## **Tanzanian English**

#### 1 Introduction

The United Republic of Tanzania consists of Tanzania Mainland and the semi-autonomous region of Zanzibar, which united in 1964, after both parts had become independent from Britain in 1961 and 1963, respectively. English is the official language, but Kiswahili is the national as well as the official language – and it is not always clear what this distinction means. Like English, Kiswahili is traditionally not a mother tongue to most Tanzanians, except in coastal areas and on Zanzibar, where Kiunguja is the traditional Kiswahili variety and the basis for modern Tanzanian Standard Kiswahili (*Kiswahili sanifu*).

Since the national census does not provide ethnic or language figures, the estimates of English speakers in Tanzania can only be derived from educational statistics, as it is mostly learnt in a modern school context and hardly informally in families and neighbourhoods. English is clearly a minority language, but with its increasing population and expanding education, the number of speakers in Tanzania must be several millions, even if proficiency can only be assumed for perhaps 5% out of over 44 million inhabitants today.

It is commonly accepted in the country that, in contrast to other post-colonial "Anglophone" nations, there are no native speakers of Tanzanian English (TznE), because all Africans learn an African mother tongue (incl. Kiswahili) first, just like Indians in Tanzania learn their Indian mother tongues; the few Tanzanian parents who really work in international diplomacy or business or live in mixed marriages favour a form of early bilingualism.

### 2 Socio-cultural and sociolinguistic background

#### 2.1 Historical context

English came late to Tanzania. The last decades of the 19th century saw the establishment of British colonial power in Kenya and Zanzibar and German colonial power on the Mainland as German East Africa (1885–1919). East Africa's famous explorers Livingstone and Stanley were followed by other missionaries and colonial administrators. European intrusion followed the established Swahili trade routes – and used their language, Kiswahili, as a lingua franca. The brief German interlude expanded Kiswahili in the colony and laid the foundation for its success as a truly national language in Tanzania later. For the British, Tanganyika was not a "real" colony like Kenya, but only a League of Nations Mandate and United Nations Trust Territory (1919–1961) and Zanzibar a Protectorate (1890–1963). The system of indirect rule through African leaders was introduced; the primacy of African interests was decided in 1923. Thus English was established only in elitist circles, when the colonial powers tried to regulate communication within the administrative, legal, and educational system. Colonial language policies did not favour English wholesale, but established a trifocal (Whiteley 1969) or triglossic (Abdulaziz 1972) system with English as the elitist and international language, the regional lingua franca Kiswahili and the "tribal" languages or "vernaculars" for local communication.

This explains why Tanzania is special in Africa and maybe in the world – despite parallels with Malaysia because of the national language and Cameroon because of the official bilingualism. The focus of development and research over the last 50 years has been on Kiswahili, and despite globalisation English is perceived as more foreign in Tanzania than in "truly" Anglophone or Commonwealth countries.

#### 2.2 The sociolinguistic situation today

Most of the published material on the sociolinguistic situation in Tanzania is rather dated: the comprehensive survey published by Polomé and Hill in 1980 was actually undertaken shortly after independence, while the educational survey provided by Rubagumya in 1990 has few concrete figures on English and could not yet consider the mushrooming of private schools adequately. The private schools teach in English, partly because this is felt to be better for the children's future in an age of globalisation. The following rough sketch is thus based on observation and expert opinion.

English is still well established in Tanzania today in the triglossic sociolinguistic situation: Kiswahili is clearly the truly national language – partly at the expense of the ethnic languages. 'Good English' is (again?) a result and a symbol of good education and, directly or indirectly, a prerequisite for well-paid jobs with international links in trade and tourism. Despite some ups and downs in the last 50 years since independence, the position of English in Tanzania is more stable than nationalists and internationalists might have predicted: neither have Tanzanians managed to replace it completely by Kiswahili, nor have they developed a national variety. Most Tanzanians today do not discuss features of TznE, but are concerned about standards of English in the context of standards of education and opportunities in globalisation. This view is almost like in nations that use English "only" as an international language and were never British colonies (like China). In sociolinguistic terms, English can still be called a "second" language in Tanzania, although it is usually learnt third after mother tongue and Kiswahili. Often it is seen rather pragmatically, a necessity that is not central to national identity, partly because almost all 'English' situations are formal in the widest sense. For, English is used officially only on the "highest levels" of the educational and legal system, and in the media. This pragmatic view is reflected in popular debates on language attitudes: the complaint tradition is well established, especially in educational debates on "national standards", but the issue of national norms (as "accepted Tanzanian English") is not directly addressed, neither in research nor, of course, in politics.

#### 2.3 Defining Tanzanian English (TznE)

Defining TznE seems more difficult than defining many other varieties. Most informants only agree on what it is not: Of course, TznE is not any English spoken or written in Tanzania, nor all English used by native Tanzanians who received English-medium education for at least 4 years (as "Educated English" was defined as the target norm for the second-language ICE corpora over 20 years ago, cf. Schmied 1990). "Tanzanian English" as a national standard variety clearly does not even include the interlanguage used by university students in Tanzania today, because teachers would mark it wrong and students would not want to identify with it. The usage aspect of frequency has to be balanced by the attitudinal aspect of acceptance or, at least, tolerance ("it is commonly used, I find it o.k., but I would not use it myself"); The socio-cognitive model of TznE (Schmied 2012) adds the dimension of awareness and unifies socio- and cognitive linguistics. TznE is what is frequently used and accepted by educated Tanzanians themselves, thus informants' opinion and corpus evidence should complement each other.

Interestingly, many discussions about English in East Africa in general refer to a conservative collection of "errors" or "mistakes" by Hocking some 40 years ago, in which he wrote:

It is possible that we may eventually develop a local, East African form of English ourselves, and if we ever do, it may be that some of the mistakes we are dealing with in this book will be part of it. However, that time has hardly come yet. (Hocking 1974: 59–60)

Recently, Buregeya has emphasised with direct reference to this statement: 'I want to claim that that time has now come; that is, this form [i.e. a local, East African form of English, or rather Kenyan English, which is in the title; JS] has indeed developed' (Buregeya 2006: 200) and tries to demonstrate that the features (i) overgeneralisation of -s plural markers, (ii) omission of articles and other determiners and (iii) invariant question tag forms (isn't) are 'typical of Kenyan English' (Buregeya 2006: 203). However, from a European perspective

I can safely say that these examples may be even more typical for "Czech English", because there articles are an even more obvious problem – and no one claims that Czechs have developed their national form of English now. I am really relieved that for Tanzania the time has not come (yet?) to discuss and decide this issue, because it is too early cognitively and empirically.

#### 2.4 The database

The prevailing attitudes and preoccupation with Kiswahili have also meant that the database of "Tanzanian English" in the sense of an accepted educated national variety is very weak. Generally in sociolinguistic research, we can use two empirical approaches: interviews and databases, neither works very well in Tanzania.

As there are no native speakers, the traditional method of relying on the intuition of a few native speakers does not really help in Tanzania. Asking language specialists from the university about WAVE features is a possibility, but they would express caution and emphasise their lack of proficiency. Even at university level, few lecturers (let alone students) are aware of the possible distinction between features of an advanced learner variety and those of a variety in its own right. Explanations for such features are seen on a personal basis ("because she got her PhD in the States" or "because of the Germans in the Department"), but not in a systematic sociolinguistic perspective. Features tend to be seen as performance errors rather than part of a (new) language system. Of course, linguists may also react less intuitively and try to deduce from the (consciously constructed) language system ("if one feature exists, the other probably exists as well"). Finally, there is no attempt to use questionnaires to elicit judgments by Tanzanians that can be compared to Buregeya's (2006) acceptability test of a few WAVE features.

The databases are not much better: There is no current "Corpus of Tanzanian English", except the Tanzanian part of the International Corpus of English: East Africa (ICE-EA) – which was compiled 20 years ago, before globalisation, and email and internet communication. Of course, many of the WAVE features are so rare that they do not show up in a small corpus – if they can be searched for at all (like deletions).

The data for the following description are based on the Tanzania part of ICE-EA (with less than 629,000 words, marked as ICE, mostly written, only about 280,000 spoken/written to be spoken), impressionistic notes from my own fieldwork over the last 30 years (FW), a stratified corpus of Tanzanian academic writing (TAC with less than 800,000 words), a Tanzanian newspaper corpus (TN with over 7.78 Million words) and the occasional search on the internet using "web as/like corpus".

Thus, despite an attempt to triangulate informant and database methodologies, the following "results" can only be taken as plausible in the (unusually?) fuzzy system of TznE.

## 3 Notable aspects of the variety's WAVE profile

#### 3.1 General trends

The most notable aspect of TznE grammar is that it is not a distinct national variety, neither compared with the other subsystems like pronunciation nor compared with other national systems like White South African English. Even the subsystems of pronouns, nouns, verbs, complementation and discourse do not constitute new subsystems. Of course, no single feature or feature cluster characterises TznE exclusively. Only some common features can be found at more abstract levels.

In contrast to the part-of-speech categorisation used in WAVE, I try to summarise the 23 pervasive or frequent TznE features (with A and B ratings) into three overlapping groups, which can be seen as more or less cognitive, assuming that language users always try to make sense of the fuzzy systems they have in their heads.

#### 3.2 Explicitness as a cognitive principle in TznE

Whereas language users who feel relatively secure in their code tend towards redundancy, most non-native language users play safe and express features explicitly. The clearest example in our feature list is the insertion of *it* where StE favours zero (F45):

(1) As it has been pointed earlier in the discussion, ... (ICEbr-disc)

This feature also includes a cognitive element, since here *as* is only seen as a conjunction, whereas in StE usage it can be categorised as a pronoun in subject position. Very few Tanzanians recognise the pronominal value of *as*, and if it is only a conjunct, a subject has to be added. The pronominal *what* after comparative *than* or *as* (F204) may be seen as a parallel case (in object position in the relative clause):

(2) this time most of us felt he had bitten more than what he would be able to swallow. (TNfeatures)

Similar cases of explicitness occur when the infinitive marker *to* (in F209) is inserted to make the syntax clearer or when redundancies in complex constructions are not noticed: whereas double conjunctions in immediate vicinity are rare (like F214), very long *although* clauses may tolerate a "resumptive" contrastive conjunction like *but* more easily (F215), especially in a broadcast talk:

- (3) When quizzed Ngapinga showed receipt copies and but couldn't explain where the cash was. (TNcourts\_and\_crime)
- (4) So although fourteen of us went but we had about twenty of them and said I belong to Tanzania. (ICEbr-talk)

The same goes for *you* in imperatives (in F233), although it is difficult to find corpus evidence due to its informal usage contexts.

More complex are several usages of would. In many cases it seems more politeness- than time-related:

(5) Would you wish I have stayed. When the time comes, it will be ... (TNverses\_2)

The tense forms in *if*-clauses and related matrix clauses are very normative in StE. To the naïve but hard linguistic thinker in Tanzania, it is not self-evident that irrealis *would* in *if*-clauses is considered redundant while past tense *would* in a certain sequence of tenses is absolutely necessary. The conditional *if I was/were* seems rather flexible (F147):

(6) If I was one of his listeners I would simply have asked ... (TNindex296e)

Clear cases of redundancy are double comparatives and superlatives (F78). However, the contrasting principle of economy can also be noticed, when comparatives are only marked by *than* (without *more* in F84), where StE seems too explicit.

Double determiners (F59) seem to be particularly frequent with *this + our*:

(7) Because of this our city is like a body without a heart, it is dead. (TNfeatures\_2)

#### 3.3 Internal variation and regularisation

A clear case of internal inconsistency are the StE comparison strategies; it is therefore not surprising that "deviations" to both sides occur (F79 and F80): *commonest* and *noblest* can be found in our news data as well as *most able*.

Most pronoun variation falls into this category as well (as in native Englishes), e.g. when *me* and *myself* (F7 and F8) are occasionally used in coordinated subjects. However, resumptive pronouns or seemingly unmotivated reflexives (like *myself*) can also be explained by explicitness:

- (8) a team of lecturers and me can visit your Faculty and hold further discussion (TACbSlet)
- (9) Myself I have been to museum premises only to attend seminars and work. (TNstreet talk)

Similarly overlapping classification could be used for infinitive marking with or without *to* (F208/209). Finally, choosing inverted word order in indirect questions that are marked by intonation as interrogative (F227) can be seen as regularised, but also as less explicit:

(10) in case you happened to be wondering as what exactly could the hotel's compass emblem mean. (TNfeatures\_2)

The most convincing case of regularisation may be the underlying system of responses to *yes/no* questions (F169), where the "African" concept of responding to the form (*no* is followed by *yes* to confirm the negation) seems very straightforward.

Of course, non-mother-tongue users may feel less inhibited to "fix" inconsistencies in their systems by regularising and levelling unnecessarily marked contrasts. This is clear in English morphology with nominal and verbal paradigms (where TznE speakers are not interested in historical changes and regulations). However, many grammar distinctions (like "count" vs. "mass" in F55) are based on sound but fuzzy cognitive concepts, which are not a problem for TznE speakers in principle, although the practical applications to nouns and verbs may vary.

#### 3.4 Cognitive restructuring

Linguistically the most interesting cases are re-categorisations: Invariant question tags (F165), mass/count noun distinctions (F55) and (the expansion of) continuous forms (F88) have been discussed in New Englishes generally. In our categorisation, they also imply some regularisation of internal variability:

- (11) and began to decipher some very old <- information><+ information>. (ICEbus-let)
- (12) ... more beautiful than when she was a house wife who was depending on her <-\_husbands><+\_husband's> salary. (TNcreative)

Simplification also plays a role in avoiding complex tenses. The most obvious problem even for advanced speakers is the strict tense sequence, which is further complicated by English modal auxiliaries (F101):

(13) The thing to be put on record is that Tanzania human civilisation has passed a stage when mere phraseology could no longer be accepted. (FW83)

Article usage (F60/F61) is apparently particularly complex: sometimes it can be easily explained, as in the case of *a state house* in (14) (since there are several in Tanzania in different parts of the country); the perception that Tanzanian see different skies and different suns (consider example 15) may be less easy to understand:

- (14) I attended a Party at a State House. (TNindex39f0)
- (15) now there is a sky, and it does not know there is a sun. (TNbreaking\_barriers)

The most frequent article problem is deletion; some learners seem to have no articles in their subsystem:

(16) President should not have say in cabinet appointments. (FW83)

Finally, some "new Englishes" generally are less aware of foreign European or classical elements in English and thus tend to integrate foreign plurals (part of F49), for instance, more radically than Europeans.

(17) He said traditional curriculums in most African universities followed the British. (ICEbr-newsT)

#### 4 General issues

#### 4.1 Consistency, perceived salience and gradience in TznE

In sociolinguistic analyses, it is a common phenomenon that features are not used consistently. Since variation is inherent in any language system, changes in usage can often only be seen in certain co-texts and contexts. In practise, this means, for instance: Quotatives (*she goes/is like*; F235) are a fast expanding feature in many varieties today, but they have not yet reached Tanzania, since most informants are surprised that this phenomenon exists. Google Tanzania displays no cases and all our corpora only show a few cases like *The story goes like this*: ... (TAC), which is of course not what we wanted. Even the example *It was like 'Go ahead'* (in TAcademic!) is not as "quotative" as *I/he/she is like* ... Such an example was not found in our (mostly written) database and rejected as "very unusual" by informants.

Similarly, *me* instead of *I* in coordinate subjects (F7) is considered pervasive in many varieties of English. Tanzanian informants, too, see no problem using it, maybe because they are used to the equivalence of *I* and *me* from emphatic *me*, *I* think from the parallel Kiswahili *mimi*, *ninafikiri*, where a personal pronoun and a personal prefix indicate first person twice. Yet, in contrast to frequent emphatic clause-initial *me*, *I*, coordinated *me* does not show up in Google Tanzania and even our largest database has only eight occurrences in subject position out of 207 and only in second, not in first position. Thus perceived salience may be in sharp contrast to "real" evidence in corpora and relative frequency – not only because corpora tend to include few informal and spoken text types, so that the styles where change is happening "from below" may not be well represented. This sociolinguistic truism is particularly relevant to TznE.

Many features like regularizing irregular plural or tense paradigms like F49 (or F129: *ran* for *run*) are perceived as pronunciation problems by Tanzanians; only when we see them in writing, regularisation of grammar forms are assumed. The pronunciation problem hypothesis is supported by the fact that the distinction of *this* and *these* is a notorious problem even in writing, the distinction between *that* and *those* is not.

Several WAVE features (like F7 and F8) are a matter of emphasis or style, which makes it extremely difficult to decide whether this is a feature or simply some stylistic inconsistency. Is the frequent *would* in conditionals (F147), prescriptively outlawed by 18<sup>th</sup> century grammarians, less likely than the plain past tense form set as standard?

When constructing national language subsystems, variability and gradience play a role on several levels, notably including the semantic variation based on speaker intentions, the stylistic variation when they are put into textual form, and the grammatical variation of overlapping abstract subcategories.

In a few cases, ambiguities and differences in meaning are not easy to detect, e.g. the difference between emphatic and habitual *do* in F91: *I do believe* does not appear as salient until the combination *As a tradition, I do visit* ... makes the habitual function clear. Only in such clear cases of contrast can semantic nuances, including emphasis vs. habitual, be proved:

(18) As a tradition I do visit my home area in Marangu every year. (TNsociety\_5)

In the case of *too* as qualifier (F222), the implied "more than usual" may be "understood" and the comparison appears less salient in some cases than in others.

This is the reason why the sources in our corpus examples have been labelled more explicitly (like TN for the Tanzania Internet Newspaper corpus), so that style differences may be deduced. Occasionally, more than one sentence is quoted so that intentions or contrasts may become clearer, although all corpus linguists are aware of the problem that evidence is only presented in cotext when often the wider context would be desirable.

#### 4.2 Systematic overlaps in East African English

Since Tanzania, Kenya and Uganda are generally seen as (the core of) East Africa, many researchers have been tempted to speak of East African English (e.g. Schmied 2004), assuming a certain overlap between the three countries that is greater than the overlap of Tanzania with Zambia or South Africa, which could be seen

as part of Central and Southern Africa, respectively. A comparison of WAVE features (cf. Buregeya and Ssempuuma, both this volume) allows us to base these comparisons on a more sophisticated level.

A really clear case of cognitive restructuring is the count/non-count distinction (F55), which is so wide-spread that it may almost be considered a breaking point in the English language itself. This is noticeable under less authoritative pressure in many parts of the world where English is seen more as a national language and British only in historical perspective (cf. Schneider 2007 or Schmied 2012).

The most interesting cases of probable new subsystems are progressive forms, the "article problem" and would usages. The expansion of progressive forms well beyond dynamic verbs and progressive meanings is well documented in many New Englishes. The article usage in Malaysia/Singapur already inspired Platt, Weber and Ho (1984) almost 30 years ago to postulate a new system, which was not really confirmed in further studies. Whereas the usage of modal auxiliaries seems to expand less into the epistemic side, would seems to have acquired new meanings; this has already been claimed for Philippine English (in Bautista 2004). Even if we assume overlapping meanings of would (from temporal distance as past tense of will in a relatively strict consecutio temporum to distance signalling politeness almost in adverbial manner), the interplay of will and would needs further analysis:

(19) Would you wish I have stayed. When the time comes, it will be ... (TNverses\_2)

To sum up, possible areas of subsystem formation in East African English are articles, "empty" pronouns (*it* and emphatic, not reflexive *-self*), count/mass distinctions, invariant word order and question tags (*isn't it* more than *innit*). But this systematisation has to be seen in the wider context of New Englishes and fluent colloquial English generally.

#### 4.3 Influences on TznE

#### 4.3.1 Learner features in TznE

Tanzanians today see Bantu first languages and Kiswahili as the decisive influence on TznE. Often "national features" would (!) not be recognised and dismissed as interference phenomena. Thus the lack of gender distinctions in pronouns (F10) will be attributed to African language interference. This is plausible, since Kiswahili (like most Tanzanian languages) does not distinguish between masculine and feminine pronouns in  $3^{rd}$  person singular (he/she), but has only a 'human' prefix (a-). When such features (pronoun mix, tense simplification and idiomaticity problems) come together in one sentence, this is clearly stigmatised as school English (as in this essay on *Song of Ocol and Lawino*):

(20)Lawino said that she don't like the behaviour of Tina because he get abotion [!] and use carbonic soap. (FW83)

Another feature of learner language is generalisation. The most prominent case of overgeneralisation is the invariant question tag (F165): whereas native-speakers tend towards *innit* (in oral language), New English users use *isn't it* even in writing:

(21) you know matching items can cover a very broader uh area, isn't it? (ICEconversation)

Interestingly, the expansion of the form (from the Standard usage after *is*) is not as dramatic as often assumed: out of 26 *isn't it* constructions in ICE-T only two are special cases, which is of course still much more often than in native Englishes.

#### 4.3.2 Native/variety influence on TznE

In traditional dialectology and even in Schneider's "dynamic model" (Schneider 2007), the influence of "transplanted English" on the formation of a new variety has been discussed intensively. In Tanzania, the im-

pact of missionaries and settlers (not only from Britain, but also from Southern Africa) was much less prominent than, for instance, in Kenya, so that the direct influence of their Scottish, South Western or White South African English can almost be ruled out – and there is no White Highland settler tradition, from which a White Tanzanian English might have emerged (like maybe in Kenya, cf. Hoffmann 2010). If these "white" features can be found in TznE, they can also be attributed to underlying subsystems of English in general.

The comparative lack of American English influence on TznE (vis-à-vis UgE or KenE) can be seen in the low frequencies of F34 (*y'all*), F221 (adverbs in adjective form) and F235 (quotatives).

#### 4.3.3 Universal features in Tanzanian English?

The purpose of WAVE is to allow researchers comparisons beyond their own immediate experience and expertise. This is extremely useful in acceptability judgments of official and unofficial norms (as in dictionaries or in national examination boards). Accepting a feature as a (passive) option (as in questionnaires "I accept it, but would not use it myself") is much easier for Tanzanians when they do not feel left alone with their language competence, which is perceived as suboptimal or in contrast to ESL nations (like Kenya).

Since English is predominantly seen as a formal and written language in Tanzania, a certain "flexibility" in style is not surprising (and most obvious in longer texts). However, this flexibility within the system is much greater than in established independent varieties. This is why I have tried to classify TznE features according to universal features in 3.2. This does not mean that learner influences and other (native) variety influences may not reinforce other cognitive processes.

#### 4.4 General trends

The sociolinguistic fact that TznE is used and perceived as a formal written language can be seen in many complex constructions and preferences for formal and emphatic forms, which appear to be more marked than intended:

(22) Mr. Hagamu and myself regarding the possibility you indicated ... (TACbSlet\_1t)

This style uncertainty towards formality is partly balanced out by simplification rules, e.g. when complex differentiations of English paradigms, like complex tenses tend to be underused (e.g. F101).

A different fruitful WAVE comparison is to see which features are not likely to be found in TznE. Obviously, there is no traditional pidgin and creole variety on the East African coast (in contrast to West Africa), because Kiswahili partly played this role until 100 years ago. New mixed youth or student jargons (like Sheng from Swahili+English in Nairobi) have not been discovered either.

Finally, in TznE, forms with weak pronunciation effort (incl. '*ll* and '*d* as auxiliaries) are less frequent than in mother-tongue English. There are two general reasons: TznE is primarily a written language and it is less stress-timed than syllable-timed; thus '*em* for *them* and '*e* for *he* are typical native English features and impossible in East Africa, where influence from native-speaker varieties is unimportant.

#### 5 Conclusions

When we look through our list of 235 possible features for TznE critically, we find only a single feature ("resumptive *it* after *as*", in other words *as* used only as a conjunct, not as a pronoun) marked as pervasive/obligatory, as even the most proficient English speakers are not always aware of an alternative when asked explicitly. Twenty-one features are rare and 22 vary between pervasive and rare, i.e. indicating possible national subsystems of English. This is clear evidence that TznE is not even a semi-independent variety; it only has its preferences in some predictable areas where English displays internal variation anyway. Not surprisingly,

this conclusion corresponds with Schneider's (2007) conclusion, which is also based on Schmied (1991a) and Schmied (2004a, 2004b).

Due to its special historical and sociocultural background, TznE is instable and fuzzy at least in its grammar system, maybe more than most other national systems. This shows again (cf. Schmied 1991b) that whereas pronunciation may divide (i.e. showing subnational differentiation), grammar unites, even beyond the national boundaries.

# Appendix: Overview of WAVE features attested in Tanzanian English

#	feature	TznE example	rating
	I. Pronouns, pronoun exchange, nomina	al gender	
7	me instead of $I$ in coordinate subjects	a team of lecturers and me can visit your Faculty and hold further discussion (TACbSlet_2t)	В
8	<i>myself/meself</i> instead of <i>I</i> in coordinate subjects	Mr. Hagamu and myself regarding the possibility you indicated (TACbSlet_1t)	В
16	emphatic reflexives with own	require financial and material support but our own self. (TNfeatures_6)	С
45	insertion of it where StE favours zero	As it has been pointed earlier in the discussion (ICEbr-disc)	A
46	deletion of <i>it</i> in referential <i>it is</i> -constructions	•	С
47	deletion of <i>it</i> in non-referential <i>it is</i> -constructions	Here is mostly farming. (TNinterview)	С
	II. Noun phrase		
48	regularization of plural formation: extension of -s to StE irregular plurals	changu (sea fish), machangu (sea fishes), mtambo (factory), linapukutisha (It shades) (TACppdisma_12t) He said traditional curriculums in most African universities followed the British (ICEbr-newsT)	В
49	regularization of plural formation:	Johnweit the British (ICEDI-Hews1)	В
	phonological regularization		
55	different count/mass noun distinctions resulting in use of plural for StE singular	I returned here and began to decipher some very old informations. (ICEbus-letT)  For example cooking utensils and even agricultural equipments such as plough instead of tractor (ICEexam)	В
59	double determiners	Because of this our city is like a body without a heart, it is dead. (TNfeatures_2) more people having fake academic credentials in this our country. (TNindex259e)	В
60	use of definite article where StE has indefinite article	It was learnt that if the teacher had contributed 200,000 Tshs for instance, he/she (TACppdisma_9t)	В
61	use of indefinite article where StE has definite article	please keep it up let the limit be a sky! ADVERTISEMENT (TNindex103b) I mean, why should anyone set a State House on fire? (TNdark_side	В е)
		I attended a Party at a State House (TNindex39f0) The birds in the trees will not trill. A sun is setting behind the hill (TNverses_2)	
		a large flock of Canadian geese, the last rays of a sun now below th horizon (TNmeditation) now there is a sky, and it does not know there is a sun. (TNbreaking_barriers)	e
64	use of definite article where StE favours zero	function of any language is to enable communication among the people. (TACppdisma_13t)	С
66	indefinite article <i>one/wan</i>	This is a real coincidence I've ever seen, one man was heard saying. (ICEcreative)	С

during this the last ten years  C  It may also come much more earlier Beet_talk) In more tastier than those sold in fast dexebb9)  B  B  B  Cer Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9)  C B  Requipment in the <-/crakdown> on  B
reet_talk) n more tastier than those sold in fast dexebb9)  B  B  er Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9)  C B
B  B  er Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9)  B  B
B  B  er Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9) C B
B er Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9) C B
er Obama to McCain (TNsociety_9) C B
В
В
equipment in the <-/crakdown > on B
equipment in the \\\7\crackdown\> on \\ D
in selling its products in AGOA
she was a house wife who was
site was a nouse trije who was
salary. (TNcreative-T)
me area in Marangu every year C
but I don't believe that
African origin.
С
C
С
В
Б
s now and in the future that would C
ts (TNfeatures_4)
l. When the time comes, it will be C
i. When the time comes, it will be
ned that there were no Kenyan C
ve ran away from post-election y (TNlocal_news_2)
would simply have asked B
1,
g together. If I was given anything, I
Mkombozi) possible, if I was working in a
ΓNindexd75a)
e and my drinking got progressively B
er walked round it as I had planned
nailbag)
ntralised power isn't it B
and the adaptate to the
ery broader uh area isn't it
tant. B
vers-T)

	A. Complementation		
204	as what / than what in comparative clauses	There is more than what meets the eye when tourists and conference delegates (TNlocal_news_1) various studies were conducted as what to do with the Tanga-based fertilizer plant (TNrep-feat-T) in case you happened to be wondering as what exactly could the hotel's compass emblem mean. (TNfeatures_2) and I was lost as what to say next. (TNsociety_4) this time most of us felt he had bitten more than what he would be able to shallow. (TNfeatures_4)	В
208	deletion of to before infinitives		В
209	addition of <i>to</i> where StE has bare infinitive  XI. Adverbial subordination	from mere budgeting to actual priority setting and to allocate their scarce resources to cost-effective (TNfeatures_11)	В
214		When guizzed Nagarings should receipt service and but souldn't	C
214	conjunction doubling: clause + conj. + conj. + clause	When quizzed Ngapinga showed receipt copies and but couldn't explain where the cash was. (TNcourts_and_crime)	C
215	conjunction doubling: correlative conj.s	So although fourteen of us went but we had about twenty of them and said I belong to Tanzania. (ICEbr-talk)	С
	XII. Adverbs and prepositions		
221	other adverbs have the same form as adjectives		С
222	too; too much; very much 'very' as qualifier	The EurepGAP standards for example, go beyond higher food safety standards to also include environmental and social demands, which are too difficult if not impossible for Smallhoder producers to comply with. (Tz webcorp)	С
	XIII. Discourse organization and word o	rder	
224	other possibilities for fronting than StE		C
229	no inversion/no auxiliaries in main clause yes/no questions		В
233	presence of subject in imperatives		С
235	like as a quotative particle	It was like "go ahead." (TACppdisma_7t)	С

#### References

- Abdulaziz Mkilifi, Mohamed H. 1972. Triglossia and Swahili English bilingualism in Tanzania. *Language in Society* 1: 197–213.
- Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. 2004. The verb in Philippine English: a preliminary analysis of modal would. World Englishes 23: 113–128.
- Buregeya, Alfred. 2006. Grammatical features of Kenyan English and their extent of acceptability. *English World-Wide* 27: 199–216.
- Hoffmann, Thomas. 2010. White Kenyan English. In: Daniel Schreier, Peter Trudgill, Edgar Schneider, and Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.), *The Lesser-known Varieties of English*, 286–312. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hocking, Brian D. W. 1974. Common Errors in English:

  A Handbook for East Africa (first published as

  All What I Was Taught and Other Mistakes: A Handbook
  of Common Errors in English). Nairobi: Oxford University
  Press.
- Mafu, Safari T. A. 2003. Postcolonial language planning in Tanzania: what are the difficulties and what is the way out? In: Christian Mair (ed.), *The Politics of English as a World Language. New Horizons in Postcolonial Cultural Studies*, 267–278. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

- Platt, John, Heidi Weber, and Mian Lian Ho. 1984. *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Polomé, Edgar C., and C. P. Hill (eds.). 1980. Language in Tanzania. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute.
- Rubagumya, Casmir M. (ed.). 1990. Language in Education in Africa: A Tanzanian Perspective. Cleveland: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Schmied, Josef. 1985. Englisch in Tansania. Sozio- und interlinguistische Probleme. Heidelberg: Groos.
- Schmied, Josef. 1990. Language use, attitudes, performance and sociolinguistic background: a comparison of English in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia. *English World-Wide* 11: 217–238.
- Schmied, Josef. 1991a. English in Africa: An Introduction. London: Longman.
- Schmied, Josef. 1991b. National and subnational features in Kenyan English. In: Jenny Cheshire (ed.), *English around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, 420–432. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmied, Josef. 2004a. East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): morphology and syntax. In: Bernd Kortmann, and Edgar Schneider (eds.), A Handbook of Varieties of

English, Vol. 2: Morphology and Syntax, 929–947. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schmied, Josef. 2004b. East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): phonology. In: Bernd Kortmann, and Edgar W. Schneider (eds.), A Handbook of Varieties of English, Vol. 1: Phonology, 918–930. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Schmied, Josef. 2011. Academic writing and New Englishes: Unifying the contrasts. *Discourse and Interaction 4*: 31-47.

Schneider, Edgar. 2007. Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Whiteley, Wilfred H. 1969. Kiswahili: The Rise of a National Language. London: Methuen.