THE DYNAMICS OF NEW ENGLISHES: FROM IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION TO DIALECT BIRTH

EDGAR W. SCHNEIDER

University of Regensburg

So-called NEW ENGLISHES, distinct forms of English which have emerged in postcolonial settings and countries around the globe, have typically been regarded individually, as unique varieties shaped by idiosyncratic historical conditions and contact settings, and no coherent theory to account for these processes has been developed so far. This article argues that despite all obvious dissimilarities, a fundamentally uniform developmental process, shaped by consistent sociolinguistic and language-contact conditions, has operated in the individual instances of rerooting the English language in another territory. At the heart of this process there are characteristic stages of identity construction by the groups involved, with similar relationships between the parties in migration contact settings (i.e. the indigenous population and immigrant groups, respectively) having resulted in analogous processes of mutual accommodation and, consequently, similar sociolinguistic and structural outcomes. Outlining a basic developmental scenario, I suggest that speech communities typically undergo five consecutive phases in this process—FOUNDATION, EXONORMATIVE STABILIZATION, NATIVIZATION, ENDONORMATIVE STABILIZATION, and DIFFERENTIATION—and I describe the sociolinguistic characteristics of each one. This framework is then applied to case studies of seven different countries (Fiji, Hong Kong, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand) which, I argue, are currently positioned at different points along the developmental cycle.*

'English is now ours, we have colonized it'
—Germino Abad, Philippine poet, Manila 1996[1]

1. NEW ENGLISHES ON THE AGENDA OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH. The globalization of the English language can be and has been viewed in a variety of perspectives. On the one hand, English is the world's leading language, the main vehicle of international communication, and in that role it is an essential, indeed indispensable tool for international economy, diplomacy, sciences, the media, and also individual interactions across language boundaries. On the other, it has been damned as a 'killer language', responsible for the extinction of innumerable indigenous languages, dialects, and cultures around the globe. What these two perspectives have in common despite all fundamental and ideological differences is that they look at English in an idealized, homogeneous, standardized form and in its transnational functions; and essentially, these discussions focus upon extralinguistic roles of the language and consequences of its use rather than its structural properties. Consequently, reactions to them have been limited in general linguistics. However, present-day English as a global language is more than the world's predominant lingua franca—it is also a language which is currently growing roots in a great many countries and communities around the world, being appropriated by local speakers, and in that process it is diversifying and developing new dialects—a process

[1] *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, 12 August 1996; quoted from Bolton & Lim 2000:431.

which, I claim in this paper, is determined by general sociolinguistic principles and characterized by a significant set of common traits across its input contact languages and cultures, and which therefore offers important insights for language study in general. Just as there are linguistic properties characteristic of language death (Thomason 2001: 222–39 and sources cited there), dialect endangerment (Schilling-Estes & Wolfram 1999), dialect transmission (Hickey 2003), and second-dialect acquisition (Chambers 1992), I am suggesting that there are principles effective in dialect birth, the disintegration of a language into newly-emerging local dialects. The present paper works out these principles on the basis of a comparative investigation of the emergence of NEW ENGLISHES around the world. Despite the substantial differences among the indigenous languages and cultures that have come into contact with English in this process, the results are surprisingly similar in many ways, both structurally and sociolinguistically. I claim that these similarities are more than chance results and coincidences; instead, they are products of fundamentally similar contact processes, to be accounted for by theories of communication, accommodation, and identity formation. I propose that New Englishes emerge in characteristic phases that ultimately result in new dialect formation, and that the entire process is driven by identity reconstructions by the parties involved that are to some extent determined by similar parameters of the respective contact situations.

   The beginnings of the study of new varieties of English as a serious topic of linguistic research and a new subdiscipline of English linguistics can be dated to the early 1980s, with the publication of some groundbreaking books (Bailey & Görlach 1982, Kachru 1986, 1992, Pride 1982, Platt et al. 1984, Trudgill & Hannah 1982, Wells 1982) and the launching of scholarly journals devoted to this topic (*English World-Wide* [1980–], *World Englishes* [1982–]).[2] Prior to that time, no more than a handful of books on some of the major new varieties of English had been published, for example on English in Australia and New Zealand (Baker 1945, Ramson 1966, Turner 1966), West Africa (Spencer 1971), and Singapore (Tongue 1974, Crewe 1977); but there was no overarching awareness of such varieties constituting a joint field of linguistic study, let alone a theory or methodology relating to this topic. In that respect, the state of the discipline appears comparable to that of pidgin and creole linguistics in the early 1960s, when the discovery of similarities in structure and sociohistorical setting across several languages began to suggest a common research agenda (Holm 1988/89). Since then, a substantial body of scholarship has been accumulated, including collective volumes (e.g. Cheshire 1991, Schneider 1997) and popularizing treatments of the subject (Crystal 1997, McArthur 1998). Two special bibliographies (Görlach 1984, 1993) covering the period 1965 to 1993 list more than 2200 publications, most of which deal with individual countries and specific topics. As is characteristic of a newly emerging field, the terminology is still somewhat variable: we find labels such as NEW ENGLISHES, WORLD ENGLISHES, GLOBAL ENGLISHES, and so on, used almost interchangeably, with minimally varying connotations. It is noteworthy that the plural form *Englishes*, meaning 'varieties of. . .', has established itself as an unmarked term. In the present context I prefer the label 'New Englishes' because their being 'new' grasps an essential detail of the argumentation: I am concerned with developmental phenomena characteristic of the early phases of colonial and postcolonial histories until the maturation and separation of

---

[2] For a competent and systematic historical survey of the emergence of the discipline and its main concerns (a little outdated by now), see Görlach 1991.

these variants as newly recognized and self-contained varieties; hence, the term is taken to encompass all varieties resulting and emerging from such histories and covered by this definition, and with reference to any given variety it has an in-built expiry date, as it were. For example, American English underwent the same development but would no longer count as one of the 'New Englishes' today.

In this paper I propose a new, coherent framework to explain the emergence of, and thus the relationships among, New Englishes, a dynamic model which suggests that some synchronically observable differences between such varieties may be regarded as consecutive stages in a diachronic process. In doing so I adopt a cyclic line of thinking that was suggested for the study of pidgin languages by Hall (1962) and later Mühlhäusler (1986), and applied to New Englishes originally by Moag (1992 [first published in 1982]).

2. BACKGROUND.

2.1. SOCIOHISTORICAL BACKGROUND: FROM COLONIAL EXPANSION TO A WORLD LANGUAGE. By and large, the linguistic developments at stake are products of the colonial expansion of the British Empire from the late sixteenth to the twentieth century, a background taken to be essentially familiar.[3] Note, however, that what counts here is not the colonial history or the former colonial status of a given country per se, and also not the specifically British connection, but rather the type of contact situation caused by these historical circumstances, the expansion and relocation of the use of a single language to new territories where a characteristic type of language contact situation evolves. In the Philippines, for instance, the same scenario arose under American, not British, influence.

The process of colonial expansion was driven by a variety of motives, among them economic, political, military, and religious ones, and its agents were the state, business companies, religious communities, missionary and colonization societies, and also simply individuals. Consequently, different types of contact scenarios arose. Thomason (2001:17–21) provides a useful survey of types of contact onsets, many of which we also find realized in the present framework (including 'the movement of one group into another group's territory', 'immigration of small groups or scattered individuals', 'importing a labor force', or cultural contacts through long-term neighborhood). Similarly, Mufwene (2001:204–6) distinguishes 'trade colonization', 'settlement colonies', and 'exploitation colonization', pointing out that this difference determines the regularity and kinds of contacts, the power stratification and amount of integration versus segregation between the parties involved, and so on. After having singled out varying language transmission patterns ('predominantly normal' vs. 'predominantly scholastic') and types (settler migration, informal acquisition, formal teaching), Gupta (1997) distinguishes five different patterns for English-speaking countries: 'monolingual ancestral English' (e.g. US, Australia), 'monolingual contact variety' (e.g. Jamaica), 'monolingual scholastic English' (e.g. India), 'multilingual contact variety' (e.g. Singapore), and 'multilingual ancestral English' (e.g. South Africa). Such distinctions provide for variations within the framework outlined below and determine distinctive subtypes. In the long run, however, they are not prime determinants of the outcome of the process of new dialect emergence—how or why two groups were brought together and what their relationship was like in the early phases turns out to be less important than the

---

[3] For an authoritative historical survey see Lloyd 1984; for a recent, statistically based documentation of the ongoing spread of English that also looks into causes of this process, see Rubal-Lopez 1996.

recognition that once the settler group stays for good they will have to get along together, for better or for worse. To a considerable extent the emergence of New Englishes is a process of linguistic convergence, followed by renewed divergence only later, once a certain level of homogeneity has been reached.

Crystal (1997) lists a number of other factors that have contributed decisively to the present-day global spread of English, including its association with (British-dominated) industrialization in the nineteenth century and, as a consequence of the superpower role of the US, economic and cultural globalization in the twentieth. This shift from British to American predominance has resulted in the fact that the influence of American English upon originally British-derived and British-determined varieties is being discussed in many countries around the globe today (although the phenomenon has not yet been systematically investigated on a broader scale).[4] Whether or not a relatively homogeneous INTERNATIONAL ENGLISH is emerging is another topic of current debate (e.g. Modiano et al. 1999, Peters 2001); interestingly enough, Chambers (2000:285) predicts that in less than a century 'Global English, a supranational standard' will be a reality. Both of these issues, however, are largely independent of the concerns of this article, which focuses upon a different process.

2.2. RELATED DISCIPLINES. Methodologically and theoretically, the study of worldwide Englishes builds upon earlier subdisciplines of linguistics with related interests and problem areas, including dialect geography (Francis 1983, Davis 1983, Chambers & Trudgill 1998), sociolinguistics (Fishman 1972, Labov 1972, Chambers 2003), and pidgin and creole linguistics (e.g. Holm 1988/89). Research in these traditions has been carried out also in countries where New Englishes are spoken and has thus contributed significantly to our understanding of the complexity of these situations. As will be pointed out below, the regional diversification of newly emerged varieties sets in only late, so it is significant that the investigation of regional dialects in, for example, Australia and New Zealand is only just beginning (see §4.5). Macrosociolinguistic questions of language policy, multilingualism, and educational issues are directly relevant and have been discussed in many multilingual societies where New Englishes are spoken, and microsociolinguistic correlational work has been carried out in some of these countries (e.g. Horvath 1985 in Australia, work reported in Bell & Kuiper 2000 in New Zealand, and work by Platt and associates (Platt & Weber 1980, Platt et al. 1983, 1984) in Singapore). Finally, the close relatedness between creolistics and the study of New Englishes results from the fact that both language types originate in contact situations and that many pidgins and creoles are spoken in regions and countries where English is an official language (such as throughout the Caribbean and West Africa, the southwest Pacific, and also Australia).

2.3. APPROACHES TO NEW ENGLISHES IN LINGUISTIC SCHOLARSHIP. Two main classifications have been suggested to categorize the varieties of worldwide English into broader types, with both looking at the functional and political role of English in a given country, and both assuming three classes.

---

[4] Trudgill (1998) provides a balanced (and skeptical) assessment of the hypothesis that a supranationally converging and Americanized international English is emerging. For documentation of some American influence on Singaporean English, see Schneider 1999:197–99; for comments on its influence on Australian English, see Baker 1978:398–404, Sussex 1989, Butler 1997:104–6, and Butler 2001; for surveys of its impact in New Zealand, see Bauer 1994:417–19 and Gordon & Deverson 1998:111–17.

The first of these models[5] distinguishes 'ENL/English as a Native Language' coun-
tries, where English is the native language of almost all or at least a significant majority
of the population (like Britain, the US, or Australia), from 'ESL/English as a Second
Language' countries, where in addition to strong indigenous languages English assumes
prominent official functions in a multilingual society as the language of politics, the
media, jurisdiction, higher education, and other such domains (as in Ghana, Nigeria,
India, Singapore, Papua New Guinea, etc.), and from 'EFL/English as a Foreign Lan-
guage' countries, in which English performs no official internal function but is still
strongly rooted and widely used in some domains (like the press or tertiary education)
because of its special international usefulness in such fields as business, the sciences,
and technology (as in Israel, Egypt, or Taiwan). Of course, the status of English in any
given country may also change over time, for instance when in an ESL country a
decision is made to move away from a special role for English and to promote an
indigenous lingua franca instead (Tanzania and Malaysia are commonly cited as recent
cases in point; see Schmied 1985, Halimah & Ng 2000).

The second widespread classification is Kachru's 'Three Circles' model (1985, 1992),
which is usually portrayed graphically as three partially overlapping ovals (see recent
representations in Crystal 1997:53–54 and McArthur 1998:100) and distinguishes coun-
tries of an 'Inner Circle', an 'Outer Circle', and an 'Expanding Circle'. While the exact
criteria for inclusion in any of these categories are not always clear, and individual
countries are assigned essentially as examples, it is obvious that in terms of their member
countries, the three circles largely correspond to the ENL/ESL/EFL distinction.[6] What
distinguishes the two models is primarily Kachru's broader goals and political implica-
tions. Kachru rejects the idea that any special prominence or superior status should be
assigned to ENL countries and native-language status, and thus he is less concerned
with the Inner Circle countries, placing greatest emphasis on the Outer Circle (see
Kachru 1992) and also the Expanding Circle. The implication is that norms and stan-
dards should no longer be determined by Inner Circle/ENL contexts; instead, Kachru
emphasizes that the English language belongs to all who use it, and that the most
vigorous expansions and developments of the language can be observed in Outer and
Expanding Circle countries.

Only rarely have New Englishes been employed as test cases for general questions
of language theory. In addition to the approaches characterized above, in many of the
countries concerned a strong emphasis on applied linguistics, that is, questions of lan-
guage pedagogy and language policy, prevails. That the sociolinguistic and linguistic

---

[5] For a discussion of this model and a documentation of the origin of its terms, see McArthur 1998:
42–55; for definitions and further discussion, see Görlach 1991:12–13.

[6] The obvious question of how many New Englishes there are and which countries belong to the various
categories suggested cannot be answered precisely at this point. Any attempt at a comprehensive listing
will require extensive discussions and unavoidably arbitrary decisions on how to draw borderlines between
languages and dialects, between distinctly 'new' varieties with an identity of their own and variants of other
varieties (related to the ESL/EFL, or Outer/Expanding Circles, or 'X English'/'English in X' distinctions
discussed in this paper), and between varieties with relatively less or more contact-induced restructuring.
To give a rough indication, an answer will lie somewhere between the following two poles: (i) Conventional
representations of Kachru's Circles model show five 'Inner Circle' countries and about a dozen 'Outer' and
'Expanding' Circles countries, respectively—with these being quite clearly meant as suggestive and exem-
plary, (ii) McArthur (1998:53–54) lists as many as 36 'ENL territories', 57 'ESL territories', and 139 'EFL
territories'—many of which, however, would be very much open to discussion.

scenarios in which New Englishes have evolved lend themselves to an investigation of such general questions as language variation and change, second language acquisition, language contact and language shift should, however, be most obvious.[7]

2.4. RELATED QUESTIONS AND APPROACHES. The first of a few additional aspects that need to be addressed concerns the notion of nativeness. Central as it may seem, the importance of being a native speaker of English has been questioned in recent years (Kachru 1986, Singh 1998, Piller 2001). While a traditional view holds that only native speakers fully command a language and have proper intuitions on its structural properties, it has been pointed out that in many parts of the world, especially in ESL/Outer Circle contexts, reality has turned out to be much more complicated than this simplistic assumption implies. Competence in a language is tied to its constant use, and in such countries we find both indigenous native speakers of English in the narrow sense (like minorities of Indians or Sri Lankans who grew up speaking English), whose intuitions may differ significantly from those of British or American people,[8] and speakers who, after having acquired an indigenous mother tongue, have sooner or later shifted to using English only or predominantly in all or many domains of everyday life. Such speakers can be classified as 'first-language English' speakers, although they do not qualify as native speakers in the strict sense. It is undisputed, however, that their importance in their respective cultures as linguistic models and as users and owners of 'New Englishes' is paramount. Accordingly, Kachru (1997:4–5) has made a convincing point in distinguishing what he calls 'genetic nativeness' from 'functional nativeness'.

Second, the variability which typically characterizes new varieties needs to be grasped and accounted for in some way (for which a microsociolinguistic description should be a necessary starting point), and decisions must be made with respect to political and pedagogical actions. Formal contexts, including teaching, require norm orientations, but the question is which and whose norms are accepted; not surprisingly, in this context emotional opinions and strong attitudes frequently prevail. Descriptive and theoretical linguists fundamentally believe that all language uses and varieties are functionally adequate in their respective contexts and internally well structured. On the other hand, applied linguists and language teachers require decisions and advice as to which norm to regard as acceptable or as a target in any given situation.

In general, in the given context it is necessary to be aware of the distinction (and tension, for that matter) between public norms and written language on the one hand and private and spoken performance on the other, epitomized by the notions of OVERT and COVERT PRESTIGE in sociolinguistics (Labov 1972:249, Chambers 2003:241–44). Some of the phenomena I point out below have an effect predominantly or exclusively on one end of this dichotomy, leaving the other largely untouched. For example, KOINÉIZATION or STRUCTURAL NATIVIZATION, as discussed below, affects some people's speech behavior but not others' attitudes; conversely, the tradition of complaining about a decrease in the 'quality' of linguistic usage or the codification of a variety characterize the top end of the sociostylistic continuum, with limited, delayed, or no effect on the

---

[7] Scholars who originate from or live in the respective countries, and thus are more directly exposed to the immediate needs of a society, tend to be more interested in questions of an applied nature, whereas scholars from other countries tend to operate from an 'outside perspective' and thus are more interested in general, comparative, and theoretical questions, and in objective description. It should be clear that both positions are perfectly legitimate and need to complement each other for each to be effective.

[8] Work by Coppieters (1987) suggests that speakers with a near-native performance show striking differences from native speakers in their intuitions and competence.

bottom end. Clearly, this parameter of variation is closely related to that of social class and associated speech differences (like the continuum between the 'broad', 'general', and 'cultivated' varieties posited by Mitchell & Delbridge 1965 for Australian English).

Third, in the wake of CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (e.g. Phillipson 1992, Pennycook 1998; for some thoughtful and healthy reactions see Conrad 1996) it has recently been pointed out that many seemingly descriptive statements (including the ENL/ESL/EFL categorization mentioned above) entail culturally biased value judgments, and some scholars doubt whether any language description can be devoid of ideological baggage (Kachru, p.c.). In many statements on global Englishes there is an inherent but hardly visible tendency to regard and portray Britain and other ENL countries as the 'centers', thus entitled to establish norms of correctness, and, conversely, New Englishes as peripheral, thus in some sense deviating from these norms and, consequently, evaluated negatively. Obviously, there are political questions and orientations behind this, and, as in political matters in general, opinions here are likely to be divided. While I personally strongly believe that what should be an objective scholarly investigation should not be turned into a debate of political issues, I agree that disguised value judgments must be avoided, and that the concerns and the dignity of the communities involved must be respected.

In the light of an ongoing discussion about the 'linguistic imperialism' attributed to the English language globally, I wish to emphasize that even while I describe macrosociolinguistic processes, this paper is not meant to address the politics of language use at all. The process with which I am concerned is largely independent of questions of right and wrong or of the moral or political evaluation of the fact that typically settlers occupy — frequently by force — a territory that indigenous groups used to regard as their own. Certainly the speed of that process and the details of its realization are influenced by the type and quality of the relationship between indigenous and immigrant groups, by whether or not military actions take place, or legal titles are obtained peacefully. In essence, however, it is triggered by an immigrant group's decision to stay in the new land for good, and the social consequences of this decision for all parties involved, whether voluntarily or not; it is a process caused solely by sociocultural and psycholinguistic realities.

3. THEORY: PHASES IN THE EVOLUTION OF NEW ENGLISHES.

3.1. SOME THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES: IDENTITY AND ECOLOGY. Central to the model which I am advocating is the notion of SOCIAL IDENTITY and its construction and reconstruction by symbolic linguistic means — a topic which has gained some prominence in recent sociolinguistic theorizing (see Gumperz & Gumperz 1982, LePage & Tabouret-Keller 1985, Woodward 1997, Wodak et al. 1999, Eckert 2000, Norton 2000, Schneider 2000b, Kroskrity 2001, Hazen 2002). Identity is defined as 'the systematic establishment and signification, between individuals, between collectives, and between individuals and collectives, of relationships of similarity and difference' (Jenkins 1996: 4), 'one's ''meaning in the world'' ' (Eckert 2000:41). For an individual as well as a community, defining one's identity implies a need to decide who one is and, more importantly, who one wishes to be. Based on regional and social histories but also value orientations and customary modes of behavior, a line is drawn between 'us' (those who share essential parts of that history and orientation, those we wish to socialize and be associated with) and 'others' (who don't share these qualities), and these attitudes and socialization patterns usually find symbolic expression — including (and perhaps most readily and rapidly) by means of linguistic variability. While other means of

expressing solidarity and identity boundaries may be costly and sometimes difficult or impossible to achieve, choosing in-group specific language forms is a relatively simple and usually achievable goal, and thus a natural choice as a means of identity expression. Furthermore, identities are not normally stable or clear-cut: Creating and recreating one's identity is a constant, dynamic process which requires continuous rethinking and repositioning of oneself in the light of changing parameters in one's surroundings, possibly to be followed by the substitution of one symbolic form of expression by another. This is by no means a simple process, because individuals as members of varying social groups assume different social roles and thus overlapping, hybrid, and at times even conflicting identities.

This is what we also find in the social contexts of colonial expansion which have led to the evolution of New Englishes: The individual parties who came into cultural and linguistic contact with each other needed to define and redefine themselves and their social roles in the light of the presence of the other groups, of their own historical roots and cultural traditions, and in their relationship to territories and distant centers of political and military power. As these relationships changed over time, so did their identities, their images of themselves in relation to others and the world, and, in turn, their language usage as an expression of these changing identities. I claim that these changes were neither random nor idiosyncratic; rather, a common underlying schema of historical evolution provided for a certain degree of uniformity of the sociopsychological as well as linguistic processes, a schema shaped by factors constant across many territories: the political and economic interests, personal goals, sources of power, and choices of action of the 'homeland', the colonizers, and the colonized, all constrained by similar conditions and thus proceeding along similar paths in partially predictable and parallel ways. Perhaps I should emphasize the importance of the fuzzy quantifier 'a certain degree' here: I am not advocating a gross generalization that disregards the important differences between one historical context, territory, culture, or individual and another: Hybridity, and hence a broad range of variability and differences, is characteristic of both identity construction and linguistic evolution in the contexts considered here. But at the same time I would argue that these processes have more in common than linguistic scholarship has recognized so far.

In addition to emphasizing the importance of the concept of identity, I adopt several positions of recent scholarship that I mention here without sketching them in greater detail. New Englishes typically emerge in language-contact situations, so a theory of language contact provides a necessary frame of reference. Clearly, in all contact situations it is most important to understand the precise nature of the communicative situations — participants and demographic factors, social relationships and mutual attitudes, the types of communicative events, the nature of the linguistic input elements, such as the similarities and typological relationships between the languages involved, in short, the ECOLOGIES of contact situations (Mufwene 2001). The linguistic outcome of such processes is constrained by the nature of the linguistic input: the forms and structures provided by all the parties' native tongues create a pool of possible choices which results in a 'competition of features' (Mufwene 2001, Thomason 2001:86–89), so in individual instances an emerging new variety of English consists of elements of both 'diffusion' from the (typically nonstandard) English input and 'selection' from an indigenous language form (Schneider 2000a). The precise nature of such a mixture of features is typically determined largely in the early phase of contact, while things are still in

flux, so a 'founder effect' (Mufwene 1996, 2001)[9] can be expected to play a role. Other relevant factors include the relative sizes of the groups involved (Thomason 2001: 78–79) and the typological relatedness between their respective languages.

The model which I am proposing is in line with the framework of conditions of language contact outlined by Thomason (2001), which essentially assumes an indirect correlation between extralinguistic causes and linguistic consequences, that is, different degrees of intensity and types of contact between social groups on the one hand and certain structural effects on various language levels on the other; obviously, only a small selection of the wide range of possible scenarios sketched there is relevant here. Most importantly, I fully agree with Thomason that all generalizations relating to language contact are idealizations, like all models, abstracting essential observations from a messy reality but unavoidably 'leaking' in some respects: no typology in this area is exhaustive, and all possible generalizations may have to face a counterexample somewhere. Nevertheless, generalizations are possible, though only probabilistic rather than absolute ones. In that vein, I sketch a prototypical scenario, one that delineates a somewhat idealized process; variations and deviations found in reality will have to be addressed later. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that even if in specific circumstances some details may have developed somewhat differently and there may be apparent counterexamples to some of the trends worked out below, on the whole the process is real, and it is robust.

3.2. THE DYNAMIC MODEL: THE EVOLUTION OF NEW ENGLISHES AS A CYCLIC PROCESS. Research into New Englishes has tended to focus upon individual varieties, their features and conditions of use (in addition to problems of language teaching). Some authors (Platt et al. 1984, Kachru 1986) have pointed out far-reaching similarities between certain countries and varieties, but even these have often been restricted to a single world region (such as South or Southeast Asia), and the predominant tendency has been to regard these varieties as individual linguistic entities, independent of each other and products of unique circumstances determined by geography and history. Of course, differences caused by colonization types and the amount of segregation practiced in an area, historical accidents, regional and cultural parameters, linguistic substrata, varying context conditions, and other idiosyncrasies cannot be ignored; all these account for the great variability that we find in comparing New Englishes. Yet the model I am proposing here is more ambitious in proposing that there is a shared underlying process which drives the formation of New Englishes, accounts for many similarities between them, and appears to operate whenever a language is transplanted.[10] This process is characterized essentially by two closely related factors.

[9] Inspired by the notion of a 'founder principle' in biology, Mufwene suggests that characteristics of the vernaculars of the earliest populations in an emerging colony predetermine the structural features of the resulting variety to a strong extent.

[10] Whether the dynamic model proposed here has wider applicability beyond contacts with English as the colonizers' language is a matter of speculation, and probably difficult to test given the rareness of comparable cases of long-term and far-reaching, quasiglobal language expansions. The diffusion of Latin and its transformation into the Romance languages in contact with earlier indigenous languages in late classical antiquity might be a parallel case, though it would be difficult to posit and document comparable sociocultural conditions of identity constructions, an inalienable component of my proposal, across millennia. The linguistic ramifications of the colonial expansion of the Romance languages (Portuguese, Spanish, French) might serve as test cases for the generalizability of the model.

First, and most importantly, a characteristic diachronic pattern of progressive stages of identity rewritings and associated linguistic changes can be observed. Ultimately, the force behind this process is the reconstruction of group identities of 'us' versus 'other'. In the beginning settlers as a group in a foreign land regard themselves as an extension of the 'us' of their country of origin as against the 'other' of the indigenous population of their country of destination. In the course of time, however, the former homeland turns into an 'other', while a new, regionally based construction of 'us', gradually including the indigenous population, is developed. Similarly, the experience of the indigenous population typically is such that the erstwhile 'other' reading of the immigrants or occupants is gradually incorporated into the 'us' of permanent residents. It is through linguistic expression that much of this negotiation, definition, and expression of changing identities operates: speech patterns, that is, linguistic usage and, ultimately, emerging language varieties signify associated identity changes. These changes are described in greater detail in the five-phase dynamic model discussed below. Viewed in that light, certain synchronic differences between New Englishes can be regarded as coexistent but independent manifestations of subsequent stages of the same underlying diachronic process.[11]

The second factor of major importance is the ecology and ethnography of the sociopolitical and, consequently, communicative relationship between the parties involved in a colonization process, a factor which I call the STRANDS OF COMMUNICATIVE PERSPECTIVE. The entire process of the rerooting of English in a foreign land can be viewed, and has been experienced, from two complementary perspectives: that of the colonizers, and that of the colonized. Any convincing model of the emergence of New Englishes needs to incorporate both. It is one of the strong claims that I am making that to a considerable extent the histories of New Englishes can be viewed as processes of convergence between these two groups, despite all the initial and persistent differences between them. Labeling these two competing but also complementary perspectives, observable in each of the five developmental stages (though with changing degrees of different or shared features), two 'strands' of development is meant to signal that they are interwoven like twisted threads. I call the settlers' perspective STL STRAND and the experience and situation of the indigenous populations IDG STRAND.

In a sense, these two perspectives are related to the notions of 'ENL' and 'ESL' respectively, but these two labels have traditionally been applied to entire countries and their respective political situations as synchronic results of historical processes, while I wish to apply my notions of the STL and IDG strands to speech communities, frequently defined along ethnic lines, as agents in an ongoing dynamic process. In the settlers' (or colonizers') group, that is, (mostly) British emigrants and their descendants — in my model, the agents of 'STL strand' evolution — English is continuously transmitted from one generation to the next without a radical break in linguistic continuity or an experience of language shift. But in the course of time their speech behavior undergoes substantial modification and evolution through contact between dialects of English and contact with indigenous tongues at first and with IDG strand usage later.

---

[11] For an earlier, comparable model that is considerably more constrained in its applicability, see Moag 1992 on the situation in Fiji. Moag distinguishes four overlapping phases — 'transportation', 'indigenization', 'expansion in use and function', and 'institutionalization' — sometimes followed by a fifth phase, 'restriction of use and function'. Perhaps the most important difference between Moag's idea and the present model is that he believes that in the end English tends to revert to a foreign language status. However, an alternative outcome is also envisioned as a possibility: 'Might second-language status for English prove to be only a passing phase, with English inexorably becoming a native language in some societies and a foreign language in others?' (247).

The IDG strand represents quite a different experience initially, that of being exposed to a politically dominant foreign language which is gradually being acquired and adopted by the indigenous community. Its first stages therefore involve second language acquisition on an individual and a community basis, possibly to be followed by language shift later on. But the essential point of my model of two intertwined strands is that both groups who share a piece of land increasingly share a common language experience and communication ethnography, and thus the forces of accommodation are effective in both directions and in both communities, and result in dialect convergence and increasingly large shared sets of linguistic features and conventions. The end result is thus the emergence of an overarching language community with a set of shared norms. At the same time, in some styles and for some social contexts, smaller, socially and ethnically defined speech communities coexist and allow for internal variability under a common roof. This corresponds to an important insight of language identity theory: the fact that individuals are members of several social communities at the same time and thus construct several, partially overlapping, identities for themselves.

This model of complementary strands of language development in subnational speech communities represents a significant improvement over the traditional ENL and ESL (or, correspondingly, 'Inner Circle' vs. 'Outer Circle') categorizations, because the conventional categorizations, based upon nation states, disregard language minorities in some countries and fail to convincingly account for the multilingual setup of others, namely linguistically heterogeneous countries with several official languages, like South Africa or Canada. Classifying countries like the US, Australia, and New Zealand as 'ENL' or 'Inner Circle', as is usually done, ignores the situation, experiences, and language varieties of minorities like Native Americans, Hispanic Americans, Aboriginals, and Maoris. Conversely, classifying countries like Nigeria, Cameroon, India, or Singapore as 'ESL' ignores both the presence of small but influential minorities of English-speaking expatriates and, more importantly, the increasing proportion of indigenous people who grow up speaking some form of English as their mother tongue and fails to do justice to those who consistently use it as a first language. Finally, in the traditional models, countries like South Africa, with a strong proportion of English speakers but also other population groups whose native languages are recognized as official languages as well, have defied a clear categorization and have therefore frequently been sidestepped in such listings, or been classified somewhat forcedly. The new model presents no such difficulties: South Africa is a country with various ethnic and immigrant groups with individual STL-strand or IDG-strand language experiences, but at the same time it is also possible to speak of an entity to be labeled 'South African English'.[12]

Thus, in essence I propose what I call the DYNAMIC MODEL OF THE EVOLUTION OF NEW ENGLISHES:

(1) As the English language has been uprooted and relocated throughout colonial and postcolonial history, New Englishes have emerged by undergoing a fundamentally uniform process which can be described as a progression of five characteristic stages: FOUNDATION, EXONORMATIVE STABILIZATION, NATIVIZATION, ENDONORMATIVE STABILIZATION, and DIFFERENTIATION.

(2) The participant groups of this process experience it in complementary ways, from the perspective of the colonizers (STL strand) or that of the colonized (IDG strand): these developmental strands become more closely intertwined and their

---

[12] For a comparable account of the history of Singaporean English see Gupta 1999.

linguistic correlates come to approximate one another in an ongoing process of mutual linguistic accommodation over time.

(3) The stages and strands of this process are ultimately caused by and signify reconstructions of group identities of all participating communities, with respect to the erstwhile source society of the colonizing group, to one another, and to the land which they jointly inhabit.

The following five distinct prototypical phases of evolution can be identified. In each case, I discuss several constitutive parameters, including extralinguistic (sociopolitical) background and identity construction, sociolinguistic conditions (varieties available and participants' usage, norm orientations, and attitudes), and typical linguistic consequences (structural changes on the levels of pronunciation, lexis, and grammar).

PHASE 1: FOUNDATION. In the initial stage English begins to be used on a regular basis in a country that was not English-speaking before, because a significant group of English speakers settles in a new country for an extended period. Typical contexts include the foundation of military forts and/or trading outposts (e.g. in Singapore after 1819), or emigration settlements (e.g. in New Zealand in the 1840s, organized by a colonization society), resulting from various political or economic motivations at home and leading to different colonization types (as listed earlier). In almost all cases indigenous languages are spoken in this area, so a complex contact situation emerges. In fact, contact operates on two levels, independent of each other at first, involving dialect contact and language contact, respectively: it concerns both the group-internal communication among the English-speaking settlers and the interaction between these settlers and the indigenous population—two different types of linguistic ecologies.

Typically, settlers come from different regional backgrounds, and, thus, do not behave linguistically in a homogeneous way, being native speakers of different regional and/ or social dialects. Accommodation theory predicts that to secure communication in such a situation, forms that are widely used and shared by many will be communicatively successful and will therefore be used increasingly, while forms that are not likely to be widely understood, that is, strong regionalisms or group markers, will frequently result in communication failure and will thus tend to be avoided. Thus, within the STL strand and predominantly in large-scale colonization settlement and in informal and oral contexts, over time speakers will mutually adjust their pronunciation and lexical usage to facilitate understanding—a process generally known as KOINÉIZATION, the emergence of a relatively homogeneous 'middle-of-the-road' variety (described in some detail for Australia by Trudgill [1986] and for New Zealand, with identification of process-internal stages, by Trudgill and colleagues [2000]). STL-strand development at its initial stage is therefore characterized by a trend toward linguistic homogeneity, and by such processes as leveling, 'focusing', simplification, and the occurrence of phonetically or grammatically intermediate 'interdialect' forms in the spoken vernacular (Trudgill 1986).[13] This effect is strongest in settlement colonies, while in trade and exploitation colonies the STL strand is weaker in numerical terms.

Contact with speakers of indigenous languages normally remains restricted in this early phase, impeded by the inability to understand each other and by different concerns and needs: Each group continues to communicate predominantly within its own confines, and cross-cultural communication is achieved by just a limited few. Typically, most members of invading and occupying groups, who tend to be dominant in political,

---

[13] Koinéization is likely to be strongest in lower social strata and less required in the upper ranks. This is not to imply that all speech differences disappear; social class distinctions are likely to have persisted from the beginning in most societies.

military, and economic terms, do not bother to learn indigenous languages. Some communication between the two groups involved is of course necessary, for trading purposes or for political or military negotiations, but the task of acquiring the required linguistic skills for these interactions tends to be left to individual members of the indigenous population (in several contact situations natives were taken captive to be trained as interpreters). Thus, in the IDG strand marginal bilingualism develops, predominantly among a minority of the local population, with speakers who interact with the immigrants as traders, translators, or guides, or in some political function. A well-known example from early Australian history is the Aboriginal Bennelong, who was taken to England for a few years in the 1890s.

At this early stage indigenous languages usually do not influence the English spoken by the settler community much, with one notable lexical exception: names for places are among the earliest and most persistent borrowings in such situations. It is, however, a sad and surprising story that has recurred several times: Even if indigenous peoples are violently subdued, frequently facing marginalization and isolation, cultural extinction, or even genocide, and leave hardly any other linguistic traces in the language of their conquerors, the names that they gave to places in their natural environment tend to be adopted, linguistically adapted (sometimes reshaped by folk etymology), and retained. We find heavy toponymic borrowing in a variety of situations which geographically and historically are quite far apart but which have resulted in outcomes which in that respect are astoundingly similar — Native American toponyms in North America (e.g. *Chattahoochee*, *Mississippi*, *Milwaukee*, *Susquehanna*, *Chicago*, *Tallahassee*), and, similarly, Aboriginal names in Australia or Maori place names in New Zealand (see 3b in §4.5). In fact, more than a millennium earlier we find the same pattern operating in a totally different colonization situation and culture but in much the same way, namely with respect to Celtic place names in Britain being integrated into the emerging Old English language of the Anglo-Saxon invaders from the European continent (e.g. *Kent*, *York*, *Thames*, *Dover*, *Duncombe*, *Huntspill*) — while hardly any other linguistic traces of the pre-Germanic Celts remain in English.

PHASE 2: EXONORMATIVE STABILIZATION. After a while, colonies or settlers' communities tend to stabilize politically, normally under foreign, mostly British, dominance, whatever the precise political status may be. English is now regularly spoken in a new environment, with a resident community of expatriate native speakers providing for most of this stable (STL-strand) usage. Whether these residents come as permanent settlers or as agents providing support and supplies to the homeland (to which they plan to return after an extended period overseas) is largely immaterial — they perceive themselves as outposts of Britain, deriving their social identity from a common territory of origin and a feeling of culturally belonging there, even if in reality for many of them this source of identity turns increasingly into an 'imagined territory of a myth of return' (Jenkins 1996:27). Consequently, they share a conservative and unaltered, though increasingly distant cultural and linguistic norm orientation: The external norm, usually written and spoken British English as used by educated speakers, is accepted as a linguistic standard of reference, without much consideration given to that question (it may safely be assumed that the question of a linguistic norm is in any case of only limited interest to many people in a settlers' community).

Concurrently with this consciousness of being representatives of British culture on foreign soil, adjustments to the local environment start to creep in and gradually modify the English being spoken in the new country: The STL strand in its spoken form begins to move toward a local language form. The English-speaking settlers begin to adopt

local vocabulary, at first predominantly for objects that the settlers encountered for the first time in the new territory. Characteristically, the earliest and the most numerous borrowings from indigenous languages as well as new coinages with English morphemes designate the local fauna and flora (see some examples below in the case studies), followed by words for cultural conventions or other customs and objects. We may safely assume that at first these become passively familiar to resident English speakers and are subsequently used by them as well to designate locally important things, thus being gradually incorporated into indigenous English usage. Thus, an English vocabulary segment of local significance, largely consisting of loans, develops. Some of these words remain strictly local and are thus opaque to outside users; others diffuse into the general, international English vocabulary. It is characteristic of such early local varieties of English to develop -ISMS: Americanisms (Mathews 1951), Australianisms (Ramson 1966), Indianisms (Yule & Burnell 1886, reprint 1986), Ghanaianisms (Dako 2001), and so on. It can be assumed that at this stage the identity of the local English community expands to encompass something like 'English plus': genuinely British no doubt, but seasoned with the additional flavor of the extraterritorial experience which those who stayed 'home' do not share, an experience which finds expression in the adoption of indigenous words. And it may be assumed that this emerging 'English-cum-local' identity carries a positive attitude and is construed as an enriching experience in the service of the less challenging, distant home country.

At the same time, the IDG strand begins to expand: bilingualism frequently spreads among the indigenous population, through education or increased contacts (especially in trade colonization); it is frequently associated with a relatively higher social status (as in the case of pre-independence Malaysia in the mid-twentieth century [Asmah 1996:515]). For the indigenous population a command of English gradually turns into an asset, opening roads to higher status or specific commercial options. Thus, knowing English becomes an ability which sets off an indigenous elite; and, therefore, a process leading to a positive attitude towards the use of English is stimulated. The identity of the English-knowing locals is enriched in a fashion not unsimilar to that of the English immigrants they associate with: Certainly their self-perception at this stage remains that of members of the local community, but at the same time their ability to communicate with the Europeans opens their eyes to aspects of another worldview and gives them an extra edge of experience and competitiveness within their own group. Work by Siegel (1987) on Fiji and Gupta (1996) on Singapore suggests that people of mixed descent play a particularly important role in this diffusion process.

This is also the kick-off phase for the process which is linguistically the most important and interesting one, STRUCTURAL NATIVIZATION: As soon as a population group starts to shift to a new language, some transfer phenomena on the levels of phonology and structure are bound to occur; these are largely unrecorded, being restricted to spoken vernaculars in the beginning. Consequently, in this phase the earliest structural features typical of local usage emerge, if only slowly. Thomason (2001:ch. 6) lists several mechanisms by means of which contact-induced change occurs, including code switching, code alternation, passive familiarity, second-language acquisition strategies, and, most importantly in the present context, 'negotiation', the case 'when speakers change their language (A) to approximate what they believe to be the patterns of another language or dialect (B)' (142)—clearly this is what happens in the emergence of New Englishes.

What happens during this phase may be not unlike the early stages of some routes leading to creolization: Pidginization and creolization are special instances of language

contact processes, and recent creolist theory has tended to minimize the fundamental difference formerly posited between creoles and other contact-induced languages (Neumann-Holzschuh & Schneider 2000, Mufwene 2000, 2001, Thomason 2001). In any case, structural innovations at this stage are likely to go largely unnoticed: in the eyes of the Europeans, the English spoken by locals will be regarded as more or less 'good' or 'broken' according to its communicative usefulness, but not as something worthy of special attention. For both parties involved, the STL and IDG strands, their traditional identities begin to be expanded and modified slowly but are not yet really shaken, and language use, judged solely on the grounds of its utility, is not yet identified as a part of this process.

PHASE 3: NATIVIZATION. The third phase, NATIVIZATION, is the most important, the most vibrant one, the central phase of both cultural and linguistic transformation in which both parties involved realize that something fundamental has been changing for good: traditional realities, identities, and sociopolitical alignments are discerned as no longer conforming to a changed reality, and the potentially painful process of gradually replacing them with something different, a new identity reflecting a changed reality, combining the old and the new, is in full swing. This process has immediate linguistic consequences, for the drastically increased ranges of communication between the parties involved now makes language use a major practical issue and an expression of new identity. Kachru confirms: 'The ''acts of identity''. . . are not only a matter of perception, but they have formal realization in lexicalization, in syntax, and in discourse, styles, and genres' (Prendergast 1998:227).

In the STL strand, this implies the transition from the acceptance of a distant mother country as the source of both political power and linguistic and cultural guidance to gradual independence — or at least a phase of striving towards it. When the 'mother country' is felt to be less and less of a 'mother', the offspring will start going their own ways, politically and linguistically — slowly and hesitantly at first, gaining momentum and confidence as time passes. To some extent, linguistic developments and orientations follow from — and mirror — social and political changes. As Greenbaum states, 'Political independence is a precursor of linguistic independence' (1996a:11). Characteristically, during this stage many countries gain political independence but retain a close bond of cultural and psychological association with the mother country, a process that results in a kind of 'semi-autonomy' in their identity construction. In the former British Empire, this stage has found a conventional political expression, useful to both sides and conforming to the perception of their mutual relationship, in the form of the 'Commonwealth of Nations', especially in its early phase. In terms of their political status (possibly involving questions of citizenship) and, hence, identity construction, the gap between immigrant and indigenous population groups is significantly reduced at this stage: Both parties regard themselves as permanent residents of the same territory (though differences in status, prosperity, and lifestyle persist) and thus realize the need to get along with each other. For the first time the STL and IDG strands become closely and directly intertwined. They are unlikely to be equal partners in this process: While the STL-strand group also incorporates some elements of local culture in its identity construction and symbolization (including select linguistic elements), the labor of mutual approximation tends to be assumed primarily by members of the IDG strand group, who undergo a process of linguistic and cultural assimilation and large-scale second language acquisition (Schumann 1978). This process is likely to lead to language shift — even if power relationships interfere and the process becomes not only one of

peaceful and voluntary assimilation but also 'a site of struggle' (Norton 2000:128; cf. Gumperz & Gumperz 1982). A case in point would be the far-reaching adoption of English by the Maoris.

During this phase, the new state of affairs increasingly finds linguistic expression, and language use becomes an issue. By this time IDG-strand usage has developed noticeable local linguistic idiosyncrasies (through substrate effects, interlanguage usage, and the like), and in the ongoing mutual, if asymmetric, negotiation and accommodation process some of these will slowly be adopted by certain STL-strand users as an expression of their identification with their current country of residence, their future rather than their past, gradually supplanting their loyalty to the country of origin. In the STL strand, a sociolinguistic continuum is likely to emerge between conservative language users who reject linguistic innovation and local adjustment altogether and advanced, possibly lower-status users, predominantly those with relatively more contact with the ethnic locals. In any case, an awareness of the deviance of some local linguistic usage from old norms of correctness grows and is bound to result in a clash of opinions and in community-internal discussions of the adequacy of linguistic usage. During this phase we can frequently observe what has come to be known as the 'complaint tradition' (see Milroy & Milroy 1985), in which conservative language observers typically claim that linguistic usage keeps deteriorating, that in the new country 'corrupt' usage can be heard which, however, should be avoided.[14] Letters to the editors of quality papers are a characteristic outlet for such complaints (see the rich documentation in Hundt 1998 and further examples in the case studies). Such discussions indicate insecurity about linguistic norms: Is the old, external norm still the only 'correct' one, as conservative circles tend to hold, or can local usage really be accepted as correct simply on account of being used by a significant proportion of the population, including educated speakers? Such questions are typically raised in public, and the process of transition is marked by some discussion of these issues and, over time, an increasing readiness to accept localized forms, gradually also in formal contexts.[15]

Largely in line with Thomason's 'borrowing scale' (2001:70–71), this stage also results in the heaviest effects on the restructuring of the English language itself. This is perhaps most conspicuous on the level of vocabulary, with heavy lexical borrowing for further cultural terms continuing, but loan words permeate also the everyday vocabulary and tend to be widely used and noted. However, the English language now changes also on those levels of its organization which do not carry referential meaning: IDG-strand speakers will consistently show a marked local accent (which in many cases linguists will be able to identify as transfer phenomena from the phonology of indigenous languages), and they will nativize the language grammatically and structurally by using constructions peculiar to the given country. This stage is of great interest to theories of language change because it illustrates how in the process of linguistic evolution a linguistic system may be modified. The spread of changes will typically follow

---

[14] See, for instance, Gordon & Deverson 1998:108: 'Emerging colonial accents were felt to be a threat to good English, and much fruitless effort was expended in attempting to eradicate them, in New Zealand and elsewhere'.

[15] Certainly 'complaint traditions' are not only characteristic of this developmental phase but symptomatic of the tension between spoken and written norms in literate societies in general. Such issues are typically raised among the educated echelons of a society, and it is doubtful whether they affect vernacular speech forms at all. The characteristic occurrence of such statements in the phase under discussion reflects a hightened awareness among some upper-class members of a society of the increasing alienation of their own orientations and linguistic behavior from that of their grassroots compatriots.

the S-curve pattern identified by language historians and sociolinguists, a 'slow-quick-quick-slow' pattern in the adoption of an innovation. Indigenous usage starts as preferences, variant forms used by some while a majority of the rest will stick to the old patterns; then it will develop into a habit, used most of the time and by a rapidly increasing number of speakers, until in the end it has turned into a rule, constitutive of the new variety and adopted by the vast majority of language users, with a few exceptions still tolerated and likely to end up as archaisms or irregularities.

In descriptive terms, it is interesting that in its early stages this indigenization of language structure occurs mostly on a lexico-grammatical level, where individual words, typically high-frequency items, adopt characteristic but marked usage and complementation patterns. Grammatical features of New Englishes emerge when idiosyncracies of usage develop into indigenous and innovative patterns and rules. When words cooccur increasingly frequently, locally characteristic collocations and 'lexical bundles' (Biber et al. 1999:987–1036) will emerge, and in the long run this may result in the development of fixed expressions or idioms. Similarly, grammatical patterns characteristic of one class of words may spread to another word or class of words (most likely initially in IDG-strand usage, where intuitions as to a pattern's acceptability are less strictly circumscribed) and become firmly rooted, thus gradually enriching the emerging new variety with additional structural possibilities and ultimately modifying parts of its grammatical makeup (i.e. its lexicogrammatical constraints). Grammatical nativization in New Englishes typically comprises phenomena such as new word-formation products (e.g. from South-Asian English *rice-eating ceremony* [Kachru 1986:41], from Pakistani English *Bhuttocracy*, *autorickshah lifters*, and so on [Baumgardner 1998], from Fiji English *bula smile* 'welcoming smile', and so on [Tent 2001a]),[16] localized set phrases (e.g. the Australianism *no worries* [Ramson et al. 1988:436]), varying prepositional usage (e.g. *different than/from/to*, known to vary between national varieties of English [Hundt 1998:105–8], *resemble to someone* [Tongue 1974:55]), and innovative assignments of verb complementation patterns to individual verbs (e.g. *screen* used intransitively and *protest* used with a direct object in NZE [Hundt 1998:109–12 and 115–18], *Moerewa farewells you*,[17] or *to pick someone* in East African, Singaporean, and Fiji English [Platt et al. 1984:82, Tent 2000a:376]).[18]

While such surface-structure phenomena may be the easiest elements to perceive in the process(es) of the nativization of English, they need to be supplemented by a broader perspective and an eye on cultural and communicative conventions. Gumperz and Gumperz (1982:6) rightly state: 'Even when the original native language is lost the new discourse conventions tend to persist and to be taken over into the group's use of the majority language'.

PHASE 4: ENDONORMATIVE STABILIZATION. The fourth phase, ENDONORMATIVE STABILIZATION, is marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic norm, supported by a new, locally rooted linguistic self-confidence, prototypically ex-

---

[16] Görlach (1995a) carries out a systematic comparison of patterns of word formation across different types of English-speaking communities, including New Englishes.

[17] Road sign in Moerewa, North Island, New Zealand, observed in May 2001.

[18] As the above examples suggest, the sources of structural characteristics of New Englishes are manifold. They include inheritance from dialects of English (with or without modification through koinéization), substrate transfer, and also simply internal structural change and innovation as in all languages, possibly determined by the operation of universal, cognitively shaped processes. Of course, these processes are not unique to New Englishes. It remains to be investigated to what extent, and possibly why, there are differences in the productivity of these processes from one language phase or evolutionary type to another.

pressed by Gordon and Deverson (1998:108) in describing the New Zealand attitude: 'In language now we can and must go alone, creating our own standards'. Given that not all strata and groups of a society adopt innovations and adjust to changes equally rapidly, traces of the previous stage will still be found; that is, some insecurity remains (residually fostered by conservative members of a society who still long for old times and old norms). However, by this stage such a conservative attitude is a minority position.

This phase typically follows and presupposes political independence: for a local norm to be accepted also in formal contexts, it is necessary that a community be entitled to decide language matters as its own internal affairs. But it appears that in some cases political independence, which may have been achieved considerably earlier, by stage 3, is not enough for this stage to be reached. While the transition may be smooth and gradual, it is also possible that the transition between stages 3 and 4 is caused by some exceptional, quasi-catastrophic political event which ultimately causes the identity alignment of STL-strand speakers to switch from a self-association with the former mother country, however distant, to a truly independent identity, a case of 'identity revision' triggered by the insight that one's traditional identity turns out to be 'manifestly untrue' or at least 'consistently unrewarding' (Jenkins 1996:95). I call this EVENT X—typically it is an incident which makes it perfectly clear to the settlers that there is an inverse misrelationship between the (high) importance which they used to place on the mother country and the (considerably lower) importance which the (former) colony is given by the homeland (as when Australia was left unsupported after being attacked in World War II). Event X may frequently cause STL-strand immigrants to feel a sense of isolation and abandonment at first, but it will then cause them to reconsider and redefine their position and future possibilities, to remember their own strength, and to reconstruct a radically new, locally based identity for themselves.

It is noteworthy that the new identity construct will give greater prominence to a group's territory of residence, now understood to be permanent, than to historical background and, to some extent, ethnicity. As the emphasis on territory, and shared territory, by necessity includes indigenous ethnic groups, that is, IDG-strand speakers, the role of ethnicity, and ethnic boundaries themselves, will tend to be redefined and regarded as increasingly less important. After all, ethnicity, too, is not a biological given but a social construct, a parameter of identity negotiation (Jenkins 1996, Kroskrity 2001). In a collective psychological sense, this is the moment of birth for a new nation, and in the present context we need to remember that 'nations are mental constructs, ''imagined communities'' ' which are constructed discursively, and that 'the discursive constructs of nations and national identities . . . primarily emphasize national uniqueness and intra-national uniformity but largely ignore intra-national differences' (Wodak et al. 1999:4).[19]

By this point the newly achieved psychological independence and the acceptance of a new, indigenous identity result in the acceptance of local forms of English as a means of expression of that new identity: The community reaches an understanding that a new local norm, distinct from the norms of the original colonizers, shall be accepted as adequate also in formal usage (see Newbrook 1997:236). This new norm may incorporate certain traits of IDG-strand usage (certainly vocabulary, more tentatively, structural patterns), so the difference between the STL and IDG strands all but disappears,

---

[19] In most cases, however, ethnic boundaries are unlikely to collapse. Their respective prominence will depend to some extent upon the colonization type and the amount of remaining segregation in a society.

or is at least reduced to the degree of difference that is found between different sociolinguistic communities in many countries.[20] Psycholinguistically, it is important that the new language variety, as a carrier of a new regional identity, has lost its former stigma and is positively evaluated. Structurally, the fact that mutual negotiation results in a shared variety, which is for some a second language and for others a first language incorporating erstwhile L2-transfer features, has been identified as a process characteristic of certain types of language contact by Thomason:

> The process through which interference features are introduced by a group of learners into a second language — a target language — has two or three components depending on whether or not the learners are integrated linguistically into the target-language speech community or not. First, learners carry over some features of their native language into their version of the TL, which can be called TL_2. Second, they may fail (or refuse) to learn some TL features, especially marked features, and these learners' errors also form part of the TL_2. If the shifting group is not integrated into the original TL speech community, so that (as in the case of Indian English) its members remain as a separate ethnic or even national group, then the TL_2 becomes fixed as the group's final version of the TL. But if the shifting group is integrated into the original TL-speaking community, so that TL_1 speakers form one speech community with TL_2 speakers, the linguistic result will be an amalgam of the two, a TL_3, because TL_1 speakers will borrow only some of the features of the shifting group's TL_2. In other words, TL_2 speakers and TL_1 speakers will 'negotiate' a shared version of the TL and that will become the entire community's language. (Thomason 2001:75)

Thomason's 'TL_2' largely corresponds to what I have called IDG-strand development, and her 'TL_3' is the newly emerging common variety. In a similar vein, Hock and Joseph develop a diagram model of convergence between two languages in prolonged bilingual contact, approximating each other:

> Let the interaction begin with two languages, A and B, producing the interlanguages A^B, based on native knowledge of language A and acquired knowledge of B, and its counterpart B^A. . . These interlanguages, in turn, will interact with each other, as well as with relatively unchanged A and B. The result will be a build-up of increasingly complex and mixed interlanguages, with increasingly longer — and more complex — series of 'superscripts' [like A^{BA}, A^{BB}, B^{AB}, etc.]. (Hock & Joseph 1996:395)

This particular aspect of my dynamic model is thus embedded in a broader range of related phenomena in language contact.

At the same time, it is characteristic of this phase that the new indigenous language variety is perceived as remarkably homogeneous,[21] and that this homogeneity is in fact emphasized. Whatever linguistic heterogeneity remains (and there certainly is some, usually along social class lines) will tend to be downplayed or ignored. To some extent, this homogeneity will be a result of the stage of koinéization in earlier STL-strand development, where some internally differentiating details were rubbed off and which typically ends in a crystallization stage also known as 'focusing' (Trudgill et al. 2000). More importantly, however, in the phase of endonormative stabilization putting an emphasis on the unity and homogeneity of one's own still relatively new and shaky identity is a natural sociopolitical move serving to strengthen internal group coherence. Emphasizing a community's linguistic homogeneity at this stage corresponds to its identity construction, focusing upon the newly gained sense of communality: In times

---

[20] Certainly social class differences play a role in this context. As was remarked by an anonymous referee, the convergence of varieties is stronger between the colonial and indigenous elites (with many members of the latter having had the benefit of an extended stay in Britain or the US) than at the bottom of the social scale, where there may be resistance to elite forms of English.

[21] Trudgill observes that 'extreme . . . uniformity appears to be quite typical of the initial stages of mixed, colonial varieties' (1986:145), citing Australia and Canada as examples.

of uncertainty, with as yet shallow roots and an unpredictable future, it is always advisable for a group to stick closely together.

Differences between STL- and IDG-strand developments may still persist (depending on the degree of integration between the population groups), but they will be less conspicuous than before, and downplayed in the interest of national unity. By this time some, perhaps many, and sometimes all members of indigenous ethnic groups have undergone a process of language shift. In too many cases the original indigenous languages are endangered, sometimes extinct. Typically, some of these people, especially members of an indigenous elite, have accommodated their speech to STL-strand usage (whose forms were influenced and modified by the IDG strand in earlier phases) completely. Others have not and retain some linguistic distinctiveness which, however, tends to be ignored in the public discourse about language usage.

Questions of linguistic norm acceptance are frequently social group struggles in disguise, so for a newly emerged language variety to be accepted as a local linguistic norm it must be codified: In westernized societies, for a language to gain official recognition requires accepted reference books, that is, dictionaries, grammars, and usage guides. Grammar books come later, because the number of grammatically deviant patterns is smaller than the number of local words, and in the light of the assumption of an internationally homogeneous 'common core' of English grammar they are apparently more difficult to accept as correct. But dictionaries are an obvious case in point, and it is a characteristic trait of this phase that dictionaries of the respective New Englishes are produced, with recent examples including the Caribbean (Allsopp 1996), Malaysia, Singapore, and the Philippines (see §§4.3–4.4).[22] Codification in these contexts may also be regarded as an interaction between spoken behavior and written norms in a society (or also, for that matter, between the lower and upper social strata): It paves the way for and implies the acceptance of earlier spoken realities as appropriate to formal and written contexts. This is a mutually reinforcing process: New national identities cause an awareness of the existence of new language varieties, which in turn causes the production of dictionaries of these new varieties; once such a dictionary is out it reinforces the distinct national and linguistic identity. The most convincing example of this process is the publication of the *Macquarie dictionary* in Australia (Delbridge 1981), by now a hallmark of Australia's national identity.[23]

The fact that by this stage high degrees of cultural as well as linguistic independence have been achieved in both developmental strands is also reflected in the emergence of a new and vigorous cultural phenomenon, namely, literary creativity in English,[24] rooted in the new culture and adopting elements of the new language variety. There is no need to go into this in greater detail here: The emergence and role of 'New Literatures in English' over the last few decades has been one of the major developments in

---

[22] For a very useful and comprehensive survey of the lexicographic coverage of New Englishes see Görlach 1995b and Görlach 1998.

[23] The process works both bottom-up (with vernacular usage being recorded and thus awarded some dignity in formal contexts) and top-down (with the existence of the written record, or book, reinforcing the usage of local forms). The fact that working-class people are less likely to consult a dictionary may be taken as a counterargument to the top-down effect, albeit a weak one: In a modern media society the very existence of a new 'national dictionary' is likely to be communicated to many and to increase their linguistic pride nevertheless.

[24] I owe this point to Kingsley Bolton of the University of Hong Kong. It is also listed as an element characteristic of what Moag (1992:241) calls 'institutionalization'. Kachru (1994:528–33) illustrates it with respect to South Asian English, and Görlach (1991:22–23) discusses it as a feature of New Englishes.

English-speaking literature (see Ashcroft et al. 2002), and the linguistic ramifications of this process were highlighted and discussed in a recent monograph (Talib 2002). Many of these authors have been extremely successful, and quite a number of them have been awarded prestigious prizes, including the Booker Prize and the Nobel Prize; and many of them address both their cultural hybridity and their use of the English language or some variety of it in their writing, as Talib (2002), like many others, has shown.

In terms of linguistic terminology, the difference between phases 3 and 4 is commonly given symbolic expression by substituting a label of the 'English in X' type by a newly coined 'X English' (exemplified below by the discussion of whether there exists just an 'English in Hong Kong' or a 'Hong Kong English'). The implications of the change of names are clear; both designation types are 'two distinct ways of conceptualizing language use and its nativization and identity with the language' (Kachru in Prendergast 1998:229).

PHASE 5: DIFFERENTIATION. By this time, the emergence of a new variety of English trails off, and is almost a thing of the past, recorded and remembered in recent history but largely completed. Politically and culturally, and hence also linguistically, a new nation has achieved not only independence, having freed herself from some external dominant source of power and orientation, but even self-dependence, an attitude of relying on one's own strengths, with no need to be compared to others. As a reflection of this new identity, a new language variety has emerged.

However, this is not the end point of linguistic evolution; rather, it is a turning point from which something new springs: the stage of dialect birth. Once a solid national basis has stabilized, one's global, external position is safe and stable, as it were, and this allows for more internal diversification. The focus of an individual's identity construction narrows down, from the national to the immediate community scale. The citizens of a young nation no longer see themselves primarily as a single entity against the former colonial power, but rather as a composite of subgroups, each marked by an identity of its own, determined by sociolinguistic parameters such as age, gender, ethnicity, regional background, social status, and so on. At this stage an individual's contacts are strongly determined by one's social networks, within which the density of communicative interactions is highest (Milroy 2002). Consequently, new varieties of the formerly new variety emerge as carriers of new group identities within the overall community: regional and social dialects and linguistic markers (accents, lexical expressions, and structural patterns), which carry a regionally or socially indicative function only within the new country, emerge. The expression of 'group identification and social categorisation' becomes more important than the 'collective identity' of the previous stage — which, in turn, need not have been 'homogeneous or consensual' either, but the emphasis has definitely shifted (see Jenkins 1996:111 and Wodak et al. 1999: 16ff.). In a strictly linguistic sense, it is likely that what Trudgill (1986:152–53) called 'reallocation' plays a major role in this process whereby variant forms originally from different dialects are assigned a new, sociolinguistically indicative interpretation in the new community.

It is likely that differentiation in this sense primarily concerns regional rather than social variation, given that in most societies some social variation is likely to have persisted throughout, but in a newly settled area there was no basis for regional speech distinctions to emerge up to that point.[25] In general, the phenomenon described here

---

[25] Perhaps, as was suggested by an anonymous referee, there simply was not enough time for regional variation to develop, given that regional differences tend to increase with time. It is true that in practically

has to be understood as effective in a relative, not an absolute sense: It would be futile to assume that there would have been no conditioned variation at all before this stage, or that the homogeneity typically perceived in the previous stage would have perfectly mirrored reality; but conversely, irrespective of whatever variation may have existed earlier, stage 5 marks the onset of a vigorous phase of new or increased, sociolinguistically meaningful internal diversification.[26]

Differences between STL- and IDG-strand varieties are likely to resurface as ethnic dialect markers at this stage (as is happening most obviously in present-day South Africa; see de Klerk 1996). Depending on the relationships between people of different ethnicities in a nation and, consequently, the identity constructions of communities along ethnic lines, such dialect differences may be reinforced or may actually develop afresh as markers of ethnic pride, or they may be relatively inconspicuous, even barely perceptible. To some extent, this depends upon the amount of bi- or multilingualism that has survived phase 4 developments. It is worth noting explicitly that phase 5 does not entail monolingualism in English at all; it is possible for varieties of English to coexist with other, mostly indigenous languages, with all of these fulfilling identity-marking functions.[27] In largely monolingual English-speaking countries like Australia or New Zealand, some former IDG-strand usage results in ethnic dialects of English. In multilingual countries like Canada, Singapore, or South Africa, the IDG strand appears as either ethnic dialects or L2-varieties of English. But the difference between the two types of situation is less significant than traditional models suggest, and the latter may actually turn into the former with time. Cases in point are Chicano English or Cajun English in the US: L2 varieties for some speakers but an ethnic L1 dialect for others, without much perceptible linguistic difference between the two.[28] These are 'new ethnic identities' (Gumperz & Gumperz 1982:6), symbolically expressed through speech, and frequently sources of pride.

Table 1 summarizes the main parameters of this model, which is to be understood as abstract and prototypical: It describes idealized, typical developmental phases and their characteristics; in reality, not all conditions need to apply in every single instance (though many will), and boundaries and the chronology of stages may be fuzzy. A given country or community may be more advanced in some respects but lag behind in others, and, as is the case with the sociolinguistic diffusion of language change, a society may comprise representatives and traces of two or more subsequent phases at a time, being usually divided into more advanced and more conservative language users and developmental strata, with respect to both speech and writing. Most importantly, in line with Thomason's position that it is social history that determines the outcomes of language contact (2001:77) and that linguistic developments are ultimately unpredictable because people's attitudes and behavior are ultimately unpredictable (2001:61), it

---

all cases we simply do not have the evidence to tell when regional diversification may have started, so it may have been around earlier than we suspect (an assumption for which Bauer and Bauer [2002], in their case study of New Zealand, found some evidence), and the difference proposed here between earlier homogeneity and later diversification may have been gradual rather than absolute.

[26] Trudgill has also observed that in colonial varieties 'degree of uniformity [is] in inverse proportion to historical depth' (1986:145).

[27] South Africa, with its eleven official languages and its ethnic, social, and regional varieties of English, is the most obvious example.

[28] This is confirmed by Thomason's observation that 'the linguistic predictions are the same for all instances of imperfect group learning of a TL [target language] regardless of whether or not actual shift has occurred' (2001:74).

STAGE	HISTORY AND POLITICS	IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION	SOCIOLINGUISTICS OF CONTACT/ USE/ATTITUDES	LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENTS/ STRUCTURAL EFFECTS
1: Foundation	STL: colonial expansion: trade, military outposts, missionary activities, emigration/settlement IDG: occupation, loss/ sharing of territory, trade	STL: part of original nation IDG: indigenous	STL: cross-dialectal contact, limited exposure to local languages IDG: minority bilingualism (acquisition of English)	STL: koinéization; toponymic borrowing
2: Exonormative stabilization	stable colonial status	STL: outpost of original nation, 'English-plus-local' IDG: individually 'local-plus-English'	STL: acceptance of original norm; expanding contact IDG: spreading (elite) bilingualism	lexical borrowing (esp. fauna and flora, cultural terms); '-isms'
3: Nativization	weakening ties; often political independence but remaining cultural association	STL: permanent resident of English origin IDG: permanent resident of indigenous origin	widespread and regular contacts, accommodation IDG: common bilingualism, toward language shift STL: sociolinguistic cleavage between innovative speakers (approximating IDG) and conservative speakers (upholding external norm; 'complaint tradition')	heavy lexical borrowing; IDG: phonological innovations ('accent' possibly due to transfer); structural nativization (in word formation, phrases, prepositional usage, verb complementation), spreading from IDG to STL
4: Endonormative stabilization	postindependence, self-dependence (possibly after 'Event X')	(member of) new nation, territory-based, increasingly panethnic	acceptance of local norm, positive attitude to it (residual conservatism); literary creativity in new variety	stabilization of new variety, homogeneity, codification (dictionary writing)
5: Differentiation	stable young nation, internal sociopolitical differentiation	group-specific (as part of overarching new national identity)	network construction (increasingly dense group-internal interactions)	dialect birth: group-specific (ethnic, regional, social) varieties emerge (as L1 or L2)

TABLE 1. The evolutionary cycle of New Englishes: Parameters of the developmental stages.

is possible that for some extralinguistic reason the internal dynamics may change direction, or the development may become frozen and fossilized at intermediate stages.[29] The model implies the prediction that every community is likely to end up at stage 5 at some point in its history, but no doubt this particular aspect of it will be faced with counterexamples, caused by local sociopolitical processes.[30] But these limitations should not distract us from the core of my argument: In essence, the above model is clearly structured and widely, perhaps universally applicable, building as it does upon unilateral implications—similarities in historical and sociopolitical processes and events lead to constants of sociopsychological identity construction, which, in turn, result in specific sociolinguistic realities and linguistic consequences.

In the next section these claims are applied to specific countries and language varieties, proceeding along the evolutionary cycle of my model. In each case I identify the traces characteristic of the phases a country has gone through so far. The case studies discussed here serve as examples; in principle, it should be possible to apply the model to most, ideally all of the New Englishes around the globe. For instance, the fact that Cameroonians are so hesitant to accept any norm other than British English as adequate (see n. 57) is indicative of the fact that the country has not reached stage 4, though stage 3 may well be under way there. With respect to Canadian English, the observation that its 'fabled homogeneity that has made urban middle-class English accents indistinguishable from Halifax to Vancouver' is now giving way to incipiently discernible regionalisms (Chambers 2000:286) supports one of my claims concerning stage 5, which it certainly has reached. So has American English, of course, a variety which would no longer be counted among the 'New Englishes' today but which, having originated under the same sociohistorical circumstances, was a 'new English' for the first few centuries of its existence and thus should provide a chance to observe and possibly date the cycle in hindsight. Note, for instance, the following: the stereotypical statements about the remarkable homogeneity of colonial American English (Read 1933, Dillard 1975, though Montgomery 1996 disputes their claims regarding the amount of koinéization) as against significant regional differences today (see e.g. Frazer 1993); the role of *Webster's American dictionary of the English language* of 1828 in strengthening the country's cultural identity; and recent claims and evidence concerning twentieth century identity-driven divergence seen in African American English (Bailey & Maynor 1989), Southern English (Bailey 1997), the Northern Cities Shift (Labov et al. forthcoming, Elmes 2001:15), and smaller communities like Martha's Vineyard or Ocracoke (Labov 1972:1–42, Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 1996), all of which make sense in the light of the above framework.

4. CASE STUDIES

4.1. PHASE 2: FIJI. Phase 1, regular use of English in Fiji, by whalers, traders, and beachcombers, started in the early nineteenth century, and was reinforced by the presence of missionaries after 1835 and the opening of a missionary school in 1894 (Tent & Mugler 1996, Tent 2000a, 2000b, 2001a, 2001c). Fiji was a British colony from 1874

[29] I am adopting the term 'fossilized' from the notion of 'fossilization' (halted development somewhere along a learner's process of progressively acquiring L2 rules) in second language acquisition.

[30] However, as was pointed out to me by the editor, it is difficult to know how a counterexample could be established as such, given that there is no need to assume that all communities move along the cycle at the same pace: It is conceivable that a community that appears to get stuck at some stage will move on at any point in the future.

until independence in 1970, but the number of European residents has never been large,[31] so in quantitative terms STL-strand development has been of marginal importance (though there is a variety labeled 'part-European English' by Tent [2001a:213 and 2001b]). On the other hand, English has been shaped by at least two distinct IDG strands, spoken by native Fijians and Fiji Indians respectively. The latter are largely descendants of Hindi-speaking Indians (from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Madya Pradesh) who came to the islands of Fiji in the last quarter of the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century as indentured laborers to work on its sugarcane plantations (Siegel 1987).

The onset of phase 2 can be dated to the 1930s, when under New Zealand education authority English was promoted heavily as a lingua franca to form a bond between the two major population groups, and bilingualism with English started to spread rapidly.[32] Today English is used as 'a de facto official language' in the country (Tent & Mugler 1996:251), the language of government, jurisdiction, the media, commerce, and, to a large extent, education, and a second language for the majority of the population. The contexts of language use as well as the semantics of loan words in Fiji English (Tent 2001a) place Fiji in phase 2, although it has reached political independence (which is normally characteristic of phase 3). The orientation is clearly exonormative. Bilingualism is fairly widespread but associated with education and, especially, urbanity; thus, as is characteristic of stage 2, it is still group-specific and sociolinguistically conditioned (see Tent 2001c). Establishing English as a lingua franca for the two major population groups may have been successful for communicative purposes (although even for that function other languages may also be chosen), but it does not appear to have affected identity constructions, which, given persistent ethnic tensions, are still predominantly ethnic rather than nation-based; 'the motivation to learn and use English is almost purely instrumental, not integrative' (Tent 2001a:212). Consequently, at this point several IDG-strand varieties can be observed which correlate with education and are predominantly marked by lexical interferences from the respective ethnic mother tongues: Tent (2001a:213–14) lists not only Fijian English and Indo-Fijian English but also Chinese Fiji English and Rotuman English, with a continuum between acrolectal and basilectal forms occurring in each case.

There are weak indications of further progress along the cycle, although these should not be overestimated. Some local grammatical features of uncertain spread and stability have been observed (Siegel 1987:235–37, 1991, Tent & Mugler 1996:256–57), and Tent (2001b) examines the possibility of a pronunciation feature emerging as a local shibboleth across ethnic groupings, but this is not enough to diagnose the beginning of structural nativization on a broader scale, and there are no signs of codification.[33] What may play a role in the future is the fact that English seems to be encroaching into the home environment, into parent-child interactions, and into intra-ethnic commu-

---

[31] According to the 1996 census, the proportion of Europeans is less than .5% (Tent 2001a:210). The proportion of native speakers of English is estimated at 2% (Tent 2001c:241).

[32] The earliest recording dates that the *Oxford English dictionary* gives for the few Fijian loans listed in it (*bure* 'Fiji-style house': 1843; *ivi* 'Tahitian chestnut': 1862; *ratu* 'title of petty monarch': 1880 in Fiji (1798 in Indonesia); *sulu* '(type of) sarong': 1850; *yaqona* 'kava': 1858) suggest an even earlier onset, but given the sociolinguistic development it seems more reasonable to assume an unusually long but light early contact phase.

[33] The title of Tent 2000b is potentially misleading here, but it refers to the collection of local lexis without implying work on a dictionary near at hand.

nication, especially in the written mode, given the difficulties associated with written Fijian and Hindi (Tent & Mugler 1996:254–55). Mugler and Tent (1998) provide some interesting survey data on uses of English in specific domains and document its slow expansion, especially among Indo-Fijians, but they make it perfectly clear that whatever shift may be occurring is only toward increasing bilingualism, without loss of the ethnic native language. On the other hand, Moag observes that 'the present generation of Chinese have already switched to English' (1992:247); even if this relates to a minority group in Fiji it constitutes an interesting model case, in line with my own cycle (rather than Moag's). In the long run, the future of English will depend upon political developments: If the two major population groups manage to coexist peacefully and construct a joint national identity, some form of English might well be its expression; otherwise, it is unlikely to substantially expand its present form and status.

The range of linguistic phenomena to be observed in Fiji English corresponds to the characteristics of phases 1 and 2 as well as, to a limited extent, 3 (see 1). Except for English-derived determinatum constituents in compound toponyms, place names are local in origin almost throughout (1a). Words for flora and fauna (1b) and cultural objects and customs, both from Fiji and Hindi (1c), abound. However, there are also early traces of lexical and grammatical nativization: words for general objects and activities, some of which have ousted English synonyms (1d), hybrid compounds, consisting of both English and Fiji or Hindi constituents (1e), local compounds with English constituents only (1f), as well as some grammatical features (1g), albeit still marginal; but the potential for progress toward stage 3 is clearly visible.

(1) Features of Fiji English (Tent 2001a, Tent & Mugler 1996)
   a. Toponyms: *Viti Levu*, *Vanua Levu*, *Nabavatu*, *Nabukaluka*, *Ovalau*, *Suva*; *Suva Point*, *Namosi Peaks*, *Kandavu Island*, *Yasawa Group*, *Nanuku Reef*
   b. flora and fauna: *baka* 'banyan tree', *yaqona* 'kava', *tiri* 'mangrove tree'; *dri loli* 'sea cucumber', *walu* 'kingfish', *kaikoso* '(kind of) shell fish', *qari* 'mud crab'
   c. cultural terms: *bure* 'Fijian-style hut', *sulu* 'Fijian-style sarong', *meke* '(kind of) dance', *reguregu* 'condolence gathering', *sawai* '(kind of) dessert', *puja* 'Hindu religious rite'
   d. *kana* 'food, to eat', *leqa* 'a problem', *yaya* 'things, belongings', *paidar* 'on/by foot', *paisa* 'money', *acha* 'okay'
   e. *bula man* 'tout', *full kasou* 'completely drunk', *no ghar* 'homeless', *talanoa session* 'chat'
   f. *big father* 'father's elder brother', *grass-cutter* 'man who mows lawns for a living', *carryboy* 'young man who brings customers to handicraft vendors', *showglass* 'shop window'
   g. *us-two* (1st person dual exclusive pronoun), *one* (indefinite article), count uses of noncount nouns (*a legislation*, *show a disrespect*), *been* (preverbal past marker) (*I been study all week*)

4.2. Phase 3: HONG KONG. Hong Kong is similar to Fiji in the historical depth of its contact with English and in its very small percentage of resident native speakers and people of British descent, but a considerably tighter colonial grip by the British for a long time has resulted in a more advanced stage: it can be regarded as having reached stage 3, with some traces of stage 2 still observable.

Since the seventeenth century activities by the British East India Company had brought English to the region and had resulted in the emergence of Chinese Pidgin

English, now believed to be extinct. But the beginnings of the developmental cycle in Hong Kong can be dated to the year 1841, when Hong Kong island became a colony in the wake of the First Opium War, and to the activities of the missions that soon after brought English education to the island (Bolton 2000a:267). After one and a half centuries of permanent and intense presence the role of English could have been expected to change drastically upon the crown colony's return to China in 1997, but actually that does not seem to be the case.

Phase 1 can be dated roughly in the nineteenth century, and phase 2 in much of the twentieth (the treaty of 1898, which gave the entire territory a stable status as a crown colony for 99 years, could perhaps be taken as conveniently marking the transition between the first two phases). Throughout most of the twentieth century the characteristics of stage 2 can be identified: a politically stable status as a British crown colony in Asia; an unchallenged exonormative orientation in language teaching and usage; the spread of elite bilingualism, and certainly also the identity constructions of expatriates as representatives of Britain in an Asian outpost (positively evaluated), and of their local contacts as Hong Kong people with British cultural contacts and experience. The vocabulary of Hong Kong English includes its share of plants and animals (e.g. *choy sum*, *bamboo snake*, *dragon's eye* 'kind of fruit'), cultural terms (*field chicken* 'kind of dish', *dragonhead* 'top leader of a triad', *black society* 'triad', *chim sticks* 'bamboo sticks used in fortune telling'), and other localisms (e.g. *Canto-pop queen*).[34]

The beginnings of phase 3 can best be dated in what Bolton (2000a:268) calls 'late British colonialism' since the 1960s, 'the economic transformation of Hong Kong from a relatively poor refugee community to a wealthy commercial and entrepreneurial powerhouse', a process which also boosted the prestige and spread of English. Associated with this, and equally important, was a new educational policy of introducing 'Anglo-Chinese' secondary schools since the 1970s, which replaced 'elitist bilingualism' with a new 'mass bilingualism' (Bolton 2000a:269). Also consistent with phase 3 are the political developments and the identity constructions in that period: After the 1970s, negotiations on the future status of the territory (which led to the Joint British-Sino Declaration of 1984 with an agreement on the handover of 1997) resulted in the gradual weakening of the political and psychological ties between the crown colony and the mother country; consequently, British expatriate residents needed to consider and decide whether to stay or not. Those who stayed needed to rewrite their identity from 'outpost/ representative of Britain in Hong Kong' to 'permanent Hong Kong resident of British origin'. In a similar vein, the identity construction of Cantonese Hongkongers is said to have changed during that period: 'The ''them vs. us'' mindset directed toward the British and ''their'' language gradually vanished even before the departure of the last governor' (Li 1999:103), and Hyland's (1997) language attitude investigations document the emergence of 'a distinctive and healthy Hong Kong identity' (207). Bilingualism has been spreading persistently, with 33.7% of the population claiming to speak English 'quite well', 'well', or 'very well' in 1993 and only 17.4% admitting to not speaking it 'at all' (Bolton 2000a:275). Li (1999) suggests the epithet 'value-added' would apply to the current status of English, which is also doubtless an indication of the positive attitude toward the language that prevails and shapes identities associated with its command. Finally, the fact that '[f]or at least thirty years, Hong Kong has had its own localized complaint tradition about ''falling standards'' of both English and Chinese' (Bolton & Lim 2000:431) confirms my categorization and also the dating of

---

[34] Sources: Butler 1997; *Grolier international dictionary* (2000).

stage 3, given that this 'ideology seems to have emerged among academics in the early seventies, and then gathered steam in the eighties' (ibid.), 'reached a peak in the late eighties' and 'has continued . . . to the late nineties and to the present' (432). Here is an example:

(2)   the university today has become a symbol of the decline in local English standards in Hong Kong (W. McGurn in Far Eastern Economic Review, 21 March 1996; quoted from Bolton & Lim 2000:433)

Thus, the constituent features of stage 3 fit together remarkably well in the case of the Hong Kong of the last third of the twentieth century.

Correspondingly, the status of the variety itself has been disputed, though decreasingly so in recent years. While some 20 years ago Luke and Richards (1982:55) observed a clearly exonormative orientation of 'English in Hong Kong'[35] and denied the existence of a distinct 'Hong Kong English', now Bolton (2000a) suggests that the time has come to accept such a reevaluation of the role and status of English. No doubt Hong Kong English has developed a distinct vocabulary segment of its own, largely to be explained as loans or interference phenomena from Cantonese in particular and Chinese in general (e.g. Benson 2000, Bolton 2000b:108–10). On the phonological level, it cannot be disputed any longer that there exists a Hong Kong English accent which can be described phonologically (Hung 2000), which is developing distinct rules and features of its own (Peng & Setter 2000), and which for Hong Kong students is beginning to be regarded as a positively evaluated source of identification (Bolton 2000a:277–78, but see Li 1999:101). With respect to syntax, evidence of distinctive traits is still limited, but some support is available: Gisborne (2000) documents 'features of the Hong Kong English relative clause system which are apparently unique to the system of Hong Kong English' (369), thus suggesting that the variety is on the path to structural nativization.

Of course, the future is always impossible to predict, and perhaps even more so given the uncertainties associated with Hong Kong's, and even China's, future economic, sociological, and political developments and choices. However, Hong Kong may become an interesting test case for the predictive implications of the Dynamic Model and the inherent power of the developmental dynamism which it describes. A first assessment five years after what might have been a major turning point suggests that the drive toward English seems to be stronger than might have been anticipated. With the handover of mid-1997, the political status of the city and its hinterland, now a Special Administrative Region of the Republic of China, changed fundamentally. That change should have resulted in strong and adverse consequences for the status of English. And so it appeared at first: Soon after that date a new educational policy sought to drastically reduce the proportion of English-medium schools from about 90% to about a quarter of all secondary schools (Li 1999:78–79), a development which would have interrupted and redirected the evolution of English in the country. On the other hand, the implementation of this policy has met with considerable resistance among Hong Kong people (Bolton 2000b:99–101), and it is no longer seriously pursued in its original form. English is clearly regarded as indispensable and inalienable in Hong Kong.

4.3. FOSSILIZED DEVELOPMENT? MALAYSIA AND THE PHILIPPINES. In Malaysia and the Philippines English has also progressed into phase 3, making even deeper inroads into everyday communication than in Hong Kong. On the other hand, both countries are

---

[35] Among teachers in Hong Kong this attitude still prevails, as Tsui and Bunton (2000) show, and Li (1999:95) essentially also still upholds this categorization.

very similar in having successfully implemented a language policy developing and promoting a national language (Malay and Filipino, respectively), which restricts the range of uses of English and, more importantly, successfully bars it from the role of symbolizing identities, national or otherwise. Thus, while there are no signs of English being recessive because of its international usefulness, in both cases the development along the cycle appears to have been halted and become fossilized, as it were.

In Malaysia, the foundation phase dates back to the establishment of the colony of Penang in 1786, and the nineteenth century saw English-medium mission schools and other schools which, however, were accessible only to the local elite that the colonial administration essentially trained to serve its own purposes. Thus, phase 1 merged gradually into phase 2 with Britain's increasing colonial and commercial interests, but in quantitative terms throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries both STL-strand and IDG-strand situations applied to relatively small speaker numbers. Asmah (1996:515) states: 'English prior to Independence in 1957 had an exclusionist-cum-divisive function. It emphasized the division between the races as well as between classes in a single racial group'. This date, then, can be taken to mark the beginnings of phase 3. The constitution of 1957 retained English as a co-official language in addition to Malay, with the intention of removing it after a ten-year grace period; after the union with part of Borneo gave rise to regional differences, this period was extended until 1985. Malay was explicitly promoted as the 'national language', with English retained as a 'second language'. The demand for the teaching of English is high, however, and it has resulted in a comeback of English-medium education in some colleges (Asmah 1996:519–20). In practice, English still plays an important, though not the dominant role in administration, commerce, the media, and the legal and other professions, and it seems that after a phase of nationalistic language policy the pendulum has been swinging back to greater weight being attributed to the usefulness of English locally (Gill 2002).

While these domains of use are all situated toward the formal end of the cline, it is important for the process of nativization that English has managed to catch on as 'the second *lingua franca* in interethnic as well as intraethnic communication' (Asmah 1996: 526) and a language of everyday informal communication, especially in urban areas; in fact, there are indications of even stronger progress: 'In Kuala Lumpur and other urban areas of Malaysia there has emerged a new generation of Malaysians for whom English has become the first language and by whom the original ancestral language has been discarded' (David 2000:65). Asmah (2000:13) estimates that about one percent of all Malaysians speak English as a native language, and about a third of the population are estimated to speak it (Asmah 1996:513). An informal register, called BASILECT by some linguists, has evolved which shows strong traces of structural nativization. Malaysian English has some distinct and characteristic pronunciation features (documented in Zuraidah 2000) as well as certain syntactic patterns of its own (for examples, see Morais 2000, with selections from conversational samples used by blue-collar workers with little if any formal instruction in English, and Morais 2001, with a rich documentation of structural phenomena on all sociostylistic levels).[36] Young people, as in most places, are generating a group-specific slang vocabulary, e.g. *havoc-lah you* 'wild and crazy', *wasted sperm* 'useless individual', *chun* 'nice', *bang* 'criticize, tease, insult'

---

[36] Platt and colleagues (1983) provide a listing of phonological and grammatical features of Malaysian as well as Singaporean English and text samples illustrative of a wide range of styles. Perhaps the most systematic discussion of Malaysian English and its structural features to date is Newbrook 1997.

(David 2000), and of course there is a sizeable set of variety-specific words, many of which Malaysian English shares with Singaporean English. As is consistent with stage 3, Malaysia also has a 'complaint tradition' of its own, lamenting 'falling standards of English' (Asmah 1996:520), and emphasizing mandatory standards in the interest of international business contacts while discarding local nonstandard usage as unacceptable (Gill 1999).

It may be argued that to some extent English has made a comeback despite the national language policy, thus indicating the strength of its forward momentum: the 'return of English to the Malaysian education scene comes as a wish of the people' (Asmah 1996:531). An awareness of the importance of the language, and hence the need to possibly develop it or at least deal with it somehow, is strong. The norm orientation is exonormative, but no longer exclusively so: a few papers in Halimah & Ng 2000 tentatively address the issue of accepting certain elements of Malaysian English usage as correct in the educational system, and Gill (1999) has advocated the development of endonormative standards. There are even early indications of codification. On the structural level at this point it is no more than an ambitious desire, but it is noteworthy that there is an explicit awareness of such a need: 'There is as yet no grammar of Malaysian English and this will need to be written before this variety can be accepted by the local and international community of users of English' (Morais 2000:104). Regional vocabulary, however, has been collected systematically, and the first dictionaries advertised as covering words of Malaysian and Singaporean English have appeared (*Times-Chambers essential English dictionary* 1997; *Macquarie junior dictionary* 1999). So, it remains to be seen whether in Malaysia the dynamic development of English has really been halted by national language policy.

Despite substantial differences in historical background and colonization style, the current situation in the Philippines shows—perhaps surprisingly—many parallels with that of Malaysia. The major difference, of course, is that it was an American rather than a British colony, primarily a military outpost, so unlike all of the other varieties discussed here Filipino English is not a product of British colonial expansion, and its history is considerably younger. It is a development of the twentieth century, dating to the American occupation of the country in 1898 and the activities of the Thomasites and other American teachers after the 'formal introduction [of English] as the main and only language of instruction in public schools in September 1901' (Sibayan & Gonzalez 1996:139). Phases 1 and 2, with only a small STL-strand but a broad IDG-strand development, seem to have practically merged and progressed very rapidly, supposedly because of the role of English as 'a socioeconomic equalizer' which gave access to poor children from the towns and barrios to desirable civil service jobs (Sibayan & Gonzalez 1996:140). In his useful historical survey, Gonzalez (1997:28) states that the 'rapid spread of the English language in the Philippines was unprecedented in colonial history': speaker percentages are said to have amounted to more than one third of the population at the time of independence in 1946 and to between more than half and two thirds in 1980, with similar figures estimated for today's situation. Thus, remarkably, in the postwar years and after independence the use of English continued to spread vigorously, while at the same time its quality was reported to be deteriorating. I take both observations as indicative of phase 3, which can be assumed to have begun after independence. The national language, officially renamed Filipino in the 1973 constitution, has been promoted since independence, but a bilingual education scheme has left room for English as a medium of instruction for certain subjects (especially the sciences). Both this policy and the fact that English is deeply rooted and widely

used in society, especially but not exclusively in urban domains and formal and public contexts, explain its continuing strong role in the country and the fact that it has proceeded well into the stage of nativization. As in the case of the other varieties discussed, Philippine English has been screened successfully for linguistic characteristics on the levels of vocabulary (Bautista 1997a), phonology (Llamzon 1997), and grammar (Bautista 2000). Actually, the publication of a recent dictionary (*Anvil-Macquarie dictionary* 2000) might be taken to foreshadow codification in stage 4, although this is also just an inclusive dictionary of English seasoned with an assortment of Philippine English words. In addition, an awareness of the pressing issues of norm selection and codification for teaching purposes as shown, for instance, in Gonzalez 1983 also indicates the dynamism of and the pressures exerted by the strong presence of English.

However, the Philippines appears to be an example of a country where the predictive implications of the dynamic model may fail. The situation is 'quite stable at present' (Sibayan & Gonzalez 1996:160), with Filipino established as a national language and English being strong in certain functional domains but showing no signs of proceeding any further. Currently, a 'resentment' against the use of English has been observed in the lower classes, where it would be considered 'a sign of affectation' (144); on the other hand, English continues to be used in higher classes and in discussions of technical subjects, and even as a home language in some families, especially among the 'economic elite' (150). In general, however, Sibayan and Gonzalez see 'little possibility . . . that it will dominate Philippine life' (1996:165). It is indicative that in adopting Moag's (1992) scheme (in its original 1982 version) Llamzon (1986) focused upon the 'restriction phase'.

4.4. PHASE 4: SINGAPORE. In contrast, the evolution of English in Singapore, largely a product of a unique language policy towards 'English-based bilingualism' (Tickoo 1996:438), is clearly much farther advanced, having reached characteristics of phase 4 in many ways, and it appears likely to go all the way through the cycle, given the linguistic dynamics that can be observed.[37]

Phase 1 begins in 1819, when Sir Stamford Raffles obtained the rights to establish a trading outpost for the British East India Company at what was then little more than a jungle island with potential. Soon we find the characteristics of stage 2: the strategically ideal location resulted in a massive influx of traders, travelers, colonial agents, and contract laborers of predominantly Chinese and Indian origin. By the late nineteenth century Singapore had experienced massive population growth and was home to a small European ruling class as well as a growing stratum of Asian professionals who were subjects to the British crown and adopted aspects of a British lifestyle, thus resulting in a cultural blend of Europe and Asia. This stable situation lasted until the brief but cruel interlude of the Japanese occupation during World War II (1942–45). One indirect, but important consequence of this period was a change of Singaporeans' identity construction: The colonial tradition was broken, and a resistance movement emphasized the island's Asian roots, so upon their return in 1945 the British were faced with a desire for *merdeka* ('independence'), promoted by a newly founded political party, the

---

[37] I ventured to predict earlier, in a BBC interview now published in part in Elmes 2001:117, that in the long run Singapore might turn out to be a largely English-speaking country. It is also indicative that Foley (2001) promotes the use of first-language rather than second-language teaching methods for the teaching of English in Singapore, based on estimates that over 50% of all children start nursery school already able to speak English (Gupta 1994). For competent surveys of the history of Singapore's language and education policy, see Gupta 1994:32–47 and Tickoo 1996. Some of this section builds upon Schneider 1997.

PAP (People's Action Party), and after self-government and a constitution in 1959 and a brief period of unification with Malaysia these movements led to independence in 1965. In terms of politics and, consequently, identity constructions, phase 3 can be assumed to have started in the postwar period and to have given way to phase 4 during the 1960s and 1970s, a transition caused by the economic success of the newly independent state and by its language policy.

   The enormous economic growth and prosperity of Singapore in the postindependence decades transformed the country into a highly modern and highly industrialized nation with a unique and novel identity merging European and Asian components. The country has been ruled by the same party since independence, with the state gently but persistently guiding its citizens towards common goals and ideals but also prescribing a great many aspects of daily life, and it is characterized by a blend of a western orientation in business and lifestyle with an emphasis on fundamentally Asian values. Singaporean English has come to be the means of expression of this Asian-cum-Western culture, a reflection of the fact that today the vast majority of the people consider themselves primarily Singaporeans rather than Chinese, Malay, Tamils, or whatever. This was caused by the nation's strictly imposed educational policy of ethnicity-based bilingualism: Every child is educated in English as a 'First Language' and in one of the other three official languages (Mandarin, Tamil, Malay) as an ethnic, 'mother-tongue Second Language' (Foley 1998:130–31). Two important facets of this policy have had decisive consequences. First, English is the only bond shared by everybody (at least in the younger generation raised under this policy) in a highly multilingual and multicultural community. Second, the ethnic languages taught in the schools, for which there is no choice (a situation which practically bars the Asian languages from developing into a lingua franca — although Mandarin, promoted by the government, is also spreading), are the standard varieties of these languages, frequently distinct from and thus not supported by the dialectal home varieties spoken by parents and grandparents. Whether intended or not, this effectively weakens the position and usefulness of the indigenous languages and, conversely, strengthens that of English.

   Consequently, striking increases in English speaker numbers, particularly in the home environment and as a first language, have been recorded. In a study reported by Platt (1980:103; regrettably based upon an unspecified sample) 11.7% of all respondents in the 18–35 age bracket claimed to use English when talking to their mother, 29.3% to their father, and an impressive 75.4% (of the same group of respondents!) in conversations with their siblings — clearly English is the language of and for the young generation. In 1980, 11.6% of all families chose English as a household language (Foley 1998:130); according to the census of 2000, this figure has risen persistently, and it is going up even more drastically among the young:

> Compared with 1990 English had become more popular as a home language for all ethnic groups. The proportion speaking most frequently in English at home increased from 19 per cent to 24 per cent among the Chinese, from 6.1 per cent to 7.9 per cent among the Malays and from 32 per cent to 36 per cent among the Indians. . . . English appears to be emerging as the language of the young among the Chinese resident population. Proportionally more children used English most frequently at home than youths and adults. In 2000, 36 per cent of the children aged 5–14 years spoke in English compared with 22 per cent of youths aged 15–24 years and 25 per cent of those aged 25–54 years. (Singapore Census of Population 2000: Advance Data Release No. 3, pp. 4, 5)

   Similar age distributions, with 9.4% of all Malay children and 43.6% of all Indian children using English at home, are reported for the other groups as well, so the process

of language shift is gradually progressing in all ethnic communities.[38] The 2000 census also reports 71% literacy in English (2).

Singaporean English has thus emerged as the symbolic expression of the country's novel, bicultural identity, of which it encodes both sides: its world-language character expresses the country's global outreach and pursuit of economic prosperity, and its distinctively local shape on certain linguistic levels reflects the country's location and traditions. The title of Ooi's recent book on Singaporean English, *Evolving identities* (2001), is indicative of the current process, which is effective across the whole stylistic range. On the formal end of the cline, professional Singaporeans nowadays claim that they are able to identify compatriots abroad by their accent, and that they are proud of this.[39] On the informal level, a distinctive local variant called Singlish, strongly marked by a Chinese substrate[40] and regarded as a 'creoloid' by some, has evolved. Singlish definitely qualifies as a dialect facilitating emotional expressiveness and play, a language of one's heart, an identity carrier.[41]

Singaporean English has gone through a vibrant process of structural nativization, more visibly on the basilectal level of Singlish but also in formal styles. It has a distinctive phonology, including features like reduced consonant clusters word-finally and word-medially; a tendency to use glottal stops for /t/ word-finally and dental plosives for word-initial fricatives; monophthongs for mid-high diphthongs; unique stress modifications in many words, and a tendency toward syllable-timing (Tay 1982, Platt et al. 1983). Its lexicon, largely shared with Malaysian English, contains a strong component of Singaporeanisms, including fauna and flora words (e.g. *durian* '(kind of) fruit', *brinjal* 'aubergine', *taugeh* 'beansprout', *rambutan* '(kind of) fruit') as well as cultural terms (*kiasuism* 'strongly competitive attitude', *kelong* 'fish trap', *baju kurong* 'Malay dress for women', *hawker stall*, *red packet*) but also words from a wide range of other domains of everyday life (e.g. *airflown* 'freshly imported (food)', *cut* 'overtake (a car)', *chin chai* 'lazy and careless').[42] Finally, its syntax, especially on the level of Singlish, is marked by many distinctive rules and patterns (e.g. the use of *can* as a complete utterance, without a subject or complement, or count uses of British English noncount nouns, like *a fruit* or *staffs*), some of which have been analyzed in greater detail in recent years (e.g. Alsagoff et al. 1998, Alsagoff 2001, Lim & Wee 2001). Less conspicuously, there are also distinctive patterns in formal English of the kind mentioned for phase 3 in §3.2; for instance, Ooi (2001:xii) documents the tendency to complement the verb *clarify* with a *that*-clause (rather than by a noun phrase or a *wh*-clause).[43]

[38] For a discussion of the situation in the Tamil community, see Saravanan 1994, especially the figures on p. 177. For the Malay context, see Bibi 1994, also including some statistics showing a similar trend (211, 219). Gupta (1994 and p.c.) suggests the census results are actually misleading in that they underreport the spread of English as a second language in in-household dyads.

[39] This paraphrases a statement by a business executive in a TV interview.

[40] Some structures have been shown to be modeled strongly upon Chinese patterns (e.g. Alsagoff et al. 1998). However, Mufwene (p.c.) suggests that due to a 'founder effect' a strong Malay influence may have affected this variety.

[41] This is exemplified most vividly by a public debate triggered by the 2002 movie *Talking Cock* and its restrictive rating by the government, in line with its 'Speak Good English Movement'. The public reaction was vigorously in defense of the filmmakers' right to use the local vernacular form of English, expressing strongly positive attitudes toward it (see Tan 2002 and the popular satirical website www.talkingcock.com).

[42] Tan (2001) provides a systematic survey of the processes effective in the nativization of the lexis of Singaporean English.

[43] See Pakir 2001:8–10 for a documentation of Singaporean uses of the verbs *send*, *bring*, and *fetch*.

By now Singapore has clearly reached stage 4 of the cycle. As was stated earlier, political independence gave the impetus to not only economic self-dependence but also a unique, territory-based and multicultural identity construction. The issue of norm selection is still under discussion (see Pakir 1993, 1994): On the one hand, Ooi (2001: x) believes that 'exonormative standards continue to define the study of English in the classrooms', while on the other Tay and Gupta (1983:177) maintain that an 'exonormative standard for Singapore is clearly impracticable for a number of reasons', and advocate further standardization. In any case, a local linguistic norm, positively evaluated by many, is an undeniable reality, and its formal recognition is called for (Ooi 2001:xi) and envisaged (Foley 1988:xiiv–xiv, 2001:32). Gupta (1988) goes a long way toward defining elements of an endonormative standard on the level of syntax. Pakir (2001) argues that Singaporean English is moving into Kachru's 'Inner Circle'. Literary writing in Singaporean English is flourishing. Linguistic homogeneization may have been weaker than elsewhere, given the diversity of ethnic IDG-strand and also STL-strand situations in the country's evolution, but it is observable as well, for instance when Platt and Weber (1980:46) note the 'increasing similarity of Singaporean English as spoken by those of different ethnic backgrounds'; on the other hand, Lim (2001), foreshadowing stage 5, already documents and discusses ethnic varieties within Singaporean English. No doubt the new variety has stabilized, and codification is under way: The *Times-Chambers dictionary* of 1997 was the first dictionary to systematically record Singaporeanisms and to advertise precisely this feature.

4.5. PHASE 5: AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. In contrast to the contexts already discussed, all of which are IDG-strand-dominant, in Australia and New Zealand, which are traditionally classified as 'ENL' or 'Inner Circle' countries and are classic examples of settlement colonies, the STL strand has prevailed, at least quantitatively, as indigenous populations have been subjugated, experiencing an IDG-strand-type language adjustment. This represents an almost complete shift away from their indigenous languages. By now, both countries have reached stage 5, although the progression from the previous stage in both cases is an event still in living memory.

Phase 1 began with the establishment of a penal colony at Botany Bay in 1788 in Australia and before the end of the eighteenth century with the arrival of the first whalers, settlers, traders, and missionaries in New Zealand. The Australian situation in particular provided for a classic example of dialect mixture and koinéization, documented to have occurred in the 1820s and 1830s (see Collins & Blair 2001:1–2 or Turner 1994, and the evidence cited there) and described in some detail on the phonological level by Trudgill (1986:129–46). Essentially the same applies to New Zealand.[44] A very large number of place names were taken over from the Aboriginals (Turner 1994:305) and Maoris respectively (see 3), so all characteristics of phase 1 apply.[45]

---

[44] There is an ongoing discussion on where and how both Australian and New Zealand English originated (in Britain or in the antipodes; if the former, in London or in East Anglia) and how closely related and similar to each other they were in the early phase (see Bauer 1994:420–28, Gordon & Deverson 1998: 25–29); recent evidence strongly supports the local origin hypothesis (Trudgill, p.c.). My essential point, that mixing did occur, is uncontroversial. Details of the process itself are examined and interpreted in Trudgill et al. 2000.

[45] Baker (1978:276) says Australians 'have used Aboriginal names fairly freely' and estimates that one third of all Australian place names derive from Aboriginal names; he also gives a figure of 57% of all New Zealand place names as being Maori in origin. Gordon and Deverson (1998:9) refer to the fact that James Cook adopted Maori names for the North and South Islands, which, however, due to their complexity were replaced among the Europeans later, and they explicitly identify 'proper names, especially place names' (65) as having been amongst the earliest borrowings from Maori.

(3) Indigenous toponyms in Australia (a) and New Zealand (b)
   a. *Wagga Wagga*, *Wodonga*, *Mundabullangana*, *Mungallala*, *Youangarra*, . . .
   b. *Aotearoa*, *Rotorua*, *Whangarei*, *Timaru*, *Oamaru*, *Omarama*, *Waitangi*, *Takapuna*, . . .

The transition from phase 1 to phase 2 was less clearly marked in Australia but can reasonably be assumed to have occurred with the number of free immigrants beginning to exceed that of prisoners (ca. 1830–50) and the associated population growth and regional expansion, concluded, perhaps, by the granting of regional autonomy in 1850 and the gold rush soon thereafter. In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840 prototypically fulfills the function, important in the identity construction of a nation, of a 'myth of origin', a 'nameable beginning' (Wodak et al. 1999:22, 24), demarcating the onset of a stable colonial status and a massive influx of British settlers in large-scale settlement activities organized by the New Zealand Company. No doubt the identity construction of the English settlers conformed fully to that stated for phase 2, as English people with what present-day New Zealanders would call OE (overseas experience), and so did their exonormative orientation and contact experience. The same applies to both IDG strands, although a positively evaluated 'local-plus-English' self-identification may have taken a while to emerge and grow among the indigenous populations (delayed by some military conflicts in New Zealand and, even more so, by the abuse and neglect of Aboriginals in Australia). Nevertheless, both among the Maoris and among the Aboriginals English spread gradually, beginning with trained interpreters and cultural mediators and then, mostly in New Zealand, encompassing members of the indigenous elite as well. In both countries we find the lexical processes characteristic of this phase: the borrowing and coinage of words for fauna and flora as well as elements of the indigenous culture and, generally, objects characteristic of the new environment:

(4) Early lexis in Australian and New Zealand English.[46]

   AUSTRALIA
   a. fauna and flora: *kurrajong* '(kind of) tree', *waratah* '(kind of) tree', *lowan* '(kind of) bird', *bobiala* '(kind of) shrub', *coolibah*, *cangaroo*, *dingo*, *wallaby*, *boobook* '(kind of) owl', *wobegong* '(kind of) fish', *currawong* '(kind of) bird'; *gum-tree*, *grass-tree*, *bottlebrush*, *whipbird*, *redbill*, *laughing jackass*
   b. indigenous culture: *nulla-nulla* 'Aboriginal club', *wurley* 'Aboriginal hut', *kylie* 'boomerang', *coolamon* 'hollowed out knot of wood'
   c. local environment: *bush*, *outback*, *station*, *backblock*

   NEW ZEALAND
   a. fauna and flora: *kiwi*, *kauri*, *pohutukawa* '(kind of) tree', *kahikatea* 'white pine', *matai* '(kind of) tree', *toetoe* 'pampas grass', *tuatara* '(kind of) reptile', *tarakihi* '(kind of) fish', *kea*, *moa*, *kotuku* 'white heron'; *white pine*
   b. indigenous culture: *waka* 'canoe', *whare* 'house', *marae* 'courtyard of a meeting house', *hei tiki* 'good luck carving', *hui* 'meeting', *hangi* 'earth oven', *whanau* 'extended family', *mana* 'prestige, standing'
   c. local environment: *dairy* 'corner shop', *walkway*, *sharemilker*

---

[46] Sources: Ramson 1966, Turner 1966, 1994, Bauer 1994. Gordon and Deverson (1998:65) also cite words for native fauna and flora and for 'Maori society itself' as early loans. Similarly, Ramson (1966:114) lists 'names for fauna and flora and for features of Aboriginal life' as the most important categories of early borrowings. See Gordon & Deverson 1998:66–74.

During the first half of the twentieth century both countries were in stage 3, with nativization and indigenization under way but the external British language norm still largely unchallenged. Politically, both countries proceeded into independence: Australia became independent in 1901; New Zealand progressed from dominion status in 1907 to full independence in 1947.[47] However, they remained closely associated with Britain politically (as Commonwealth members), economically (through their major markets), and culturally, as the source of their history-based identities in the STL strands. In the IDG strands, the indigenous populations suffered from marginalization and population shrinkage (more so in Australia than in New Zealand), and most of them in the long run succumbed to the pressure to adjust and underwent large-scale language shift towards English (with many Aboriginal languages becoming extinct or strongly endangered).[48] On the strictly linguistic level, local forms and patterns on the levels of pronunciation, vocabulary, and (less conspicuously) grammar developed; these have been described frequently.[49] It is characteristic of phase 3 that contemporary observers typically complained about this development:

(5) Complaint tradition in New Zealand:[50]
    'a dialect, and . . . not a defensible one, is becoming fixed in the Dominion' (1910)
    'faulty methods of production . . . have uglified the young colonial's voice' (1910)
    'this objectionable colonial dialect' (1912)
    'We are always waging war against the colonial accent.' 'Do you think things are becoming worse?' 'Yes I think so.' (1912)
    'Well educated New Zealanders speak of hospiddles, . . . and I repeat that this is just slovenly and without excuse' (1945)
    'New Zealand speech, characterised by its sloppiness due to inattention to the appropriate value of both vowels and consonants' (1994)
    'lumpen-proletarianisation of English' (1994)

Bauer (1994:393–94) and Gordon and Deverson (1998:23–25) date the onset of the complaints about the deteriorating New Zealand pronunciation to the early 1900s.

In these two countries it seems possible to identify 'Event X' experiences in recent history, incidents which in the STL strand led to dramatic shifts away from a still Britain-related self-perception towards a regionally rooted identity construction, and which thus resulted in the transition from phases 3 to 4. In Australia, this event was apparently the experience of World War II, especially the fact that Australia was left unprotected against a Japanese attack in 1942. In New Zealand, the economic and

---

[47] It is frequently stated that the World War I experience of the Australia and New Zealand Army Corps (ANZAC), involving heavy losses and still strongly commemorated today, gave rise to a feeling of nationhood in the antipodes.

[48] These deplorable processes are still going on, albeit in a much weaker form. In New Zealand, the Maori culture and language have come to be recognized as part of the country's distinctive cultural heritage, although the present-day policy of official bilingualism does not reflect the fact that the Maori language is regularly spoken only by a very small minority of the population. In Australian politics, Aboriginal rights have been a major issue (see Moore 2001), and language preservation and revitalization projects have flourished, but it is impossible to undo the past.

[49] See Turner 1966, 1994, Bauer 1994, Gordon & Deverson 1998.

[50] Sources: Gordon & Abell 1990, Gordon 1998:65–66, Hundt 1998:159–75.

political consequences of the British entry to the European Union in 1973, which suddenly deprived the country of its heretofore almost exclusive export market, had a similar effect (Gordon & Deverson 1998:108). Both historical events made it clear to the populations in these two countries that there was a markedly unequal relationship between themselves and the 'mother country' giving rise to political self-dependence (replacing the earlier state of what could be called 'dependent independence') and new, regionally-founded national identities. Furthermore, the territorial foundation of this new identity forced the dominant group of European Australians and New Zealanders (some of them, at least) to reconsider their attitude toward the indigenous populations and their ancestors' behavior toward these groups; it was thus no accident that Maori and Aboriginal rights (including land titles) became an issue during the last decades of the twentieth century.

In both countries there is strong evidence of the linguistic characteristics of phase 4, the claim to homogeneity and the beginnings of codification. Notwithstanding social class differences along the lines identified by Mitchell and Delbridge (1965), the internal regional homogeneity of both varieties counts as standard wisdom. Statements on the 'much-reported extreme uniformity of Australian English' (Trudgill 1986:143) and the fact that 'geographical dialects are not obvious' in New Zealand (Kuiper & Bell 2000: 12) have been stereotypically repeated and can be found in most writings on the subject. The process of linguistic codification also reached new focal points: New national dictionaries provided the authority needed to underline the autonomy of the new national varieties of English. In Australia, the *Macquarie dictionary* (Delbridge 1981) can practically be regarded as an explicit declaration of linguistic independence, a cornerstone in the process of the codification of a distinctly Australian variety of English (Delbridge 2001), soon followed by another dictionary which carries the word *National* in its title (Ramson 1988). Other sources and bodies, like the *Style manual* (Australian Government Publishing Service 1988), the *Australian English style guide* (Peters 1995), or the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, have also promoted endonormative orientations.[51] Perhaps less nationalistic in tone and impact but equally effective descriptively, New Zealand has also had a series of national dictionaries of various shapes and sizes by now (e.g. Orsman & Orsman 1994, Orsman 1997). Distinct grammars of these two varieties are unlikely to appear in the near future, as their rules largely conform to the norms of a 'common core' of standard English, but some structurally distinctive patterns have been investigated and documented (see Hundt 1998 and references cited there, especially earlier work by Laurie Bauer, Quinn 2000, Newbrook 2001 and references cited there). Endonormative standards and positive attitudes towards their own local forms of English are now normal in both countries (Gordon & Deverson 1998:171).

Gordon and Deverson (1998) conclude their book by explicitly emphasizing the connection between 'New Zealand English and New Zealand identity':

> There is now a shift apparent in the way some New Zealanders at least are viewing their own form of English speech. Perhaps the chief factor in this is New Zealand's new, or heightened, sense of independent nationhood. . . . New Zealanders have come to see themselves as carving out their own destiny in a distinctively Pacific setting. The word 'antipodean' has come to seem rather outdated. . . . We are where we are, rather than at the other end of the world from somewhere else. We are now evolving our own ways, our own standards, looking less over the shoulder at the example of Mother England. . . . Language is an integral part of any country's cultural makeup. A growth in national maturity and self-respect inevitably brings greater prestige to the national language or variety. New Zealand English,

---

[51] Based upon a longitudinal study, Bradley and Bradley (2001) report an increasingly positive attitude among Australians to Australian English.

then, is slowly acquiring more 'respectability' (among New Zealanders themselves, most importantly) as the country's individual choice, one of our national assets. (175)

In the present context and in comparison with the earlier case studies, perhaps the most interesting observation concerning Australian and New Zealand forms of English is the ongoing birth of new dialects, the sign of having reached the end of the cycle, stage 5. In contrast with the earlier standard statements about the varieties' homogeneity, in recent years the fact that internal differentiation has been developing is receiving public awareness and scholarly attention both in Australia and in New Zealand.[52] Australians increasingly claim that they can identify a fellow Australian's regional origin by their accent. Trudgill (1986:145), Bradley (1989), and Horvath and Horvath (1997, 2001) have documented emerging regional differences on the sound level. For vocabulary, Bryant's work (e.g. 1989, 1997) has documented regional diversity within Australian English, and it is significant that in 2001 the Macquarie Dictionary Company, upon the initiative of Sue Butler and in collaboration with the ABC, launched a large-scale public invitation to help collect and catalogue regionalisms for the dictionary's next edition.[53] In terms of the emergence of regional diversification, New Zealand seems to be lagging behind Australia by the same few decades that separated the two countries' respective 'Event X'. During the 1990s and after, a vibrant sociolinguistic scene in New Zealand has analyzed several ongoing sound changes, which are being functionalized to mark social and ethnic identities (see Bell & Kuiper 2000 and references listed there). In general, however, except for a customary concession to regional speech found in Otago/Southland due to its Scottish background, and occasional notes on minor lexical localisms (see Bauer 1997, Gordon & Deverson 1998:126–34), the conclusion that New Zealand English is regionally homogeneous is still accepted. This is likely to change in the near future, however: in an ongoing large-scale research project, Bauer and Bauer (2002) are observing the emergence of regional dialects in New Zealand English among school children.

Variation by social class, represented by the cline between 'broad' and 'educated' varieties, has always persisted in both Australia and New Zealand; this is not the topic of the present article. However, distinctively ethnic varieties have emerged under IDG-strand conditions in both countries, and they are increasingly receiving attention among linguists. Aboriginal English is an umbrella term for a range of IDG-strand varieties, with internal regional differentiation: Malcolm (1995) gives examples of features which are 'particular to specific areas' (25), and Malcolm and Koscielecki (1997:57–73) examine some differences between dialects from Western Australia and New South Wales. In general, Aboriginal English displays characteristic phenomena in its phonology (Malcolm 1995:22–26, Malcolm & Koscielecki 1997:20–25, 57–59, 65–67, Cahill 1999:33, Malcolm et al. 1999b:52–53), grammar (Malcolm 1995:24, Malcolm & Koscielecki 1997:25–39, 60–64, 67–73, Cahill 1999:28–29, Malcolm et al. 1999b:47–51), and lexical semantics (Malcolm 1995:25, Malcolm & Koscielecki 1997:39–41, Cahill 1999:31–32, Malcolm et al. 1999b:44–46), but also, and perhaps most importantly, in its rules for the cognitive organization and pragmatic uses of texts, representing different discourse conventions (Malcolm & Koscielecki 1997:54–59, Malcolm et al. 1999a: 54–59), textual schemata, and a different world view (Malcolm & Rochecouste 2000,

---

[52] Among the first to observe this was Trudgill (1986), who stated: 'It is interesting to note, however, that the relatively new, mixed, uniform Australian variety is now showing definite signs of beginning to develop regional differentiation' (145). See Collins & Blair 2001:9–10.

[53] See the project announcement at http://www.abc.net.au/wordmap.

Malcolm et al. 1999a). In contrast, Maori English has been found to be comparatively 'elusive' (Bell 2000:221), although perceptually it is claimed to exist; Bell (2000) documents some of its features (see also Bauer 1994:413–17), and Stubbe and Holmes (2000) explicitly identify it as a marker of Maori identity, with discourse characteristics of its own.

Collins and Blair (2001) have captured the binary perspective that characterizes phase 5 in Australia (and, correspondingly, elsewhere):

> The role of language as a badge of social identity means that English in Australia serves a double social function. Within Australia, the range of varieties (or Englishes) provides a set of cultural and social indicators of ethnicity, social class, gender and age. From an external viewpoint . . . the language provides a marker of 'Australian-ness'.(11)

5. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY. Having outlined and exemplified the Dynamic Model of the evolution of New Englishes, I conclude by briefly summarizing and discussing its major foundations and implications.

Essentially, the model rests upon the following frameworks:

- IDENTITY THEORY (Gumperz 1982, Jenkins 1996, Woodward 1997, Wodak et al. 1999, Eckert 2000): Language variation and the emergence of New Englishes are regarded as functions of sociopolitically-driven identity reconstructions of all parties involved. This is in keeping with recent sociolinguistic thinking, which since its inception (Labov 1972), and increasingly so in recent years (e.g. Wolfram & Schilling-Estes 1996, Eckert 2000, Schneider 2000b, Hazen 2002) has identified identity as one of the main, perhaps the major factor in the choice of linguistic varieties.[54]
- LANGUAGE CONTACT THEORY, including the study of pidgin and creole languages (Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Thomason 2001, Neumann-Holzschuh & Schneider 2000, Mufwene 2001): The evolution of New Englishes is regarded as a special type of contact-induced language change, closely related to the genesis of pidgin and creole languages, from which it cannot be distinguished in principle. In fact, the idea of cyclic thinking has been adopted from pidgin and creole theory, and in many countries where an English-lexifier creole is spoken, for instance throughout the Caribbean, historical and synchronic facts resemble the above model in many ways.[55]
- ACCOMMODATION THEORY (Giles 1984, Thomason 2001:142–46, Trudgill 1986): Co-operative speakers approximate each other's speech forms to be maximally successful in their communication and to gain each other's approval, thus initiating a process of linguistic convergence.

In which ways does this model improve upon earlier categorizations of New Englishes? At least four qualities need to be pointed out:

- It is HOLISTIC by imposing an overarching and unifying perspective to the static and individualizing typologies of earlier approaches, thus reinterpreting isolated observa-

---

[54] An interesting parallel case, suggestive of the paramount importance of identity in shaping language varieties, is the strange group of 'bilingual mixed languages' discussed by Thomason (2001), all of which, despite substantial differences in structure and ecological setting, she characterizes as explicit and deliberate expressions of threatened group identities.

[55] To cite but a few examples: The lexicographic coverage of Caribbean English(es) both reflects and contributes to the distinct identity and stabilization of these varieties (e.g. Cassidy & LePage 1980, Allsopp 1996), and so does the grammatical and lexicographic codification of southwest Pacific Pidgins (e.g. Wurm 1985, Verhaar 1995, Jourdan 2001). Recent work by Blake (2002) shows the emergence of closely related white and black forms of Bajan on Barbados.

tions and case studies within a coherent framework, relating them with each other and with relevant linguistic theories in a systematic fashion.

- It adds an essential DYNAMIC dimension to earlier static classifications, regarding differences between varieties of English as instantiations of characteristic phases of an underlying, uniform evolutionary process. This is a claim with far-reaching implications — the idea that there is a single evolutionary process underneath what we see emerging at various locations all around the globe is a provocative assertion, open to discussion.

- It has PREDICTIVE power — again, a strong claim but also a quality required of good science.[56] The dynamic reinterpretation of the relationship between varieties of English predicts that a given variety which can be observed to be currently in, say, phase 3 may proceed to phases 4 and, ultimately, 5. In other words — and this is clearly the most speculative claim of all — such a country is likely to turn into a more or less fully English-speaking country in the long run.

- It adopts the SPEECH COMMUNITY rather than the nation state as its sociolinguistic unit of description; it is thus (e.g. by distinguishing between STL- and IDG-strands and by allowing for speech differences between ethnic, social, and regional communities) descriptively more adequate than the ENL/ESL/EFL or 'Three Circles' models which fail to provide for intranational differentiation.

Unavoidably, all models and far-reaching claims, being abstractions, meet with certain difficulties when faced with the messy realities of real-life situations. Two limitations implied in what was said above should be conceded at the outset and will need to be given special consideration in individual applications; both correspond to Thomason's (2001) assessment of the generalizability of language-contact typologies:

- The PROTOTYPICALITY of the model: It should be clear that the features listed above for the cycle's individual stages must not be regarded as a checklist of 'necessary and sufficient conditions' but should rather be interpreted as characteristic properties of prototypical stages. It is useful to put such features together, but in reality categories are frequently fudged; thus, in individual cases not *all* features listed need to apply in order for a variety to be identified as belonging to a given stage, but *some* typically will. Furthermore, the existence of separate and subsequent stages implies the occurrence of transition periods in between: New features and developments take time to develop and spread in a society, and in all processes of change old phenomena lag behind within conservative subgroups. The constituent elements of the five stages may evolve independently of each other, and so one may expect to find cases in which features characteristic of consecutive stages arise concurrently.

- The LIMITATIONS OF PREDICTABILITY: The linearity of linguistic evolution operates only under the default assumption that social history will hold no major surprises, that there will be no catastrophic upheavals, no revolutionary changes of direction that will turn the tides of a given society's linguistic evolution altogether. As Thomason and Kaufman state, 'the history of a language is a function of the history of its speakers' (1988:4). This includes redirections of language policy, as in the cases of Tanzania, Malaysia, and the Philippines — countries which in their recent histories

---

[56] However, it needs to be recognized that the notion of prediction has quite a different status in the social and behavioral sciences from the natural sciences. As Mufwene (p.c.) points out: 'At least according to Stephen Jay Gould, no theory of evolution is expected to be predictive, because there are so many variables to grasp. Theories of evolution are turned to the past, not to the future. . . . Every new situation may highlight a factor that is more significant there than elsewhere'.

decided to reduce the internal importance of English and replace it by languages developed and promoted to become truly national languages instead. It seems possible that a kind of fossilization of an earlier stage in the developmental cycle may occur in such instances.

I believe the model holds promises of an applied nature by repositioning and suggesting a reconsideration of the role and assessment of norms of correctness in the usage of English in different countries. Irrespective of linguists' striving for descriptiveness, norms are still required as guidelines in certain spheres of society — language teaching and formal public discourse, to name two of the most important ones. But which linguistic norm to accept and adopt is a difficult decision and a painful process for many countries,[57] in part because issues of linguistic correctness often function to camouflage power relationships. It is important for a society to understand that linguistic norms are not absolute but rather, as the Dynamic Model implies, they change, varying from one context to another: today's norms may not be tomorrow's usage any longer. It is absolutely necessary to develop some tolerance toward such changes — they are not 'for the worse', as conservative language observers typically claim. One must also be aware that within a society a variety of competing norm orientations is likely to exist, including the difference between a written standard and a spoken vernacular and a competition between 'overt' prestige and 'covert' solidarity norms. In the long run, speech communities and societies of necessity define their own norms of acceptance, as the Dynamic Model implies in positing a change from an exonormative to an endonormative orientation.

The Dynamic Model of the evolution of New Englishes, suggesting that identity reconfigurations are reflected in language variability and ultimately lead to dialect birth, is undoubtedly only a starting point: Further testing against global realities is invited, and further refinement is to be expected. But the model already contributes something to a variety of perspectives concerning human language. It shows that linguistic usage is a highly variable phenomenon, constrained by intralinguistic and extralinguistic parameters. It testifies to the importance of sociolinguistic and sociocultural perspectives in language analysis, and especially to the overriding impact of identity expression as a function of language. And it illustrates the fundamental and shaky balance in human language between uniformity, a dependence upon deeply rooted principles of organization and evolution on the one hand, and variability, the probabilistic dependence of realization options in detail upon certain parameters, historical accident, and chance on the other. Even if New Englishes are the products of a relatively uniform underlying process, the outcomes of this process are anything but uniform.

REFERENCES

ALLSOPP, RICHARD (ed.) 1996. Dictionary of Caribbean English usage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ALSAGOFF, LUBNA. 2001. Tense and aspect in Singapore English. In Ooi, 79–88.

---

[57] To cite another example: In English-speaking countries in West Africa and East Africa, the idea that the only acceptable and correct norm of pronunciation is that of educated British English, RP, is deeply rooted nowadays and may not be seriously challenged — although this myth does not conform at all with African English pronunciations in reality and thus, almost automatically, places a vast majority of speakers of African English in a defensive, seemingly inferior position. For instance, Ngefac (2001), in the first sociolinguistic correlational study of Cameroonian English pronunciation, adopts the percentage of British English pronunciations in a given environment as his yardstick, arguing that no other norm of reference would be acceptable.

ALSAGOFF, LUBNA; BAO ZHIMING; and LIONEL WEE. 1998. Why you talk like that?: The pragmatics of a why construction in Singapore English. English World-Wide 19.247–60.

Anvil-Macquarie dictionary of Philippine English for high school. 2000. Pasig City: Anvil Publishing.

ASHCROFT, BILL; GARETH GRIFFITHS; and HELEN TIFFIN. 2002. The empire writes back. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

ASMAH, HAJI OMAR. 1996. Post-imperial English in Malaysia. In Fishman et al., 513–55.

ASMAH, HAJI OMAR. 2000. From imperialism to Malaysianization: A discussion of the path taken by English towards becoming a Malaysian language. In Halimah & Ng, 12–21.

AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING SERVICE. 1988. Style manual for authors, editors and printers. 4th edn. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

BAILEY, GUY. 1997. When did Southern English begin? In Schneider 1997, vol. 1, 255–75.

BAILEY, GUY, and NATALIE MAYNOR. 1989. The divergence controversy. American Speech 64.12–39.

BAILEY, RICHARD W., and MANFRED GÖRLACH (eds.) 1982. English as a world language. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

BAKER, SIDNEY J. 1945 [1978]. The Australian language. Sydney: Angus and Robertson Ltd. 1978. 3rd edn. Milson's Point, NSW: Currawong Press.

BAUER, LAURIE. 1994. English in New Zealand. In Burchfield, 382–429.

BAUER, LAURIE. 1997. Attempting to trace Scottish influence on New Zealand English. In Schneider 1997, vol. 2, 257–72.

BAUER, LAURIE, and WINIFRED BAUER. 2002. Can we watch regional dialects developing in colonial English? The case of New Zealand. English World-Wide 23.169–93.

BAUMGARDNER, ROBERT J. 1998. Word-formation in Pakistani English. English World-Wide 19.205–46.

BAUTISTA, MARIA LOURDES S. 1997a. The lexicon of Philippine English. In Bautista 1997b, 49–72.

BAUTISTA, MARIA LOURDES S. (ed.) 1997b. English is an Asian language: The Philippine context. Proceedings of the conference held in Manila on August 2–3, 1996. Sydney: Macquarie Library Ltd.

BAUTISTA, MARIA LOURDES S. 2000. The grammatical features of educated Philippine English. In Bautista et al., 146–58.

BAUTISTA, MARIA LOURDES S.; TEODORO A. LLAMZON; and BONIFACIO P. SIBAYAN (eds.) 2000. Parangal cang Brother Andrew: Festschrift for Andrew Gonzalez on his sixtieth birthday. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

BELL, ALLAN. 2000. Maori and Pakeha English: A case study. In Bell & Kuiper, 221–48.

BELL, ALLAN, and KOENRAAD KUIPER (eds.) 2000. New Zealand English. Varieties of English around the world G25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BENSON, PHIL. 2000. Hong Kong words: Variation and context. In Bolton 2000c, 373–80.

BIBER, DOUGLAS; STIG JOHANSSON; GEOFFREY LEECH; SUSAN CONRAD; and EDWARD FINEGAN. 1999. Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Harlow: Longman.

BIBI JAN MOHD AYYUB. 1994. Language issues in the Malay community. In Gopinathan et al., 205–30.

BLAIR, DAVID, and PETER COLLINS (eds.) 2001. English in Australia. Varieties of English around the world G26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BLAKE, RENÉE. 2002. Not as clear as black and white: A study of race, class and language in a Barbados community. New York: New York University, MS.

BOLTON, KINGSLEY. 2000a. The sociolinguistics of Hong Kong English and the space for Hong Kong English. In Bolton 2000c, 265–85.

BOLTON, KINGSLEY. 2000b. Hong Kong English, Philippine English, and the future of Asian Englishes. In Bautista et al., 93–114.

BOLTON, KINGSLEY (ed.) 2000c. Hong Kong English: Autonomy and creativity. Special issue of World Englishes 19.3.

BOLTON, KINGSLEY, and SHIRLEY LIM. 2000. Futures for Hong Kong English. In Bolton 2000c, 429–43.

BRADLEY, DAVID. 1989. Regional dialects in Australian English phonology. In Collins & Blair 1989, 260–70.

BRADLEY, DAVID, and MAYA BRADLEY. 2001. Changing attitudes to Australian English. In Blair & Collins, 271–85.

BRYANT, PAULINE. 1989. Regional variation in the Australian English lexicon. In Collins & Blair 1989, 301–14.

BRYANT, PAULINE. 1997. A dialect survey of the lexicon of Australian English. English World-Wide 18.211–41.

BURCHFIELD, ROBERT (ed.) 1994. The Cambridge history of the English language. Vol. 5: English in Britain and overseas: Origins and development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BUTLER, SUSAN. 1997. Corpus of English in Southeast Asia: Implications for a regional dictionary. In Bautista 1997b, 103–24.

BUTLER, SUSAN. 2001. Australian English — an identity crisis. In Blair & Collins, 151–61.

CAHILL, ROSEMARY. 1999. Solid English. Perth: Education Department of Western Australia.

CASSIDY, FREDERIC G., and ROBERT B. LEPAGE. 1980. Dictionary of Jamaican English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHAMBERS, J. K. 1992. Dialect acquisition. Language 68.4.673–705.

CHAMBERS, J. K. 2000. World enough and time: Global enclaves of the near future. American Speech 75.285–87.

CHAMBERS, J. K. 2003. Sociolinguistic theory. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

CHAMBERS, J. K., and PETER TRUDGILL. 1998. Dialectology. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHESHIRE, JENNY (ed.) 1991. English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

COLLINS, PETER, and DAVID BLAIR (eds.) 1989. Australian English: The language of a new society. St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

COLLINS, PETER, and DAVID BLAIR. 2001. Language and identity in Australia. In Blair & Collins, 1–13.

CONRAD, ANDREW W. 1996. The international role of English: The state of the discussion. In Fishman et al., 13–36.

COPPIETERS, RENÉ. 1987. Competence differences between native and non-native speakers. Language 63.544–73.

CREWE, WILLIAM (ed.) 1977. The English language in Singapore. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

CRYSTAL, DAVID. 1997. English as a global language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DAKO, KARI. 2001. Ghanaianisms: Towards a semantic and formal classification. English World-Wide 22.23–53.

DAVID, MAYA KHEMLANI. 2000. The language of Malaysian youth — an exploratory study. In Halimah & Ng, 64–72.

DAVIS, LAWRENCE M. 1983. English dialectology: An introduction. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

DE KLERK, VIVIAN (ed.) 1996. Focus on South Africa. Varieties of English around the world G15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DELBRIDGE, ARTHUR. 1981. The Macquarie dictionary. Sydney: Macquarie Library.

DELBRIDGE, ARTHUR. 2001. Lexicography and national identity: The Australian experience. In Blair & Collins, 303–16.

DILLARD, JOEY L. 1975. All-American English: A history of the English language in America. New York: Random House.

ECKERT, PENELOPE. 2000. Linguistic variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High. Oxford: Blackwell.

ELMES, SIMON. 2001. The routes of English 4. London: BBC Adult Learning.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA A. 1972. The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

FISHMAN, JOSHUA A.; ANDREW W. CONRAD; and ALMA RUBAL-LOPEZ (eds.) 1996. Post-imperial English: Status change in former British and American colonies 1840–1990. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

FOLEY, JOSEPH (ed.) 1988. New Englishes: The case of Singapore. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

FOLEY, JOSEPH A. 1998. Code-switching and learning among young children in Singapore. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 130.129–50.

FOLEY, JOSEPH A. 2001. Is English a first or second language in Singapore? In Ooi, 12–32.

FOLEY, JOSEPH A.; T. KANDIAH; BAO ZHIMING; ANTHEA FRASER GUPTA; L. ATSAGOFF; HO CHEE LICK; L. WEE; T. S. TALIB; and W. BOKHORST-HENG. 1999. English in new cultural contexts: Reflections from Singapore. New York: Oxford University Press.

FRANCIS, W. NELSON. 1983. Dialectology: An introduction. New York: Longman.

FRAZER, TIMOTHY C. (ed.) 1993. 'Heartland' English: Variation and transition in the American Midwest. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

GILES, HOWARD. 1984. The dynamics of speech accommodation. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 46. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

GILL, SARAN KAUR. 1999. Standards and linguistic realities of English in the Malaysian workplace. World Englishes 18.215–31.

GILL, SARAN KAUR. 2002. Language policy and English language standards in Malaysia: Nationalism versus pragmatism. Journal of Asia-Pacific Communication 12.1.

GISBORNE, NIKOLAS. 2000. Relative clauses in Hong Kong English. In Bolton 2000c, 357–71.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW. 1983. When does an error become a feature of Philippine English? In Noss, 150–72.

GONZALEZ, ANDREW. 1997. The history of English in the Philippines. In Bautista 1997b, 25–40.

GOPINATHAN, S. ANNE PAKIR; HO WAH KAM; and VANITHAMANI SARAVANAN (eds.) 1994. Language, society and education in Singapore: Issues and trends. Singapore: Times Academic Press.

GORDON, ELIZABETH. 1998. The origins of New Zealand speech: The limits of recovering historical information from written records. English World-Wide 19.61–85.

GORDON, ELIZABETH, and MARCIA ABELL. 1990. 'This objectionable colonial dialect': Historical and contemporary attitudes to New Zealand speech. New Zealand ways of speaking English, ed. by Allen Bell and Janet Holmes, 21–48. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

GORDON, ELIZABETH, and TONY DEVERSON. 1998. New Zealand English and English in New Zealand. Auckland: New House.

GORLACH, MANFRED. 1984. A selective bibliography of English as a world language (1965–1983). A bibliography of writings on varieties of English, 1965–1983, by Wolfgang Viereck, Edgar W. Schneider, and Manfred Görlach, 225–319. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, MANFRED. 1991. English as a world language — the state of the art. Englishes, by Manfred Görlach, 10–35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, MANFRED. 1993. Part IV: Writings on Englishes in the rest of the world. A new bibliography of writings on varieties of English, 1984–1992/93, by Beat Glauser, Edgar W. Schneider, and Manfred Görlach, 125–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, MANFRED. 1995a. Word-formation and the ENL: ESL: EFL distinction. More Englishes, by Manfred Görlach, 61–92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, MANFRED. 1995b. Dictionaries of transplanted Englishes. More Englishes, by Manfred Görlach, 124–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GÖRLACH, MANFRED. 1998. Recent dictionaries of varieties of English. Even more Englishes, by Manfred Görlach, 152–86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GREENBAUM, SIDNEY. 1996a. Introducing ICE. In Greenbaum 1996b, 3–12.

GREENBAUM, SIDNEY (ed.) 1996b. Comparing English worldwide: The international corpus of English. Oxford: Clarendon.

Grolier international dictionary: World English in an Asian context. 2000. Macquarie University, NSW: The Macquarie Library.

GUMPERZ, JOHN J. (ed.) 1982. Language and social identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GUMPERZ, JOHN J., and JENNY COOK-GUMPERZ. 1982. Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In Gumperz, 1–21.

GUPTA, ANTHEA FRASER. 1988. A standard for written Singapore English? In Foley 1988, 27–50.

GUPTA, ANTHEA FRASER. 1994. The step-tongue: Children's English in Singapore. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

GUPTA, ANTHEA FRASER. 1996. English and empire: Teaching English in nineteenth-century India. Learning English: Development and diversity, ed. by Neil Mercer and Joan Swann, 188–94. London: Open University.

GUPTA, ANTHEA FRASER. 1997. Colonisation, migration, and functions of English. In Schneider 1997, vol. 1, 47–58.

GUPTA, ANTHEA FRASER. 1999. The situation of English in Singapore. In Foley et al., 106–26.

HALIMAH MOHD SAID and NG KEAT SIEW (eds.) 2000. English is an Asian language: The Malaysian context. Kuala Lumpur: Macquarie Library.

HALL, ROBERT A. 1962. The life cycle of pidgin languages. Lingua 11.151–56.

HAZEN, KIRK. 2002. Identity and language variation in a rural community. Language 78.240–57.

HICKEY, RAYMOND (ed.) 2003. The legacy of colonial Englishes: Transported dialects. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HOCK, HANS HENRICH, and BRIAN D. JOSEPH. 1996. Language history, language change, and language relationship: An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

HOLM, JOHN. 1988/89. Pidgins and creoles. Vol. 1: Theory and structure. Vol. 2: Reference survey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HORVATH, BARBARA M. 1985. Variation in Australian English: The sociolects of Sydney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HORVATH, BARBARA M., and RONALD J. HORVATH. 1997. The geolinguistics of a sound change in progress: /l/ vocalization in Australia. Working papers in linguistics: A selection of papers from NWAVE 25, ed. by Miriam Meyerhoff, Charles Boberg, and Stephanie Strassel, 105–24. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

HORVATH, BARBARA M., and RONALD J. HORVATH. 2001. The geolinguistics of short /a/ in Australian English. In Blair & Collins, 341–56.

HUNDT, MARIANNE. 1998. New Zealand English grammar: Fact or fiction? A corpus-based study in morphosyntactic variation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

HUNG, TONY T. N. 2000. Towards a phonology of Hong Kong English. In Bolton 2000c, 337–56.

HYLAND, KEN. 1997. Language attitudes at the handover: Communication and identity in 1997 Hong Kong. English World-Wide 18.191–210.

JENKINS, RICHARD. 1996. Social identity. London: Routledge.

JOURDAN, CHRISTINE. 2001. Pijin: A dictionary of the pidgin of the Solomon Islands. Canberra: Australian National University.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures, ed. by Randolph Quirk and Henry G. Widdowson, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and The British Council.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1986. The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. (ed.) 1992. The other tongue: English across cultures. 2nd edn. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1994. English in South Asia. In Burchfield, 497–553.

KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1997. English as an Asian language. In Bautista 1997b, 1–23.

KROSKRITY, PAUL V. 2001. Identity. Key terms in language and culture, ed. by Alessandro Duranti, 106–9. Oxford: Blackwell.

KUIPER, KOENRAAD, and ALLAN BELL. 2000. New Zealand and New Zealand English. In Bell & Kuiper, 1–22.

LABOV, WILLIAM. 1972. Sociolinguistic patterns. Oxford: Blackwell.

LABOV, WILLIAM; SHARON ASH; and CHARLES BOBERG. Forthcoming. Atlas of North American English: Phonetics, phonology and sound change. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Project website: http://www.uni-marburg.de/linguistik/dgweb/atlas/index.htm.

LE PAGE, ROBERT B., and ANDRÉE TABOURET-KELLER. 1985. Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LI, DAVID C. S. 1999. The functions and status of English in Hong Kong: A post-1997 update. English World-Wide 20.67–110.

LIM, CHOON YEOH, and LIONEL WEE. 2001. Reduplication in Singapore English. In Ooi, 89–101.

Lim, Lisa. 2001. Ethnic group varieties of Singapore English: Melody or harmony? In Ooi, 53–68.

Llamzon, Teodoro A. 1986. Life cycle of New Englishes: Restriction phase of Filipino English. English World-Wide 7.101–25.

Llamzon, Teodoro A. 1997. The phonology of Philippine English. In Bautista 1997b, 41–48.

Lloyd, T. O. 1984. The British empire 1558–1983. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luke, Kwang-Kwong, and Jack C. Richards. 1982. English in Hong Kong: Functions and status. English World-Wide 3.47–64.

Macquarie Junior Dictionary. World English — Asian context. 1999. Macquarie University, NSW: Macquarie Library.

Malcolm, Ian. 1995. Language and communication enhancement for two-way education. Perth: Edith Cowan University and Education Department of Western Australia.

Malcolm, Ian, and Marek M. Koscielecki. 1997. Aboriginality and English. Report to the Australian Research Council. Perth: Center for Applied Language and Literacy Research, Edith Cowan University.

Malcolm, Ian G., and Judith Rochecouste. 2000. Event and story schemas in Australian Aboriginal English discourse. English World-Wide 21.261–89.

Malcolm, Ian; Yvonne Haig; Patricia Königsberg; Judith Rochecouste; Glenys Collard; Alison Hill; and Rosemary Cahill. 1999a. Towards more user-friendly education for speakers of Aboriginal English. Perth: Center for Applied Language and Literacy Research, Edith Cowan University.

Malcolm, Ian; Yvonne Haig; Patricia Königsberg; Judith Rochecouste; Glenys Collard; Alison Hill; and Rosemary Cahill. 1999b. Two-way English: Towards more user-friendly education for speakers of Aboriginal English. Perth: Center for Applied Language and Literacy Research, Edith Cowan University.

Mathews, Mitford M. 1951. A dictionary of Americanisms on historical principles. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McArthur, Tom. 1998. The English languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1985. Authority in language. London: Routledge.

Milroy, Leslie. 2002. Social networks. The handbook of language variation and change, ed. by J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes, 549–72. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mitchell, A. G., and Arthur Delbridge. 1965. The speech of Australian adolescents: A survey. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

Moag, Rodney F. 1992. The life cycle of non-native Englishes: A case study. In Kachru 1992, 233–52.

Modiano, Marko; Michael Toolan; Augustin Simo-Bobda; Loreto Todd; Alan S. Kaye; Francois Chevillet; and Prayag D. Tripathi. 1999. International English in the global village. English Today 58, 15.2.22–34.

Montgomery, Michael. 1996. Was colonial American English a koiné? Speech past and present: Studies in English dialectology in memory of Ossi Ihalainen, ed. by Juhani Klemola, Merja Kytö, and Matti Rissanen, 213–35. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

Moore, Bruce. 2001. Australian English and indigenous voices. In Blair & Collins, 133–49.

Morais, Elaine. 2000. Talking in English but thinking like a Malaysian: Insights from a car assembly plant. In Halimah & Ng, 90–106.

Morais, Elaine. 2001. Lectal varieties of Malaysian English. In Ooi, 33–52.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1996. The founder principle in creole genesis. Diachronica 13.83–134.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2000. Creolization is a social, not a structural, process. In Neumann-Holzschuh & Schneider, 65–84.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. The ecology of language evolution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mugler, France, and Jan Tent. 1998. Some aspects of language use and attitudes in Fiji. SICOL: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Oceanic Linguistics. Vol. 1: Language contact, ed. by Jan Tent and France Mugler, 109–34. Pacific Linguistics C–141. Canberra: Australian National University.

Muhlhausler, Peter. 1986. Pidgin and creole linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell.

NEUMANN-HOLZSCHUH, INGRID, and EDGAR W. SCHNEIDER (eds.) 2000. Degrees of restructuring in creole languages. (Creole language library 22.) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

NEWBROOK, MARK. 1997. Malaysian English: Status, norms, some grammatical and lexical features. In Schneider 1997, vol. 2, 229–56.

NEWBROOK, MARK. 2001. Syntactic features and norms in Australian English. In Blair & Collins, 113–32.

NGEFAC, ALOYSIUS. 2001. Extra-linguistic correlates of Cameroon English phonology. Yaounde, Cameroon: University of Yaounde dissertation.

NORTON, BONNY. 2000. Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change. Harlow: Longman.

NOSS, R. B. (ed.) 1983. Varieties of English in Southeast Asia. Singapore: Singapore University Press for SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

OOI, VINCENT B. Y. (ed.) 2001. Evolving identities: The English language in Singapore and Malaysia. Singapore: Times Academic Press.

ORSMAN, ELIZABETH, and HARRY ORSMAN. 1994. The New Zealand dictionary. Educational edition. Takapuna: New House.

ORSMAN, HARRY. 1997. A dictionary of New Zealand English on historical principles. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

PAKIR, ANNE (ed.) 1993. The English language in Singapore: Standards and norms. Singapore: Singapore Association for Applied Linguistics.

PAKIR, ANNE. 1994. English in Singapore: The codification of competing norms. In Gopinathan et al., 92–118.

PAKIR, ANNE. 2001. The voices of English-knowing bilinguals and the emergence of new epicentres. In Ooi, 1–11.

PENG, LONG, and JANE SETTER. 2000. The emergence of systematicity in the English pronunciations of two Cantonese-speaking adults in Hong Kong. English World-Wide 21.81–108.

PENNYCOOK, ALASTAIR. 1998. English and the discourses of colonialism. London: Routledge.

PETERS, PAM. 1995. The Cambridge Australian English style guide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PETERS, PAM. 2001. What is international English? Paper given to the Australian Style Council Conference, Sydney, April 2001.

PHILLIPSON, ROBERT. 1992. Linguistic imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PILLER, INGRID. 2001. Who, if anyone, is a native speaker? Anglistik 12.109–21.

PLATT, JOHN, and HEIDI WEBER. 1980. English in Singapore and Malaysia: Status, features, functions. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

PLATT, JOHN; HEIDI WEBER; and MIAN LIAN HO. 1983. Singapore and Malaysia. Varieties of English Around the World T1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

PLATT, JOHN; HEIDI WEBER; and MIAN LIAN HO. 1984. The New Englishes. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

PRENDERGAST, DAVID. 1998. Views on Englishes: A talk with Braj B. Kachru, Salikoko Mufwene, Rajendra Singh, Loreto Todd, and Peter Trudgill. Links and Letters 5.225–41.

PRIDE, JOHN (ed.) 1982. New Englishes. Rowley: Newbury House.

QUINN, HEIDI. 2000. Variation in New Zealand English syntax and morphology. In Bell & Kuiper, 173–97.

RAMSON, W. S. 1966. Australian English: An historical study of the vocabulary 1788–1898. Canberra: Australian National University Press.

RAMSON, W. S. 1988. The Australian national dictionary. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

READ, ALLEN WALKER. 1933. British recognition of American speech in the eighteenth century. Dialect Notes 6.313–34.

RUBAL-LOPEZ, ALMA. 1996. The ongoing spread of English: A comparative analysis of former Anglo-American colonies with non-colonies. In Fishman et al., 37–82.

SARAVANAN, VANITHAMANI. 1994. Language maintenance and language shift in the Tamil community. In Gopinathan et al., 175–204.

SCHILLING–ESTES, NATALIE, and WALT WOLFRAM. 1999. Alternative models of dialect death: Dissipation vs. concentration. Language 75.486–521.

SCHMIED, JOSEF. 1985. Englisch in Tansania. Sozio- und interlinguistische Probleme. Heidelberg: Groos.

SCHNEIDER, EDGAR W. (ed.) 1997. Englishes around the world. Vol. 1: General studies, British Isles, North America. Vol. 2: Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia. Studies in honour of Manfred Görlach. Varieties of English around the world G18, G19. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

SCHNEIDER, EDGAR W. 1999. Notes on Singaporean English. Form, function and variation in English: Studies in honour of Klaus Hansen, ed. by Uwe Carls and Peter Lucko, 193–205. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.

SCHNEIDER, EDGAR W. 2000a. Feature diffusion vs. contact effects in the evolution of New Englishes: A typological case study of negation patterns. English World-Wide 21.201–30.

SCHNEIDER, EDGAR W. 2000b. From region to class to identity: 'Show me how you speak, and I'll tell you who you are?' American Speech 75.359–61.

SCHUMANN, JOHN H. 1978. The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching, ed. by Rosario C. Gringas, 27–50. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO P., and ANDREW GONZALEZ. 1996. Post-imperial English in the Philippines. In Fishman et al., 139–72.

SIEGEL, JEFF. 1987. Language contact in a plantation environment: A sociolinguistic history of Fiji. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SIEGEL, JEFF. 1991. Variation in Fiji English. In Cheshire, 664–74.

Singapore Census of Population 2000. Online: http://www.singstat.gov.sg/keystats/people.-html#census.

SINGH, RAJENDRA (ed.) 1998. The native speaker: Multilingual perspectives. London: Sage.

SPENCER, JOHN (ed.) 1971. The English language in West Africa. London: Longman.

STUBBE, MARIA, and JANET HOLMES. 2000. Talking Maori or Pakeha in English: Signalling identity in discourse. In Bell & Kuiper, 249–78.

SUSSEX, ROLAND. 1989. The Americanisation of Australian English: Prestige models in the media. In Collins & Blair 1989, 158–68.

TALIB, ISMAIL S. 2002. The language of postcolonial literatures: An introduction. London: Routledge.

TAN, HWEE HWEE. 2002. A war of words over 'Singlish'. Time Asia 160.3, July 29.

TAN, PETER K. W. 2001. Melaka or Malacca; Kallang or Care-Lang: Lexical innovation and nativisation in Malaysian and Singaporean English. In Ooi, 140–67.

TAY, MARY. 1982. The phonology of educated Singapore English. English World-Wide 3.135–45.

TAY, MARY W. J., and ANTHEA FRASER GUPTA. 1983. Towards a description of Standard Singaporean English. In Noss, 173–89.

TENT, JAN. 2000a. The dynamics of Fiji English: A study of its use, users and features. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago dissertation.

TENT, JAN. 2000b. English lexicography in Fiji. English Today 63, 16.3.22–28.

TENT, JAN. 2001a. A profile of the Fiji English lexis. English World-Wide 22.209–45.

TENT, JAN. 2001b. Yod deletion in Fiji English: Phonological shibboleth or L2 English? Language Variation and Change 13.161–91.

TENT, JAN. 2001c. The current status of English in Fiji. Who's centric now? The present state of post-colonial Englishes, ed. by Bruce Moore, 241–68. South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

TENT, JAN, and FRANCE MUGLER. 1996. Why a Fiji corpus? In Greenbaum 1996b, 249–61.

THOMASON, SARAH G. 2001. Language contact: An introduction. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

THOMASON, SARAH GREY, and TERRENCE KAUFMAN. 1988. Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

TICKOO, MAKHAN L. 1996. Fifty years of English in Singapore: All gains, (a) few losses? In Fishman et al., 431–55.

Times-Chambers essential English dictionary. 1997. 2nd edn. Singapore: Federal Publications.

TONGUE, R. K. 1974. The English of Singapore and Malaysia. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

TRUDGILL, PETER. 1986. Dialects in contact. Oxford: Blackwell.

TRUDGILL, PETER. 1998. World English: Convergence or divergence? The major varieties of English, ed. by Hans Lindqvist, Staffan Klintborg, Magnus Levin, and Maria Estling, 29–36. Växjö: Acta Wexionensia, and Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

TRUDGILL, PETER, and JEAN HANNAH. 1982. International English: A guide to varieties of Standard English. London: Arnold.

TRUDGILL, PETER; ELIZABETH GORDON; GILLIAN LEWIS; and MARGARET MACLAGAN. 2000. Determinism in new-dialect formation and the genesis of New Zealand English. Journal of Linguistics 36.299–318.

TSUI, AMY B. M., and DAVID BUNTON. 2000. The discourse and attitudes of English language teachers in Hong Kong. In Bolton 2000c, 287–303.

TURNER, GEORGE W. 1966. The English language in Australia and New Zealand. London: Longmans.

TURNER, GEORGE W. 1994. English in Australia. In Burchfield, 277–327.

VERHAAR, JOHN W. M. 1995. Toward a reference grammar of Tok Pisin. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

WELLS, JOHN. 1982. Accents of English. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WODAK, RUTH; RUDOLF DE CILLIA; MARTIN REISIG; and KARIN LIEBHART. 1999. The discoursive construction of national identity. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

WOLFRAM, WALT, and NATALIE SCHILLING-ESTES. 1996. Dialect change and maintenance in a post-insular community. Focus on the USA, ed. by Edgar W. Schneider, 103–48. Varieties of English around the world G16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

WOODWARD, KATHRYN. 1997. Concepts of identity and difference. Identity and difference, ed. by Kathryn Woodward, 8–48. London: Sage.

WURM, STEPHEN A. 1985. Handbook of Tok Pisin. Canberra: Australian National University, Department of Linguistics.

YULE, HENRY, and A. C. BURNELL. 1986 [orig. 1886]. Hobson-Jobson: A glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian words and phrases, and of kindred terms, etymological, historical, geographical, and discursive. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

ZURAIDAH, MOHD DON. 2000. Malay + English → a Malay variety of English vowels and accent. In Halimah & Ng, 35–45.

University of Regensburg   [Received 10 May 2002;
Department of English and American Studies   accepted 13 September 2002]
D–93040 Regensburg
Germany
[edgar.schneider@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de]