

DYNAMIC MODEL OF THE EVOLUTION OF POSTCOLONIAL ENGLISHES: SOME REFLECTIONS ON IT IN THE CONTEXT OF PAKISTANI ENGLISH

Naeem Khan Jadoon^{1*}, Dr. Mustanir Ahmad², Marriyam Qureshi³

*¹Assistant Professor, Department of Higher Education, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, ²Associate Professor/Chairman Department of English, Hazara, University, Mansehra Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan, ³PhD Scholar, Doctoral School of Humanities, University of Warsaw, Poland.

naemkhanjadoon@gmail.com*, mustanir@hu.edu.pk, m.qureshi@uw.edu.pl

Corresponding Author: *

Received: 22 August, 2023 **Revised:** 20 September, 2023 **Accepted:** 27 September, 2023 **Published:** 30 September, 2023

ABSTRACT

This study sought to evaluate the propositions of Schneider's (2007) Dynamic Model of the Evolution of Postcolonial Englishes, with a focus on its applicability to Pakistani English. The study found that the model is a valuable investigative framework in the analysis of the origins and growth of postcolonial Englishes, however its sequential or quasi-sequential nature posed a challenge in its objective applicability to the study of Pakistani English, which is developed in an erstwhile exploitation colony. Therefore, the researchers proposed a potential revision in the unidirectional nature of the model in order to accommodate the multi-directional dynamism that may be linear and non-linear as well as random in the evolution and development of nativized variants of English, like Pakistani English. The analysis indicates, Pakistani English has developed a number of characteristics for each phase, although not in the model's proposed linear order.

Keywords: Pakistani English; Schneider's (2007) Dynamic Model; Settler Colonies; Exploitation Colonies; Postcolonial Englishes

THE DYNAMIC MODEL

This study intends to evaluate the propositions of Schneider's (2007) Dynamic Model of the Evolution of Postcolonial Englishes, with a focus on its relevance to the context of Pakistani English. The model is based on the notion of contact linguistics, which claims that social variables, historical precedent, and the future course of speech communities all play a significant role in the structural implications of language contact. Since language and cultural boundaries in contact settings are somewhat permeable and the force of diffusion is always in motion, osmotic pressures are permitted. Diffusion may have both horizontal (from speaker to speaker) and vertical (from parents to children) aspects. The linguistic alterations that occur over time in both dimensions, as well as with regard to contact and affiliated factors, may

be referred to as "dynamics." The dynamics that play a significant role in language contact situations include topography, demography, social and cultural stratification, and languages and/or dialects (with varying levels of linguistic interaction intensity). In addition, power/pressure-institutions and institutional biases toward language and/or language users; prestige and status; social mobility directions; attitudes (societal and institutional); and others are also considered major contributors in contact induced language change, which indicates that extra-linguistic factors typically take precedence over linguistic factors. Therefore, the contact situation is the sum of these extra-linguistic and linguistic variables. In this complex context, Schneider (2007) proposed the "Dynamic Model of the Evolution and Development of

Postcolonial Englishes." The model, according to Schneider (2007), is more ambitious in that it suggests an identical underlying process that drives the development of languages, explains many of their similarities, and seems to work whenever a language is transplanted. However, by its very nature, the model does not aim to explain every observable detail or apply equally to every instance of the process it outlines (p. 29). Although Schneider (2007) maintains that the model does not apply equally to every instance of the process it describes, it does offer a framework for a more insightful analysis of specific varieties with little revision. Hence, it served as a robust framework for additional research into the phenomena of emergent English variants in contexts of complex linguistic interaction. It outlines the important attributes of the change in accessible layers apparent in points-in-time and exemplifies the multiple factors that lead to the formation of contact-induced variants of English. In describing the interplay and interdependence of the extra-linguistic and linguistic elements in terms of Mufwene's (2001) concept of "feature pool," a collection of linguistic patterns, the model draws attention to the persistent similarities in the emergence and development of postcolonial Englishes. The model projects the future of contact linguistics in general in addition to the analysis of Postcolonial Englishes since it demonstrates the ability to foresee possibilities that have not yet materialized. Its ability to foresee, for example, may take into account the likelihood that the same processes would probably take place each time a language is introduced. Since the procedures are unidirectional and irreversible on the end of the languages. Although it tends to be a formidable task, how the predictions may achieve precision, which is crucial to the nature of the phenomena it analyzes because there are so many contributing variables and the subtleties of how they interact in the language interaction scenario defy quantitative enunciations, the model acknowledges this fact, when Schneider (2007) asserts that all generalizations in the domain of language interaction are essentially probabilistic in character. It means these are not absolute in nature, whether as linguistic standards and/or

structural implications. Instead, they relate to or explain the majority of observable occurrences (p. 22).

In this context, the model identifies five phases in the evolution and growth of Postcolonial Englishes: foundation, exonormative stability, nativization, endonormative stabilization and differentiation. Each Postcolonial English variants moved sequentially from one phase to the next and eventually to the final phase; differentiation, the phases are linear or almost linear. The model takes into account these five phases of the developmental cycle as indicators for determining the postcolonial Englishes' developmental history and grade them on a scale of achievements based on their growth. Since each developmental phase is characterized by four variables that include socio-political background, identity construction, sociolinguistic context, and linguistic outcomes. The model concedes that "distinctions [between the developmental phases] are hardly ever clear-cut, and the stages and their defining criteria may be overlapping to some extent" (Schneider, 2014, p. 11). These variables have the potential to blur the boundaries between the phases, which means that occasionally, characteristics of one phase may be somewhat present in another or subsequent phases. Since the variables that characterize each phase are based on not only linguistic but also sociocultural and political dynamics, therefore, it is important to give a brief description of each phase and its associated variables, with a particular focus on the top two variables, i.e., "sociolinguistic conditions" and "linguistic effects," as the model's formulations of them.

When a sizable population of settlers enters a new territory or nation, Schneider (2007) claims that the socio-political context enters the foundation phase. They bring English with them, and it begins to be used in the country that does not have English as its native tongue. This is attributable to the establishment of military forts, trading outposts, or immigrant settlements that are sparked by domestic political and economic considerations. When colonization gets underway, the number of migrants may initially be modest but eventually rise, and relationships between immigrants and indigenous people may

range from cordial to antagonistic. Identity consciousness creeps in at this point, and there is a definite linguistic demarcation between the settler and indigenous communities, meaning that each community perceives itself as being “different” in terms of culture and language. On the one hand, the native population considers itself as the only legitimate inhabitants and owner of the land. The settlers, on the other consider themselves as members of British society who are representing their nation of origin in a distant region with the possibility of returning soon or refusing to leave and culturally rebuild the nation where they came from. A complex scenario for contact then develops when settlers establish themselves in a new territory where there are native languages spoken. The first type involves the settler population, which has different British dialectal backgrounds. The second type results from contact between settlers and indigenous people; in plantation colonies, slaves and laborers are just as much influenced as the indigenous people. Communication between communities may remain minimal and solely utilitarian, because of the lack of mutual understanding. With the exception of missionaries, the majority of the settler community does not bother to learn the indigenous languages. While the indigenous population that has been invaded may be compelled by the circumstances to learn the invaders' language. This trend might result in marginal bilingualism among the indigenous people, especially among individuals who may be trained by the settlers as interpreters for administrative purposes. As a result, certain settler language words begin to spread through frequent interaction, which inevitably signals the beginnings of second-language learning.

On the linguistic front, at this stage, the following alteration processes usually took place: “Koineization, incipient pidginization, and toponymic borrowing” (Schneider, 2007, p. 35). The process of Koineization produces a fairly consistent intermediate sort of variation as speakers gradually adjust their pronunciation and vocabulary use to improve intelligibility. While settlers may have arrived from many areas of the parent country at this early stage, the language development of the population may tilt towards

linguistic homogeneity (Schneider, 2007). This stage, which is characterized by predominantly informal speech contexts, may be an inter-dialect, as evidenced by phonetic simplification and grammatical emphasis. Koineization could be slowed by the involvement of high-ranking settlers, who may have minimal interaction with vernacular speakers. However, a common language is supposed to develop as a result of the rapidly expanding contact between people who do not speak the same languages. Toponymical borrowings often have the most linguistic influence on the settlers' language at this stage, if any at all, and they often endure even if the indigenous culture is completely annihilated.

The colonial apparatus establishing itself in the colonies and the colonists' power beginning to be asserted are what characterize the exonormative stabilization phase, which this foundation phase progressively enters. The use of the English language has significantly increased at this point as the settlers' economic prosperity increases as a result of geographic expansion. It compels a growing number of indigenous people who desire to improve their socioeconomic conditions to learn the language of the invaders. However, the settlers still remain conscious of the distinctions their experience of living abroad makes between them and their peers back home and still have a sense of belonging elsewhere (namely, Britain), not in the new territory. At this point, it might be presumed that the local British community's identity has broadened to encompass something akin to “British plus” (Schneider, 2007, p. 37). While they could still consider Britain to be “home,” for example, a false “myth of return” has taken hold. Children of purely British ancestry identify with their own culture, but children of mixed-ethnicity parents “develop a hybrid cultural identity” (Schneider, 2007, p. 37).

Within the native population, on the other hand, a new socioeconomic class of educated and English-speaking natives arises, with an advantage over other natives who may not be as “privileged,” because of their contacts with the colonizers and their ability to speak English, the colonizers' language. This might be the onset of “segregational elitism” (Schneider, 2007, p. 37) based on the superior socioeconomic standing

between those who can speak the language of the colonizers and those who do not. Consequently, bilingualism among the indigenous people starts to expand (especially in trade and exploitation colonies) through greater interaction with settlers and education. In education, the standard language conventions of Britain are upheld, and the learner community develops communication that is enriched and characterized by indigenous terminology.

In terms of linguistic evolution, this phase reflects that lexical borrowing, syntax, and morphological structures start to be enriched by cross-cultural language interactions, and the settler community eventually modifies their spoken English to correspond with the surrounding indigenous reality. The natively educated elite starts to exhibit more code switching and mixing, while the settlers start to adopt names for objects they first encounter in the new territory; these names serve as linguistic markers for their "British plus" identity. These appropriations can be characterized by "isms," such as Indianism, Americanism, and so on. In turn, structural nativization progressively develops among natives who are proficient in English; settlers describe it as "more or less 'good' or 'broken' depending on its communicative effectiveness" (Schneider, 2007, p. 40).

After it comes the nativization phase, which is "the central phase of both cultural and linguistic transformation" (Schneider, 2007, p. 40). The most significant sociopolitical and sociolinguistic developments at this time are driven by the desire for greater sociocultural independence from Britain in terms of language. Politically and linguistically, the offspring will begin to go their separate ways as the former parent nation progressively loses its significance as a "mother country" (Schneider, 2007, pp. 40–41). The linguistic and political winds of independence gather momentum, and political discourse starts to take centre stage. Parties in favour of the change and those opposed to it were pitted against one another.

These developments, which lead "toward psychological, political, and economic independence and its consequences, significantly affect the identity constructions of parties

involved, resulting in a kind of 'semi-autonomy'" (Schneider, 2007, p. 41), and the gulf between the settlers and indigenous communities is bridged by their shared goal of independence, while subtle differences in socioeconomic status, race, language, and culture tend to become less significant over time (Schneider, 2007, p. 41). As a result, contacts between the two groups becomes regular and involve sizable numbers of both groups in a variety of situations, positions, and contexts (Schneider, 2007, p. 42), and a certain degree of flexibility is gained for effective and successful communication. The native population may be overburdened by this accommodating strategy, which might result in extensive second language acquisition of English and, ultimately, a linguistic shift as they may acquire the settlers' language. As a result, it is possible that some indigenous languages may disappear. The inventive English variant of the native populations, which incorporates vocabulary and other characteristics from the native languages, is more appealing to those members of the settler group who may be less conservative. The conservative settler group may insist on metropolitan standards while rejecting innovations, but at this point, it is already obvious that the metropolitan norm is "an external one" (Schneider, 2007, p. 43). Thus, the wheel of linguistic change starts spinning, despite conservative groups' best efforts to uphold metropolitan standards, and a nativized version of English obtains acceptability and takes center stage. Since actions of identification are not just matters of perception but also have formal realization in lexicalization, syntax, and discourse, styles, and genres, this stage has the greatest influence on the reconstruction of the English language itself. It is fundamental to the emergence of a brand-new, formally distinct Postcolonial English (Schneider, 2007, p. 44).

This change is more conspicuous at the level of the lexicon, as a large number of "predominantly, loans from indigenous languages" (Schneider, 2007, p. 44) creep into the vocabulary of the newly nativized version of English. The speech of indigenous communities typically exhibits a distinct local accent, which is often attributed to a phenomenon of transfer from the phonology of

indigenous languages, with proximity to native speakers' pronunciations forms increasing in association with status, education, and frequency of engagement with them. Over time, certain regional pronunciation variations are adopted more judiciously and start to develop an indigenous flavour (albeit they may not be acknowledged as the official norm) of pronunciation (Schneider, 2007, p. 44). Variations on the morphosyntactic level reflect structures unique to a particular territory (e.g., "How you can ask?" as wh-questions without subject-auxiliary inversion are frequently used in Pakistani English). It is worth noting that during this process, speakers take on the role of "language builders," actively constructing something new as opposed to merely consuming linguistic forms derived from source varieties and subject to contact-induced change mechanisms like interference (Schneider, 2007, p. 47). Moreover, the difference between first-language and second-language variants quickly blurs at this time. The early stages of indigenization may focus on modifying lexico-grammatical restrictions; lexical chunks or bundles are constructed with distinctive collocations, including the formation of phrasal nouns and phrasal verbs in the speech of indigenous communities, in particular. In such a context of interaction, the innovation may involve borrowing from indigenous languages, adjusting cultural norms of communication, or altering the pragmatics of language use. This may include "distinctive greeting customs, politeness expressions, and status distinctions (Schneider, 2007, p. 47). Herefore, mixing of codes takes place not just as an indication of bilingualism, as in code switching, but also as a means of self-identification.

The nativization phase is followed by the endonormative stabilization phase. As the name implies, it is frequently characterized by cultural independence and the associated new identity building after political independence, which is likely to give rise to a new language. Since a community must have the autonomy to decide on language-related matters on its own; a national linguistics standard must exist and be recognized in official contexts. At this point, the settler

community's influence is also significantly diminished since the native population often takes the lead and draws attention away from them because they no longer command the political power they once did. Under such situations, the settlers who remain behind (like in South Africa) integrate with the native population and come to identify with it as a member of a newly established nation that also incorporates the identity of the native population.

This new identity, therefore, gives its new territory more weight than the historical or settler background. In the new identity or territory, ethnic distinctions are also downplayed. In a psychological sense, this is the emergence of a new country – [where nation is a mental construct] –that emphasizes shared characteristics while downplaying internal distinctions (Schneider, 2007, p. 49). This designates a stage of "nation building" in heterogeneous new nations, frequently as a stated political objective, which the society as a whole share but may be optional for individuals. The growing acceptance and acknowledgement of nativized versions of English as a means of expressing that identity correlates with newly attained psychological independence and acceptance of indigenous identity, and nativized rules, hitherto denigrated by British standards, start to acquire acceptance even in formal situations, particularly with vocabulary items and cautiously with syntactic features (Schneider, 2007, p. 49).

Even among more conservative groups, there could still be remnants of earlier conventions, although these concerns, like the tradition of decrying over the declining linguistic standards, are relatively uncommon. The term "English in X" is changed to "X English," which designates a separate tongue. This change leads to a new 'literary creativity' in English, that is firmly established in the new sociocultural context and incorporates traits of the new language variant (Schneider, 2007, p. 50). The substantial surge in English-language literature over the time serves as evidence for this. Furthermore, it is typical at this stage that the new indigenous language variety is perceived as strikingly homogeneous and that this homogeneity is actually highlighted

(Schneider 2007: 57). The production of dictionaries of the respective PCEs [Postcolonial Englishes] is a hallmark of this phase, which is characterized by the adoption of new linguistic conventions. Once such a dictionary is published, it strengthens the distinctive national and linguistic identity as well as the forms used to signal it (Schneider, 2007, p. 52).

The endonormative stabilization phase eventually gave way to the differentiation phase, when the nativized variety has fully evolved and produced its own socially acceptable varieties. Since then, the newly constituted country has firmly established itself as an independent state with the accompanying self-reliance in numerous spheres of everyday life, which included a nearly perfect sense of linguistic independence. Some internal diversification is likely as a result of this persistent national variety at this stage, as Schneider (2007) asserts that in comparison to the former colonial power, the people of a nascent nation no longer consider themselves primarily as a unified social unit but rather as a combination of subgroups, each of which is distinguished by a unique identity (p. 53). Prior to independence, collective identities masked the internal variety of the newly merged country, but it has since reemerged, with language use serving as a key indicator. So, from a sociological standpoint, internal heterogeneity is highlighted as being veiled by umbrella-like "collective identities" (Schneider, 2007, p. 53). Since in every community, there are social networks that individuals strongly identify with. These networks primarily control their contacts and interactions, resulting in the highest levels of communication among individuals inside their social networks. The claim that a person's connections are significantly influenced by his or her social circle, where there is the largest density of communicative encounters, may therefore establish the fundamental sociolinguistic conditions (Schneider, 2007, p. 53). The emergence of new varieties of the formerly new variety, as carriers of new group identities within the larger community, is a significant linguistic outcome. Regional and social variations, linguistic markers (accents), lexical expressions, and structural patterns that are unique to the new

nation emerge (Schneider, 2007, p. 54). Regardless of whatever variation that may have existed, phase V heralds the start of an intense period of new or increased internal sociolinguistic diversity—a development that may have existed earlier than imagined (Schneider, 2007, p. 54), but could not generally be dated.

In light of the model of evaluation just discussed, the researchers examine the Pakistani variant of English and reevaluates where it stands on the model's proposed developmental cycle. Even the model offers an insightful analytical framework for analyzing the development of postcolonial Englishes, it has certain inherent limitations that need to be examined and addressed in order to deal with the complex sociolinguistic realities of postcolonial countries like Pakistan. As Schneider (2007) notes, that the progression and development of Postcolonial Englishes is a series of distinctive Phases of identity rewritings and associated language alterations that affect the parties engaged in a colonial-contact situation (Schneider, 2007, p. 29). This plainly suggests that the model is exclusively applicable to the former settler colonies and is specifically centered on the idea of two communities, namely the settler community and the indigenous community (e.g., America, South Africa).

Yet, in the case of former exploitative colonies, conditions are extremely different (e.g., British India). Even under colonial control, there were not two separate communities; instead, there were colonists, a small group of colonizers, and the colonized, or the natives. Identity rewriting was therefore impossible in this context of colonial interaction; however, linguistic developments highly influenced the colonized. The colonizers used a range of strategies, such as the formal education system, employment, and power structures, to impose their language on the natives in the exploitative colonies and keep them psychologically under control. In light of this, the researchers argue that Schneider's (2007) dynamic model's evolutionary stages—foundation, exonormative stabilization, nativization, endonormative stabilization, and differentiation—as well as its constituent parameters—extralinguistic (sociopolitical)

background, identity constructions, sociolinguistic conditions (contact settings and participants' use of specific varieties; norm orientations and attitudes), and linguistic effects (structural changes on the levels of lexis, pronunciation, and grammar)—are all operating differently and in a different linear sequence (Schneider, 2007, p. 33).

Therefore, the researchers propose that the final three phases of the model—nativization, endonormative stabilization, and differentiation—need to be revised with the objective to measure the evolution and development of the English language in erstwhile exploitative colonies like Pakistan. This revision in the final three phases of the model is justified by the fact that Schneider's (2007) model examines Postcolonial Englishes from the perspective of settler communities in former settler colonies, whereas in former exploitation colonies like Pakistan, the situation unfolds differently and necessitates different theorization to examine the origin and evolution of non-native Postcolonial Englishes. So, this study examines the evolution of Pakistani English in Schneider's (2007) dynamic model in the section that follows and recommends a revision of the model to address the various sociocultural realities in postcolonial countries like Pakistan.

PAKISTANI ENGLISH IN SCHNEIDER'S (2007) DYNAMIC

This study, at the outset, presents the varietal evolution of Pakistani English within the framework of Schneider's (2007) dynamic model, from its foundation (when there was only a vague impression of the incursion of a foreign language) until exonormative stabilization (when it was recognized as a foreign language on the Indian subcontinent). Since this model centers on the evolution and development of Postcolonial Englishes in the former settler colonies, the researchers have focused on the final three phases of the dynamic model—nativization, endonormative stabilization, and differentiation—from the perspective of the former exploitation colonies and have provided observations and revisions where they are required.

Phase I: Foundation

The foundation of English was laid down in this region of the world, formerly known as the Indian subcontinent (which spans present-day Bangladesh, Pakistan, and India), when, on December 31, 1600, under the auspices of the East India Company, Queen Elizabeth authorized traders in London a charter to conduct trade with India. This major development paved the way for English to spread over the Indian subcontinent in the following years as a contact language. In the 17th century, the East India Company (henceforth Company) built trade posts on Indian soil and sponsored missionaries to spread the light of Christianity. These missionaries eventually persuaded some of the natives to become Christians in the 17th and 18th centuries. Although the missionaries often used indigenous languages in this endeavour, the schools they established in various places around the country were frequently administered in English, fostering the language. Therefore, Schneider (2007) believes that missionaries were the primary agents behind the spread of English over the Indian subcontinent.

As a result, English gradually established its footprint on the subcontinent's soil over the course of approximately two centuries, albeit with little impact on Indian lives. Only in the latter part of the 18th century did the expansion of English gather significant momentum, when the Company started wresting control of areas across the subcontinent from Indian rulers and other colonizers, primarily through wars and dewanees (land grants with authority to collect revenue), which changed the Company's position on the subcontinent from a trading entity to a major power player. Meanwhile, through the Indian Act of 1784, the British Crown jointly assumed the control over the territories under the Company's administration (Kachru, 1994, p. 502).

The Indian subcontinent begins to become more Anglicized, but the identities of the parties involved remain unchanged: Englishmen comprised the merchants, sailors, and missionaries who interacted with the Indians. The number of settlers in the region was fairly modest. While some missionaries acquired indigenous language skills, bilingualism with English developed slowly among the natives. However, due to the lack of a sizable settler population during this time, there is no

evidence of koineization, even though some dialect interaction occurred.

Phase II: Exonormative Stabilization

The transition on the Indian subcontinent from the foundation phase to the exonormative stabilization phase as a result of stable colonial status is difficult to pinpoint since it happened gradually over the course of the second half of the 18th century. Lord Robert Clive's victory against Siraj-ud-Daulah, the last Nawab of Bengal, at the Battle of Plassey in 1757 marked the beginning of the Company's transformation from a trading entity into a major power player on the subcontinent. In the following years, the company established and consolidated its supremacy over the majority of the subcontinent with the assistance of the British Crown. As a result, English bilingualism surged and it reached its pinnacle in the 19th century, when even influential Indians favored English-medium schooling over Indian languages-dominated education system. This native preference, together with Macaulay's Minutes on Indian Education (1835), which institutionalized English language teaching throughout the Indian subcontinent, this exonormative stabilization phase achieved its zenith.

Schneider (2007) believes that the Indian subcontinent went through an exonormative stabilization-like sociolinguistic situation for most of the 19th century. The bilingualism ratio among the indigenous people grew quickly because of the frequent and pervasive linguistic interactions between English and indigenous languages. The linguistic origination was unmistakably exonormative, with British English as the target language. Knowledge of English was associated with social status, making it a trait of the elite, although this notion should not be interpreted too narrowly, since functional communication competence in English was necessary for a wide range of intermediate positions (clerks, railway agents, military personnel, servants, and others). Thus, English had spread to lower and middle classes in Indian society which resulted in the substantial lexical borrowings from subcontinental languages into English. A variety of terms signifying numerous contextual areas, such as religious, social, cultural, apparel, cuisine, and lifestyle, were transferred into English, in addition to the customary share of fauna and flora.

Phase III: Nativization

In the context of former exploitative colonies like Pakistan, the third phase of Schneider's (2007) model—the nativization of English—poses a significant difficulty since English is constantly restructuring itself to reflect the new sociocultural realities of the Indian subcontinent. Yet, despite the post-partition governments of India and Pakistan's intentions to avert the use of English, English experienced a nativization phase in the Indian subcontinent at the turn of the 20th century. Schneider (2007), however, holds that nativization, or the emergence of its structural idiosyncrasies, which began long before 1947, was the fundamental requirement of English (a precursor for its later durability) in the Indian subcontinent. In addition, political events from the early 20th century, when the people of the subcontinent stood up against the British Raj, may be linked to the commencement of the nativization phase. As political debates gain prominence, a widespread movement for independence ramps up. The independence movement was further intensified by the partition of Bengal in 1905 and the foundation of the All India Muslim League in 1906. In this movement of independence, language gained paramount significance as an instrument of resistance.

The native people challenged the colonial authorities by using the colonizers language, which ultimately drove them out of their lands. The English language's reorganization is affected most significantly during this stage (Schneider, 2007, p. 44), but not as an act of “identity,” rather as a tool of protest against the imposed linguistic norms, despite the fact that the National Congress pushed for Hindustani and the Muslim League for Urdu. At this juncture, the newly nativized variety of English had a sizable vocabulary that was predominantly, loans from indigenous languages. Moreover, the nativization process altered the language at all levels, which turned the colonizers' language inside out so that it might echo the screams of the colonized. As Sidhwa (1993) says that we, the ex-colonized, have just squashed the language into submission and made it our own. The reality remains that we have given English a new shape, substance, and dimension by tailoring it to our use, pounding it on its head, and even twisting its tail (p. 212). It is interesting to note that, although the parameters for the nativization phase as postulated in

Schneider's (2007) model were vastly different in the context of exploitation colonies like British India, the language output nevertheless reflects relatively comparable implications.

Phase IV: Endonormative Stabilization

In Schneider's (2007) model, the endonormative stabilization phase, which follows political independence and is frequently characterized by cultural self-reliance and related new identity creation, is likely to give rise to a new language. Since a community must have the independence to make decisions on language-related matters on its own, a national linguistics standard must exist and be acknowledged in official contexts. However, in the case of Pakistan, English would be designated as the official language soon after the country gained its independence because Urdu was unable to immediately satisfy the criteria for being an official language. Thus, English was given political legitimacy as Pakistan's officially recognized second language, even if only for a 20-year transition period in the 1956 Constitution of Pakistan, before Urdu had an opportunity to develop and be able to meet the standards of official correspondence. The subsequent Constitutions of Pakistan have expressed a similar intent to replace English with Urdu, and despite attempts to replace it with Urdu, English still remains the official language of Pakistan. In addition, after 1947, without considerable native input, it evolved its own features to meet the communication needs of Pakistani society.

With the Indian subcontinent's partition, the settler strand, as defined by Schneider (2007), has all but vanished. In terms of identity formation, Pakistanis no longer consider themselves to be much influenced by the British because there are hardly any British people living in Pakistan today. As a result, the sociolinguistic interaction context in Pakistan differs from that of English used in America or Australia. Hence, English in Pakistan merely performs the role of an official second language. Moreover, given the vast range of indigenous languages used in Pakistan, linguistic transfer processes are not confined to just one language but rather affect the emerging form of English as a second language. Likewise, bilingualism is not as widespread in Pakistan (in the context of English) as the dynamic model of postcolonial Englishes envisions, and although the users of Pakistani English make up the influential

elite of Pakistani society, who hold tremendous power within the society, a complete language shift does not appear likely.

Pakistani English has evolved into a nativized variant through word formations, word conversions from one part of speech to another, archaic vocabulary use, phrase level reduction, collaged words, regional aphorisms, culturally eclipsed meanings, and grammatical changes in the adjective, verb, and noun complementation at the sentence level (Jadoon, 2017, p. 4). As a result, "a typically Pakistani English idiom does appear to be emerging, as a result of the language's new context of use," (Baumgardner, 1990, p. 61), which is present at all linguistic levels, although a number of conservative linguists frequently assert that linguistic use is deteriorating (Schneider, 2003, p. 248) and the general perception of Pakistani English is that this is a mass of uneducated blunders rather than a variation of English, and it must not be fostered (Rahman, 2014, p. 2). But, this conservative mindset is gradually fading, and it is now proper to declare that Pakistani English has moved deeply into phase three of Schneider's (2007) model, is firmly nativized, and shows the signs of endonormative stabilization, such as literary creativity, as Pakistani Anglophone literature has grown rapidly in recent years, in almost every genre, such as poetry, novels, short stories, drama, and literary non-fiction. As Shamsie (2017) notes, "Pakistani English language literature is no longer a marginalized, disparaged genre as it once was. It is now part of the mainstream of Pakistani literature and indeed a leading light. It continues to develop at a rapid rate, and there are so many new books published every month" (p. 606). But in terms of identity construction, it is unlikely that the Pakistani variety of English will be used as a first language anytime in the foreseeable future.

As for as linguistic effects are concerned, in Pakistani society, immediately after the actualization of the shared goal (independence), in contrast to Schneider's (2007) postulation, which centers on shared goals of nation building, internal differences on ethnolinguistic grounds surfaced, which also influenced the development of Pakistani English. As a result, in Pakistan, English has not developed into a homogenized variety of nativized English, which is a characteristic of the endonormative stabilization phase, but rather into a complex cline of varieties

that reflect substratum influences of various language families, such as the Indo-Aryan and Indo-Iranian language families, and speakers' competence. As, Rahman (2014) asserts, in addition to a sizable number of variations based on the speakers' ethnolinguistic backgrounds, Pakistani English has four sub-varieties centered on the proficiency level of the users. These sub-varieties include Anglicized Variety on the one extreme, which differs from Received Pronunciation only in a few phonological-phonetic characteristics but is otherwise similar to British English, and the Basilect Variety on the other, which is used by clerks, junior officials, typists, and those with less education, is the most challenging for foreigners to comprehend since it is rife with bureaucratic clichés. In between these two are Acrolect and Mesolect Varieties, Acrolect Variety differs from British English in terms of morphology, syntax, lexis, and semantics in addition to phonology, comes after the anglicized variant. While, Mesolect Variety is more distinct from British English in every respect than the other two varieties (Rahman, 2014). In spite of this, codification and homogeneity are far behind. Endonormative stabilization is still a way off due to the variability of Pakistani English and the absence of an explicit general standard aside from a scientific descriptive account of Pakistani English. Although several scholars, like Baumgardner, Kennedy, Rahman, Talaat, and Mahboob, explored different facets of Pakistani English, their research may be viewed as the forerunners of a scientific descriptive analysis of the language.

Phase V: Differentiation

Schneider (2007) claims that in this final phase, the nativized variation has entirely evolved its own socially acceptable variants. Closer social ties and contacts among the country's educated and privileged elite, who hold executive positions and enjoy higher social standing may be indicators of this scenario. As a result, socio-linguistically, the nativized variety develops different social and regional dialectal variations. Schneider (2007), however, notes that almost always, we simply have not enough information to determine when regional diversification may have begun (p. 54). Yet, this dialectal diversification in Pakistani English might be correlated to the endonormative stabilization phase, when the Minutes of Macaulay (1835)

marked the linguistic beginning of the British Raj, and the colonial power devoted all of its efforts promoting English literary and scientific knowledge on the Indian subcontinent. The status of English in India's multilingual network was altered by this deliberate introduction of the English language, which led to it being the dominant language of government, law, and education across the whole Indian subcontinent (Annamalai, 2004, p. 153). Even, at the height of nationalism, between 1844 and 1905, the British government made a series of policy decisions that were used to implement English education in various ways. While, English literate Indians were hired by the Governor-General Hardinge (1844) for lower-level positions in the administration of the East India Company, which enhanced English usage and gave the British government cost-effective employees. These developments paved the way for English to quickly become the dominant language on the multiracial, multireligious, multiethnic, and multilingual Indian subcontinent.

The status of English language, however, most dramatically changed in the history of the Indian subcontinent near the end of the 19th century when Indians who were against British rule began to use it as a tool against the rulers themselves. After being founded in 1885, the National Congress had spread throughout the subcontinent by the turn of the 20th century. Its members used English language to communicate and spread the message National Congress with the multilingual people of the Indian subcontinent (John, 2007). As explained by Masani (1987), English played a vital role in the struggle for freedom, by the 1920s, it was evident that the very education that the Raj believed would produce subservient Indians who would be loyal to its rule had become the source of its opposition (p. 89).

It indicates that the phase five's key characteristic, diversification, has been there for a long time and exists at acrolectal levels, where it is frequently difficult to determine a speaker's place of origin from their speech. In Pakistani English, therefore, phases four and five should be assumed to merge with phase three if Schneider's (2007) model's provisions are strictly adhered to; otherwise, the claims of linearity become dubious. Albeit, the study reveals that Pakistani English is still not homogeneous. While differentiation appears to

be one of Pakistani English's fundamental traits, a national standard has not yet been reached. The researchers assert that the English that educated Pakistanis use, regardless of their native language, contains enough shared characteristics to be distinguished as the standard variety of Pakistani English.

REFLECTIONS ON THE MODEL'S APPLICABILITY TO PAKISTANI ENGLISH

This section goes into further detail on the dynamic model's characteristics that pertain to its reliability as a theory of language development and its practical applicability in the context of erstwhile exploitation colonies, like, Pakistan, in addition to meta-linguistic considerations and ontological dilemmas. The model, in the researchers' perspective, conceptualizes the fundamental characteristics of Postcolonial Englishes evolution and development as sequential or quasi- sequential; that is, they are progressive, but the progression only goes in one direction, from phase one to phase five. Also, these are incremental or developmental and might not be realized in another way. Yet, the study of Pakistani English suggests that phases three, four, and five may have merged or become indistinguishable from one another. The ontological basis of the phases is thus challenged, particularly when homogenization and diversification parameters do not readily apply in any perceptible linearity; rather, the order appears clearly reversed, though it may occur simultaneously when the emergence of acrolectal norms and societal elitism are taken into account. Language reconstruction appears to be operational even in phase five, which is a characteristic of the nativization phase.

This challenge could be resolved by lifting the linearity restriction of this model—or, to be more precise, by permitting parametric preferences—so that different evolutionary patterns of English variants may be examined in light of their sociocultural contexts. The other is for the model to reconfigure the phases so that phases three, four, and five are followed by phases three, five and four, respectively. This is particularly significant given that the Pakistani experience makes this seem rather impractical, and since the parameters postulated by the model are not hierarchical, no such sequence may be necessary when they are operationalized in any of

the phases. In this modified configuration, differentiation in the last phase of modal is replaced by endonormative stabilization. Moreover, in the context of Pakistani English, the researchers also recommend revising the model's phase four and phase five terminology to “diversification” and “standardisation.” In addition, the phase-wise development of Postcolonial Englishes is directional but merely unidirectional in nature moving from phase one to phase five, as opposed to the study findings of Pakistani English, which demonstrate simultaneous development at different levels and, instead of making the transition from one phase to another, each phase develops simultaneously; the only difference is in the degree of development.

The model is dynamic, and the researchers believe that except for its unidirectionality, it has successfully handled this challenging phenomenon of the evolution of Postcolonial Englishes. Yet, this unidirectionality appears overly extreme provided that the framework acknowledges the potential for drastic changes, which may be caused by radical government policies, wars, the outcomes of social conflicts, military coups, and a large cultural reorientation, among others. Even so, the model's linearity and unidirectionality undermine the ontological foundation of dynamism, which has to be addressed. Therefore, one may contend that a dynamic model would take into consideration inertia, depression, growth, and stability, among other factors, and it could be able to identify both short- and long-term environmental variations. Since sociocultural and linguistic factors are inextricably linked to one another, this would involve a multi-dimensional or multi-directional dynamism that may be linear, non-linear, as well as random, and which needs to be considered an essential element in any framework of language analysis in linguistic contact situations. If the implications of the term “dynamism” are not intended, it might be better referred to as something like a “developmental transition model.”

The model provides a valuable framework for the study of contact-induced postcolonial Englishes, the researchers conclude, notwithstanding the issues raised by this study. The model's objective is to offer a unified description of a number of processes that have really occurred apart from one another—a generalization that removes numerous complexities

and intricacies (Schneider, 2007, p. 55). However, the dynamic character of the model would be strengthened and further enhanced by taking the observations presented in this research into consideration in the context of former exploitative colonies like Pakistan.

CONCLUSION

This study has so far examined the tenets of Schneider's (2007) dynamic model in the context of Pakistani English. The model serves as an analytical tool and an investigative framework in the study of contact-induced Postcolonial Englishes. It notes that these English variations have evolved through five evolutionary phases, with four subparameters constituting each phase. The phases, which are linear, provide a standard to determine the growth or development of a Postcolonial English variant.

In light of this model, this research examined the development of Pakistani English. The findings suggest that Pakistani English has progressed to the third phase, nativization, and there are signs that some characteristics of its fourth phase, endonormative stabilization, and fifth phase differentiation may also have been achieved, but some characteristics of these phases are still lagging behind. In other words, it is plausible to assert that Pakistani English has already exemplified a variety of characteristics from each of the model's five phases, but not necessarily in the sequence the model suggests. Instead, Pakistani English has practically obliterated the distinctions between the postulated phase boundaries. Hence, in terms of nativization, it is reasonable to conclude that English in Pakistan has significantly advanced into phase three, has firmly nativized, and is still making headway at a rapid pace. In addition, the preconditions for indigenous identity are obviously met as part of endonormative stabilization, and it is recognized as a Pakistani language. Literary creativity is another prerequisite for endonormative stabilization, and Pakistani English is as creative in this domain as any of the native varieties of English while differentiation (diversification) is a well-documented phenomenon in Pakistani English. However, it takes more time to achieve codification, which also includes dictionary compilation and harmonization. Finally, the study recommends that by taking a broader perspective on dynamism, the model be improved to more properly

account for contact-induced language change, particularly in former exploitative colonies. This is due to the fact that the researchers consider language change as a continuous process that may be handled in that way.

REFERENCES

- Annamalai, E. (2004). Nativization of English and its Effect on Multilingualism. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3(1),151-162.
- Baumgardner, R. J. (2014). The indigenization of English in Pakistan. *English Today* 6(1), 59-65.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *The Language Revolution*. Malden: Polity Press.
- Jadoon, N. K. (2017). Abrogation and Appropriation of English in Arundhati Roy's *The God of Small Things*. *Research Scholar* 5(3), 6-18.
- Jadoon, N. K. (2017). Pakistanization of English in Kamila Shamsie's *Kartography*. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research* 5(4), 1-17.
- John, B. K. (2007). *Entry from Backside Only. Hazaar Fundas of Indian-English*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.
- Kachru, B. B. (1994). English in South Asia. In Robert Burchfield (Ed.), *The Cambridge History of the English Language* (Vol. 5) (PP. 497-553). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Masani, Z. (1987). *Indian Tales of the Raj*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McArthur, T. (2001). World Englishes and World Englishes: Trends, Tensions, Varieties, and Standards. *Language Teaching* 34(1), 1-20.
- Mufwene, S. S. (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahman, T. (2014). *Pakistani English: The linguistic description of a non-native variety of English* (Rev ed.). Islamabad:

- National Institute of Pakistan Studies,
Quaid-e-Azam University.
- Schneider, E. W. (2003). The Dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 2(79), 233-281.
- Schneider, E. W. (2007). *Postcolonial English varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2014). New reflections on the evolutionary dynamics of world Englishes. *World Englishes* 33(1), 9-32.
- Sidhwa, B. (1993). New English creative writing: A Pakistani writer's perspective. In Robert J Baumgardner (Ed.), *The English Language in Pakistan* (pp. 212-220). Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Young, G. M., (Ed). (1935). *Speeches by Lord Macaulay, with his Minute on Indian Education*. London: Oxford University Press.

