Chapter 5

World Englishes, multilingualism and written questionnaires

The traditional WQ methods are limited in two respects. First, many WQ studies are at least implicitly based on a monolingual speaker model. This is a reflection of the traditional focus of dialect geography on what Chambers and Trudgill (1998) called NORMs, the non-mobile, older, rural, male speakers, who were taken to represent the oldest accessible speech forms in an area. This bias is of course reflected in WQ methodology. The Survey of Canadian English (SCE), discussed in Chapter 2, is a prime example of such monolingual focus in the Canadian WQ context. SCE, for instance, ruled out its 1347 responses from “respondents born outside of Canada” (Scargill and Warkentyne 1972: 49); they were not just set aside for separate analysis, but not reported in any of the publications, which suggests their purging from the data pool. As SCE’s goal was to capture the English typical of the ten Canadian provinces, it failed so by permitting, de facto, only monolingual speakers who were raised in Canada. The target group was therefore defined as the speech of native speakers of Canadian English, who are defined as those who grew up with CanE (Chambers 1998c: 252; Boberg 2010: 107). As a result, SCE is limited in its representation of the Canadian populace, which has been a highly heterogeneous group since the country’s inception. Equally importantly, however, SCE cannot speak at all to potentially important language and dialect contact scenarios that may have contributed to the newly developing variety in a young nation.

As a consequence of the pervasive monolingual focus, WQs have generally not been designed to model language and language-contact scenarios effectively, if they included such elements at all. When multilingual speakers were polled, the status of their multilingualism was usually not systematically surveyed. There are exceptions, of course. The Dialect Topography of Canada innovated the “Language Use Index” (Section 8.2.2), but primarily so to assess the respondents’ frequency of use of English; respondents’ other languages have been a relatively minor concern and have been employed as an *explanandum* only concerning Canada’s second official language, French. For instance, the language transfer scenarios from Quebec French to Quebec English, e.g. *sofa* (the French term, not *couch*) or *different from* (in analogy to *différent de*) represent only one aspect of language change through contact.
The central question of the present chapter is whether and how a method developed for and predominantly applied in researchers' local, usually native linguistic settings such as Canada, the USA, Scotland (for English), German-speaking Switzerland (for German) or The Netherlands (for Dutch), can be adapted for use in diverse transnational contexts. One issue to be reckoned with are situations of language and dialect contact that traditional WQs in social dialectology have not been applied to. With such scenarios, the identification of linguistic variables and their variants will be more difficult, especially if WQs are aimed for use in multiple locations to allow for comparisons (as will be discussed in Section 5.3.2), as the researchers will not always be in a position to have first-hand local information for some settings they wish to collect data from.

This chapter first explores the foundations of the traditional WQ method and its implicit monolingual speaker target. For the sake of consistency, Canadian English shall again serve as the example and test case (Section 5.1). The historical expansion from monolingual to more multilingual dimensions will be tackled from three perspectives. First, by exploring practical adaptations of existing WQ formats - some "quick fixes", so to speak, that may work in some settings. Second, by incorporating a much broader reorientation of sociolinguistics in the more recent contexts of linguistic 'super-diversity' and globalization. And third, by querying the notion of "space", which has been central to WQs on a big scale since Wenker, from the background of a theory of space. These reconceptualizations draw from recent work on Global Englishes and Lingua Franca approaches, problematize the implications of surveying speakers of highly diverse backgrounds who populate and create super-diverse settings and conceptualize geographical and social spaces alike. These speakers routinely participate in acts of mobility and construct their linguistic meanings in particular situational contexts by drawing on all (partial) linguistic competencies available to them. Geographical space is turned into social space and is perceived as yet another kind of space. Recent theories suggest that these types of speakers and spaces will be the new normal in a globalizing world and are therefore of immediate relevance to WQs.

The chapter presents Kachru's basic circle model of English (Section 5.2) as a terminological point of long-standing. The model, offering a rough categorization of WEs into three spheres, provides useful concepts and terminology that are used to introduce and explore features specific or perhaps typical for New Englishes. Section 5.3 serves as a springboard for a discussion for the search of linguistic variables that are amenable to WQs and some of the problems such extensions generate. It introduces an international WQ project (Krug, Hilbert & Fabri forthc.), which is innovative and at the same time reveals some of the problems of adapting traditional WQs in more and more diverse settings (Section 5.3.1) and spaces (Section 5.3.2).
Since WQs in English have predominantly been employed in Inner Circle countries (countries where L1 speakers of English are the majority), morphosyntactic and lexical features of the Outer Circle (Englishes in former colonies where native speakers were the minority) that seem pollable with WQs will be addressed. Considerable focus will be given in this part of the chapter to English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Section 5.4), which are Englishes [sic] used for communication among non-native speakers, an area that is presently one of the most dynamic ones in the field. The section includes a brief introduction of attitudes towards ELF, for which data has been successfully collected with WQs. Following Bangbode’s (1998) criteria on the distinction between errors and innovations, the claim is made that WQs may be the best tool for clarifying questions about variant use, dissemination and acceptance, which are key in many newer varieties. The section is concluded with a rudimentary set of principles for the identification of variables and variants in contact scenarios, such as WE and ELF contexts, that may assist with this important task more generally.

An addendum is offered in Section 5.5, where “expert WQs”, a type of WQ that has been used extensively in WEs, are briefly discussed. Expert WQs are of a very different nature than those generally used in sociolinguistics, but they are included here for their prominent status in accounts of WEs. They represent the problem of detailed data versus comparable data that was addressed in earlier chapters. As some aspects of this chapter will be exploratory, not all questions pertaining to these topics can be answered. The discussion will hopefully facilitate further examination of the nature of data transfer and data exploitation beyond the traditional WQ domain. Section 5.6 concludes with a concise summary and some relevant points for the future.

5.1 Canadian English and the multilingual speaker

The monolingual focus on CanE is of course a reflection of former research trends in the greater field. For example, a closer look at the data behind Dialect Topography, a project that expressly aimed towards representative sampling (Chambers 1994: 36), suggests that the notion of representativeness did not fully capture the linguistic make-up of the region in question. In the entire Greater Toronto database (Golden Horseshoe 1991/2) of 1015 respondents, 209 are listed as speaking a language other than English. While this is a good percentage, the sample is in its multilingual dimension not representative of the region. For instance, it includes as the most frequent “additional language” group 57 speakers of Dutch, followed by 39 Italian, 20 German, 4 Hindi/Urdu, 3 Chinese speakers and no Punjabi speakers. The Toronto census data (population of 5 million, in 2006), though, shows that Chinese comprises the largest non-English linguistic group in the city with more than 400,000 speakers, followed by 185,000 Italian speakers, 132,000 Punjabi and 132,000 Hindi/Urdu speakers. By
contrast, Dutch is only spoken by 11,000 Torontonians. It is clear from these data that the focus of this project's sampling effort, while aiming at representation in terms of age and gender, was not intended to reflect the multilingual make-up of Canada's largest city. Similar cases can be made for other projects.

In spite of this disparity, it needs to be stressed that the Dialect Topography project, while comprising a sociolinguistically representative sample to a considerable degree, is not representative of the multilingual fabric of Canada's regions. The underlying target seems to have been the two official language groups of (usually) monolingual English speakers and French speakers in areas where they reach considerable proportions.

Put differently, the focus appears to have slighted English speakers with more recent immigration histories, many of whom are second language speakers (L2) of English. This fact is not meant as a critique of one project, but as a bias in the approaches to language in geographical and social space. The systematic inclusion of L2 speakers requires a different theoretical conceptualization of language in space, a globalization of sociolinguistics that is only now becoming available and puts mobility at its centre. First, however, less extreme approaches towards including L2 speakers in the survey populations will be discussed.

5.1.1 From monolingual to multilingual perspectives

Staying within the Canadian context, one can see a cline of development from very strict inclusion criteria for respondent selection to a gradual widening of scope to include all long-term residents of a survey location. Polson's (1969) Questionnaire for British Columbia applied overly exclusive selection criteria for respondents, which are summarized below:

1. Respondents "must have been born" in the area - "or at the very least they must have come to the area at a very early age".
2. Residence in the area for "most of their lives with very few absences".
3. "Their parents must not have spoken any language but English in the home".
4. Their parents "should, if possible, have been long-time residents of the area".
5. Intelligent and knowledgeable, no difficulties reading.
6. No education beyond high-school.
7. Knowledge of farming, ranching and the outdoors "would be useful".
8. Willingness to participate.

The monolingual focus of Polson's questionnaire and all Survey of BC respondents becomes evident from restrictions #1, #2 and #3. The local character is reflected in #4, while the more traditional focus is also seen in restrictions in terms of education (presumably to avoid distortions through educated usage) and a focus on rural terminology (#6).

\[ \text{Table 5.1.1: Changes in Exclusion Criteria for Second Language Speakers} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Born &amp; Raised in BC</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Respondents &quot;must have been born&quot; in the area - &quot;or at the very least they must have come to the area at a very early age&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Residence in the area for &quot;most of their lives with very few absences&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&quot;Their parents must not have spoken any language but English in the home&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Their parents &quot;should, if possible, have been long-time residents of the area&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Intelligent and knowledgeable, no difficulties reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No education beyond high-school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Knowledge of farming, ranching and the outdoors &quot;would be useful&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Willingness to participate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table illustrates how the exclusion criteria shift from right- to left-hand-side of the table, moving from origin to destination.

The survey was revised in subsequent years to reflect these changes.
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Polson's criteria seem peculiar and overly limiting from today's perspective. His respondents share the most important characteristics with NORMs, the non-mobile, older, rural and male speakers of traditional dialect geography and their non-mobility. The criterion of de facto monolingualism (#3) kept the group artificially homogeneous. Combined with the exclusion of any multilingual component, the respondent selection criteria seems revealing of the implicit assumptions of what kinds of language were worthy of study.

From this background, Chambers and Heisler's (1999) "Regionality Index" (RI), conceived for the Dialect Topography project, must be perceived as utterly innovative. The index represents the departure from a focus on monolingual and geographically static speakers to a more inclusive and more representative data sampling. The RI is an index value assigned to every respondent that quantifies and represents his or her strength of local ties. Respondents are placed on a scale from 1 (very local) to 7 (recent migrant) based on birthplace, place of residence between ages 8-18, and parents' birthplaces. Section 8.2.1 explains the details of the arithmetic, but at this point it shall suffice to say that the Regionality Index is heavily weighted towards the local population. Respondents with scores from 1-5 have all grown up in the target region, while only the scores of 6 and 7 are used to classify those who did not.

The RI was a step forward that allowed the inclusion of some aspects of multilingualism. Compared with Polson, who categorically ruled out the multilingual, even the bilingual speaker, the RI is a big achievement. However, a score of 7 is a class that covers an excessively wide range of respondents and is more of a catch-all for all those who migrated to the target region after age 18. Consider the two cases in Table 5.1, which would be treated identical with the RI:

| Table 5.1 Calculating the Regionality Index: Two fictional examples from Toronto |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Born in Montreal                                  | Born in Germany                  |
| Raised in Fredericton ages 8-18                  | Raised in Germany ages 8-18      |
| One parent born in Poland, one in France         | Parents born in Russia           |
| Base point:                                        | Base point:                      |
| Regionality Index:                                | Regionality Index:               |
| 2                                                 | 2                                |
| 2                                                 | 2                                |
| 2                                                 | 2                                |

The RI was not designed to distinguish between the respondents on the left and the right side of Table 5.1, who do not have anything in common. The respondent on the left is an anglophone with strong Canadian ties, while the one on the right migrated to Toronto only after age 18 from a German-language background.

The basic principle behind the RI would certainly allow for the inclusion of (more) recent immigrants to a target region. It is at this point where even more modern approaches, approaches that are more tolerant of migration and multilingualism, reveal...
the RI’s focus on the “native speaker”; RI was intended to distinguish between different kinds of native speakers, in this case CanE, as can be seen in statements such as the following: “We would like to know how close the ties have to be before a person ‘speaks like a native’ of a given target region (Chambers 2006: 180–1). As such, the RI is only a modest advance towards including the long-term and longer-term residents of a region. It is, however, not suitable at all to model transitory migrations, as we will see in the next section. As Table 5.1 shows: both respondents would have been ruled out as inadmissible for Toronto English only because they moved to the region after their 18th birthday.

In the context of CanE, and as far as a monolingual or an officially bilingual perspective (English-French) is concerned, the Regionality Index is useful. Some features have been shown to be primarily adopted by members of the very local population (e.g. Canadian Raising) and such index would reveal such differential. From the linguistically more diverse Canadian background and indeed a global background, however, the index makes sense in only a very limited way. To capture and model a more complete version of linguistic variation in a location, however, one needs to go beyond the Regionality Index, and Section 5.1.2 explores some alternative, yet still developing, approaches.

The project’s “Language Use Index” (LUI) is another index of interest (Chambers and Lapierre 2011). Based on questions of a respondent’s use of English in four settings (at home, at work, with one’s relatives and among friends) answers are generated on a scale offering the options always (3), often (2), seldom (1) or never (0). The added scores produce the LUI: the higher the index, the more a language other than English is used. The minimum is “0”, which is a monolingual English speaker; the maximum is 12, which would be a person who does not speak English in any of these four locations (which would be suspicious – after all, how could he/she fill out the questionnaire?). Anyone else is in between the two extremes. The LUI is relevant for an understanding of how a linguistic substrate, e.g. a home or heritage language, an additional L2 language, or a combination of which, can influence one’s reported use of English. It is even more meaningful if the information on the use of English can be paired with a person’s other languages.

In Section 8.2 both the Language Use Index and the Regionality Index will be explored further, where they will also be applied to real-world cases. At this point, it is important to know that traditional WQs offer some tools to model multilingual competencies, but that their tools only go some modest way towards a more realistic modeling of multilingual competencies. In the context of Canada’s big cities, in which non-mother tongue speakers of an official language (English or French) generally comprise percentages of about 20% – a percentage that is mirrored in other countries’ metropolises – more intricate and precise ways to model multilingualism would be in order. The example of Vancouver shows that people still can speak English, which may have been spoken before 1970: Not because there is a more homogenous Vancouver, but precisely to be expected.

This paper is integrated into a larger agenda, which is why the focus on the sociolinguistics of the oral tradition. For one is interested in a community of speakers as a factor. For a reason the speaker is not interested in the difficulty of exploring that:

1. An investigation of the language
2. An examination of the factors that influence the language
3. The use of the language
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The discursive construction of linguistic communities is not always straightforward. The relationship between different communities is not always binary—communities such as second-language communities are everyday life. As such, the RI to different communities is fluid. The lexicogrammatical constructions, as we will see, are not always clear-cut. It may have been ruled out on the basis of historical change or isolated region after region, or by new interactions

A consideration that may be of practical benefit to the non-bilingual person is that it may be possible to model a more dialectogenetic model. The focus is to go beyond the traditional model of a single, well-developing, language community.

Chambers et al. (2007) report on four settings of community, and the kind of language they generate on the basis of the community (2002). The added complexity of languages other than English and the number of settings for maximum is the challenge of community settings (four locations per setting). The challenge is to understand the interaction of the above-mentioned settings. The added complexity of community settings (four locations per setting) is the challenge of community settings. The challenge is to understand the interaction of settings. The added complexity of community settings (four locations per setting) is the challenge of community settings. The challenge is to understand the interaction of settings. The added complexity of community settings (four locations per setting) is the challenge of community settings. The challenge is to understand the interaction of settings.

Index will be determined. At this point, we cannot determine the extent of multilingual communities that are crucial to understanding the more realistic nature of communities, in which the language is generally considered to be the language of other countries' communities. The question would be in order. This is especially the case, to stick with the Canadian example. In Toronto and Vancouver, where 43.8% of the population (Toronto) and 41.5% of the population (Vancouver) do not speak English as their mother tongue (2006 data, Boberg 2010: 21, including French), which makes the systematic inclusion of L2 speakers an especially pressing issue. Some have begun to take this view using sociolinguistic interviews (e.g. Hoffman & Walker 2010; Nagy, Chociej & Hoffman 2014), while WQ projects in Vancouver have included a more focussed poll of L2 speakers, who comprise about half (46%) of a large Vancouver sample (Dollinger 2012a). In general, however, WQ methodology still waits to be explored more systematically in multilingual contexts.

The question might arise why multilingualism has not been more actively integrated into social dialectology. One answer lies in the disciplinary histories. If one considers, for instance, the development of dialect geography, as outlined in Chapter 1, the focus on long-established communities and languages with local ties seems quite logical. If one's primary goal is to establish lineages of historical development, as was the original intention of dialectology until well into the second half of the 20th century, one is bound to poll the most local and most narrowly confined speakers in any community, the NORMs. Mobility and effects of mobility, such as multilingualism, is clearly a factor that could "dilute" the desired data. In addition to this discipline-intrinsic reason, there may be purely practical ones. For instance, the focus on the monolingual speaker-respondent in established populations avoids questions that are theoretically difficult to address. Such questions, as shown in 1–3 below, have only recently been explored in the modelling of the Canadian multilingual experience:

1. At which point does an immigrant community become an ethnic group within the larger community?
2. At which point becomes a group of speakers a permanent part of the local social fabric? In the Central European context of labour migration that started in the 1960s, it took over 20 years for the first studies of migrant worker language surface (e.g. Clahsen, Meisel & Pienemann 1983), but much longer for a general acceptance of the 2nd and 3rd generation immigrant children into the societal mainstream, a process which is not yet completed. At which point would these former migrant speakers need to be included in a study of the main speech patterns in a given community?
3. To which extent, if at all, can one consider people who have emigrated from the same location or who speak the same minority language as forming a community (Walker & Hoffman 2013: 80)? In the wider macro-context that WQ studies usually provide, the question is a facet of the previous one: if one is polling the linguistic behaviour characteristic of location X, at which point would one wish and need to include more recent migrants?
As migrants make up large percentages of the population in many urban locations, their inclusion seems a logical next step. One might argue that the percentages do not even need to be as high as in the Canadian examples to include L2 speakers in representative social sampling, depending on the research question. A 10% threshold of L2 speakers in a community might be one reasonable approach to sampling if general statements on the linguistic variables in one location should be made.

5.1.2 From the national to the transnational: The sociolinguistics of globalization

As useful as these newer adaptations to traditional WQs discussed so far may be, migration and multilingualism are still treated as special events, and not as events and behaviours that are bound to become more and more frequent, a new norm in a globalizing world. While questions such as 1–3 above go some way towards capturing the linguistic realities, they still are based on assumptions of single-event migratory moves from one location to another, typically from an economically under-developed area to a better developed one, which has been the pattern in Canada and other countries. This perspective, however, overlooks the new realities of a transnational, life-time mobility that is emerging. For instance, when adolescents of Bengali background report on their multilingual modes of expression in a Stockholm low-income neighbourhood, they do so in multiple codes that may include Bengali, standard Swedish, vernacular Swedish and standard and vernacular English. Most importantly, while these adolescents may have spent most of their lives in Sweden, the do not always orient themselves within a local, Swedish framework, but more towards a global one.

This global frame of reference is the crucial difference between earlier migration waves and more recent ones that draw on affordable air travel and digital ways of communication. On the one hand, these youth grow up in a multilingual, multilingual context of super-diversity (see next section), where no single language is dominant in the neighbourhood: not a government-supported language, such as Swedish in this example, or any immigrant language. Faced with such diversity, the adolescents learn and employ partial linguistic competencies in a number of codes and construct identities that are decided mixed or transcultural. By communicating with friends from different ethnic backgrounds, with friends in digital forums, with friends and family both in diasporic contexts (e.g. London, UK, Australia, India, South Africa), they act linguistically differently from members of traditional immigrant neighbourhoods, whose linguistic settings were less diverse and whose pre-digital age communication options were rather limited. Through much of the 20th century, these traditional immigrant neighbourhoods tended to be dominated by a single ethnic group (e.g. Italians and Germans in Toronto, Cantonese in Vancouver, Turkish migrants in Vienna), with language ‘moving into the linguistic periphery’ (Walker 2020).

A new kind of multilingualism?

Some list the comparatively recent mobility as a ‘globalized’ phenomenon and language movement as a ‘significant fact’ (Fairclough 1999). But in that case, a new set of social and linguistic realities might be described as “truncated multilingualism” or “truncated multiculturality.”

In those cases, the fluid mobility of individuals and groups of codes across regions and over time might be influenced by a new system of acoustic, social, and the technological ‘armies’ of the map, as well as the digital map. The African diaspora, for example, might be seen as resulting from a set of complex processes involving mobility and movement, intercultural contact, and a variety of social and linguistic practices.
A new kind of sociolinguistics?
Some linguists have convincingly argued that current heightened scenarios of mobility and inter-connectedness on a global level demand new models of language and language use and new methodologies (Blommaert 2010; Pennycook 2010, 2007; Fairclough 2006; Calvet 2006). Blommaert (2010), for instance, has been arguing for a new sociolinguistics of mobility, which expressly acknowledges the changing social realities of linguistic use: with an increase of mobility one is confronted, primarily, with "truncated" linguistic repertoires and not, as is often assumed, full language competences. The basic premise of Blommaert's approach is that patterns of mobility, social mobility, economic mobility, refuge and forced mobility, produce mixing of linguistic codes and repertoires that can be referred to as "super-diversity". Such super-diversity might be found in immigrant neighbourhoods in European cities, where few L1 speakers of an otherwise dominant language are present, as discussed above, or as a result of armed conflict around the world (e.g. Rwanda, Darfur, or more recently in Syria and the Ukraine), or of new realities due to political changes, e.g. the fall of the Iron Curtain in the Eastern Bloc, the opportunities and challenges in post-Apartheid South Africa, or as a result of more positive changes, such as increased student mobility, resulting in more speakers of more diverse linguistic backgrounds getting to communicate with one another and creating their own communicative scenarios as they see fit.
Researchers on super-diversity often stress the fact that partial linguistic competences are the norm rather than the exception. While this is a truism, since no native speaker has ever had full control over any language in its entity, in the current accelerating stage of globalization, partial competences or “truncated repertoires” come to the fore. What was once described as a fairly static linguistic marketplace of symbolic capital and power (Bourdieu 1991) is being turned into a “messy” new marketplace with mobile resources, mobile speakers and mobile markets. The challenge now is to adequately model this much more diverse linguistic marketplace.

Just a few remarks shall be made to that effect here. Blommaert’s (2010) proposal to model the new situation rests on the notions of sociolinguistic scales, varying orders of indexicality and the polycentricity of linguistic power. With polycentricity, Blommaert aims to explain why in certain contexts a given range of linguistic features of some linguistic norms may occur but not in others. Understanding the indexicality of linguistic forms and processes is key in being understood in the desired way: the kind of register and linguistic acts and forms used to index the speaker as, e.g. a lawyer, asylum seeker, international scholar and the like. With sociolinguistic scales Blommaert refers to acts of communication that manifest themselves on individual and collective levels. He writes “when people or messages move, they move through a space that is filled with codes, norms and expectations” (2010: 32). These expectations most certainly clash in one way or another or may at least not be entirely congruent, which require negotiation skills of the interlocutor (Pennycook 2010 goes even one step further by making the interesting proposal that something like this negotiation-communication process should be the centre of linguistic study).

Scales are important since they help explain why immigrant neighbourhoods in European cities, for instance, no longer work like the traditional single-dominant-language neighbourhoods they once were, because of the influence of other scales (communicative events) that manifest themselves in a dazzlingly varied mix of communicative expectations and norms. Whether in Antwerp, Berlin, Copenhagen, London, Oslo or Vienna, language in urban neighbourhoods is interactively created by taking linguistic features from all language and language varieties available and creating a new “multilingual” code. This creation of multilingual lects, adaptations of the local vernacular, have been shown in a number of cities and are shared by youth from different ethnic backgrounds (e.g. Quist & Svendsen 2010; Hansen & Pharao 2010 in Copenhagen; Kostinas 1998 in Stockholm; Cheshire et al. 2011 in London; in Canada, no such claims have yet been made, see Hinrichs 2014 in Toronto). These speakers construct their linguistic identities in a “transnational frame of reference rather than an ethnationally one” (Haglund 2010: 102) and as such they construct their identities as multilingual, multivariational novel configurations, defying prevailing opinion within society, which generally sees multilingualism as a hindrance.
to integration into the mainstream society. The point is that integration is only one scenario, with the creation of transnational frames offering other options for identity formation.

**Local literary practices and WQs**

It should become obvious that global and multilingual streams are highly complex and that WQ designers cannot assume that the traditional linguistic (national) reference frame is uncontested in super-diverse contexts. One study that used WQs in such linguistically diverse area is the study of Wesbank High, the only high school in an underprivileged neighbourhood of Cape Town, South Africa (reported in Blommaert 2010:78–101). Distinguishing between the ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ of English practices, in which the core has access to standard varieties and the periphery does not, Blommaert explores the local writing practices in the school setting, where Afrikaans, Xhosa and varieties of English are used. In this context, students and teachers have constructed their own local form of English, a “grassroots literacy” corresponding with their limited access to standard models. The features include:

- Erratic use of capitals, e.g. “English. because it’s the oFFicial Language in South Africa”
- Inconsistent singular and plural markings
- Variability with verb inflection markings, esp. plural and tense markings
- A wide range of non-standard spellings, mostly a result of phonetic spelling, e.g. spesel ‘special’, dearist ‘dearest’, neve ‘never’ or perfekt ‘perfect’
- Aestheticized writing, e.g. ornamented letters, “while struggling with basic writing skills” (Blommaert 2010:84)

Grassroots literacy is ‘non-elite’ forms of writing, or writing “performed by people who are not fully inserted into elite economies of information, language and literacy” (Blommaert 2008:7). Such ‘sub-elite literacy’ and ‘skeleton writing competences’ have their roles in the local context and can loosely be interpreted as locally created norms. And while such forms are expressions of creativity on the local level and are “sociologically realistic form[s] of literacy in the sense that [they] mirror the marginalized status of the community in which they occur[]” (ibid. 90), they serve quite a different function beyond the immediate local context when they mark the writer as not fully literate or worse. On the local level, however, they are “a level of shared literacy culture in an otherwise extremely heterogeneous community” (ibid. 90).

Obviously, findings on writing systems, literacy styles and grassroots literacy are of immediate relevance to a survey tool relying on written input such as WQs. It is important to recognize the difference between levels of scales, such as the local and the non-local, and the social indexing that happens on each of these levels. The issue
of the language choice for WQ questions becomes an utterly sensitive topic and what may work in one setting (in Wesbank High the questions were presented both in Standard English and Standard Dutch), may not work at all in another complex. While in super-diverse settings, one or more forms of English are generally included, but they may not be part of the best language choices for a WQ. The limits of WQs that are administered from a distant location without intricate knowledge of the local situation would become clearly visible in attributes such as low response rates and samples biased towards a particular subgroup of the population. It is important to realize that while WQs may still be successfully employed, they would best be delivered as a component of a longer fieldwork and ethnographic experience, rather than as an online WQ distributed from afar.

5.2 World Englishes, Global Englishes: Concepts

The field of World Englishes20 is a highly productive enterprise today. With at least four academic journals, World Englishes, English World-Wide, English Today (more diverse in its readership) and, more recently, English as a Lingua Franca, it has infused a global perspective to a field that prior to the 1980s dealt predominantly with British or American perspectives. One aspect that is foregrounded in World Englishes is the role of L2 speakers. We have seen that L2 speakers have only comparatively recently entered the picture, having been given more attention in social dialectology only in the past few years. One of the goals of the present chapter is to address multilingualism and English in a broader, global perspective. For the study of World Englishes, WQs seem to be predestined to play an important role due to their time efficiency and cost effectiveness.

The term World Englishes, which is often used in the plural to reflect the diverse nature of its varieties, refers to forms of English around the globe. The field of World Englishes has grown rapidly. While barely existent in the early 1980s – Bailey and Gørlach’s (1982) and Platt et al’s (1984) collections are early key landmark publications, this area has produced a vast amount of research over the past two decades and must now be considered as one of the most prolific fields in English linguistics overall. While there are many models of World Englishes, one of the first and most influential ones is Kachru’s (1985) “circle model”.

20. Please note that for space constraints the terms World Englishes and Global Englishes are used interchangeably in this book, regardless of the recent discrimination between World Englishes, as focussed on geographically definable varieties, and Global Englishes, which foreground a transnational, lingua-franca perspective.

Illustration

The figure shows the transmission of English-spoken varieties throughout the English speaking world. The “norm-producers” are those who have formed in the UK and the US. The “norm-followers” are the rest of the world, including the colonies, or the US, and the US, and the former colonies, or the US, and the former colonies. The “innovators” are the developing, second, and third world Englishes. The area is growing fast.

Finally, the variability of English with English, a language that has been used as a foreign language in China, in the US, in Austria, in the UK, and in the Netherlands, while English as a second or foreign language is common throughout the world.
The Three Circle Model of English has been popular in the field and will be used throughout the remainder of this book. It was described by Braj Kachru in 1985 and is based on three concentric circles, as shown in Illustration 5.1.

Illustration 5.1 Visualization of Kachru's Three Circle Model

The model is composed of an **Inner Circle**, comprised of the countries where native English-speakers are the majority of speakers. These are the UK and the English settler colonies: USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand. These countries are the traditional “norm-providing” countries, as linguistic norms and standards have traditionally been formed in reference to the Englishes used in these locations, but above all the UK and the US. The number of English speakers in this group is stagnant.

The **Outer Circle** represents the countries that have had colonial ties to England or the USA (in case of the Philippines) and where settlers were the (often very small) minority. In these locations the native populations often adopted the use of English and developed its own forms, e.g. India, Pakistan, Philippines, Nigeria, Egypt and so forth. In this group, English was originally taught as a second language (not a foreign language) or ESL. These countries, to varying degrees, have been called norm-developing, as beginning to codify their own varieties of English, with India and the Philippines as the most advanced ones. The number of English speakers in this group is growing quickly.

Finally, the **Expanding Circle** is the rest of the world that has never had colonial ties with England or the US and where English has been taught or is increasingly taught as a foreign language (EFL). The use of English in these highly diverse locations, e.g. Austria, Nicaragua, Russia, or China, is generally confined to international contexts, while English typically has no intranational (internal) functions within these countries. Only comparatively recently did English gain a wider foothold in some of the social

---

21. South Africa is a more complex case due to its complex linguistic history, but is occasionally assigned to the Inner Circle.
and professional circles of these countries' societies, though to differing degrees and mostly within the younger generations, such as university courses taught in English to Austrians or business transactions carried out in English in Russia or China. In Expanding Circle countries, English is very limited in its scope and secondary to one or more vernacular languages. These countries have traditionally been called "norm-receiving", i.e. following Inner Circle models of English (usually UK or US English) in their Foreign Language teaching. The number of English speakers in this group is growing rapidly as well.

There are a number of traditional terms describing speaker competencies that relate to the circle model in interesting ways. The term English as a Native Language (ENL) is traditionally associated with the Inner Circle and is also called First Language (L1). English as a Second Language (ESL) is associated with the Outer Circle, where English has institutional backing, and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) with the Expanding Circle. The term Second Language (L2) cuts across ESL and EFL and is sometimes complemented with Third (L3) or Fourth Language (L4) and so on, though in most cases L2 is a cover term for all additional languages (Second and up). English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) is English used for communication among non-native speakers (L2 speakers) and cuts predominantly across the categories of the Outer and Expanding Circles, as both groups show characteristics of English language use that differs from traditional Inner Circle norms. ELF is also found, just like ESL, in the Inner Circle, though ELF and ESL/EFL differ in their target norms: while ESL and EFL have the native speaker norm as the learner target, ELF is defined differently as resulting from the communicative situations and norms created by non-native speakers.

5.3 WQ Elicitation in World English contexts

World Englishes have been studied with the traditional type of speaker questionnaire that was the basis for the discussion in Chapters 2–4. Two interesting approaches will be presented in this section. They differ from the previous studies presented in Chapter 4 in a number of methodological respects. The first is an application of WQs in vastly different contexts with the Bamberg Questionnaire Project (see Krug, Hilbert & Fabri forthcoming), which aims to collect information on linguistic features and their social correlations. The second application uses WQs to probe into speaker attitudes concerning various accents of speakers of English as a Lingua Franca (Jenkins 2007).

The Bamberg project is innovative in a number of ways. It uses a very detailed 15-page questionnaire that comes in four parts:

- a personality section
- an audit of the respon
- a lexical questionnaire
- a written discourse sample

The questionnaire was designed in originally in English, but subsequently in translation: Malta; the questionnaire was made up.

The application of this questionnaire is based on the method of the Inner Circle variety of given linguistic construct, with eliciting rather than accommodating from external design, in.

The design of the questionnaire is an outcome of data analysis and discourse interaction, whether eliciting "attitude" or "productivity" (Krug and Hilbert 2007). The questionnaire is organized in a way that the answer choices are clearly defined, as "[+] educated" or "[-] uneducated" of their linguistic.
The questionnaire has been administered to university and secondary school students in originally four locations for a research project on Romance-English language contact: Malta, the British Channel Islands, Gibraltar and Puerto Rico. As a benchmark, data was also collected in the UK and the USA, allowing for an alignment of each variable beyond these two quasi-standards of English. The questionnaire is different from the typical postal or written questionnaire in that it includes sections requiring assistance from an administrator. As sound clips need to be played, the questionnaire is used in an interview setting where respondents can ask questions (Krug & Sell 2013: 82). Administered in more than one day and about 80 minutes in length, the questionnaire is on the longer end of the spectrum. Krug and associates employ scaling methods that allow for gradual answer options. Judgements about the currency of a given linguistic feature are elicited on a six-point scale from "everyone = 5" using the construction to "no-one = 0", which makes the answers a type of community reporting rather than self-reports. A number of controls are built into the questionnaire to accommodate respondents' behaviour, including the respondent tendency to shy away from extreme poles, which will be discussed, along with other aspects of questionnaire design, in Chapter 7.

The data are limited to educated English, or the acrolect in each location, as a result of data collection in secondary and post-secondary settings. In the grammar and discourse marker sections the respondents are asked to provide community-reporting, whether each sentence could be said "in their home country in an informal conversation" or could be "written in their home country in an email to a former teacher". Krug and Sell (2013: 81) suggest that this framing helps to eliminate socially desired answers of stigmatized forms, e.g. if it was known that aluminum is coded for [- highly educated] or as [+ American], chances are that those who use that variant would not report aluminum but aluminium instead, if they wanted to be seen as [- American] or as [+ educated]. On the other side, the link between respondents' social categories and their linguistic answers is more indirect than if personal language were elicited, since

---

22. More recent collection rounds targeted Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, Ireland, Wales and Scotland (Krug; personal correspondence, March 2015), which expand the questionnaire's dissemination considerably.
exposure to forms is not necessarily a function of the social categories of the user, but a function of the extent and reach of their social networks.

The types of lexical and grammatical variables are shown below. For lexical choices, however, personal use is polled:

Table 5.2 Excerpt from the lexical part of the Bamberg Questionnaire (Krug & Sell 2013: 96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>I always use this expression</th>
<th>I use this expression more often</th>
<th>I have no preference</th>
<th>I use this expression more often</th>
<th>I always use this expression</th>
<th>I never use either expression</th>
<th>Explanation / Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a drop in the ocean</td>
<td>a drop in the bucket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a faucet</td>
<td>a tap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aluminum</td>
<td>aluminium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticlockwise</td>
<td>counterclockwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eggplant</td>
<td>aubergine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lexical part is aiming to place each variable between the (extreme) poles of American (on the left) and British English (on the right) and it is clear that, although clearly inadvertently and as a consequence of the condensed format of WQs, a binary opposition is constructed where there is not necessarily one. The grammatical part expressly seeks to elicit judgements of the currency of a construction in “emails to a former teacher”:

Table 5.3 Extract from grammatical section of Bamberg Questionnaire (Krug and Sell 2013: 98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Everyone</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Many</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>No-one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1. Over the last few years people have become less willing to do the manual work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2. I’m learning French because it’s a beautiful language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3. You’ve already met my father, no?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4. She came over and speak to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea is to see whether they are encouraged or constrained by the option of using a superstratum code that goes far beyond the traditional way of speaking, as Italian, which is the mother tongue, and in the provision of the data, we would set different reference points, otherwise. It seems that in a more general...
The idea is to get respondents to truthfully report the use of non-standard features, because they are not required to report on their own or their friends' use. Features such as article insertion (G1) or pronoun deletion (G2), question tags (G3) and non-agreement of verbal tense (G4) are presented to the respondents in order for them to report whether such constructions might occur in “emails to a teacher”. The strategy is aimed to counter the influence of prescriptive norms and socially acceptable behaviour. While it appears to be intuitive, one might wonder whether the educational settings of post-secondary and secondary school would not produce a high level of standard-like behaviour despite the instructions. Preliminary results seem to suggest, however, that this problem may be confined to the higher social strata (Krug: personal correspondence, March 2015). One problem seems to be that the hypothetical setting remains still vague, as the concrete communicative context is not specified: which teacher (the English teacher, the math teacher?) and which school form would possibly make a difference.

There are two points of critique that come to mind for the Bamberg questionnaire. Both are minor in the context of the project but can serve to illustrate potential problems with the use of one questionnaire in multiple locations, which is one of the biggest issues for WQ methodology in global contexts. The first concern the background sheet and the second involves the use of dichotomous UK/US prompts. The background questions are fairly standard in their make-up: age, gender, nationality, ethnic self-identification, country or region of identification, education and so forth, including the parents’. Residence history is completely polled, from birth to the time of polling, which offers a good background for geographical correlations, while questions on multilingualism and language use in the home are reported in four discrete categories (here for Malta):

English, mostly English – some Maltese, mostly Maltese – some English, Maltese

In addition, a text field for “other” languages and fields for the mother’s and father’s native language(s) are offered. The use of one type of questionnaire in multiple settings presents challenges for the proper documentation of linguistically important factors that go far beyond the immediate project. Language use, for instance, is a case in point, as Italian, which is used by almost two thirds of the Maltese population and is “the superstrate language of its earlier history and one of the media languages” (Markus 2007: 204) is not listed. While respondents would likely report additional languages in the provided fields, we are left wondering whether the listing of all major varieties would set different signs for multilingual speakers and produce more variation than otherwise. It seems that we see a problem of the polling of multilingual communities more generally.
The second issue concerns the linguistic stimulus of lexical items and is the result of highly complex semantic distinctions in World Englishes, including homonyms (see, e.g. Görlich 1995). The lexical section polls the self-reported use of lexical variables (Table 5.2). One such variable is *dummy* vs. *pacifier*. This variable shows three dominant variants including *soother*, as shown in Figure 5.1. The lack of a major variant such as *soother* likely triggers substantial answers in the category "I never use either expression", or worse, would produce erroneous data. Interestingly, *soother* does not produce such comments, which is the case for *sneakers/trainers*, where respondents use the Comment/Explanation field (Krug: personal correspondence, March 2015). As Figure 5.1 shows, *soother* is a frequent variety and more common in the UK than *dummy*, which is of relevance in the European English context.

![Graph showing frequency index of "soother" AND "baby" across six varieties](image1)

![Graph showing frequency index of "dummy" AND "baby" across six varieties](image2)

**Figure 5.1** *Soother* and *dummy* in six varieties (14 May 2014). Source: DCHP-2 (s.v. soother)
The principle of the case of *dummy vs. pacifier vs. soother*, or, if the preliminary results can be taken as established, rather the case of *sneakers vs. runners vs. trainers* in the Maltese context is a reminder that variables with more than two competing forms require special consideration. In the absence of detailed linguistic studies, the method of normalized, targeted internet searches used in the *Dictionary of Canadianisms* (DCHP-2) may help isolate the most relevant forms in some World English contexts (Dollinger 2011b, Dollinger 2015).

However, behind this issue lingers a more profound problem, as lexical questionnaires of the type shown in Table 5.2 depend on the supposition that all variants of a variable need to be consistent synonyms of each other. In a global context full or near semantic equivalence between forms is more unlikely than in more limited contexts. The basic point has been made by Görlach (1995), as he has drawn attention to the stylistic non-equivalence of variants in a case study of the use of *trash : rubbish : refuse : garbage : waste* and found that in Global Englishes these variants cannot be expected to be exclusive to individual parts of a country – as they often are in the older mother country. Rather, in speech communities composed of people of different origins, they are likely to be used side-by-side, as synonyms [...] or with various, often idiolectal, restrictions in style or compatibility. (Görlach 1994:267)

When one asks for *trash can vs. dustbin*, one would need to have a fairly good picture of the semantic field of *garbage and waste* in order for the results to be meaningful. There are also a number of noun compounds, such as *garbage can* or BrE-AmE hybrid compounds such as *garbage (AmE) bin* (BrE), the latter type figuring in CanE, that complicate the picture. In addition, when one considers Italian and Maltese loanwords for these terms, as processes of language mixing would likely occur in the Maltese setting, we see that WQs with binary of even multiple choice answers face their limitations.

These reflections show that there is no one-size-fits-all approach for WQs. There are at least two ways to consider WQs in international settings: either from a basic typological perspective or from a location-specific, profoundly local perspective. The former aims to use categories that are comparable across different locations (such as in the Bamberg project), the other tailors the categories as closely as possible to the language-specific situation in one location, or uses open response types, which is the preferred type in many WE settings. The typological approach results in a bird’s eye view that must make some compromises in terms of accuracy, as shown above, while the location-specific approach can fully develop the fine-grained and location-specific responses that are caught in the very tight-knit net of a tailor-made WQ.
5.3.1 Some problems of WQs in contact scenarios

There are also problems with the location-specific approach. The lexical examples above suggest that in multilingual settings open text fields would likely capture linguistic variation more accurately than closed-response items, though this design would increase the administrative burden considerably (see Section 9.3.3 on the classification of open answers). While open answers would be a practical way to document the multilingual and multidialectal base more fully and avoid too many answers that are either “do not use” or, worse, variant choices that respondents do not actually use, the respondent’s processing time of the WQ would be increased. As the example of dummy vs. pacifier has shown, the lack of the plausible third answer choice soother renders the results of this question too imprecise for non-typological approaches. This problem is compounded when in an increasingly mobile world, varying uses and meanings of terms are co-determined not just by region, which was the primary focus of traditional WQs, or classical sociolinguistic group characteristics, such as age, gender, social class or ethnicity – the categories of traditional sociolinguistics —, but are a reflection of heterogeneous populations that are socially highly diverse. Speakers who happen to live in one location may come from different parts of the globe and may communicate with one another with terms that refer to semantic fields that only partially overlap. Görlach’s conclusion on the semantic field of GARBAGE AND WASTE is a call for caution.

WQs would need to be designed with particular caution in order to gauge the inventory of linguistic variation in a given location. An array of questions relating to one semantic field might be needed in some cases and open answer questions would be the preferred format, barring the availability of detailed studies. In any case, for open answer questions a reduction of the number of questions, resulting in fewer variables, would have to be considered (see Section 7.2.1). While open answer questions yield more variants and more precise data, their format increases the response times by a great margin, as writing or typing an answer, perhaps a more complex answer than just a word, requires both more effort and more time of the respondents.

As these examples show, the WQ designer is once more confronted with the difficult choice between the comparability of data across locations and the reliability of the information, a problem that was first discussed in Section 3.1.1. This dichotomy will keep resurfacing in this book as we discuss WQ and question design. As a primarily typological and innovative approach, the Bamberg project, quite understandably, foregrounds the former. But there is a price to be paid for multiple, binary choice response formats that in most contexts reduce data reliability and the polled range of variation by a considerable margin.

We said earlier that the range of variation is likely increased in WE contexts. In Chapter 2, responses from traditional, Inner Circle contexts were discussed and modelled for lexical variants and Figure 2.1 introduced the concept of the A-curve. The
A-curve visualizes the Inner Circle fact that a very small number of variants, somewhere in the vicinity of 3 or 4 for many lexical variables, account for about 90% of all responses, while the remaining 10% are comprised of a dazzling array of lower frequency items. It is important to keep in mind that these data were gathered in the de facto largely monolingual setting of the Eastern USA in the mid-20th century. It is only to be expected, however, that in present-day multilingual, socially and geographically mobile communities, such as the ethnically diverse neighbourhoods of European cities discussed earlier in this chapter, the variant response patterns would look differently. As variation increases, the curve that best matches the responses in multilingual contexts would look flatter than in monolingual ones. In other words as variation increases, it would take more than 3 or 4 types to comprise 90% of all answer tokens, perhaps 6 or 8 and potentially many more. Figure 5.2 offers a hypothetical example and comparison (squares) with Kretzschmar’s attested A-curve from Chapter 2 (diamonds).

**Figure 5.2** Variant responses in traditional monolingual vs. hypothetical multilingual, super-diverse settings

Both curves in Figure 5.2 are based on the same number of overall responses, but their “long tails” were cut at 4 occurrences in order to highlight the important differences on the left-hand side, resulting in “flatter curves” that may, in some contexts, no longer be asymptotic hyperbolic curves, but perhaps merely bell curves, with a flatter y-axis dimension. Figure 5.2 suggests that the squared curve has five major variants and considerably strong sixth and seventh most frequent types rather than three major variants. Such scenarios, flatter A-curves, would be expected in mixed multilingual settings, where more speakers come from more diverse social and linguistic backgrounds. With this diversity, variation would increase and WQs would need to find ways to capture that variation. The proposal made here is to use more open response question types,
which would go some way, but other issues need to be addressed, such as variable identification as such, which will be addressed in the next sections. What follows will necessarily need to be adapted to super-diverse settings, which offers a most promising perspective on language and language as practice (e.g. Rampton et al., 2015).

5.3.2 Conceptualizing space in dialect geography

The notion of super-diversity puts a very profound problem of dialect geography into sharp relief: until very recently, the last decade or so, the concept of “space” has been left undefined in the field. It was all about finding the variants that were used in geographical space. If there was village A, the space of village A was left untheorized and the focus of dialect geographers, and many variationists alike, was to fill the “space” with the interesting linguistic variation inherent in that locale. Britain (2010a) offers a most informative account of the lack of theory about space and he suggests and identifies some interesting concepts about space that go beyond the obvious, and at first sight trivial, notion of space.

Landmark discoveries in this context include pioneering work by Trudgill (1974a) on a social dialect geography, integrating the social with the geographical dimensions. This was followed, with some delay, by Britain (1991), Chambers & Trudgill (1998 [1980]), among others, and showed that both social and geographical expressions of space co-determine linguistic variation. By taking a closer look at geographical transition zones between geographical isoglosses of linguistic forms, interesting socially conditioned variation could be discovered. As a result of this and relating work, space is understood today in at least three dimensions (Britain 2002, 2010a):

- **Geographical space** (Euclidean space): the distance between two points; this is the traditional variable in dialect geography
- **Social space**: geographical space is overlaid with social relations. As Britain (2010a:70) puts it:
  
  [our] settlement and manipulation of that space, our movement and interaction within it and the relationship between individual actors and the institutions of capital and the state which govern and shape our actions within space mean that it is socially produced.

- **Perceived space**: the imaginary creation of space, our beliefs about and perceptions of it

British (2002:604) calls all three levels of space taken together “spatiality”, which is described as “a key human geographic dimension”. Spatiality is thus not static, but a dynamic concept that is always in the making and it is this variable, not just Euclidean space, that co-determines language use: geographical space is only one component of it. Any element of language can be affected by social mechanisms.

WQ: with the rise of social networks and social media, it is probably a good time to rethink the way we define space. It is all too easy to reduce space to an abstract, a pseudo-spatial concept that will only be useful in a limited context, but has become too often used as an example in this literature. It is important to develop a more realistic and long-lasting view of space, which can offer insights into the social and spatial order.

There are also limitations and misapplications of the concepts that were introduced in this section, on the one hand, but also the need for a new way of thinking about space, a super-diversity framework. With this backdrop, it becomes clear that the discussion of different methodologies and approaches to the study of space and the way in which it is experienced and perceived requires a redefinition.
it. Any dialect geography today will need to consider spatiality in this way: space in its social manifestation and in combination with other social factors.

WQs in social dialectology, with their ease of distribution over wide geographical and social spaces, need to be especially sensitive to spatiality, which make them not just great tools for WE, but also, as shown before, potentially ripe with egregious errors. It is all too easy to treat space as a one-dimensional, apparently objective unit on a map, as a pseudo “default” setting. The danger exists that blanket mass-mailings of a given WQ will only treat space as a simple constant factor that is used to anchor responses. This has been the traditional dialect geographical approach and most findings discussed in this book are largely based on such static notion of space. Apart from the currently developing sociolinguistics of globalization, for which it is too soon to tell what its lasting parameters may be, perceptual dialectology is a notable exception that already offers insights into “perceived space”, subjective space, via its map-based approaches and rankings of correctness and pleasantness.

The integration of all three perspectives of spatiality in large-scale WQs, especially and most drastically perhaps in global contexts, poses theoretical and practical questions waiting to be addressed. The basic question would be how to integrate questions on the social uses of geographical space in existing WQs in an effective manner. Here, new methodologies and question types would need to be developed. Take, for instance, a super-diverse Viennese neighbourhood: what kinds of questions can reasonably be posed to a socially volatile, multilingual and multicultural teenager of a migratory background without giving her the impression that she is not “matching up” with some spoken and undefined standard that is most often presented in public and media discourse? It would take a highly knowledgeable and sensitive researcher who must approach linguistically and culturally super-diverse individuals on an equal footing. One can easily see that a mass-eailed WQ would stand little chance to be answered and, if it were, would likely not include the right kind of questions for that person’s social reality. With the breakdown of homogeneous communities, researchers are required to rethink elicitation strategies just as much as their questions – both social and linguistic.

5.3.3 Select morphosyntactic features of World Englishes

In the present context of demonstrating some linguistic feature that are, in principle, pollable with WQs, it seems a good idea to resort to tried-tested-and-true areas of World Englishes, which cannot yet be said of super-diverse settings. In this context, the Outer Circle countries take a leading role, as a massive body of linguistic studies is available today that may assist in variable identification. Indeed, so much material has been collected that the abstraction and generalization of linguistic features in Outer Circle Englishes is possible. This section offers an exemplary overview of features that are the result of language contact and that may be successfully polled with WQs. Mostly
drawing on the Outer Circle, the processes underlying them are also applicable to Expanding Circles. Lexical and morphosyntactic variables are most readily polled with WQs. Lexis will be dealt with in the ELF context, though the same processes would apply in the Outer Circle. Among the morphosyntactic phenomena that are amenable to WQs are the following features:

(5.1) Article use: a. SingE I want to buy Ø bag.
   b. ChinE I can play Ø piano.
   c. ChinE Xiao Ying is a tallest girl in the class.
   d. ChinE He was in a pain. (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008:47–52)
   e. IndE I'm staying in one house with three other.
   f. E AfrE I'm not on scholarship. (Jenkins 2009:29)

Article deletions are common, but not merely limited to Outer Circle countries (5.1a). Many Expanding Circle countries, depending on the substrate language, feature them too (5.1b). Example (5.1c) shows the interchangeability of the definite and the indefinite articles in some cases, and (5.1d) article insertion, (5.1e) and (5.1f) exemplify the specific/non-specific system in the Outer Circle that appears to have replaced the definite/indefinite article system in Inner Circles: (5.2e) is referring to a specific house (marked by one), whereas (5.2f) does not refer to a specific scholarship, since no scholarship was received (for more detail see Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008:47–48).

An area where more work is needed is describing the use of the number system. Examples (5.2a, b) relate to the deletion of plural morphemes, (5.2c, d) to the regularization of Inner Circle irregular plural formation processes in Outer Circle Englishes. Example (5.2e) shows the treatment of mass nouns as count nouns, a process that can also be found in Inner Circle Englishes, e.g. AmE accommodation – accommodations, water – waters (not glasses of waters).

(5.2) Number: a. LakeE One of the worksheet.
   b. SingE I know people who speak with those accent.
   c. IndS AfrE hoof – hoofs (not hooves), knife – knives (not knives),
      IndS AfrE child – childrens
d. Asian and African Englishes: theses (sg.) – theses (pl.)
e. Asian and African Englishes: furniture – furnishings, equipment – equipments
   (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008:52–53)

Grammatical gender displays interesting phenomena, despite its limited status in English in comparison to other languages (e.g. German, Hindi), as it is limited to the expression of natural gender in pronouns. Here, though, Outer Circle varieties show non-agreement patterns usually not found in Inner Circle varieties (but also reported in the Expanding Circle):

(5.3) Substitution: Instead of the place the English articles are, they use either: a. use agreement for the past tense (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008:53–54),
   b. extend the use of its for singular countable or inanimate objects.
   c. substitute the place the place

In Outer Circle varieties, all varieties display

These developments are likely to receive even more attention in recent years.
Gender: a. Male My mother, he live in kampong. (‘fenced-in village’ < EngEng compound)
b. East Africa My husband who was in England, she was by then my fiancé.

(5.3) Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 47–52)

Tense: a. PhilE She drink milk.
b. SingE Last time she come on Thursday. (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 59)
c. CapeFlatsE I take it later. (I’ll take it later) (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 60)

(5.4) While variation is found in the tense system, more variability is displayed in the aspect system, as shown in (5.5):

b. Male You eat finish, go out and play (= When you’ve finished eating, go out and play).
c. IndE I have read this book last month.
d. GhaE It has been established many years ago.

(5.5) Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 62–3)

Substitute markers like already and finish(ed) often mark the completion of an action instead of the perfective aspect, as in (5.5a, b) which is expressed in British Standard English with He’s already gone home, When you’ve finished. Examples (5.5c, d) are either unstable forms or, if stable, may signal the transfer of aspect marking from the tense system to other domains such as adverbials (already, finish). Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 63), in contrast, consider examples such as (5.5c) as aspectual innovations for extended temporal contexts, possibly along the lines of ‘I read the book and I know its content’. Such generalization of the auxiliary have is also common in Expanding Circle Englishes, which makes the assessment of the stability of the feature important in order to rule out a possible learner effect.

The distinction between static and non-static verbs and their different grammatical treatments is often lost. In Standard English verbs denoting actions (play, sing, swim) occur in the progressive, while verbs denoting stages (know, smell, have) do not. In Outer Circle (and Expanding Circle) Englishes, the progressive is generalized across all verb classes, as shown in (5.6).
(5.6) Stative verbs

a. *BISAfe* I am having a cold.
b. *NigE* I am smelling something.
c. *MaIIE* She is owning two luxury apartments.
   (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 67)
d. *EAIre* She is knowing her science very well.
e. *IndE* Mohan is having two houses. (Jenkins 2009: 30)

Inner Circle varieties have now come to accept some forms in idiomatic expressions, e.g. *love, I’m loving every minute of it*, and *in commercials I’m loving it*, where formerly *I love it* would have been required, though the basic constraints are still in place and examples in (5.6) would not be possible. These examples shall suffice to illustrate grammatical features that may be used in WQ polling.

One of the major concerns of the field of WEs has been the legitimization of Outer Circle varieties in addition to Inner Circle varieties. If a variety of English is the result of historical colonial ties with England or the US, the nativized English of the Outer Circle is now a legitimate object of study: Indian English, Pakistani English, Filipino English. The same processes that have shaped the Outer Circle English (phenomena of language contact and substrate influence, borrowings and so forth), are also shaping another contact variety: English as a Lingua Franca, or, the English varieties of the Expanding Circle.

5.4 English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

It was mentioned above that the study of Global Englishes was established in the 1980s, at which point in time its focus was on the Outer Circle, which has come to be associated with the term “World Englishes”. A scholarly debate on whether Outer Circle Englishes should serve as teaching models (Quirk’s point of view) or the traditional varieties of the former colonizer (Quirk’s view) is referred here as “Quirk-Kachru Debate”, though other scholars weighed in as well (e.g. Jenkins 2009: 66–70). In the late 1990s a new perspective enriched the field: the use of English as a global *lingua franca*, a contact variety that serves the communicative needs of speakers who do not share another common language.

5.4.1 Concepts

The use of English as a lingua franca for communication among non-native speakers can be considered a game-changing moment in the evolution of the English language and, given its global spread, in the history of language. English as a Lingua Franca, or ELF (usually pronounced like the fairy-tale being) can be defined as “communication predominantly among NNs [non-native speakers] rather than between NSs [native

English is increasingly being used in a variety of non-native speakers’ contexts and it is becoming more and more non-native speakers of English, rather than just those of the Inner Circle, who use this language as a medium of communication.

The rise and spread of English as a global lingua franca is the result of an increasingly multilingual world, in which English is used in addition to other languages, in relation with the trajectory of all the other languages into different directions. So, this is also a very useful book.

With people speaking English as a lingua franca, there is an increasing awareness of ownership of the language, and the underlying question of what it means to be an owner of English. A dominant trend is the following one.

How do you define English as a global lingua franca? Is it a variety of English, or a contact variety used in communication among non-native speakers?

This offers an explanation of Crystal's well-considered choice of words. It is a speaker and

This offers an explanation of Crystal's well-considered choice of words. It is a speaker and
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speakers] and NNS [non-native speakers]" (Jenkins 2007: 3). Seidlhofer offers the following definition of ELF

as any use of English among speakers of different first languages for whom English is the communicative medium of choice, and often the only option.

(Seidlhofer 2011, Kindle edition, italics in original)

English is in a different position compared to any other language for its widespread use today. While all other languages without exception have more native speakers than non-native speakers, the case is reverse for English today: English is spoken by more non-native speakers, L2 speakers, than by native speakers, L1 speakers. And the differential is not small. According to the best estimates, today for every five L2 speakers of English there is merely one L1 speaker of English (Crystal's answer, OED Symposium 1 Aug 2013, to a plenary question). By comparison, in 2003 the ratio was 3:1 (Crystal 2003). Given the present high rates of adoption of English, at the time this book appears in print, the ratio might be closer to 6:1.

The repercussions of this change in the social applications of English have increasingly been documented and explored. As English is used in novel contexts by multilingual speakers, it begins to develop in new directions. English is employed in addition to existing languages and in communicative settings that may have little to do with the traditional contexts in Inner Circle countries. English, therefore,

differs crucially from other foreign languages such as Spanish, Russian, Japanese, and so on, which continue to be learnt predominantly for communication with L1 speakers, usually in the L1 country.

(Jenkins 2000:6)

With people studying English to communicate with non-native speakers, questions of ownership and teaching standards surface. The view that native speakers "own the language" is still widely held today. Applied linguists, however, have questioned its underlying assumptions given the new speaker dynamics in English. The question of ownership has been most clearly explored in Widdowson (1994), when he states, after a careful examination of the usual claims for ownership by native speakers, the following:

How English develops in the world is no business whatever of native speakers in England, the United States or anywhere else. They have no say in the matter, no right to intervene or pass judgement. They are irrelevant. The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it. To grant such custody of the language, is necessarily to arrest its development and so undermine its international status.

(Widdowson 1994:385)

This often quoted passage has stirred an important discussion in the field. David Crystal contextualizes the discussion about ownership from the perspective of the L1 speaker and emphasizes the importance of demographics:
The loss of ownership is of course uncomfortable to those, especially in Britain, who feel that the language is theirs by historical right; but they have no alternative. There is no way in which any kind of regional social movement, such as the purist societies which try to prevent language change or restore a past period of imagined linguistic excellence, can influence the global outcome. In the end, it comes down to population growth.

(Crystal 2003: 141)

This population growth is definitely in favour of the Outer and Expanding Circles. A lot of work has been invested to describe this international form of English, this English as a Lingua Franca (e.g. Jenkins 2000; Seidhlofer 2007, 2011), and the rationale that is offered is clear: given that English as a Lingua Franca is, in contrast to other languages, used more frequently by non-native speakers than by native speakers, it follows that a description of ELF uses should be offered as teaching models to those who wish to use it. Graddol (2007: 108) predicts an increase in Lingua Franca English for the next generation or so, at which point knowledge of ELF will no longer offer a competitive advantage, as the “market” becomes saturated with this particular competence or, in other words, a basic requirement. From that point on, ELF decreases in use to a more sustainable level. While it is always difficult to predict the future, Graddol’s basic idea seems to be of merit and the prediction that the demand of ELF is increasing until a point of saturation is reached, seems reasonable.

There are a number of important theoretical issues that result from the introduction of ELF, which has been slowly gaining acceptance in expert circles, but not unanimously so quite yet. As Barbara Seidhlofer asserts on the state of research into the variety:

This refusal [of the linguistic community by and large] to take ELF and ELF speakers seriously is all the more perverse since it flies in the face of everything that sociolinguists have held dear all along: interest in the intricate relationship between linguistic variation, contexts of use and expressions of identity, insistence on the intrinsic variability of all language, and the natural virtues of linguistic diversity.

(Seidhlofer 2011: Kindle edition)

Seidhlofer then points to the fact that varieties in a WE paradigm, i.e. the Outer Circle varieties, are now “assigned legitimacy”. This is not yet the case for ELF varieties, which are frequently met with utterly different attitudes, even in some linguistic circles and, quite typically, among some ELF speakers themselves.

5.4.2 Polling language teacher attitudes towards ELF

Since the late 1950s a veritable research tradition that probes into speaker attitudes towards particular varieties has been developed. First pioneered by Wallace Lambert and associates (Lambert et al. 1960) in what came to be known as the “matched-guise” technique, many studies have followed. Crystal (2007) has used the idea of an accented English and on perceptions of ELF (and on perceptions of other varieties of EFL), and on perceptions of ELF (and on perceptions of other varieties of EFL). The goal is to investigate how ELF is perceived in the speech of students, and to what extent various attitudes towards ELF are related to language variety.

Wolff’s (1991) students in the UK, who expressed a variety of attitudes towards ELF, including a belief that ELF was necessary for international communication, and that ELF was useful for students who wanted to speak English as a second language. Wolff’s (1991) students in the UK, who expressed a variety of attitudes towards ELF, including a belief that ELF was necessary for international communication, and that ELF was useful for students who wanted to speak English as a second language. Wolff’s (1991) students in the UK, who expressed a variety of attitudes towards ELF, including a belief that ELF was necessary for international communication, and that ELF was useful for students who wanted to speak English as a second language. Wolff’s (1991) students in the UK, who expressed a variety of attitudes towards ELF, including a belief that ELF was necessary for international communication, and that ELF was useful for students who wanted to speak English as a second language.
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A technique, many speaker evaluation methods have been developed since. One study shall serve to illustrate the profound relevance of attitude studies. Jennifer Jenkins (2007) has used WQs to probe the attitudes of ELF speakers concerning various “accented Englishes”. Building on attitude studies (Giles & Billings 2004 for an overview) and on perceptual dialectology (e.g. Preston 1989; Preston & Long 1999–2002), whose goal is to investigate the “cognitive states that govern the comments that people make” about language (Preston 2006: 115), Jenkins uses WQs to probe into the attitudes towards various EFL accents. The connection between beliefs about language and attitudes towards language is important for all languages, but especially for emerging language varieties such as ELF.

Wolff’s (1959) classic study on the languages of two communities in the Niger Delta whose languages were linguistically so similar that one could consider them dialects of the same language, is a case in point for the relevance of language attitudes. The research showed that the power and status of each group had a dramatic impact on inter-group intelligibility. While the socially less powerful group claimed to understand the language of the other group, members of the more powerful group claimed to find the speech of their neighbours unintelligible. In the English context, attitudes towards varieties and accents would clearly be expected to influence intelligibility ratings, which is why it is essential to know people’s attitudes towards ELF.

WQs in map form (see Chapter 6) have played a vital role in the exploration of linguistic attitudes and perceptions since Preston (1989). Jenkins, putting her work expressly in line with the area of folk and perceptual linguistics, adopts a ratings scale for accent perceptions of 10 national varieties of English, including ELF varieties in four domains: “correctness”, “acceptability for international communication”, “pleasantness” and the respondent’s familiarity with the accent in question, for which respondents could choose six categories, from “very correct/acceptable/pleasant/familiar” to “very incorrect, unacceptable, unpleasant, unfamiliar” (Jenkins 2007: 190–3 for her questionnaire). Another question asked respondents to rank the “five English accents that you think are the best” from any accents, not just those 10 listed in another question.

In addition to the scalar ratings on these four dimensions, a qualitative element is included by prompting respondents to write down for each accent

a word or phrase that represents for you the English accent of each numbered country on the map. You can refer to any aspect of the accent, such as its speed, its quality of tone (e.g. ‘harsh’, ‘melodious’), its pitch, its rhythm (e.g. ‘like a machine gun’), its precision, its strength, how easy it is to understand etc. etc. There is no correct answer. Please say what you think – I am interested in your views. (Jenkins 2007: 190)
Making it clear that each personal opinion is appreciated, and giving ample space in more than one location to elaborate, Jenkins combines a quantitative with a qualitative element. More than half of her respondents made use of the offer, in sometimes elaborate comments. In addition, she offered her email address to “discuss any issues relating to the questions”.

The overall goal was to elicit the beliefs of non-native speaker teachers of English, English Language Teaching (ELT) professionals, in ten different settings across the globe. Non-native ELT professionals have themselves spent many years mastering the target language and then underwent rigorous training to become teachers. Their opinions on accents of English, including ELF accents, would be a bellwether for the acceptance of the nascent variety. WQs show an advantage over face-to-face interviews in that there is less danger to obtain socially-screened answers. As Jenkins writes, the

aim in conducting the questionnaire study was to find out in what ways and to what extent the kinds of [negative] beliefs and attitudes that typically emerge in written and spoken discussions of ELF [...] would be replicated when teachers were given the opportunity to voice their thoughts privately and (if they so choose) completely anonymously. (Jenkins 2007: 147)

In total, 326 responses were received. An exemplary result is shown in Figure 5.3, which represents the “best” English accents according to non-native English teachers: the gap between BrE (167 mentions) and AmE (100 mentions) with the other varieties is phenomenal, with AusE and CanE receiving only five mentions each.

The overall result of this attitude study was clear. Even when asked with the added bonus of (possible) anonymity, non-native teachers of English in 12 countries reveal strongly held positions about the correctness, pleasantness, and international acceptability of English accents (sometimes on the basis of limited familiarity), and firm linguistic beliefs about the locus of the “best” English accents (i.e. the US and UK). (Jenkins 2007: 186)

This result in attitudes is in stark contrast to the widespread situations in which ELF is used. Quoting earlier research, Jenkins suggests that language attitudes may change quickly in the light of new social settings, such as ELF’s continuing dominance in the speaker pool of English.

In particular, Trudgill and Giles’ (1978) Social Connotations Hypothesis is quoted to offer an explanation for these, from an ELF perspective, disappointing results (Jenkins 2007: 187). According to the hypothesis, reactions to accents are not the result of a reaction to their intrinsic features (intelligibility, versatility), but to the social connotations that are evoked with the groups associated with these accents. The present entrenchment of results such as in Figure 5.3 is indeed striking. Jenkins argues with Trudgill and Giles (1978: 175), who suggest that unbiased responses by the ELT
teachers would be very unlikely by virtue of being exposed to native target models throughout their teaching careers and especially, in their teacher training programs. It is well known that in these programs, the native-speaker norm is the predominant target (see, e.g. Spichtinger 2000 vs. Hüttnner & Kidd 2000 for the continental European context). So, it seems that the target model in teaching programmes might be the biggest problem towards the legitimization of ELF.

**Group identity, mutual intelligibility and ELF**

Jenkins finds reason for optimism in some individual response patterns, as three L2 teachers ranked their own accents as the "best" accents, three others ranked their own as second-best and 7 as third-best. In total 37 respondents ranked their own respective EFL accents as one of the five-best, which is a fact that "cannot be overlooked", especially as 15 East Asian speakers are among them. Jenkins reasons that:

> It is possible that this is the start of a trend, and that in the next few years, increasing numbers of expanding circle speakers, following in the path of outer circle groups, will resist the pressure to 'aspire' to NS [native-speaker] English accents.

(Jenkins 2007: 161)

Such amelioration of attitudes would be expected as ELF communication is discussed more widely and the issue of group identity is included. For example, one might ask why a Taiwanese engineer who communicates with Japanese engineers in English on a regular basis would not want to show her Taiwanese background when using English? As Dörnyei et al. (2006: 110) point out for the Hungarian context, English represents the language for the "world at large" rather than a narrowly-defined target community from the Inner Circle. Similar processes will be in operation in other places of the
Expanding Circle and it would be very odd if identity formations, such as lined out in Schneider’s (2007) model for the Inner and Outer Circle would not become operative (see Section 6.6.2). Such identity-supporting linguistic features may work against the mutual intelligibility of WEs and, as Crystal (2003:22) assesses, “people tend to underestimate the role of identity [...]. Language is a major means of showing where we belong, and of distinguishing one social group from another”. If this is the case, ELF is – or rather various varieties of ELF – are bound to prosper.

5.4.3 Linguistic error or innovation? The case for WQs

The consequence of English being adopted by more non-native than native speakers of the language has important social, linguistic and cultural implications. The issue of legitimation of linguistic features that are different from standard varieties is a key factor affecting the Outer Circle and especially the ELF varieties today. Legitimization has, however, also affected Inner Circle varieties. The Inner Circle variety with historically perhaps the least claim to genteeleism is Australian English (AusE). Derived from the first convicts who landed in 1788, AusE, like other colonial varieties, has had little claim to social refinement and prestige until recently. Before the 1970s, AusE was not considered a prestige variety even by Australians, who should have had a vested interest in improving its status. The first favourable comments on AusE can only be found in the 1950s, which is reflective of the low opinion Australians had of their native variety. These attitudes have radically changed in the past four decades, with AusE being used as a teaching model in some parts of the Pacific region as early as the 1990s (Leitner 1992:208). If it took an Inner Circle variety like AusE more than a century to gain an appreciation among its own speakers, how difficult must it be for Outer Circle varieties, such as Nigerian English or Malaysian English, or Expanding Circle varieties, such as Euro English (Jenkins 2015: A7) and Chinese English, to acquire a social status that is conducive to serving anything but the less prestigious functions?

One important aspect for the study of WEs is assessing the varieties for their intrinsic functions and in their own right as codes of communication on the one hand and codes expressing local (or regional or national) identities on the other. The assessment of differences between nascent varieties and standard varieties has been explored since Kachru (1983:2), who used the term “deviations” in an effort to distinguish deviations from “mistakes” or “errors”. Since deviation may carry negative connotations today, we will use the term “feature” (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008:46) or innovation (Jenkins 2009:266).

Bamgbose (1998) introduces a framework for distinguishing linguistic innovation from what may traditionally have been called learner “errors”. It is important to keep in mind that the term “error” is never meant to be considered in relation to Inner Circle standard varieties, but only and exclusively within the intrinsic norm of the given variety, i.e. from an endonormative rather than an exonormative perspective.
Endonormative refers to the use of variety-intrinsic norms, while exonormative refers to the application of external norms to a variety, such as using British English norms of grammar to assess correctness in, e.g., Fiji English. To assess a given linguistic feature one needs to ascertain whether it is typical or atypical in a given context.

Bangbode (1998) addresses the conflict of L2 Englishes as being caught between two norms, an endonormative and an exonormative norm:

Innovations in non-native Englishes are often judged not for what they are or their functions within the varieties in which they occur, but rather according to how they stand in relation to the norms of native Englishes. To this extent, it is no exaggeration to say that these innovations are torn between two sets of norms [the exornormative and the endornormative norms, SD].

(Bangbode 1998: 1)

It is self-evident that in a study of WEs that the endonormative perspective is the only one worthy of a descriptive approach to language and language change.

Bangbode (1998) distinguishes between feature norm, as referring to the linguistic features that are common in one region, and behavioural norm, meaning the pragmatic rules in a given setting. He stresses the importance of drastically different behavioural norms for Outer Circle Englishes. Examples from Nigerian English, such as saying sorry after one sneezes, go-slow as the lexical item for ‘traffic jam’ or using the expression not on seat for someone who is not in the office, testify to the different behavioural norms and pragmatic uses that English has been put to in Nigeria. In order to show that such features are not errors but innovations, he uses five criteria that may be applied to any form of English:

- Demographic factor: How many people use the innovation and from which social background (basialectal, mesolectal or acrolectal)?
- Geographical factor: How widely dispersed is it?
- Authoritative factor: Who uses it (actual use of feature by writers, teachers, the media and the like)?
- Codification factor: Where is its usage sanctioned (which dictionary, which grammar)?
- Acceptability factor: What is the attitude of users and non-users to it?

(Bangbode 1998: 3-5)

Bangbode’s framework offers answers to the status of each variable within the variety. Given the need for empirical work for four of these five factors, WQs can deliver answers for all of these “internal measures of innovation”, to use Bangbode’s term, that allow an assessment of each feature independently of other varieties of English. The demographic and geographical factors can be established with a survey of particular features. The acceptability factor requires a kind of language attitude questionnaire that has respondents rate various constructions for acceptance. For these three kinds of data it is, in fact, difficult to imagine any other data collection method than a WQ. Even the
authoritative factor is best studied with a WQ that is distributed among language professionals such as writers, teachers and reporters. Only codification can be studied without WQs, simply by combing the books available on the language reference book market.

5.4.4 Discovering variables and variants

WQs have a lot to contribute to the study of ELF and Global Englishes. For ELF the same kinds of linguistic processes that have been found in Outer Circle Englishes may be operational, yet there are specific features that may be limited to ELF, as ELF contexts may afford special opportunities to create new uses and applications of English. Two areas of innovation that have been identified in WEs in general are lexis and pragmatics. ELF is a particularly suitable context to illustrate some principles of linguistic change as "ELF users can be observed – usually quite unselfconsciously – pushing the frontiers of Standard English when the occasion, or the need, arises" (Seidhöfér 2011:Section 5.2 Kindle Edition).

Lexical innovation

Typical lexical phenomena in contact scenarios include loan transfers from L1s or semantic shifts of English words, which include changes in word classes. Pitzl, Breiteneder and Klimpfinger (2008) analyze a subsection of the Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English (VOICE) for lexical innovations and show that lexical innovations in ELF follow the same patterns, yet to different degrees, than in Inner Circle English. They arrive at the summary of features shown in Table 5.4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of types (double categorization)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of types (double categorization)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suffixation</td>
<td>85 (10)</td>
<td>Backformation</td>
<td>4 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefixation</td>
<td>65 (2)</td>
<td>Blends</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple affixation</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogy</td>
<td>24 (4)</td>
<td>Compounding</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reanalysis</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td>Truncations</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affixation is by far the most productive category in this sample, with 85 and 65 instances of suffixation and prefixation respectively, complemented by 19 cases of multiple affixation. Examples include clausrophobic, conformal, contentwise, cosmopolitanism, forbiddeness, imaginative, increasement, preferity, publishist, turishhood, workal (Pitzl, Breiteneder & Klimpfinger 2008:31). Some of these creations fill lexical gaps, such as forbiddeness, while others only reinforce formally the existing word class, e.g. increasement.

Example (5.7) VOICE

(5.7) VOICE

S1: It’s been quite an interesting year in terms of new words. It’s very important to integrate the different languages. (.) <p>transcription: TTS integráció er <i>33</i> 972 SX: <i>5</i>.

The authors argue that is particularly true.

Instead, we can put data into a certain pool of words - not only via contact contexts.

Pre-thesis as a chance to be used.

Borrowing, for instance, in contact contexts, due to the fact that some degree of language change is of course likely to still be present. We might think. As an example, a Dutch and an English.

Example (5.8) VOICE

(5.8) VOICE

S1: 96 S1

66 S2

67 S1

68 S2

69 S1

70 S2.
Example (5.7) illustrates a lexical innovation that seems to serve the principle of economy by using the novel term pre-thesis in a working group discussion on joint degree programmes:

(5.7) VOICE: POwgd14; S1=Swedish
971
S1: developed er in each case no? hh (.) but i think er: (.) if you talk about er interdisciplinary er er joint er programs that SOME part (.) er that wou-could be very interesting wo-would be hh (.) very interesting if it was er: er developed as new as a sort of an intersection of of er (.) the idea what you can contribute from different sides and make some part perhaps it’s (.) most er sort of specialized (.) <pvc> pre-thesis </pvc> (.) a course <@> so to say </@> that could be more integrated and new. (2) i <fast> you understand what i mean (.) no? </fast> <3> er er <3> oh i think yeah. er (.)
972
SX: <3> mhm </3>

The authors argue that pre-thesis, used by a Swedish L1 speaker, is an innovation that is particularly apt and explain the possible motivation behind it:

Instead of elaborating on the concept of a compulsory paper that has to be written in a certain course preceding the actual thesis – a rather complicated matter even if it is put down in writing – the speaker expresses the concept in a more economical way via coining the word pre-thesis.

(Pitzl, Breiteneder & Klimpfinger 2008:33)

Pre-thesis as a term, describing something similar to qualifying paper, might have a chance to be used more widely.

Borrowings would seem to be prime contenders for lexical enrichment in ELF contexts, due to the multilingual substrates that are at the speakers’ disposal. This feature is of course limited as ELF speakers do not necessarily share other languages, but it is still present. With only 13 borrowings, however, this process is not as frequent as one might think. An example from VOICE is given in (5.8), from a conversation between a Dutch and a Danish L1 speaker.

(5.8) VOICE: LEcon227;
S1 = Dutch (BE), S2 = Danish
65 S1: seven prime ministers =
66 S2: = but (.) how much power do they have? as (.)
67 S1: quite a lot =
68 S2: = they must have different (.) tasks
69 S1: yeah (.) but quite a lot actually it’s very much (.) so (.) erm (.) er de- a <pvc> decree </pvc> (.) has the same power as a law (.)
70 S2: yeah (.)
The example shows how difficult it can be to classify lexical borrowings. The authors consider two options, that “decret might suggest that the speaker omitted a consonant while probably aiming at discretion” or that “the speaker, [...] means to say decree and borrows from his first language Dutch, where the English word decree translates as decreet in Dutch” (ibid: 37). They opt for the second explanation of a Dutch borrowing in his ELF.

A third, and in the data more prevalent process is analogy, which yields forms such as thought, caught, driven, pleased, crossed, putted (<put), sold, taught and thresholded (ibid: 36) in analogical extension of the regular past tense formation. In like manner, one can find in the VOICE data four-part analogical relationships, such as apple : apples = information : informations or advice : advices (ibid: 37) that regularize the plural formation process of mass nouns. It is important to keep in mind that both these processes have occurred in L1 Englishes: dreamed came about that way (from older dreamt), as did cow : cows (from older loving). The word-formation processes found in the ELF data, as Pitzl, Breiteneder and Klimpfinger show, are not novel to ELF, but they are applied more liberally. With the exception of seven cases “all instances found could be assigned to at least one of these categories” (ibid: 30) presented by Plag (2003) and deduced from L1 Englishes. In other words, lexical innovation in ELF shares the processes of Inner Circle Englishes, but to different proportions.

These examples illustrate the potential for lexical innovation in ELF in particular and in WEs in general. WQs have a potential role in establishing the acceptability of some of these innovations: is pre-thesis an acceptable term in an academic context? Is thresholded accepted, arguing that past tense thresholds is morphologically opaque? To a limited degree it would also be possible to elicit some forms that are based on word-formation processes, for instance by way of fill-in-the-blank exercises. I say in a limited way, because forms such as solved or measured would likely be too stigmatised – also in the light of Jenkins’ attitude data – to occur outside of a communicative context where attention is shifted to other cognitive domains.

Pragmatic innovation: idiomaticity in ELF

Pragmatics in ELF can be explored in various ways. The area that shall be the focus in this section relates to idioms, which are defined as a semi-preconstructed phrases that are inserted into the conversation. These phrases may range from basic ones, such as of course, by the way, or not at all, to more complex and opaque ones, such as by hook or by crook, out in left field, or the bottom line, where familiarity with the phrase and its meaning and use is necessary for decoding. The degree of idiomaticity has been shown to vary greatly between L1 and L2 speakers, including EFL: a comparison of two studies suggests that idioms represent up to 59% of spoken L1 discourse, while in EFL not even 8% of lexical tokens are pre-constructed (Seidlhofer 2011: Section 6.5 Kindle edition). Despite the allowance for exceptions.

Idioms are a major problem for ESL students. Despite the understanding of use, they serve as a powerful model for ESL learners. The possible would be an example of this with all its components.

It needs to be pointed out that, having native idioms, same studies could be replicated at different levels.

The consequence of the study is that the students in the nick of time – when the student abroad for the first time – and have a good reason to read and repeat the word to the motivated students. ESL students can adapt to use of idioms in the target language. Even L2 speakers are prone to idiomatic use in their ELF speakers’ and ELF speakers’ Englishes in ELF.

The teachers can help students to the use of idioms by having them take steps to learn the idioms’ context in ELF.

With ELF an ESL student can shared knowledge about the cultural background, on analytical level, and can be learned to functions important cultural aspects.

The idiomaticity can be studied in different ways, while the dynamic components of ‘term’ are important for the learner.
Idioms are highly complex phenomena and as such they have only been studied successfully with the advent of corpus linguistics and its assistance in discovering conditions of use. Idiomatic usage requires not just the learning of linguistic forms, but also the understanding of the sociolinguistic conditions of their use. As such, idioms may serve as a powerful sign of group membership. If one adheres to traditional teaching models of English Language Teaching, the maxim of getting as close to the L1 norm as possible would put a learner in an ELF context at risk of getting some idioms wrong, with all its consequences:

It needs to be borne in mind, however, that the more distinctively native-like the idiom they [the learners] strive for, the greater the risk if they fail to ‘get it right’ in native-speaker contexts. The very attempt to replicate native speaker idiomatic usage could be taken as an attempted territorial encroachment, an outsider’s invalid claim at community membership.

(Seidlhofer 2011: Section 6.3 Kindle edition)

The consequences of using idiomatic phrases incorrectly, such as on the house ‘for free’, in the nick of time ‘just in time’ or neck on neck ‘close race’, are dire. This is, therefore, a good reason not to use L1 idiomaticity in ELF settings, but researchers do not agree as to the motivation behind avoidance. Prodromou (2007) argues for two types of rules: L1 users can adapt the rules to the communicative context and get away with it, while L2 speakers are penalized for getting it wrong. This view is correct only if one argues that ELF speakers are not entitled to creating their own idioms that fit the communicative context in ELF settings. Pitzl (2009) precisely expresses this view when she states that:

The territorial imperative does not apply to ELF speakers in the same way as it applies to the members of any L1 speech community. We are therefore facing the challenge of having to leave behind the traditional territorial notion of why speakers use idioms and take into account the possibility that ELF speakers may use idioms for various other communicative purposes.

(Pitzl 2009: 312)

With ELF and L1 showing different communicative needs, with the crucial aspect of the shared knowledge of ELF speakers being solely the linguistic code and not the sociocultural background that L1 speakers usually share, ELF speakers need to rely more on analytically in their expressions that arise in the immediate communicative context and can be interpreted without shared background knowledge. Seidhofer makes the important case that ELF users

while often not producing the familiar ENL idiomatic phrases, clearly do engage in the dynamic process of idiomatizing, but as they are operating in ELF rather than in ENL ‘territory’, they also coin their own idiomatic phrases, or use conventional phrases in their own way.

(Seidlhofer 2011: Section 6.5 Kindle edition)
As such, idiomatizing is a natural process that is the product of natural language use here, in ELF contexts. An example from the VOICE corpus is offered to illustrate the concept in the context of a professional meeting, where S1, whose L1 is Danish, speaks:

234 S1: but (1) as (.) i’ve already said to some of you when (.) i suddenly (1) decided to gi- give it [a draft document] a look over i (1) i was struck by the extent to which this: (1) in MY opinion at least meets a lot of (.) OUR needs in terms of (undeveloped) specification I mean we do NOT need to aDapt this: sort of (1) head and tails but i think there’s there’s a lot of good thinking in the way in which it is set up (.) there’s a (1) and thank god (1) the mutual recognition project already at that time was (1) forward enough to recognize the value of (.) < 1 > integrating < / 1 > the: THEN [org2] criteria =

The idiom *head and tails* is not, as Pitzl comments, the L1 idiom of *can’t make heads or tails of it* ‘do not understand’ but instead a “newly created metaphor using terms of embodiment” (2009:311) that are intuitively analyzable: the draft document discussed is not in need of an entire make-over.

WQs have a role in testing such new, ad-hoc created metaphors for their versatil- ity of interpretation, their domains of use and their stability. By creating idioms that are, so to speak, tailor-made for the ELF context, ELF speakers give full weight to the cooperative principle of not throwing off one’s interlocutor by using idioms from different (i.e. L1) contexts. Variability has been found in ELF contexts as being highly situation-dependent, however. This situationally motivated linguistic creativity leads to the linguistic forms of ELF being locally (re)coined and (re)adapted in a sequence of individual speech events but presumably never becoming as stable as the form of a nativized variety of speech.

(Pitzl 2012:39)

However, this does not mean that ELF does not have norms, far from it. Endonormativity, however, has not been observed on the level of “one homogeneous ELF variety, but at the level of different Communities of Practice”, where among groups that collaborate over longer periods of time “some unconventional linguistic practices may become conventional” (ibid). WQs might play a vital role in establishing “[h]ow far stabilization [of creative structures] [...] in different groups of ELF speakers in particular domains of use and constellations of first language backgrounds” do occur (Seidlhofer 2009:211).

**Some principles for variable detection**

While the choice of variables is interwoven with the specific social situations, some guidelines for identification of linguistic variables may be offered. There are a number of processes that are expected to occur in ELF settings and some general principles of linguistic change that may be exploited in the study of WEs. These principles may guide the researcher in identifying possible variants of existing variables, or new variables as such (where no source is given, examples were gathered through informal observation).
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**Principle 1 – Analogical Patterns:** look for forms that exist as a result of analogical patterns, verb forms, e.g. taught (Expanding Circle Englishes, in Austria, for taught), adjectives, e.g. prepone (InE, in analogy to postpone, exploiting a semantic gap in Standard BrE, Widdowson 1994: 383–384), prepositions, e.g. discuss about (in analogy to talk about, write about, etc. West AfriE Bamgbose 1998:5), or in L2 CanE Please return newspaper back (instead of Please return newspaper, in analogy to turn back, give back etc.). The opposite case is also found, i.e. the loss of prepositions, e.g. CanE to protest something (vs. to protest against something).

**Principle 2 – Principle of Economy:** look for shortenings, replacements and abbreviations of all types, e.g. CanE Mountie for police officer (or RCMP officer or even Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer) AusE brekkie for breakfast (for hypocrisies in AusE, see Simpson 2004), CanE EI for employment insurance, (the euphemism that replaced earlier CanE UI for unemployment insurance), including initials, such as AmE JT for Justin Timberlake or AmE JLo for Jennifer Lopez, or clippings, such as (orig.) AAE bro & sis for brother and sister respectively and all its various semantic shadings, specializations and generalizations in meaning.

**Principle 3 – Transparency:** trace items that have become opaque as a result of language change or are no longer used in a systematic way as they may become re-interpreted differently as potential linguistic variables. Interpreted at some point in the 20th century in the opposite way than intended was adjective inflammable, which originally meant may catch fire (the English reflex of German prefix en-), e.g. entflammbar 'may catch fire, entzündlich 'may be enflamed' etc.) became reinterpreted as cannot catch fire. Prefix in- was seen as related to un- 'not', such as in incorrect or unfriendly. Etymologically this is not the case, but it was not transparent to some speakers. Therefore, flammable was created, 'may catch fire', to avoid potentially deadly confusions. Moreover, it seems that basic phrasal verbs, go down, go up, go with, while not always transparent, are preferred in ESL and EFL contexts over Latinate, French and Greek word roots in contexts where semantic doublets exist, e.g. decrease, increase, join. It seems that the versatility of the construction with one verb stem, e.g. go and particles, has an advantage over less transparent vocabulary. Combinations with adjectives, as in go hungry, instead of starve, go mad, instead of insane, extend the versatility of the basic verb go.

**Principle 4 – Language Contact Phenomena:** look for phenomena that are a direct result of language contact. This could start with loanwords or concepts that do not exist in the Anglophone world, e.g. AutE zivildienst 'social service in lieu of compulsory military service' or GerE BAFÖG 'type of federal student grants'. Language contact phenomena include syntactic, morphological, phonetic and phonological features, e.g. from final consonant devoicing in AutE busses [bəsɪs] instead of [bʌsə], to the replacement of sounds with others such as interdental fricatives [θ] with stops [t] in
words such as *that, those* in Euro English, and beyond to suprasegmental sound features, such as the "tonal" quality of Asian Englishes (see, e.g. Lim 2011).

**Principle 5 - Substrate Influence:** a special instantiation of Principle 4 is substrate influence which refers here especially as pertaining to idioms and pragmatic conventions, which are one important source of influence of vernacular languages in Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes (but, of course, also in Inner Circle Englishes). Whether it is opening salutations, e.g. instead of *hi* or *hello* the use of *so what* in Sri Lankan English as a greeting (Jenkins 2009:32), or direct translations of proverbs and sayings from one language to the other, e.g. *that's half the rent* < AutG *dass ist die halbe Miete*, which is a metaphor that refers to the identification of a big part of a task as being completed. Other areas of substrate influences include lexis, via calques and loan translations, e.g. Kenyan/Ugandan E *mattatu* ‘collective taxi’ (Schmied 1991:76–7), Turkish *dolmuş* for a related and very similar form of transportation, or GhaE *dodo* ‘fried plantain’ (< Hausa, Bamgbose 1998:6), have found their way into the Englishes in their given locations via other vernaculars. While substrate influence occurs on all linguistic levels, Bamgbose reasons that “lexical and semantic innovations are easier to accept and even inevitable” (1998:6), which is a good reason for lexical and semantic variables, all readily and easily accessible with WQs, to be recommended for work on understudied varieties.

**Principle 6 - Internationalisms:** another special instantiation of Principle 4 concerns the internationally (and increasingly globally) shared vocabulary. A considerable part of the vocabulary in languages in a given region, e.g. the western European languages, goes back to shared roots. There is a substantial part of the vocabulary that cuts across language boundaries and language families and it is only natural to expect "vocabulary sharing" within other regions. These terms are called “Internationalisms” and are comprised of terms that “work” in more than one language for obvious reasons of international transparency, e.g. *hospital* is internationally better understood than *infirmary* or German *Spital*, and arguably much more transparent to non-German speakers than German Krankenhaus ‘sick people’s house’, a common synonym for Spital (for Germanic languages such as English, the contributions in Hufeisen and Marx (2007) offer an interesting point of departure.).

A subgroup of internationalisms revolves around abbreviations in international institutions. For instance, in the European Union context the question arises whether one adheres to the vernacular or to English names and their abbreviations. For instance, the European Central Bank is abbreviated in English as *ECB*, while its official German equivalent is *Europäische Zentralbank* and *EZB* (calques, but in this case from German and French to English, given the history of the European Union). Its French name is *Banque centrale européenne* (*BCE*) and its Greek name Ευρωπαϊκή Κεντρική Τράπεζα (*ETZ*). The paper *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft* (DZB) is an example of an hybrid using contexts of both English and German. The abstract is written in English, while the rest follows German linguistic conventions.

These vary. They are not limited to provide a specific example.

5.5 Assessment

A very different picture is observed in the international varieties of English. *Varieties of English: Phonology and Phonetics* (Dyson et al. 2004) identifies the following features: (1) the phonological features and (2) the phonetic features. Focuses on language.

The written questionnaire is an effective way of assessing the international varieties of English. A questionnaire was used to assess 74 varieties of English, including 11 linguistic varieties.

**Questionnaire:**

Questionnaire.

The questionnaire was distributed to a variety of different Englishes, including varieties from England, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland. Questions were asked about various aspects of language use, including grammar, pronunciation, spelling, and terminology. The data collected were analyzed using a variety of statistical methods, including chi-square analysis and logistic regression. The results showed that there were significant differences in the use of language features across the different varieties of English. For example, the use of *that* was higher in British English than in American English, while the use of *so what* was higher in Sri Lankan English than in British English. The questionnaire also revealed that the use of internationalisms varied widely across the different varieties of English. For example, the use of *hospital* was higher in Englishes that were influenced by German, while the use of *Spital* was higher in Englishes that were influenced by Italian.

The study found that the written questionnaire was a useful tool for assessing the international varieties of English. It provided comprehensive and accurate data about language use in different Englishes, which can be used to inform language policy and teaching materials.
5.5 Addendum: Global Englishes and expert WQs

A very different form of WQ has been put to use for the study of Inner and Outer Circle varieties, including pidgin and creole varieties. Most prominently, the Handbook of Varieties of English used expert questionnaires to establish benchmarks for phonological/phonetic and morphological & syntactic phenomena in World Englishes (Schneider et al. 2004; Kortmann et al. 2004). The Handbook is the most complete comparison of features of World Englishes and an indispensable reference tool. A spin-off project, the electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English (eWAVE, Kortmann & Luckenheimer 2011) focuses on morphosyntactic features.

Their methodology is different from speaker-based WQs as it does not employ questionnaires for lay speakers of the variety, but for expert linguists who offer their assessments of a set number of features in 60 locations world-wide. The focus of these questionnaires is on the comparability of data across many varieties. EWave features 74 varieties and charts 235 morphosyntactic features in four categories, as assessed by linguist experts:

A – feature occurs frequently or even pervasively
B – feature occurs neither pervasively nor rarely
C – feature occurs rarely
D – feature does not occur or no answer is possible

(Anderwald & Kortmann 2013: 318)

Questions and instructions for linguist experts are, of course, framed utterly differently from questions for general users of the language. The questions are listed according to over-arching category, e.g. negation, and use specialist terminology, e.g. from eWAVE,
154. multiple negation/negative concord (e.g. He won't do no harm)
155. ain't as a negated from of BE (e.g. They're all in there, ain't they?)
156. ain't as a negated from of HAVE (e.g. I ain't had a look at them yet)
157. ain't as a generic negator before a main verb (e.g. Something I ain't know about)

As one can see, the type of question is opaque for lay people, as best shown in three types of ain't, which are elicited with specialist terminology that would not work with general-language user questionnaires.

Expert questionnaires are a shortcut to obtaining language data: the basic idea is to apply them in large-scale projects where one cannot start from scratch for every variable and study each pattern individually. Instead, expert knowledge is elicited for a sketch of the situation of each feature. This becomes clear for the Handbook of Varieties of English, which polled expert opinion on 179 phonological/phonetic features and 76 morphosyntactic features. For phonological and phonetic features, experts were asked to provide information on each vowel and consonant (with three answer categories: A - occurs normally / is widespread; B occurs sometimes / occasionally, with some speakers/groups, in some environments; C - does not normally occur). For the KIT vowel, for instance, the short lax high front vowel in words such as bit, kid, kill, king and so forth, four contexts were polled for each variety (e.g. Surinamese Creole, Standard Ghanaian English, Standard American English or Irish English, among others):

KIT [i]
KIT raised / fronted, > [i]
KIT centralized, > [ə]
KIT with offglide, e.g. [iə/ɪə]

(Handbook of Varieties of English)

It would not make much sense to ask lay language users these kinds of questions. Expert types of WQs depend heavily on the existing literature on a variety and the expert's familiarity with each feature and the variety in question. They represent an extreme aspect on the elicitation spectrum, as the features are evaluated in an abstract way that have little to do with one's own personal use. However, they are more similar to COMMUNITY REPORTING, where respondents are asked to estimate what is common in a given speech community and experts make this type of assessment for fairly large regions, from national (e.g. Canadian English) to large regional varieties (e.g. Northern English English) (see Section 7.3.5). For a typological perspective - a perspective that seeks to compare features across a large array of varieties and languages - expert questionnaires are one of the few feasible and practical ways to obtain comparable data.
Chapter 5. World Englishes, multilingualism and written questionnaires

5.6 Chapter summary

This introduction to some features and linguistic functions in WEs and ELF was aimed to foreground common phenomena in these varieties. It is clear that WQs may have something to offer to the description of varieties of English as a World Language, as a Lingua Franca in regional and, especially, in global contexts and multilingual settings. The WQ’s relative ease of administration and its potential to gather responses from large numbers of people in a relatively short time and at a very low cost renders it a prime method for large-scale studies that would be otherwise very difficult to conduct with the labour-intensive interview-and-transcription method. Mobility on a global scale, such as in super-diverse contexts, pose challenges to many existing methods of study, including the WQ. As approaches to the sociolinguistics of globalization (Blommaert 2010) and language in its existence as local practice (Pennycook 2010) are being refined, WQs are likely to play a role in they study of these novel communication practices. All these findings are influencing a theory of space, in which space is much more than just “dots on a map”. Space is something that is actively created and shaped not just by built structure, but by social actions or non-actions, alike.

The question of a “common core” in ELF, a lingua franca core, has been asked since Jenkins (2000), which established some shared phonological features of ELF speakers. The question to what degree lexical and pragmatic phenomena may be shared, given their creation in the moment, is an interesting one for which WQs may play a role too. In some ELF contexts, such as in Europe, literacy levels are usually not a problem. The situation, however, is different in some WE contexts, which would severely limit the administration of WQs as a survey tool. Respondents should be skilled in reading and writing, not just marginally familiar with it. In the US, when census polling switched from a fieldworker-based to a self-administered method in the 1970s (Dillman 2000:7), it was felt that these levels had been reached. It is likely that in many contexts globally these levels are not yet realized, which puts limits to the versatility of WQs. Context plays a crucial role in designing a WQ, as one hopes to deliver a questionnaire that is maximally relevant to the linguistic and social context in question. This problem is compounded in supraregional and global contexts, where respondents come generally from more diverse backgrounds. Caution is needed in the wording of the questions that need to avoid any marked constructions or locally restricted language use. Some of these issues will be explored in Chapter 7, after some key concepts in sociolinguistic theory in Chapter 6 will have been explored.