creolization,' in T. K. Bhatia and W. C. Ritchie (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 2nd ed., Blackwell Publishing Limited, Somerset pp. 514-541.
- Simonson, D., Sakata, K. and Sasaki, P., 2010. *Pidgin to da Max*. Bess Press, Honolulu.
- Takahata, T., 2010. *Shanai kou yougo no eigoka ni yoru kokusaika to Ruu Oshibaka*. [Online] Available at: http://blogs.itmedia.co.jp/teppetakahata/2010/07/post_2.html [Accessed 24 April 2016].
- Thomason, S. G., 2001. *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Tiersten, L., 2001. *Marianne in the market: Envisioning consumer society in Fin-de-Siecle France*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Winford, D., 2000. '"Intermediate" creoles and degrees of change in creole formation: The case of Bajan,' in I. Neumann-Holzschuh and E. W. Schneider (eds.), *Degrees of restructuring in creole languages*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 215-246.