CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter will review the relevant literature on the new varieties of English. The different terms used by other researchers to represent stipulative terms in other new varieties of English will be introduced and discussed at length. This will be followed by a discussion on the reasons for the emergence and development of stipulative terms in Malaysia as well as other parts of the world. The researcher will also put forward the views of other researchers on stipulative terms in the new varieties of English that is, whether they are considered "deficient" or creative. This last section will be the focus of this chapter.

2.1 Terms Used by Other Researchers

As has been explained earlier in Chapter One, "stipulative" is used for a term or word that is given a new meaning that is entirely different from its lexical definition. It follows then that a stipulative definition is "the definition that arises from the deliberate assignment of a meaning" (Copi and Cohen, 1994:169).

This research seeks to identify English terms that have stipulative definitions in Malaysian English. Nonetheless, it is not only in Malaysian English that one can find stipulative terms. Stipulative terms can also be found in other varieties of English such as Nigerian English, Singapore English and Indian English to name a few.
2.1.1 Loanshift

Stipulative terms can be found in Nigerian English and Tanzanian Kiswahili English but they are known as loanshifts (Bamiro, 1994; Kishe 1994). According to Bamiro, loanshifts need not necessarily be words that have an extended meaning to cover a new concept. They can also come in the form of a group of words that are "imbued with new meanings and connotations" that are used primarily to reflect the Nigerian worldview (Bamiro, 1994:49). Below are examples of terms and phrases in Nigerian English that have stipulative definitions.

The first example is:

*It may be that he branched somewhere on the way.* (Ike, 1980:94 in Bamiro)

In Standard English, "branch" has several lexical definitions. "Branch" can take the form of a noun or a verb. If "branch" is a noun, then it could mean either one of these lexical definitions:

a) Arm-like division of a tree, growing from the trunk or from a bough.

b) Similar division of a river, road, railway or mountain range.

c) Subdivision of a family, a subject of knowledge, or a group of languages.

d) Local office or shop belonging to a large firm or organization.

On the other hand, "branch" as a verb would mean:

a) (Of a tree) send out or divide into branches.

b) (Of a road) divide into branches.

However, "branch" in the Nigerian English example cited above does not mean any of the lexical definitions indicated in the dictionary. Instead, Nigerian users of English have assigned a stipulative definition to it that is, "called at”, “visited” or “stopped by”. In
other words, “he branched somewhere on the way” means “he stopped by somewhere along the way”.

The second example is:

*He chopped the money of the people*... (Omotoso, 1982 in Bamiro, 1994:50)

In this sentence, “chopped” was used to mean that someone had embezzled money. According to Bamiro (1994:50), the stipulative definition of “chop” was derived from Nigerian Pidgin English to mean exactly the same thing. “Chop” as a verb in Standard English means “to cut something into pieces with an axe, a knife, etc” or “to hit something with a short downward stroke or blow”. When these lexical definitions of “chop” are compared with its stipulative definition, it is obvious that they do differ greatly in meaning. However, the replacement of “embezzled” with “chopped” in Nigerian English did not hamper comprehension and the stipulative definition of “chop” is already an accepted definition in Nigerian English.

The third example is:

*That was Garba, the son of the soil.* (Alkali, 1984 in Bamiro, 1994:50)

This phrase in Standard English means “a son whose father worked on the land who follows his father’s occupation” according to Bamiro (1994:50). However, in Nigerian English, a new meaning was assigned to this phrase that is, “a male indigene of a locality, especially one who is rich, prosperous and influential” (Bamiro, 1994:50).

Kishe (1994) who carried out research on Tanzanian Kiswahili English was also able to identify several English terms that have stipulative definitions when used within the context of Tanzania. However, like Bamiro, Kishe also used the label “loanshift” instead of stipulative terms. Kishe agrees with D’Souza’s (1987 in Kishe, 1994:189)
opinion that loanshift and semantic extension are the same, that is, they "arise from a shift in meaning of an established native word so as to accommodate the meaning of a foreign word" (Hock, 1986:398 in Kishe, 1994:189). An example of an English term that has a stipulative definition in Tanzanian Kiswahili English is "rhinoceros". Although the lexical definition of "rhinoceros" is "a large heavy animal of Africa and South Asia which has very thick skin and either one or two horns on its nose", this is not always the intended meaning whenever the term "rhinoceros" is used in Tanzania. Depending on the context, "rhinoceros" can sometimes be used to mean a military tank and this may probably be due to the fact that a rhinoceros and a military tank have some kind of similarity in terms of their weight and size. The phrase "to suck" also does not take on its lexical definition that is, "to draw liquid or air into the mouth or out of something" but instead means "to exploit" in Tanzanian Kiswahili English. Although the abovementioned terms may not be understood by other speakers of English, they are nonetheless significant as they reflect linguistic innovation and the development of new styles to ensure that communication among Tanzanians is ever more competent and effective (Kishe, 1994).

2.1.2 Semantic Shift

From his research on Swaziland English, Kamwangamalu (1996) also discovered that there were several English lexical items that were given new meanings within the Swaziland context. Kamwangamalu named this process semantic shift. According to Kamwangamalu (1996:303), the English words that have undergone the semantic shift process are likely to be heard in colloquial Swaziland English. For example, in this
sentence, “the money has been eaten by mice”, the word “mice” referred to individuals who have misused the public funds (Kamwangamalu, 1996) and not “an animal like a small rat with a long thin tail” as the lexical definition suggests. In this sentence, “my young father and young mother have gone to the funeral”, “young father” referred to the father’s younger brother while “young mother” referred to the mother’s younger sister (Kamwangamalu, 1996). According to Kamawangamalu, these stipulative terms reflect the culture of Swaziland.

As with Swaziland English, in Korean English, lexical items that take on stipulative definitions are also known as words that have undergone the process of semantic shift. This term was used by Shim (1994). According to Shim, there are many English loanwords used in Korea that have undergone semantic shifts. For example, “handle” stipulates a “steering wheel” while an apartment also means a condominium in Korean English (Shim, 1994:229). These words that have been given stipulative definitions are now part of a wide range of accepted “Koreanized” English words in Korea.

In his research on Indian English, Dubey also used the term “semantic shift” to describe the process in which stipulative terms are created. According to Dubey (1991:23), a language may undergo restrictions but these processes are “fairly natural” and they may even go unnoticed in a native communication. This is especially so when the participants of a conversation are familiar with the socio-cultural context of the conversation (Dubey, 1991:23). In his research on Indian English, he discovered that semantic shifts appear not only in everyday conversations but in the Indian English newspapers as well. In the matrimonial advertisements of the Indian English newspapers,
Dubey was able to identify many English terms that have stipulative definitions but they are all extremely culture-bound and thus a native speaker of English (or any English speaker for that matter) will not be able to comprehend the meaning of such terms. From the matrimonial advertisements, Dubey discovered that “well-placed” was usually used to mean “wellmatched” as in “spinster invites proposals from well-placed bachelors” (Dubey, 1991:23). “Well-placed” is not a conventional term in Standard English. Most speakers of English might think that “well-placed” actually means that a place or a thing is placed in a good or strategic position but this was not the intended definition of the writer.

In this next example, “…Sindhi…well-placed…alone looking for a bride with a male only child”, “alone” and “only child” have a similar stipulative definition. According to Dubey (1991:24), these two terms imply within an Indian context that “the person does not have any liabilities to bear, or is no longer a member of a joint family”. However, in Standard English, “alone” lexically means that someone is without any companion while the lexical definition of “only child” suggests that a person has no siblings.

In another example, the term “decent” is assigned a stipulative definition in Indian English. In this sentence, “parents well settled…seeks decent, well-established match…decent marriage assured” (Dubey, 1991:24), “decent” means that the suitable male candidate for marriage should come from a very rich family and with that a huge sum of dowry will be offered to his parents and him. This is an acceptable phrase in Indian English since it can be found even in the daily newspapers of India. However, in Standard English, this would be deemed a rather unusual term since it is not the norm to
collocate "decent" with "marriage". "Decent" in its lexical definition means "proper", "acceptable" or "satisfactory". Conventionally, one would say "a decent meal" or "a decent outfit" but not "a decent marriage" as found in Indian English.

From the matrimonial advertisements in the Indian English newspapers, Dubey found many terms and phrases that have stipulative definitions. Dubey (1991:25) believes that the semantic shifts of these terms to their stipulative definitions are significant as they reflect the rapid changing "economic values" of modern Indian society.

2.1.3 Semantic Extension

The term semantic extension was used by Bobda (1994) in his research on Cameroon English to represent the list of English words that are stipulated new meanings in Cameroon English. This is not an interlingual extension whereby an English term is used to explain a cultural element as in the case of Indian English. According to Bobda (1994:251), an English term that is involved in this process will take on a new meaning which is actually that of another word in the English language. Hence, when a Cameroon speaker of English uses the term "reach", he/she actually means "to arrive at" as in, "we left Yaounde at seven o'clock and reached Bamenda four hours later" (Bobda, 1994:252). " Applicant" is another term in Cameroon English that has a stipulative definition. "Applicant" is used by Cameroonians to imply that one is jobless or unemployed (Bobda, 1994:252) and not "a person who applies for something" as suggested in its lexical definition.
2.1.4 Meaning Changes

For Platt and Weber (1984), stipulative definitions are known as meaning changes. However, meaning changes is used in a broader sense because for Platt and Weber (1984), meaning changes does not only mean that a term is given a stipulative definition. According to the two researchers (1984:101), meaning changes in a term can come in three different forms. Firstly, a word can lose its old meaning and take on an entirely different one. Meaning changes can also mean that the meaning of a word is restricted so much so that only part of its lexical definition is implied whenever it is used. These meaning changes are very rare and hence, only a handful can be found in the new varieties of English. However, these two researchers believe that the third form of meaning changes that is, stipulative definitions is more apparent in the new varieties of English such as Singapore English and Philippine English. According to Platt and Weber (1984:103), the term “hammer” may sometimes be used by Singaporeans to mean “to tell someone off” as in “the boss, he really hammer me properly today”. Nonetheless, the original meanings of “hammer” which are “a tool with a heavy metal used for breaking things or hitting nails” and “to hit or beat something or somebody” are retained in Singapore English and they are often used in different contexts and situations. Sometimes, the term “fire” is also used instead of “hammer” to mean “telling off” in Singapore English (Platt and Weber, 1984:103) as in “my boss fired me last night” although native speakers of English would generally assume that “fire” in this context means that the person was given the sack.
2.1.5 Polysemic Variation

Stipulative terms are known as polysemic variation by Baskaran (1988) in her research on Malaysian English. According to Baskaran (1988:89), polysemic variation are “Standard English lexemes that have the original English meaning as well as an extended semantic range of meanings” that are not originally found in Standard English. For example, Baskaran (1988:89) found that in Malaysian English, “cut” was not only used to mean “to slice something” but it was also given a stipulative definition that is, “to overtake”. From her research, Baskaran also found that “open” can be used to mean “to switch on” the light or “to turn on” the tap. Nonetheless, the lexical definition of “open” that is, “to allow things or people to go or to be taken in, out or through” is still acknowledged in Malaysia. Baskaran (1988:89) believes that this process enables Malaysian English speakers to achieve the “communicative effect” faster.

2.2 Causes for the Emergence and Development of Stipulative Terms

Stipulative terms arise from nativization, that is, a process in which the English language experiences language change in a country and hence becomes a new variety of English that is distinct from its Standard or “parent imported variety” (Moag, 1982:271). According to Lowenberg (1992), when nativization of the English Language occurs in a particular country, systematic changes will come about and this include phonology, morphology, syntax, lexical items, semantic features and even conventions of discourse and rhetoric. Stipulative terms are part of the lexical items that change and develop as a result of nativization. Hence, in this discussion on the emergence and development of
stipulative terms, the researcher will look at the factors that caused nativization since the existence of stipulative terms is part and parcel of the process of nativization.

2.2.1 To Create Solidarity Among its Speakers

As a marker of solidarity (Martin, 1996 in Svalberg, 1998), language is important as it allows for speakers within a conversation to identify with each other, knowing that they belong to the same community and culture. Therefore, non-native speakers of English may sometimes choose to use a nativized variety of English instead of Standard English to speak with one another as this reflects their cultural identity. This is especially so in an informal setting whereby a speaker who wishes to speak casually can do so without restraint (Lee, 1998). It is an interesting fact to note that educated speakers of English who have the ability to speak in Standard English do not wish to speak in Standard English at all times. This is mentioned by Lee (1998) and Svalberg (1998). Lee's (1998: 11) opinion on Malaysian English is that “most Malaysians who have a command of English know how to speak proper English and when and how to switch to Manglish”. Lee mentioned that Malaysians would speak to one another in Malaysian English or “Manglish” as she calls it whenever they are in a “more informal setting” and hence, wish to communicate in a “casual manner”. On the other hand, Svalberg (1998:327) noted that Bruneians preferred to use Brunei English rather than Standard English in their casual conversations because if the “latter is used in the wrong context, it can easily be perceived as pedantic or pretentious”. From these two examples, it can therefore be said that the new varieties of English are instrumental to non-native speakers of English especially the educated ones as their usage reflects solidarity. It is indeed the
desire of a non-native speaker of English to identify with the other members of a group whenever conversations take place, so that they will not be regarded as an outsider (Fernando in Kachru, 1990). Hence, localized linguistic items are added to the English Language discourse of a non-native speaker and this includes the usage of stipulative terms. The use of stipulative terms entails solidarity among its speakers. Communicative competence is achieved since the speakers understand each other as the stipulative terms that are used are accepted and acknowledged by them (Kamwangamalu, 1996). This ultimately reflects a sense of group identity among the speakers.

2.2.2 To Meet with the Expressive Needs of the Speakers

When speaking among themselves, non-native speakers of English would prefer to use the nativized variety of English (Lee, 1998; Svalberg, 1998) as there are many expressions and things that cannot be described or explained accurately in Standard English. Hence, nativized processes such as loanwords and stipulative definitions exist so that communicative competence can be achieved in which the speaker is able to express him/herself more efficiently and accurately while the listener is able to better comprehend the speaker. These terms are effective in their purpose as they have been accepted and acknowledged by the speakers as well as the listeners and they are frequently used (Kamwangamalu, 1996). However, these terms can only be understood in a non-native context and native speakers of English will not be able to comprehend them. Their usefulness and effectiveness in conveying a message is restricted to a non-native context. For example in Malaysia, Malaysians would use “tackle” instead of “court” when they are talking about how a male is trying to win the favour of a female. Although
“court” is more appropriate and “correct” in Standard English, “tackle” is still often used by Malaysians instead of “court” because it gives the indication that the male is persistently pursuing the female by showering her with gifts and flowers (Toh, 1979). “Court” is more formal and one cannot identify with the persistence of the male in pursuing the female when this term is used.

Nativized English words are also culture-bound. Some English words may carry a different meaning in a non-native context to reflect the different socio-cultural background of a speaker (Platt, 1984). For example, the term “hawker” takes on a new meaning in Singapore English. A hawker, in Standard English refers to “an itinerant seller of various portable goods” but in Singapore, a hawker is someone who runs a stall that “sells food (in particular) or other goods” (Platt, 1984) as this is usually the case in Singapore. Although this may seem inappropriate in Standard English it is nonetheless accepted in Singapore (and even in Malaysia) and thus, is widely used by speakers of both Singapore and Malaysian English so much so that these speakers believe that this definition of “hawker” is actually its lexical definition.

According to Pride (1981), nativization is more apparent in lexical and semantic features. It is a communicative strategy for non-native speakers of English to retain certain features of their native language in English so that “successful everyday speech functions can be achieved” (Pride, 1981:65). This indicates that nativized English words are fundamental in ensuring that successful communication takes place whereby the speaker is able to express him/herself better by using nativized English terms that are a reflection of the cultural uniqueness of a particular language community. As mentioned by Bamiro (1994:48), in using non-native English, one is actually “subjecting the English
forms and norms to the socio-cultural logic and imperatives” of the non-native environment.

On the other hand, for Sridhar and Sridhar (1986 in Svalberg, 1998) and Kachru (1990), nativization is known as a “transfer of culture” that reflects positivity. Although nativized English terms may not be understood by native speakers of English, this is not a crucial matter since the new varieties of English are mainly used by non-native speakers of English who are bilinguals or multilinguals and they happen to live in a community where various languages (that may not be their mother tongue or the language that they speak) are used. What needs to be realized here is that the emergence and development of the new varieties of English can act as the “grease to make the wheels of bilingual communication” (or multi-lingual communication, for that matter) turn smoothly (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1986 in Svalberg, 1998:341).

2.2.3 Influence of the Local Languages and Mother Tongue

The nativization of English can take on many different forms such as borrowing a local word that does not have an equivalent in English and extending the meaning of a word beyond its lexical definition using localized particles. These processes of nativization may be caused by the transfer of local languages or the mother tongue of a non-native speaker to English. This is indicated by several researchers such as Lowenberg (1992) Baskaran (1988), Platt (1984), Kachru (1984) and Richards (1982). Lowenberg (1992) mentioned that the English that is used in the socio-linguistic context of Malaysia has long diverted from Standard English since there is a “relative absence” of
its native speakers. Besides this, there is constant contact with the local languages of Malaysia since they are often used by the different ethnic groups in Malaysia.

According to Baskaran (1988: 71):

In Malaysia, for instance, the variety now known more commonly as Malaysian English has, among various factors, the local languages as one of the ingredients that colour this variety (these local languages being basically Malay, Chinese and Tamil).

On the other hand, Kachru (1984), in his research on Indian English explained that the models for teaching English in India are very "Indian" since they are very much influenced by Indian languages such as Tamil, Newari, Dravidian, Kashmiri and Sinhala. Platt (1984) and Richards (1982), who have both carried out research on Singapore English found that the influence of local languages or mother tongue on Singapore English was inevitable since there was a need for the non-native speakers to identify with one another. At the same time, the assimilation of English with the local languages or mother tongue is fundamental as certain words or phrases in the local languages or mother tongue do not have an English equivalent. Hence, these words were ultimately borrowed and used when non-native speakers spoke in English (Bamiro, 1994; Kishe, 1994; Platt and Weber, 1985; Cheng 1982).

An example of local languages or mother tongue influence on new varieties of English can be found in Nigerian English. Nigerians use "wash" as in "please wash your teeth" instead of "brush" because "wash" is a direct translation from Igbo, a Nigerian dialect that means "brush" in English (Bamiro, 1994: 55). In the example, "... gatemen are bribed by the big men..." (Ike, 1980 in Bamiro, 1994:55), "big men" actually means
“affluent members of Nigerian society” and it is also a direct translation from an expression in the Igbo dialect which stipulates the latter (Bamiro, 1994:55).

In Cheng’s (1985) research on Chinese varieties of English, Cheng explained that some English idioms that were used in China were actually direct translations from Chinese idioms. According to Cheng, it would not be appropriate to phrase the Chinese idioms in “proper” English since the Chinese element in the idioms would be completely lost. Examples of Chinese idioms translated directly into English are “iron and steel and hat factories” which means “wanton attack” while “a capitalist roader” means “someone who is in favour of a capitalist system” (Cheng, 1985:133).

Hence, the researcher believes that certain Malaysian English stipulative terms are also directly translated from the local languages of Malaysia such as Bahasa Malaysia, Hokkien and Tamil. These stipulative terms with a local flavour enable the speakers who use them to achieve the communicative effect faster (Baskaran, 1988). The speaker is able to convey his/her message effectively and accurately to the listener. Examples of stipulative terms that are direct translations from the local languages of Malaysia are “cut” and “deep”. “Cut” is used to mean “overtake” and it is a direct translation from the Bahasa Malaysia word “potong” (Baskaran, 1988: 89). On the other hand, when a Malaysian uses the word “deep” in the context of language fluency as in “your Hokkien is very deep”, he/she is actually implying that the person is speaking the formal or educated variety of Hokkien (Platt, 1984:396). The word “deep” is a direct translation from its Hokkien equivalent, “chim”. Although these nativized terms may not be understood by native speakers of English, Malaysians who use them are able to achieve
communicative competence. More than that, these nativized terms reflect the unique linguistic and cultural heritage of a non-native speaker of English (Lee, 1998).

2.2.4 Inadequate Exposure to Standard English

Some researchers believe that the emergence of a new variety of English is a result of "interference" from the local languages or mother tongue of a country. According to Bamiro (1994:54), the translation of Nigerian words to English is caused by the Nigerian speakers' inadequate exposure to the English language. He called this "the constant reflexification of the Nigerians' mother tongue". On the other hand, Strevens (1982:28 in Bamiro, 1994:252) believed that the nativized variety of English is a "shortfall variation" that came into existence because of "incomplete learning, ineffective learning and tacit fossilization" on the part of the non-native speakers of English. The views of Strevens and Bamiro are favoured by Bobda (1994:252) who said that the many cases of semantic extensions in Cameroon English are actually due to the speakers' confusion between words or wrong selection of words that are semantically related. For example, "ground" is used instead of "earth" to mean the latter while a "stranger" is used to mean a "guest" or a "visitor" in Cameroon English.

Although these views imply that nativization causes the emergence of a "lesser" variety of English, it cannot be denied that these "inadequacies" are accepted within the context of these countries and as Kamwangamalu (1996:304) said:

Within the world Englishes paradigm, they have been defined as viable communication systems in their own right.
Therefore, one cannot say entirely that nativized Englishes are “deficient” and only the uneducated non-native speakers of English speak them since they do contribute to the innovation and development of new styles and rhetoric. If a person was an uneducated speaker, he/she would not be able to translate a term correctly from his/her local dialect into English in such a way where the meaning of the actual word is preserved.

2.2.5 Obeying the Principle of Least Effort and Economy of Expression

Stipulative terms are used so that the communicative effect can be achieved faster (Baskaran, 1988). This means that the speakers of Malaysian English or Singapore English, for example, use stipulative terms so that they can simplify their sentence by economizing on words. Communication is not impeded since the terms that are used are acknowledged and therefore widely used in their non-native contexts. For example, the word “open” in Malaysian English is used to refer to many different things, as in “open the tap” and “open your shoes” (Baskaran, 1988). Although the use of “open” above can be replaced by more appropriate words such as “turn on (the tap)” and “remove (your shoes)”, Malaysians tend to use “open” for these items (especially in informal situations) since it is a known fact that in Malaysian English, “open” serves many different functions for different situations. It is expected of Malaysians to simplify and economize their sentences and words since this is a communicative strategy that allows the speakers to use English to suit their needs (Wong, 1981). As Wong (1981:126) says:

...Malaysians have found that a simplified form of standard formal English more than suffices to meet their requirements in the friendly and familiar domains.
2.3 Views on Stipulative Terms

In the past decades, numerous studies have been carried out on the new varieties of English in which different responses and receptions were received from native speakers and non-native speakers of English alike. Conflicting issues that were controversial continue to arise and until today, they have not been entirely resolved. Since it has been mentioned earlier in the chapter that stipulative terms are a part of the process of nativization, the researcher, in this section, will put forward the views of theorists and researchers on the nativization of English. Two sides have always existed since theorists and researchers began to take notice of the new varieties of English and they are, namely, the views of the native speakers and that of the non-native speakers of English. Both sides, however, are not exactly at opposing ends since each side consists of mixed responses that are negative as well as positive.

2.3.1 Views of Native Speakers of English

Initially, the emergence of the new varieties of English created a general negative response on the part of the native speakers of English. According to Llamzon (1981:96), the native speakers' attitudes varied from one of "disregard, suspicion, anxiety and even hostility". These negative attitudes of the speakers may have emerged out of a sense of loyalty and patriotism towards a language that they felt belonged to them and thus, they held the responsibility of preserving it. Whatever the reasons may be, the traditional viewpoint of the native speakers portrayed the new varieties of English as a sub-standard variety that is filled with errors and will ultimately lead to a "deleterious effect" on the educational systems of many countries where English is used as a second or foreign
language (Kachru, 1988a in Bamiro, 1994:58). The new varieties of English were constantly labeled as "deficient", "mistakes" and "errors" (Kachru, 1986; Quirk, 1981:4). The native speakers believed that the new varieties of English were created out of insufficient contact between the native speakers and the non-native speakers of English and for this reason alone, they were considered signals of "language decay, language corruption or language death" (Kachru, 1986:29). The transfer of local languages into the English language were not seen as innovations or creativity but an "interference" of the mother tongue because the non-native speakers received inadequate learning and exposure to the "correct" usage of English (Bamiro, 1994; Kachru, 1986).

Some theorists have even concluded that the new varieties of English are nothing more than approximations (Nemser, 1971 in Lowenberg, 1986) and "interlanguages" (Selinker, 1972 in Lowenberg, 1986:71). These new varieties initially attempted to follow the rules and norms of Standard English but unfortunately, their attempts failed when the new varieties became "fossilized" (Selinker, 1972 in Lowenberg, 1986:71), that is, they could not develop into a standard variety due to mother tongue "interference". Prator (in Llamzon, 1981:96) called these new varieties English "British Heresy". In his view on Philippine English, Prator is against the use of Philippine English, indicating that the widespread use of this variety would cause the deliberate "lowering of instructional standards". According to Prator (in Llamzon, 1981:96), Philippine schools would greatly improve if they disregarded the idea that it is sufficient to teach Philippine English and learning American English is wrong.

Quirk's (1988 in Kachru, 1990) viewpoint on the new varieties of English also follows along the line of Prator's as he too believed that the new varieties of English
cannot be used as models to teach in a non-native speakers classroom. He held that language teachers must constantly be in touch with the native language so that their learners would be able to speak "proper" English. Like Prator, Quirk rejects the use of "identificational terms" (Kachru, 1990:8) such as "Malaysian English", "Singapore English" and "Indian English" because to him, these terms are "misleading, if not entirely false..." (Quirk, 1988 in Kachru, 1990:8).

Although these negative views on the new varieties of English continued to take centrestage in various research and conferences, new ideas and viewpoints gradually emerged in which the new varieties of English were looked upon in a more positive light. Skeptics still pondered over whether the usage of English in such a “deviant” manner was a sacrilege but apart from these ponderings, researchers and theorists are now beginning to respond to the new varieties of English differently. Non-native writers’ literary works are fast gaining world recognition (Baskaran, 1988) and these writers had a firm stand on why they chose to write in their native variety of English. As Achebe (1965 in Baskaran, 1988:92) said:

The English language will be able to carry the weight of my African experience. But it’ll have to be a new English still in full communion with its ancestral home but altered to suit its new African surroundings.

As literary scholars began to accept these works of literature, linguists such as Firth, Halliday, Strevens and Smith gradually acknowledged and accepted such varieties as well (Baskaran, 1988). The notion of “correctness” based on grammar was put aside and theorists and researchers began to question the meaning of “intelligibility” instead. The meaning of “intelligibility” needed to be defined as it could provide a clearer and more accurate scenario of the status of the new varieties of English. Different theorists
came up with different definitions of "intelligibility". Bansal's (1969 in Nelson, 1982) definition of "intelligibility" was derived out of a study that he had conducted in which a tape was played to a group of listeners who had to identify the words from the tape by writing them down or repeating them to the researcher. In this case, Bansal's interpretation of "intelligibility" is somewhat narrow and superficial as the listeners are not expected to comprehend the word but merely to identify them verbally or in written form.

On the other hand, Olsson (1978 in Nelson, 1982:63) defines "intelligibility" as a linguistic message that is "comprehended by a receiver in the sense intended by the speaker". This definition of "intelligibility", although more precise compared to Bansal's, still causes confusion because of the phrase "sense intended". Discrepancies may occur in which one may ask whether the "sense intended" means the linguistic sense of the speaker or entails an implicit meaning.

In her attempt to define the meaning of "intelligibility", Nelson (1982: 63) said:

Language as a communication system cannot be divorced from its social functioning, which requires heterogeneity for a range of situation types and functions.

Hence, for Nelson (1982), "intelligibility" is defined as a process in which a listener is able to understand what the speaker is saying with regard to the sociolinguistic context. It is not only the language, as in the phonological and grammatical features that counts. The social function of language must also be considered to ensure that communicative competence is achieved. It is through this definition of "intelligibility" that more and more theorists and researchers are beginning to consider the new varieties of English as varieties that have linguistic as well as cultural values.
Although so-called “incorrect” or “deviant” forms are often used in the new varieties of English, these forms do actually facilitate the communicative process (Nash and Fayer, 1996). The new varieties of English have taken on some linguistic features of the non-native speakers’ local languages, such as borrowing, stipulative terms and codeswitching, making these new varieties of English ever more remote and different from the native speakers’ English. Nonetheless, these nativized elements are generally accepted and used in the non-native speakers’ countries as they reflect the culture and social background of the non-native speakers. With this in mind, theorists and researchers are beginning to see the new varieties of English as “living and changing systems, naturally acquiring new identities in new socio-cultural context” (Kachru, 1986:30). The native speakers who view these new varieties of English in a positive light are called “Pragmatics” and “Functionalists” by Kachru (1986) and they believe that these new Englishes should no longer be viewed as sub-standard varieties of English since they are intelligible among their speakers and more than that, each variety of English reflects the cultural uniqueness of its speakers, allowing them to efficiently and accurately express themselves in ways that Standard English cannot. As Pride (1981:65) said:

...language varieties and styles across a wide range of significant contexts...[assist] the speakers in expressing [their] cultural identity or identities.

Native speakers also began to view the new varieties of English as creative (Quirk, 1982) especially in terms of their literary creativity (see also Kachru, 1990). The lack of inhibitions and impositions of norms and standards on these new varieties of English would enable individuals to be creative in their self-expressions (Quirk, 1982). This is already evident in the linguistic features of the new varieties of English such as
the use of stipulative terms. The positive views of the native speakers are more realistic in the sense that they have now come to a realization that English is fast acquiring "international identities" and with this comes the acquisition of "multiple ownerships" (Kachru, 1986:30).

2.3.2 Views of Non-native Speakers of English

Just like the native speakers, the non-native speakers have mixed reactions towards the emergence of the new varieties of English. Although some non-native speakers have responded positively to the emergence and development of these new varieties of English, some are still skeptical about its value and usage. For instance, in a survey conducted by Crismore, Ngeow and Soo (1996) on Malaysian English, they found that the respondents namely, students and lecturers from a higher learning institution, had conflicting views on the importance of Malaysian English. Although most of them acknowledged the fact that Malaysian English was fundamental within a Malaysian context, they were nonetheless eager to acquire Standard English. Malaysian English is widely used in Malaysia and Malaysians are generally comfortable using it especially in an informal setting but it appears that the prestige value of using Standard English is more important than the communicative value of Malaysian English. From the survey, the researchers also discovered a rather alarming fact that although Malaysians readily used Malaysian English in informal settings, the majority of the respondents felt that Malaysian English is actually broken English, filled with mistakes made by Malaysians who have a poor command of the English Language.
There were more positive than negative responses from non-native speakers on the new varieties of English. According to Dustoor (in Kachru, 1986:97), non-native speakers must be expected to speak differently from native speakers since nativized English will always have an "indigenous flavour". In fact, it was discovered that many non-native speakers do not wish to speak Standard English at all times and looked upon those who strove to speak only the standard variety of English with distaste. For example, Nigerians who spoke only Received Pronunciation or who attempted to speak it were seen as snobbish (Bamgbose, 1972 in Kachru, 1986). According to Sey (1978 in Kachru, 1986:97), educated Ghanaian speakers of English were expected to speak the localized variety of English since a Ghanaian who "strives too obviously to approximate the Received Pronunciation...is frowned upon as distasteful [sic] and pedantic". Kandiah (1981 in Dustoor, 1986) who carried out a study on Sri Lankan English discovered that like the Nigerians and the Ghanaians, Sri Lankans favoured the localized form of English and those who spoke Standard English were generally unpopular. The attitude studies conducted by Kachru (1976 in Lowenberg, 1986) and Shaw (1976 in Lowenberg) indicated that a large number of English medium educated speakers had no desire to acquire Standard English and they were comfortable using their very own nativized English since these varieties of English were able to meet the communicative needs of the speakers. Hence, one can say that the new varieties of English are the preferred choice of many non-native speakers especially in informal settings and as such, they are slowly gaining strength and recognition. Many non-native speakers of English have disclaimed the view that the new varieties of English are basically a "deviant and incorrect" form of English that resulted from lack of exposure and learning on the part of the speakers.
Since the views and opinions on the new varieties of English are varied and complex, there is indeed a need for tolerance among non-native and native speakers (Tay and Gupta, 1981) so that the issues can be slowly resolved and a more favourable response from both parties can come about. In fact, both native and non-native speakers of English should realize that language is constantly changing and evolving and therefore it can never be the same at all times (Kachru, 1990 and Pride, 1981). As Platt (1981:222) said:

There is no single "correct" English appropriate for use in all situations. Stylistic variation is natural and normal.

The English language in a non-native context must be seen as a tool for modernization. According to Kishe (1994:186), the emergence of the new Englishes is actually sociolinguistically motivated and they contribute to the "development of new styles and innovations" in the field of applied linguistics. A new variety of English taking on a local identity can serve as a "distinct identification symbol for a society, like a national flag" (Crismore, Ngeow and Soo, 1996:334).

In this chapter, the researcher has discussed and explained the factors that have resulted in the emergence and development of stipulative terms as well as the views of native and non-native speakers. The next chapter will look at the research methodology and design of this research.