**Culture**

**Culture is a regulator of human life and identity** as suggested by Antonio Damasio (2010). Cultures provide diverse ways of interpreting the environment and the world, as well as relating to other people.

**Nineteenth-Century Definition**

In the 19th century, the term culture was commonly used as a synonym for Western civilization. The British anthropologist Sir Edward B. Tylor (1871) popularized the idea that all societies pass through developmental stages, beginning with “savagery,” progressing to “barbarism,” and culminating in Western “civilization.” It’s easy to see that such a definition assumes that Western cultures were considered superior. Both Western cultures, beginning with ancient Greece, and Eastern cultures, most notably imperial China, believed that their own way of life was superior. The study of multiple cultures without imposing the belief that Western culture was the ultimate goal was slow to develop.

**Today’s Definition**

Cultures are not synonymous with countries. Cultures do not respect political boundaries. Border cities such as Juárez, El Paso, Tijuana, and San Diego can develop cultures that in some ways are not like Mexico or the United States. For example, major stores in U.S. border cities routinely accept Mexican currency.

Among other aspects, the term culture refers to the following:

• A community or population sufficiently large enough to be self-sustaining; that is, large enough to produce new generations of members without relying on outside people.

• The totality of that group’s thought, experiences, and patterns of behavior and its concepts, values, and assumptions about life that guide behavior and how those evolve with contact with other cultures. Hofstede (1994) classified these elements of culture into four categories: symbols, rituals, values, and heroes. Symbols refer to verbal and nonverbal language. Rituals are the socially essential collective activities within a culture. Values are the feelings not open for discussion within a culture about what is good or bad, beautiful or ugly, normal or abnormal, which are present in a majority of the members of a culture, or at least in those who occupy pivotal positions. Heroes are the real or imaginary people who serve as behavior models within a culture. A culture’s heroes are expressed in the culture’s myths, which can be the subject of novels and other forms of literature (Rushing & Frentz, 1978). Janice Hocker Rushing (1983) has argued, for example, that an enduring myth in U.S. culture, as seen in films, is the rugged individualist cowboy of the American West.

• The process of social transmission of these thoughts and behaviors from birth in the family and schools over the course of generations.

• Members who consciously identify themselves with that group. Collier and Thomas (1988) describe this as cultural identity, or the identification with and perceived acceptance into a group that has a shared system of symbols and meanings as well as norms for conduct.

As Collier and Thomas suggest each of us has a cultural identity. That identity may or may not be the same as citizenship in one of the world’s 200-some countries.

We can have no direct knowledge of a culture other than our own. Our experience with and knowledge of other cultures are limited by the perceptual bias of our own culture. An adult Canadian will never fully understand the experience of growing up an Australian. To begin to understand a culture, you need to understand all the experiences that guide its individual members through life. That includes language and gestures; personal appearance and social relationships; religion, philosophy, and values; marriageand family customs; food and recreation; work and government; education and communication systems; health, transportation, and government systems; and economic systems. Think of culture as everything you would need to know and do so as not to stand out as a “stranger” in a foreign land. Culture is not a genetic trait. All these cultural elements are learned through interaction with others in the culture (see Focus on Culture 1.1).

**FOCUS ON CULTURE 1.1**

**Personalizing the Concept**

Let’s try to develop a personal feeling for what is meant by the term culture. I will assume you have a sister, brother, or very close childhood friend. I would like you to think back to your relationship with that sibling or friend. Probably, you remember how natural and spontaneous your relationship was. Your worlds of experience were so similar; you shared problems and pleasures; you disagreed and even fought, but that didn’t mean you couldn’t put that behind you because you both knew in some way that you belonged together. Now let’s imagine that your sibling or friend had to leave you for an extended period. Perhaps your sister studied abroad for a year or your brother entered the military and served overseas. For some time, you were separated. Time brought you back together again, but you recognized that your relationship had forever changed because of the different experiences you had had during that separation. You still had years of common experiences and memories to reinforce your relationship, but sometimes differences cropped up from your time apart—small differences, but differences nonetheless—that led you both to know that you were more separate than you had been before. During the time your sister studied abroad, she likely acquired new vocabulary, new tastes, and new ideas about values. She uses a foreign-sounding word in casual conversation; she now enjoys fast food or hates packaged food; she now has strong feelings about politics. Of course, these are small things, but they somehow remind you that you don’t share as much as you had in the past. During the time of your separation, each of you had different experiences and challenges and had somehow been changed by those experiences and challenges. In a very simple way, this experience can be the beginning point of understanding what is meant today by the term culture. Even so, it illustrates only one aspect of the word’s definition— shared experiences.

**Cultures within Cultures**

Just as culture is a regulator of human life and identity, so can cultures within cultures be. Now let’s look at the definitions of the terms subculture, ethnicity, and co-culture as attempts to identify groups that are cultures but that exist within another culture.

**Subculture**

Complex societies such as the United States are made up of a large number of groups with which people identify and from which are derived distinctive values and norms and rules for behavior. These groups have been labeled subcultures. A subculture resembles a culture in that it usually encompasses a relatively large number of people and represents the accumulation of generations of human striving. However, subcultures have some important differences. They exist within dominant cultures and are often based on economic or social class, ethnicity, or geographic region.

Economic or Social Class

 It can be argued that socio-economic status or social class can be the basis for a subculture (Brislin, 1988). Social class has traditionally been defined as a position in a society’s hierarchy based on income, education, occupation, and neighborhood. Gilbert and Kahl (1982) argue that in the United States, the basis of social class is income and that the other markers of social class follow from income level. For example, income determines to some extent who you marry, your career, and the neighborhood in which you are likely to live. Melvin Kohn (1977) has shown that middle-class and working-class parents emphasize different values when raising children. Middle-class parents emphasize self-control, intellectual curiosity, and consideration for others. The desired outcomes of self-direction and empathic understanding transfer easily to professional and managerial jobs that require intellectual curiosity and good social skills. Working-class parents emphasize obedience, neatness, and good manners. Gilbert and Kahl (1982) argue that these lead to a concern with external standards, such as obedience to authority, acceptance of what other people think, and hesitancy in expressing desires to authority figures. These working-class concerns can be a detriment in schools, with their emphasis on verbal skills. The resulting learned behaviors transfer more directly to supervised wage labor jobs. Though these observations are based on large numbers of students, they should not be interpreted to apply to any one family. Working-class parents who encourage verbal skills through reading and conversation have children who are as successful in school. Although the United States does have social classes that have been shown to have different values, many people in the United States believe that these barriers of social class are easier to transcend in the United States than in other countries.

Ethnicity

 Another basis for subcultures is ethnicity. The term ethnicity is like the term race in that its definition has changed over time. Its different definitions reflect a continuing social debate. **Ethnicity**can refer to a group of people of the same descent and heritage who share a common and distinctive culture passed on through generations (Zenner, 1996). For some, tribes would be a more understood term. In Afghanistan, for example, people identify by tribes— Tajiks and Pashtuns. According to some estimates, there are 5,000 ethnic groups in the world (Stavenhagen, 1986). Ethnic groups can exhibit such distinguishing features as language or accent, physical features, family names, customs, and religion.

**Ethnic identity** refers to identification with and perceived acceptance into a group with shared heritage and culture (Collier & Thomas, 1988).

Just as definitions of words such as culture have changed, the way words are written has changed. In U.S. English, ethnic groups are usually referred to in hyphenated terms, such as Italian-American. The hyphen gives the term a meaning of a separate group of people. Most style manuals today have dropped the use of the hyphen, as in Italian American, using Italian as an adjective, giving the meaning of “Americans of Italian descent”—a change that puts the emphasis on what Americans share rather than on what makes groups different from one another.

What about ethnic groups, such as German-Americans, who are not commonly referred to by a hyphenated term? Does this mean these groups have lost ethnic identities in an assimilated U.S. nationality? Does this imply that the U.S. national identity is composed only of those assimilated groups?

To determine what labels to use in its job statistics, the U.S. Labor Department asked people how they prefer to be identified. The results for those people who did not identify as Asian-American, American Indian, Black, Hispanic, or multiracial are shown in Table 1.1A. Very few people chose to use the term European-American, which would indicate a culturally based identification.

Most chose White or Caucasian, which at best is a socio-historical racial label. This text uses the word White in this same sense. The same survey noted that the label preferred by native tribes is American Indian (see Table 1.1B).



**Co-Culture**

Whereas some define subculture as meaning “a part of the whole,” in the same sense that a subdivision is part of—but no less important than—the whole city, other scholars reject the use of the prefix sub as applied to the term culture because it seems to imply being under or beneath and being inferior or secondary. As an alternative, the word co-culture is suggested to convey the idea that no one culture is inherently superior to other coexisting cultures (Orbe, 1998).

However, mutuality may not be easily established. Assume the case of a homogeneous culture. One of the many elements of a culture is its system of laws. The system of laws in our hypothetical homogeneous culture, then, was derived from and reflects the values of that culture. Now assume immigration of another cultural group into the hypothetical culture. New immigrants may have different understandings of legal theory and the rights and responsibilities that individuals should have in a legal system. In the case of a true co-culture, both understandings of the law would be recognized.

Can one nation have two legal systems? Can two legal systems coexist equally? Some 309 distinct nations exist by treaty within the territorial limits of the United States. One is the government in Washington, DC. The remaining 308 are American Indian nations that enjoy some areas of complete sovereignty and some areas of limited sovereignty. By treaty, the American Indian nations have their own territory, governmental structure, and laws; collect their own taxes; and are protected by U.S. federal law in the practice of their culture and religion (Dudley & Agard, 1993). The American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 proclaimed “to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right to believe, express and exercise the traditional religions.”

 Recent Supreme Court decisions, however, have negated this law. In 1988, in Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protection Association, the Supreme Court held that the U.S. Forest Service could build a road through an area sacred to three Indian tribes. And in 1990, in Employment Division of Oregon v. Smith, the Court held that the state could deny unemployment benefits to two men fired from their jobs because they ingested peyote as part of their religion. The Smith decision has now been cited in cases involving a Sikh’s wearing a turban on the job, a Hmong couple’s protesting their son’s autopsy, and an Amish man’s refusal to post traffic signs. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 attempts to restore those rights; however, the point being made here is that the U.S. government exercises ultimate dominance over all indigenous peoples within its boundaries.

When nations adopt one system of laws, that system reflects the cultural values of one culture. But when one is surrounded by a more powerful culture or exists within the culture of the other, the less powerful culture must accept the laws and legal system of the other, thus subordinating any other understanding of legal systems. At least in this one way, the groups are not mutually powerful. The case of American Indians supports the argument that the term co-culture does not accurately reflect reality in the United States.

**Subgroup**

Just as cultures and subcultures are regulators of human life and identity, so can subgroups. Let’s look at the definition of the term subgroup and look at how subgroups can function in a similar manner to cultures and subcultures.

Definition Psychologists have long recognized that subgroups, or membership groups, have an important influence on the values and attitudes you hold. Like cultures, subgroups provide members with relatively complete sets of values and patterns of behavior. Subgroups exist within a dominant culture and are dependent on that culture. One important subgroup category is occupation. Think of large organizations and of occupations in which most people dress alike, share a common vocabulary and similar values, and are in frequent communication, as through magazines and newsletters. These subgroups include nurses and doctors, police officers, and employees of large organizations such as Microsoft.

Subgroups usually do not involve the same large number of people as cultures and are not necessarily thought of as accumulating values and patterns of behavior over generations in the same way cultures do.

Deviant Label

The term subgroup has at times been linked to the word deviant. Actually, however, deviant simply means differing from the cultural norm, such as vegetarians in a meat eating society although in normal discourse, most people associate deviance with undesirable activities.

Temporality

Membership in some subgroups is temporary; that is, members may participate for a time and later become inactive or separate from it altogether. For example, there are organizations devoted to Ford cars and trucks. Some people are preoccupied with that for a while and then lose interest and relinquish membership in the group. Membership in other subgroups may be longer lasting [such as being a fire-fighter or a doctor].

However, it is a mistake to think of membership in a culture or subgroup as being so exclusive that it precludes participation in other groups. All of us are and have been members of a variety of subgroups. Think of times in your life when you were preoccupied with the concerns of a certain group. At those times, you were a subgroup member. Examples range from Girl Scouts to youth gangs to religious cults to the military.

“Wannabe” Behavior

The term **reference group** refers to any group to which one aspires to attain membership (Sherif & Sherif, 1953). This behavior is identified in contemporary slang as the wannabe, an individual who imitates the behavior of a group he or she desires to belong to. Some people dress like and talk like gang members but are not members of any gang.

# Just as each of us has a cultural identity and one or more subcultural identities, we may, as well, have a subgroup identity. While that group membership may be short-lived, it can, for a while, provide some symbols, rituals, values, and myths that you acknowledge and share with others.

**Culture and Ideology**

**Ideology**

An ideology is a collection of ideas. An ideology can be thought of as a comprehensive vision, as a way of looking at things. Ideology can also be seen as a set of ideas proposed by the dominant class of a societyto all members of this society. For example, different types of gender ideologies would describe what roles are expected of women and men in a society\*. The ideology of economic liberalization could be seen to particularly promote the interests of the business classes.

**Ideology in Everyday Life**

Every society has an ideology that forms the basis of the public opinion or common sense, a basis that usually remainsinvisible to most people within the society. This dominant ideology appears as `neutral', while all others that differ from the norm are often seen as radical, no matter what the actual circumstances may be.

[**Influencing**](http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?ideology_and_culture_ideology_in_everyday_life_hegemony_cultural_anthropology&b=98&c=30#73516963)**Ideology**

Organizations that strive for power influence the ideology of a society to provide a favorable environment for them. Political organizations (governments included) and other groups (e.g. lobbyists) try to influence people by broadcasting their opinions, which is the reason why so often many people in a society seem to think alike.

A certain ethic usually forms the basis of an ideology. Ideology studied as ideology (rather than examples of specific ideologies) has been carried out under the name **systematic ideology**.

**Systematic ideology** began as an attempt to rationally examine and describe how people’s attitudes and ideas arise and mature. The theory is thus marked by an attempt to analyze the larger picture, and to make generalizations which transcend cultural and historical barriers. The definition of ideology commonly used in systematic ideology is the following: an ideology comprises the “basic ideas (or rather assumptions) underlying any system if ideas” which will extend to cover the “whole field of propositions – political, economic, religious, philosophical, scientific or otherwise.”

*http://gwiep.net/wp/?p=487*

\* **Gender Roles:**In some cultures, gender roles are rigidly defined, in other cultures they can overlap. In general terms, however, there is considerable uniformity in gender roles found throughout the world.Men engage in war-fare, clear land, hunt and trap animals, build houses, fish, and [work](http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?gender_and_culture_gender_stratification_suggested_readings_cultural_anthropology&b=98&c=18#94978439) with hard sub-stances. Women, on the other hand, tend crops, prepare food, collect firewood, clean house, launder clothes, and carry water (tasks compatible with child rearing). *http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?gender\_and\_culture\_gender\_stratification\_suggested\_readings\_cultural\_anthropology&b=98&c=18*

There are many different kinds of ideology: **political, social, epistemological, ethical.**

The popularity of an ideology is in part due to the influence of moral entrepreneurs [those who make

 up new morals according to their cultural needs], who sometimes act in their own interests. A political

ideology is the body of ideals, principles, doctrine, myth or symbols of a social movement, institution,

class, or large group that references some political and cultural plan. It can be a construct of political

thought, often defining political parties and their policy.

**Hegemony**

When most people in a society think alike about certain matters, or even forget that there are alternatives to the current state of affairs, we arrive at the concept of **hegemony.**

The ideologies of the dominant class of a society are proposed to all members of that society in order to

make the ruling class' interests appear to be the [interests](http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?ideology_and_culture_ideology_in_everyday_life_hegemony_cultural_anthropology&b=98&c=30#49376444) of all, and thereby achieve**hegemony**.

**IDEOLOGICAL**[**HEGEMONY**](http://www.sociologyindex.com/hegemony.htm) arises in a situation where a particular ideology is pervasively reflected throughout a [society](http://www.sociologyindex.com/society.htm) in all principal social institutions and permeates cultural ideas and social relationships. Ideological hegemony is a system of thought control.

*http://www.sociologyindex.com/ideological\_hegemony.htm*

[*http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?ideology\_and\_culture\_ideology\_in\_everyday\_life\_hegemony\_cultural\_anthropology&b=98&c=30*](http://www.zeepedia.com/read.php?ideology_and_culture_ideology_in_everyday_life_hegemony_cultural_anthropology&b=98&c=30)

# Culture and Society

**Culture** consists of the beliefs, behaviors, objects, and other characteristics common to the members of a particular group or society. Through culture, people and groups define themselves, conform to society's shared values, and contribute to society. Thus, culture includes many societal aspects: language, customs, values, norms, mores, rules, tools, technologies, products, organizations, and institutions. This latter term **institution** refers to clusters of rules and cultural meanings associated with specific social activities. Common institutions are the family, education, religion, work, and health care.

Popularly speaking, being **cultured** means being well‐educated, knowledgeable of the arts, stylish, and well‐mannered. **High culture**—generally pursued by the upper class—refers to classical music, theater, fine arts, and other sophisticated pursuits. Members of the upper class can pursue high art because they have **cultural capital**, which means the professional credentials, education, knowledge, and verbal and social skills necessary to attain the “property, power, and prestige” to “get ahead” socially. **Low culture**, or **popular culture**—generally pursued by the working and middle classes—refers to sports, movies, television sitcoms and soaps, and rock music. The definition of *culture* is different from the following terms: *cultured, high culture, low culture*, and *popular culture*.

**Society**is defined as the people who interact in such a way as to share a common culture. The **cultural bond** may be ethnic or racial, based on gender, or due to shared beliefs, values, and activities. The term *society* can also have a *geographic* meaning and refer to people who share a common culture in a particular location. For example, people living in arctic climates developed different cultures from those living in desert cultures. In time, a large variety of human cultures arose around the world.

Culture and society are intricately related. A culture consists of the “objects” of a society, whereas a society consists of the people who share a common culture. When the terms *culture* and *society* first acquired their current meanings, most people in the world worked and lived in small groups in the same locale. In today's world of 6 billion people, these terms have lost some of their usefulness because increasing numbers of people interact and share resources globally. Still, people tend to use *culture* and *society* in a more traditional sense: for example, being a part of a “racial culture” within the larger “U.S. society.”

*<http://www.cliffsnotes.com/sciences/sociology/culture-and-societies/culture-and-society-defined>.*

**Mass Media and Modern Culture**

**Key concepts:** Mass media Situated culture Mediated culture Popular culture Postmodern culture

**What do we mean by 'mass media' and 'modern culture'?**

We are to a large extent dependent on regular contact with the mass media for information, entertainment, ideas, opinion and many other things all of which are connected to our attempts to 'make sense' of who and what we are.

Our cultural experiences are affected by the development of systems of mass communication. A look at current research shows that we spend from 18 to 35 hours per week watching TV, for example. It is 'normal' to spend 3 - 4 hours per day in the company of a TV set. Large amounts of our time are spent in a range of media related activities.

To study 'media' is to study also how we define our own sense of who and what we are. What do we mean by 'culture'? How does a media text shape or construct or change cultural identity? What exactly is 'mass media' or 'mass communication'?

We all inhabit particular situations and things like our surroundings, family, friends; school, work, neighborhood and so on shape our individual identities. In media-speak we refer to this aspect of our cultural identity as our **situated culture**. In other words, the small-scale communications and interactions we have on a day-to-day basis with the place we live in and the people around us. This kind of culture is primarily an oral one - it is passed on and formed largely by intimate word-of-mouth communication.

Since the mid-19th century, we have come to live not only in a situated culture, but in a **culture of mediation**. The press, film and cinema, television and radio and more recently, the Internet, have developed to supply larger scale means of public communication. So now our situated culture exists within a much wider mediated world. The introduction of the term 'global village' in the 1960's illustrates how much our world has changed and the change is due almost entirely to the development of mass communication.

**So what do we mean by 'mass communication' or 'mass media'?**

Think of it as the transmission (sending) and reception of 'messages' on a very large scale. Most communication is done on a direct face-to-face basis in a situated cultural context and it is a two-way process. The received message can be responded to instantly. There is 'feedback'.

With mass communication there are four main distinctive features, as follows:

1. There is a gap or an institutional break between the 'sender' of the message and the 'receiver'. The makers of the media texts, the 'senders' of the messages, do not have an obvious feedback relationship with the audience (Shouting at the TV screen does not count as feedback!) Audience responses are rarely 'heard'. This means that mass-mediated culture tends to be a one-way process. Producers have to target imaginary, generalized or stereotypical audiences. They can (and do) 'shape' products accordingly. They also make assumptions about audiences that are based on conceptual ideas of what people are like, rather than how they really are. Look at any glamour magazine and you can see what the makers of the texts think men and women should look like, for example.
2. Specialized technologies, especially the internet, have begun to affect the one-way system of communication described above. In addition, these technologies have made it possible to 'capture' messages in a very physical form (photographs, film, tape-recordings) which in turn has led to historical permanence or records. Our sense of 'history' is thus affected (and some would say, constructed.)
3. Media messages can be extended 'outwards', so that events taking place regionally or locally now have glo-bal coverage (9/11, for example). Audiences are frequently calculated in billions! This has major significance in terms of media institutions. Lots of profit to be made from selling syndicated rights to the whole world's media!
4. Media messages have therefore become a modern commodity - an industry - a product. Market forces thus have a definite impact on the production and distribution of media texts. It is argued that as mass media have become 'facts of life' and we have all become socially and culturally more dependent on them.

It is argued that the media now occupy a central role in defining and interpreting the very nature of the world according to certain values, cultural principles and ideologies. We inhabit an information and consumer society as a result and concerns are expressed about exactly what effects the media have on society.

*Ideology - a set of ideas or a view of the world that is selective and gives a particular version of reality -sometimes seen as deliberately constructed by powerful groups in order to maintain power and control.*

There are three major areas of concern, as follows:

1. Mass media has a political and a persuasive power over us. Radio, TV, the press and film can manipulate whole societies. Political propaganda, advertising and the so-called 'mind-bending' power of the media are long-standing causes of debate and concern.
2. Since the 19th century there has been a mistrust of so-called **'popular culture'**, which is thought to debase or degrade cultural traditions and standards. The ongoing debate about the future of public service broadcasting in Britain in the 1990's is an example of this. What exactly is 'quality' and cultural value in broadcast output?
3. The most contentious issue concerns the effects of the mass media on social behavior, in particular violence and delinquency. The media have regularly been accused of 'causing' outbreaks of unrest in society.

**How does culture relate to mass communication?**

Culture can be defined as the beliefs, values, or other frameworks of reference by which we make sense of our experiences. It also concerns how we communicate these values and ideas.Mass media are centrally involved in the production of modern culture.

Media production, media texts and media reception are like a series of interlinked circuits. What is produced is influenced by cultural values; how the texts are formed and represented are influenced in the same way and the readings of the texts are also subject to both abstract and particular cultural viewpoints.

**What is popular culture?**

Historically (until the 19th century, at any rate) the term 'popular' was quite a negative thing, with overtones of vulgarity and triviality - something not 'nice' or 'respectable'. In the modern world, the term means widespread, liked or at least encountered by many people. It has also come to mean 'mass-produced', i.e. made for the 'mass' of people. There is a downside to this, of course, in that it can also be interpreted as 'commercial' or 'trashy'.

This leads into a further consideration, which is the definition of 'popular culture' as 'low' culture, something not for the elite, but for the 'common' people. Cultural value ('high' culture) has been traditionally associated with dominant or powerful groups - those who have appreciation of classical music, art, ballet, opera and so on. 'Low' or popular culture is everything not approved of as 'high'. It is vulgar, common, or 'easy'.

Another definition of 'popular' is literally 'of the people', a kind of 'folk' culture and this is an interesting area, because it encompasses the idea of an 'alternative' culture which includes minority groups, perhaps with sub- versive values. The 'indie' music scene is an example of this. So 'popular' culture can and sometimes does, challenge the 'dominant' cultural power groups.

**What is postmodern culture?**

It is argued that modern culture has entered a so-called 'post-modern' phase. Put simply there are four areas of definition here:

1. Because popular culture and media images dominate the age, they dominate our sense of reality. The world is now '**intertextual'** (images, copies, simulations and so on are so global that there are no authentic originals any more) The result is that popular culture has replaced art and 'high' culture and the contrived and the simulated has replaced the reality of experience and history. How and what we consume has become more important than what and how we produce.
2. Postmodernism is about style. Pastiche, collage, bricolage (the mixing and re-using of images, signs and symbols) are emphasized at the expense of content or substance.
3. Time, space history and place have become less secure - more confused. The forces of global communications and networks are eroding national cultures. This causes tension and uncertainty.
4. Postmodernism is sceptical about absolute truths, artistic, scientific, historical or political, so a secure sense of time and place is becoming more difficult to sustain. Once secure theories are now open to question and doubt.

**Conclusion**

The media have influence the development of modern life in three main ways:

**1.**They represent the emergence of large-scale systems of public communication

Newspapers & print media from the 1850s
Photography from the 1880s
Cinema in the 1900s
Radio in the 1920s
Television in the 1950s

**2**. The development of the media has had an important influence on private life, the 'withdrawal into inner

space' with TV and radio. Leisure activities have been concentrated in the home, although ironically still

connected to the outside 'global village'.

1. The media and mass communications have interacted and mixed with pre-existing cultures, forms and values, especially in the development of 'popular culture'.

© V Pope 2002

*http://www.litnotes.co.uk/mass\_media.htm*

**The Issue of Identity**

**Race**

The Concept of Race

It was popularly believed that differences between peoples were biological or racial. From the popular biological perspective, race refers to a large body of people characterized by similarity of descent (Campbell, 1976).

The biologically based definition is said to derive from Carolus Linnaeus, a Swedish botanist, physician, and taxonomist, who said in 1735 that humans are classified into four types: Africanus, Americanus, Asiaticus, and Europeaeus. Race became seen as biologically natural and based on visible physical characteristics such as skin color and other facial and bodily features. In the 19th century, scientists thought that the races had different kinds of blood, so hospitals segregated blood supplies.

Most scientists today have abandoned the concept of biological race as a meaningful scientific concept (Cavalli-Sforza, Menozzi, & Piazza, 1994; Owens & King, 1999; Paabo, 2001).

Another way to define race is as a socio-historical concept, which explains how racial categories have varied over time and between cultures. Worldwide, skin color alone does not define race. The meaning of race has been debated in societies, and as a consequence, new categories have been formed and others transformed. Dark-skinned natives of India have been classified as Caucasian. People with moderately dark skins in Egypt are identified as White. Brazil has a history of intermarriage among native peoples, descendants of African slaves, and immigrants from Europe, the Middle East, and Asia, but no history of explicit segregation policies. So in Brazil, with the world’s largest Black population after Nigeria, and where half of the population is Black, there are hundreds of words for skin colors (Robinson, 1999), including a census category parda for mixed ancestry. The biologically based definition establishes race as something fixed; the socio-historically based definition sees race as unstable and socially determined through constant debate (Omi & Winant, 1986). People may be of the same race but of diverse cultures: Australia and South Africa have very different cultures that include individuals of the same ancestries. Then, too, people can be of the same culture but of different ancestries: The United States, for example, is a culture of people of many ancestries (see Focus on Culture 1.2).

***Racial identity is how people view and identify their own race as well as other races.***

**FOCUS ON CULTURE 1.2**

 **U.S. Census Bureau Definitions of Race**

Information on race has been collected in every U.S. census beginning with the first in 1790, but what the U.S. Census bureau considered as a racial category has changed in almost every census. For example, according to Gibson and Jung (2002) from 1790 to 1850, the only categories used were “White and Black (Negro), with Black designated as free and slave” In 1860, American Indians (excluding those living on reservations) and Chinese were identified separately. Japanese were identified separately starting in 1870. During decades of high immigration, Irish, Italians, and many central European ethnic groups were considered distinct races. “Armenians were classified as white in some decades, but not in others” (Hotz, 1995, p. A14). In the 1930 census, there was a separate race category for Mexican; later people of Mexican ancestry were classified as White and today as Hispanic but who could be of any race. Immigrants from India have gone from Hindu, a religious designation used as a racial category, to Caucasian, to non-White, to White, to Asian Indian. Michael Omi, an ethnic studies expert at UC Berkeley, described the resulting confusion, “You can born one race and die another” (Hotz, 1995, p. A14).

**Identity and Race**

To be a co-culture or subculture, individuals must identify with one another as a group. Racial categories were created by power-holding Europeans who constructed the cultural and behavioral characteristics associated with each racial category, linking superior traits with Europeans and inferior traits with Blacks and Indians. Scholars from a variety of disciplines have argued that White people in the United States are observed by other groups to be distinct, superior, and unapproachable, whereas Whites themselves are relatively unaware of their racial identity compared to people of color (Dyer, 1997; Hayman & Levit, 1997; Katz & Ivey, 1977).

Peggy McIntosh (1994) uses a comparison to being right-handed. Pick up a pair of scissors, grasp a door handle, and sit at a student’s desk. They are all designed for right-handed people. Yet right-handed people do not tend to recognize how the world favors right-handedness. White culture resulted from a synthesis of ideas, values, and beliefs inherited from European ethnic groups in the United States. As the dominant culture in the United States, White culture is the foundation of social norms and organizations.

McIntosh has written about White privilege, which describes how a dominant culture empowers some:

*As a white person, I have realized I had been taught about racism as something which puts others at a disadvantage, but had been taught not to see one of its corollary aspects, white privilege, which puts me at an advantage. I think whites are carefully taught not to recognize white privilege, as males are taught not to recognize male privilege. So I have begun in an untutored way to ask what it is like to have white privilege. I have come to see white privilege as an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in on each and every day, but about which I was “meant” to remain oblivious. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, code books, visas, clothes, tools and blank checks. (p. 12)*

Are race and skin color an identifying factor determining a co-cultural or subculture identity? The answer is not simple. Race and skin color can be an identifying factor, but they don’t necessarily define co-cultural or subculture identity.

Take **ethnicity** for example. In their 1982 survey conducted among the highly mixed population of Belize (formerly British Honduras), Le Page and Tabouret-Keller found out that different people ascribed themselves to different ethnicities as either as either ‘Spanish’, ‘Creole’, ‘Maya’, or ‘Belizean’, according to which ethnic criterion they focused on – physical features (hair and skin), general appearance, genetic descent, provenance, or nationality.

**Group identity based on race** would seem easier to define, and yet there are almost as many genetic differences, say, between members of the same White, or Black race as there are between the classically described human races, not to speak of the difficulty in some cases of ascertaining with 100 per cent exactitude a person’s racial lineage. For example, in 1983 the South African Government changed the racial classification of 690 people: two - thirds of these, who had been Coloreds, became Whites, 71 who had been Black, became Coloreds, and 11 Whites were redistributed among other racial groups! And, of course, there is no necessary correlation between a given racial characteristic and the use of a given language or variety of language.

*Language and Cultureby Claire Kramsch*

[**Race** is associated with biology whereas **ethnicity** is associated with culture. Ethnicity is the term for the culture of people in a given geographic region, including their language, heritage, religion and customs. To be a member of an ethnic group is to conform to some or all of those practices. Race and ethnicity can overlap, but they are distinct. For example, a Japanese-American would probably consider herself a member of the Japanese or East Asian race, but, if she doesn’t engage in any of the practices or customs of her ancestors, she might not identify with the ethnicity, but might instead consider herself to be American.]

**National Identity**

One would think that **national identity** is a clear-cut either/or affair (either you are or you are not a citizen), but it is one thing, for example, to have a Turkish passport, another thing to ascribe to yourself a Turkish national identity if you were born, raised and educated, say, in Germany, are a native speaker of German, and happen to have Turkish parents.

Despite the entrenched belief in the one language = one culture equation, individuals assume several collective identities that are likely not only to change over time in dialogue with others, but are liable to be in conflict with one another. For example, an immigrant's sense of self, that was linked in his country of origin perhaps to his social class, his political views, or his economic status, becomes, in the new country, overwhelmingly linked to his national citizenship or his religion, for this is the identity that is imposed on him by others, who see in him now, for example, only a Turk or a Muslim. His own sense of self, or cultural identity, changes accordingly. Out of nostalgia for the 'old country', he may tend to become more Turkish than the Turks and entertain what Benedict Anderson has called 'long distance nationalism'. The Turkish he speaks may become with the passing of years somewhat different from the Turkish spoken today in the streets of Ankara; the community he used to belong to is now more an 'imagined community' than the actual present-day Turkey. *Langauge and Culture by Claire Kramsch*

**Language and Identity**

It is widely believed that there is a natural connection between the language spoken by members of a social group and that group’s identity. By their accent, their vocabulary, their discourse patterns, speakers identify themselves and are identified as members of this or that speech and discourse community. From this membership, they draw personal strength and pride, as well as a sense of social importance and historical continuity from using the same language as the group they belong to.

But how to define which group one belongs to? In isolated, homogeneous communities like the Trobrianders studied by Malinowski, one may still define group membership according to common cultural practices and daily face-to-face interactions, but in modern, historically complex, open societies it is much more difficult to define the boundaries of any particular social group and the *linguistic* and cultural identities [e.g. identity based on race, ethnicity and nationality]of its members.

In their 1982 survey conducted among the highly mixed population of Belize (formerly British Honduras), **rarely was language used as an ethnically defining criterion.** And, of course, there is no necessary correlation between a given racial characteristic and the use of a given language or variety of languages.

Language Crossing As Act of Identity

One way of surviving culturally in immigration settings is to exploit, rather than stifle, the endless variety of meanings afforded by participation in several discourse communities at once. More and more people are living, speaking and interacting in in-between spaces, across multiple languages or varieties of the same language: Latinos in Los Angeles, Pakistanis in London, Arabs in Paris, but also Black Americans in New York or Atlanta, choose one way of talking over another depending on the topic, the interlocutor and the situational context. Such **language crossings**, frequent in inter-ethnic communication, include, as we saw in Chapter 4, the switching of codes, i.e. the insertion of elements from one language into another, be they isolated words, whole sentences, or prosodic features of speech. Language crossing enables speakers to change footing within the same conversation, but also to show solidarity or distance towards the discourse communities whose languages they are using, and whom they perceive their interlocutor as belonging. By crossing languages, speakers perform cultural **acts of identity**. Thus, for example, two bilingual 12-year olds from Mexico in a US American school. M is telling F what she does when she comes back from school. M and F usually speak their common language, Spanish.

M: Mira, me pongo a hacer tarea, despues me pongo leer un libro, despues me pongo a hacer matematica, despues de hacer matematica me pongo a practicar en el piano, despues de terminarse en el piano-

F: =you got a piano?

M: I have a piano in my house, don't you guys know it?... No me digas que no sabfa ... yo lo dije a Gabriel y a Fernando ... todo el mundo. [M: Look, I do homework, then I read a book, then I do science, I do math, after doing math I practice the piano, after I finished with the piano =

The fact of owning a piano marks M as belonging to a different social culture than F who shows his surprise—and his dis­tance—by using the dominant Anglo-American language. M acknowledges her membership in that culture by responding in English, but immediately switches back to Spanish to show her solidarity with her Latino peers in the classroom, who come from more modest backgrounds.

Not infrequently speakers who belong to several cultures insert the intonation of one language into the prosody of another, or use phrases from one language as citational inserts into the other to distance themselves from alternative identities or to mock several cultural identities by stylizing, parodying, or stereotyping them all if it suits their social purposes of the moment.

**[Language crossing:** The switch from one language code or variety to another, or stylization of one variety, or creation of hybrid varieties of the same code, as an act of identity or resistance. **Act of identity:** Way in which speakers display their cultural stance toward their membership in a specific culture (2), and toward the culture of others through their use of language.]

*Language and Culture by Claire Kramsch*

**Language, Social Class and Identity**

One of the most obvious manifestations of social class is found in language— perhaps more so than personal possessions, style, or place of residence. For our purposes, we will reduce class distinctions to differences in economics, education, familial prestige, and some other ways people might rank them­selves in society. Speech differences can characterize different economic or social status. In the most extreme situations, such as the castes of India, hered­itary social classes restrict the association of their members with members of other classes, and this is often reflected in language. For example, John Gumperz (1958), who spent two years in the Indian village of Khalapur, about eighty miles north of Delhi, reported that although the population at the time of his research was only about 5,000, it was divided into thirty-one endoga- mous castes, none of which had equal status. The linguistic differences were of several types. For instance, where the majority speech, or Standard, had a contrast between single vowels /a/, /u/, and /o/ and the corresponding diph­thongs /ai/, lull, and /oi/ before consonants, this contrast was absent in the speech of the Sweeper caste, who had only the simple vowels. Where the speakers of the Standard had /u/ before a stressed vowel in the next syllable, the speech of most of the Shoemaker caste and many of the untouchable land­less laborers had /a/. And there were also some lexical differences between the vocabularies of the different castes. The larger castes had special words for items of their subcultures, such as food, clothing, and the like.

But even in places where the class differences are less pronounced, simi­lar kinds of linguistic stratification can be found. In the United States, William Labov conducted a well-known study of sociolinguistic change- linguistic change understood in the context of the society in which it occurs. Labov's pioneering work was concerned with the relationship between the social status of speakers in New York City and their pronunciation of r- sounds. The study was conducted in some of the department stores of the city in 1962. The variation of the phonetic feature under consideration ranged from the absence of (r) altogether to its presence in postvocalic po­sition, as in the words car, card, four, and fourth.

On the basis of exploratory interviews, Labov decided to test the follow­ing hypothesis: "If any two subgroups of New York City speakers are ranked in a scale of social stratification, then they will be ranked in the same order by their differential use of (r)" (Labov 1972b:44). Rather than simply com­paring the pronunciations of occupational groups representing the city's so­cial stratification, which would be difficult to operationalize and quantify, in an elegant experiment Labov chose to try to find out to what extent strat­ification is identifiable within a single occupational group. The population he selected for his study consisted of salespeople in the stores of Saks Fifth Av­enue, Macy's at Herald Square, and S. Klein at Union Square. These three stores represented respectively three status rankings—high, middle, and low—according to newspaper advertisements, the prices of their merchan­dise, the physical appearance of the store, and the socioeconomic status of their customers.

Assuming that salespeople in large department stores were likely to "bor­row prestige" from their customers, Labov hypothesized that "salespeople in the highest-ranked store will have the highest values of (r); those in the mid- die-ranked store will have intermediate values of (r); and those in the lowest- ranked store will show the lowest values" (Labov 1972b:45). To elicit the relevant linguistic data, Labov asked a question that was best answered "[On the] fourth floor." Pretending not to understand the answer, he had the in­formant repeat the phrase in a more emphatic style of speech. As soon as he was out of view of his informants, Labov recorded the two words phoneti­cally, noting not only the store in which the data were obtained but also the gender, function, race, and approximate age of the informant.

The results supported his hypothesis. At Saks, 30 percent of the sales­people interviewed always pronounced both r-sounds of the test phrase "fourth floor," whereas 32 percent pronounced them sometimes and some­times not (as though "fourth floor" were written "fawth floah"). For Macy's, results were 20 percent and 31 percent, and for Klein's 4 percent and 17 per­cent . Furthermore, at Saks the difference between casual and emphatic pro­nunciation was insignificant, whereas at the other two stores the difference was considerable. Careful, emphatic speech appeared to call for the final (r) offloor, but casual speech did not.

Although prior to World War II certain r-sounds were "dropped" (except before a vowel) in the more prestigious pronunciation of New York City, in the years since then it had become one of the markers of social prestige. By the 1960s, its occurrence had increased, particularly in formal speech. In fact, some New Yorkers pronounced r-sounds even where they did not occur in spelling, as in the words idea, Cuba, and saw when the next word began with a vowel. Such a pronunciation or usage, which in an attempt to ap­proach a presumed standard goes too far and produces a nonstandard form, is called hypercorrection. In short, as Labov's study showed, the pronunci­ation of r-sounds in the dialect of New York City was quite variable, de­pending on social factors such as status or class, and speech context such as casual versus emphatic speech.

Collecting authentic sociolinguistic data is not a simple matter because speakers are likely to adjust their manner of speaking if they are aware of being carefully observed or recorded. One way for the investigator to divert speakers' attention from their own speech is to lead informants into a relaxed dialogue. Natural speech also tends to characterize topics that help re-create emotions, as when one asks an informant, "Have you ever been in a situation where you were in serious danger of being killed? . . . What happened?" The answer to such a question is likely to be spontaneous, that is, given in an un­affected manner (Labov 1972b:209-210). Tape-recording data has a great ad­vantage over writing out a phonetic transcription of speech. Recording conversation between two or more speakers, or recording one speaker long enough or often enough for the person to become unconcerned, is preferable to recording a more or less formal interview that may well keep the inform­ant from relaxing into the vernacular—the casual, normal spoken form of the language or dialect of the person's speech community.

In early sociolinguistic studies, scholars sought to identify language vari­eties and relate them to social differences among speakers. Since the mid- 1960s, largely because of the stimulus of Labov's work, linguists have emphasized the use of the quantitative method in order to be able to describe with some accuracy the relationship between social differences and linguis­tic varieties. From the incidence and distribution of language variables in different social groups, scholars expect not only to learn the rate and direc­tion of linguistic change but also to obtain valuable clues concerning the mo­tivations that lead to such change.

In this connection, it may be appropriate to introduce the concept of social network. Each speaker has a social network that includes all those people with whom a speaker interacts. A high-density network refers to a group of indi­viduals who are in frequent contact and are therefore familiar with each other. A multiplex social network is one in which interacting parties share more than one role, often reciprocal—for example, employer/employee as well as father- in-law/son-in-law. The denser and more multiplex the network, the stronger it is (perhaps the father-in-law and son-in-law are also members of a chess club and a choral society). Members of a strong network tend to make use of what is referred to as restricted code—informal speech lacking in stylistic range because the speakers share enough assumptions that some of the mean­ing of their messages is derived from context and gestures. By contrast, elab­orated code refers to the variety of language use characteristic of relatively formal speech situations. In such situations, little if any, reliance is placed on extralinguistic context to make the message fully meaningful.

**Language and Gender**

J. K. Chambers in his textbook on sociolinguistic theory (1995:102) states categorically that "in virtually all sociolinguistic studies that include a sam­ple of males and females" there is unequivocal evidence that "women use fewer stigmatized and non-standard variants than do men of the same social group in the same circumstances." Although admitting specific cultural dif­ferences, he claims this finding holds true cross-culturally as well.

Among the questions to be asked are: Do members of a society (group) dif­ferentiate gender in their speech behavior? If so, what forms does this dif­ferentiation take, under what culturally authentic circumstances does it occur, and does it have any effect on the nonverbal behavior of a society's members? To what extent is any differentiation of gender in speech the re­sult of socialization, and more specifically, how does the expression of gen­der in speech relate to such aspects of social identity as ethnicity, so-called race, age, and socioeconomic class? Under what circumstances do men and women interact as equals (or nearly so), and under what circumstances do they not?



**Gender and Speech in American Society**

In American English, some dif­ferences have been noted in intonational patterns between male and female speakers. If one analyzes intonational contours as four relative pitch levels, then men tend to use only three, hardly ever reaching the highest one. Con­sider, for example, how men and women say the phrase "Oh, that's terrible!" Women's range frequently includes all four. Among the contours very rarely heard from men is the full downglide from the highest to the lowest pitch level, as when expressing surprise, excitement, concern, and the like. In gen­eral, women's speech appears to be more dynamic, making greater use of paralinguistic features and extending over a broader pitch range.

Scholars have described a variety of differences between the speech of men and women. For example, in a small sample of children in a semirural New England village studied by John L. Fischer (1958), the girls were more likely to pronounce the present-participle suffix -ing [ig] rather than -in [in], a form used more frequently among the boys. The choice between-ing and -in' appeared to be related not only to gender but also to the personality (aggressive versus cooperative) and mood (tense versus relaxed) of the speaker, the nature of the conversation (formal versus informal), the so­cioeconomic circumstances of the family (above versus below median), and the verb used (for example, attending versus goin' to).

The choice of words by men and women varies according to the occasion, the type of audience present, and various other circumstances. Profane or coarse speech is less likely to be heard when children or people held in re­spect are within earshot, and a job interview calls for a more considered vo­cabulary than a casual conversation between two close friends. Nevertheless, some lexical differences between the speech of men and women are fairly common and can be illustrated from American English. Certain words are used by women much more frequently than by men. Among such words are expressive adjectives that convey approval or admiration—for example, delightful, spectacular, charming, divine, lovely, fascinating, and sweet—and fashionable color names—for example, beige, chartreuse, fuchsia, magenta, and mauve.

Men are much more likely to phrase their approval or liking for something by using a neutral adjective, such as fine, good, or great, and reinforcing it, if necessary, with such an adverb as damn, as in "That was a damn good show." As a rule, men's color vocabulary is much less discriminating, and hence somewhat poorer, than women's. But in the United States differences between men's and women's word choices seem to be steadily growing smaller. For ex­ample, until a decade ago, sweet and awesome were slang terms exclusively used by young women, but now these adjectives are commonly used by both genders. And profanities are now casually used by many young women whose mothers and grandmothers not only would never have uttered them but would probably have been embarrassed even to hear them. Nonetheless, on the whole, as several authors have noted, in careful speech women are likely to use fewer stigmatized words than are men.

One of the characteristics of women's speech—particularly of older women—is the use of a "tag question" in certain contexts. The term refers to a question attached to an utterance to obtain the assent of the addressee, as in "That was a silly thing for them to do, wasn't itV' Seeking confirmation or validation of a statement may indicate the speaker's desire to avoid as- sertiveness. A "tag" in the form of a question may also be attached to an order or a criticism to soften it, as in "Answer the phone, would you?" or "You are drinking a bit too much, don't you think?" Another purpose of the tag question is to include the person spoken to in friendly conversation by of­fering the opportunity to respond, as in "It's a beautiful day, isn't it?" Today, younger women use tag questions much less frequently. When men use tags, they do so to obtain or confirm information, as in "To get this work done, I would have to leave the car here until sometime tomorrow, wouldn't I?" On the subject of tag questions, some scholars have argued that "a more sophis­ticated view of the complexity of both linguistic and social behaviour" is needed (Cameron, McAlinden, and O'Leary 1988:92).

Another way women may try to avoid assertiveness is to use so-called hedge words or phrases, such as maybe, rather, perhaps, I guess, sort of, I am wondering, and others. A sentence using a hedge word may even be com­bined with tag questions, as in the first of the following examples: "You are rather tired, aren't you?" "I have been kind of wondering if I should go" " Well,I guess I might have been right" and "Maybe we could try adding some sea­soning" Once again, young American women tend to use less of this type of speech behavior, or to be free of it altogether.

To sum up, in American English there are no pronunciations, grammat­ical forms, words, or sentence constructions that are employed exclusively by men or by women. Rather, what differences there are between male and female speech have to do with the frequency with which some usages are employed by one sex or the other. That these differences are decreasing rather than maintaining themselves or growing is an indication that long­standing social differences between women and men are in the process of breaking down.

Other differences between the speech behavior of men and women were suggested. For example, some investigators found that when women talk with other women on a social basis, favored topics are relationships, social is­sues, house and family, the workplace, and personal and family finances. When men talk with other men, the favored topics have been work, recre­ation and sports, and women. In other studies of speech behavior, women interviewees were found more cooperative and polite, and offered more in­formation than did men.

And with respect to any society, the following issues may be considered: what counts as a turn (rotation of speakers) in a discourse; how turns and in­terruptions are handled; to what extent culture-specific gender differences may be overridden by culture-specific socioeconomic and other hierarchies; what cues male and female speakers use to allocate turns; and so on. In short, important as the male/female distinction may be in a particular society, one should never assume that it is the only, or the main, criterion as to how the various aspects of communicative behavior are chosen and employed.

Some scholars have approached the topic of speech behavior of the gen­ders with the view that women's language reflects men's dominance over them. They note that in many societies, American society included, men tend to control conversations. Furthermore, their talk is usually blunt (some­times even tough), straight, and colloquial in style. Others have pointed out that women are usually better conversationalists, raising the level of dis­course by striving for more harmonious relations with their face-to-face interactants. The great majority of languages, however, give grammatical priority to males: In deriving nouns designating females from nouns desig­nating males—for example, aviator-aviatrix, duke-duchess, hero-heroine, and waiter-waitress; instances of derivation in the opposite direction are few; only two come readily to mind: widow-widower and bride-bridegroom.

**Gender and Speech: Theoretical Movements**

In the mid-1960s and early 1970s, when phonological differences as markers of social class were being investigated by William Labov and his students, he also suggested that gen­der might be marked in a similar fashion. Probably the most influential work at that time was Robin Lakoff's Language and Women's Place (1975). She found not only phonological differences but also subtle differences in the lexicon and syntax. Some instances of these included **greater use of tag questions** (" . . ., right?"; " . . . don't you think?") **greater use of polite forms** ("If you don't mind, could you . . . ") **greater use of wh- words**("Why don't we go to the store?") **greater use ofhedges** ("I kinda like it") **greater use of apologies** ("Sorry to bother you, but. . . ") **greater use of intensifies** ("That's so so adorable!") **greater use of certain "women's vocabulary**" (e.g., colors) **greater use of modal auxiliaries** ("We ought to/should/might. . . ") **wider range of intonation greater use of adjectives expressing admiration** ("She wore a divine dress") **less use of swear words or profanity.**

In addition, Lakoff explored how language was used for different commu­nicative purposes by men and women.

We might view current work on gender and language through **[two]** ap­proaches: **subculture theory and social power theory.**

Subculture theory claims that the social lives of women lie in a subcul­ture somewhat apart from the mainstream. Women and women's language are marked as different from men and men's language. As we saw in a pre­vious section, this is why we find certain marked terms for women, such as actress, waitress, woman, bachelorette, and female, derived from the mascu­line forms. In other words, men's language is thought to offer the normative forms from which women's terms are derived.

The linguist Deborah Tannen is perhaps the most active proponent of the subculture theory, and advocated this notion in a series of professional and popular best-selling books such as You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation (1990), Talking from Nine to Five: Men and Women at Work (1994b), and That's Not What I Meant! How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relations with Others (1986). Tannen calls gender-associated varieties of language genderlects. According to Tannen, each gender has dif­ferent means of accomplishing conversational goals, and perhaps ultimate ends as well. The goal for men in communication is to send factual infor­mation, which Tannen calls the report style. On the other hand, women want to build and maintain relationships among participants of the conversations, which she calls the rapport style.

Social power theory goes back to the 1980s when William M. O'Barr and Bowman K. Atkins (1998) studied how witnesses speak in court. In several important ways their work challenges the approaches of Lakoff's and Tan- nen's views of women's language. O'Barr and Atkins studied courtroom wit­ness testimony for a two and half years, looking at the ten speech differences between men and women proposed by Lakoff and others. They concluded that speech patterns were "neither characteristic of all women nor limited only to women." Instead, they found that women who used the lowest fre­quency of women's language traits had unusually high social or economic sta­tus (for example, being well-educated professionals with middle-class back­grounds). A similar pattern was found for men (i.e., men with high social or economic status spoke with few women's language traits). O'Barr and Atkins argued that it was power and status, rather than gender, that accounted for these differences. A powerful position that "may derive from either social standing in the larger society and/or status accorded by the court" allowed speakers—both male and female—certain linguistic advantages. Thus, what the so-called women's speech is really manifesting is difference in power within mainstream society, where women typically are at a disadvantage.

**Language, Race and Ethnicity**



African-American English. A good example of an ethnic language variety is African-American English (AAE) in the United States. To begin with, we should say that such terms as "African American English" or "Black English" are open to some criticism because they imply that all people of African an­cestry in America speak the same way. Thus, these labels should be used with some degree of caution.

AAE is characterized by pronunciations, syntactic structures, and vocab­ulary associated with and used by a fairly large number of African-Ameri­cans. Some of those who speak AAE use it habitually; others use it in certain situations, Standard English in others. As the speech of a sizable portion of a population living in a continent-sized area, AAE is no more uniform than the English spoken by other Americans. It exhibits a wide range of pronun­ciations and forms varying as to the degree in which they differ from each other and from Standard English. Some AAE pronunciations characterize Southern speech in general, black and white, although they are likely to occur in AAE with greater frequency or to a larger degree.

 Spoken rather than written (with the exception of those writers who try to represent faithfully the AAE of their characters), AAE is used to great ef­fect by African-Americans ranging from religious and civil rights leaders to school dropouts spending most of their time in the streets of black ghettos. Studies made of their speech have repeatedly established the importance as­signed to verbal skills at all levels. Far from being limited to ordinary com­municative functions, AAE ranges from the rhyming narrative poetry of so-called toasts to the accommodating style of "shucking (it)" and "jiving" on the one hand and the more aggressive needling or goading referred to as "sig­nifying" on the other.

 Because of the dialectal variation that exists in AAE, only some of its most prominent and common characteristics are discussed here. These features are not found in the speech of all African-Americans, particularly some of those who have lived in the North for several generations. For the most part, these features characterize the nonstandard variety of English spoken by African-Americans in urban ghettos of the United States, a variety referred to as African-American Vernacular English (AAVE).

 In pronunciation, the vowels of AAVE tend to be much more variable than consonants. The most common vowel contrasts of Standard English that are likely to be lost are in such word pairs as pride and prod or find and fond as well as pride and proud or find and^found, which in AAVE tend to be pronounced alike. The loss of contrast in these and similar word pairs is usu­ally limited to the position before the consonants b, d, g, m, n, r, and I. The words oil and all and similar word pairs also frequently sound alike in AAVE, in particular when vowels are followed by the consonant I. Finally, such word pairs as fear and fair and sure and shore may be pronounced alike; in terms such as these, the loss of vowel contrast is conditioned by the consonant r that follows the vowels.

 The least stable consonants of AAVE are those found at the end of words. The sound written as th may be heard in the final position as/, making the words both and with rhyme with loaf and sniff, respectively. The consonants r and / tend to be weakened or are completely lost. After a vowel, the weak­ened r makes such words as sure, shoe, and show or your and you sound alike or nearly so; r between vowels may be lost completely, leading to such pro­nunciations as inte'estin', pass, and tess for interesting, Paris, and terrace, re­spectively. A weakened / before a consonant may be heard in such words as help or wolf; when it is completely lost, such word pairs as fooled and/ood, toll and toe, or bolt and boat come to sound alike.

The stops t and d are quite commonly lost or modified after another con­sonant: Thus last may come to sound like lass, mend like men, rift like riff, and told like toll. Other final consonant clusters are frequently subject to sim­ilar simplification, resulting in the pronunciation dess for desk or liss for lisp. Other differences from Standard English are less generalizable.

Grammatical differences are usually more noticeable than differences in pronunciation or vocabulary. This is so because it is the use of "proper" gram­mar that is associated with a style of speaking considered prestigious and wor­thy of imitating. From the perspective of linguistic anthropology, the grammar used by native speakers of any language variety cannot be termed incorrect, even when it differs from other dialects or the standard itself. Some of the features that differentiate the grammar of AAVE from Standard Eng­lish are to be found in the speech of non-African-Americans as well.

When compared to other European languages, English has few inflec­tional suffixes; the tendency in AAVE is for even these few to be weakened or lost. The -s of the third person singular is frequently lacking in AAVE verbs, as in "Johnny run" or "He eat meat." The -5 marking the possessive (spelled's) may be lost, as in "Hand me that man coat." The -5 in the plural of nouns is retained, as in desses for desks after the simplification of the word- final consonant cluster -sk in the singular, but there is a tendency toward making irregular plurals regular, that is, making use of such forms as foots, mens, and childrens for feet, men, and children.

The past tense of verbs is either retained as in gave, weakened as in kep (instead of kept) or toll (instead of told), or lost altogether as in "He pay me yesterday." When there is an option in Standard English to use a contraction, for example, "He is going" to "He's going," AAVE offers the additional op­tion of full deletion of the form of be, resulting in "He going." When the op­tion to contract does not exist in Standard English, as in the latter part of the sentence "That's the way it is here" (one would never say "That's the way it's here"), the option to delete the form of be likewise does not occur in AAVE, which would use "That the way it is [or be] here." The phrase there is that introduces a sentence or clause is replaced in AAVE by it is or the contrac­tions it's or simply 's.

In comparison with Standard English, AAVE is characterized by multi­ple negation, as in the following sentences that are to be understood as state­ments rather than questions: "Didn't nobody see it," "Wasn't nobody home," "Ain't nobody complainin but you, man," and "I don't got none."

The verb form be, as in "She be busy," contrasts in AAVE with its ab­sence, as in the corresponding "She busy." The latter, "She busy," means that the person referred to is busy at the time the statement is made. "She be busy" denotes a habitual or repeated state of busyness, what in Standard English would be expressed as "She is always busy," "She keeps busy," or "She is often busy."

AAVE further differs from Standard English in specialized vocabulary, variant stress patterns on certain words, and the like. Despite these and other features that set the two Englishes apart, however, the adjustment a non- speaker of AAVE has to make to comprehend it is no more than the effort needed to understand cockney.

Scholars disagree on the current developmental tendencies in AAVE. Some believe that the long-standing but slow decreolization is continuing, that is, that the speech of African-Americans is converging with the English spoken by non-African-Americans. Others, including Labov, have reported that as a result of the increasing segregation and isolation of urban African-Americans from the rest of the society, and despite the homogenizing influence of the media on language, AAVE appears to be steadily diverging not only from Standard English but from regional and local white dialects as well. If this is so, children who speak it will encounter even more difficulties when at age six they enter an environment that uses a strikingly different code.

**Language and Nationality**

In the last decades of the twentieth century, many scholars argued that "eth­nicity is not always the survival of cultural diversity born of geographical and social isolation, but may be the outcome of intensive interaction, a con­stellation of practices that evolve to channel complex social relations" (Woolard 1989:3). Following this approach, Susan Gal (1979:3) studied lan­guage shift in Oberwart, a bilingual area in eastern Austria. After 400 years of Hungarian-German bilingualism, German began replacing Hungarian in everyday conversation as well as in local business. She asked:

By what intervening processes does industrialization, or any other social change, effect changes in the uses to which speakers put their languages in everyday interactions? How does the social change affect the communicative economy of the group? How does it change the evaluations of languages and the social statuses and meanings associated with them? How does it affect the communicative strategies of speakers so that individuals are motivated to change their choice of language in different contexts of social interac­tion—to reallocate their linguistic resources radically so that eventually they abandon one of their languages altogether?

We might ask these questions even more broadly. Is speaking the same language sufficient grounds for people to establish a nation? Should all peo­ple in the same nation speak the same language? If the answer to both ques­tions is no—and probably most people in the twenty-first century would agree—what should be the status of "minority" languages in multilingual so­cieties? Because of the symbolic value of language—especially with regards to group solidarity and the ethnic identity of its speakers—language choice, maintenance, and shift are some of the most important personal and politi­cal social issues of any community.

In this section we will focus on language and the nation-state. We will look at how the symbolic value of languages is used by the people to pursue political power and ends, and foster consciousness among members of the group. **[We will look at two case studies: India and Canada]**

**India**

 Occupying an area only one-third as large as the United States but with the second largest population in the world (of more than a billion peo­ple), India is one of the most multilingual countries in the world. What makes India one of the world's most linguistically diversified nations is that more than 400 languages are spoken there (Gordon 2005: 353); they span at least four language families (Indo-European, Dravidian, Austroasiatic, and Tibeto-Burman), as well as some isolates. There are twenty-two official "scheduled" languages recognized in the Constitution. Although English is not a legally sanctioned language, the Presidential Order of I960 states that it "should be the principal official language and Hindi the subsidiary Offi­cial Language till 1965. After 1965, when Hindi becomes the principal of­ficial language of the Union, English should continue as the subsidiary official language."

How does India, a federal republic, deal administratively with such a vast collection of languages? On a regional basis, eastern India is dominated by three Indo-European languages (Bengali, Oriya, and Assamese), western India by two (Marathi and Gujarati), northern India by four (Hindi and Urdu, Panjabi and Kashmiri), and southern India by four languages of the Dravidian language family (Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, and Malayalam). The principal official language in six of the twenty-five states of the republic as well as of the country at the federal level is Hindi. However, as long as many non-Hindi-speaking citizens are reluctant to accept Hindi, English—the lan­guage of those who governed most of India as a British crown colony for nearly a century—serves as the associate national language and as a lingua franca acceptable in both the Hindi-speaking north and the Dravidian- speaking south.

In a country where many languages are spoken but do not all enjoy the same degree of prestige, bilingualism, multilingualism, and diglossia are of common occurrence. For interethnic oral communication of an informal nature, Hindi or Urdu is used to a varying degree throughout the country (the two are very similar in their colloquial forms, but Hindi is written in the Devanagari script, Urdu in a modified form of Arabic script). For reasons of cultural prestige, there has been some resistance to the use of Hindi as a contact language in the Dravidian-speaking part of the country and in Ben­gal. For formal and written communication, English (its South Asian variety) is used to a great extent. The importance of English can readily be seen: In 1977, although newspapers and periodicals in India were available in about seventy languages, Hindi- and English-language newspapers and periodi­cals accounted for, respectively, 26 and 20 percent of the total published, and those in English had the highest circulation. When India became independ­ent in 1947, the official use of English was intended to be only temporary. But the need for English continues and in some respects has even increased. For example, to translate technical and scientific works into Hindi would be a nearly impossible task. Today, more than a half century after India gained independence, knowledge of English is still considered indispensable for high government positions, and although only a very small percentage of the population speaks and reads English, Indians with a knowledge of Eng­lish tend to be the cultural, economic, and political leaders.

Such a large linguistic variety (in both languages and dialects) as exists in India poses a number of questions. Although it might be expected that one official language would tend to promote unity in a multiethnic nation, such unity would be achieved at a considerable loss of prestige to other native lan­guages spoken by many millions of people. This is why the most widely used second language in India, Hindi, has encountered resistance in many parts of the country. And this is also why a nonindigenous and formerly colonial language, English, has maintained itself surprisingly well as an associate of­ficial language since India's independence and will undoubtedly continue to do so in the future. A second language for many Indians, English does not give an advantage to speakers of one particular native language, as does Hindi. Another question has to do with determining the languages to be taught and used for instruction in Indian schools. What eventually became known as the three-language formula has resulted in secondary students being taught the regional language, Hindi, and English (and in many in­stances their mother tongue is yet a fourth language or local dialect).

Throughout much of the world, dialectal differences have tended to di­minish rapidly in recent decades as a result of the mass media, education, and mobility. This has not happened in India, where caste differences are effectively symbolized by speech differences. As long as the old and well- established social hierarchy persists, linguistic differences serve a useful function and are likely to be retained.

****

**-------------------------------------------------------------**

****

**Canada**

 As in India and the United States, there is great linguistic di­versity in Canada—some eighty-five languages being spoken (Gordon 2005:235)—but the biggest issue is the tension between the two official lan­guages, French and English. Problems of bilingualism have always been the central issue in the nation's politics even before the Confederation of 1867. Jacques Cartier landed in current Quebec in 1534 and claimed the territory for King Francis I, eventually calling it New France. A century and a half later, British entrepreneurs, incorporated by royal charter, started fur trad­ing in the Hudson Bay area in northern Canada. After that, animosity be­tween France and Britain gradually increased, and as a result of the Seven Years' War (1756-1763), the British government took over lower Canada and New France (which was renamed Quebec). The differences between these two colonial populations were significant. French colonists spoke French, practiced Catholicism, and followed the French civil code; British colonists spoke English, practiced Protestantism, and followed traditional English common law. To avert further local conflict, the British passed the Quebec Act of 1774; this guaranteed the residents the use of the French lan­guage, Catholicism, and French civil law. This practice was reified several times, and in 1969 the Official Languages Act made English and French Canada's two official languages. According to 2007 government figures, about 60 percent of Canadians claim English as their native language, as do about 23 percent for French. The majority of these French speakers—about 85 percent—live in Quebec. More than 17 percent of the population is bilin­gual in French and English.

In spite of the unique characteristics and background of the original British and French settlers, Anglophone Canadians began to control most elite positions in business and industry, even in Quebec. By the 1960s, many Francophone residents began to feel that the French language was being overwhelmed by English. To maintain Canada's professed bilingualism, the federal and local governments created various departments and institutions to oversee the use of the languages in the province. For some Canadians, one of these—the Quebec Board of the French Language—has sometimes been draconian in its enforcement of language policies. For example, the Board's "language police" (as labeled by some nationalist newspapers) gave tickets to shop owners who neglected to provide signs in French. However, by the end of the twentieth century, such extreme policies were rescinded, and the laws modified to make French just markedly predominant on exterior busi­ness signs, as suggested by the Supreme Court of Canada.

For the most part, the promotion of personal bilingualism in English and French is an important objective of the Canadian government (though one not always easily obtained or consistently supported). For example, in 2003, the federal government announced a ten-year goal to double bilingualism among Canadian college graduates from 24 percent to 50 percent by 2013. In 1970, the federal government launched the official languages in education program and supported French-language immersion education in many An­glophone public school districts. However, the influence of English still re­mains strong. According to Monica Heller (1988), because of the social and economic tensions between Francophone and Anglophone speakers in Que­bec, how bilingual speakers of French and English see these two languages is highly charged. An awareness of the social value of the two languages re­flects how they are used in daily conversations.

These language issues have important political implications. Some believe that the only way to protect the French language and Francophone rights is for Quebec to split off from the rest of Canada. This has been an issue in al­most every election since the 1980s. Although it is unlikely that Canada will divide, the cultural and linguistic tensions remain.

**Linguistic and Cultural Imperialism**

**Linguicism** has been defined as 'ideologies, structures, and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and unmaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language', as Phillipson says in his book *Linguistic Imperialism* , in which English**linguistic Imperialism** is seen as a type of linguicism.





The spread of English is undeniable, and it is viewed by those who suffer from it as a totem for a certain Anglo-American 'culture' or way of life, but it is not clear whether the appropriate response in the long run is to make English and other languages into cultural icons, or to rely on the remarkable ability that speakers have to create multiple cultural realities in any language. This is not to say that linguistic pluralism is not a desirable good in itself. The Babel threat is not the splintering off in mutually unintelligible languages, but the monopoly of one language over others. As in Babel's days, the complacent belief that people are working for a common cause just because they speak a common language is a dangerous illusion. Being human means working through the shoals of mutual misunderstanding.

**Summary:** Although there is no one-to-one relationship between anyone's language and his or her cultural identity, language is *the* most sensitive indicator of the relationship between an individual and a given social group. Language is an integral part of ourselves - it permeates our very thinking and way of viewing the world. It is also the arena where political and cultural allegiances and loyalties are fought out.

[**Linguicism:** Term coined by Robert Phillipson to refer to discrim­ination and prejudice on the grounds of language, analogous to racism, sexism. **Linguistic imperialism:** Worldwide expansion of one language at the expense of others.]

*Language and Culture by Claire Kramsch*

**English: from British empire to corporateempire**

RobertPhillipson

DepartmentofInternationalLanguageStudiesandComputationalLinguistics,CopenhagenBusinessSchool,Denmark rp.isv@cbs.dk

**Abstract**
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# 1. Introduction

TherearecountlessbooksandjournalsbeingpublishedinEnglishonthehistoryofthelanguageand its assumed status as a ‘global’ or ‘world’ language. Likewise there areauthoritativepublications (encyclopaedia, handbooks) in English covering language policy, the ecologyoflanguages, linguistic human rights, and threats to worldwide linguistic diversity. There is also avast amount of sociolinguistic coverage of many languages in books and journals, including analysesofthecurrentpositionofGermanandSpanishinternationally,writteninEnglish.Thisinformationoverload in English contrasts with the paucity of works in French and German onmacro-sociolinguisticissuessuchaslanguageinglobalisationorregionalintegration.Onecanconcludethereforethat,evenifthereissignificantcoverageoflanguagepolicytopicsinJapanese,Spanish, Russianandotherlanguages,scholarlypublishingintheareaoflanguagepolicy,languageandpower, and linguistic imperialism confirms Anglo-American dominance. This dominance ispartlydue to economies of scale that reflect the size of the academic linguistic market, national (theUSA) andinternational,butisdueequallytothegate-keeping,hegemonicparadigms,andmonolingualcontrol that consolidate Anglophonic power in the information society and the knowledgeeconomy.Onerevealingexample:benchmarkinghandbooksonlanguageandlinguisticsexcludeSpanish-language references: ‘the current English dominance within the geopolitics of knowledgeis enhancingthesymboliccapitalofEnglishandcontributingtotheerosionoflinguisticdiversity’(Mendieta,PhillipsonandSkutnabb-Kangas2006).Howhasthiscomeabout?Isthelinguisticimperialism of the colonial age being perpetuated and reinforced in the contemporary world? Isthecurrentpre-eminenceofEnglishthedirectresultofexplicitandactiveUSpolicyintheAmericassince the formulation of the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, and similar policies in Europe throughoutthe20th century (Arnove 1982, Smith 2003), and globally since1945?

I see *linguistic imperialism* as involving thefollowing:

● itisaformof*linguicism*,afavouringofonelanguageoverothersinwaysthatparallelsocietalstructuringthroughracism,sexismandclass:linguicismalsoservestoprivilegeusersofthestandardformsofthedominantlanguage,thosewithconvertiblelinguisticcapital

● itis*structural*:morematerialresourcesandinfrastructureareaccordedtothedominantlanguage than toothers

● itis*ideological*:beliefs,attitudes,andimageryglorifythedominantlanguage,stigmatizeothers, and rationalise the linguistichierarchy

● the dominance is *hegemonic*, it is internalised and naturalised as being‘normal’

● linguisticimperialisminterlockswith*astructureofimperialism*inculture,education,themedia, communication, the economy, politics, and militaryactivities

● inessenceitisabout*exploitation*,injustice,inequality,andhierarchythatprivilegesthose able to use the dominantlanguage

● this entails *unequal rights* for speakers of differentlanguages

● languageuseisoften*subtractive*,proficiencyintheimperiallanguageandinlearningitineducation involving its consolidation at the expense of otherlanguages

● linguistic imperialism is invariably *contested andresisted*.

This pattern of activities holds for the role of language in all empires, even if theseinevitablydisplaygreatvarietyovertimeandspace(andsomescholarsdonotseeapatternoflinguisticimperialism, e.g. Ostler 2005). The Latin of the Roman empire left behind a massivelegacythroughout Europe. Four European languages have major footholds on other continents –Spanish,Portuguese,French,andEnglish–whereaspoliticalandmilitarydefeatdiminishedtheimpactof suchlanguagesasDutch,GermanandItalian.Ahierarchyoflanguagesisintegraltoanimperialsocialorder,discriminationbymeansoflanguage–theacquisitionanduseoflinguisticcapital- marking off privileged classes and groups from others, linguicism being entrenched structurallyandideologically.

Throughout the British Isles a monolingual ideology was propagated, with devastating effects,evenif some Celtic languages have survived and are currently being revitalised. A monolingualideology wasexportedtosettlercoloniesinNorthAmericaandAustralasia,accompanyinggenocideofthelocal population. More differentiated policies were needed in exploitation colonies such astheIndian subcontinent and most African colonies. Since Nebrija, language has been theexplicithandmaiden of empire, but one may need to distinguish between types ofempire:

‘formal’ and ‘informal’ imperialism: the first meaning physical control orfull-fledgedcolonial rule, while the second implied less direct but still powerful kindsofdominance, like Britain’s 19th century hegemony in Chile and Iran, or the USA’smorerecent role in much of central America. (Howe 2002:24

The notion of ’informal empire’ can be traced back to Macaulay, the most eminent Britishhistorianofthemid-19thcentury,politician,andIndianadministrator(Louis1999:5).Languageplayedamuchlessimportantroleininformalempiresofthecolonisingtype.Inthecurrentneoimperialworld, English is increasingly in evidence. Plans to introduce English as a ‘second officiallanguage’ in Chile, Japan and Korea, and the policy of making the learning of English compulsory

throughout education in China are symptomatic of this trend. The combined effect of thedovetailingofEnglishwiththeBritishEmpire,thestrengthoftheAmericaneconomysincethemid-19thcentury,andtheglobalpowerstructuresputinplacefrom1945(BrettonWoods,WorldBank, IMF, WTO, United Nations etc), along with the imploding of a communist alternative,haveall contributed significantly to the current pre-eminence of thelanguage.

The historical record shows that this evolution was not left to chance: English has been(Phillipson 1992)andstillisactivelypromoted,forinstancebyGordonBrownonhisfirstofficialvisittoChina and India. His Press Release of 17 January 2008(http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page14289.asp)revealsaplantomakeEnglishthegloballanguageof‘choice’throughstrategicinvestmentsinEnglishlearning.TheMurdoch-ownedtabloid*TheSun*declaredthatBrownbelievesthiswill‘addastaggering£50billionayeartotheUKeconomyby2010’. Imperialism has always been aboutprofit.

The corporate agenda that drives neoliberalism and the new imperialism (Harvey 2005)was preciselyandprescientlydescribedin*TheCommunistManifesto*byMarxandEngelsin1848.

Bourgeoissociety

has set up that single unconscionable freedom – Free Trade. In a word,for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substitutednaked,shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. […] The need of a constantly expandingmarketfor its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole face of the globe. It mustnestleeverywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. […] In place oftheoldlocalandnationalseclusionandself-sufficiency,wehaveintercourseinevery direction, a universal interdependence of nations. And as in material, so alsoinintellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nationsbecomecommonproperty.[…]Itcompelsallnations,onpainofextinction,toadoptthebourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it callscivilizationintotheirmidst,i.e.tobecomebourgeoisthemselves.Inoneword,itcreatesaworld after its own image. (reprinted in Mendel 1961: 15, 16,17).

This is echoed by Bourdieu (2001: 84, translationRP):

‘Globalisation’servesasapassword,awatchword,whileineffectitisthelegitimatory mask of a policy aiming to universalise particular interests andtheparticular tradition of the economically and politically dominant powers, above alltheUnited States, and to extend to the entire world the economic and cultural modelthatfavoursthesepowersmost,whilesimultaneouslypresentingitasanorm,arequirement, and a fatality, a universal destiny, in such a manner as toobtainadherence or at the least, universalresignation.

The forms that globalisation has taken since the 1970s have consolidated the position of Englishinwhat Hardt and Negri (2000) see as Empire. Other dominant languages are of moreregionalsignificance, more localised variants of linguisticempire.

# 2. Patterns of colonisation, new andold

EuropeanexpansionistpoliciesinNorthAmericasometimesaimedattheassimilationofNativeAmericansratherthantheirextinction.European‘values’andChristianitywereto‘civilise’the‘savages’ to a capitalist economy and patriarchy, whether through European orindigenouslanguages.Literacyflourishedinsomeofthese,forinstanceCherokee(Spring1996),andNativeAmericanswereintroducedtoLatin,GreekandHebrewaswellasEnglishandmorepracticallyorientedknowledge.In1838theBoardofForeignMissionsoftheUSA(thenonly13states,allseparatecolonies)articulated‘abeliefinthemanifestdestinyofAnglo-Saxonculturetospread around the world’ (ibid., 145). When the pressure on land became fiercer, more liberal policieswere replaced by cultural and physical genocide. In education English generally became the solelanguage used. There are currently attempts to reversethis.

The policy of the USA transforming a diverse immigrant and indigenous populationintomonolingualEnglishuserswasarticulatedbyPresidentTheodoreRooseveltin1907:‘Wehaveroom for but one flag, the American flag... *We have room for but one language here, and that istheEnglish language*... and we have room for but one sole loyalty and that is a loyalty to theAmerican people.’ (Italicsadded)

Education in US colonies functioned along similar lines. In the Philippines, there was aninsistenceonanexclusiveuseofEnglishineducationfrom1898to1940:‘…publiceducation,specificallylanguage and literature education during the American colonial period, was designed todirectlysupport American colonialism. The combined power of the canon, curriculum, andpedagogy constituted the ideological strategies resulting in rationalising, naturalizing, and legitimizingmyths about colonial relationships and realities.’ (Martin 2002:210).

Comparison of the British and French empires, drawing heavily on the analysis of scholars fromthecolonized world, leads to the conclusion that despite differences in the articulation ofpolicies,

What the French and British empires had in commonwas:

* thelowstatusofdominatedlanguages,whetherthesewereignoredorusedineducation,
* a very small proportion of the population in formal education, especially afterthelowestclasses,
* local traditions and educational practice beingignored,
* unsuitable education being given toAfricans,
* an explicit policy of ‘civilizing thenatives’,
* the master language being attributed civilizing properties. (Phillipson 1992:128)

Thesebroadgeneralizationsarevalid,evenifpolicieswereinfactworkedout*adhoc*inawide varietyofsituations.InFrenchcolonies,thegoalofproducingablackFrencheliteentailedusingthe educational content and methods of metropolitan France (Johnson 2005). In the Britishempire,‘Englishwastheofficialvehicleandthemagicformulatocolonialélitedom’(Ngŭgĭ1985:115). ‘By the opening decades of the twentieth century the crass objective of confining colonizedpeoplethrough inferior education had been dressed up with “scientific” justifications and permeatedalmostevery corner of the Empire apart from South Asia’ (Etherington 2005b:269).

InIndiathesituationwascomplex,duetoitssizeanddiversity,andsincetherewerestrongandancientliteracytraditionsinthemainlanguages.Educationinthesewaswidespreadbeforethepolicy of promoting English was officialised. Three universities were founded in 1857, 14 by1921, and 20 before independence in 1947. But westernization was in effect confined to elites. Thesehaveretained the role of the colonizers’ language for postcolonial elite formation andprivilege.

There are major differences in the way British language policy in India has been interpreted. Atoneextreme is the view that the decision to promote English and neglect Indian languages was ‘largelyarecognitionoflocalIndiandemands’,andthattheideaofcolonialistimpositionofEnglishisatwentieth century ‘myth’ (Frykenberg 1999: 210). A more differentiated view is that thepromotionofEnglishreflectedafirmbeliefinprogress,‘Englishliberty,tolerationandimprovement’,as articulatedbytheimperialspindoctor,Macaulay,who‘heldarrogantbutrepresentativeviewsonEngland’s cultural ascendancy in the world and on what he believed to be the benevolent impactof BritishruleinIndiaandelsewhere.ThecontroversialMinuteonEducation,writteninIndiain 1835,managedtoreconcileBritish*realpolitik*andidealisminawaythatleftalastingmarkon subsequentinterpretationsofBritishrule’(Louis1999:5).Attheotherendofthespectrumistheanalysis of an Indian who has lived through the entire post-independenceperiod:

The colonial language policy, therefore, was a part of the overall policy ofgoverning the ‘native subjects’ in such a way that their minds would cease to beIndian.Languagebecameaninstrumentforthispurpose.Ithelpedproduceefficientand dedicated slaves who would be faithful to their masters and grateful to be slaves.TheBritish rule consolidated itself mainly by dividing India into two classes: theloyalEnglisheducatedIndiansandtheignorantmassesrestrictedtotheir‘vernaculars’.(Naik 2004:254-5).

In British Africa until the 1950s, 90% of educational work was in the hands of missionaries, fromarange of European countries as well as the USA, working for dozens of differentChristiandenominations. Their primary goal was evangelisation, whether through English or themany African languages that missionaries codified, artificially because of colonial boundariesandlinguisticallyandculturallyuninformedselectionpractices.Christianmissionariesremainactiveworldwide, often in the guise of teachers of English, posing a major ethical dilemma for theEnglishteaching profession (Canagarajah and Wong forthcoming). Missionaries were generallylookeddown on by colonial administrators, and were often at odds with settlers and commercialinterests,becausetheytendedtodisapproveofhowthecolonizedwerebeingtreated(Etherington2005a).There was in fact a tension throughout the history of the British Empire between theempire-builders and critics ofimperialism.

When colonies acquired political independence, a number of competing factors, supply anddemand,‘aid’anddependence,haveresultedinthecontinuationofthelanguagepoliciesofthecolonial period till the present (Bamgbose 2006, Ricento 2000). In language education, fivetenetshave been of decisive influence since the 1960s, each of which is false (Phillipson 1992:183-218):Englishisbesttaughtmonolingually(themonolingualfallacy);theidealteacherofEnglishisanativespeaker(thenativespeakerfallacy);theearlierEnglishistaught,thebettertheresults(theearly start fallacy); the more English is taught, the better the results (the maximumexposurefallacy); if other languages are used much, standards of English will drop (the subtractivefallacy).

The acquisition of linguistic capital in postcolonial societies is structurally constrained bylinguisticmarket forces in such a way that ‘choosing’ English is contingent rather than free,since

European languages were *imposed* on Africans in the colonial period. Africanpeopleas communities did not *choose* to learn those languages.[…]

Individual Africans do not necessarily *choose* to learn these languages(French,English, Portuguese). Since the language of instruction in almost all Africancountriesisthelanguageoftheformercolonialpower,goingtoschooldoesnotleaveanychoice…

Individualswhodonotgotoschool,andthereforedonotlearnEuropeanlanguages,do not choose not to go to school. They do not have access to schooling(Rubagumya2004:134).

In the global village there are ‘a few chiefs – very powerful economically and militarily – and alotofpowerlessvillagers.[…]Themarkethasindeedreplacedimperialarmies,butonewonderswhethertheeffectisanydifferent.[…]ItisthereforenotthecasethatmoreEnglishwillleadtoAfricanglobalintegration;thereverseismorelikely.[…]Givingfalsehopesthateverybodycanhave access to ‘World English’ is unethical’ (ibid.:136-139).

Themostsignificantsourceforfundingforeducationinpostcolonialstatesintheclosingdecadesofthe20thcenturywastheWorldBank,whichhaschannelledfundstowardthelearningoftheformer colonial languages. World Bank policies filter through into the ‘aid’ agendas of the USandtheBritishOverseasDevelopmentAdministration(ODA),whichfavoura‘transition’fromlocallanguages toEnglish:

…oneneedstobecautiouswhentheWorldBank,whichcontrolsandinfluencesthemajorityofaidpackagestothethirdworld,supportsthetransitionalmodel.WorldBankofficialswhovisitedSouthAfricain1992madeitquiteclearthatadditivebilingualism was not on the World Bank agenda and that funds would not beavailabletosupportsuchprogrammes.Asmentionedearlier,USAIDandODAareheavilyinfluenced by World Bank agendas, and the language education models theyaresupporting are consistently transitional … a concrete example of just howpowerfully persuasive Western aid agencies are in influencing policy’ (Heugh 2003: 343,initiallypublished in1995).

The World Bank’s real position … encourages the consolidation of theimperiallanguages in Africa. … the World Bank does not seem to regard thelinguisticAfricanisation of the whole of primary education as an effort that is worthitsconsideration. Its publication on strategies for stabilising and revitalisinguniversities, for example makes absolutely no mention of the place of language at this tertiarylevelof African education (Mazrui 1997:39).

Astratifiededucationsystemthatservestheinterestsofelitesandneglectsothersiscommon.InIndia the ‘biggest failure in 50 years of independence – its shameful neglect of primaryeducation’(Malhoutra 1997: 152). This failure was to be addressed in the wake of the Jomtien (‘Educationfor all’)conferenceof1991throughtheuseofforeignaidandloans,butprojectssuchasIndia’sDistrictPrimaryEducationProjectwereplaguedwithfinancialmismanagementandcorruption(ibid.).Indianresearchindicatesthat‘Overthepost-Independenceyears,Englishhasbecomethesinglemostimportantpredictorofsocio-economicmobility.[…]Withtheglobalizedeconomy,English education widens the discrepancy between the social classes’ (Mohanty 2006:268-9). Educational policy may be changing towards a more active commitment tomultilingualism(Agnihotri2007).

Alexander (2006: 241) considers that in post-apartheid South Africa two factors determinecurrentpractices and attitudes in the relationship between language andpower:

* + the hierarchies of the linguistic market are largely determined by the mundanefactof economic and political, or militarydominance
	+ the“colonisedmind”(NgŭgĭwaThiong’o1994)ofconqueredpeopleshasoftenledtoafailureonthepartoftheirleadershiptorealisethepowerthatislatentinthe languages of the oppressed and of other subaltern strata orgroups.

In South Africa ‘politicians and even cultural leaders have never thought deeply about thelanguagequestion. […] an English-only or even an English-mainly policy might have some of thefollowing effects:

* + preventing the majority of the people from access to vital informationand, therefore, from full participation in the democratic politicalprocess
	+ underminingtheself-confidenceofL2-speakersandevenmoresoofthevast majority for whom English is effectively a foreignlanguage
	+ bythesametoken,smotheringthecreativityandspontaneityofpeoplewhoarecompelled to use a language of which they are not in fullcommand
	+ attheeconomicandworkplacelevels,causingmajoravoidableblockagesthathave significant impacts on productivity and efficiency’ (ibid.:251).

ElsewhereinAfricathesituationiscomparable.Omoniyi(2003)inanarticleanalysingwhytheNigerian military government decreed in 1998 that French should be the ‘second officiallanguage’ofthecountry,describestheneglectoflocallanguagesasa‘rapeondemocracy’(2003:23).Thedecisionisagoodexampleofpushandpullfactorsworkingtogetherinneoimperialism.Thepush ofFrencheconomicinterestsintheregionpromotedthrough‘aid’(sixteenlanguageattachés,support for 100 pilot schools, 6 colleges of education and 6 universities, 13 Frenchlanguagecentres,ibid.:20-21)combineswithaNigerianpoliticalwish(apull)tosubvertUSinterestsandCommonwealth criticism of a military regime. Omoniyi refers to ‘two Europhone cohorts thathaveoutlived colonisation: Anglophone and Francophone Africa […] they resuscitate and/orperpetuatecolonialpresenceandrivalries,andneo-imperialistdiscoursesinsupposedlypost-colonialtimes’(ibid.:23).

It is also important to recall that TESOL (the Teaching of English to Speakers of OtherLanguages) itself is a significant export item – teaching materials, examinations, know-how, teachers et al -for the British and Americans, and a vital dimension of English linguistic neoimperialism. ‘The Englishlanguageteachingsectordirectlyearnsnearly£1.3billionfortheUKininvisibleexportsandour othereducationrelatedexportsearnupto£10billionmore’(LordNeilKinnock,ChairoftheBritishCouncil,intheForewordtoGraddol2006).Themajorpublishinghousesarenowglobal.For instance, ‘Pearson Education's international business has been growing rapidly in recentyears,and we now have a presence in over 110countries.’([http://www.pearson.com/index.cfm?pageid=18,](http://www.pearson.com/index.cfm?pageid=18) accessed 15 January 2008). The websiteof Educational Testing Services of Princeton, NJ, which is responsible for the TOEFL test ofEnglishlanguage proficiency, states: ‘Our global mission goes far beyond testing. Our products andservices enable opportunity worldwide by measuring knowledge and skills, promoting learningandperformance,andsupportingeducationandprofessionaldevelopmentforallpeopleworldwide.’ The ambivalent role of the TESOL enterprise is explored insightfully in a number ofthecontributions to Edge2006.

USandUKinterestsandservicesarethusinsymbiosiswitheducationworldwideandwiththeevaluationofproficiencyinEnglish,withtheassessmentoflinguisticcapital.Thosewishingfor credentials in this linguistic market must invest in the form of ‘global’ English thatexaminationboards profitably dispense. They administer what Bourdieu refers to as the sanctions of the(global)linguisticmarket.

# 3. An English-dominant worldsystem

The archetypical aggressive British imperialist is Cecil Rhodes, who made a fortune in thediamond minesofSouthAfrica,becamethecountry’sPrimeMinister,andpushednorthwards,founding countrieswhichwerenamedafterhimuntiltheymorphedintoZambiaandZimbabwe.Helefthis fortuneintheformofRhodesScholarshipsandanOxfordinstitution,hisprimarygoalbeingto influencekeypeoplefromthedominions(Australia,Canada,NewZealand),IndiaandtheUnitedStates. Rhodes’ purpose, as expressed in his first will (1877 – he died in 1902)was

* The extension of British rule throughout the world, the perfecting of a system ofemigrationfromtheUnitedKingdomandofcolonizationbyBritishsubjectsofalllandswhereinthemeans of livelihood are attainable by energy, labour andenterprise,
* theultimaterecoveryoftheUnitedStatesofAmericaasanintegralpartoftheBritishEmpire,
* theconsolidationofthewholeEmpire,theinaugurationofasystemofColonialRepresentationintheImperialParliamentwhichmaytendtoweldtogetherthedisjointedmembers of theEmpire,
* andfinallythefoundationofsogreatapowerastohereafterrenderwarsimpossibleandpromote the best interests of humanity. (Quigley 1981: 33, bullet structureadded)

Only part of this scheme has been realized, but perhaps more than meets the eye. Theconstitutionalbonds of Empire have been loosened in the establishment of a British Commonwealth of Nations,anetworkofAnglophonic‘globalleaders’intheRhodesmould.TheAmericandoghaswavedtheBritishtailsince1945,butwitha‘specialrelationship’whichcanbetracedthroughChurchill-Roosevelt,Thatcher-ReaganandBlair-BushII.ThestronglinksbetweentheUSandtheUKwerearticulatedbyChurchillandRooseveltin1941inthe‘AtlanticCharter’,whichsetoutapolicyfor thepost-warworld,ChurchillstressingintheHouseofCommonson24August1941:‘…theBritish Empire and the United States who, fortunately for the progress of mankind, happen to speakthe same language and very largely think the same thoughts …’ (Morton 1943: 152).BritishambivalenceaboutitsmembershipoftheEUispartlyduetothelegacyofempirebutmoresignificantly to the competing tug of the political, military, cultural and linguistic links with theUS. SomeUSthinktanksenvisageseeingtheUKdetachedfrom‘Europe’andthecreationofatrans- atlantic Anglosphere (see Phillipson2008a).

US policies have become more visibly aggressive as the neoconservatives behind the Project fortheNew American Century, the Cheney-Wolfowitz-Rumsfeld doctrine, have been in power underBush II. The overall strategy was analysed in *Harper’s Magazine* in 2002 (cited in Harvey 2005:80):

TheplanisfortheUnitedStatestoruletheworld.Theovertthemeisunilateralism, butitisultimatelyastoryofdomination.ItcallsfortheUnitedStatestomaintainitsoverwhelming military superiority and prevent new rivals from rising up tochallengeit on the world stage. It calls for dominion over friends and enemies alike. It saysnotthattheUnitedStatesmustbemorepowerful,ormostpowerful,butthatitmustbeabsolutelypowerful.

CondoleezzaRiceregularlyarticulatesthisvision.Therhetoricofglobal‘leadership’waswarmlyembracedbyTonyBlair:‘centuryuponcenturyithasbeenthedestinyofBritaintoleadother nations.Thatshouldnotbeadestinythatispartofourhistory.Itshouldbepartofourfuture.Wearealeaderofnationsornothing.’(fromaspeechin1997citedin*LeMondeDiplomatique*,May 2007, 16.). This sentiment is scarcely compatible with the EU’s principle of a foreignpolicycommon to all memberstates,

ItisperfectlylogicalforTonyBlairtooptforinternationalbankingafterleavingBritishpolitics, sincefinancialglobalisationiscentraltothecurrenteconomicworld‘order’.Massivewealthhas beenconsolidatedinthehandsofthetop1%oftheworld’spopulationinthetransitionfromacapitalism based on commodities to trading in financial services. The accumulation of this wealthis notterritoriallybased(itdependson‘price-space’ratherthan‘physicalspace’)andisintrinsically linked to the impoverishment and dispossession of the rest of the world’s population,whileprivileging a small elite worldwide. While commodity capitalism evolved with pre-eminence foranumber of ‘large’ languages, finance capital is symbiotically linked to the consolidation ofEnglish, anditsacceptancebythosewhomightearlierhaveinsistedonparityforotherlanguagessuchas French (Lysandrou & Lysandrou2003).

# Approaches to English linguisticimperialism

ThepapersfromaconferenceinJapanthatcontrastedvariouslinguisticimperialismsaresummed upinaConclusionbyoneoftheeditors,Calvet(2005:364),whereheappearstostatethatlinguisticimperialismonthepartoftheBritishandFrenchisathingofthepast:inthecaseof English it is no longer needed, whereas in the case of French - in my interpretation of hiscomments

- two issues need highlighting, The birth rate in former French colonies will influence the vitalityof francophonie, which confirms Chaudenson’s contention (2000) that the fate of French as a‘world’ languagewillbedecidedinAfricaratherthaninEurope,wherethebattlehasalreadybeenlost.Secondly, when French official discourse equates francophonie with diversity and itsmaintenance,thisimpliesthatitispointlesstocontinuepreachingthesuperiorityofFrench.Whilemanyof Calvet’sothersummarypointsareuncontroversial(distinguishingbetweenlinguisticnationalismand linguistic imperialism; different manifestations in particular historical periods), to suggestthatFrenchlinguisticimperialismisdeadandburiedisfalse(theclaimisinfactdisputedbyMiuraNobutaka in the same volume). There is abundant evidence that virtually all the criteriafor linguisticimperialismthatIlistinitiallyinthisarticleapplytobothFrenchandEnglishinthepresentworld.HowelsecanthemassiveeffortsoftheBritishCounciltoestablishEnglishinthepost-communistworld,ortheFrenchtoputFrenchratherthanAfricanlanguagesonschooltime- tablesinformerBritishcoloniesinAfricabeunderstood(seetheNigerianexampleabove)?How elsecantheactivitiesofbothgovernmentstobidforandimplementWorldBankpoliciesthatfavour European languages be understood? Calvet is a prolific author who operates with aschematichierarchyoflanguages(basedondeSwaan’stheoryofhypercentral,supercentralandother languages), and rightly exemplifies many of the variables (top-down, bottom-up,attitudinal)that influence the mosaic of languages. However, his analysis does not seriously engage withissues ofpower,ortheorisecontemporarylinguisticimperialism,andIcannotdetectanyawarenessofhumanrightsprinciples(thestatement‘Fairecroireparexemplequel’onpeututilisertoutesleslanguesdumondepourl’éducationdesenfantsestuneimposturenéfaste’,Calvet2002,207is uninformed),norofthesignificanceofculturalandlinguisticdiversityforlanguageecologyandbiodiversity (Skutnabb-Kangas2000).

Scholars who are sceptical about linguistic imperialism as an explanatory model for theway Englishhasbeenconsolidatedworldwidetendtoanalysemattersasthoughthereisastrictchoicebetween (a) active US-UK promotion of English, supported by linguicist policies that favour itoverandaboveotherlanguages,and(b)colonisedpeopleandothersactivelywishingtolearnEnglishbecause of the doors, economic, social, political, and cultural, that it opens. Matters are summedup as though (a) involves imposition, whereas (b) is a ‘free’ choice (Kirkpatrick 2007: 35-7). This isafalsedichotomy,thetwoelementsinnowayexcludingeachother.Inaddition,neitherimpositionnor freedom is context-free. Nor should (a) be seen as necessarily entailing the adoption of ‘Anglo-culturalnorms’and‘BritishandAmericanculture’,whichistrue,whereas(b)wouldnot,which incorrectly ignores the lexico-grammatical substance embedded in the language, and the usestowhich the language is put. Mono-causal explanations should be avoided. The norm is for there tobepush and pull factors contributing to linguistic hegemony andhierarchy.

Kirkpatrick (ibid.) also accepts Fishman et al’s analysis of ‘Post-imperial English’, whichconcludesthat the strength of English in former British and American colonies is more due to suchcountries’engagementinthemodernworldeconomyratherthan‘toanyeffortsderivedfromtheircolonialmasters’ (1996: 640). This analysis seems to ignore the fact that ‘engagement in the modernworld’means a western-dominated globalization agenda set by the transnational corporations and theIMF, andtheU.S.militaryintervening,withorwithoutamandatefromtheUnitedNations,whenever ‘vital interests’ are at risk. World Bank, NAFTA, and World Trade Organization policiescontributeto political instability, and provide less favourable conditions for education,democratization,cultural and linguistic diversity. English serves to consolidate the interests of the powerfulgloballyandlocallyandtomaintainanimbalancedexploitativeworldorder,todisenfranchisespeakersofother languages. A world polarized between a minority of English-using haves (whether as a firstor second language) and a majority of have-nots is not likely to provide healthy conditions forpeoplewho speak languages other than English to flourish, so I have difficult in sharingFishman’srestrained optimism about linguisticpower-sharing.

There is currently a considerable effort going into the documentation of English worldwide (see,for instance, Kachru, Kachru and Nelson 2006), its formal and functional diversity. Much ofthedescriptioniscelebratory,compoundedbytheuseofsuchfuzzytermsas‘global’and‘international’. Halliday has elaborated an intriguing distinction betweenthese:

Englishhasbecomeaworldlanguageinbothsensesoftheterm,internationaland global: international, as a medium of literary and other forms of cultural lifein(mainly)countriesoftheformerBritishEmpire;global,astheco-genitorofthenew technological age, the age of information. So those who are able to exploit it,whetherto sell goods or ideas, wield a very considerable power. […] It is important, I think,todistinguish these two aspects, the international and the global, even though theyobviouslyoverlap.Englishhasbeenexpandingalongbothtrajectories:globally,as English;internationally,asEnglishes.BothoftheseexpansionsinvolvewhatIhavecalled semogenic strategies: ways of creating new meanings that are open-ended,likethe various forms of metaphor, lexical and grammatical. But they differ.InternationalEnglishhasexpandedbybecomingworldEnglishes,evolvingsoastoadapttothemeanings of other cultures. Global English has expanded – has become “global” –by takingover,orbeingtakenoverby,thenewinformationtechnology,whichmeanseverything from email and the internet to mass media advertising, news reporting,andall the other forms of political and commercial propaganda. (Halliday 2006:362-3)

Halliday’sbinarydistinctionishelpful,butthenotionthat‘world’Englishesare‘international’is invalid, since what is being referred to here is in fact *local* Englishes (Kenyan or PakistaniEnglish). The terminology in this area istreacherous.

Halliday’sfocusonhowadaptinglinguisticsystemstonewculturaldemandscanfunctionlocallyandgloballyisgrounded(nothereexplicitly)inamaterialandideologicalunderstandingthatis characteristicofMarxistapproachestolanguage,whichwererefinedinthe20thcenturyprimarily

byGramsciandBourdieu.TheformerBritishcolonythathasbeenmostsuccessfullytransformed into a first-world economy is Singapore. Its language policy has downplayed tradition andethnicity,and transformed citizens of diverse linguistic origins (mainly variants of Chinese andIndianlanguages) into users of English both in the public domain and increasingly even at home. This isaprimeexampleoflanguagemanagementsuccessfullyachievingitsgoalsthroughthecreationof citizens who essentially identify with the materialism and consumerism that drive theglobaleconomy (Chew 2007). An authoritarian state aims at proficiency in British English and theultimate elimination of the hybridSinglish.

Brutt-Griffler, in a book entitled *World English: A study of its development* (reviewed inPhillipson 2004a)hasarguedthatcolonialeducationwasmoreconcernedtopreventcolonialsubjectsfrom havingaccesstoEnglishthanwithimposingthelanguage.SheseesWorldEnglishasdoingaway with hierarchy among speech communities, non-Western nations taking equal part in the creationof theworldeconoculturalsystemanditslinguisticexpression.Atthesametimesheacknowledges thattheUSandUKdominatetheworldmarketandthatWorldEnglishisthedominantsocio- political language form. Her attempt to explain the growth of English worldwide isthereforeinternally inconsistent, theoretically flawed, and based on argumentation that ignores the realityof themarketforces,political,economicandmilitary,thatstrengthensomelanguagesattheexpenseof others locally andglobally.

Some see a focus on the declared goals of US and UK policy and ‘aid’ investments as aconspiracytheory.Thisissimplisticandfalse.Ihaveelsewhere,inanarticlethatexposesthewaySpolskymisrepresentsmywork(Phillipson2007a),arguedagainstthisput-down.Aconspiracysmear(ithas nothing to do with theory) is often, as a study of neoliberal agendas and ideologies shows,‘thestandard invalidating predicate to block tracking of strategic decisions’ (McMurtry 2002: 17).Whatcritical scholarship should be concerned with is ‘the deeper question of the life-and-deathprinciples ofregulatingvaluesystemswhichconnectacrossandexplainsocialorders’(ibid.).Thisistheoverall context within which uses of ‘global’ English needexploration.

Others see a strong emphasis on material and structural power as too deterministic, and asdeprivingthosewhovotewiththeirfeetforEnglishofagency.Iwouldclaimthatinanygivencontextthereare many push and pull factors that determine the way English linguistic hegemony is asserted. Itis logical and comprehensible that English should be seen as desirable for the society andtheindividual, and involves agency, without endorsing a spurious use of ‘choice’. There is noproblemhere*providedthatEnglishislearnedandusedadditively*,asanextensionofone’slinguisticrepertoire,butthisisnotthecasewhenmothertonguesareneglected,whichisthecaseinmany countriesworldwide.

# English linguistic imperialism moves to continentalEurope?

The European context needs book-length treatment (Phillipson 2003) rather than a coupleof paragraphs.Inarecentsurveyarticle(2007b)IconcludethatthereisnowEuropeanlinguisticapartheid of three types: the exclusion of minority mother tongues from schools, public servicesandrecognition; the *de facto* hierarchy of languages in the EU system, in internal andexternalcommunication;inequalitybetweennativespeakers,particularlyofEnglish,andotherEuropeans, in international communication and especially in EU institutions. Unfortunately there aremany obstacles to supranational, Europe-wide language policy formation. They can be enumeratedin outline. Each of them impinges on English as both threat and promise. The length of the list makes it abundantly clear that the tension between English as an invasive, imperialist language andthepromisesthatitholdsoutisnotstraightforward.Whatisuncleariswhattheoutcomesofpresenttrends willbe:

* European history has led to different cosmologies in national linguistic cultures, makingcross- cultural dialoguetreacherous;
* therearecollisionsofterminology(e.g.linguafranca,multilingualism,workinglanguage)indiscourse(politics,media,businessetc),andindistinctacademicdisciplines,aswellasindifferent countries;
* overall responsibility for language policy in the EU is fragmented (Council ofMinisters, Directorates for Education & Culture, Translation, …), and is ultimately aninter-governmentalresponsibility;
* thereisapoorinfrastructurenationally(exceptinFinlandandCatalonia,perhapsinSweden afterlegislation)andsupranationallyforaddressinglanguagepolicyissues*,*includingaweak infrastructure inresearch;
* internationalcoordinationamongnationallanguagebodiesisinitsinfancy,andtheprocessesfor dialogue between scholars, interest groups, and policy-makers arefragile;
* language policy is politically untouchable at inter-governmentallevel;
* EU institutions are inconsistent in living up to ideals of multilingual equality(website, communications with member states) and in effect practise linguisticapartheid;
* the EU translation and interpretation services are impressive in many respects, but aredetachedfrom international research, and subject to an economic rationale, seeing themselves as aservicefunction rather thanpolicy-making;
* the language of EU written texts is increasingly under attack, even if the translation industryandtranslation technology are of increasingimportance;
* the rhetoric of EU multilingualism and linguistic equality is seen as a charade bymany;
* linguistichumanrightsarearecentdevelopmentininternationallaw,anddonotconstrain‘international’ languages;
* criteria for guiding equitable supranational language policy areunder-explored;
* journalistic coverage of language issues tends to beill-informed;
* alternativestomarketforces(thecomparativeadvantageofEnglishintheEuropeanlinguisticmarket) and linguistic nationalism (e.g. Esperanto) areunexplored;

ItissignificantthatboththeEUandtheCouncilofEuropenowrecommendsomesupportfor migrant languages, though there is still a long way to go before these are recognised in anymemberstate as representing significant resources or involves them being seen as triggeringrights. Ultimately language policy is a matter of power politics, linguistic nationalism*,* andeconomics.

When there are so many uncertainties currently, and when supranational national policyformationis stymied, market forces are allowed free rein. These all strengthen English nationallyand supranationally. Thus when there are discussions about ‘domain loss’ in the Nordic languages,thecentralconceptisinappropriatewhenitobscurestherealitythatitistheforcesandagentsof linguistic neoimperialism which are causing the linguistic capital dispossession of otherlanguages.

# Conclusion: exploring English as project, product andprocess

Theterm*linguafranca*hasbeenusedinwidelydifferentsensesinthepastandissostill.Iwouldclaimthat*linguafranca*isa**pernicious**,invidioustermifthelanguageinquestionisafirst languageforsomepeoplebutforothersaforeignlanguage,suchcommunicationtypicallybeingasymmetrical.Iwouldclaimthatitisa**misleading**termifthelanguageissupposedtobeneutralanddisconnectedfromculture,fromitsusesandthepurposesitserves.Andthatitisa**false**termfor a language that is taught as a subject in general education, which English is worldwide. Thereis anironichistoricalcontinuityin*linguafranca*beingusedasthetermforthelanguageofthemedieval Crusaders battling with Islam, the Franks, and currently to refer to English as thelanguageof the crusade of global corporatisation, marketed as ‘freedom’ and ‘democracy’. In alengthyForum article to which seven scholars respond (Phillipson 2008b), ‘Lingua franca orlinguafrankensteinia? English in European integration and globalisation’, in the journal *World Englishes*,I have explored misuse of the term in contemporary neoliberalism. The Frankenstein image referstothe agent behind the monster that gobbles up (speakers of) otherlanguages.

Onecanattempttobringtogethersomeofthemanythreadsdrawnoninthispaperbyseeingthe

*lingua franca/frankensteinia* ***project*** asentailing

* + theimaginingofacommunity,inthesamewayaspolitiesareimagined (Anderson 1983), an English-usingcommunitywithout territorial or nationalboundaries;
	+ the invention of traditions (in the sense of HobsbawmandRanger 1983), customs, rituals and discourses thatconnectpeople through a merging of the language with hybridagendas uniting the national, the European, the universal andglobal;
	+ ultimately the project reflects metaphysical choicesandphilosophicalprinciplesthatunderpinthetypeofcommunitywe wish to live in, the beliefs, values, and ethical principlesthatguide us, in a world that is currently dominatedby neoliberalism, unsustainable consumerism, violence,andlinguisticneoimperialism;
	+ ourchoicescaneitherservetomaintaindiversity,biological,cultural and linguistic (<[www.terralingua.org](http://www.terralingua.org/)>) or toeliminateit, and current trends arealarming;
	+ allofwhichleadtovisionsofandforEnglish,inEuropeandelsewhere,andifthesedonotdefine*linguafranca*insuchaway as to ensure equality and symmetry ininterculturalcommunication, but are essentially one-sided promotionof English, the project tends to be more that of a*linguafrankensteinia*.

The *lingua franca/frankensteinia* ***process*** can be seen asentailing

* + building communities of practice, of language use andlanguagelearning
	+ that people identify with at variouslevels
	+ which can be personal, interpersonal, intercultural, andsub- cultural
	+ in contexts of use, discourses, anddomains
	+ which conform to norms of linguistic behaviour thatareinstitutionally (re-)inforced, legitimated andrationalised
	+ in societies that hierarchise by means of race, class, gender,andlanguage
	+ leading to English being perceived as prestigious and‘normal’,hence the feeling of native speakers that the languageis universally relevant and usable, and the need for others tolearnand use the language, in some cases additively, inothers subtractively.

The *lingua franca/frankensteinia****product***

* + interlocks with economic/material systems,structures,institutions, and USempire
	+ is supported ideologically in cultural (re-)productionandconsumption
	+ in political, economic, military, media, academicandeducationaldiscourses
	+ throughnarrativesofthe‘story’,the‘spread’ofEnglish,andlanguage‘death’
	+ through metaphors of English as ‘international’, global,God-given, rich
	+ withtheprestigecodethatofelitesinthedominantEnglish- speaking countries, and embedded in the lexis and syntax ofthelanguage.

HeuristicwaysofclarifyingwhethertheadvanceofEnglishrepresents*linguafranca*ratherthan*lingua frankensteinia* trends would entail asking a series of questions, and relating each of themtoEnglish as project, process andproduct:

* + Is the expansion and/or learning of English in any givencontextadditive orsubtractive?
	+ Is linguistic capital dispossession of national languagestakingplace?
	+ Is there a strengthening or a weakening of a balancedlocallanguageecology?
	+ Where are our political and corporate leaders taking usinlanguagepolicy?
	+ How can academics in English Studies contribute topublicawareness and politicalchange?
	+ If dominant norms are global, is English serving local needsor merely subordinating its users to the American empireproject?

Empiricalstudiesofsuchquestionsareneededbeforefirmerconclusionscanbedrawn,intandemwitharefinementofthetheoreticalframeworkforunderstandingthesechangesintheglobalandlocal languageecology.
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