Meierkord, Christiane. "Extending the Scope of World Englishes: Interactions across Englishes in Post-Protectorates and at the Grassroots." *Research Developments in World Englishes*. Ed. Alexander Onysko. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 47–72. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167087.ch-004>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:49 UTC.

Copyright © Alexander Onysko and Contributors 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Extending the Scope of World Englishes: Interactions across Englishes in Post-Protectorates and at the Grassroots

Christiane Meierkord

1. Introduction

As is well known, over the centuries, and particularly in the last few decades, English has come to be increasingly, if not predominantly, used for interactions that involve speakers for whom English is a second (L2) or foreign (FL) language, and who interact across their individual Englishes (Meierkord 2012). However, the majority of research into world Englishes has so far typically focused on post-colonial settings and the spread of English has largely been associated with and analyzed as spoken by the “educated” elites¹ of their respective societies. As Saraceni (2015) pointed out, this has resulted in World Englishes research reaching some sort of an impasse, struggling to catch up and draw level with advances in sociolinguistics, such as Blommaert’s (2010) “Sociolinguistics of Globalisation” framework, which puts migration but also the grassroots of societies at its focus.

The latter has largely been ignored, resulting in, as Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 36), for example, lament, a lack of an integration of social class, which “is noticeably missing from Schneider’s [(2007)] model (and in fact from many of the “circles” models)” despite the existence of “a large gap between the middle-class varieties of New Englishes and their jargon, pidgin or basilectal counterparts.” In fact, several studies have demonstrated that elite and grassroots uses of English do differ (e.g., Darwin 2017; Toefy 2017; Myrick 2014; Ofori and Albakry 2012; see Section 4.2). Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 9) further notice that post-protectorates have not sufficiently been covered and integrated into theorizing world Englishes despite the fact that they “may well have a status intermediate between ESL and EFL territories” and, thus, offer important input to theories. The same, I propose, is the case with those territories that were protected states, League of Nations mandates and United Nations trust territories (PPSMTs²).

In fact, former PPSMTs, for example the post-protectorates Uganda or the Maldives, differ crucially from most post-colonial settings in that, due to restrictions on land

purchases, a significant settler strand in the sense of Schneider (2007) was crucially missing. Whilst Uganda, despite having a low settler strand, attracted British administrators and colonial personnel, the Maldives did not have any British personnel until 1941, when a military base was established on the island of Gan. And whereas English was quickly established as a medium of instruction (MOI) in Uganda, this domain has only been occupied by English in Maldives since the 1960s. Contrary to these histories, it seems that today there has been a reversal in that English seems to spread more easily at all levels of society in Maldives. In both countries, speakers of English, both from the societal elites and from the grassroots, typically do not interact with speakers of the same variety of English. Rather, they engage in what Meierkord (2012) models as Interactions across Englishes, either with their fellow country people or with individuals (e.g., migrants, expatriates, or tourists) from abroad.

2. Interactions across Englishes

Crucially, the enormous spread of English to every part of the world and increasingly into all spheres of societies involves interactions between individuals who speak different varieties of English. Graddol (1999: 57) argued more than two decades ago that, in the future, English would be “used mainly in multilingual contexts as a second language and for communication between non-native speakers.” In fact, over the last decades, interactions between speakers for whom English is not their first language (L1) have come to be the majority of all those interactions that are conducted in English. Meierkord (2012) envisages these as Interactions across Englishes (IaEs). The core assumption of the model is that the Englishes spoken by the individual participants potentially merge in these interactions and that this, also potentially, results in an array of new emergent linguistic systems (cf., Meierkord 2012: 2). Depending on how frequent and regular such interactions occur, these outcomes may be stable linguistic patterns that involve accommodation to each other’s ways of using English or more ad-hoc communicative solutions that are characterized by processes of simplification and regularization as well as pragmatic strategies employed to cope with the diversity of and unfamiliarity with participants’ patterns and conventions of using English.

Generally, IaEs involve communication between two or more speakers who use English as their L2 or as an FL³, either in a standardized form or in a pidginized or a more or less stable learner language variety. Examples include speakers of Pakistani English, speakers of Cameroon Pidgin English, Turkish or Chinese users of English who may interact in a local Cameroon market place. Similarly, there are intranational interactions, for example in Uganda, between speakers of Ugandan English, who have a Bantu or Nilotic L1, and speakers of Ugandan Indian English. Finally, a Polish and a Philippina nurse may interact in a London hospital.

The individual speakers of these different varieties of English will, albeit to varying degrees, use forms of pronunciation and grammar as well as lexical items and pragmatic strategies that are characteristic of their variety. More generally speaking, individual

speakers thus contribute their various features to a feature pool, in the sense of Mufwene (2001): for example, a speaker of Pakistani English may use articles differently and employ the phrase *Insha-Allah* (God willing) to express a polite refusal or a non-committing promise (Mahboob 2009). Potentially, the other speakers in the interaction notice her behaviors and accommodate to it by copying or appropriating it.

As Meierkord (2012) documents, such IaEs occur both at an *intranational* level as well as at an *international* level. At the intranational level IaEs are typically found in post-colonial nations, such as South Africa, where different Englishes are spoken within one country. In South Africa, the unfortunate Apartheid system gave rise to the separate development of White South African English, Black South African English, Colored South African English and South African Indian English. Since the collapse of the Apartheid system in 1989/90, speakers of these different varieties have increasingly interacted across their Englishes. Meierkord (2012: 116–27) shows that colored speakers accommodate to black speakers in their extended uses of progressives and their pronunciation of the GOOSE vowel.

Nowadays, international interactions involve speakers from any country, be they L1, L2 or FL speakers of English. However, mostly, international uses of English have been associated with countries of the expanding circle (see Kachru 1985), where English does not hold and perform a special role as L2 within the country, due to the fact that it does not serve as an official language, nor as an MOI, and is not used in the media. Such international cases are, obviously, extremely heterogeneous, with participants in such interactions typically finding themselves in ever-novel constellations. This results in interactions where participants may not be familiar with the different features that characterize each other's Englishes as regards pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and pragmatic conventions. As Meierkord (1996) found, participants then frequently resort to what they believe to be safe modes of communication, such as high frequency formulaic phrases for greetings or requests. At the same time, the learner status of individual participants frequently results in the use of paraphrase, shorter sentences and of coping strategies such as frequent back-channels, cooperative overlap, jointly constructed turns and the negotiation of meaning sequences (see Meierkord 2012: 158–94; compare also Kirkpatrick 2007: 155–70), and Firth (1996) finds that participants employ strategies that he calls *let it pass* and *make it normal* to deal with any idiosyncracies in each other's Englishes.

Seemingly, intranational interactions in outer circle countries and international interactions between individuals from expanding circle countries may be two poles on a continuum, and seeking similarities as do, for example, the papers in Mukherjee and Hundt (2011) or those in Deshors (2018), is one important way of understanding the continuum between the two. At the same time, however, along the continuum there seem to exist nodes, but these have not received sufficient attention yet. One of these, I propose, are those countries that have no history of significant English L1 settler populations, as the colonies do. This seems to be the case with former protectorates and protected states, but also former League of Nations mandates and United Nations trust territories, as well as with Commonwealth members that do not belong to either of the aforementioned.

3. Post-Protectorates, Protected States, Mandates and Trust Territories—The In-Between Cases

As has been mentioned in the introduction, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 9) argue that countries that were previous British (or American) protectorates may be “in-between” post-colonial nations (for which Schneider’s 2007 Dynamic Model proposes a uniform trajectory of the development of their Englishes) and such nations in which English is typically a foreign language, used for international communication. Traditionally, these two have been discussed as outer circle and expanding circle countries, following Kachru (1985).

Whilst colonies were typically intended to provide land for permanent settlement or natural resources (see Mufwene 2001: 8–9 on settlement versus trade and exploitation colonies) and under full sovereignty of the colonizer, protectorates were, typically, contractual arrangements formalized in a treaty between the protector and the protégé, outlining rights and duties of both.⁴ This involved “the transfer of the management of some or all of the international affairs to the protecting State,” so that the protectorate can no longer act internationally on its own behalf and does “not qualify as an independent or a sovereign State” (Trilsch 2011, no page numbers).

A protected state, on the other hand, maintained some sovereignty over the conduct of her international affairs. Furthermore, it retained full control over her internal affairs. An example is Tonga from 1900 to 1970.

A League of Nations mandate was a legal status resulting from the Covenant of the League of Nations, signed as part of the 1919 Treaty of Versailles, and applied to territories that, as a consequence of WWI, were no longer ruled by their prior sovereign, Germany and the Ottoman (Turkish) Empire. Crucially, annexation of these territories was excluded, as was the construction of fortifications and the raising of an army, but the precise level of sovereign control was determined for each mandate, individually. This ranged from giving administrative advice and assistance (class A mandates, formerly controlled by the Ottoman Empire) via full administration of the territory (class B mandates, all former German territories in West and Central Africa) to administration under the laws of the mandatory power (class C mandates, e.g., Southwest Africa and South Pacific Islands). In any case, mandates typically involved a considerable degree of control over the territory’s external and internal affairs (cf., Gordon 2013, no page numbers).

When after WWII, in 1946, the League of Nations dissolved and was replaced by the United Nations, any remaining mandates turned into United Nations Trust Territories, with the sole exception of South-West Africa, which remained under South African control and gained independence in 1990 as Namibia. This status envisaged the “progressive development towards self-governance or independence” (Melnik 2013, no page numbers), which inevitably implied involvement of the trustee in the internal affairs for some time, which in turn implied the presence of administrative personnel and other L1 speakers of English.

Finally, there are countries, Rwanda and Mozambique, which do not have any history of British control, but became members of the Commonwealth after they had long been independent nations.

3.1 English in the British PPSMTs

Given the fact that land purchases were not possible in PPSMTs, these territories typically did not attract large numbers of settlers. However, as Schneider (2007) explains, a settler population is crucial in the development of a post-colonial variety of English, claiming that “to a considerable extent the histories of PCEs [postcolonial Englishes] can be viewed as processes of convergence between these two groups [the settlers and the indigenous population]” (2007: 31) and by labelling the two *strands*, thereby signalling “that they are interwoven with each other like twisted threads.”

Informal acquisition of English through interaction with L1 speakers of English was scarce, and English was typically acquired formally, through the education system and only by a minority. As Section 3.3 documents for the case of Maldives, the teaching of English was not necessarily involved in the activities of the sovereign, depending on the degree of involvement in the administration of the territories. That is, when the role of the sovereign restricted itself to foreign affairs, no English-speaking personnel was required to administer the inner/internal affairs.

From the description of the different PPSMTs, it would now be tempting to assume a cline of L1 English-speaking populations as well as a correlating cline of current uses and statuses of English in the independent states. Seemingly, protectorates would range closer to colonies, protected states closer to expanding circle countries, and mandates as well as trust territories in-between.

Table 4.1 in the Appendix provides a list of those PPSMTs that were controlled by inner circle countries. It reveals that English plays a significant role in almost all of these nations today. Whilst it is not an official language in large numbers of the former protectorates, others have retained it in this function after independence (e.g., Uganda). At the same time, English plays a huge role as an MOI in many of these countries, although this varies as regards the onset of its use as MOI, ranging from primary school (for example Maldives) to tertiary education (for example Egypt).

These uses set the post-protectorates (and similar states) apart from those countries that Kachru (1985) had identified as typical expanding circle countries, e.g., Germany, Turkey, Japan or China, in terms of the scope of *intranational* uses of English. Although English is making inroads in the education sector of these countries, too (particularly in the Scandinavian countries (Bolton and Meierkord 2013) and in the Netherlands (Edwards 2016), most courses are still offered in the local official language. Also, for the vast majority of the populations of these countries, English has not attained the status of a L2, but it remains a FL.

However, what also emerges from Table 4.1 is a very heterogeneous picture across the diverse former PPSMTs as regards the current status and use of English. The differences seem largely dependent on whether there is another transnationally relevant language (a super-central language in the sense of de Swaan 2002, 2010) spoken in the country that is deemed capable of fulfilling the same roles as English, particularly in serving as the official language and MOI at the various levels of education. Thus, countries which are dominantly Muslim and where Arabic is known, have chosen not to have English as MOI except for individual courses at tertiary level,

as in Egypt or Iraq. Similarly, territories that are now part of China do not have English as OL or MOI, given the Chinese government's language policy. Tibet is a case in point. Those countries that maintained English as the official language after independence frequently use at least one of the indigenous languages as co-official, as in Tanzania or the Cook Islands. On the other hand, several countries have chosen to rely almost entirely on English for official purposes and in the education sector. Obviously, the proposed cline does not result in a correlating cline of current uses of English. In fact, available studies paint a rather kaleidoscopic picture.

3.2 Former PPSMTs in World Englishes Research

Research on former PPSMTs under inner circle control is scarce in comparison to that on typical postcolonial nations such as India, Philippines or Singapore, but has been growing recently.

Countries in the Arab world have received some attention: Schaub (2000) describes the sociolinguistics and history of English in Egypt as well as attitudes towards English. More recently, Abouelhassan and Meyer (2016) discuss the history of English and uses of English in Egypt schools. Hamdan and Abu Hatab (2009) focus on the status of English in Jordan, as reflected in job advertisements, finding that English proficiency has become a crucial requirement in the job market. Both Mustafa (1995), and Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2001) explain uses of English in Jordan's universities, and Alomoush (2019) describes how English is used on shopping bags in the country. Dashti (2015) investigates the role and status of English in Kuwait, whilst Fussell (2011) covers the Gulf states as a whole and briefly reports on their history and socio-political context as well as some features. Randall and Samimi (2010) explain the status of English in Dubai (also see Siemund et al., this volume).

African countries have also received attention: Kamwangamalu (1996) analyzes siSwati-English bilingualism, including a brief sketch of the sociolinguistics of eSwatini. Arua (1998) describes selected syntactic features of Swazi English, and Kamwangamalu and Chisanga (1996) discuss the form and function of English in the country. The very short paper by Richmond (1989) provides a list of Gambian expressions but no account of the history or sociolinguistics of English in the country. Kamwendo (2003) offers a very brief discussion of the use of English in Malawi. Stell (2014) is on uses and functions of English in Namibia, which has also received considerable attention by Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2014), and Schröder and Kautzsch (2016). Both Ochieng (2015), and Mohr and Ochieng (2017) discuss the status of English in Tanzania, the latter with a focus on education. Tripathi (1990) offers a brief description of the features of English in Zambia, i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. McGinley (1987) provides a brief account of the status of English in Zimbabwe, which, however, is now outdated. Bernstein (1994) discusses the functions of English and English-Shona diglossia in the country, and Mlambo (2009) describes uses and some features of English. Schmied (1996) covers English in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi, pointing out the colonial histories, post-independence language policies and individual features of English in the three countries.

Research has furthermore covered the Pacific Islands: Pine and Savage (1989) explain the history and recent issues of English as an MOI in the Marshall Islands, and Buchstaller and Wilson (2018) discuss the sociolinguistics of Marshallese English and provide a first sketch of its features. They also find that use of English at home correlates with a high level of education. Watson-Gegeo (1987) juxtaposes the histories and present-day uses of Pijin and English in the Solomon Islands. Jourdan (1989) points out the Pijin-English situation and holds that adults who “come to Honiara seeking unskilled labor jobs for which the knowledge of Pijin but not of English is important” (1989: 29), indicating that, at the grassroots, Pijin was the target language at the time of her writing. Völkel’s (2016) comparison of Tongan and English kinship terminology includes a brief description of the sociolinguistics of the island state of Tonga. Biewer (2015) includes descriptions of Samoan English and Cook Islands English.

A large amount of research has been devoted to the Asian state of Brunei: Cane (1994) includes an account of the present-day uses of English in the sultanate of Brunei Darussalam’s education system post-independence up until 1994, and Deterding and Sharbawi (2012) is a monograph focusing on English in Brunei. In 2016, *World Englishes* published a special issue on English in Brunei Darussalam. In this issue, Coluzzi (2016) finds a strong presence of English in street signs, particularly in bottom-up signage, and discusses this against the sociolinguistics of Brunei.

Crucially, the picture that emerges is that former PPSMTs are highly heterogeneous, both in terms of their histories of English usage as well as in their present-day uses of English. Sections 3.3 and 3.4 illustrate this heterogeneity with research that has been conducted for Uganda and Maldives.

3.3 English in Uganda

Uganda is a landlocked country in East Africa, bordering South Sudan to the North, Tanzania and Rwanda to the South, Kenya to the East, and the Democratic Republic of Congo to the West. Similar to many other East African areas, it became a sphere of British interest at a comparatively late stage in the history of British colonial expansion. In 1858, British explorers arrived in the area, with the aim of discovering the source of the Nile. Following a visit to King Mutesa I of Buganda in 1875, British missionaries established churches and educational facilities in 1876, and traders soon followed. In 1888, the Imperial British East Africa Company was established to trade with the area but also to administer and develop it. Following a period of civil war caused by conflicting religious interests and territorial claims, the British declared a protectorate over the kingdom of Buganda in 1894.

When the British protectorate was formally effected for the whole of what is now Uganda, in 1990, the language policy promoted the use of Kiswahili throughout East Africa from 1926 (see Ssempuuma 2019: 37 ff. for details) and it was used, together with Luganda and other Ugandan languages, in the lower administrative echelons, particularly in the army and police force. English was the language used at higher administrative levels, in the legislation and higher courts and from 1926 “promoted as a unifying language in East Africa” (Ssentanda 2016: 97). However, the amount of

British administrative personnel up until WWII was very low, amounting to only 521 members of staff in 1939 (see Meierkord 2016 for more details). Also generally, the European population during the times of the protectorate remained low, amounting to only 2,282 at the end of 1938. It was outnumbered by Asian immigrants who arrived initially on indentured labor contracts and later voluntarily, from 1896 onwards (see Meierkord 2016; Rathore-Nigsch and Schreier 2016).

Education was entirely mission based until 1920, but when trained personnel was in demand after WWI, governmental schools and later also colleges were established. It was particularly in the prestigious boarding schools where the offspring of an elite part of the society were taught English modelled on the British system, with a very strong exonormative orientation towards British English. The Baganda as well as missionaries demanded the teaching of English such as to bring Ugandans to a position that would allow them to acquire modern Western knowledge and skills. After WWII, the British abandoned the promotion of Kiswahili and promoted the spread of English instead, investing hugely in the education sector (see Meierkord 2021). Nevertheless, only few Ugandans could speak English at independence, and even ten years after, only 21 percent of the population were able to hold a conversation in English (Ladefoged et al. 1972: 25). Nevertheless, Uganda enshrined English as its sole official language in the constitution, resulting also in its being the sole MOI under the Obote government in 1967. At this time, British expatriates were still involved in the education system, and the numbers of Europeans had increased considerably, to 11,200 in 1962, when Uganda gained her independence. However, when Idi Amin overthrew Obote in 1971, he quickly dispelled the Asian community from the country in 1972, which caused most other nationals to leave Uganda, too. Following his rule, a period of political unrest discouraged British as well as other L1 English speaking individuals from entering the country, let alone getting involved in the education system, until political stability was regained in the 1990s. Since English was upheld as a MOI, teaching was then through L2 speaker teachers, which must have paved the way for nativization to proceed quickly in the country.

Since 2005, English has been co-official with Kiswahili, as per the constitution. However, English has remained the sole *de facto* official language, since an enabling law is required to effect the constitutional change, but this has not been passed so far. As regards the education sector, teaching is in the L1 until year 4, after which a transition to English is meant to take place in year 5, after which English then becomes the sole MOI. English is also the sole medium of communication in Uganda's parliament, although, as Namyalo et al. (2016) and Nakayiza (2016) explain, the local languages are used at lower levels of government.

English further serves as a lingua franca for most of the country's elite, for example at conferences and workshops. Ssempuuma (2019: 47) furthermore explains that in larger supermarkets, such as Shoprite, English is the dominant language for interactions, particularly since many tourists and expatriates do their shopping there, as well as Uganda's elite. Additionally, English is increasingly used in the previously Luganda-dominated music and entertainment industry. The elite also favor English-medium schools, given their high mobility and the likelihood of them having to move their family to another part of the multilingual country, where their offspring would not be able to follow instruction in the local language (cf., Ssempuuma 2019: 45).

Whilst uses of English in Uganda clearly have their roots in the history of the country as a former protectorate and in the practices of missionary education, the situation is considerably different in Maldives.

3.4 English in Maldives

Despite having been a protectorate from earlier than Uganda, Maldives' history as a British protectorate did not involve any English L1 speakers until 1941. Maldives is an islands state located in the Indian Ocean, south of India. It consists of 1,192 islands which form 26 natural atolls and 21 administrative units.

The language spoken by Maldivians is Dhivehi (see Gnanadesikan 2017 for a concise description of this language), and the nation used to be largely monolingual until the twentieth century, despite the fact that it became a British protectorate in 1887. Before that it had been a British protected area since 1796, following a brutal rule of the Portuguese from 1558 to 1573 and subsequently having been a Dutch protectorate. Britain took a very low-key approach to the Maldives, offering protection in terms of foreign affairs. However, this was administered from what at the time was Ceylon (today Sri Lanka), and no personnel was posted to Maldives. As a result, English speakers did not contribute to the linguistic ecology of the country.

Since Britain did not interfere with the internal affairs (with the exception of giving consent to the throne of the sultan) of Maldives and English was not used as a language of administration, there was no need to raise a group of Maldivians who would be able to serve as clerks in the administration.

The situation changed during WWII, when the British established a military base for the Royal Navy and the Royal Air Force in the southern atoll of Gan in 1941 and 1942. Here, around 600 permanent British personnel interacted regularly with approximately 900 Maldivian and 100 Pakistani members of staff who came from the neighboring islands (The Guardian, 1975). As Masters (2009: 164) explains, the Maldivians in the atoll "spoke good English and had experience working for Westerners." However, this was a regionally restricted phenomenon, which obviously had no impact on the other atolls.

The eventual spread of English resulted from a decision taken in 1960 by the then Prime Minister to introduce a modern state-run education system, modelled on Western systems and with English as the sole MOI. Traditionally, education had been through Madrasahs and included teaching of literacy in Divehi, reading the Qur'an and arithmancy. Initially introduced in the capital island Malé, the education reform eventually resulted in a national curriculum in 1984. Almost simultaneously, in 1961, schools in Malé made English the MOI. It took four decades, but by the end of the 1990s all schools throughout Maldives had completed the transition to English as the MOI (UNESCO-IBE, 2012). It is currently introduced at pre-primary level, in a playful way, to prepare children for primary school where English is the MOI for all subjects except Divehi, Qur'an and Islam. Given this policy, English is learned by individuals of all social backgrounds (cf., Meierkord 2018). Given the fact that almost all Maldivian children attend school, which is free at primary and secondary levels, they attain a good command of English, and the younger generations are those with highest

proficiency levels. However, “English is spoken widely at rudimentary level, a tribute to the tourist boom in the last decade and local schooling” (Yadav 2014: 104).

Today, Maldives is home to numerous languages, resulting from the high amount of work migration into Maldives, particularly since the advent of tourism in the country in 1972, and English serves as the lingua franca for a now multilingual society. The 2014 census reports 15.83 percent foreigners among the resident population, most of which originate from Bangladesh, India and Sri Lanka. However, the fact that tourism is the country’s main economic sector has resulted in a vast number of languages being spoken by staff on the resort islands and, of course, by tourists.

Besides exposure to English via formal instruction, informal acquisition is also taking place via the Internet. Maldives has high speed Internet offered through Dhiraagu and Ooredoo telecommunication systems, which is used by 370,000 Maldivians, that is by 81.9 percent of the population. English is widely used for email communication and text messages and on social media, and “code-mixing between English and Divehi has become increasingly evident, especially among the younger generation” (Mohamed 2013: 188).

As this section has revealed, uses of English in Uganda and Maldives, despite the differences in their histories, were initially restricted to the elites of both countries. However Isingoma (2021) as well as Meierkord (2018, 2020a and 2020b) show that, in both nations, English has spread to the grassroots. Such spread has taken place throughout the world, albeit to much varying extents in the individual countries (see Meierkord 2020a). It is therefore just as timely to also integrate the grassroots in theorizing world Englishes.

4. Integrating the Grassroots

4.1 English(es) at the Grassroots and Grassroots Englishes

The grassroots of societies have only recently become a focus of attention. The online *Oxford English Dictionary* records its first use in a figurative sense in 1899, when, in the U.S., it referred to “[o]rdinary people considered as the foundation or main body of an organization, industry, etc., or of society more generally.” With reference to uses of English, the term has been used in two different meanings.

Khubchandani and Hosali (1999: 254) use the term *grassroots English* with reference to mixed codes used “among those who spontaneously acquire certain rudimentary characteristics of the language in plurilingual settings (and not through formal education)” in such a way that they “are in a position to handle rudimentary tasks in English” (1999: 255). In their paper, this refers to Hinglish and Tamlish, two mixed codes, in which speakers mix English with Hindi and Tamil, respectively. The emphasis on informal acquisition and limited proficiency is also at the center of Schneider’s (2016: 3) narrower definition of *grassroots Englishes*. To him, these have typically been learned “in direct interactions rather than through formal education” by individuals of poor backgrounds and with little or no access to formal education.

Somewhat different, Meierkord (2012) prefers to talk of *English(es) at the grassroots* to refer to uses of English that take place outside the contexts of international organizations, education, academia, and the business world, adopting Blommaert's (2008: 7) use of the term for "a wide variety of 'non-elite' forms." A more concise discussion of the term is offered in Meierkord 2020a and 2020b. Crucially, her use of *English(es) at the grassroots* implies that acquisition may be through formal or informal routes, or a combination of both. Furthermore, the Englishes used at the grassroots may be standardized and reflect a range of proficiency levels, and their uses may go much beyond just rudimentary tasks.

What all discussions of the grassroots in relation to the spread of English have in common is the emphasis on a "non-elite", i.e., members of the lower classes of societies. To these, English has spread in different ways, typically depending on whether acquisition was via formal instruction (and whether this was or is available to the masses, cf., Meierkord 2021) or through interaction with L1 speakers of English. Typically, outer circle countries are former British colonies, either trade or exploitation colonies, as distinguished by Mufwene (2001). Exploitation colonies served the purpose of being exploited for their natural resources. As knowledge of English was not necessary for the majority of the colonized people, it was taught only to a local elite. However, Schneider (2011: 46) argues that, at the grassroots, less educated colonial personnel, such as soldiers and traders and farmers used nonstandard forms of English in regular contact with indigenous speakers of similar lower ranks. In trade colonies, contact between the traders and the local population was typically sporadic only, due to the non-permanent nature of these colonies. As Mufwene explains, in the West African coastal regions such interaction was restricted during the times of the slave trade, and resulted in the formation of pidginized varieties of English. Whilst individual locals from these areas were trained as interpreters in Europe and became an ESL-speaking middle class (cf., Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 17–18), the majority acquired English in the form of a jargon, pidgin or a basilectal form, with a large gap existing between these two poles (cf., Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 36).

More recently, typically after independence, acquisition of English in the outer circle countries has often been through the education system, too, particularly when English serves as the MOI. As Table 4.1, discussed in Section 4.1, shows, however, the spread of English via its use as MOI does not take place in all former PPSMTs of the inner circle. Also, as Meierkord (2020b, 2021) documents, quality English-medium education is not accessible to all citizens in all of these nations.

By stark contrast, in most expanding circle countries, English was normally acquired in schools, (see Meierkord 2020a for details), initially by the offspring of traders and in private schools, later by the masses, when it gradually became part of the curricula of public schools. Informal acquisition in most of these countries has been a recent phenomenon, following increased migration and access to English via the Internet.

4.2 Research on English at the Grassroots

Studies of grassroots uses of English are generally scarce (for an account of existing studies see Meierkord 2020a; Meierkord and Schneider 2021b), and studies investigating lower classes in former protectorates and similar areas are very few and far between.

For the case of Oman, Buckingham (2015: 414) explains that non-Arabic speaking expatriates use commercial signage in English, to “address the South Asian community in Oman, even when the products advertised cater specifically, or even exclusively, for the needs of this community.” Southeast Asian migrant workers are mainly from the Philippines, and South Asian workers originate from India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. As a result, English “has emerged as one of the principal [...] *lingua francas* between multilingual speakers in the region” (2015: 411) and is used also “in low-skilled sectors such as small-scale street retailers and manual workers” (2015: 411). Schaub (2000) finds that in Egypt “[e]ven the poorest of street merchants or juice sellers stand to greatly increase profits, and sometimes prices, if they are able to communicate with the affluent visitors who themselves primarily use English for all transactions in Egypt.” She uses the term “tourist English” to refer to uses of formulaic phrases by “street hustlers”, which have also been described by Stevens (1994), who examines pragmatic failure in the use of formulaic phrases used between Egyptian street hustlers and international tourists and foreign residents in Egypt. Akhidenor (2013) describes code-switching between Chinese traders and their customers in Botswana.

Meierkord and Schneider (2021a) provide a first collection of empirical studies into behaviours at the grassroots. Contributions to their volume that concern themselves with former PPSMTs are the following: Mohr (2021) discusses trajectories of English acquisition by young Zanzibaris who work in the tourism industry. Meierkord (2021) compares grassroots users of English from Uganda and South Africa, with a focus on the impact that access to formal instruction in English has on the resulting forms of English used by individuals. Bamidele-Akhidenor (2021) investigates interactions that take place at Manama Souq in Bahrain, between the local Arab traders and their international customers, discussing how strategies of intercultural communication and negotiation are employed to ensure successful communication. Chowdhury and Erling’s (2021) study is located in the Middle east and centers around the question of whether proficiency in English is a factor that positively constrains the influence of Bangladeshi’s economic migration.

4.3 The Grassroots in Uganda

As explained above, English serves as the main MOI in Uganda and becomes the sole MOI from year 6 (the pre-final year of primary school in Uganda). As a result, Ugandans who have completed the lower secondary level after eleven years in school can be held to have obtained a stable, intermediate level of English (Namyalo et al. 2016: 23). However, many Ugandans do not reach this stage. Whilst education has been free at primary level from 1997 and at secondary level from 2007, many children drop out of the education system, despite primary education being compulsory. This is typically due to the fact that children are required to assist their parents with agricultural work, to help care for their younger siblings while their parents are at work, or because they need to work themselves to add to the family income or because their parents have passed away. As a result, only 35.5 percent of

Ugandan primary school attendants stay on to the last grade of primary education in 2016.⁵

At the same time, the amount of money that Uganda can invest in the education sector is low. In 2017, Uganda had a GDP of \$1,868 per capita and spend 2.64 percent of its GDP on education. As a result, high dropout rates in Uganda combine with a comparatively under-resourced education system with large classrooms and lowly trained teachers in many rural areas (see Ssentanda 2016), and there exists a huge urban-rural divide (cf., Meierkord 2020b for details).

Nevertheless, uses of English as a *lingua franca* within the country can also be observed at grassroots level. As Ssempuuma (2019: 46) explains, English serves as such “especially in urban areas among Ugandans and between Ugandans and foreigners” in the homes, residential areas, and at the work place for trade and business transactions. In Uganda, interethnic marriages between individuals speaking non-mutually intelligible L1s, e.g., Luganda and Acholi, are common, and English is then chosen as a neutral language between the spouses. Similarly, particularly the capital Kampala is home to vast numbers of work migrants from all parts of Uganda, resulting in multiethnic and multilingual residential areas, which further fuels the use of English as a *lingua franca*. In the field of trade and business, the recent influx of returnee Indian and new Chinese traders and business people creates further transactions that take place across Englishes at the grassroots. As Ssempuuma (2019: 47) reports, he “observed that in shops owned by Indians in Kampala, the shop proprietors who are Indians use English to communicate to the shop attendants who were Baganda. The shop attendants then communicated in Luganda to the customers who could not express themselves in the English language.”

Another area where English serves as a *lingua franca* is that of tourism, which typically affects the rural areas where Uganda’s national parks are located. Schneider (2016) explains that tourism is a field where interactions between grassroots speakers of English and tourists are frequent, and Uganda is no exception. Whilst the staff at most hotels and tour operators (e.g., drivers and guides) can probably be better described as belonging to Uganda’s middle class, there are many shop owners and artisans selling their produce to tourists, using English in the process (albeit often restricted to some formulaic phrases only).

4.4 The Grassroots in Maldives

As in Uganda, English in Maldives is used as a MOI. Different from what is the case in Uganda, however, English is acquired by children of all social backgrounds through its use as the almost sole MOI from the first grade of primary school onwards. Education in Maldives is free and compulsory throughout primary and secondary education, which means that all young Maldivians will be constantly exposed to English for the twelve years of their education. Typically, more than 90 percent of all students stay on to the last grade of primary school (see Meierkord 2020b). By contrast with Uganda, Maldives is much more affluent and is in a position to invest considerably in its education system. In 2016, the country had a GDP of \$16,688 per capita and

spent 4.07 percent of its GDP to support the education sector. There is however, as Meierkord (2020b) explains, an urban rural divide, which in Maldives is a divide between the capital island of Malé and the more remote atolls. Tertiary education is available in Malé and a few other islands, meaning that students from most islands will need to migrate, making further access to English available only for those who can afford this.

However, most young Maldivians continue to encounter English at work, as it has emerged as “a second working language” widely used in the government (Yadav 2014: 79), but also in most commercial businesses and, overwhelmingly, in the tourism industry. The use of English in the various sectors has, unfortunately, not been adequately researched so that precise figures for its use at grassroots level are not available. However, since “there is a dearth of qualified Maldivians to fill technical, middle and senior management positions in the tourism sector” (May 2016: 7) and since large numbers of Bangladeshi, Indian and Sri Lankan staff are employed in the construction sector as well as in fishing, trade, and transport, it is highly likely that English serves as a lingua franca across workers in these sectors. In the tourism sector, English is typically used by staff on the various resort islands (islands which have no local, Maldivian, populations but are essentially hotels), including restaurant staff, room attendants and cleaning personnel. From 2009, when the local inhabited islands were opened to tourism, English has also increasingly been used by Maldivians as well as migrant workers establishing and operating hotels, guest houses, excursion companies and dive schools on such islands. Similarly, many inhabitants of these islands now manage food stalls or small cafés where they interact with tourists of diverse L1 backgrounds, whilst artisans sell their handicrafts (see Meierkord 2018 for details).

5. Conclusion: Former PPSMTs, the Grassroots and Models of World English(es)

Over the decades, research investigating and comparing international varieties of English has proposed a number of models to conceptualize what Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008), following McArthur (2003), call the English language complex. Integrating former PPSMTs as well as uses of English at the grassroots is, I argue, likely to make a valuable contribution to this enterprise, towards modelling the full English language complex such as to comprehensively account for the similarities and differences between the contexts in which English is employed.

5.1 Recent Modelling of World Englishes and its Limitations

Whilst Sridhar and Sridhar (1986) argued for an integrated approach to English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) more than 30 years ago, the two have typically been treated separately. Recently, research (e.g., the papers in Mukherjee and Hundt 2011; Edwards and Laporte 2015; Gilquin 2015) has

found that “[a]n integrated and comprehensive approach to non-native Englishes is particularly relevant to the future agenda of English linguistics because today the English language is used to a much larger extent as a non-native language (ESL/EFL) than a native language (ENL)” (Hundt and Mukherjee 2011: 2). Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2017: 113) propose to do so by extending Schneider’s Dynamic Model such as to describe Englishes in both postcolonial and non-postcolonial areas in a model of Extra- and Intra-territorial Forces, in which “the group of extra-territorial forces includes any factor entering the country from the outside and intra-territorial forces are such that mainly operate on a local, that is, national or regional, level and therefore influence the cultural and linguistic development from within” and include colonization and attitudes to it, language policies and attitudes, globalization and its acceptance, foreign policies and socio-demographic background. Together with its further refinement in Buschfeld et al. (2018), the model assumes that, like postcolonial Englishes, non-postcolonial Englishes go through stages of foundation, stabilization and nativization. However, there is a need to assess to what extent nativization in different types of former PPSMTs is reshaped when uses of English are predominantly non-intranational but international IaEs, involving ever-changing speakers of various varieties of English, and typically not leading to stable linguistic patterns (see Meierkord 2012: 158–94).

5.2 Former PPSMTs and Models of World Englishes

While Buschfeld et al. (2018) combine postcolonial and non-postcolonial contexts in one model, they do so maintaining the ESL-EFL and the outer circle-expanding circle dichotomies. This, however, ignores that there is an in-between (see Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 9) and that there might exist a cline between ESL and EFL contexts, with post-protectorates being one point on it, which may be home to a further type of varioversals (Szemrecsanyi and Kortmann 2009). At yet another point seem to be those nations that have made English their official language and MOI but have no history of English usage (through colonial personnel, settlers, etc.). Models of world Englishes do not yet cater well for these contexts, in which uses and users of English differ as a result of education systems, socio-economic and demographic factors (cf., Meierkord 2018, 2020b and 2021), and where there is often a previous history of another exogenous language (e.g., Afrikaans in Namibia (cf., Buschfeld and Kautzsch 2014, Schröder and Kautzsch 2016). Here the acquisition of English frequently implies processes of third language acquisition (cf., the papers in Cenoz et al. 2001 and Aronin and Hufeisen 2009), and complex interactions of the previously acquired languages with the English acquisition process (e.g., Siemund et al. 2018).

Furthermore, whilst speakers of English in all contexts are increasingly of various socio-economic backgrounds, models of English as well as the corpus data underlying them have typically been based on what has been labelled the “educated” speaker. However, fully assessing the status of English and describing the forms in which it is used requires looking beyond the (upper) middle class “elite” of societies, at the “grassroots”.

5.3 The “Grassroots” in Models of World Englishes

There is a growing awareness of the need to integrate the grassroots in models of world Englishes (e.g., Mair 2018). However, as a consequence of the paucity of descriptive research addressed above, “non-educated” forms of English have typically been excluded as pointed out in the Introduction. However, there is clear evidence that “elite” and “grassroots” uses of English do in fact differ, as shown by, e.g., Darvin (2017) on Filipino immigrants in Vancouver, Toefy (2017) on pronunciation differences in speakers of Colored South African English, Myrick (2014) as regards rhoticity in speakers of English on the Caribbean island of Saba, and Ofori and Albakry (2012) on attitudes towards English in Ghana. Finally, a comparison of Mesthrie (2010) and Meierkord (2012) reveals that in fact “grassroots” speakers accommodate differently to the accents of others than “elite” speakers. These differences do not only need to be acknowledged and described but also integrated into theories and models. The integration of Englishes at the “grassroots” offers a lot of potential for English Linguistics, particularly for its variationist and its World Englishes branches, to catch up and draw level with recent advances in sociolinguistics. As Saraceni (2015: 6) explains, it is particularly those developments associated with the sociolinguistics of the “grassroots” which World Englishes does not integrate at the same speed as other fields.

Against the above concerns and based on the research available on former PPSMTs and on the grassroots, I propose a research agenda to describe these Englishes and to integrate them into current theorizing. This includes, but is not limited to:

- (Comparative) studies into the present-day sociolinguistics and the histories of English in former PPSMTs of inner circle countries.
- Rigorous data collection and, based on these, (comparative) studies of the structural and pragmatic features of English spoken in these former PPSMTs, as well as attitudinal studies.
- Descriptions of those factors (political, economic, social and developmental) that, besides a history of English teaching and/or informal acquisition, determine access to and use of English at all levels of society.
- Based on the above, a cogent discussion of whether and how English in former PPSMTs ranges on a cline between typical postcolonial and expanding circle contexts.
- At a more applied level, this raises the question as to which factors contribute towards inclusion or marginalization of members of societies through English, either as a gatekeeper or as a link language.

Clearly, all of the above are best approached in collaboration with local researchers residing in the individual countries, as proposed earlier by Bolton, Graddol and Meierkord (2011).

Appendix 1

Table 4.1 Uses of English in Former Protectorates, Protected States, League of Nations (LoN) Mandates and United Nations (UN) Trust Territories under Inner Circle Countries' Rule

Current State name	Protectorate etc. name	Type, e.g. protectorate	Status of English today
Africa			
Botswana	Bechuanaland Protectorate 1885–1966	British protectorate	OL, MOI from grade 5
eSwatini	Swaziland 1902–1968	British protectorate	OL with Swazi, MOI from grade 5
Gambia	Gambia Protectorate 1894–1965	British protectorate	OL, MOI from grade 4
Malawi	Nyasaland Protectorate 1893–1964	British protectorate	OL, sole MOI
Mozambique	no history of British involvement; former Portuguese colony	Commonwealth member since 1995	no OL, no MOI
Namibia	Walvis Bay 1878–1884; South West Africa 1915–1990	British protectorate LoN Mandate 1915–1966, direct South African administration until 1978, full independence of entire territory in 1994	OL, MOI from grade 4
Rwanda	no history of inner circle rule	Commonwealth member since 2009	OL with Kinyarwanda, Kiswahili and French, MOI since 2008
Somalia	British Somaliland, 1884–1960	British protectorate	no OL, MOI from secondary
Sudan	Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1899–1956	British protectorate	OL
Tanzania	Tanganyika Territory, 1922–1946 Trust Territory of Tanganyika, 1946–1964	British LoN Mandate for East Africa, UN trust territory	OL (with Kiswahili), MOI from primary onwards
	Sultanate of Zanzibar, 1890–1963	British protectorate	
Uganda	Uganda Protectorate, 1894–1962	British protectorate	OL, MOI from grade 5
Zambia, declared independent	Barotseland, 1900–1964	British protectorate	OL, MOI from grade 5
Zimbabwe	Northern Rhodesia, 1924–1964	British protectorate	OL with 15 others, MOI from grade 8
Arab world			
Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, UAE States (Abu Dhabi, Ajman, Dubai, Ras Al Khaimah, Muscat and Oman)	British Residency of the Persian Gulf (various, but generally 1822–1971)	British protested states	no OL but MOI in tertiary education in Bahrain, most Universities in Kuwait,

Current State name	Protectorate etc. name	Type, e.g. protectorate	Status of English today
Egypt	Khedivate of Egypt 1882–1914	British occupation with no legal basis but <i>de facto</i> protectorate	
	Sultanate of Egypt, 1914–1922	British protectorate	no OL, MOI in some schools and at tertiary level in dentistry, engineering, medicine
	Kingdom of Egypt 1922–1956	British protectorate	
Iraq	Mandatory Iraq, 1922–1932	mandate not enacted, but Anglo-Iraqi Treaty	no OL, MOI for medicine and engineering
Jordan	Emirate of Transjordan, 1921–1946	British LoN mandate	no OL, MOI in some schools and universities
South Yemen	Aden Protectorate, 1872–1963	British protectorate	no OL, MOI in tertiary in technical, natural sciences and medicine
Asia			
Afghanistan	Emirate of Afghanistan, 1879–1919	British protected state	no OL, MOI at tertiary level
Brunei	Brunei 1888–1984	British protected state	no OL, main MOI in secondary and tertiary level
Kingdom of Bhutan	Bhutan 1910–1949	British protected state	no OL, MOI
Maldives	Maldiv Islands, 1796–1886	British protected area	no OL, MOI from grade 1
	Maldiv Islands, 1887–1965	British protectorate	
Nepal	Kingdom of Nepal, 1816–1923	British protected state	no OL, MOI in many private schools, no MOI in most public schools
Tibet (Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China)	Kingdom of Tibet, 1904–1910; 1912–1921	British protected state	no OL, no MOI
Caribbean / Central America			
Nicaragua & Honduras	Mosquito Coast, 1655–1787 & 1844–1860	British protectorate	OL with Spanish, Miskito and five other languages in Nicaragua; no OL in Honduras; MOI
Pacific			
Cook Islands	Cook Islands, 1888–1902	British protectorate	OL with Cook Islands Maori, MOI in upper secondary and tertiary
Republic of Kiribati / Tuvalu	Gilbert and Ellice Islands, 1892–1916	British protectorate	OL with Kiribati, main MOI; Tuvalu: OL with Tuvaluan; MOI from year 4

Republic of the Marshall Islands	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	UN trust territory (US)	OL with Marshallese, MOI from grade six
Federated States of Micronesia	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	UN trust territory (US)	OL
Nauru	Nauru; Trust Territory of Nauru	1914 captured by Australian troops, British control until 1920; LoN mandate from 1923 (Australia-UK-NZ), UN trust territory after liberation from Japanese occupation in WWII (Australia-UK-NZ) from 1947	OL with Nauruan; MOI
Niue	Niue, 1900–1901	British protectorate	OL with Niuean
Republic of Palau	Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	UN trust territory (US)	OL with Palauan, MOI with Palauan
Papua New Guinea	Territory of New Guinea Territory of Papua 1884–1888	1884 British protectorate; 1888 British annexation, 1902 transfer to Commonwealth of Australia, 1906 as “Territory of Papua” with Australian administration; British LoN mandate 1920; 1946 UN mandate under Australia	OL with Tok Pisin & Hiri Motu; MOI from year 3
Samoa	Western Samoa; Trust Territory of Western Samoa (NZ)	mandate; 1947 UN trust territory	OL with Samoan, MOI from year 5 primary
Solomon Islands	British Solomon Islands, 1893–1978	British protectorate	OL
Tokelau	Tokelau, 1877–1916	British protectorate	OL with Tokelauan, MOI with Tokelauan
Tonga	Tonga, 1900–1970	British protected state	OL with Tongan, MOI from grade 7

Notes

- 1 The notion of the “educated speaker” was established by Quirk (1972), Kachru (1976) and Strevens (1977).
- 2 For the remainder of this chapter, I use the acronym PPSMTs to refer to protectorates, protected states, mandates and trust territories together.
- 3 The model does not cater for interactions that involve L1 speakers of English. Such interactions have been shown to crucially differ from those among L2 and FL speakers (Knapp 2002; House 2003).
- 4 Exeptions do exist. For example, in the case of Egypt, Britain unilaterally declared a protectorate that lasted from 1914 to 1922.

- 5 Data have been taken from UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2019a and 2019b <http://uis.unesco.org/en/country/mv> and uis.unesco.org/en/country/ug

References

- Abouelhassan, R. S. M. and L. M. Meyer (2016), "Economy, modernity, Islam, and English in Egypt," *World Englishes*, 35 (1): 147–59.
- Akhidenor, A. (2013), "Code-switching in the conversations of the Chinese trading community in Africa: the case of Botswana," *English Today*, 29 (4): 30–6.
- Alomoush, O. I. S. (2019), "Is English on mobile landscape resources no longer viewed as a linguistic threat to Arabic in Jordan? Exploring functions of English on printed shopping bags in Jordan," *English Today*, First View. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078419000282>
- Aronin, L. and B. Hufeisen, eds. (2009), *The Exploration of Multilingualism. Development of Research on L3, Multilingualism and Multiple Language Acquisition*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arua, A. E. (1998), "Some syntactic features of Swazi English," *World Englishes*, 17 (2): 139–51.
- Bamidele-Akhidenor, A. (2021), "Facets of intercultural communication employed in the conversations of local Arab traders in Bahrain," in C. Meierkord and E. W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 143–64, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bernstein, J. (1994), "English and Shona in Zimbabwe," *World Englishes*, 13 (3): 411–18.
- Biewer, C. (2015), *South Pacific Englishes. A Sociolinguistic and Morphosyntactic Profile of Fiji English, Samoan English and Cook Islands English*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Blommaert, J. (2008), *Grassroots Literacy. Writing, Identity and Voice in Central Africa*, London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2010), *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolton, K, D. Graddol and C. Meierkord (2011), "Towards Developmental World Englishes," *World Englishes*, 30 (4): 459–80.
- Bolton, K. and C. Meierkord (2013), "English in contemporary Sweden: perceptions, policies, and narrated practices," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17 (1): 93–117.
- Buchstaller, I. and N. D. Wilson (2018), "Marshallese English: a first sketch," *World Englishes*, 37 (2): 356–83.
- Buckingham, L. (2015), "Commercial signage and the linguistic landscape of Oman," *World Englishes*, 34 (3): 411–35.
- Buschfeld, S. and A. Kautzsch (2014), "English in Namibia: A first approach," *English World-Wide*, 35 (2): 121–60.
- Buschfeld, S. and A. Kautzsch (2017), "Towards an integrated approach to postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes," *World Englishes*, 36 (1): 104–26.
- Buschfeld, S., A. Kautzsch and E. W. Schneider (2018), "From colonial dynamism to current transnationalism. A unified view of postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes," in C. Deshors (ed.), *Modeling World Englishes: Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, 15–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cane, G. (1994), "The English language in Brunei Darussalam," *World Englishes*, 13 (3): 351–60.

- Cenoz, J., B. Hufeisen and U. Jessner, eds. (2001), *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition. Psycholinguistic Perspectives*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Chowdhury, Q.H. and E.J. Erling (2021). "The value of grassroots English for Bangladeshi migrants to the Middle East," in C. Meierkord and E.W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 165–85, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Coluzzi, P. (2016), "The linguistic landscape of Brunei," *World Englishes*, 35 (4): 497–508.
- Darvin, R. (2017), "Social class and the inequality of English speakers in a globalized world," *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 6 (2): 287–311.
- Dashti, A. (2015), "The role and status of the English language in Kuwait: How is English used as an additional language in the Middle East?," *English Today*, 31 (3): 28–33.
- Deshors, S. D., ed. (2018), *Modeling World Englishes. Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- de Swaan, A. (2002), *The World Language System: A Political Sociology and Political Economy of Language*, Cambridge: Polity.
- de Swaan, A. (2010), "Language systems," in N. Coupland (ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*, 56–76, Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Deterding, D. and S H. Sharbawi (2012), *English in Brunei: A new Variety in a Multilingual Society*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Edwards, A. (2016), *English in the Netherlands. Functions, Forms and Attitudes*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Edwards, A. and S. Laporte (2015), "Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes: The competing roles of norm orientation and proficiency levels," *English World-Wide*, 36 (2): 135–69.
- Firth, A. (1996), "The discursive accomplishment of normality: On "lingua Franca" English and Conversation Analysis," *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26 (2): 237–260.
- Fussell, B. (2011), "The local flavour of English in the Gulf: In a matter of fifty years, English has attained its own distinctive features in the Gulf," *English Today*, 27 (4): 26–32.
- Gilquin, G. (2015), "At the interface of contact linguistics and second language acquisition research: New Englishes and Learner Englishes compared," *English World-Wide*, 36 (1): 91–124.
- Gnanadesikan, A.E. (2017), *Dhivehi. The Language of the Maldives*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Gordon, R. (2013), "Mandates," *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law* (MPEPIL), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graddol, D. (1999), "The decline of the native speaker," *AILA Review*, 13: 57–68.
- Hamdan, J. M. and W. A. Abu Hatab (2009), "English in the Jordanian Context," *World Englishes*, 28 (3): 394–405.
- House, J. (2003), "English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism?" *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7: 556–78.
- Hundt, M. and J. Mukherjee (2011), "Discussion forum. New English and Learner Englishes—quo vadis?," in J. Mukherjee and M. Hundt (eds.), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes*, 209–18, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Isingoma, B. (2021), "The sociolinguistic profile of English at the grassroots level: A comparison of Northern and Western Uganda," in C. Meierkord and E. W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 49–69, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jourdan, C. (1989), "Nativization and anglicization in Solomon Islands Pijin," *World Englishes*, 8 (1): 25–35.

- Kachru, B. B. (1976), "Indian English: A sociolinguistic profile of a transplanted language," *Studies in Language Learning*, 1 (2): 139–89.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). "Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle," in R. Quirk and H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, 11–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and The British Council.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (1996), "Sociolinguistic aspects of siSwati-English bilingualism," *World Englishes*, 15 (3): 295–305.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. and T. Chisanga, (1996), "English in Swaziland: Form and function," in V. De Klerk (ed.), *Focus on South Africa*, 285–300. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kamwendo, G. (2003), "Is Malawi guilty of spoiling the Queen's language?," *English Today*, 19 (2): 30–33.
- Khubchandani, L. M. and P. Hosali (1999), "Grassroots English in a communication paradigm," *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 23 (3): 251–72.
- Khuwaileh, A. A. and A. Al-Shoumali (2001), "Private tuition in English: The case of two universities in Jordan," *English Today*, 17 (1): 31–5.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007), *World Englishes. Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knapp, K. (2002), "The fading out of the non-native speaker," in K. Knapp and C. Meierkord (eds.), *Lingua Franca Communication*, 217–44. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Ladefoged, P., R. Glick and C. Cripser (1972), *Language in Uganda*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2009), "English as an Islamic language: A case study of Pakistani English," *World Englishes*, 28 (2): 175–89.
- Mair, C. (2018), "Stabilising domains of English-language use in Germany. Global English in a non-colonial languagescape," in S. Dehors (ed.), *Modeling World Englishes. Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*, 45–75, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Masters, T. (2009), *Maldives*, London: Lonely Planet.
- May, J. F. (2016), *Maldives' Population Dynamics: Policy Prospects for Human Growth and Opportunity*, Malé: United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) Maldives Country office and National Bureau of Statistics Maldives.
- McArthur, T. (2003), "World English, Euro English, Nordic English?," *English Today*, 19 (1): 54–8.
- McGinley, K. (1987), "The future of English in Zimbabwe," *World Englishes*, 6 (2): 159–64.
- Meierkord, C. (1996), *Englisch als Medium der interkulturellen Kommunikation*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Meierkord, C. (2012), *Interactions across Englishes. Linguistic Choices in Local and International Contact Situations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meierkord, C. (2016), "A social history of English(es) in Uganda," in C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma and S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*, 51–71, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Meierkord, C. (2018), "English in paradise: The Maldives," *English Today*, 34 (1): 2–11.
- Meierkord, C. (2020a), "The spread of English at the grassroots," in D. Schreier, M. Hundt and E. W. Schneider (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of World Englishes*, 311–38, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meierkord, C. (2020b), "Spread of English at the grassroots? Sociolinguistic evidence from two post-protectorates: Maldives and Uganda," in A. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, London: Routledge

- Meierkord, C. (2021), "Access to English and the Englishes of the disadvantaged: Examples from Uganda and South Africa," in C. Meierkord and E.W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 91–114, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meierkord, C. and E. W. Schneider, eds. (2021a), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Meierkord, C. and E. W. Schneider (2021b), "Introduction: English spreading at the grassroots," in C. Meierkord and E.W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 1–22. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Melnyk, A. Y. (2013), "United Nations trusteeship system," *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law [MPEPIL]*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mesthrie, R. and R. M. Bhatt (2008), *World Englishes: The Study of New Varieties*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, R. (2010), "Socio-phonetics and social change: Deracialisation of the GOOSE vowel in South African English," *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 14 (1): 3–33.
- Mlambo, M. (2009), "A survey of the language situation in Zimbabwe," *English Today*, 25 (2): 18–24.
- Mohamed, N. (2013), "The challenge of medium of instruction: a view from Maldivian schools," *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 14: 185–203.
- Mohr, S. (2021), "English language learning trajectories among Zanzibaris working in tourism," in C. Meierkord and E.W. Schneider (eds.), *World Englishes at the Grassroots*, 70–90, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mohr, S. and D. Ochieng (2017), "Language usage in everyday life and in education. Current attitudes towards English in Tanzania: English is still preferred as medium of instruction in Tanzania despite frequent usage of Kiswahili in everyday life," *English Today*, 33 (4): 12–18.
- Mufwene, S. (2001), *The Ecology of Language Evolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mukherjee, J. and M. Hundt, eds. (2011), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mustafa, Z. (1995), "Using Arabic and English in science lectures," *English Today*, 11 (4): 37–43.
- Myrick, C. (2014), "Putting Saban English in the map. A descriptive analysis of English language variation on Saba," *English World-Wide*, 35 (2): 161–92.
- Nakayiza, J. (2016), "The sociolinguistic situation of English in Uganda: A case of language attitudes and beliefs," in C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma and S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalizing Post-Protectorate*, 75–94, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Namyalo, S., B. Isingoma and C. Meierkord (2016), "Towards assessing the space of English in Uganda's linguistic ecology: Facts and issues," in C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma and S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalizing Post-Protectorate*, 19–49, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ochieng, D. (2015), "The revival of the status of English in Tanzania: What future does the status of the English language have in Tanzania?," *English Today*, 31 (2): 25–31.
- Ofori, D. M. and M. Albakry (2012), "I own this language that everybody speaks. Ghanaians' attitude toward the English language," *English World-Wide*, 33 (2): 165–84.
- Pine, P. and W. Savage (1989), "Marshallese and English: Evidence for an immersion model of education in the Republic of the Marshall Islands," *World Englishes*, 8 (1): 83–94.
- Quirk, R. (1972), *Linguistic Bonds across the Atlantic. The English Languages and Images of Matter*, London: Oxford University Press.

- Randall, M. and M. A. Samimi (2010), "The status of English in Dubai," *English Today*, 26 (1): 43–50.
- Rathore-Nigsch, C. and D. Schreier (2016), "Indian English in Uganda: The historical sociolinguistics of a migrant community," in C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma and S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-Protectorate*, 251–74, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richmond, E. B. (1989), "African English expressions in The Gambia," *World Englishes*, 8 (2): 223–8.
- Saraceni, M. (2015), *World Englishes. A Critical Analysis*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Schaub, M. (2000), "English in the Arab Republic of Egypt," *World Englishes*, 19 (2): 225–38.
- Schmied, J. (1996), "English in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi," in V. De Klerk (ed.), *Focus on South Africa*, 301–21, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schneider, E. W. (2007), *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2011), *English Around the World. An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, E. W. (2016), "Grassroots Englishes in tourism interactions," *English Today*, 32 (3): 2–10.
- Schröder, A. and A. Kautzsch (2016), "English in multilingual and multiethnic Namibia: Some evidence on language attitudes and on the pronunciation of vowels," in C. Ehland, I. Mindt and M. Tönnies (eds.), *Anglistentag 2015 Paderborn. Proceedings*, 277–88. Trier: WVT.
- Siemund, P., S. Schröter and S. Rahbari (2018), "Learning English demonstrative pronouns on bilingual substrate: Evidence from German heritage speakers of Russian, Turkish, and Vietnamese," in A. Bonnet and P. Siemund (eds.), *Foreign Language Education in Multilingual Classrooms*, 381–405, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sridhar, K.K. and S.N. Sridhar (1986), "Bridging the paradigm gap: Second language acquisition theory and indigenized varieties of English," *World Englishes*, 5 (1): 3–14.
- Sempuuma, J. (2019), *Morphological and Syntactic Feature Analysis of Ugandan English. Influence from Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango*, Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Ssentanda, M. (2016), "Tensions between English medium schools and mother tongue education in rural Ugandan primary schools. An ethnographic investigation," in C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma and S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalizing Post-protectorate*, 95–117, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stell, G. (2014), "Uses and functions of English in Namibia's multiethnic settings," *World Englishes*, 33 (2): 223–41.
- Stevens, P. B. (1994), "The pragmatics of street hustlers' English in Egypt," *World Englishes*, 13 (1): 61–73.
- Strevens, P. (1977), *New Orientations in the Teaching of English*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szemeccsanyi, B. and B. Kortmann (2009), "Vernacular universals and angloversals in a typological perspective," in M. Filppula, J. Klemola and H. Paulasto (eds.), *Vernacular Universals and Language Contact. Evidence from Varieties of English and Beyond*, 33–53. London: Routledge.
- Toefy, T. (2017), Revisiting the KIT-split in Coloured South African English. *English World-Wide*, 38 (3): 336–63.

- Trilsch, M. (2011), "Protectorates and protected states," *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law (MPEPIL)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tripathi, P.D. (1990), "English in Zambia," *English Today*, 6 (3): 34–8.
- UNESCO-IBE (2012), *World Data on Education: Seventh edition 2010–11*, Geneva, Switzerland: UNESCO International Bureau of Education.
- Völkel, S. (2016), "Tongan-English language contact and kinship terminology," *World Englishes*, 35 (2): 242–58.
- Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1987), "English in the Solomon Islands," *World Englishes*, 6 (1): 21–32.
- Yadav, R. (2014), *Tourism in Asia: A Study of Maldives*, New Delhi: G.B. Books.