



**ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ
ЛИНГВИСТИКА/THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.81.1> EDN: SAMUNG

**RUSSIAN ENGLISH AND CHINA ENGLISH WITHIN VARIOUS MODELS OF ENGLISH: A COMPARATIVE
SURVEY**

Research article

Liu P.^{1,*}

¹ Russian State Pedagogical University in the name of A.I. Herzen, Saint-Petersburg, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author (18854809713[at]163.com)

Suggested: 20.04.2026; Accepted: 20.08.2026; Published: 09.09.2026

Abstract

The globalization of English has led to the emergence of numerous native and non-native varieties, challenging monolithic standards and necessitating robust theoretical frameworks for their analysis. This paper presents a comparative survey of two significant Expanding Circle Englishes — the Russian English and the China English — through the lens of four influential models of World Englishes: B. Kachru's Three Circles Model, M. McArthur's and M. Görlach's Wheel Models, and E.W. Schneider's Dynamic Model. The study aims to delineate the sociolinguistic status, linguistic features, and evolutionary trajectories of these varieties.

Findings indicate that while both varieties share a macro-level classification as performance varieties within the Expanding Circle, they exhibit distinct developmental paths. Russian English, characterized by direct pragmatic transfer and a growing endonormative orientation, appears to be advancing more confidently towards Schneider's phase of endonormative stabilization. In contrast, China English, shaped by state-driven policy and a primary focus on international intelligibility, demonstrates robust nativization but remains under stronger exonormative control.

The analysis underscores that the Expanding Circle is not a monolithic entity but a dynamic space where English is actively and uniquely reshaped by local linguistic and cultural norms. This comparison contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the centripetal and centrifugal forces operating in the global landscape of English.

Keywords: comparative survey, linguistic variantology, models of English, China English, Russian English.

**РУССКИЙ АНГЛИЙСКИЙ И КИТАЙСКИЙ АНГЛИЙСКИЙ В РАЗЛИЧНЫХ МОДЕЛЯХ АНГЛИЙСКОГО
ЯЗЫКА: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ**

Научная статья

Лю П.^{1,*}

¹ Российский государственный педагогический университет им. А.И. Герцена, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация

* Корреспондирующий автор (18854809713[at]163.com)

Предложена: 20.04.2026; Принята: 20.08.2026; Опубликовано: 09.09.2026

Аннотация

Глобализация английского языка привела к появлению многочисленных национальных и интернациональных вариантов языка, что поставило под сомнение существование единого стандарта и потребовало разработки четких теоретических рамок для их анализа. В данной статье представлен сравнительный обзор двух значимых вариантов английского языка из «расширяющегося круга» — русского и китайского английского — через призму четырёх влиятельных моделей мирового английского: модели концентрических кругов Б. Качру, колесообразных моделей М. МакАртура и М. Герлаха, а также динамической модели Э.В. Шнайдера. Цель исследования — выявить социолингвистический статус, языковые особенности и эволюционные траектории этих вариантов.

Результаты показывают, что, хотя оба варианта на макроуровне классифицируются как «производные» разновидности в рамках расширяющегося круга, они демонстрируют различные пути развития. Русский английский, характеризующийся прямым прагматическим переносом и усиливающейся эдонормативной ориентацией, продвигается к фазе эдонормативной стабилизации в классификации Шнайдера. В противоположность ему, китайский английский, формируемый государственной языковой политикой и ориентированный преимущественно на международную взаимопонятность, демонстрирует активную нативизацию, однако остаётся под более выраженным экзонормативным контролем.

Анализ подчёркивает, что расширяющийся круг не является монолитным образованием, а представляет собой динамичное пространство, где английский язык переосмысливается и адаптируется под местные языковые и культурные нормы. Проведенное сравнение способствует более глубокому пониманию центростремительных и центробежных сил, действующих в глобальном ландшафте английского языка.

Ключевые слова: сравнительный анализ, лингвовариантология, модели английского языка, китайский вариант английского языка, русский вариант английского языка.

Introduction



In the context of cross-cultural communication, the English spoken by Russian and Chinese users frequently exhibits phonetic and grammatical markers. For example, documented utterances, such as "let's mi spik from may khart, in English" [1] and replacing /h/ with /x/ [2], illustrate pronounced phonetic interference from Russian and Chinese phonological systems, respectively. Beyond these phonetic specificities, such examples often reveal underlying grammatical transfer; in the first instance, the standard English construction *let somebody do something* is morphosyntactically substituted with the localized varieties *let's do something*, like *let's me speak*. Although these localized usages diverge from native-speaker norms, they remain largely intelligible and facilitate effective cross-cultural exchanges in international business, politics, and diplomacy.

When evaluated strictly against conventional British or American standards, these iterations may be classified as deviations; however, if such linguistic features attain systematic recognition — evidenced by the acceptance of localized dictionaries, grammars, and usage guides — they may transition from mere errors to distinct language varieties in their own right.

The academic discourse regarding the status of English varieties remains active. H. Ahn [3] reported that English teachers in South Korea showed a positive attitude towards Korean English and tended to regard it as a legitimate English. In the following year, however, H. Ahn [3] found that Korean English teachers were likely to reject and ignore other local or regional varieties such as Singaporean English (SE), Indonesia English, Japanese English, and China English [4]. However, most of the recent research has claimed that the status of many English varieties has been elevated, and numerous studies no longer categorize them as non-standard English [5]. A general shift has taken place from "correctness" to "appropriateness" and "intelligibility" [6]. And B.E. Evans and T. Imai [7] point out that capturing the attitudes of non-native speakers to varieties of English provides understanding of the influences on the shape of English as a global language, as attitudes are known to have a powerful influence on the usage and perceptions of language varieties.

The linguistic complexity inherent in these emerging varieties exceeds conventional understanding. The evolution of such varieties is widely regarded as a dynamic process, influenced by a multitude of factors — including ideology — which underscores the necessity of analyzing their developmental trajectories in full. A case in point is the longstanding debate in China over whether English should remain a compulsory subject in the National College Entrance Examination (Gaokao). In recent years, this has led to the introduction of other second-language options, such as German, Russian, and Japanese. Concurrently, the utilitarian presence of English continues to expand across semiotic landscapes in both China and Russia, appearing frequently in public spaces such as cafeterias and commercial decorations.

However, as R.G. Piotrowski [8] observes that language contact and active interaction push a language towards a "bifurcation zone", in that it entails unbalancing the language system, inevitably generating a certain resistance on the part of traditionally-minded language users. Thus, both in Russia and China, a growing concern for the purity of national languages and attempts at limiting the presence of English as a protective measure can be seen.

To systematically comprehend the dynamics of the global Anglosphere, researchers have proposed several foundational theoretical models over recent decades. One pivotal framework is Kachru's Three Circle Model, introduced in 1985, which introduces such fundamental to the new paradigm categories as the Inner Circle (IC), the Outer Circle (OC), and the Expanding Circle (EC) on the basis of the diverse structures and functions of English worldwide. E.W. Schneider [9] presented his Dynamic Model of World Englishes, which provides a unified framework to explain how English develops in former colonies. And five dynamic phases — foundation, exonormative stabilization, nativization, endonormative stabilization, and differentiation — are proposed to outline the evolutionary process of postcolonial Englishes. Therefore, many scholars set forth various models which have different focuses, like T. McArthur's Circle of World Englishes [10], to offer a more holistic understanding of World Englishes.

This study applied these broad theoretical paradigms to investigate two highly problematized EC varieties of Russian English (RusE) and the China English (ChE). Regarding the choice of terminology, this study adopts the term China English rather than Chinese English. Although China English, Chinese English, and Chinglish were occasionally used interchangeably in the early literature, and early World Englishes scholarship, including B.B. Kachru [11] and T. McArthur [10], generally adopted the term Chinese English, subsequent research has increasingly distinguished these concepts. In particular, China English has been defined as "a performance variety of English which has Standard English as its core but is colored with characteristic features of Chinese phonology, lexis, syntax, and discourse pragmatics, and which is particularly suited to expressing ideas and concepts specific to Chinese culture" [12], [13]. By contrast, Chinglish is generally regarded as a stigmatized label referring to typically non-educated forms of English resulting from negative transfer from Chinese. Chinese English, on the other hand, has traditionally been associated with learners' interlanguage in earlier studies. Accordingly, the present study follows the more recent convention and adopts the term China English. Similarly, following Z.G. Proshina [14], the term Russian English is employed throughout this paper, as it has become the most widely accepted designation for the English variety used in the Russian context within contemporary World Englishes scholarship. Specifically, this comparative analysis addresses the following research questions:

- 1) How do Russian English and China English behave under the leading-edge theoretical framework of World Englishes?
- 2) What are the principal divergences in their respective developmental paths?

Models of English

The study of models of English involves theoretical frameworks utilized to comprehend and classify the global diversity of the English language. These models illustrate the intricate relationships among various regional varieties, particularly in postcolonial and international contexts, thereby moving beyond the prescriptive notion of a single "correct" English. The subsequent sections outline several significant models of World Englishes to provide a foundational framework for analysis.

2.1. Kachru's Three Circles Model

Over recent decades, the study of World Englishes has shifted focus toward the diverse circumstances and adaptations of English across global contexts. The conceptual framework that divides English varieties into three concentric circles — the IC, OC, and EC — was developed by B.B. Kachru [11]. The IC comprises nations, including the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, where English serves as the primary language and is traditionally regarded as the standard. The OC encompasses nations, such as India, Nigeria, Singapore, and the Philippines, where English functions as a second language with institutionalized roles. Finally, the EC includes regions, such as China, Russia, Brazil, and Saudi Arabia, where English is utilized as a foreign language and users typically reference IC norms for standardization.

This model underlines the sociolinguistic legitimacy of non-native English varieties, paving the way for studies on localized English forms such as ChE and RusE [15], [16]. As one of the most influential frameworks in World Englishes, it challenges the concept of a monolithic standard language by emphasizing the inventiveness and functionality of English in OC countries. By concentrating on "how English is used across diverse sociocultural contexts" [17], this model effectively moves the conversation away from prescriptive notions of correctness. Consequently, it is widely supported by academic institutions for illustrating the general contours of World Englishes and remains actively employed by scholars investigating related linguistic phenomena.

The model continues to be in active use, with scholars adopting it to investigate problems relating to World Englishes [18], [19]. To cite an example, K. Kurusu et al. [20] applied Kachru's Model to examine the role of English in the internationalization of higher education and international student mobility. Their findings indicate that while IC countries remain the primary destinations for most international students, EC countries — where English is not an institutionalized medium of instruction — are also increasingly emphasizing English by expanding English-medium instruction (EMI) degree programs and incorporating English proficiency test scores into their admission requirements.

Despite its profound impact, this paradigm has faced extensive criticism throughout the years [21]. Primarily, the taxonomy relies on geography and history rather than user proficiency and linguistic function. Furthermore, the model struggles to account for the dynamic and fluid nature of global English in the modern era [19]. Critics also argue that this hierarchical structure inadvertently marginalizes the legitimacy of OC and EC varieties by perpetuating linguistic hegemony and native-speakerism [22].

2.2. Wheel Model of World Englishes

The world is depicted as a wheel with geographical sections in T. McArthur's 1987 Model [23]. Within this framework, each spoke represents a geographically specific dialect, connecting linearly from a central hub to the outer border. Unlike Kachru's Model, T. McArthur introduces the concept of a central "hub" — an idealized core that highlights the centrality of standard forms without representing any particular nation. This paradigm validates the question of mutual intelligibility among these diverse Englishes; however, the depiction of their interconnections remains somewhat oversimplified.

The Wheel Model was subsequently refined by M. Görlach [24], who introduced a more complex, layered model of English varieties. The central "hub" in Görlach's model encompasses established regional and national standards, signifying accepted linguistic norms within specific geographic regions. Expanding outward, the subsequent ring contains sub-regional semi-standards, indicating variations that possess linguistic significance in defined areas despite lacking broad formal acceptance. The outermost ring, termed "the rim," features creoles and non-standard forms, representing highly localized and often informal versions of English [10].

M. Görlach's approach presents World Englishes as a concentric layered model by combining T. McArthur's concentric structure with B.B. Kachru's differentiation of the sociofunctional varieties of English [24]. The core concept of the "rim" highlights situations where English as a foreign language is functionally restricted to international communication. This layered methodology provides a more precise and thorough explanation of global English.

While T. McArthur's model [10] included the concept of a rim, his focus remained predominantly on the center. Regional variations, such as American English and Filipino English, are situated on these rims. The primary implication of this model is its emphasis on the equality and functionality of all standardized varieties, effectively decentering the original speaker and shifting the analytical framework from prescription to functional description. Nevertheless, this model does not fully account for the dynamic growth of "rim" varieties as they establish independent norms and influence one another or the central hub. Due to globalization, for instance, Indian English may influence other South Asian dialects directly, and Australian English may be shaped by American media without passing through a London hub.

2.3. Schneider's Dynamic Model

A key sociolinguistic theory for comprehending how English dialects evolve globally is Schneider's Dynamic Model. It posits the dynamic evolutionary processes are driven by social contact and identity creation between the indigenous population (IDG, the locals) and the settlers (STL, the native English-speaking colonists). The key processes as identified by the author of the model are the following.

1. Foundation: English is introduced to a new territory through colonization.
2. Exonormative Stabilization: the colonial standard is the linguistic norm.
3. Nativization: the most crucial, creative, and transformative phase.
4. Endonormative Stabilization: the new variety is accepted as a local standard.
5. Differentiation: the now-established variety begins to develop its own internal sociolects and dialects.

This model emphasizes how Englishes have developed dynamically while integrating sociolinguistic elements, such as social power dynamics and identity construction. It frames linguistic adaptation as a natural process of innovation rather than the corruption of a standard form. While E.W. Schneider [9] notes that this model primarily concentrates on colonial contexts, it also provides valuable insights for analyzing other global Englishes as indicators of globalization. For instance, if English is utilized extensively in a specific location, that variety may also undergo a nativization process. Consequently, such varieties should be recognized as legitimate if the global community identifies them as significant and valuable. The updated

Schneider's Dynamic Model encompasses Introduction, External Dependence, Local Innovation, Internal Acceptance, and Social Diversification. These phases supply a robust analytical framework for the cross-latitudinal comparison of ChE and RusE.

To summarize, the models surveyed herein offer significant theoretical insights for the analysis of World Englishes. The application of these frameworks to the examination of RusE and ChE forms the core research focus of the subsequent section.

Discussions and Findings

The emergence of diverse linguistic traits among EC varieties indicates their growing prominence in global contexts. Consequently, further empirical data is required to comprehensively analyze these developments. The theoretical models previously discussed provide a robust framework for evaluating the sociolinguistic trajectories of RusE and ChE.

3.1. Russian English within Models of English

Given that Russia was never colonized by an English-speaking nation, its linguistic context fundamentally aligns with Kachru's EC. Globalization, technology, commerce, and academia are the main forces behind the use of English. In Russia, English is mostly a foreign language that is utilized for practical purposes [25].

Applying Görlach's Wheel Model, RusE is positioned on an independent trajectory as a performance variety. It exhibits systematic features significantly influenced by the Russian language. To cite an example, direct translations or calques frequently occur at the lexical level, such as the use of "get a ticket" in place of "to buy a ticket." Pragmatically, RusE communication styles are often perceived as directness, reflecting Russian cultural norms. T. Larina [26] elucidates that RusE speakers frequently apply the communication strategies in Russia into English, which causes pragmatic transfer, adopting a direct and explicit way of expressing thoughts, which might be perceived by native speakers as bluntness. Furthermore, R.B. Kaplan [27] highlights syntactical divergences, noting that Russian-influenced writing often deviates from the linear English model, topic sentence → supporting sentence A → supporting sentence B → conclusion. Instead, it frequently features complex, elongated sentences with multiple subordinate clauses and apparent digression.

Despite these distinct features, RusE users dynamically navigate between their localized variety and forms closer to the "hub" of standardized English, particularly since educational targets typically emphasize British or American standards.

Analyzed through Schneider's Dynamic Model, Russian is currently situated within the Nativization phase (phase 3), with strong indicators of moving towards Endonormative stabilization (phase 4). Historically, the foundation phase was initiated through trade, diplomacy, and Cold War interactions. Subsequently, the variety entered Exonormative Stabilization, during which pedagogical objectives strictly adhered to British or American native-speaker norms.

Currently, RusE exhibits key markers of Nativization: structural independence, identity construction, creative application, and the development of extensive linguistic databases. English is increasingly employed to articulate a distinct Russian identity in international contexts, such as in multinational business and digital media, thereby acquiring a unique cultural signature. Phonologically, this is evidenced by the frequent omission of dental fricatives [28] and the adaptation of vowel reduction patterns that mirror the Russian phonetic system. Moreover, researchers are actively compiling large corpora to systematically investigate these nativized forms [29]. While domestic debates persist regarding the academic legitimacy of these nativized structures compared to traditional norms, there is a growing consensus that RusE functions as a valid communicative tool without requiring strict adherence to IC standards – a hallmark of advancing toward Endonormative Stabilization.

3.2. China English within Models of English

China occupies a unique position within the EC due to its immense demographic of English users and learners. Propelled by its significant scale and cultural confidence, ChE is progressively transitioning beyond a strictly norm-dependent status. National initiatives, notably the Reform and Opening-up strategy and accession to the World Trade Organization, have catalyzed the integration of English to facilitate modernization, economic growth, and global engagement. However, because English remains a foreign language (EFL) acquired primarily through formal education, it lacks official institutional standing. As a result, IC varieties — especially American English — are the goal models in educational curricula, rendering ChE heavily exonormative in its formal instruction.

Within the framework of the Wheel Model, ChE occupies its own distinct vector, functioning as a performance variety that is actively developing and consolidating its linguistic norms. It has cultivated recognizable features heavily influenced by Chinese linguistic and cultural paradigms. Lexically, loan translations and calques, such as "to lose face" (丢脸, *diū liǎn*) and "paper tiger" (纸老虎, *zhǐ lǎo hǔ*), have become firmly integrated. Syntactically, the topic-comment structure is highly prevalent; for instance, the Chinese Learner English Corpus documents utterances such as "Hog Deer, its shape is very clemysy (sic)".

Evaluated through Schneider's Dynamic Model, ChE is currently in an advanced stage of Nativization (phase 3), showing preliminary indicators of Endonormative Stabilization (phase 4). The Foundation phase dates back to 17th century. *The History of Ming* [30] documented the initial contact between British merchants and Chinese locals in 1637, when an expedition of four ships under the command of Captain John Weddell anchored in Macao and Guangzhou [31]. By 1984, the Chinese Ministry of Education formalized English as a compulsory component of the National College Entrance Examination (Gaokao), cementing its Exonormative Stabilization phase, wherein instructional goals strictly mimicked native speaker norms.

Presently, ChE is in the key phase, Nativization, in which the unique linguistic features have developed. In particular, English is increasingly used to express a Chinese identity and to discuss Chinese-specific concepts, such as "socialism with Chinese characteristics" and "Chinese Dream". To facilitate this cultural exchange, extensive corpora have been established, including the Translation and Publication Portal for Chinese Key Terms and Expressions.

Furthermore, early indicators of phase 4, endonormative stabilization, are emerging. Scholars are actively documenting and describing the features of ChE, which is the first step toward codification [32], [33]. And acceptance among the public that ChE is a legitimate vehicle for expressing Chinese culture and identity, rather than just a flawed approximation of an American standard, is growing. Consequently, national education policies increasingly stress the role of English in telling China's story to



the world, requiring a sinicized form of English. To summarize, the tension between the need for global intelligibility and the desire for local expression is the central force shaping its ongoing development.

3.3. Similarities and Differences of Russian English and China English within the Models of English

Analyzed through these theoretical models, RusE and ChE function as structural analogues but manifest as cultural and evolutionary opposites. They are analogous in their macro-linguistic status: both are EC, performance varieties undergoing nativization. Drawing on the acrolect-mesolect-basilect continuum discussed by T. McArthur [34], both RusE and ChE may be regarded as localized EC varieties exhibiting features predominantly at the acrolectal and mesolectal levels. Conversely, they diverge significantly in their cultural pragmatics (directness vs. indirectness) and their evolutionary momentum.

RusE, shaped by a distinct political history and a cultural tradition of direct linguistic engagement, demonstrates a more confident progression toward endonormative stabilization. In contrast, ChE, which is heavily mediated by a state-guided educational infrastructure and prioritizes global integration, has cultivated a robust nativized identity but remains subject to stricter exonormative control. Ultimately, both varieties illustrate that the EC is not a monolithic classification, but rather a highly dynamic landscape where global English is continuously and uniquely reconfigured by localized realities.

Conclusion

The global proliferation of English has catalyzed its diversification beyond a monolithic standard, resulting in the growing sociolinguistic recognition of numerous localized varieties. To systematically analyze this complex linguistic landscape, scholars have developed several foundational frameworks.

By classifying World Englishes into the IC (native language), OC (second language), and EC (foreign language), Kachru's "Three Circles Model" delineates the multicentric aspect of the language. With regional variety on the rim and standard types at the core, Görlach's "Wheel Model" depicts English as a cohesive whole, demonstrating the coexistence of diversity and shared characteristics. Schneider's "Dynamic Model" takes a historical stance, highlighting the five stages of English's development in post-colonial contexts as it interacts with regional languages and cultures, culminating in the creation of distinctive new varieties.

Applying these theoretical paradigms, this comparative analysis demonstrates that both RusE and ChE function as EC varieties currently undergoing active nativization. Despite sharing this macro-linguistic classification, their cultural pragmatics diverge significantly; RusE users frequently employ direct communicative strategies, whereas ChE users tend to rely on indirectness. Furthermore, while their foundational developmental paths share structural similarities, their current evolutionary trajectories exhibit distinct momentums. RusE appears to be advancing more autonomously toward endonormative stabilization, whereas ChE, despite robust local innovation, remains more heavily stabilized by exonormative pedagogical regulations. Ultimately, this comparison highlights the dynamic capacity of the EC, illustrating how global English is continually and uniquely reshaped by localized sociocultural paradigms.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Лебедева И.Л., Московский государственный университет, Москва Российская Федерация
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.81.1.1>
Сообщество рецензентов журнала Russian Linguistic Bulletin.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.81.1.2>

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

Lebedeva I.L., Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow Russian Federation
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.81.1.1>
Community of Reviewers of the Russian Linguistic Bulletin.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/RULB.2026.81.1.2>

Список литературы / References

1. Rivlina A.A. Russian English and what it is not / A.A. Rivlina // Russian Journal of Linguistics. — 2020. — Vol. 24. — № 3. — P. 649–668. — DOI: [10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-649-668](https://doi.org/10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-649-668).
2. Wang Q. Phonological Features of China English: An Acoustic Investigation on Segmental Features of Educated China English Speakers / Q. Wang // Proceedings of the 16th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics. — 2011. — P. 422–425.
3. Ahn H. Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea / H. Ahn // Asian Englishes. — 2015. — Vol. 17. — № 2. — P. 132–151.
4. Lee J.S. Teacher as change agent: attitude change toward varieties of English through teaching English as an international language / J.S. Lee // Asian Englishes. — 2019. — Vol. 21. — № 1. — P. 87–102.
5. Liu P. Citespace-Based Bibliometric Analysis of Englishes: Insights and Trends / P. Liu // Discourse. — 2025. — Vol. 11. — № 2. — P. 170–181.
6. Seidlhofer B. A concept of international English and related issues: from "real English" to "realistic English" / B. Seidlhofer. — Strasbourg : Council of Europe, 2003. — 28 p.
7. Evans B.E. "If we say English, that means America": Japanese students' perceptions of varieties of English / B.E. Evans, T. Imai // Language Awareness. — 2011. — Vol. 20. — № 4. — P. 315–326.
8. Пиотровский Р.Г. Лингвистическая синергетика: исходные положения, первые результаты, перспективы / Р.Г. Пиотровский. — Санкт-Петербург : Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2006. — 159 с.
9. Schneider E.W. Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world / E.W. Schneider. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007. — 367 p.



10. McArthur T. The English languages / T. McArthur // *English Today*. — 1987. — Vol. 3. — № 11. — P. 9–13.
11. Kachru B.B. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle / B.B. Kachru // *English in the world*. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1985. — P. 11–36.
12. 李文中. 中国英语与中国式英语 / 李文中 // *外语教学与研究*. — 1993. — № 4. — 18–24 页. — URL: https://www.zhangqiaokeyan.com/academic-journal-cn_foreign-language-teaching-research-bimonthly_thesis/02012102896848.html (已访问: 26.07.2026).
13. Wei Y. Using English in China: From Chinese Pidgin English through Chinglish to Chinese English and China English / Y. Wei, J. Fei // *English Today*. — 2003. — Vol. 19. — № 4. — P. 42–47.
14. Proshina Z.G. Elaborating on the Expanding Circle / Z.G. Proshina // *World Englishes*. — 2019. — Vol. 38. — P. 233–244.
15. Bolton K. World Englishes and English-using communities / K. Bolton // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. — 1997. — Vol. 17. — P. 66–87.
16. Jenkins J. Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca / J. Jenkins // *TESOL Quarterly*. — 2006. — Vol. 40. — № 1. — P. 157–182.
17. Crystal D. English as a global language / D. Crystal. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. — 212 p.
18. Yano Y. Reflection on English in Japan and 'Japanese English' / Y. Yano // *Asian Englishes*. — 2023. — Vol. 25. — № 1. — P. 167–173.
19. Kobayashi Y. East Asian English learners crossing Outer and Inner Circle boundaries / Y. Kobayashi // *World Englishes*. — 2018. — Vol. 37. — № 4. — P. 558–569.
20. Kurusu K. English in the internationalization of higher education and international student mobility / K. Kurusu, C. Oda, M.A.C. Go [et al.] // *AILA Review*. — 2024. — Vol. 37. — № 1. — P. 120–136.
21. Alsagoff L. English in Singapore: Culture, capital and identity in linguistic variation / L. Alsagoff // *World Englishes*. — 2010. — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 336–348.
22. Bruthiaux P. Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide / P. Bruthiaux // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. — 2003. — Vol. 13. — № 2. — P. 159–178.
23. Bilal H.A. Beyond the standard: Exploring models and dynamics of world Englishes / H.A. Bilal, A. Shahid, Z. Iqbal [et al.] // *Linguistic Forum – A Journal of Linguistics*. — 2023. — Vol. 5. — № 1. — P. 56–72.
24. Görlach M. Varieties of English world-wide: Where we stand / M. Görlach // *Links & Letters*. — 1998. — № 5. — P. 13–36.
25. Gritsenko E.S. English as a "local" language in Russia: The practice of meaning-making in in-group communication / E.S. Gritsenko, A.O. Laletina // *Linguistics & Polyglot Studies*. — 2024. — Vol. 10. — № 2. — P. 154–165.
26. Larina T. Directness, Imposition and Politeness in English and Russian / T. Larina // *Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes*. — 2008. — № 33. — P. 33–38. — URL: <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/23152-research-notes-33.pdf> (accessed: 07.07.2026).
27. Kaplan R.B. Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education / R.B. Kaplan // *Language Learning*. — 1966. — Vol. 16. — № 1–2. — P. 1–20.
28. Proshina Z.G. Russian English: History, functions, and features / Z.G. Proshina. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2016. — 309 p.
29. The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics / edited by D. Biber, R. Reppen. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2015. — 642 p.
30. 张廷玉. 明史 / 张廷玉. — 北京 : 中华书局, 1974. — URL: <https://www.diancang.xyz/lishizhuanji/mingshi/> (已访问: 07.07.2026).
31. Airey F. Pidgin Inglis Tails and Others / F. Airey. — Shanghai : Kelly & Walsh, 1906. — 94 p.
32. Li Wenzhong. On the shoulders of John Sinclair: The EUM analysis / Li Wenzhong // *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*. — 2021. — Vol. 21. — № 6. — P. 13–26.
33. 濮建忠. 语料库驱动的翻译研究: 意义单位、翻译单位和对应单位 / 濮建忠 // *解放军外国语学院学报*. — 2014. — № 1. — 53–63 页. — URL: https://www.zhangqiaokeyan.com/academic-journal-cn_journal-pla-university-foreign-languages_thesis/0201236496125.html (已访问: 07.07.2026).
34. McArthur T. The English Languages / T. McArthur. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. — P. 5–10.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Rivlina A.A. Russian English and what it is not / A.A. Rivlina // *Russian Journal of Linguistics*. — 2020. — Vol. 24. — № 3. — P. 649–668. — DOI: 10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-3-649-668.
2. Wang Q. Phonological Features of China English: An Acoustic Investigation on Segmental Features of Educated China English Speakers / Q. Wang // *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*. — 2011. — P. 422–425.
3. Ahn H. Awareness of and attitudes to Asian Englishes: A study of English teachers in South Korea / H. Ahn // *Asian Englishes*. — 2015. — Vol. 17. — № 2. — P. 132–151.
4. Lee J.S. Teacher as change agent: attitude change toward varieties of English through teaching English as an international language / J.S. Lee // *Asian Englishes*. — 2019. — Vol. 21. — № 1. — P. 87–102.
5. Liu P. Citespace-Based Bibliometric Analysis of Englishes: Insights and Trends / P. Liu // *Discourse*. — 2025. — Vol. 11. — № 2. — P. 170–181.



6. Seidlhofer B. A concept of international English and related issues: from "real English" to "realistic English" / B. Seidlhofer. — Strasbourg : Council of Europe, 2003. — 28 p.
7. Evans B.E. "If we say English, that means America": Japanese students' perceptions of varieties of English / B.E. Evans, T. Imai // *Language Awareness*. — 2011. — Vol. 20. — № 4. — P. 315–326.
8. Piotrowski R.G. Lingvisticheskaya sinergetika: iskhodnye polozheniya, pervye rezul'taty, perspektivy [Linguistic synergetics: initial provisions, first results, prospects] / R.G. Piotrowski. — Saint Petersburg : Saint Petersburg State University, 2006. — 159 p. [in Russian]
9. Schneider E.W. Postcolonial English: Varieties around the world / E.W. Schneider. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007. — 367 p.
10. McArthur T. The English languages / T. McArthur // *English Today*. — 1987. — Vol. 3. — № 11. — P. 9–13.
11. Kachru B.B. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle / B.B. Kachru // *English in the world*. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1985. — P. 11–36.
12. Li Wenzhong. Zhongguo Yingyu yu Zhongguoshi Yingyu [China English and China-style English] / Li Wenzhong // *Waiyu Jiaoxue yu Yanjiu* [Foreign Language Teaching and Research]. — 1993. — № 4. — P. 18–24. — URL: https://www.zhangqiaokeyan.com/academic-journal-cn_foreign-language-teaching-research-bimonthly_thesis/02012102896848.html (accessed: 26.07.2026). [in Chinese]
13. Wei Y. Using English in China: From Chinese Pidgin English through Chinglish to Chinese English and China English / Y. Wei, J. Fei // *English Today*. — 2003. — Vol. 19. — № 4. — P. 42–47.
14. Proshina Z.G. Elaborating on the Expanding Circle / Z.G. Proshina // *World Englishes*. — 2019. — Vol. 38. — P. 233–244.
15. Bolton K. World Englishes and English-using communities / K. Bolton // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. — 1997. — Vol. 17. — P. 66–87.
16. Jenkins J. Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca / J. Jenkins // *TESOL Quarterly*. — 2006. — Vol. 40. — № 1. — P. 157–182.
17. Crystal D. English as a global language / D. Crystal. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. — 212 p.
18. Yano Y. Reflection on English in Japan and 'Japanese English' / Y. Yano // *Asian Englishes*. — 2023. — Vol. 25. — № 1. — P. 167–173.
19. Kobayashi Y. East Asian English learners crossing Outer and Inner Circle boundaries / Y. Kobayashi // *World Englishes*. — 2018. — Vol. 37. — № 4. — P. 558–569.
20. Kurusu K. English in the internationalization of higher education and international student mobility / K. Kurusu, C. Oda, M.A.C. Go [et al.] // *AILA Review*. — 2024. — Vol. 37. — № 1. — P. 120–136.
21. Alsagoff L. English in Singapore: Culture, capital and identity in linguistic variation / L. Alsagoff // *World Englishes*. — 2010. — Vol. 29. — № 3. — P. 336–348.
22. Bruthiaux P. Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide / P. Bruthiaux // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. — 2003. — Vol. 13. — № 2. — P. 159–178.
23. Bilal H.A. Beyond the standard: Exploring models and dynamics of world Englishes / H.A. Bilal, A. Shahid, Z. Iqbal [et al.] // *Linguistic Forum – A Journal of Linguistics*. — 2023. — Vol. 5. — № 1. — P. 56–72.
24. Görlach M. Varieties of English world-wide: Where we stand / M. Görlach // *Links & Letters*. — 1998. — № 5. — P. 13–36.
25. Gritsenko E.S. English as a "local" language in Russia: The practice of meaning-making in in-group communication / E.S. Gritsenko, A.O. Laletina // *Linguistics & Polyglot Studies*. — 2024. — Vol. 10. — № 2. — P. 154–165.
26. Larina T. Directness, Imposition and Politeness in English and Russian / T. Larina // *Cambridge ESOL: Research Notes*. — 2008. — № 33. — P. 33–38. — URL: <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/23152-research-notes-33.pdf> (accessed: 07.07.2026).
27. Kaplan R.B. Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education / R.B. Kaplan // *Language Learning*. — 1966. — Vol. 16. — № 1–2. — P. 1–20.
28. Proshina Z.G. Russian English: History, functions, and features / Z.G. Proshina. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2016. — 309 p.
29. The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics / edited by D. Biber, R. Reppen. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2015. — 642 p.
30. Zhang Tingyu. Ming Shi [History of Ming] / Zhang Tingyu. — Beijing : Zhonghua Book Company, 1974. — URL: <https://www.diancang.xyz/lishizhuanji/mingshi/> (accessed: 07.07.2026). [in Chinese]
31. Airey F. Pidgin Inglis Tails and Others / F. Airey. — Shanghai : Kelly & Walsh, 1906. — 94 p.
32. Li Wenzhong. On the shoulders of John Sinclair: The EUM analysis / Li Wenzhong // *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*. — 2021. — Vol. 21. — № 6. — P. 13–26.
33. Pu Jianzhong. Yuliaoku qudong de fanyi yanjiu: yiwei danwei, fanyi danwei he duiying danwei [Corpus-driven translation studies: Units of meaning, translation units, and correspondence units] / Pu Jianzhong // *Jiefangjun Waiguoyu Xueyuan Xuebao* [Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages]. — 2014. — № 1. — P. 53–63. — URL: https://www.zhangqiaokeyan.com/academic-journal-cn_journal-pla-university-foreign-languages_thesis/0201236496125.html (accessed: 07.07.2026). [in Chinese]
34. McArthur T. The English Languages / T. McArthur. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. — P. 5–10.