

# Englishes in China: Evolution and Recognition in World Englishes

Yiting Shen \*

Department of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 311121, China

\* Corresponding author Email: shenyiting@stu.hznu.cn

---

**Abstract:** This study offers an in-depth examination of the development of “China English” (CE) within the framework of World Englishes (WE). Tracing the historical trajectory of English in China, from its origins in Chinese Pidgin English to the contemporary manifestations of CE, the paper conducts a comprehensive analysis of its various stages. Situating CE within the broader context of WE, the study engages in debates regarding its recognition as a distinct variety of English. Moreover, it investigates the process of nativization of CE, highlighting its phonological features, lexicon enriched with cultural nuances and discourse patterns shaped by sociocultural dynamics. Despite ongoing debates surrounding the legitimacy of CE, the paper argues that its evolution conforms to established parameters of nativization, thereby establishing it as a legitimate variant within the global landscape of English. Beyond linguistic examination, the study emphasizes the significant role of CE in facilitating international English communication amidst China's expanding global influence. By delving into the intricate interplay of language, culture, and identity in our interconnected world, this research provides valuable insights into the evolving dynamics of global communication.

**Keywords:** China English; Nativization; World Englishes.

---

## 1. Introduction

Since the 1960s, the term “New Englishes” [1] has been employed to describe “regional varieties” of international or global English. This evolution in language study has posed a significant challenge in the examination of Chinese or China English today. The investigation into “China English (hereafter CE)” is currently gaining prominence. Renowned scholars have explored and defined the objective existence of CE and its various forms from diverse perspectives [2-8]. Notably, Du and Jiang delved into the phonemic, lexical, and discourse aspects of CE [9]. Du elucidated the phenomenon of CE through the lens of English nativization, and Meng and Yu explored the connection between CE and English teaching in China [10-11]. Numerous articles on CE have been published in various academic journals, reflecting its objective existence. However, it is essential to acknowledge that CE is not a phenomenon without a source or a development that occurs overnight.

In discussing the relationship between CE and “Chinese Englishes”, British scholar Kingsley Bolton, in his book *Chinese Englishes---A Sociolinguistic History*, characterizes “Chinese Englishes” as a socio-linguistic history. Bolton points out that CE is the outcome of a gradual evolution from unconscious to autonomous variants, moving from non-standardized forms to more standardized ones [12-13]. Indeed, projections suggest that CE may soon surpass the total number of speakers in both the UK and USA combined. In the event of this occurrence, CE could wield considerable influence over the continued development of the English language. According to Deterding, “At that time, native speakers may even become irrelevant [...] and Chinese English will truly be in the forefront of the development of the language” [14]. As such, this study pursues a dual objective. Firstly, it aims to delineate distinct stages of “Chinese Englishes” and delve into CE within the broader context of World Englishes (WE), emphasizing the

significance of CE. Secondly, within the framework of WE, this study explores the nativization of CE. This dual approach enables a comprehensive exploration of the evolution of English in China, from its diverse stages to its status within the global spectrum of English varieties.

## 2. English Languages in China

Since its introduction in the 18th century, the evolution of English in China can be delineated across three distinct stages. Initially, there was a phase of partial colonization accompanied by the development of Chinese Pidgin English (hereafter CPE). This was followed by a phase characterized by a Chinese-influenced variety commonly referred to as Chinglish. In more recent times, there has been a process of indigenization, resulting in a variety known as both Chinese English and, with a subtle change of emphasis, China English. This section will provide an introduction to these “Chinese Englishes”.

### 2.1. Chinese Pidgin English

The global spread of English originated from British imperialism. On the one hand, the colonization of new territories like Australia, New Zealand, and North America involved a substantial migration of people from the British Isles, establishing English as both dominant and native in those regions. On the other hand, imperial control in certain areas introduced the language to unfamiliar populations, resulting in the formation of non-native Englishes—a consequence of “colonialism” without settlers, as exemplified by India. In the case of China, Western powers, including Britain, primarily reached coastal areas such as Canton (Guangzhou), Xiamen, and Shanghai.

The emergence of CPE can be traced back to the 18th century when the British established a trading post in Guangzhou, within the Pearl River Delta. CPE originated from the need for communication between English-speaking traders and local Chinese. Although it extended to other

coastal cities and the Changjiang Valley after 1843, CPE experienced a decline in the late 19th century. Despite this, during its prime, CPE significantly influenced other pidgin English in East Asia and the Western Pacific. Its developmental stages include Sino-Portuguese Mixed English, Guangzhou English, pidgin English, and post-pidgin English. Initially appearing in Macau and Guangdong, it later shifted to Shanghai as a center of Sino-foreign trade, eventually transitioning to the post-pidgin English era after the 1990s.

CPE primarily served as “a communication tool between foreign masters and Chinese servants and found usage in retail shops catering to foreigners” [15]. Characterized by a limited vocabulary, reduced grammar, and simplified phonology compared to native English, CPE functioned as a mixed language, with English as the “superstratum” and Chinese as the “substratum”, displaying significant divergence from native English. For quite a long time, CPE has been labeled as a degraded form of English characterized by poor grammar. Some even criticize it as a negative imposition on the Chinese people, contending that it has contaminated the language of a nation in terms of phonology, vocabulary, semantics, and syntax [16]. However, many contemporary linguists reject the notion that pidgin languages are inferior iterations of their source language(s). Instead, they view pidgins as natural languages that arise in specific circumstances, typically within limited contact situations, to fulfill immediate and restricted communication requirements [17-18].

Numerous structures in CPE exhibit similarities with both English and Cantonese, either as shared features or as simplifications derived from both languages. Nevertheless, a considerable number of structural characteristics can be exclusively attributed to Cantonese influence. These distinctive features encompass the treatment of English labial fricatives, where the absence of *v* in Cantonese results in its replacement by *b*, while the presence of *f* in Cantonese leads to its retention in CPE. Other Cantonese-influenced features include the obligatory use of a classifier piece, the adoption of the V-no-V question form, the incorporation of a copula between the subject and an NP predicate, and the omission of a copula between the subject and an AP predicate. Additionally, at the discourse level, the omission of theme-related NP from a series of sentences is identified as a specific Cantonese contribution.

Additionally, except for the shared features, within the grammar of CPE, the rules exhibit universality, incorporating multiple meanings and polysemy. Formal differences present in Standard English, such as the interchangeable use of “my” with “I, we, mine, ours” and the merging of words like “shop, ship, soap, and sample” into the pronunciation “shaopo”, underscore a phenomenon akin to incomplete bilingual acquisition. This phenomenon aligns with the pidginization hypothesis of second language learning, suggesting that pidginization is a prevalent characteristic in the initial stages of acquiring a second language, influenced by cognitive constraints and various social and psychological factors. Exploring pidginization proves valuable not only for advancing theoretical linguistics but also for contributing to the fields of sociology of education, social anthropology, and sociolinguistics.

## 2.2. Chinglish

According to Yun and Jia, Chinglish is characterized as an

interlanguage, typically presenting itself through Chinese-style syntax with English words, incorporating Chinese phonological elements in pronunciation, or displaying grammatical variations attempting to adhere to Standard English rules but falling short [15]. Consequently, as Eaves concludes, Chinglish can be recognized as a nonsensical language form, signifying an effort to communicate in English, often stemming from deficient translation tools or individuals with limited language proficiency (although distinguishing between the two causes may not always be feasible in a given instance of Chinglish) [19]. This form of English often poses challenges for native English speakers, as it can be either incomprehensible or deemed unacceptable. For instance, the translation of the Chinese expression “你的身体很健康” as “Your body is very healthy” in English communication may seem linguistically accurate but is perceived as unconventional due to the incorporation of the Chinese communication habit, such as using “Teacher Zhang (张老师)” as a term of address. Similarly, the greeting “你吃过了吗?” rendered as “Have you eaten up?” lacks grammatical errors, yet it diverges from English cultural norms and may be categorized as Chinglish. In such instances, while the sentences may not contain grammatical inaccuracies, their usage deviates from the linguistic and cultural expectations of standard English communication.

Chinglish is pervasive, both in spoken and written form, including the majority of English learners and users. Its influence extends to various mediums, including publicity slogans, signboards, product descriptions, introductory notices, and even newspapers and books, highlighting the extensive prevalence of Chinglish and its societal repercussions. Zhang delves into the diverse forms and detrimental effects of Chinglish in his book [20]. As has been shown, Chinglish exhibits several defining characteristics: Firstly, it has been inherently conceived as pejorative. Secondly, it emerges from Chinese individuals lacking sufficient English proficiency, leading them to subjectively use English words without adherence to English grammar or cultural norms. Thirdly, while Chinglish shares some common features, it remains arbitrary and lacks a comprehensive and strict system. Moreover, Chinglish, as a phenomenon, persists widely and is not expected to naturally diminish or disappear. Lastly, it is marked by its incomprehensibility and unacceptability to native English speakers, rendering it unsuitable for international communication.

Additionally, Chinglish exhibits resemblances to Pidgin in various aspects. Firstly, it manifests as a linguistic hybrid resulting from language contact, incorporating pronunciation and vocabulary rooted in a foreign language. Secondly, akin to Pidgin, Chinglish lacks systematic grammar and displays arbitrary and irregular structures, heavily influenced by Chinese grammar. An illustration of this is the use of Chinese word order in English sentences, leading to constructions like “This book I like” instead of the standard English “I like this book”. It's crucial to underscore that Chinglish diverges from Pidgin as it is not a byproduct of colonialism.

Delving into its linguistic characteristics, Chinglish's grammar is notably shaped by Chinese influences, yet it lacks a coherent and systematic grammatical framework. Unlike an autonomous language, Chinglish falls short of serving as an effective medium for domestic or international communication, lacking the fundamental social functions of a fully developed language. To recap, Chinglish, akin to

Pidgin, emerges from language contact and incorporates elements borrowed from foreign languages. However, its distinctive attributes, such as its arbitrary grammar and absence of colonial origins, set it apart from Pidgin and highlight its limitations in fulfilling comprehensive language functions.

### 2.3. Chinese English into China English

In recent decades, propelled by deepening reforms, an open-door policy, and heightened demand, especially following China's entry into the WTO, English has emerged as the most widely studied foreign language in China. Originally perceived as a valuable tool for accessing Western science and technology, the primary focus of English language study has shifted towards better serving societal needs—specifically, fostering mutual communication with individuals from diverse cultures. Although investigations reveal a rising use of English in China, the acknowledgment that non-native speakers may not attain native-like proficiency prompts the recognition of English as a tool evolving into a distinctly Chinese brand. In recent years, the widely accepted term for this phenomenon has been CE, representing “English as used in China”. Some scholars categorize it as an interference variety in cross-cultural communication due to inevitable influences from the Chinese language. However, CE has gained increased attention as a member of the global English family.

The term CE, originating from Chinese English, was introduced in 1980 by Professor Ge, who emphasized the necessity of expressing uniquely Chinese concepts when communicating in English, both historically and in contemporary China [21]. Examples of such concepts include imperial examinations, hanlinyuan, the May Fourth Movement, Mr. Science, Mr. Democracy, baihuawen, two hundred policies, people's commune, and four modernizations. These terms, absent in English-speaking contexts, are appropriately designated as CE. Xie further elucidates that CE is grounded in standardized English, seamlessly integrating into English communication, with its frequency and effectiveness linked to the proficiency of its users [22]. Luo succinctly characterizes CE as an English variant distinguished by distinctive Chinese linguistic features [23].

Diverging from CE, Chinese English has encountered more criticism than encouragement, often being lumped together with both Chinglish and CPE. However, in the context of the increasing global importance of English within China, some scholars have not only acknowledged the existence of Chinese English but also highlighted its significance. As a result, the study of Chinese English has progressed from examining its lexical aspects to exploring discourse patterns, revealing it to be a frequently nativized linguistic product shaped by the sociocultural dynamics of English learning and usage.

Scholar Li contends that Ge's term CE is more apt, considering that Chinese English tends to be viewed unfavorably by both native speakers and many Chinese individuals [24]. According to Li, “China English is based on standard English, expresses Chinese culture, has Chinese characteristics in lexis, sentence structure and discourse but does not show any L1 interference” [25].

The term CE has justified itself as a descriptor for an English variant with distinctive Chinese characteristics and culture—an integral member of the broader English language

family. Certain elements within Chinese English distinguish it from other English varieties, notably what is conventionally known as standard English (SE).

Synthesizing the aforementioned perspectives leads us to the following conclusions: CE is a linguistic phenomenon that arises from the cultural exchange between Chinese and English. It is firmly grounded in SE, facilitating its seamless integration into English communication without the influence of the native tongue. Significantly, CE plays a crucial role in disseminating Chinese culture. This process is poised to be heightened and enriched as more Chinese individuals embrace English, imparting it with distinctive Chinese characteristics.

## 3. China English with the Framework of WE

As English has evolved into a global lingua franca, various forms of English have emerged, distinct from British and American English. The linguistic community commonly categorizes these variations as World Englishes. Linguist Kachru delineates Anglicization into three concentric circles: the Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle. The Inner Circle comprises English from the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, serving as the core and source of normative English. The Outer Circle encompasses English from former British colonies like India, Singapore, the Philippines, and Nigeria. While not adhering strictly to British or American English standards, these countries emphasize English usage, exhibiting distinctive features in vocabulary, phonology, and pragmatics while sharing core features with the Inner Circle. The Expanding Circle refers to countries where English functions as a foreign language, such as Russia, China, Japan, and Egypt. These countries exhibit normatively dependent variants of English.

However, since Ge initially introduced the term CE, discussions have ensued regarding the legitimacy of this concept [21]. While Ge doesn't elaborate extensively on the definition of CE, he does introduce expressions specific to Chinese culture and English speakers in China (e.g., eight-legged essay, four modernizations, imperial examination). As these expressions are not native to English, their understanding may require additional explanations for English speakers outside China. Consequently, the introduction of CE has sparked contentious and ideological debates, particularly regarding whether CE should be categorized as a distinct variety of English within the framework of WE [25-27].

The central focus of the ongoing discourse on CE centers around the distinction between CE and Chinglish. Chinglish, often considered a form of “pidgin English” or an “interlanguage” [4, 28], emerges as a linguistic phenomenon characterized by interference from the native Chinese language during English learning. This interference leads to communication difficulties due to deviations from Standard English. Scholars propose a continuum that encompasses both CE and Chinglish, recognizing subtle and wide distinctions between the two. Hu contrasts Chinglish, which he deems ungrammatical and incomprehensible, with CE, regarding the latter as a communicatively effective tool. However, the categorization of expressions or morphosyntactic features into CE or Chinglish remains a complex endeavor due to the nuanced nature of English use in China and its reflection of Chinese culture's national

identity. The distinction between CE and Chinglish becomes further obscured by evolving linguistic norms and cultural influences on both languages. Expressions such as “long time no see”, originating from Chinese Pidgin English, seamlessly integrate into global English usage, blurring the boundaries between the two linguistic varieties.

Arguments in favor of CE as a legitimate English variety abound. Kirkpatrick and Xu assert that language change will inevitably propel a shift toward CE, defining it as a developing variety subject to ongoing codification and normalization [25]. Xu emphasizes that CE, characterized by the transfer of Chinese linguistic and cultural norms, is primarily used by Chinese speakers for both intra- and international communication. Hu [28] supports CE within the WE framework, contending that it retains a common core intelligible to speakers of other English varieties. He further argues that CE, due to its political, economic, and cultural proximity to certain Asian countries, as well as its large number of English language learners, may eventually become an honored member of the Inner Circle.

Despite these compelling arguments, CE is presently regarded as a “performance variety” [29-30], employed for international communication purposes. As a performance variety, it holds that China English (CE) is not restricted to users within China, and it is not exclusively rooted in SE but rather has SE as its foundational element. From this standpoint, English in China allows for flexible usage, and CE may not necessarily be perceived as a distinct variety of English within specific communities. As China progresses socially and experiences economic openness in the next decade, the utilization of English is poised to broaden and undergo further refinement, establishing itself as a recognized variant within the Expanding Circle of WE [19].

## 4. The Nativization of China English

The English language has achieved such widespread global use that native speakers no longer exclusively dictate its course. Recently, there has been a growing recognition of the considerable diversity among English varieties worldwide as we have mentioned the concept, WE. While maintaining a shared grammar and core vocabulary to facilitate global communication is essential, each country where English is taught as a second or foreign language has nativized aspects of its own culture into the language’s grammar and vocabulary. Pronunciation differences are even more noticeable. It is imperative to investigate these linguistic, cultural, political, and social characteristics. Regarding CE, as possibly a new addition to the extensive family of WE, it is necessary to describe and interpret its linguistic features. These descriptions and interpretations should encompass all three fundamental language components—phonology, lexicon, and discourse. In this section, I will specifically focus on the phonological, lexical, and discourse nativization that are believed to reflect the Chinese identity within CE [4], further setting CE as a variety of English.

### 4.1. Phonology

Although the prevailing belief asserts the absence of a standard spoken model for English [1, 31], I contend that there does exist a concept termed Standard Spoken English. While people may exhibit diverse accents like the aforementioned, there is a shared core that facilitates mutual comprehension among international English users. This standard is dynamic and operates along a continuum with

minimum and maximum acceptability at its two extremes. China English, like other varieties, falls somewhere between these two ends.

There are two distinct tiers of phonological representation, namely segmental and suprasegmental. The predominant focus of English language studies in China has historically centered on the former. In the realm of individual pronunciations, variations are apparent both across diverse regions and among individuals. As highlighted by Bailey and Goralach [32], residents of Hong Kong often substitute single vowels for double vowels (e.g., /teiks /, takes) and employ short vowels instead of long ones (e.g., /ʃɑ:ks/, sharks), a tendency influenced by the pronunciation of the Cantonese dialect. Additionally, individuals in Shanghai may encounter difficulties distinguishing between /n/, /ŋ/, and /l/, while those in Shenyang might struggle with differentiating between /s/ and /ʃ/. It’s important to note that these pronunciation variations are not universal features of Chinese English; rather, they reflect regional influences on the phonetic nuances within specific Chinese communities. This holds lesser significance for Chinese English (CE) as an international language variety, given that proficient Chinese English speakers, unlike those with markedly distinct accents from other regions, do not exhibit notable idiosyncrasies in the pronunciation of the 44 English phonemes.

However, the distinctive Chinese sound in Chinese English (CE) primarily stems from the suprasegmental level. Leather asserts that suprasegmental transfer is cumulative, while the phonemic transfer is “self-limiting” [33]. In other words, the fossilization of suprasegmental features poses increasing challenges for speakers to be understood as they learn more and speak faster. On the other hand, the fossilization of phonemic features causes definite but limited communication troubles.

English suprasegmental features encompass stress, pitch, juncture, weakening, and liaison. It is these features that render CE a “foreign talk” to native speakers while facilitating comprehension for Chinese speakers. In general, CE is somewhat syllable-stressed and lacks phonetic processes like weakening, liaison, assimilation, and juncture. Notably, prepositions, the verb “BE”, and articles are typically stressed. Jiang observes that Chinese English speakers often fail to distinguish between compound noun and “modifier + noun” stress patterns, as seen in “blackboard” versus “black board” or “ENGLISH teacher” versus “English TEACHER” [34]. There is also an absence of so-called shifting stress.

In the verb + adverbial pattern, stress typically falls on the verb, resulting in expressions like “LOOK down” and “LOOK up”, akin to issuing commands. Some of these features may be found in other outer-circle Englishes, but their combination imparts a unique Chinese flavor to listeners. For instance, many native Chinese speakers might say “LADIES AND gentlemen, how ARE YOU?” instead of the more conventional “Ladies an’ GENTlemen, how ARE you?”.

Jiang notes that the pronunciation of CE tends to be conservative and old-fashioned, attributing this phenomenon to the prolonged use of the Daniel Jones system in Chinese dictionaries and textbooks, rather than the widely accepted EPD-14 system introduced in the 14th edition of the English Pronouncing Dictionary [35]. It’s crucial to recognize that most phonetic and phonological studies on the pronunciation of Chinese English speakers or learners often overlook the fact that there is no standard English pronunciation [36-37].

These studies typically view any phonological deviation from Received Pronunciation (RP) or General American accent as “errors” requiring improvement. Unfortunately, a study on the oral proficiency of Chinese English majors in universities chose to exclude phonetic processes such as stress, pitch level, liaison, weakening, and juncture [38].

In essence, it is widely acknowledged that the ultimate goal of foreign language pronunciation teaching is to achieve a “near-native” proficiency [33]. This is deemed necessary to preserve the speaker’s identity when communicating in English as a second or foreign language [39]. Nihalani’s pioneering work compares Japanese English with RP, standard Scottish English, standard Singaporean English, and educated Indian English. It advocates tolerating phonemic features of non-native Englishes in teaching, emphasizing the importance of preserving cultural identity through attention to suprasegmental features. Consequently, future studies should shift focus towards describing such features to provide a more accurate depiction of English usage in China.

## 4.2. Lexicon

Like numerous other varieties of English, CE is characterized by its distinct lexicon, consisting of words that are indigenous to China or possess meanings particular to the Chinese context. In the political domain, from “the Great Leap Forward” in the 1950s to “the Cultural Revolution” in the 1960s and the influence of “the Gang of Four” in the 1970s, newly coined compounds with Chinese socio-political backgrounds have transitioned from being nativized terms with distinct Chinese characteristics to becoming commonplace vocabulary, and in some instances, they have integrated into the general lexicon of the English language at various points in time. Since the 1980s, terms such as “four modernizations” and “one country two systems” have also found their way into British and American publications. More recently, expressions like “opposing bourgeois liberalism”, “macro-economic control system”, “constructing clean politics”, and “enterprise contracted production responsibility system” have been employed to discuss situations in China. These phrases adhere grammatically to SE requirements. Nevertheless, they bear the distinctive imprint of Chinese characteristics, remaining authentic and firmly rooted in the Chinese context.

Additionally, numerous Chinese words and phrases that encapsulate Chinese culture find expression in CE. Particularly, names or terms associated with acupuncture, qigong, and local operas often necessitate direct English usage through phonetic translation. Remarkably, a multitude of Chinese loanwords have already become integral components of the English lexicon. For instance, in the context of tea, names like bohea, congou, hyson, pekoe, souchong, twankay, campo, keemun, and various other valuable kinds are now officially recognized entries in the English dictionary

However, the existence of numerous dictionaries for CE terms, both domestically and internationally, fails to effectively tackle the challenges associated with using such expressions. A primary concern with Chinese borrowings in English lies in the absence of standardized forms for loan translations. Each dictionary adopts its own approach to handling these translated English versions, leading to confusion among readers. This inconsistency is noticeable even in official media outlets like China Daily and China Today. The evident necessity for a standardized China English

dictionary is underscored by the current variations that impede effective communication.

Complicating the matters further is the inclination of Chinese dictionary compilers and media towards anglicized versions, while native speakers often employ transliterated forms. This divergence introduces potential misunderstandings. For instance, terms like “fengshui” are frequently unnecessarily explained in Chinese-English dictionaries designed for Chinese speakers, while transliterations like “t’ai chi (ch’uan)/tai chi (chuan)” find a place in English dictionaries. This disparity underscores the need for a more unified approach in Chinese-English dictionaries, especially as English increasingly becomes a functional language rather than merely a tool for education or examinations. Influential dictionaries, such as the widely used one by Wu [40-41], may wield significant influence in shaping the evolving landscape of CE.

## 4.3. Discourse

Insufficient scholarly attention has been directed toward unraveling the intricacies of discourse patterns within CE, a linguistic phenomenon that has gained prominence. Kirkpatrick and Xu contribute significantly to this discourse by shedding light on a distinctive feature in its written communication—emphasizing the role of “facework” [25]. This intricate pattern involves salutation, facework, reason/justification, request, and sign-off. Illustrating this pattern through a personal email, the writer meticulously adheres to the prescribed structure, placing substantial emphasis on facework and justification before articulating the actual request. For example, the use of elaborate salutations and expressions of gratitude is often observed in CE discourse, reflecting a cultural emphasis on politeness and interpersonal relationships. Such a discourse pattern, marked by cultural sensitivity to “face”, stands out in stark contrast to the conventional approach in Standard English, where similar letters typically accord less prominence to these elements.

Turning the lens to oral discourse in the context of CE, a realm that has received limited scholarly scrutiny, Gao’s study delves into the communication styles of CE [42]. It unveils a prevailing preference for a “reduction strategy” over “achievement strategies”. For instance, Chinese English speakers may opt for simplifying expressions to ensure clarity, a strategy that contrasts with the more complex structures often found in formal English communication. Meanwhile, Feng’s research challenges the simplistic notion of rejecting Chinese characteristics in English [43]. By exploring everyday dialogues between Chinese and native English speakers, the study brings attention to the nuanced dynamics of initiating talks, receiving compliments, expressing thanks, accepting offers, giving advice, and showing concern. Notably, English’s status as a global language has been demonstrated by its adaptability, with native English speakers exhibiting increased tolerance, especially in countries like China where English serves as a second language. For example, the use of English in business contexts in China often involves a blend of formal English expressions and localized terms, reflecting a pragmatic approach to effective communication. The Co-operative Principle emerges as a dominant force over the Politeness Principle in English usage, underscoring the paramount importance of effective communication. This multifaceted exploration reinforces the evolving nature of CE, signaling its trajectory toward becoming an established and distinctive variety within the

broader spectrum of English.

CE, marked by its distinctive linguistic characteristics spanning phonology to discourse, is undergoing an evolutionary process. This dynamic evolution opens up the possibility for CE not only to establish its unique identity but also to solidify its position as an acknowledged and established variant within the wider realm of English. For instance, the integration of Chinese cultural elements into English discourse, such as the use of idioms and proverbs, contributes to the richness and distinctiveness of CE. This progression harmonizes effortlessly with Butler's parameters for nativization, indicating the continuous development and assimilation of CE into the worldwide mosaic of English varieties. As CE persists in its adaptation and advancement, its path to acknowledgment serves as evidence of the linguistic intricacies and diversity arising from the cultural interchange between Chinese and English influences.

## 5. Conclusion

To conclude, the exploration of CE as a linguistic phenomenon reveals a dynamic and evolving variety within the broader spectrum of English. The paper navigates through the historical stages of English in China, from the emergence of CPE in the 18th century to the development of Chinglish and the contemporary manifestation of CE. The examinations of CE within the framework of WE underscore its significance as a developing variety with roots in standardized English yet uniquely enriched by Chinese linguistic and cultural influences. Scholars' debates on whether CE should be considered a distinct variety within WE highlight the nuanced nature of English use in China, reflecting both linguistic evolution and cultural identity.

The nativization of CE, spanning phonology, lexicon, and discourse, contributes to its growing recognition. Phonological features, characterized by a syllable-stressed nature and conservative pronunciation, showcase a distinctive Chinese flavor. The lexicon of CE incorporates indigenous terms and expressions, reflecting China's socio-political history and cultural nuances. Discourse patterns, both in writing and oral communication, reveal a unique emphasis on "facework" and a preference for a "reduction strategy", showcasing the adaptability of English in a Chinese context.

While acknowledging the ongoing debates and complexities surrounding the legitimacy of CE as a distinct variety, the paper suggests that CE's evolution aligns with Butler's parameters for nativization. As CE continues to adapt and advance, incorporating Chinese cultural elements into its discourse, it solidifies its position as a recognized and established variant within the global mosaic of English varieties.

In essence, the study of CE goes beyond linguistic analysis; it reflects the intricate interchange between Chinese and English influences, contributing to the linguistic diversity and richness of WE. As China's global influence grows, so does the role of CE in shaping the landscape of international English communication. The ongoing evolution of CE provides a fascinating lens through which to understand the complex interplay of language, culture, and identity in our interconnected world.

## References

- [1] Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Sun, L. (1989). The study of country-specific variants of English and English in China. *Foreign Languages (Journal of Shanghai Institute of Foreign Languages)*, (02), 19-25.
- [3] Wang, R. P., (1991). Chinese English as an Objective Existence. *Journal of the PLA Foreign Language Institute*, (01), 1-8+56.
- [4] Li, W. (1993). Chinese English and Chinese-style English. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, (04), 18-24+80.
- [5] Zhang, P. C., (1995). Purpose of use and country-specific variants - also on Chinese English. *Modern Foreign Languages*, (03), 16-21+72.
- [6] Jia, G. J., & Xiang, M. Y. (1997). A defense of Chinese English. *Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching*, (05), 10-11.
- [7] Pan, Z. X., (2002). The study of Chinese English variants--Retrospect and Prospect. *Foreign Language Studies*, (06), 24-27.
- [8] Qiu, L. Z., & Ning, Q. X. (2002). Questioning "Chinese English": A discussion with Mr. Du Ruiqing and Mr. Jiang Yajun. *Foreign Language Teaching*, (06), 23-27.
- [9] Jiang, Y., & Du, R. (2003). The problem of "Chinese English" - A response to the article "Questioning 'Chinese English'". *Foreign Language Teaching*, (01), 27-35.
- [10] Du, Q. M. (1998). World English Contexts and Language and Culture in Chinese English. *Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching*, (08), 13-15.
- [11] Meng, Z., & Yu, Z. T. (2003). Chinese English and English Language Teaching. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching*, (01), 9-11.
- [12] Bolton, K. (2003). *Chinese Englishes: A sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Li, W. (2005). The History and Reality of English in China--Introduction to English in China: A Sociolinguistic History. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, (01), 76-78..
- [14] Deterding, D. (2006). The pronunciation of English by speakers from China. *English World-Wide*, 27, 175-98.
- [15] Yun, W., & Jia, F. (2003). Using English in China. *English Today*, 19(4), 42-47.
- [16] Chen, Y. (1979). *Yuyan Yu Shehui Shenghuo, Life, Reading and Knowledge*. Trinity Press, Hong Kong.
- [17] Holm, A. J. (1988). *Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [18] Thomason, S. G., & T. Kaufman. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- [19] Eaves, M. (2011). English, Chinglish or China English?: Analysing Chinglish, Chinese English and China English. *English Today*, 27(4), 64-70.
- [20] Zhang, W. Z. (1998). Teaching you how to use authentic English. World Knowledge Publishing House.
- [21] Ge, C. G. (1980). (1980). Ramblings on the problem of translating from Chinese to English. *Chinese Translation*, (02), 1-8.
- [22] Xie, Z. J. (1995). Chinese English: An intrusive variant in cross-cultural language communication. *Modern Foreign Languages*, (04), 7-11+72.
- [23] Luo, Y. Z. (1998). The pre-English landscape in China. *Foreign Languages and Foreign Language Teaching*, (05), 23-24+50.
- [24] Li, W. (1993). Chinese English and Chinese-style English. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, (04), 18-24+80.

- [25] Kirkpatrick, A., & Xu, Z. (2002). Chinese pragmatic norms and "China English". *World Englishes*, 21(2), 269–79.
- [26] Hu, X. 2005. China English, at home and in the world. *English Today*, 21(3), 27–38.
- [27] Yang, C. & Zhang, L. J. (2015). China English in trouble: evidence from dyadic teacher talk. *System*, 51, 39–50.
- [28] Hu, X. (2004). Why China English should stand alongside British, American, and the other 'World Englishes. *English Today*, 20(2), 26–33.
- [29] Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- [30] Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C.L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- [31] Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2008). *International English: a guide to the varieties of Standard English*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203785225>
- [32] Bailey, R. W., & Gollach, M. (1982). *English as a world language*. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Leather, J. (1983). Second-language Pronunciation Learning and Teaching. *Language Teaching*, 16, 198-219.
- [34] Jiang, Y. J. (1995). Chinglish and China English. *English Today*, 41, 51-53.
- [35] Jiang, Y. J. (2002). RP as World Standard Spoken English. *Speaking English*, 35, 19-25.
- [36] Le, M. Y., & Ling D. X. (1994). Pronunciation Errors of Different Dialect Areas in China. *Xiandai Waiyu (Modern Foreign Languages)*, 41(3), 55-60.
- [37] Meng, Y., & Wang, Y. Y. (1992). The Impacts of Learning Putonghua on Learning English Pronunciation. *Waiyu Jiaoxue Yu Yanjiu (Foreign Language Teaching and Research)*, 89(1), 10-13.
- [38] Wen, Q. F., & Wu, C. X. (1999). An Assessment of Oral Proficiency of English Majors. *Waiyu Jiaoxue Yu Yanjiu (Foreign Language Teaching and Research)*, 117(1), 29-34.
- [39] Nihalani, P. (1999). Vowel Phonology of Asian Englishes: Towards a Characterization of 'International English'. *Proceedings of International Congress of Phonetic Science 99*, San Francisco.
- [40] Wu, J. (1979). *A Chinese-English Dictionary*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [41] Wu, J. (1997). *A Chinese-English Dictionary (revised ed.)*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [42] Gao, H. (2000). A Study of Chinese EFL Learners' Strategic Competence in Oral Communication. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 1: 53-58.
- [43] Feng, Z. (2000). The Pragmatics of English Dialogues in the Chinese Context. Paper presented at the fourth workshop of Gotalog 2000, Gothenburg University. Available at: [http://www.ling.gu.se/konferenser/gotalog\\_2000/FinalP/feng.pdf](http://www.ling.gu.se/konferenser/gotalog_2000/FinalP/feng.pdf).