

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Approaches to World Englishes Literature

Dr. Pairote Bennui

Assistant Professor of English, Western Languages Program
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, Muang, Songkhla, Thailand

Abstract:

This paper presents a review of salient frameworks projected to analyse and interpret World Englishes literature. It is obvious that the Kachruvian framework initially theorises literary and linguistic creativity in a so-called 'contact literature'. This results in the emergence of various paradigms and concepts regarding the literary perspective of Englishes proposed by other leading scholars. Overall, a description of such frameworks contributes to the construction of distinct approaches to World Englishes literature.

Keywords: *Approaches, World Englishes literature, the Kachruvian framework*

1. Introduction

Since the most popular approach to World Englishes, namely 'Concentric Circles of English' was officially established in 1985 (Kachru, 1985), several frameworks for studying English in non-Anglophone contexts have been created by Kachru himself and his followers (e.g. Strevens, 1987; Y. Kachru, 1987; Nelson, 1988; Smith, 1992) as well as many other scholars (e.g. McActhur, 1998; Schneider, 2007; Trudgill & Hannah, 2008; Leitner, 2010). It appears that no theorists, except Kachru, offer paradigms that cover three areas of World Englishes – literature, linguistics and pedagogy. This is evident in the statement "The approaches to the study of world Englishes, therefore have to be disciplinary and integrative, and different methodologies must be used (literary, linguistic and pedagogical) to capture distinct identities of different Englishes, and to examine critically the implications of such identities in cross-cultural communication and creativity" (Kachru, 1997: 212). Although an emphasis of such three perspectives of English studies marks Kachru's approach, only the literary sphere seems to be the most outstanding. The linguistic and pedagogical disciplines of World Englishes have been commonly implemented in a variety of studies on dimensions of linguistic features, language in use and teaching-learning of English in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and the South Pacific. Meanwhile, the World Englishes School of literary studies neither looks at literary criticism using Western/Oriental literary theories nor analyses conventional literary stylistics of Anglophone and postcolonial literatures in English. The school is interdisciplinary in that literary works in English by non-native authors worldwide can be studied using an integrated framework of linguistics, culture, pedagogy and communication for enunciating indigenous identity and reflecting new varieties of English. In other words, Kachru's approach to World Englishes points to non-native English literature by proposing the concept of World Englishes literature. This proposal has been accepted by a number of his supporters via different paradigms offered with theoretical underpinnings that aim at examining literary works and their relevant artistic products created by non-Anglo users of English.

Indeed, the term 'World Englishes literature' is unique due to its manifestation of theory and research studies. The scholarship of World Englishes literature has been formed on the basis of disciplines ranging from structural linguistics, sociolinguistics, textual and discourse studies, education, cultural studies, gender and media studies to communication. These multidisciplinary functions support a canon of World Englishes literature. To understand the significance of this scholarship and its application, this paper intends to describe key concepts and paradigms as well as theoretical frameworks that constitute 'approaches to World Englishes literature'. Moreover, it highlights strengths of such approaches in certain empirical studies and in a comparative way. This account will thus enrich an insightful recognition of World Englishes literature as an alternative field of literary studies.

Before certain frameworks by key theorists are to be described, their diagrammatic illustration needs to be displayed for an overview as follows:

Theorists	Framework (s)/Paradigm(s) for World Englishes Literature
Braj. B. Kachru	Contextualisation and Lexical Innovation (1983); Bilingual's Creativity and Contact literature (1986a; 1987); Non-Native Literatures in English as a Resources for Language Teaching (1986b); Cultural Contact and Literary Creativity in a Multilingual Society (1992); Englishisation and Contact Linguistics (1994); Transcultural Creativity in World Englishes and Literary Canons (1995); and Nativising Mantra as Identity Construction in Anglophone Englishes (2003).
Peter Strevens	Cultural Presuppositions (1987)
Tamara Valentine	Nativisation of Gender in New Literatures in English (1992)
Wimal Dissanayake	Cultural Studies and World Englishes (1997)
Cecil Nelson	Intelligibility in World Englishes (2011)
E.Dawson Varughese	Beyond the Postcolonial: World Englishes Literature (2012)

Table 1: An Overview of Frameworks/Paradigms for World Englishes Literature

In this paper, each framework/ paradigm in Table 1 which sheds light on theories of World Englishes literature will be reviewed so that its theoretical foundation will be beneficial to global academia and research communities in the discipline of English studies.

2. The Kachruvian Approach

The Kachruvian approach to World Englishes literature is the richest one as it contains a large number of frameworks including different literary genres, linguistic structures, national identities as well as functional uses. Each is subsequently described.

2.1 Contextualisation and Lexical Innovation

This framework aims at analysing linguistic features of New Englishes using the two key concepts, namely 'contextualisation' and 'lexical innovation'. The former term was adopted from the 'Firthian framework of linguistic science' (Firth, 1957) while the latter was originally created. *Contextualisation* refers to the final product of linguistic analysis regarding 'the context of situation' of a text because language is considered as both a process that yields the notion of 'culture' and an integral part of it. Kachru examined the two concepts in Indian English creative writings, where there appears to be certain linguistic characteristics. *Contextualisation* appears in four types of lexico-grammatical transfer - lexical transfer (loans), translation (established equivalent items of L1-L2), shift (an adaptation of items in L1 into L2), and calques (rank-bound translation). Other types of transfer are collocations and speech functions. Hence, Indian English (IE) collocations consist of four features distinct from British English (BE) collocations - deviation with grammatical compounding, loan shifts, IE collocations, and contextual units. Moreover, *contextualisation* is also observed in several IE speech functions: (i) text of attitudes contains *modes of addressing and referencing, cursing, and blessing*; (ii) text of status and social position entails *superiority, inferiority, and caste*; (iii) text of social roles is of *rituals and ceremonies*; and (iv) text of individual habits, which is not socially determined yet. In terms of *lexical innovations*, Indian English writings contribute to two types of South Asian (SA) English words, that is, single items (shifts and loan translation) and hybrid items. *Hybridisation*, the major representative of a lexical innovation, contains open and closed sets. The open set named *classification of hybrid formations* follows two structures - SA item as head and SA item as modifier. The closed set entitled 'hybridisation and derivative suffixes' is grouped into three categories - non-English head and English derivational suffix, English head and non-English derivational suffix, and non-English head and English prefix of negation. All in all, Kachru points to these features as a result of the two concepts as a model for studying vocabulary in literary and non-literary texts in other Englishes (Kachru, 1983).

2.2 Bilinguals' Creativity and Contact Literature

It is likely that the framework 'contextualisation and lexical innovation' leads to a development of the bilingual's creativity and contact literature. This is because the concepts of *contexts and innovation* are embedded in linguistic features in contact literature. However, they are extended to syntax and discourse. Moreover, the notion of innovation is reconstructed as 'creativity'. This framework indeed provides four characteristics of the linguistic and literary creativity of a bilingual writer. Firstly, the processes used in this creativity occur with the basis of local, cultural, and stylistic strategies that cannot be determined with one norm from one literary and cultural tradition. Secondly, the process of nativisation and acculturation of texts yields an altered context of situation for the language. Thirdly, an emergence of bilinguals' creativity parallels the shape of two or more linguistic codes. The new code must be contextualised in a perspective of the novelty language use. Finally, this creativity is manifested in a distinct context of situation, as seen in a formal mixture of different underlying language designs, and in a creation of cultural, aesthetic, societal, and literary canons.

This framework is the pioneer approach to discovering contact literature. This literary text has a unique feature; the altered meaning system resulted from many linguistic processes highlights the characteristics of such literary text. Such linguistic processes carry three aspects of nativisation. *Nativisation of context* involves historical and cultural presupposition, narrative technique, and collocation relationship of the literary texts. *Nativisation of cohesion and cohesiveness* is found in collocation

extension, the use and frequency of grammatical forms, lexical shift, hybrid, and loan translation. *Nativisation of rhetorical strategies* consists of three main components. Firstly, this literary text makes choices of styles referring to the stylistic norms appropriate to the concept of high and popular culture. Secondly, it provides authenticity or linguistic distinctiveness to the discourse type such as *Nigerianness* and *Indianness*. Lastly, it realises the following styles: (i) the use of native similes and metaphors in collocation deviation, (ii) the transfer of proverbs and idioms, (iv) the use of culturally dependent speech styles, and (v) the use of syntactic devices. Overall, these three perspectives of nativisation represent the lexical, syntactic, and discourse levels of linguistic creativity in contact literature (Kachru, 1986a).

Towards this framework, *linguistic realisation of thought patterns* is added to point out the bilingual's creativity on discourse styles as seen in a paragraph organisation in English written by South Asian writers in a spiral-like structure which disappears in Anglo writing convention. Indeed, the structure of Marathi is viewed as 'circular' from a native-English speaker's *the strategies* perspective, so it influences the authors' English writing. In this aspect, contrastive discourse/stylistics meets contact literature. It shows the way other non-native writers create their English literatures with styles in divergence to native English styles is to be judged with thought patterns in L1 (Kachru, 1987).

2.3 Non-Native Literatures in English as a Resource for Language Teaching

Kachru (1986b) proposes the term 'non-native literature in English' as an alternative paradigm for teaching English for non-native students. This type of literature is offered as it represents a linguistic, literary, cultural product of English written by a non-Anglo author. It will probably enhance non-native English teachers and students' awareness of their own culture and identity in addition to reading British/American English literature. This paradigm appears in certain suggestions for using non-native literature in English in classroom and research studies. Firstly, teachers need to grade such literary texts by firstly differentiating *the stages* from of use. The former refers to the acquisition stages of the learner while the latter concerns particular devices which a teacher use for making the learner more contextually comprehend. This step requires a teacher to understand the following four characteristics of such literary texts – *variety* (e.g. Indian English or Singapore English as a medium of writing), *register* (e.g. political or religious, or historical styles of English), *author* (certain writers have their style similar to or different from others), and *text* (e.g. two literatures by an author can be different according to their textual features). Secondly, teachers need to explain how a non-native English writer uses linguistic devices to contextualise his/her vernacular in his own 'un-English' culture. This step is called an application of nativisation of literary texts. That is, teachers can encourage students to analyse the following devices embedded in this literary texts: (i) *lexical innovations* (e.g. a hybrid item 'policewala' or 'policeman' in Indian English); (ii) *translation equivalence* (e.g. 'cherisher of the poor' in Urdu English); (iii) *contextual redefinition* (e.g. kinship terms); and (iv) *rhetorical or functional styles* (e.g. Sanskrit or Arabic or Persian styles in South Asian literatures in English). Finally, beyond linguistic devices, teachers should be careful about selecting non-native English literary texts with a variety of themes, cultural settings, and identity of characters to motivate students to read. Furthermore, Kachru also suggests non-native literatures in English for teaching those who use English as a native language. This will increase a comprehension on how English is used in a non-Western context, resulting in an emergence of stylistic innovations different from their Anglophone culture, as well as will reinforce a cross-cultural understanding between native and non-native users of English. In conclusion, this paradigm is not for prioritising non-native literatures in English classrooms, but it suggests that both native and non-native literatures in English should be a paralleling instructional material.

2.4 Cultural Contact and Literary Creativity in a Multilingual Society

Contact literature in a multilingual community is significant in that its main elements are of an integration of linguistic and cultural contact. This framework points to 'the trimodal approach to diversity' in which three fields – linguistics, sociolinguistics, and literatures - are interrelated. *Linguistic field* contains (i) register development; (ii) resource for 'mixing', 'switching', and formal innovations at each linguistic level; and (iii) discourse strategies, and discourse structure in the light of units like paragraphing and punctuations. *Sociolinguistic field* consists of (i) conventions in the use of speech acts as well as modes of references and address; (ii) strategies in persuasion, apology and anger; and (iii) expansion of style range marking levels of modernisation, education, and mobility. *Literary field* comprises (i) new literary genres; (ii) expansion within genre like sonnet and blank verse; (iii) expansion of the thematic range; (iv) resource for ideological shift such as the progressive writers' movement; and (v) mathetic function. All these elements are illustrated in Indian English literature and local literature in Indian languages with the process of *Englishisation*. In this regard, code-mixing is highlighted to serve as the notions of convergence and creativity in a contact area like India. Indian English writings present an intercourse between English and Indian languages such as the mixing of Hindi and Punjabi loanwords in English sentences. This makes English a part of the local repertoire of literatures and cultures; English and other vernaculars are similarly interwoven in literary creativity. The notions of identity and cultural awareness emerge in this framework. Contact literature, namely a historical novel, conveys the use of English as a medium to express identity and cultural awakening via heritages, glory, and civilisation of non-Anglo nations to westernisation. Additionally, four terms that are paradigms of contact and multilingual societies are embedded in contact literature – (i) codes as a repertoire (languages, varieties, and styles); (ii) the repertoire of religious identities in styles; (iii) identity manipulation (style shifts for non-native identity); and (iv) code dynamics (ethnic, caste, and social roles of languages and varieties) (Kachru, 1992: 150-154).

2.5 Englishisation and Contact Linguistics

The term 'Englishisation' refers to certain linguistic processes resulting from a contact between English and other vernaculars. The notion of 'contact linguistics' of English plays a vital role in this framework. Such a notion has its literary facet, namely

'contact literature' in English, thus this framework is inevitably related to literary works. Nevertheless, this framework can also be useful for studying non-literary texts such as newspapers, scientific documents, and advertising. In this regard, particular perspectives on literature will be more emphasised, however. Indeed, the *Englishisation* process functions as a vital contact language of a so-called *Englishness* that influences the structural change of a local language and literature in a society where English is not used as a mother tongue. Such change appears in lexical, semantic, phonological, syntactic and discourse components of spoken and written expressions as well as in literary tradition and literary genres. In vernacular literature, certain writers seem to use several types of lexicalisation based on *Englishisation* – loan words, loan shifts, hybridisation, and parallel lexical sets. For instance, Indian writers often use at least one component from English – *rit darkhastu* 'writ petition' (Telugu) and *tikit ghar* 'ticket office' (Marathi). Moreover, several writers in South Asia use impersonal constructions due to the influence of English such as 'zahir hai' (it is evident) in Hindi-Urdu. Furthermore, Thai, Chinese, and Japanese writers frequently use passive constructions, especially 'passivisation with extended semantic functions', for instance, 'It is....' construction (Thai), 'pronoun modifiers' (Chinese), and the use of 'anata' (Japanese) due to the influence of English 'you'. In terms of discourse, the *Englishisation* process focuses on stylistic elements of writings in local languages influenced by Western styles. This can be linked to new movements in literary genres and traditions of local authors with the influence of Anglo-English literary forms. Clearly, historical novels by an English author, namely Walter Scott (1771-1832) inspired Indian writers to experiment historical fictions such as *Mirijiyari* (1894) (in Assamese) by Rajanikanta Bardoloi (1867-1939) and *Karan Ghelo* (1866) (in Gujarati) Nadshankar (1985-1905), etc. Besides, the norms of *Sanskritisation* and *Persianisation*, namely *The Great Tradition*, which have been influencing South Asian literature, are affected by English literary norms. For instance, Romantic movements in T.S. Eliot and William Wordsworth were adopted by young Indian writers. Additionally, the discourse level of *Englishisation* is extended to code-mixing (the mixing of English words) and the written mode (the *Englishised* punctuation marks in paragraphs) in non-fictional writings (Kachru, 1994). Overall, these features represent the way the *Englishisation* process contributes to World Englishes literature.

2.6 Transcultural Creativity in World Englishes and Literary Canons

The nativisation of rhetorical strategies in the bilinguals' creativity and contact literature is extended to an analysis of '*transcultural creativity*' because it represents the process of translation, transfer, and transcreation as the powerful stylistic device. In this paradigm, the transcreational process plays an important role in literary creativity in the '*mother tongue*' (national literature translated in English) and in the '*other tongue*' (World literature written in English).

Kachru theorises transcultural creativity with three types of crossovers adopting Smith's (1992) study. Firstly, *the crossover within a speech fellowship* refers to the members of a speech fellowship who have shared underlying socio-cultural resources. The linguistic resources of such members differ although they convey the mutual intelligibility. For instance, Punjabi, Hindi, and Kashmiri speakers of India have shared "regional dialects of English and educated English". This type yields the concept of '*intelligibility*' that involves surface decoding of a linguistic utterance. In varieties of English, a number of lexical items are not problematic in decoding the denotative meaning, but one still needs to comprehend the extended meaning which concerns the crossover in literary texts. Secondly, *the crossover within speech communities sharing identical literary, cultural, and religious canons* is evident in the case between the Dravidian south and the Indo-Aryan north in India in which languages are divergent but underlying cultural identity is convergent. This is found in the *Sanskritisation*, *Persianisation*, and *Englishisation* processes of literary and religious discourses. This type suits the term '*comprehensibility*' or a comprehension of a text of a variety of English within the situational context of another variety. One needs to comprehend the connotative meaning of certain English expressions. This concept points to cultural and religious meanings of non-native English items. Lastly, *the crossover within speech communities which are culturally, sociolinguistically, and linguistically divergent* refers to non-native English writers/speakers with distinctive cultural, linguistic and literary canons. This type meets the notion of '*interpretability*'. One is obliged to interpret contextualisation of the text in which source language is constructed. This appears in a new interpretation or an addition of commentaries to translations of holy texts such as the *Bible* and the *Bhagawad Gita*, etc. To achieve the interpretability, one must establish the relationship of a text within an appropriate context-language as a component of culture. In World Englishes literature, this stage means the way English is reincarnated into the local culture.

All types of crossovers above are based on the translation, transfer and transcreation processes of multilingual writers. First of all, the Nigerian novelist *Amos Tutuola* and Indian Novelists *Raja Rao* and *Mulk Raj Anand* have used 'translation equivalence' to keep the English text close to Yoruba and Panjabi-Hindustani respectively. *Raja Rao's The Serpent and the Rope* conveys the *Sanskritisation* of English. Moreover, *Raja Rao's* writing shows transfer of the diglossic situation in L1 into English. This example indicates that the bilingual writer aims to remain close to the mother tongue style specifically the formal pattern of English. Finally, transcreation is used by *Tutuola* to establish an ancestral link between Nigerian English creativity and the oral past tradition. All strategies serve as transcultural creativity for linguistic and cultural convergence and contact in World Englishes literature (Kachru, 1995).

2.7 Nativising Mantra as Identity Construction in Anglophone Englishes

In literary studies, the notion of 'mantra' refers to messages and mythology. Nativising mantra in World Englishes displays distinctiveness in linguistic, literary, and ideological creativity of a bilingual writer. In this regard, a bilingual writer falls into one of three users of English in the so-called circle of *Anglophone Englishes*. This circle concerns varieties of English in the Anglophone region of Asia. Speakers of Anglophone Englishes are of three groups – L1 users (Australia and New Zealand), L2 users (India and Singapore), and FL users (Korea and China). Currently Asia becomes the largest region of English users, thus the term 'Anglophone Englishes' is more appropriate than 'Asian Englishes'. Nativising mantra for writers' identity construction

employs three linguistic processes – (i) locating the bilingual’s creativity within the contexts of linguistic and cultural pluralism that feature such speech communities; (ii) treating the linguistic construction as a cohesive text representing structural, discourse and cultural hybridity; and (iii) distinguishing the bilingual’s competence in the light of a linguistic repertoire bearing certain relations to textual structure. An instance of the third process appears in Raja Rao’s *Kanthapura* (1938), in which Indian language repertoire constructed for intellectual and emotional make-up is mixed in English texts, serving as the mythology of the sacred cows of linguistic purity. Mantra can also be referred to as ‘medium’. It includes political and social constructions of language. Evidently writers of postcolonial literature nativise messages to respond to the coloniser’s linguistic medium, namely to construct their non-native identity in English. Moreover, a mantra covers philosophical and spiritual constructions. This nativisation is seen in the use of Sanskritised or Arabic English sentence patterns in sacred texts in World Englishes literature for linking linguistic and cultural boundaries between English and vernaculars. This also supports an identity construction of non-native writers (Kachru, 2003: 55-71). In brief, nativisation of mantra is a new paradigm for studying certain strategies a non-native English writer used to construct his/her ideology for empowering linguistic, literary, and cultural creativity in Anglophone Englishes.

3. Strevens’ Cultural Presuppositions

Strevens’ well-known approach to World Englishes is ‘World Map of English’ (1980, 1982). His literary paradigm falls into only ‘cultural presuppositions’ (Strevens, 1987). In this regard, the cultural presuppositions of a society are textually expressed in six domains in English, marking the degree of cultural loading between native and non-native English speakers.

Firstly, *religion and philosophy* concern the following four issues (i) *animism and theism* or faiths in ‘no god’ and in ‘God or many gods’, both respectively are embedded in different groups of people’s perspectives, identity, habitual and behavioural features, and daily speech patterns; (ii) *the relation of man to God, of man to man, of man to nature* involves the beliefs that regulate one’s response to other people of the same or different beliefs; (iii) *views on life and death, peace and war, and an after-life* are based on language and cultural expressions; and (iv) *ethics and morals* appear in ideas of right or wrongdoing and the balance of goodness and evil in personal behaviour, etc.

Secondly, *concepts of nature* imply that each society has its own views on a condition of a human being with regard to culture (e.g. different attitudes toward animals in different religions). Moreover, an occurrence of a supernatural force is undoubtedly accepted by non-native English speakers while native-English speakers seek scientific factors influencing such force.

Thirdly, *notions of governments* influence one’s beliefs, values, and communication. For instance, whether the social control is determined with heredity, kingship, caste and class, democracy, and even whether the government needs to be efficient, emerge in expressions in language and personal behaviour.

Fourthly, *concepts of science* in the Western and non-Western worlds are dissimilar. The Western science is highly standard and conscious whereas the non-Western one appears in different kinds of science. This distinction results in each society’s construction of its own concepts of Mathematics, Agriculture and Architecture, so the cultural contrast affects learning science. Hence, these concepts of the two cultures embedded in textual presuppositions often shock non-native English learners.

Fifthly, *literature* in Anglo and non-Anglo cultures is dissimilar. Native English literature has a culture-specific concept. Universally literature of all societies is a language-based art form, but its nature varies. Some non-native English societies ignore written literature but point to an oral tradition of literature such as drumming and dancing for young learners. Furthermore, literature is closely tied to religion. Thus, Jewish and Christian doctrines in Anglophone English literature are somewhat an obstacle for non-native English learners. For example, Thai students may find it difficult to interpret such doctrines hidden in such literature; however, they perhaps can easily understand Thai English literature in which themes are grounded in Buddhism.

Finally, *the society’s ‘ultimate myths’*, based on Sir James Frazer’s *The Golden Bough* (1922), are that all societies have similar myths regarding mankind via explanations for natural and supernatural phenomena, and the origins of men and women, etc. However, such myths are culturally different, especially relating to beliefs in the magical properties of effects of plants, animals, or special individual, human beings. Indeed, Anglophone culture has ultimate myths according to certain concepts such as *Aristotle’s rhetoric* and *Judeo-Christianity*.

All these concepts in English texts may cause cultural barriers to non-native users. In brief, these presuppositions differ across cultures and mirror the discourse of people from a variety of cultures although they can speak or write English effectively

4. Valentine’s Nativisation of Gender in New Literatures in English

Valentine’s (1992) framework on gender identities in World Englishes points out the role of gender in identity construction of non-native English writers. This framework is a pioneer one extended from *the Bilingual’s creativity in contact literature* (Kachru, 1986a) that emphasises the notion of gender in relation to age and ethnicity. It relates to pragmatic components of literary texts as it focuses on the way creative writers use speech functions in dialogues expressed by characters to display their indigeneness in lexis, grammar patterns, and discourses in English. That is, certain local linguistic items are transferred in English as a representation of female-male speakers’ cultural identities different from those in Western/Anglo culture. This framework employs instances from Indian and African English literatures as a model for other researchers to have further explorations.

The framework provides three aspects of speech functions – kinship terms, indirectness and politeness, and turn-taking strategies. Firstly, Indian and African English writers depict the way characters use certain words of kinship terms for addressing and referencing according to their traditional cultures. For instance, in a novel *Gauri* by Mulk Raj Anand, the mother character

'Laxmi' uses English words 'child, childing, girl, and daughter' to maintain her maternal role and local words '*beta* and *beti*' to pinpoint her affection when addressing to her married daughter 'Gauri'. Moreover, as Indian tradition does not allow a wife to call her husband's name, the writer creates the daughter character using the terms 'they' and 'the master of the house' to reflect her social status as a married wife. Additionally, this writer employs the terms 'sister' and 'daughter' used by female neighbours, community members, and even strangers in India in this writing to indicate a close social relationship between women. Likewise, this also happens in African societies. Ama Atta Aidoo uses the terms 'my daughter, my friend, and my sister' in his writing to show the in-group relationship of endearment among female characters. Secondly, Indian and African writers create discourse patterns of indirectness and politeness. This is evident in the creation of sentence patterns and proverbs for gender identities. For example, a novel *Efuru* by Flora Nwapa uses indirect sentence patterns with lengthy conventional greetings, wishes, and complements before a plain talk occurs in order to show politeness in African culture, especially among female speakers. In Amadi's *The Concubine*, an African English saying "men have the one voice whereas women have no mouth" mirrors the social inequality of males and females. Besides, Dina Mehta uses the abusing terms "dried up old witch" and "barren slut" in a collection, namely *the Other Woman and Other Stories*, for married Indian women. Finally, this framework shows that 'gender' is a marker used by Indian and African writers to structure discourse strategies for turn-taking in dialogues. In both cultures, the male speakers become dictated in his longer and first speaking while the female speakers use shorter speaking and take short turns in conversations. This occurs in literary texts. Bhattacharaya's *A Goddess Named Gold* indicates that Indian wives are not allowed to directly address their husbands, except only when her husband asks his wife with the expression 'To you?' This is only a way for an Indian wife to take her turn in a conversation. In African English writing, *The Tongue of the Dumb* by Dominic Mulaisho, a male character uses the kinship terms 'my daughter' that expresses social obligations and 'mother of the son' that exhibits motherhood as markers in take his turn in conversation. Meanwhile, a female character addresses the term 'uncle' to start his turn of speaking.

In conclusion, those three perspectives identify the remaining features of the framework that marks sexual ideology and sociolinguistic strategies in World Englishes literature.

5. Dissanayake's Cultural Studies and World Englishes

Dissanayake's (1997) *Cultural Studies and World Englishes* attempts to examine the way the notion of culture plays a vital role in relation to the ontology of World Englishes. The term 'culture' is interdisciplinary; it foregrounds literary studies, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, communication, media studies, and feminist studies. This framework, however, prioritises literary texts as a source in which other academic disciplines are embedded and interwoven for shaping a conceptualisation of cultural studies. That is, literary works mirror socio-anthropological rhetoric, historical narratives in fictional events, philosophical thoughts and discourses as well as are a meaningful transformation into filmic texts, etc. Regarding World Englishes, literary texts and modern cultural studies are linked to the significance of creative writings by non-native English authors. The framework encourages researchers to explore topics for investigating such literary texts using cultural paradigms of World Englishes. There appears to be five topics illustrated in this framework.

Firstly, the notion of *power and ideology*, a term by Foucault (1972), is culturally based on World Englishes. The World Englishes approach indicates that English is used as a world language due to a language of power and ideology of non-native English users. New literatures in English are thus a cultural product that articulates power and identity of colonised people. Consequently, the notion of power and ideology can be examined in linguistic and thematic elements of such literary texts. For example, Raja Rao's *Kanthapura* (1963) shows the use of the speech rhythms of Kannada, a vernacular of Indians, to recreate the very cultural experience of a South Asian character.

Secondly, the notion of *public sphere*, based on Habermas' (1992) term, is related to the concept of World Englishes (WE). WE is formed with the basis of socio-political domain; the importance of English in a certain society is shaped by the most influential group of people – government – according to a variety of public domains. Likewise, creative writers in non-Western countries are a privileged group of people, namely elites, who use English in order to mirror their socio-political thoughts to influence the public sphere on local readers. This notion can be observed in R.K. Narayan's *The Guide* (as cited in Spivak, 1994). This writing is outstanding in that it employs the term 'devadasis' (temple dancers) as a vehicle for the writer's narrative about a male protagonist and the questionable issue of female subjectivity in an androcentric society of India. This novel is transformed into a *Bollyhood* film for the popularity of audiences.

Thirdly, the concept of *locality and globality* refers to the relationship between vernacular writings (locality) and English writings (globality) in a society. This concept is connected in World Englishes as WE points out the impact of vernaculars on the creation of linguistic and literary forms of new varieties of English. In this concept, certain features of postcoloniality shared by the two literary types can be examined for articulating the question of nationhood.

Fourthly, the notion of *politics* is linked to World Englishes; the spread of English to the regions of Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean is driven by politics of culture, politics of social location, as well as colonialism and imperialism. Certain political aspects of literary works to be examined rely on metaphorical selves; how writers present 'selfhood' in their writing for decolonising English is the main focus of this investigation. This notion also covers an exploration of 'home and exile' depicted by migrant writers from the regions. In fact, the term 'metaphoric self' is related to the political culture of colonialism; writers intend to carry their cultural topography to a new nation state. Migrant writers display an act of cultural translation as well as reconstruction and reshaping of cultural and linguistic identities. Furthermore, examining metaphoric selves in literary texts using *the Cultural Studies framework* requires two important factors. The first is the interplay of Western and non-Western cultures. This factor is observed in the concept of cultural and subjective spaces enunciated by writers of the two regions. Examining such spaces will help an understanding of writers' metaphorical selves. Another factor is problematising culture. World Englishes

literature demonstrate both homogenous and heterogeneous cultures for serving symbolic systems, so analysing metaphorical selves needs a deliberate interpretation of an interaction of cultures with others.

Finally, the notion of *hybridity* taken from Bhabha (1989) has implications for World Englishes; WE focuses on an emergence of Englishes in a society where habitats have linguistic and cultural pluralism. Indeed, hybridity conveys “conceptual spaces from which the intricate interactions between the West and Asia or West and Africa” (Dissanayake, 1997: 141). In literary texts, cultural hybridity can be found in a mixture of the Western and non-Western worlds in identities of characters or writers, for example. This can be observed in an ambiguous answer to the question of whether Salman Rushdie is an English or a Pakistani novelist and whether his *The Satanic Shame* is written for Islamic thoughts or the novel of manners. This author represents an outstanding instance of a creative writer who thematically and rhetorically express in English for the cultural hybridity.

As a whole, these five notions are indicative features of *the Cultural Studies framework* on analysing themes, styles, forms, and techniques in World Englishes literatures.

6. Nelson’s Intelligibility in World Englishes

Nelson (2011) proposes the theoretical framework on intelligibility in World Englishes with an application to different disciplines - pragmatics (language and communication), media studies (advertising and newspapers texts), literary studies, as well as teaching-learning (classroom interaction). This framework is grounded in Smith’s (1992) ontology of three terms regarding ‘understanding’ in World Englishes – *intelligibility*, *comprehensibility*, and *interpretability*. The first term refers to the way one recognises sound elements of an English variety he/she is hearing or reading and one apprehends the phrases and words that will provide comprehension and apprehension of intentions. The second involves the way one is capable of assigning meaning to what he/she hears and reads in order to select linguistic elements to express his/her intentions. The final is that one recognises the purpose of an utterance he/she heard or of a passage he/she read, especially regarding certain speakers/writers’ perlocutionary effects which contain real-world background knowledge, awareness of context of situation, as well as sensitivity to the wants, intentions, and reactions of others involved in a speech event.

The three concepts can be examined in the light of World Englishes literature. This is firstly evident in a textual analysis of a Thai English novel *Little Things* (1973) by Prajuab Thirabutana. This literary work presents a problem of *intelligibility*, *comprehensibility* and *interpretability*, especially in the following excerpt:

“So you’ve come? Is this your daughter that you’ve told me about?” a woman who was sitting on a low raised place in the shop greeted us.

“Yes. Ee-nang, salute Koon Maa.” (p.15)

The terms ‘Ee-nang’ and ‘Koon Maa’ make the dialogue more difficult for non-Thai readers to understand although these words are intelligible as recognisable words in Thai English and are comprehended as names or forms of address. Foreign readers need to be aware of Northeastern Thai cultural meaning of the term ‘Ee-nang’ or ‘the youngest daughter’ and of ‘Koon Maa’ which is a typical Thai term for respectfully addressing an older woman as if she were a member of one’s family. Furthermore, the word ‘salute’ here needs to be interpreted using one’s knowledge of the Thai way of saluting an older people (Nelson, 2011: 45, as cited in Y. Kachru & Smith, 2008: 65). Therefore, this text is a good example for applying this framework to a literary study in Englishes. For another example, the notions of hybridity, creativity and multilingualism are brought to this framework. An example is based on an Indian English novel *Namesake* (2003) by Jhumpa Lahiri. This writing presents a linguistic and cultural problem. Certain lexicons in the writing used for addressing the kinship terms ‘aunt’ and ‘uncle’ in India vary – “*mashi* and *pishi*, *mama* and *maima*, as well as *kaku* and *jethu*” – according to the maternal or paternal side or the marriage or blood relation. This somewhat confuses non-Indian readers. Furthermore, this writing conveys a cultural clash between Bengal Indian and American as depicted in a character’s mind. The protagonist wife, *Ashima*, worked as a birth labourer in an American hospital, and she heard a man says “I love you, sweetheart” to his couple. She has never heard this utterance from her husband, *Ashoke*. A Bengali wife is not allowed to call her husband’s name, except his surname. Such sweet words never come out of her husband, only the expression “Are you listening to me?” Understanding this character’s background, attitudes and thoughts requires one’s awareness of intelligibility, comprehensibility and interpretability. These two instances show how World Englishes literature is analysed using this framework.

7. Dawson’s Beyond the Postcolonial: World Englishes Literature

Dawson (2012) constructs the framework, namely *Beyond the Postcolonial: World Englishes Literature*, to investigate a variety of short stories written by authors in seven countries of the ex-British colonies – Cameroon, Nigeria, Uganda, Kenya, Malaysia, Singapore, and India – in order to ascertain whether they present a shift from the tradition of classic postcolonial texts (i.e. a resistance to the colonial rules and the empire’s power and ideology) to the notion of post-millennial writing of the contemporary world. Examining this framework requires an empirical study; this framework becomes recognisable after this research has been conducted by this theorist. That is, the researcher (this theorist) attempts to prove this framework using the findings of such stories through an ethnographic method of interviewing creative writers and a grounded theory of a literary stylistic interpretation. Indeed, this framework adopts only the term ‘World Englishes Literature’ according to the Kachruvian approach but the analysis of literary and interview data is based on her own integrated approach of genre and Englishes. In terms of genre, the analysis is central to several literary classifications adapted from Turco’s (1999) work - love story, crime horror, Bildungsroman, urban-political, satirical, family relations, HIV, sexuality, death, and others (i.e. urban fantasy and rape). In the light of Englishes, the framework involves the way local varieties of English or non-standard English are used in literary texts. It is noticed that the Englishes framework does not employ Kachru’s model, but Trudgill’s (1984), Crystal’s (1995), Strevens’s (1982) and Kirkpatrick’s (2007) works. This part of the analysis looks at the use of lexical, phonological, grammatical, and stylistic features

of Englishes for the following four functions: (i) written in the Englishes of the place in question, (ii) significant employment of Englishes from the place in question, (iii) some employment of the Englishes of the place in question, and (iv) Standard English – no ‘local’ English employed. Overall, certain writers of the six countries present the notion of World Englishes literature in their works beyond the postcolonial reflection as seen in their thematic development for the millennial world and employ non-standard English for enriching their cultural identity of non-Anglophones.

8. Approaches to World Englishes Literature: A Comparison and Application

The Kachruvian framework is inevitably the most influential one because of his model on Concentric Circles of English (1985), which is worldwide marketed. It has been in controversies and interest of many researchers and scholars. Hence, his literary frameworks have also received a special attention. Among them, *the Bilinguals' creativity and contact literature* (Kachru, 1986a) is the most popular one as it has been adapted or adopted by several scholars for their research papers. In the Outer Circle or an ESL context, there appear to be studies on literary writings in Nigerian English (Bamiro, 1991, 2006), Indian English (Nelson, 1992), Malaysian English literature (Lowenberg, 1992; Cesarano, 2000; Fadillah, 2000; Velautham, 2000), Philippine English (Cruz, 1986), Sri Lankan English (Dissanayake and Nichter, 1987); South Pacific Islands (Tawake, 2003), and Nepalese English (Karn, 2012), etc. In terms of an EFL context or the Expanding Circle, a number of studies employing this framework are based on China English literature (Zhang, 2002), Thai English literature (Watkhaolarm, 2005) and Egyptian English literature (Albakry and Hancock, 2008). Furthermore, this framework and *the contextualisation and lexical innovations* (Kachru, 1983) are integrated by Gargesh (2006) to study Indian English poetry. Likewise, this framework as well as *contextualisation and lexical innovations* (Kachru, 1983), and *transcultural creativity* (Kachru, 1995) become an eclectic approach to study lexical creativity in Thai English literature (Bennui and Hashim, 2013). Similarly, this framework and others – *cultural contact and literary creativity* (Kachru, 1992), *transcultural creativity* (Kachru, 1995), and *nativising mantra* (Kachru, 2003) – are integrated to examine stylistic innovations in Thai English writings (Bennui and Hashim, 2014). In this regard, Bamiro (2011) has initially used Kachru's (1995) *transcultural creativity* to investigate Nigerian English literature. Surprisingly, Kachru's (1994) *Englishisation and contact linguistics* is used to examine Japanese literature (Ono, 1992, 1999). Finally, the Kachruvian model (1986b) on using non-native English literature for classroom materials is taken to implement a classroom of Singapore English literature (Talib, 1992). This description is evident that Kachru's remaining frameworks on World Englishes literature have been pointed out by worldwide researchers due to their coverage of multilayers of linguistic and educational aspects of World Englishes – lexis, phonology, grammar, semantics, stylistics and discourse, and pedagogy. In addition, they are designed to explore features of Englishes expressed by more non-native users than native ones.

Kachru's (1995) *transcultural creativity* and Nelson's (2011) *intelligibility in World Englishes* are similar in that their construction owes Smith's (1992) terms – *intelligibility*, *comprehensibility* and *interpretability*. These terms are valuable and useful as they are extensively employed by key scholars of World Englishes. This also reinforces the strength of the two frameworks though the former is widely used rather than the latter.

Compared to the Kachruvian approach, Strevens's framework for World Englishes literature provides less linguistic aspects. That is, it focuses more on textual or stylistic and socio-cultural components of literary works by non-native English writers. Because of this, a few researchers have adapted or adapted the framework for empirical research. However, only Velautham (2000) as well as Bennui and Hashim (2014) apply this framework to interpret nativisation of rhetorical strategies in Malaysian English and Thai English fictional works respectively because of a realisation on a manifestation of non-Anglophone cultural orientation that highlights the construction of Malaysian and Thai English literary styles.

Valentine's (1992), Dissanayake's (1997), Nelson's (2011) and Dawson's (2012) frameworks have not been popular. No empirical research studies by other scholars using such frameworks are found due to their really specific areas of literary analysis. Several studies employ non-World Englishes approaches to study language and gender, culture, intelligibility, as well as generic structure of literary texts, respectively. The last two frameworks are newly constructed, thus they will take some time to interest scholars of World Englishes literature. Besides, it should be acceptable that a few researchers focus on the literary periphery of World Englishes. Currently, emerging frameworks on World Englishes are interdisciplinary – linguistics, pedagogy, media studies, professional communication, academics, as well as science and technology. Consequently, very few scholars rely on literary studies.

Overall, this comparison does not intentionally address a gap among the frameworks which have been mostly implemented in research papers. Instead, it highlights a current trend in and attention paid to particular frameworks for researchable functions.

9. Conclusion

Obviously the Kachruvian framework to World Englishes literature is still the most dynamic one as seen in a large number of studies grounded in his paradigms and concepts. Other scholars' works are not widely used. Nevertheless, it is not fair if only the Kachruvian framework is reviewed although it has been commonly known by worldwide researchers. This paper thus encourages the research community in World Englishes to pay attention to other literary frameworks as options for their literary research. This will enhance the growth of the scholarship of World Englishes literature. All the frameworks documented in this paper are significant. They are definitively a colourful representative of ongoing definitions, facets and dimensions, as well as strategies and methods of analysing and researching World Englishes literature. Their reviews and summaries here will ease researchers in search of applications for their empirical studies or argumentative papers.

10. References

1. Albakry, M. & Hancock, P.H. (2008). Code-switching in Ahdaf Soueif's *The Map of Love*. *Language and Literature*, 17 (3), 221-234.
2. Bamiro, E.O. (1991). Nigerian Englishes in Nigerian English literatures. *World Englishes*, 10(1), 7-17.
3. Bamiro, E. O. (2006). Nativization strategies: Nigerianisms at the intersection of ideology and gender in Achebe's fiction. *World Englishes*, 25(3/4), 315-328.
4. Bamiro, E. O. (2011). Transcultural creativity in world Englishes: Speech events in Nigerian English literature. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-16.
5. Bennui, P. & Hashim, A. (2013). Lexical creativity in Thai English fiction. *Kritika Kultura*, 21/22, 132-163.
6. Bennui, P. & Hashim, A. (2014). Stylistic creativity in Thai English fiction. *Asian Englishes*, 16(2), 1-20.
7. Bhabha, H. (1989). Location, intervention, incommensurability: A conversation with Homi Bhabha. *Emergences*, 1(1), 63-88.
8. Cesarano, G. (2000). Ethnolectal and sociolectal creativity in Malaysian literature with the reference to the work of K.S. Maniam. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
9. Cruz, I.R. (1986). English and Tagalog in Philippine literature: A study of literary bilingualism. *World Englishes*, 5(2/3), 163-176.
10. Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Dawson, E.V. (2012). *Beyond the postcolonial: World Englishes literature*. Hamshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Dissanayake, W. (1997). Cultural studies and World Englishes: Some topics for further exploration. In L.E. Smith & Michael L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000* (pp.126-145). Hawaii: College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature.
13. Dissanayake, W. & Nichter, M. (1987). Native sensibility and literary discourse. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 114-22). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
14. Fadillah Merican. (2000). Going native and staying strong: Malaysian fiction in English. In Halimah Mohd Said & N. Keat Siew (Eds.), *English is an Asian language: The Malaysian context* (pp. 107-124). New South Wales: The Macquarie Library.
15. Firth, J.R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934-1951*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
17. Gargesh, R. (2006). On nativizing the Indian English poetic medium. *World Englishes*, 25(3/4), 359-371.
18. Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Kachru, B. B. (1983). *Indianization of English: The English language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
20. Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning of language and literature* (pp.11-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Kachru, B. B. (1986a). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
22. Kachru, B.B. (1986b). Non-native literatures in English as a resource for language teaching. In C.J. Brumfit & R.A. Carter (Eds.), *Literature and language teaching* (pp. 140-149). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23. Kachru, B. B. (1987). The bilingual's creativity: Discoursal and stylistic strategies in contact literatures. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 125-140). New York: Prentice Hall.
24. Kachru, B. B. (1992). Cultural contact and literary creativity in a multilingual society. In E.C. Dimock, B.B. Kachru, & B.H. Krishnamurti, *Dimensions of sociolinguistics in South Asia: Papers in memory of Gerald B. Kelly* (pp. 149-159). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
25. Kachru, B.B. (1994). Englishization and contact linguistics. *World Englishes*, 13(2), 135-154.
26. Kachru, B.B. (1995). Transcultural creativity in world Englishes and literary canons. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles & practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 271-287). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
27. Kachru, B.B. (1997). *World Englishes 2000: Resources for research and teaching*. In L.E. Smith & M.L. Forman (Eds.), *World Englishes 2000* (pp.209-251). Hawaii: College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature.
28. Kachru, B. B. (2003). On nativizing mantra: Identity construction in Anglophone Englishes. In R. Ahrens, D. Parker, K. Stierstorfer, & K.K. Tam (Eds.), *Anglophone cultures in Southeast Asia: Appropriations, continuities, contexts* (pp. 55-72). Winter Heidelberg: Universitätsverlang.
29. Kachru, Y. (1987). Cross-cultural contexts, discourse strategies and discourse interpretation. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 87-100). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
30. Kachru, Y. & Smith, L. E. (2008). *Cultures, contexts, and World Englishes*. New York: Routledge.
31. Karn, S.K. (2012). This is how I can write: Towards Nepalese English literature. *Journal of NELTA*, 17(1/2), 26-39.
32. Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
33. Leitner, G. (2010). Developmental stages in the formation of epicenters of English. In O. Palusci (Ed.), *English, but not quite. locating linguistic diversity* (pp. 17-36). Trento: Tangram Edizioni Scientifiche.

34. Lowenberg, P.H. (1992). The marking of ethnicity in Malaysian English literature: Nativization and its functions. *World English*, 11(2/3), 251-258.
35. McArthur, T. (1998). *The English languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Nelson, C. L. (1988). The pragmatic dimension of creativity in the other tongue. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 173-181.
37. Nelson, C. L. (1992). Bilingual writing for the monolingual reader: Blowing up the canon. *World Englishes*, 11(2/3), 271-275.
38. Nelson, C. L. (2011). *Intelligibility in World Englishes: Theory and application*. New York and London: Routledge.
39. Ono, R. (1992). Englishized style repertoire in modern Japanese literature. *World Englishes*, 11(1), 29-50.
40. Ono, R. (1999). The use of English in the Japanese novel *Tôsei shosei katagi*: The influence of English on Japanese in the late 19th century. *Asian Englishes*, 2(2), 59-86.
41. Schneider, E.W. (2007). *Postcolonial English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. Smith, L.E. (1992). Spread of English and issues of intelligibility. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The other tongue: English across cultures* (2nd ed) (pp.75-90). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
43. Spivak, G. C. (1994). How to read a 'culturally different' text. In F. Baker, P. Hulme & M. Iverson (Eds.), *Colonial discourse/post-colonial theory* (pp.126-150). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
44. Stevens, P. (1980). *Teaching English as an international language: From practice to principle*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
45. Stevens, P. (1982). *What is standard English?* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
46. Stevens, P. (1987). Cultural barriers to language learning. In L.E. Smith (Ed.), *Discourse across cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* (pp. 125-140). New York: Prentice Hall.
47. Talib, I. (1992). Why not teach non-native English literature? *ELT Journal*, 46(1), 551-55.
48. Tawake, S. (2003). Bilinguals' creativity: Patricia Grace and Maori cultural context. *World Englishes*, 22(1), 45-54.
49. Trudgill, P. (1984). *Language in the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
50. Trudgill, P. & Hannah, J. (2008). *International English: a guide to varieties of standard English* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
51. Turco, L. (1999). *The book of literary terms*. London: University Press of New England.
52. Valentine, T. (1992). The nativizing of gender: Speech acts in the new literatures. *World Englishes*, 11(2/3), 259-270.
53. Velautham, L. (2000). *A discourse analysis of three Malaysian short stories*. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
54. Watkhaolarm, P. (2005). Think in Thai, write in English: Thainess in Thai English literatures. *World Englishes*, 24(2), 145-158.
55. Zhang, H. (2002). Bilingual creativity in Chinese English: Ha Jin's *In the Pond*. *World Englishes*, 21(2), 305-315