

12 Standards of English in East Africa

JOSEF SCHMIED

12.1 Introduction

The geographical limits of East Africa are not always clearly defined. This contribution will concentrate on the ‘heartland’ of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania since these countries share a common ‘anglophone’ background and a common potential for standardisation, despite some interesting differences in their colonial heritage and their current sociolinguistic framework. The three countries are characterised by a complex pattern of African first languages (mainly from the Bantu and Nilosaharan language families), a common lingua franca (Kiswahili) and an equally complex mixture of Christian, Islamic and native African religious and cultural beliefs, which is relevant to language attitudes and use. The revival of the East African Community (1967–76) in 1997 is a sociopolitical expression of this common heritage and future potential.

Although many sociolinguistic features, e.g. code switching and borrowing, and linguistic features, e.g. vowel mergers, syllable-timed rhythm in pronunciation, overgeneralisation in grammar, a formal tendency in style, can also be found in other parts of Africa, East African English (EAfE) can be distinguished clearly enough from other varieties to justify the term (Schmied 1990, 2008a, b). However, whether the common heritage and the common usage forms justify the concept of a standard of English in East Africa is hardly discussed in the region – and probably rightly so, as long as the issue of accepted national standards is far from decided.

The following pages describe the historical background to an ongoing debate about ‘standards’ in East Africa. They show clearly that the debate about standardisation (to say nothing of the codification in national dictionaries and grammars), seen as a first attempt to ‘emancipate’ national varieties from (British) Standard English (StE), has hardly begun. The discussion also shows the way in which official and acceptable codification may

I wish to thank Raymond Hickey, Serah Mwangi and Susanne Wagner for the discussion this contribution is based on. *The International Corpus of English, East African Component (ICE-EA)* and the accompanying manual are available free from www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/real/eafrica/.

be achieved. Of course, standardisation of officially accepted national norms begins long before explicit codification. From the linguistic point of view, it depends on a decision, conscious or unconscious, a growing awareness of self-sufficiency and independence, of identity and otherness. Although evidence for such awareness in public and private discourse can be found, it is difficult to generalise and the reproach of generalising anecdotal evidence has to be taken seriously. Thus an empirical description should be based on authentic data from quantifiable sources: from a stratified database like the *Corpus of East African English* compiled within the framework of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE-EA, Hudson-Ettle and Schmied 1999; Schmied 2007), the bigger web-based compilation of media texts (Schmied and Wagner forthcoming), or internet search engines or tools (like *WebPhraseCount*, abbreviated below as WPC) using the World Wide Web as a database (Schmied 2006).

12.2 Backgrounds

12.2.1 *The colonial heritage*

Despite British colonial rule, colonial language policy was not simply pro-English but more complex than is often assumed (see Spencer 1971). The various colonial administrations tried to regulate official language use in their territories and this usually involved three types of language: (i) the local 'tribal' mother tongues, (ii) the African lingua franca (usually Kiswahili, only occasionally Luganda) and (iii) English, for local, 'intrateritorial' and international communication respectively. Other agents played a role as well: the churches, for instance, had enormous influence not only on church language but also on school language. The three British mission societies (the Universities Mission to Central African, the Church Mission Society and the London Mission Society) did not use English for evangelisation. The German missionary Krapf (who worked for the Church Mission Society) propagated a Latin spelling system for Kiswahili, which had been traditionally written in Arabic script, since he saw Kiswahili as 'the most cultivated of dialects' and as a key to the inland languages. Protestant missions in general favoured (in Martin Luther's tradition) 'the language of the people', i.e. the ethnic languages, but also the African lingua franca, Kiswahili. The Catholic Church usually used Latin in its services and Kiswahili for preaching.

After World War I, the British administration in Tanzania did not introduce English wholesale after taking over the former German colony. Rather, they admired the efficient German administration system, which according to a report from 1921 'made it possible to communicate in writing with every *akida* and village headman, and in turn to receive from him reports written in Kiswahili'. Thus English was established only in elitist circles when the

colonial powers tried to regulate communication within the administrative, legal and education system. The considerations summarised in a report by the Phelps-Stokes Fund (see Schmied 1991a: 15) proposed a basically trilingual language policy with the ethnic 'vernacular' for local communication and basic education, Kiswahili in ethnically mixed centres and English for the highest functions in administration, law and education. This led to the foundation of the Interterritorial Language Committee in 1929, which later developed into the East African Swahili Committee, responsible for standardisation, orthographical reform and expansion on the basis of the Zanzibar variety KiUnguja (and not the KiMvita of Mombasa). English was the language of instruction mainly in the few prestigious secondary schools, e.g. at King's College, Budo, Uganda, the school for chiefs' sons in Tabora or Alliance High in Nairobi, and of course at the first East African university, Makerere, founded as a technical school in 1922 and as a university college in 1949.

Thus colonial language policies established not an 'anglophone', but a 'trifocal' or trilingual system with (a) English as the elite and international language, (b) the regional lingua franca and (c) the 'tribal' languages or 'vernaculars' for local communication. The expansion of English down the social hierarchy began only at the end of colonial rule with the democratisation and expansion of education that was to prepare Africans for independence (see Schmied 1991a: 18). After independence, surprisingly few changes occurred; although lip-service was usually paid to African languages, only Tanzania made great progress towards expanding the functions of Kiswahili at the expense of English and local African languages.

12.2.2 *The range of variation in English in East Africa*

One of the broadest categorisations of the English used in Africa in general is suggested by Angogo and Hancock (1980: 71), who distinguish the following types according to speakers:

- (a) native English of African-born whites and expatriates;
- (b) native English of locally born Africans;
- (c) non-native English spoken fluently as a second language;
- (d) non-native English spoken imperfectly as a foreign language.

The first category, White African English, is relatively insignificant in East Africa today, although the influence of the early British and South African settlers may have been considerable seventy years ago, when over 2,000 had come to the 'White Highlands' north of Mount Kenya and east of Mount Elgon. The three types of (Black) African English constitute a continuum of English forms, which ranges from ENL to ESL and EIL (Native/Second/International Language) varieties. It is worth noting that these categories were originally used to illustrate differences between entire

nations, especially in the process of developing (hypothetical) national varieties of English. However, when it comes to analysing language forms which are actually used in Africa, intranational and intrapersonal variation, the individual speaker's sociolinguistic background and the actual speech-act situation must be taken into consideration. At the individual level, the type of English spoken by Africans depends largely, i.e. if we ignore special exposure to English either through personal acquaintances or the modern mass media, on two factors: (a) on their education, i.e. the length and degree of formal education in English, and (b) on their occupation, i.e. the necessity for and amount of English used in everyday life. In this broad spectrum, the borderline between standard and non-standard usage is not easy to draw. The clear violation of 'standards' is usually looked down upon as a sign of little education and, especially in Kenya, ridiculed in literary texts or political campaigns, e.g. in cartoons in the daily newspapers.

The range of variation in EAF is similar to other New Englishes (see Platt, Weber and Ho, 1984 and Hickey 2004). Because they are ESL varieties, and as such not transmitted directly via native speakers, usage is formed mainly through the medium of instruction in school and reinforced outside school. The ESL varieties are used in public functions in the national educational, legal and administration system. Interestingly enough though, the term 'New English' is rarely used in East Africa, probably because StE with EAF pronunciation or as a hypothetical independent East African Standard is considered more appropriate.

12.2.3 *The sociolinguistic situation today*

Because of this, the common cultural background makes the sociolinguistic situation rather similar. The major difference is the status of Kiswahili. In Tanzania, it is the true national language, since it is spoken nationwide as a lingua franca, learnt in a relatively homogeneous form (sometimes called 'Government Swahili') in all primary schools and used in most national functions including education in most secondary schools. In Kenya, Kiswahili is losing its association with the coast or with lower social positions. In Uganda, Kiswahili is unfortunately still associated with the military and the 'troubled' times of the 1970s and 1980s. This leaves more room for English and the other East African languages in Kenya and Uganda.

The official status of English in government, parliament or jurisdiction is not always easy to establish, as conflicting laws, regulations and proclamations since independence fifty years ago contradict each other. Whereas it is clearly the language of nationwide politics in Uganda, it is rarely used in those functions in Tanzania.

English is not really associated with white settlers any more: Although their distinct accents can still be heard, they are to be found outside the general national norm. The multilingual educated African elite invests large

sums of money in 'good education' and 'good English'. The Asians in East Africa are usually equally multilingual, speaking not only their native languages, mainly Gujarati or Panjabi, but also their own versions of Kiswahili and English.

Knowledge and actual use of English are based on rough estimates, since no nationwide census data are available¹ and the last language survey was sponsored by the Ford Foundation more than forty years ago. To say, for instance, that English is 'spoken' by 30 per cent in Uganda, 20 per cent in Kenya and only 5 per cent in Tanzania implies considerable numbers of speakers since the three countries have almost 35, 40 and 60 million inhabitants respectively. However, all these estimates must be treated with great caution. But at least, it gives an indication of the (historical) differences in education, urbanisation, modernisation or internationalisation. Since knowledge of English is prestigious, informants' self-evaluations are unreliable and nationwide proficiency tests for national certificates of education are often disappointing. The fact that even universities have started extensive course programmes in 'Communication Skills', or more explicitly 'Remedial English', reveals some of the problems on the highest level. The discussions can be followed on the internet today in various contributions including numerous letters-to-the-editor in major national newspapers (e.g. 'MUK enforces English for all' in *The New Vision, Uganda's Leading Daily* 13/01/02). The key problem is that English is used as the language of instruction from upper primary school onwards (in Uganda) and is thus the basis for all further education. The discussion is less about teaching English properly than teaching (other subjects) in English properly.

In Kenya and Uganda English is still, and in Tanzania it is again, a result and a symbol of good education and thus, directly or indirectly, a prerequisite for well-paid jobs with international links in trade and tourism. This is often reflected in popular debates on language attitudes in East Africa.

12.2.4 Language attitudes today

Attitudes towards languages and usages in Africa can be inferred from many debates, but systematic studies are rare and difficult. The general attitudes towards using English in East Africa have to be distinguished from the practical attitudes towards specific East African usages as an acceptable national or transnational standard.

The stereotyped notions of English (useful, interesting, etc.) are normally very positive. They may, however, have little effect on attitudes to actual language use and usage in East Africa. Apart from the occasional ideological

¹ The 2002 Tanzania Population and Housing Census asked 25 per cent of individuals from private households over five years of age, if they could read and write in Kiswahili only, English only, both Kiswahili and English or in any other language(s), and the results are included in the official Census publication.

debate on linguistic imperialism in academic circles, language is mainly viewed in extremely practical terms, since it is too obvious that English is the international language of science and technology and worldwide communication. Thus internationalist arguments in favour of English are also uncontroversial. Even the great supporter and translator of Kiswahili, President Nyerere of Tanzania, emphasised the importance of English calling it ‘the Kiswahili of the world’. The real issue is the use (and usage) of English in intranational communication, especially in African schools. Although the first-language principle (based on UNESCO recommendations since the 1950s) is normally accepted by African educationalists, nationally minded Tanzanians support the use of Kiswahili from the first day at school, whereas internationally minded parents in Uganda advocate a ‘fast track’ to English, which had been common at independence. The stage of switching to English is usually after lower primary school (four years) in Uganda and after secondary school in Tanzania, whereas in Kenya it is at the beginning of the four years of secondary school at the latest. The debate is most heated in Tanzania, where on the one hand in recent years many new private secondary schools have advertised English as a medium of instruction, whereas on the other hand even some universities have proposed teaching in Kiswahili. The same arguments pro and contra have been used for decades (see Schmied 1991a: chapter 7) and they can be also detected in recent newspaper debates (e.g. online in www.ippmedia.com).

In contrast to the debates on practical language issues, attitudes towards African varieties of English are rarely discussed outside scholarly circles. Accepting African forms is hardly openly admitted except in pronunciation, where ‘aping the British’ is seen as highly unnatural. Grammar in particular is considered the glue that holds the diverging varieties of English together; and international intelligibility is deemed absolutely essential as this major asset of the international language must not be jeopardised. Standard English with African pronunciation may be accepted as an intranational norm, but Ugandan, Kenyan and Tanzanian English as a whole are still not considered independent varieties in their own right. Nevertheless, the theoretical British norm is only upheld in books and rarely experienced in use in present-day Africa. The path towards independence and acceptance of new national standards has to be discussed on different levels of language description.

12.2.5 *The current status of codification and standardisation*

Although a similar ‘complaint tradition’ and ‘schizophrenic discrepancy’ between official and practical standards are reported from the East African countries as for other ESL countries, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania are not easy to place in the current theoretical models. Kachru (e.g. Kachru,

Kachru and Nelson eds 2006) sees Kenya and Uganda as outer circle and Tanzania rather as expanding circle, Schneider (2007, 2008) refers to occasional calls for an endonormative orientation and considers this process in Tanzania as halted. In most cases the pleas for standardisation are related to education (e.g. Kembo-Sure 2003).

Despite the number of universities with linguistics and the PhD theses written in this field, there is no comprehensive data collection and no comprehensive publication on East African, Kenyan, Tanzanian or Ugandan English. This implies that there is no official dictionary of East African English (as there is for South African English, for example), no unofficial dictionary (as for Nigeria or Cameroon, for example), no extended collection of usage phenomena (like Jowitt 1991 for Nigeria), and no detailed error lists with the exception of Hocking (1974), which describes an instance of Kenyan English interlanguage without specifying that in the title.

Although all countries have national language institutes, these usually concentrate on African languages, especially Kiswahili. There is also no national dictionary project or data compilation project as far as English is concerned. This shows the official scepticism (by politicians) towards standardising English at national levels and leaves room for a common East African initiative – the standardisation debate has hardly begun.

Thus everyday decisions on official and semi-official English usage are delegated to the higher editors in newspapers, the senior journalists in the newsroom, the senior correctors in national examination councils, the individual teachers at all levels of education, etc. A reference work including national or East African guidelines towards a standard would be useful for professional language users and many others.

Since decisions on codification cannot be based on intuition alone, a stratified data collection of educated English would be desirable. But such an official database does not exist, except *ICE-EA* (and that was compiled in 1990–6). Although there are many approaches to the standardisation of New Englishes (e.g. Bamgbose 1998), systematic data collection is the basis for codification, evaluation, acceptance and finally official publication. Today the internet can offer an opportunity for many to participate in a discussion forum on specific East African, Kenyan, Tanzanian or Ugandan structures, as listed below, that would go far beyond the traditional letters-to-the-editor.

From a theoretical perspective, this procedure could give us an insight into how (re-)conceptualisation may lead to homogeneity in usage and acceptance as endonormative stabilisation and finally standardisation. The establishment of a usage norm is the first step towards standardisation, and this is why this survey explores linguistic subsystems that may serve as a starting point for standardisation in the long run or for the recognition of ethnic dialects which are the last stage of complex variety formation.

12.3 Standardisation processes in EAfE subsystems

12.3.1 *Towards acceptability in subsystems of pronunciation*

The phonology of EAfE is of particular importance because (non-standard) pronunciation features seem to be the most persistent in African varieties, i.e. they are retained even in the speech of the most educated speakers. In many languages, pronunciation seems to be the most flexible element, which can be used (subconsciously) to express subtle sociolinguistic messages of speaker identity and of distance from or solidarity with the listener. English appears to be particularly fluid at this level, because even the supposed norms in Britain have moved so far away from the institutionalised written form that the graphemic system cannot symbolise the diverging phonemic systems any more (although mistakes in the form of phonetic spellings allow conclusions about the pronunciation from written texts).

The features characterising African pronunciations of English can be found at subphonemic, phonemic and supraphonemic levels. Differences at the phonemic level are important because here differences of lexical meaning are maintained. This can be illustrated (and elicited) in minimal pairs like *ram* and *lamb*, *beat* and *bit*, or *show* and *so*. Many Africans would not distinguish clearly in pronunciation between the elements of such pairs.

12.3.1.1 *Towards standardisation in EAfE vowel systems*

A comparison of the English phoneme system with that of most East African languages shows that the major differences are not the consonants but the few vowel contrasts. Thus the vowel system of EAfE deviates systematically, vowels tend to merge, because the extreme range of the English vowel continuum is not covered by the underlying African systems of the Bantu languages, for instance. On the whole three basic generalisations may be made for English vowels:

- (a) Length differences in vowels are levelled and not used phonemically; thus FLEECE and KIT, GOOSE and FOOT, THOUGHT and NORTH, as well as BATH, STRUT and TRAP tend to merge. This is not only a quantitative, but also a qualitative shift, as usually short vowels in EAfE are longer and more peripheral than in RP, especially /i/ tends towards /i:/, /ɛ/ towards /u:/, /ɔ/ towards /o:/ and /ʌ/ and /æ/ towards /a:/.
- (b) The central vowels, STRUT, NURSE and LETTER, are avoided and tend towards half-open or open positions like BATH and, less often, DRESS. This conforms to the tendency towards more extreme articulatory positions of the tongue in general. It leads (together with syllable-timing) to the phenomenon that vowels in full syllables tend to be underdifferentiated while those in unstressed ones may be overdifferentiated; thus the difference between *policeman* and *policemen* or between the suffixes *-ance* and *-ence* may be clearer than in standard English.

- (c) Diphthongs tend to have only marginal status and to be monophthongised. In the short closing diphthongs MOUTH and particularly FACE the second element is hardly heard in many African varieties (as in Scotland; thus coinciding almost with the DRESS vowel). Diphthongs with a longer glide are preserved, but they are not really pronounced as falling diphthongs, i.e. with less emphasis on the second element than on the first, but rather as double monophthongs (e.g. /o:/, /a:/). All the centring diphthongs (NEAR, SQUARE, CURE) tend to be pronounced as opening diphthongs or double monophthongs (/ia, ea, ua/; cf. tendency (b) above).

These shifts and mergers seem to hold for so many African varieties that this cannot be interpreted merely as a product of mother-tongue interference. This may also be the reason why they are rarely criticized and will be included in an accepted standard despite the possible homophones and intelligibility problems.

An interesting single parameter in this respect is the deviation of the RP long central NURSE vowel: it tends toward a back vowel /ɑ/ in West African varieties, towards a front vowel /a/ in Eastern and towards /e/ in Southern African varieties, but these tendencies are not uniform in all regions, neither across all ethnic groups, nor across the lexicon. In Tanzania *girl* tends towards a front articulation (DRESS) and *turn* towards back pronunciation (START) because of spelling pronunciation.

12.3.1.2 Differentiation in EAfE consonant systems

Like the vowel system, the English consonant system poses a big problem to East African users. Since consonants are not as uniform in the usage norm as the vowels, but differentiate the (ethnic) subnational systems, they cannot be part of wider standardisation. The liquids /r/ and /l/ are a particularly infamous pair for many Bantu speakers, both rendered as one and the same, often intermediate sound between /loli/ and /rori/ instead of /lori/ *lorry*, for instance. In Kenya, the pair is a clear subnational identifier (Schmied 1991b), since even educated Gikuyu clearly tend towards /r/ and the neighbouring Embu towards /l/. Occasionally the sets voiced and voiceless fricatives around the alveolar ridge /tʃ/ /ʃ/ and /s/, and /dʒ/, /ʒ/ and /z/ are not distinguished clearly either. Other problematic consonants are /θ/ and /ð/, which often deviate in the direction of /d/ and /t/ or, sometimes, /z/ and /s/, rarely /v/ and /f/. Most of these deviations are registered by East Africans as subnational peculiarities. Although these phoneme mergers do not endanger the consonant system as a whole, they may be clearly noticeable and stigmatised and are not part of national standardisation. The differentiation is more along language-typological lines: Nilosaharan groups from Northern Uganda and Kenya (e.g. Acholi and Luo) show similar 'deviations', as they are seen by other groups, in their fricatives.

12.3.1.3 *Standardisation of suprasegmental patterns on a pan-African level?*

Other important features of African English are supraphonemic, i.e. related to phoneme sequences, word stress, intonation and general rhythmic patterns. Many of these phenomena are difficult to describe, but some examples from three particularly striking aspects may suffice: the avoidance of consonant clusters, the more regular word stress and special rhythm.

Consonant clusters are a major phonotactic problem in EAFē, as many African languages have a relatively strict consonant-vowel syllable structure (often CV–CV–CV). Final consonants are dropped when there are two or more in a sequence, e.g. in [neks] for *next* and [hen] or [han] for *hand*. But this tendency also occurs in native-speaker English and its frequency seems to vary a lot. The general rule appears to be that if plosives are preceded by fricatives, they are dropped in word-final position; if they are preceded by other plosives or occur in non-final position they are split by vowels inserted between the consonants. A similar phenomenon occurs when final vowels are added to closed syllables (i.e. syllables ending in consonants). The vowels inserted or added are normally [ɪ] or [ʊ], depending on the occurrence of palatal or velar consonants in the environment (e.g. [hospɪtəlɪ] for *hospital* or [spɪrɪnɪ] for *spring*) or on vowel harmony (e.g. in [bʊkʊ] for *book*).

A particularly striking feature is the African tendency towards more regular stress rhythms. Again, the problem lies often with the English tendency to maintain partly the Romance principle of word stress on the penultimate syllable in contrast to the general Germanic principle of stressing the stem. This leads to differences in word stress between etymologically obviously related words when prefixes and suffixes are added. Thus *ad'mire* is not stressed on the same syllable as *admi'ration* and '*admirable*'; here East Africans are tempted to stress [ad'mairabl] and sometimes even [ad'maire'ʃen] just like [ad'maia]. Of course, the problem of a whole series of unstressed syllables is intrinsic to British Standard English; even American English has secondary stress regularly in words like *secretary*. Thus the final word stress on suffixes like –'ize and particularly –'ate may not be that surprising in practice. The tendency is not systematic, since in most cases the frequency and familiarity of words supports the 'correct' British English pronunciation, in other cases better known, etymologically related or similar words may serve as analogical models. This raises the problem that standard English uses stress to indicate word class; in EAFē the stress distinction between the verbs *pro'test*, *alter'nate*, *at'tribute* and the nouns '*protest*', '*alternate*', '*attribute*' is rarely maintained.

The most striking feature of African Englishes is the tendency towards syllable-timed rather than stress-timed rhythm. Thus EAFē speakers tend to give all syllables more or less equal stress and do not compact sequences of several unstressed syllables together into one stress unit as speakers of British English do. This underlying pattern accounts for most suprasegmental patterns in EAFē mentioned above (e.g. to give too much weight to

unstressed syllables) and its sometimes unfamiliar rhythm. It may also cause misunderstandings in intercultural communication, when EAFé may be misjudged as ‘unfriendly machine-gun fire’ or ‘childish song-song’. It is an interesting question whether this helps communication with francophone Africans, whose speech is also syllable-timed.

3.2 *Stigmatisation of variation in inflectional morphology*

In contrast to intonation, inflection is clearly codified in StE, so that ‘errors’ are clearly stigmatised. Inflectional endings are not always added in EAFé, but the general, regular or unmarked forms are used instead. This applies to the regular endings of the third-person singular present tense and of the past tense and to irregular verb forms as well as plurals. Since such deviations from the (British) norm are stigmatised, educated East Africans only use them in special cases. Some cases seem a simple expansion of the British norm, where a unit can be seen as a whole or as several pieces.

- (1) K.shs. 33,500/- *was* [StE *were*] raised during our pre-wedding (ICE-EA: S1BCE05K)
- (2) It is the City Inspectorate who *assigns* the City Askari. (ICE-EA: S1Bo66K)

Where conceptual recategorisation seems possible, most cases will not find general acceptance as an (official) standard (see Section 12.3.3 below). A good example here is provided by adjective endings. In EAFé, as in many other ESL/EIL varieties, adjectives tend to be used as adverbs. The unmarked adverbial form is correct in very few cases in StE (*hard, first, high*, in certain contexts or sayings like *Take it easy*, etc.; but not in *Do it proper*), but it occurs not only in African, but also in some native English varieties. Still, in EAFé it is hardly accepted.

12.3.3 *Towards standardisation and recategorisation of grammar*

East African tendencies in morphology and syntax can often also be found in other parts of Africa and even beyond, in so-called New Englishes (see Hickey 2004), and even in some first-language varieties in Britain, America or Australia. Partly, at least, English varieties all seem to develop in similar directions, as for instance in terms of simplification and regularisation. Frequency, consistency, systematicity and the developmental, regional and social distribution over various spoken and written text types are a matter for further research. The question of implicational hierarchies in frequency and acceptability can only be discussed on this basis. However, it is clear that such widespread recategorisations are a good empirical basis for arguing in favour of standardising new patterns not only in East Africa.

The first description of subsystemic recategorisation of grammar was by Platt, Weber and Ho (1984: 52–9). They saw a completely different system of articles in New Englishes: whereas standard English uses the definite/indefinite system (*known/not known*) as the basic distinction, the ‘New Englishes’ prefer to use the specific/non-specific (*particular/not particular*) system, as in the standard English determiner pair *certain – any*. In this system, non-specific reference is expressed by no article (as in *Give me beer*, which gives the typical impression of an EAFé ‘rude style’) and specific reference by *the*. The tendency of omitting determiners also applies to indefinite, possessive and demonstrative pronouns.

- (3) Standing hay, though of poor quality, offers animals nutrients required for __ maintenance of their body condition (ICE-EA: W2B033K)
- (4) There is __ need for development of small, hand-driven machines (ICE-EA: W2B033K).

Many EAFé grammar features have multiple explanations (like transfer from African languages and overgeneralisation of intralanguage patterns), but the most intriguing analysis is cognitive and multivariate. This applies to the grammatical ‘mass’ concept, i.e. the count–non-count distinction, which has repercussions for plural formation as well as for determination, although with different frequencies (the plural *advices* is less frequent than *an advice*). Recategorisations do not occur consistently each time a construction is used and are very often applied to subsystems, which are hardly challenged, and thus represent good candidates for the accepted standardisation of New English usages.

12.3.3.1 Towards standardising extended continuous forms

The use of expanded forms (BE + VERB + *-ing* construction) is frequent and does not necessarily imply StE (progressive) meanings. Such continuous forms represent a marked verbal system in contrast to the unmarked simple tense system that can be used to express the progressive, but also many others contextual meanings (including speaker attitude). This affects the distinction between the non-stative and the stative use of verbs and applies particularly to some verbs that are used with *-ing* forms only in marked, specific meanings, particularly *have*. This can often only be noticed in larger contexts, especially when the meaning is certainly not ‘temporary’ but rather ‘habitual’:

- (5) Some of us may think that women always are having a lot of things to do (ICE-EA: S1BINT13T)
- (6) It is really very toxic to the user because it produces a lot of smoke heavy smoke and it is smelling (ICE-EA: S1BINT13T)

12.3.3.2 *Towards accepting nominal recategorisation*

The tendency to extend plural morphemes to non-count nouns is quite common in New Englishes and often accepted, since it is obviously cognitively motivated: although they can be seen as collective units, several individual pieces can be distinguished, e.g. with *luggages, furnitures, firewoods* or *grasses*. Sometimes this tendency conflates more or less subtle semantic differentiations in standard English, such as those between *food–foods, people–peoples*, sometimes it merely regularises (historical) morphological StE irregularities (*fishes*). East African usage basically ignores the grammatical distinction of count vs non-count nouns, which does not always correspond to the semantic one. In StE plural *-s* is not added to nouns that are considered abstract or collective/mass and thus non-count (*discontents, informations*). But even in StE, some of the non-countables may occur in the plural in special meanings (e.g. *works*) or in stressed contexts (e.g. *experiences*). Consequently, differences are often a question of interpretation and frequency.

- (7) These **advices** are coming because they've already studied all of us (ICE-EA: S1BINT12T)

12.3.3.3 *Towards accepting prepositional variation*

English prepositions are polysemous and idiomatic. Because of a lack of inflectional morphology, prepositions are particularly important in English and StE is peculiar in that the use of prepositions is often fixed and either dependent on the preceding verb, noun, adjective or adverb or the following noun. The choice of idiomatic preposition may follow semantic, morphological or even traditional Latin rules. The matching of prepositions to verbs, nouns, adjectives or adverbs is therefore neither easy nor logical to a second-language user.

Generally the most frequent English prepositions *of* and *in* (at the expense of the more special *into*) occur significantly more frequently in East Africa than in British English (see Mwangi 2003), which may be explained as a 'safety strategy'. More specific simple prepositions (like *off* or *across*) are used less often. This is sometimes seen as underdifferentiation in StE, e.g. disregarding the distinction between restricted position and extended position (*at Nairobi* is used regularly in Kenya, even when it does not suggest a point in a global perspective, but an extended place where *in Nairobi* is clearly preferred in StE). Since the prepositional systems in English are much more complex than in African languages, more general prepositions tend to be chosen (e.g. *in* for *into*) and analogy plays an important role. Rare prepositions (like *underneath, spatial past, or down*) are used even less in EAF. Another case of simplification is the neglected distinction between locative *beside* and contrastive *besides* (ibid.).

Similarly, frequent complex prepositions (like *because of, according to* and *due to*) occur more frequently, less frequent and more complex ones

(like *in front of*, *in favour of*, *by means of*, *in the light of*) less often in spoken EAfE.

- (8) What is the main reason of [StE *for*] the decrease of production? (ICE-EA: S1B041T)
- (9) Many people are just coming **in** (*to*) the country. (ICE-EA: S1A018T)

Phrasal/prepositional verbs are particularly important in English word formation; adding particles or prepositions after the English verb is a style-specific alternative to prefixation, especially with Germanic stems (e.g. *go about* = 'begin', *go ahead* = 'proceed', *go back* = 'return', *go down* = 'decrease', *go on* = 'continue', *go up* = 'increase'). This alternative and special phrasal/prepositional usage is unknown in African languages. Especially for phrasal verbs, the corresponding preposition is not easy to conceptualise for non-native speakers, since the meanings are figurative. Selection criteria may be extensions from cognitively similar phrasal verbs or from etymologically related nouns in English, like *talk about* > *discuss about* or *discussion about* > *discuss about*. Whether a phrase should be considered tautologous is not easy to decide. In the end, the difference between British and EAfE is often a matter of frequency, i.e. *discuss about* occurs on web pages in the Kenyan domain (.ke) about three times as often as on the corresponding UK pages.

In formal descriptive categories, prepositions may be omitted (the well-known *I will pick you* [StE *up*] *at eight*; *crop* [StE *up*], *provide* [*with*]), or substituted (e.g. *attach with* [StE *to*], *concentrate with* [StE *on*], *congratulate for* [StE *on*], *participate with* [StE *in*], *result into/to* [StE *in*]), or added, which seems to be the most frequent case (e.g. *advocate for*, *mention about*, *join with*). Particles are omitted when they appear 'obvious' (*protest* [StE *against*]). The substituted particles are often consistent with the prefix morpheme (e.g. *deprive from* instead of *deprive of*) or closely related in meaning (e.g. *out* and *off*, as in *switch out the light* [StE *off*], *put off* [StE *out*] *the fire*). The additional particles are often logically possible, but are considered redundant with the verb according to StE norms but are used after the corresponding noun (e.g. *emphasise on* < *N emphasis on*; similarly, *demand for*, *request for*, *stress on*). Besides analogy, interference from African languages is possible, since their propositional system is relatively simple and thus polysemous. For instance, one basic locative proposition in Kiswahili, seen in *mwituni*, can be translated as *at*, *to*, *in/inside*, *by/near/next to* and *from the forest*.

12.3.3.4 Towards accepted variation in (non-finite) verb complementation

As verb complementation is usually a matter of individual lexemes rather than rules, collocations and structures would have to be listed (learnt and taught) with individual verbs. Frequency and familiarity also determine how stigmatised the expression is. Again, Africans often try to solve apparent

irregularities by applying cognitively ‘understandable’ criteria, thus *allow him go* is analogous to *let him go* and *made him to do* parallel to *forced him to do*, but they do not correspond to British norms. Sometimes two similar constructions are confused (as with *decide to* + INFINITIVE and *decide on* + *-ing*). The subtle distinctions between infinitive and gerund constructions (e.g. between *stop to do* and *stop doing*) tend to be neglected and the choice seems random. Although this may be viewed as unnecessary simplification, it is usually difficult to argue in favour of maintaining such ‘minor distinctions’ in a broader standardisation process.

- (10) Would you mind **to** tell us uh a brief background about ICAC
and uh what uh are you going to discuss in Arusha (ICE-EA:
S1Bo41T)
- (11) he has indicated to want to stop **to** deliver what he has (ICE-EA:
S1Bo31T)

12.3.4 *Towards flexibility in word order, focussing and complementation*

More than in other areas of grammar, it is difficult to assess emphasis as right or wrong. It is considered inappropriate only in certain cases since the presentation of information remains flexible to a large extent. Often, however, the question of whether an unusual construction implies special emphasis or contrast is difficult to decide.

Topicalisation through fronting and corresponding intonation is rare in StE, but common in many English varieties (e.g. Irish English). StE has developed special forms like cleft and pseudo-cleft constructions instead, which are again too complex for ESL users.

In general, word order in EAfE is much more flexible and can be used to express emphasis and focus more readily than in StE (in this respect it can be seen as closer to colloquial spoken English).

Indirect speech which uses the word order of direct speech could be interpreted as correct in spoken English where one cannot distinguish between the direct and indirect versions – if it is marked by different intonation and a break marking a question mark. That may be the reason why this feature occurs also in non-standard native-speaker English.

- (12) I would like to know as to where and when **are you going** to
have your celebrations and who will be the guest of honour
(ICE-EA: S1BINT13T)
- (13) Are there any other activities you’re going to show in this week or
you’ll be only informing the public about the two international
conferences in Arusha (ICE-EA: S1Bo41T)

Maintaining the word order *question word – verb – subject* seems to contradict another tendency, i.e. to retain the normal order *subject – verb – object*

wherever possible, but it must be interpreted as a simplification or regularisation of the formation rules for all types of questions, direct and indirect.

- (14) **Already** appeals have been sent out to individuals, foundations, and other organisations to help contribute (ICE-EA: W2Bo09K)

A special case of information processing is ‘double pronouns’ or pronoun appositions, i.e. a personal pronoun does not have the usual anaphoric function of linking sentences but of ‘repeating’ a noun (phrase) in the same sentence. This usage is a particular discourse strategy in which the theme of a sentence is fronted with the pronoun as a placeholder for the noun phrase which was extracted by the fronting process. In StE, pronoun apposition is perfectly acceptable when the previous noun phrase is introduced by *as for*, *as far as NP is concerned* (S1a/b), etc. When speakers seem to hesitate or have lost the thread of their sentence copying a pronoun may help the listener to process the message; EAfE seems to be more liberal as far these rules are concerned, at least in speech.

- (15) As for the calcium in bone, it plays two important roles (ICE-EA: W2Bo30K)
 (16) As for me and my house, we declared war on poverty (ICE-EA: W2Fo02K)

Pronoun copying occurs especially in oral English after long and complex subjects, involving prepositional constructions, infinitives or relative clauses. Redundant pronouns can be found within relatives when personal pronouns take up the head of a relative construction (as above) and when possessive pronouns premodify the head of a relative construction (i.e. the possessive pronoun and the relative clause subject refer to the same person, as in *my book that I read*).

- (17) So human being in the first time of his existence **he** found that he was <-/subjected> to the work (ICE-EA: S1Bo04T)
 (18) there is our glue which we are getting **them** near (ICE-EA: S1Bo47I)

12.3.5 Towards national standardisation of additions in the lexicon

The lexicon of EAfE comprises of course the core lexicon of standard English and specific East Africanisms, which would not be interpreted easily or equally by the non-initiated, e.g. readers/listeners not familiar with English usage in East Africa. Despite some cultural, especially sociopolitical, differences between Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, the use of (Kiswahili) loans, the semantic extension of StE lexemes and a high degree of idiomatic flexibility are common and accepted features.

12.3.5.1 *Loanwords from African languages*

Lexical East Africanisms consist of several layers: old Africanisms that developed during colonial days and remained in use in East Africa (not only in international films, like *daktari*), post-independence Africanisms (mainly in politics, like *ujamaa*) and recent Africanisms (like *mitumba* for 'used/second-hand clothes', but sometimes transferred to 'second-hand' in general, as in *mitumba cars* or even *mitumba mentality*). On all three levels, national standardisation is accepted, especially in culture-specific areas where any semantic expansion of lexemes from European English would give a totally wrong flavour.

Very old borrowings, such as *askari* ('soldier/guard'), *baobab* ('*adansonia*'), *bwana* ('Master/Mr.'), or *safari* ('travel'), mainly in the environmental field, have already been incorporated into general English and are thus codified in general large dictionaries of world English, for instance, the *Oxford English Dictionary* with its supplements. Their range transcends African English by far, and some have even been integrated into other European languages. These borrowings are, however, restricted to African contexts (e.g. *travel in Africa*) and thus have a more specific meaning in general English than in the particular regional variety of English. A well-known example is the Kiswahili word *safari*. In East Africa it denotes any 'journey' (*journey* is seldom used, possibly because of pronunciation difficulties). For European tourists it always refers to a small 'expedition' to see and shoot game (in colonial days with a gun, nowadays usually with a camera), normally in national parks. Interestingly enough, *safari* in standard English can also refer to the group of people setting out on such a safari, a semantic expansion which is not possible in Kiswahili. Very few Africanisms have such a secure existence in general English, most of them being marginal and only used to render meanings in an African context.

This becomes understandable when one examines the areas of life or domains in which most East Africanisms occur. Schmied (1991a: 80–1) shows a few examples mainly from Kiswahili, grouped according to the major domains of Africanisms. As can be expected, the African environment is inadequately reflected in the standard English lexicon and is supplemented by African names for characteristic landscapes, plants or animals. African loans cluster around 'African' domains just as English loans cluster around 'European' domains. It is interesting to see that the semantic expansion of Standard English lexemes may create problems of distinction as in the case of *potatoes*, where Africans often have to specify *Irish/European potatoes* or *sweet potatoes*. In general, the preferred staple food dish is hardly ever translated: Kenya's/Tanzania's *ugali* is Uganda's *posho* (from colonial English *portion*, which was allocated to workers), the traditional maize dish (somewhat like *polenta* in Italy).

The field of food is probably culture-specific everywhere, but in many African countries there is a marked contrast between European and African

food (and eating habits) because Europeans in East Africa have tended not to adopt African food, in contrast to the British in India. Some dishes are also marked by ethnicity or region, like *githeri* for a Gikuyu bean dish or *vitumbua* for coastal rice-cakes. Some are, of course, clearly imported from Asia like *bajia* (an Indian potato dish) and *chai* (tea, usually black). All are accepted though not necessarily in common use everywhere.

As is wellknown, many African words for kin relations in the intimate family and beyond are retained, especially when used as a form of address (like *Babu* for ‘grandfather’). Where African clothing is still worn it is, of course, referred to by African names. Other African customs, which have to be rendered in African words, are concerned with traditional customs or pastimes (e.g. *lobola* ‘bride-price’), or with rules of politeness (like *habari* greetings).

An important domain of Africanisms today is politics. As African languages have often played a major role in mobilising the masses, even before *uhuru* (‘independence’) was reached, and *harambee* (‘pulling together’) and *nyayo* (ex-President Moi’s following in the ‘footsteps’ of Kenyatta) were national slogans in Kenya and *ujamaa* (‘familyhood’) and *kujigetemea* (‘self-reliance’) in Tanzania. It is clear that most of these terms have to be seen in their sociopolitical context, otherwise they may conjure up wrong connotations. Many politicians wish to demonstrate their local roots by including African vocabulary in their speeches even when using English, so there is no alternative to national additions to the traditional English lexicon.

A more comprehensive dictionary entry would have to add typical collocations and sample sentences (in some cases only a picture may explain matters to the non-initiated). Thus a dictionary entry for the famous East Africanism *matatu* (including inflections and denotative and connotative meanings) etymology and collocates) could be:

matatu pl ~s N ‘collective taxi’ in EAfr., esp. Kenya usu. licensed for fixed routes of public transport, but flexible, they leave when they are considered ‘full’; infamous for reckless driving and overcrowding; etym. < Swahili ‘three’, orig. 3 shillings fare; collocates: N driver, tout, operator, passenger; LOC. park, stand, stage, stop; PREP in, on board a ~; VERB enter, board a ~

Matatu also shows interesting national differences – and the advantages of a good, current on-line encyclopaedia:

The reference to the Swahili term *matatu* has been removed from the entry on ‘taxi’ to avoid confusion. This term is NOT widely used in Uganda as an equivalent of taxi. It was widely used in the 1970’s to refer to pickup trucks that were modified to carry passengers; these have been supplanted by minivans since and the term is now rarely heard in Uganda. Kigongos (talk) 15:21, 24 January 2008 (UTC) http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Ugandan_English (06/08/10)

Table 12.1 *Distribution of Swahili matatu generated by WebPhraseCount*

		<i>matatu</i>	<i>daladala</i>	<i>taxi</i>
ke 7,160,000	absolute:	30,900	1	21,800
	relative:	0.432%	0%	0.304%
	intrasite share:	58.6%	0%	41.4%
tz 971,000	absolute:	10,400	3,210	1,850
	relative:	1.071%	0.331%	0.191%
	intrasite share:	67.3%	20.8%	12%
ug 1,100,000	absolute:	608	2	10,300
	relative:	0.055%	0%	0.936%
	intrasite share:	5.6%	0%	94.4%
uk 839,000,000	absolute:	1,990	151	2,700,000
	relative:	0%	0%	0.322%
	intrasite share:	0.1%	0%	99.9%

This is also shown in the WPC diagram for *matatu* and its Tanzanian and general 'equivalent' shown in Table 12.1. The absolute figure for *matatu* in the UK is surprisingly high, but by far the most refer to a Kenyan context.

The table also shows that *taxi* (or *minibus*), the referential equivalent to *matatu* and *daladala* (from *dollar* in Tanzania), is relatively rare. But this reference shift creates the need for a new word for 'taxi' in Uganda, which is filled by *special* (*hire*) in the phrase *We take a special hire if we have enough money*, which also shows the exceptional nature of this means of transport.

A related case from Uganda and Kenya is the 'cycle taxi' *boda-boda*, which is explained as follows by the UgandaWiki:

This word is used to refer to the motorcycles and bicycles that engage in the business of transporting passengers. Sometimes it can refer to the riders of the motorcycles ... Probably originated from the border between Kenya and Uganda at Busia, where there is a 1km stretch of no man's land. Enterprising young men would carry passengers on bicycles/motorcycles over this land, and would be heard calling for passengers 'border-border'. (www.ugandawiki.ug/Boda-boda)

In this semantic field of local transport national terms have developed, which makes EAfE harmonisation towards a transnational standard more difficult than in other fields.

Finally, a few examples of Ugandanisms (again from UgandaWiki), as a WPC query (Table 12.2) clearly shows, can be given. An example with an English lexical base is *detoother*, a *gold-digger* (i.e. somebody has a sexual relationship with a member of the opposite sex, usually a *sugar-daddy*, primarily for material gain). This word is also used as a verb as in *She has detoothed many men in this town*. Because of their connotations meanings in this field are less widespread and tend to be replaced in (youth) jargon easily.

Table 12.2 Mbu, detoother, kwanjula and kyeyo as clear Ugandanisms on the internet (extracted with WPC)

		<i>detoother</i>	<i>kwanjula</i>	<i>kyeyo</i>	<i>Mbu</i>
ke 7,160,000	absolute:	0	32	12	516
	relative:	0%	0%	0%	0.007%
	intrasite share:	0%	5.7%	2.1%	92.1%
tz 971,000	absolute:	0	0	1	2,900
	relative:	0%	0%	0%	0.299%
	intrasite share:	0%	0%	0%	100%
ug 1,100,000	absolute:	56	1,090	2,020	3,090
	relative:	0.005%	0.099%	0.184%	0.281%
	intrasite share:	0.9%	17.4%	32.3%	49.4%

The traditional Baganda marriage ceremony *kwanjula* (also as a verb, even with inflections like *kwanjulering*, *kwanjulad*) is legally fully recognised today. It is practised similarly by other ethnic groups in Uganda, but the term has not spread into general EAFē.

The modern example is *kyeyo* (lit. broom), it is used in *to do kyeyo* or *to be on kyeyo* meaning to earn one's livelihood in a foreign country and is found in related compounds (like *kyeyo lifestyle* or *kyeyo behaviour*). The verb is *nkuba kyeyo* ('to use the broom') and thus *nkuba kyeyos* are Ugandan economic refugees, who have their own special history since Idi Amin's days.

A discourse example is *mbu*, a speech act marker like StE *that*, but with sceptical overtones (*nti* is supposed to be more neutral). Since it is from Luganda, it is not used in Kenya and Tanzania.

12.3.5.2 Standardisation of semantically changed lexemes of StE

In Africa, many English word forms occur in slightly different contexts than in British Standard English, thus usually expanding their referential meaning. The most striking examples of this are kinship terms. Even the most casual visitor to Africa notices that Africans seem to have very many 'brothers' and 'sisters' or even 'fathers'; this can not only be attributed to the high birth rate and the extended family structure. Kinship terms are expanded as reference and address terms, because they go far beyond the British core meanings related to the biological features of consanguinity, generation and sex and are related to the social features of seniority (age), solidarity, affection and rolerelements. Thus, all the mother's co-wives or sisters may be addressed as *mother*, many elderly men as *father* and people from the same village without direct blood relations as *brothers and sisters*. As it is very important to show respect to older people in general, even older sisters may be ascribed the higher status of *auntie*. This is supported by different kinship categorisations in African languages, where seniority is most important.

A famous example of a different usage of an English discourse particle, which may cause some amazement, is *sorry*. Many visitors to Africa have noticed that their African friends seem to apologise frequently. When Africans say *sorry*, however, they merely use the appropriate African form of expressing solidarity or sympathy, because it is customary to express sympathy when someone has an unfortunate experience. Thus the same word, which expresses apology in standard English, has expanded its meaning to sympathy in African English, because a gap in the vocabulary seems to have been felt by African users. Other items of semantic incongruence can be detected when the usage of expressions of gratitude (*thank you*) and politeness (*please*), in replies corresponding to American *You are welcome*, are examined carefully.

The limits of acceptable standardisation can be seen in word meanings where expansions of one lexeme clash with others in the field. Common ‘confusables’ clash, for instance, the cases when *to book* is used like StE *to hire*, *to forget* like *to lose*, *to refuse* like *to deny*, *to convince* like *to persuade*, *to see* like *to look*, *to reach* like *to arrive*, *arm* like *hand*, *guest* like *stranger*, *strange* like *foreign* and so on. In most of these cases either the meanings have been expanded or more specific features (selection restrictions) have been dropped. *Escort*, for instance, originally implies a special guard or act of courtesy, but by Africans it may be used in the more general sense of *accompany*, without the narrower connotation of offering protection. Occasionally meanings are restricted, as in *move with* in the sense of ‘go out with friends or a boy-/girlfriend’. Sometimes the semantic overlap between items accounts for the ‘confusion’, e.g. *exchange information* has certainly a close relationship with *compare*, but when British students *exchange notes* this implies that sheets of paper are swapped and not merely that *notes are compared*, as with African students. Again some problem cases are also stigmatised in StE style guides: *clarify* means usually an effort by somebody who holds information and is in a position to make things clearer: *I should clarify that point from the principal* refers to an authority from whom one can seek clearance or permission.

12.3.5.3 Flexibility in idiomaticity

Second-language English is characteristically less idiomatic than first-language English, which may make communication more difficult for Africans listening to European English speakers than the other way round. But EAfE has developed some idiomatic meanings, which may not be obvious at first sight. Thus if an unsuspecting traveller needed *to make a short call* in East Africa, he might be shown the way to a toilet (or place used for that purpose). Of course, extreme cases are rare and the few exceptions prove the rule.

However, contexts and style choices constituting idiomaticity form a complex interplay and this special flavour can only be studied across larger

stretches of authentic texts. This is why a few examples of typical verb usage in the spoken part of *ICE-EA* may suffice:

- (19) I am a matatu driver **operating** route No. 44. (ICE-EA: S1Bo65K)
- (20) It is the City Inspectorate who **assigns** the City Askari. (ICE-EA: S1Bo66K)
- (21) But he never saw anybody himself; nor anybody **alighting** from the police m/v go to the house. (ICE-EA: S1BCEo7K)

Whether EAfE is really more explicit (*according to me = in my view*), more flexible (*to sail in the same boat* seems to be as frequent as *to be in the same boat*) and more illustrative (as in *big with child*) can only be decided on the basis of large-scale comparative surveys or informant interviews and elicitation tests (see Skandera 2003).

Again, the limits of accepted flexibility can be seen in expansions of StE collocations. Collocations may be less fixed than idioms, because their particular meaning occurs not only in the idiomatic context; but collocates still ‘expect’ each other to some extent. In EAfE, combinations are less fixed and similar words may replace StE stereotypes (*smooth* [StE *plain*] *sailing*). Often fairly general terms are used instead of more specific collocates (*an election is done* [StE *conducted/held*] or *to commit an action* [StE *crime*]). It is not always the case that collocations are stronger or lexemes used more specifically in British Standard English, because African English has developed its own specific forms (as in *I dropped* [*got out/down, alighted (from the car)*] *near the hospital*).

Most of the connotations of English lexemes in an African context can lead to intercultural problems in discourse. It may seem too obvious to mention that *rich* may conjure up very different ideas in a rural African context, but this may also apply to *travelling* and *holiday*, even *Sunday* and *game*, where associative African values and preferences may differ considerably from European traditions. Of course, such meanings are accepted as standard in East African contexts.

12.4 Research issues

12.4.1 Research data and generalisations

The problem of insufficient research data has been mentioned in various parts of this summary. Although the internet with East African newspapers and even radio broadcasts (see the accompanying CD) has made new data more accessible to the ‘European’ arm-chair researcher on Africa, fieldwork is still essential, partly to evaluate and scrutinise the data available, partly to complement such data with other text types, situations and speakers. Data from newspapers, radio, TV and other media tend to mirror public oral and written production and clearly have an urban and elitist bias.

The only broad and stratified collection of EAfE is the East African part of the *International Corpus of English (ICE-EA)*, freely available with manual from the internet). It was collected between 1990 and 1996 and is compatible with the other parts of this collective effort to record true English usage in its first and second-language varieties (principally each with 1 million words in 500 text types, half written and half spoken). The computerised collection from Kenya and Tanzania allows comparisons with the first-language varieties of Britain and Australia, but also with the second-language varieties of India and the Philippines, for instance. Thus general processes of second-language development can be distinguished from more special East African features. However, the size of the corpus (about 1.5 million words with only about half a million words of spoken English) makes it a convenient source for analyses of grammar and frequent lexemes, especially as far as stylistic or text-type-specific differences are concerned; it is not really sufficient for lexical and collocational research, where a much larger corpus would be necessary.

For such quantitative comparisons and sample retrievals, the internet with the domains .ug, .ke and .tz can be used. Such a procedure using modern web browsers provides examples of rare cases much more easily now, although again the texts have to be evaluated critically, e.g. whether they can really be seen as 'educated East African English'. This way, country-specific patterns can be distinguished, e.g. Kiswahili address forms like *ndugu* or *mzee* have higher hits in Tanzania than in Kenya, or *duka* and *fundi* are less frequent in Uganda, but *sodas* occur in all three East African countries in contrast to South African *minerals*. Finally, a plea to look at the data carefully is appropriate: *soda* as well as *minerals* of course belong to general English as well, but in other contexts, baking and mining, for instance. Even *mitumba* also occurs on .uk websites, but usually with an explicit explanation in the form of premodifiers or appositions (*the second-hand mitumba* or *mitumba, second-hand clothes*); in South Africa it is often used with explicit reference to East Africa.

Interestingly, the specific EAfE lexemes discussed here are not found among the most frequent 2,500 words (Table 12.3), so that any discussions about the autonomy of an EAfE lexicon seem premature and lexical standardisation is not a pressing issue.

12.4.2 Research discourse

EAfE is so under-researched that there are few areas where systematic empirical scholarly work can be evaluated. A special case is the corpus-linguistic examples presented here (and elsewhere, e.g. Schmied 1991a) vs the questionnaire-based acceptability results obtained by Buregeya (2006). He partly uses features described in Schmied (1991a) as African tendencies, asking 188 of his students at Nairobi University to fill in a

Table 12.3 East African lexemes in the 18+ million-word corpus of EAFÉ newspapers

Lexeme	Meaning	Rank	Tokens (sing.)	Tokens (plural)
<i>safari</i>	travel, trip	1895	1163	613
<i>matatu</i>	collective taxi	5773	301	98
<i>daladala</i>	collective taxi	9790	100	41
<i>wananchi</i>	fellow countrymen	4876	301	
<i>dawa</i>	trad. Medicine	19257	31	

questionnaire. He emphasises: ‘I want to claim that that time has now come; that is, this form [in context: a local, East African form of English, in the title: Kenyan English] 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’ (2006: 203). One of his examples is *enable them improve* (2006: 207), based on Schmied 1991a: 69): ‘V5: Verb complementation (infinitives, gerunds, etc.) varies freely’. This allows us to compare his result (of 78 per cent acceptability) with our usage results from WPC (Table 12.4), both of which contribute to the standardisation process.

Here only absolute figures are given, since the relative figures are small (except in the UK) and the variation is enormous. Obviously, Buregeya is right when he looks at the usage preference for *enable + improve*, but would we not expect similar usage results for *expect + do*? And how do we explain the differences between Kenya and Tanzania, except by stating no standard is yet in sight? The example illustrates the complexities of future research in standardisation in EAFÉ.

12.4.3 Outlook

Since their independence fifty years ago, East Africans have developed an interesting trifocal language system, where English has a widespread African language, Kiswahili, as a rival in high-language functions in the region (and through the Organisation of African Unity even on the continent). Although other African languages play a role in subnational communication and influence English pronunciation, East Africa is unique among the English-speaking areas of the world precisely because of this dichotomy. Interestingly enough, it does not threaten English in the area since its losses in national functions have been greatly compensated by the many international functions of English that have been important for East Africans since their integration into worldwide communication networks over 100 years ago. EAFÉ shares many features, especially in grammar, with other New Englishes, which also have comparable tendencies in lexical

Table 12.4 *Complementation of enable in the top level domains ke, tz, ug and uk (using WPC)*

	<i>enable them do</i>	<i>enable them to do</i>
ke 7,190,000	3	309
tz 991,000	83	3
ug 1,070,000	1,670	546
uk 832,000,000	248,000	200,000
	<i>enable them improve</i>	<i>enable them to improve</i>
ke 7,190,000	85	42
tz 991,000	16	19
ug 1,070,000	165	25

development. Thus EAfE can be seen in a larger framework, e.g. in that of the *International Corpus of English* as mentioned above.

The trends of globalisation will reinforce the cross-fertilisation of New Englishes. The influence of Nigerian English can be clearly felt in Kenya (Hoffmann 2010), for instance, through many Nigerian films that are aired on Kenyan TV and have become popular. No wonder that some tendencies survive the short-lived fashions in restricted (youth) jargon and become part of the wider usage repertoire of the new global generation in East Africa. This complements the older additions to the British base, the influence of Indian English through education, media and business, and the influence of American English through military co-operation and the media (with Nigerian Nollywood following Bollywood and Hollywood). The inter-African exchange through the new media can hardly be accurately estimated today since internet access is still relatively restricted across the region.

In the long tradition of African multilingualism and the new tradition of English globalisation, English in East Africa remains a fascinating case of convergence and differentiation. The appreciation of national and regional features will develop and lead to explicit standardisation one day, hopefully on a common EAfE basis. The chances for harmonisation are much greater than in West Africa. Until then, this long-term process makes English in East Africa interesting to watch for both casual observers and specialised researchers alike.

References

- Angogo, Rachel and Ian Hancock 1980. 'English in Africa: emerging standards or diverging regionalisms?', *English World-Wide* 1: 67–96.
- Bamgbose, Ayo 1998. 'Torn between the norms: innovations in world Englishes', *World Englishes* 17: 1–14.
- Buregeya, Alfred 2006. 'Grammatical features of Kenyan English and their extent of acceptability', *English World-Wide* 27: 199–216.

- Hickey, Raymond (ed.) 2004. *Legacies of Colonial English: Studies in Transported Dialects*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hocking, Brian D. W. 1974. *All What I Was Taught and Other Mistakes: a Handbook of Common Mistakes in English*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmann, Thomas 2010. 'White Kenyan English', in Daniel Schreier, Peter Trudgill, Edgar W. Schneider and Jeffrey P. Williams (eds.) *The Lesser-Known Varieties of English: an Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 286–310.
- Hudson-Ettle, Diana and Josef Schmied 1999. Manual to accompany the East African Component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-EA). Background information, coding conventions and lists of source texts. Chemnitz. <http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/real/eafrica/>
- Jowitt, David 1991. *Nigerian English Usage*. Lagos: Longman.
- Kachru, Braj B., Yamuna Kachru and Cecil L. Nelson (eds.) 2006. *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kembo-Sure 2003. 'Establishing a national standard and English language curriculum. change in Kenya', *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 16: 197–211.
- Mwangi, Serah 2003. *Prepositions in Kenyan English: A Corpus-based Study in Lexical-Grammatical Variation*. Aachen: Shaker.
- Platt, John, Heidi Weber and Mian Lian Ho 1984. *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Schmied, Josef 1990. 'Language use, attitudes, performance and sociolinguistic background: a study of English in Kenya, Tanzania, and Zambia', *English World-Wide* 11.2: 217–38.
- 1991a. *English in Africa. An Introduction*. London: Longman.
- 1991b. 'National and subnational features of Kenyan English', in Jenny Cheshire (ed.), *English Around the World: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 420–34.
2006. 'New ways of analysing ESL on the www with WebCorp and WebPhraseCount', in Antoinette Renouf and Andrew Kehoe (eds.), *The Changing Face of Corpus Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 309–24.
2007. 'Exploiting the Corpus of East-African English', in Roberta Facchinetti (ed.), *Corpus Linguistics 25 Years on*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, pp. 317–32.
- 2008a. 'East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): phonology', in Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and South East Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 150–63.
- 2008b. 'East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): morphology and syntax', in Rajend Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and South East Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 451–71.
- Schmied, Josef and Susanne Wagner forthcoming. 'Comparing English on the Web, the case of ICEweb-East Africa'.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English. Varieties around the Word*. Cambridge University Press.
2008. 'Towards endonormativity? African English and the dynamic model of the evolution of postcolonial Englishes', in Kenneth Harrow and Kizitus Mpoche (eds.), *Language, Literature and Education in Multicultural Societies:*

Collaborative Research on Africa. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, pp. 283–305.

Skandera, Paul 2003. *Drawing a Map of Africa: Idiom in Kenyan English*. Tübingen: Narr.

Spencer, John (ed.) 1971. *The English Language in West Africa*. London: Longman.