

Alhassanain (p) Network for Islamic Heritage and Thought

Language and Globalization: Alternative Models from a Cognitive Semantics Viewpoint

Imran Ho Abdullah

**School of Language Studies & Linguistics
Faculty of Social Science and Humanities
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
imranho@pkrisc.cc.ukm.my**

www.alhassanain.org/english

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
1. Introduction	4
2. The construct	5
3. The expressions and their operational metaphors	7
3.1 The operational metaphors of globalization.....	8
GLOBALIZATION IS A TOOL	8
GLOBALIZATION IS A KEY	10
LINEAR ORDER SCHEMA	11
GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT	12
GLOBALIZATION IS HOMOGENEOUS	13
Conclusion	14
TOOL MODEL	15
LINEAR ORDER (NUMERICAL ORDERING) MODEL	16
GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT	17
GLOBALIZATION IS HOMOGENEOUS	18
References	19
English as the Global Language:	21
Good for Business, Bad for Literature	21
Notes for Editors:	24
Some Facts to Consider	25
Concordance	25
The expressions in the British documents include pertaining	28
Key collocates:	29

Abstract

This paper explores the interaction between language and the process of globalization. One of the major issues is the dominance of English as the de facto language of international communication [read: global communication]. Not surprisingly, various language communities have voiced their concern and distress over this linguistics hegemonization in the name of globalization. Questions remain whether there are new ways of framing the global language discourse by putting more emphasis on multilinguality for global communication. Using a cognitive semantics approach, this paper provides several alternative models to the discourse on language and globalisation.

1. Introduction

How we as Malaysians are made to view and understand the English language vis-a-vis the phenomena of globalization and thus define the role and importance of English in our nation will in many ways determine our language policies especially in relation to English in our curricula. This paper argues that, in many respects, our understanding of language in a globalized world is constructed by the language used in the discourse of language and globalization. Accordingly, new realities of language and globalization can be constructed via the use of new and relevant (perhaps also exciting conceptual metaphors) in the discourse of language and globalization.

Specifically, this paper will attempt to apply a Lakoffian cognitive semantics framework to the analysis of “language and globalization” by examining the linguistic expressions used to articulate this concept. Lakoff and other metaphor analysts have argued how our understanding of events and concepts is shaped (consciously and/or unconsciously) by metaphorical thinking or conceptual metaphorical images. For instance, the Control is Up metaphor underlies expression such as ‘I am on top situation’, ‘I have control over him’; ‘He is under my spell; ‘I have it all under control’. (http://cogsci.berkeley.edu/metaphors/Control_Is_Up.html). Similarly the Anger is Heat and the Body is Container for Emotions metaphors can explain linguistic expressions such as: ‘You make my blood boil’; ‘He’s just blowing off steam’; ‘He boiled over’. ‘He blew his top’. ‘I can’t keep my anger bottled up anymore’. (http://cogsci.berkeley.edu/metaphors/Anger_Is_Heat.html)

The paper is structured as follows. First, I present a brief description of the cognitive semantics framework for linguistic description, paying particular attention to the construct of conceptual metaphors. This is followed by an analysis of how current discourse frames the discussion of language and globalization. The last section of the paper will provide a few suggestions as to how we might “reframe” the notions of ‘language and globalisation’ via the use of alternative conceptual metaphors in domestic discourse of language and globalization in Malaysia.

The aim of this paper is primarily to ask and examine what are the prevalent metaphors of language and globalization. The analysis attempts to reveal how a cognitive linguistics analysis of the expressions used in discussing language and globalization can reveal the multifaceted meaning conveyed by such expressions through different conceptual metaphors. A better understanding of English and globalization will do doubt be crucial as this issue has become so crucial as Malaysia seeks to maintain a competitive edge in the global economy. Hopefully the study here would serve to reveal what is sometimes concealed in our debate and discussion of language and globalization in Malaysia. However, the paper does not pretend to be exhaustive in its analysis and addresses only a few issues in the hope that the analysis will be useful towards the next frontiers of globalization in Malaysia.

2. The construct

Geeraerts perceives cognitive linguistics as “an approach to the analysis of natural language that focuses on language as an instrument for organizing, processing, and conveying information”. As such, the analysis of the conceptual and experiential basis of linguistic categories is seen to be of primary importance. “The formal structures of language are studied not as if they were autonomous, but as a reflection of general conceptual organisation, categorisation principles, processing mechanisms, and experiential and environmental influences” (Geeraerts 1997:7).

Although the CL enterprise is not a monolith (Goldberg 1996:3), most if not all cognitive linguists share some foundational assumptions. Newman summarizes the theoretical assumptions of the cognitive linguistics enterprise as follows (Goldberg 1996:3-4; Geeraerts 1997:7, Heine 1997:3-7):

there are important links between linguistic structure and human cognition, making it imperative to acknowledge the role of human cognition and human experience in motivating and explicating linguistic structure;

a language community imposes its own categorisations upon the entities which constitute reality and such categorisations may differ considerably from one language community to another;

most of the categories relevant to linguistics are viewed as having central and less central members rather than being criterially defined;

where the meaning of a form needs to be elaborated, then a larger context or ‘frame’ [domain] needs to be invoked in order to properly describe the meaning.

Newman (1996:ix)

A particular strong influence in the cognitive semantics paradigm has been the work of Lakoff. For Lakoff, our conceptual system is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. Non-metaphorical thought is for Lakoff only possible when we talk about purely physical reality. Being a linguist, Lakoff seeks to illustrate the above thesis by recourse to the everyday language we use to talk about various things.

The present paper shares the above assumptions and accepts the Cognitive Linguistics conception of semantic representation and their views on a system of conceptual metaphors in everyday language as essentially correct. Specifically, the semantic structure of an item or expression can be explicated in terms of conventionalized conceptual metaphors and the meaning of the expression can be defined with respect to some domain (Rudzka-Ostyn 1989:615). In cognitive linguistics, metaphor is defined as understanding one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain, e.g. one person's life experience versus another's. A conceptual domain is any coherent organization of experience (Lakoff 1987). The semantics of “language and globalization” to be drawn out in this study is dependent on the notion of conceptual metaphors and the identification of the source domains of such metaphors in the discussion of language and globalization. Fundamentally, the framework accepts the expression used in the discussion of language and globalization may utilize different conceptual metaphors with some conventional metaphors being the

“default” or the “preferred” metaphor. To this extent, how someone understands language and globalization is dependent on the organizing metaphor or the “framing” of the discourse. Such “framing” can place a portion of coherent referent situation into the foreground of attention while placing the remainder of that situation into the background (Talmy 1994). In this regard, how we understand language and globalization might very well be dependent on that is what is fore grounded and what is back grounded.

3. The expressions and their operational metaphors

How do we talk about language and globalization and what are the typical expressions we hear and read about. In other words, how is the issue of language (especially English) framed in relation to globalization? Here is a sample of the expressions typical of such discussions:

... the global dominance of the English language ...

The situation of English is peculiar in that perhaps no other language has ever been so important on a global scale

It is becoming a global language unlike any other in history. English is an increasingly classless language

The rise of the English language to global proportions ...

With interest in English around the world growing stronger, not weaker there are some linguists and others who say: Why fight it?

If you write for a global audience that includes people whose native language is not English ...

In addition we believe that, in the context of increasing globalisation, the value of English ...

... English for these young people is a commodity,

They see possession of English as a key to opportunities to better their circumstances.

“... selling the English language as a commodity to a global market...”

These expressions provide us with the means of understanding and explaining language and globalization. In some ways, the expressions are also reflective of the reality of the language issues in globalization in Malaysia (logical positivism) and in another, these expressions in turn shape how we understand language and globalization - a process of mental ‘construction’ (Ortony,1979). From a cognitive linguistics perspective these expressions are not only a source of literal descriptions of ‘reality’ but are significant metaphors by which we make sense of English in globalization in our concrete experience of the world. In the words of Lakoff and Johnson (1980:3) “metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language, but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature”. Our understandings of these expressions are the outcome of a complex interaction between the information given, the context in which this takes place and the pre-existing knowledge of the interlocutors.

3.1 The operational metaphors of globalization

GLOBALIZATION IS A TOOL

The English as a tool metaphor provides the justification or rationale for the teaching and learning of English in Malaysia and I suspect also elsewhere where English is not a native language. Underlying this metaphor, the language “English” is understood through the metaphor of “a tool”. In the context of Malaysia, the tools allows us “to do business”, “to operate and compete in a global market”, to access the Internet and wealth of information there”, “to access knowledge particularly in the fields of science and technology”. “a tool for communication”. For the tool to be functional it must be “sharpened” and there are corresponding “components” to the tool, all of which must be functional in order for the tool to serve its purpose. Likewise, with tools which must be calibrated there is the notion of “standard” and “certification” with globalization.

Part of the conceptual network associated with the functions of a tool is used in the expressions to characterize the concept of “globalization”, if not “English” and in the process show how we understand, talk about, and the needs for globalization is structured by that association.

I must stress that I am not disputing the importance of this “rationale” for globalization. My point is that it is difficult for us to talk about the rationale for globalization other than in through the tool metaphor. [This in itself is proof of the power of metaphor in shaping and structuring how we think and act (cf. Harrison, Clarke and Reeve (1999)). Can we not substitute the metaphor of the system (or culture) for that of tool and would that change how we experience, talk and practice globalization in Malaysia? However, since this tool metaphor is so ingrained in Malaysia globalization, we should examine how it shape and structure our understanding of globalization and whether this metaphor in some ways skew and limit our vision of globalization.

The metaphor begs several questions. While Malaysian are quick to embrace (and master) tools and devices for communication such as the mobile phone with all its SMS, VMS technology we still have problem with English. English as a tool or device just isn’t the same as any other gadgets or tool. Otherwise, I am sure we would have “mastered” it by now and will be second nature to us, just us many of our youngsters are so comfortable with their mobile phone and proudly show them off. So the metaphor of English as a tool just is not working (or not convincing enough) for our students.

Secondly, if language is to be “a tool”, what is the role of globalization? Surely globalization itself isn’t the tool. globalization is to “build” this tool much in the fashion of the die-casting process. What about the raw ingredients or production material? Whatever, it is the process of building this tool begins at an early age for Malaysians and continues on for a good 11 years or so. At some stage the tools must surely have been built and globalization turns to training them how to use the tool effectively. Since the tool is multifunctional and have various components, each of these functions and components must be calibrated in order for the tools to be really effective.

However, unlike real tools, say a screwdriver or a drill which we can purchase ready made, English as a tool involves the building of this tool and the subsequent refining of skill needed to use and operate the tools.

Based on the elaborate description of the metaphor, one could reasonably ask whether current globalization syllabus and practice fit in with the metaphor. This is because some already have the tool while others are tool less. Even the tools they have are different. Some are using power drills while others still rely on the hand drill and others make do with a hammer and nail. In such an environment the tool metaphor for globalization really needs further examination.

GLOBALIZATION IS A KEY

A key can view as a specific kind of tools - one for opening door and gaining access. Expression such as “English is the key ...” As an extension to the tool metaphor, the key metaphor also provides reasons as to why we need to learn English. Employment and business opportunities can “open up” to those with English. There is a down side to this metaphor. Part of the conceptual network associated with the functions of a “key” is that there is a lock that keeps the gates and doors closed to those without the key. Hence, the “key“ can also characterize the concept of “globalization” as gatekeepers. The notion of English as gatekeepers continues in globalization in the insistence of some university for their students to achieve a certain band in the Malaysian University English Test (MUET) before they can graduate from the program. Such policy and regulations are related to the metaphor of ENGLISH IS A KEY. A set back of course is that this metaphor can also create resentment and dissatisfaction as globalization and their proponents are seen as acting as gatekeepers. The recent proposal for a university BM entry exam also utilizes the key metaphor.

LINEAR ORDER SCHEMA

Another metaphor commonly associated with globalization in this part of the world is the notion of “second language”. A basic kinesthetic image schemas (Johnson 1987) central to human experience, namely the linear order schema is applied to our understanding of language or in this case globalization. One could legitimately ask “Second to what? Second in what sense?”. The use of the linear order schema, especially in relation to a linear numerical order in the case of globalization in Malaysia is perhaps to show the importance of the language. I propose that this order, namely the use of the word “second” is defeating in itself.

For many, English is not a second language – it is a foreign language. For others, it is a third or fourth. Yet for some Malaysians, English is their “first” and home language. Only for a small minority is English truly their second language in order of acquisition. Thus the linear order schema used does not really tie in with the reality on the ground. I propose we get rid of this notion of “English as a second language” or at least the use of this linear order schema. This is the strategy some use to neutralize (pacify) our insistence on English by adding it is vital to learn all languages including Arabic, French etc. English is basically a subject and recently has become the language of instruction for Science and Mathematics but this by no means entails that it is a second language. Hence, in some travelogue, it is stated that English is “widely spoken” rather than the use of the linear order schema.

GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT

In recent times, negativity permeates the media discourse on English and globalization. In particular expressions such as “decline of standard of English” “poor command of the language” “inability to communicate” are quite typical in the main stream newspaper. As a result the most persuasive image of learners we are presented with is that of decline and dilapidations. In other words, globalization in Malaysia has seen better days. Such discourse on globalization are based on a conceptual metaphor which I shall call the GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT metaphor. While the laments are not without foundation but I think we have placed ourselves in a pit which makes it difficult for us to climb out of it. What is primarily wrong with this metaphor is the yardstick by which we measure the decline. Most of the people who laments the fall in standard uses the pre-80s yardstick to measure students and product of the English medium schools with those of the National medium products. Surely this is comparing apples with oranges. I suggest that the appropriate measure would be to measure the standard of English of the pre-80s Malay medium with those of the present day national medium schools. We might perhaps find that there are overall gains in terms of “standards of English”. For one thing, the teaching of English is much more broad based. While the defunct English medium schools were located primarily in the urban areas, current globalization has no such boundaries. Thus, we have to examine this metaphor in detail and come up with more appropriate and suitable metaphors. What we need to construct more forcefully is globalization as active regenerating, growing and positive. In this sense globalization is seen as reaching for the mass, something that is continuous (life-long), rewarding and natural.

GLOBALIZATION IS HOMOGENEOUS

One serious misconception, which all practitioners know and Curriculum Development Centre is very well aware of is the globalization as an homogeneous activity. We talk of “English” and “globalization” as being a singular concept. While there are different English papers in the form of the 1119 which is an elective and additional paper, English as a subject is undifferentiated i.e. homogeneous. In the Mathematics curriculum, at the secondary four level we make a distinction between Modern Mathematics and Additional Mathematics. For Arabic, there is Advanced Arabic (Bahasa Arab Tinggi) and Arabic as two different subjects. Yet we have only one homogeneous English subject for all and sundry, when in fact there are some in the urban schools for whom a more advanced type of English might be in order and at the same time there are some in certain areas for whom English is truly alien. Why can't we have two different papers much in the same mode as Mathematics and Arabic and students take the different papers according to their needs and proficiency. After all, English is not homogeneous and most curriculum (apart from the KBSR / KBSM) acknowledges this with graded level courses. This will make globalization not only more meaningful but also more fun.

Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to explore the metaphors which frames our discussion of globalization in Malaysia. While the “descriptive adequacy and accuracy” of the metaphor are appropriate in some instances, in other instances they are self defeating and takes us down a very narrow road. As I have explored in this paper, in talking about globalization, the conceptual metaphors underlying the expressions we use affect and shapes how we view and comprehend globalization. In fact, some expressions have become commonplace in the discourse of globalization and are unconscious (used largely without being noticed). Some of the metaphors identified include

TOOL MODEL

Where English (the language) is a tool seen in the expression “to sharpen English language skills”; the role of globalization is the process that is suppose to make the tool an efficient one. The metaphor also provides the many justification for globalization. A variation of this is the ENGLISH IS A KEY metaphor which sees English as opening up doors of opportunities and also as gate keepers.

LINEAR ORDER (NUMERICAL ORDERING) MODEL

This model provides legitimacy in some respect for globalization where the language has an order of priority (though the accuracy of this order is not clear). The model is self-defeating as the subject is relegated to second place. Constant reminder of being second cannot be good.

GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT

This metaphor permeates our discussion of globalization and has an element of nostalgia. While to some degree, our standard has declined but the yardstick of globalization should be redefined.

GLOBALIZATION IS HOMOGENEOUS

This is the sin of the Curriculum people who have not seen it fit to develop different levels of English (perhaps due to certain implementation constraints of classrooms and teachers) and different English papers in our school curriculum to better reflect globalization in Malaysia.

Through this metaphors, for instance the GLOBALIZATION IN MALAYSIA IS DEFICIENT metaphor, we have some how accepted and tolerated the “sub-standard ness” of English among our students – sometimes even making excuses for them or placing blame elsewhere. I have argue that we should discard some of these expressions and consciously fashioned expressions utilizing different and unique conceptual metaphors to reframe the discourse of globalization, thus making globalization more effective and not alienating globalization. In order to do this, it is vital we first understand the current metaphors within the discourse of globalization and strive for new and appropriate conceptual metaphors to lead us into the new frontiers of globalization in Malaysia.

References

- Bereiter, C. (2002). Education and mind in the knowledge age. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). Learning by expanding. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.
- Hargreaves, D. H. (1999). The knowledge-creating school. British Journal of Educational Studies, 47, 122-144.
- Paavola, S., & Hakkarainen, K. (2003). A Knowledge Creation Metaphor - an Emergent Epistemological Approach to Learning. The proceedings of the 6th International History, Philosophy & Science Teaching Conference, November 7 - 11, 2001, Denver, Colorado, USA.
- Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. Educational Researcher, 27, 4-13.
- On the road again: the metaphor of the journey in understandings of learning.
- Roger Harrison, Julia Clarke and Fiona Reeve, Faculty of Education and Language Studies, Open University
- Lakoff, G. and Mark Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, G. and Mark Turner. More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lakoff, G. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Johnson, M. (1987). The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization#Characteristics>
<http://www1.worldbank.org/economicpolicy/globalization/>
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm>
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/index.htm>
- English as a Global Language
David Crystal
Cambridge University Press 1997
A book review by Danny Yee © 1997 <http://dannyreviews.com/>

Crystal begins *English as a Global Language* by asking what it means for a language to be global, and what the advantages and disadvantages of having a global language are. In three chapters he then traces the rise of English to that status. The first surveys the extent of its use around the world and briefly outlines the history of its spread. The second examines some nineteenth century ideas about the place of English in the world and the foundations for its success laid by the British Empire and the Industrial Revolution. The third describes the cultural legacy that underpins the present dominance of English — its use in diplomacy and international communications, in the media (Hollywood, popular music, books), in education, and on the Internet. The final chapter looks at the future of English as a global language, focusing on debates about its status within the United States and the possibility of its fragmentation into regional dialects (Crystal suggests these might end up coexisting with some form of "World Standard Spoken English").

With just 150 pages to cover such a broad topic, superficiality is hardly avoidable. (The maps could easily have been improved on, however: most are unexciting political maps with no information an ordinary atlas wouldn't have.) Those with a reasonable background in modern history and general politics will find nothing substantially new in *English as a Global Language*. Many of the details may be unfamiliar, however, and it is instructive to have them all pulled together. Crystal is, in any event, writing for the broadest possible popular audience — and he has succeeded in producing an accessible and enticing treatment of his subject.

13 August 1997

English as the Global Language:

Good for Business, Bad for Literature

English is well on its way to becoming the dominant global language. Is this a good thing? Yes, in fields such as science where a common language brings efficiency gains. But the global dominance of the English language is bad news for world literature, according to CEPR researcher Jacques Méritz (Centre de Recherche en Economie et Statistique, Paris and CEPR). Why? Because if the English language dominates world publishing, very few translations except those from English to other languages will be commercially viable. As a result, virtually only those writing in English will have a chance of reaching a world audience and achieving ‘classic status’. The outcome is clear, Méritz argues: just as in the sciences, those who wish to reach a world audience will write in English. “World literature will be an English literature”, Méritz warns, “and will be the poorer for it – as if all music were written only for the cello”. His work appears in "English-Language Dominance, Literature and Welfare," (CEPR Discussion Paper No. 2055). By literature, he refers to imaginative works of an earlier vintage that are still read today, and therefore the accumulation of world literature refers to the tiny fraction of currently produced imaginative works which will eventually be regarded as ‘classics’. According to Méritz, the tendency of competitive forces in the global publishing market to privilege the translation of English fiction and poetry into other languages for reading or listening enjoyment may damage the production of world literature and in this respect make us all worse off.

Méritz makes the following points:

- Language matters: In the case of literature, as opposed to other uses of language, language does not serve merely to communicate content (say, a story line) but is itself an essential source of enjoyment. Therefore, it is futile to argue that nothing would change if all potential contributors to literature wrote in the same language. “We might as well pretend that there would be no loss if all musical composers wrote for the cello” said Méritz. Translations can only approximate the rhythms, sounds, images, allusions and evocations of the original, and in literature, those aspects are essential.
- Great authors write in only one language: Remarkably few people have ever made contributions to world literature in more than one language. Beckett and Nabokov may be the only two prominent examples. Conrad, who is sometimes mentioned in this connection, is a false illustration in a glaring regard: he never wrote in his native Polish. Quite conspicuously, expatriate authors generally continue to write in their native language even after living for decades away from home. This holds not only for poets, such as Mickiewicz and Milosz, which may not be surprising, but also for novelists. Mann went on composing in German during a long spell in the US. The list of authors who have inscribed their names in the history of literature in more than one language since the beginning of time is astonishingly short.
- English is much more likely to be translated: For straightforward economic reasons, only works that enjoy exceptionally large sales have any

notable prospect of translation. Heavy sales in the original language represent an essential criterion of selection for translation, though not the only one. As a result, translations will be concentrated in original creations in the major languages. Since English is the predominant language in the publishing industry, authors writing in English have a much better chance of translation than those writing in other tongues.

- English dominance of translations has increased: The dominance of English in translations has actually gone up over the last 30 years, despite a general decline in the market share of English in the world publishing market. When English represented about a quarter of the world publishing market in the early 1960's, the percentage of English in translations was already 40%. With the general advance of literacy and standards of living in the world, the share of English in world publishing fell to around 17% in the late 1980's. Yet the language's share in translations rose to surpass 50% during this time.

- If you want to reach a world audience, write in English: In science, as in literature, a person writing in a minor language has a better chance of publication than one writing in a major tongue, but will necessarily have a much smaller chance of translation and international recognition. The result in science is clear. Those who strive to make a mark in their discipline try to publish in English. By and large, the ones who stick to their home language – English excepted, of course – have lower ambitions and do less significant work. The same pressure to publish in English exists for those engaged in imaginative writing who wish to attain a world audience.

- English dominance may cause the world pool of talent to dry up: However, the evidence shows that in the case of literary writing, the gifted – even the supremely gifted – in a language other than English generally cannot turn to English by mere dint of effort and will-power. Thus, the dominance of English may sap their incentive to invest in personal skills and to shoot for excellence. Working toward the same result are the relatively easier conditions of publication they face at home. If so, the dominance of English in translations may cause the world pool of talent to dry up.

- Literature may become just another field where the best work is in English: In other words, the dominance of English poses the danger that literary output will become just another field where the best work is done in English. In this case, the production of imaginative prose and poetry in other languages may be relegated to the same provincial status that such writing already has acquired in some other areas of intellectual activity. But whereas the resulting damage is contestable in fields where language serves essentially for communication, such as science in general, the identical prospect is alarming in the case of literature.

Along with the advances in telecommunications in the last thirty years, the dominance of English in auditory and audiovisual entertainment has become far greater than in books. Does the argument about translations in literature apply more generally and explain this wider ascension of English too? The answer is partly positive as regards television, but mostly negative in connection with the cinema. US television series indeed benefit from an

unusually large home audience and only travel abroad when successful domestically. On the other hand, a film need not succeed in the home market before being made available to foreign-language cinema audiences. Hollywood achieved an important place in the cinema in the era of the silent film.

Notes for Editors:

CEPR is a network of over 450 Research Fellows based throughout Europe, who collaborate through the Centre in research and its dissemination. CEPR helps its Research Fellows to develop projects, obtain funding, administer them and disseminate their results. The Centre's research ranges from open economy macroeconomics to trade policy, from the economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe to regionalism in the world economy. CEPR takes no institutional policy positions. CEPR is an ESRC Resource Centre. For further information about CEPR, please contact Rita Gilbert, External Relations Officer, Tel 44 □ □7878 2917, Fax 44 20 7878 2999 or by email on rgilbert@cepr.org. □

Jacques Mélitz is a Professor of Economics at Centre de Recherche en Economie et Statistique and a Research Fellow in CEPR's International Macroeconomics programme.

The tendency of a single world market to privilege the translation of English fiction and poetry into other languages for reading or listening enjoyment may damage the production of world literature and in this respect make us all worse off. In order to develop this thesis, the article begins with an economic model of the market for imaginative works in which translations are systematically concentrated on writings in the original language with the largest share in world sales. The model is then shown to agree with the facts. Next, it is argued that high concentration of translations on works coming from one particular language hurts the production of literature directly, because variety of languages of origin is enriching as such, and indirectly, because the concentration damages the incentives of those who do not write in the leading language to invest in their own talents. "Literature" in the paper refers to earlier production of imaginative works which represents capital or is still read.

Are we moving toward the use of a single language for global communication, or are there ways of managing language diversity at the international level?

Some Facts to Consider

More people study English than any other language

Most non-native speakers use English as a lingua franca *

Most international telephone calls are placed in English

Most international mail is in English

Most computer text is stored in English

English has the largest vocabulary of any language

English is the predominant language used by global travelers

Currently, most websites are all or part English **

One person in seven uses English in some way

Currently, most on-line communication is in English **

* lingua franca: Any of various languages used as a common language.

** With the explosive growth of Internet use throughout Asia, the numbers may change in the very near future.

Concordance

1 NSTITUSI PENGAJIAN TINGGI 3.1 PENDIDIKAN TINGGI
DAN DAYA SAING 3.1.1 Globalisasi mengakibatkan dunia seolah-
olahnya mengecil menjadi sebuah desa buan

2 u ini kerana ketidakpedulian bukan lagi merupakan pilihan kepada
kita. 1.1.8 Globalisasi yang merupakan kesan sampingan daripada revolusi
IT telah menukarkan

3 dan mereka pula menghadapi cabaran-cabaran dalam perkembangan
dan kemajuan R&D global: perubahan tema, agenda dan metodologi;
persaingan daripada pelbagai kump

4 ju dalam inkuiri, invensi dan inovasi. Kita tiada pilihan kerana
rempuhan deras globalisasi ini tidak memihak kepada tindak balas bertempo
evolusi, serta peluan

5 merupakan komponen penting untuk membina daya saing negara
dalam era k-ekonomi global. Malaysia tidak mungkin menjadi negara maju
tanpa kapasiti sains dan tekn

6 egara Tetangga 1.1.11 Jiran-jiran kita yang terdekat telah menerima
fenomena globalisasi sebagai lumrah dan tatacara kehidupan abad ke-21.
Adalah mustahak d

7 elesaikan. Imperatif Luaran 1.1.7 Imperatif luaran pula ialah
fenomena globalisasi, revolusi IT dan perkembangan order baru dunia.
Ketiga-tiga imperati

8 , dan tidak ada sebuah pun negara dunia yang tidak terseret ke dalam
gelombang globalisasi. Kelangsungan sesebuah negara dalam gelombang
tersebut bergantung k

9 engantarabangsa pendidikan tinggi dengan cara menjalankan inisiatif-inisiatif global dan mewujudkan jaringan perkongsian antarabangsa. Antara inisiatif tersebut

10 mempelajari pemikiran dan idea mereka dalam menghadapi dan menyelesaikan isu-isu global seperti isu keamanan, keselamatan, pandemik pencemaran alam, penerokaan a

11 yang bersifat penerokaan dan pengajian perbandingan secara global agar isu-isu global, di samping isu-isu tempatan, dimasukkan ke dalam kurikulum pengajaran

12 -usaha untuk menyediakan wahana pendidikan tinggi yang sejajar dengan keperluan global itu perlu dirancang dengan teliti dan menyeluruh. Perancangannya adalah s

13 asai kemahiran-kemahiran yang diperlukan untuk bersaing dalam pasaran pekerjaan global yang sentiasa berubah. IPT di negara berkenaan menyediakan kurikulum peng

14 ekad dan bekerja dengan lebih kuat demi mempertajam daya saing negara di pentas global. Kita tiada pilihan kecuali memulakan langkah berani mentransformasi pend

15 tarabangsa. Selain itu usaha-usaha untuk mendapatkan pengiktirafan di peringkat global juga perlu dilakukan dengan bersungguh-sungguh bagi membolehkan IPT dan p

16 l dan sarjana bagi memastikan Malaysia dapat menyertai dan memenangi persaingan global dalam era k-ekonomi. Perakuan: Jawatankuasa memperakukan supaya Ke

17 nggi negara demi mengupayakan bangsa Malaysia berdepan dengan rempuhan-rempuhan globalisasi dan menyertai gerakan deras bangsa-bangsa yang telah maju dalam inku

18 kampus cawangan di luar negara tersebut. 3.2.7 Untuk meningkatkan daya saing global pendidikan tinggi Malaysia, usaha memasarkan pendidikan tinggi negara di

19 Jerman mempunyai inisiatif strategik yang khusus untuk meningkatkan daya saing global dalam sektor pendidikan tinggi. Salah satu inisiatif strategik tersebut

20 if. 6.4 PEMANTAPAN KURIKULUM PRASISWAZAH 6.4.1 Untuk mencapai daya saing global, Malaysia perlu membangunkan kemampuan untuk menggarap dan menangani bany

21 embangunan masyarakat adil, progresif, beridentiti kebangsaan dan berdaya saing global. (ii) Misi Pendidikan Tinggi Malaysia M

22 n penyelidikan dan pengantarabangsa sarjana. 3.2 PENINGKATAN DAYA SAING GLOBAL 3.2.1 Daya saing pendidikan tinggi negara perlu ditingkat dan diperkas

23 program pendidikan yang bersifat penerokaan dan pengajian perbandingan secara global agar isu-isu global, di samping isu-isu tempatan, dimasukkan ke dalam k

24 kapkan secukupnya untuk berkembang maju dalam persekitaran yang menjadi semakin global dan kompetitif".1 1.1.23 Sebenarnya cabaran-cabaran yang timbul pada a ice. 1.1.9 Sesetengah bahagian dunia telah

merasakan bahang dan padah teruk globalisasi apabila mereka ditimpa keruntuhan nilai mata wang pada tahun 1997 ya

26 tinggi negara untuk mengukuhkan strategi Malaysia dalam dunia pendidikan tinggi global dan antarabangsa; iv) Memperkasakan pendidikan teknikal dan pembelajaran of an international dimension to the curriculum and the connections of HE with other parts of the world should be further supported within the sector.

**The expressions in the British documents include
pertaining**

Global challenges, global citizens, pressures of global competition global competition, global competition has intensified globally competitive knowledge economy globally connected world global development communication global economy increase global engagement benchmark ourselves globally, global market global partnerships global perspective meeting the nation's global challenges

Key collocates:

- N Word
1 COMPETITIVENESS
2 ECONOMY
3 VALUE
4 MARKET
5 MARKETS
6 COMPETITIVE
7 EDUCATION
8 KNOWLEDGE
9 TECHNOLOGY
10 GENDER
11 RESEARCH
12 WORLD
N Centre R1 R2
1 GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS AND
2 GLOBALLY ECONOMY MARKETS
3 VALUE INDEX
4 MARKETS THE
5 MARKET CHAINS
6 TECHNOLOGY
7 COMPETITIVE
8 EDUCATION
9 KNOWLEDGE

British

- N Word
1 PARTNERSHIPS
2 COMPETITION
3 ECONOMY
4 AND
5 COMPETITIVE
6 THE
7 A
8 AS
9 GLOBAL
10 GLOBALLY
11 IN
12 INNOVATION
13 NEED

In 'Metaphors we live by' George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) assert that:

"Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature." If metaphors are indeed a fundamental aspect of our conceptual system then it would be possible to gain an understanding of a writer's opinion on given subject matter by investigating their choice of metaphor – even if their opinion about the subject matter is not overtly stated in the text. The English language has been discussed in recent years at academic and more general texts in terms of its global reach. In academic texts the presentation of data, expression of an opinion and the formulation and discussion of hypotheses on this subject is usually presented drily, with little if any resort to literary devices such as metaphor. General non-fiction texts on the other hand are more likely to draw on metaphor and other devices as ways of enriching the text for a general readership. I suggest that the investigation of metaphor within these general texts will reveal something about the attitudes of their authors to English and its increasing use and diversification around the world.

This project involved the investigation of four general non-fiction texts and the work of George Lakoff and his colleagues in the area of metaphor. All four texts were written by native speakers of standard British and North American English varieties. The approach comprised an empirical measurement of metaphors in the texts and an analysis of what (if anything) they revealed about author attitudes to the use of English around the world.

**All rights reserved for Al-Hassanain (p) Network, Imam Hussain (p)
Foundation**

Alhassanain (p) Network for Islamic Heritage and Thought

www.alhassanain.org/english