Deshors, S.C. & G. Gilquin. 2018. 'Modeling World Englishes in the 21st century. New reflections on model-making'. In S.C. Deshors (ed.) *Modeling World Englishes: Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties* (pp. 281-294). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Modeling World Englishes in the 21st century: New reflections on model-making

Sandra C. Deshors
Michigan State University

Gaëtanelle Gilquin
Université catholique de Louvain

Abstract

This chapter seeks to bring together all the contributions in the volume. We identify converging lines of argumentation and findings across the studies featured in the book and we show how the approaches they adopt and the linguistic patterns they uncover shed new light on globalized Englishes, the diversity of their uses and their emerging functions. Based on these studies, we discuss possible avenues for future research in the modeling process of World Englishes (WEs) and we make suggestions as to what contemporary theoretical models of WEs should look like in order to truly capture the developmental patterns of WEs in the 21st century. Generally, it emerges that theoretical models anchored in the 'moment of communication' are likely to reflect most effectively the intricate dynamics that lies behind the development of Englishes worldwide and that is stirred by linguistic, pragmatic, social, ideological and cultural forces, simultaneously.

Keywords: modeling World Englishes, core aspects of theoretical models, 'communicative event' approach, dynamics of World Englishes

1 Introduction

This book set itself the goal of assessing the capacity of theoretical models to reflect the uses, development and dynamics of World Englishes (WEs) in the 21st century. What the different contributions have underlined is that the unprecedented position of English in today's world requires new models that account for the ever-expanding roles that it plays in an increasingly large number of contexts. A model like Kachru's (1985) Three Circles of World Englishes, one of the first attempts to represent the English language in its global dimension, had the great merit of highlighting the non-monolithic nature of English and recognizing the status of non-native varieties of English (especially those in the Outer Circle), as did McArthur's (1987) Circle of World English or Görlach's (1990) Circle Model of English, for example. However, most of these traditional models have become untenable for at least three reasons, having to do with the expansion of English, the advent of corpora and the progress in language modeling.

Starting with the expansion of English, it is clear that the English as we know it today is very different from the English as it was used in the 1980s or 1990s, when the traditional models of WEs were devised. As noted by Buschfeld et al. (this volume), English is "continuously moving, expanding and growing into new regions, functions and application domains". The process of

rethinking our theoretical models of WEs has unveiled new uses of Englishes which should be accounted for, such as "digital Englishes" (Friedrich & Diniz de Figueiredo 2016) or "global English slang" (Coleman 2014). Several of these recent uses are examined in the chapters of this volume and are shown to cross the boundaries established by traditional models and hence challenge the validity of these models. In addition, new language contact situations have emerged, both locally – cf. the use of English in Germany (Mair this volume) or in the Netherlands (Edwards this volume) – and globally – e.g. through the increasing permeability of territorial borders (Siemund this volume). Theoretical models, in order to be ecologically valid, need to be representative of these new linguistic and sociolinguistic realities (see van Rooy & Kruger this volume).

The advent of corpora, and in particular of comparable corpora representing different varieties of English (like the International Corpus of English), has also led to a questioning of traditional models. Corpora have shifted the focus away from the political and historical considerations that lay at the core of most of these models, onto language as such. This has brought about a different perspective, more linguistically oriented, and not always in sync with the political-historical perspective. Recent corpora, especially those representing new types of Englishes (such as the interactive online data collected by van Rooy & Kruger this volume), make it possible to shed light on WEs in the 21st century, while diachronic corpora (cf. Gries et al. this volume) reveal how English varieties have evolved through time. More generally, corpus studies like those brought together in this volume show that the linguistic realities of English and the links between varieties are far more complex than suggested by earlier models. They also underline the importance of having models whose assumptions have been tested empirically – or at least models formulated in such a way that their claims can be tested empirically (Gries et al. this volume).

Finally, the practice of language modeling as a whole has undergone drastic changes over the last few years. By using sophisticated statistical techniques and applying them to corpus data, researchers have been able to represent language usage with a level of refinement never attained before. It has thus become possible to group WEs according to how a certain linguistic phenomenon behaves in these varieties (e.g. Mukherjee & Gries 2009) or to identify patterns of development of certain English varieties (e.g. Gries et al. this volume). In this context, simplistic models like those proposed thirty years ago are obviously not up to standard. Besides, they have been shown not to stand up to the test of statistical analysis, as illustrated for instance by Deshors's (2014) analysis of data representing English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL). While necessarily aiming at a certain degree of generalization, theoretical models should also seek to capture the complexity of language and language users, taking into account the heterogeneity of speakers (Buschfeld et al. this volume) and the multiplicity of factors potentially affecting language use (Gries et al. this volume).

The contributors to this volume all aspire to better theoretical models, able to represent the dynamics of 21st-century English use worldwide. While most of them have built on existing models, they have shown how these models could be improved or, in some cases, replaced by other models. In what follows, we describe some of the main aspects of 21st-century modeling of Englishes that have emerged from the different contributions.

2 Core aspects of 21st-century modeling of Englishes

Rethinking the theorizing of WEs for the 21st century has helped identify aspects of English uses that are central to a modeling process aimed at capturing the dynamics of English in today's world. In this section, we focus on modes of communication (with special emphasis on computer-mediated communication), genres of expression, multilingual settings, and ideologies and identity construction.

2.1 Modes of communication and digital Englishes

The turn of the century has been characterized by the digital revolution. Computer-mediated communication (CMC) has become a major channel to interact with each other and has facilitated exchanges between individuals to such an extent that it can be said to be one of the driving forces behind globalization (see van Rooy & Kruger this volume). It also emerges as an important factor in how the language is shaping. On the one hand, the language used on the internet represents a mode of communication that differs from both written and spoken language (Simpson 2002). It has also led to the creation of many new genres, including emails, tweets or blogging, which "behave quite distinctly from the more traditional genres" (Laitinen this volume). On the other hand, the global dimension of CMC means that individuals from different linguistic backgrounds interact with each other, which "has produced unprecedented forms of language contact and code-switching and mixing" (Buschfeld et al. this volume). English, as the predominant language of this digital revolution, has been greatly affected by these linguistic changes: new modes of communication have led to new linguistic features; new genres have led to new communicative functions; and new language contact situations have led to new varieties (including hybrid varieties, cf. van Rooy & Kruger this volume).

Existing traditional models of WEs have understandably not given a prominent place to these types of communication, since the digital revolution had hardly begun when the first models were developed. Current models, however, simply cannot ignore this factor. Due emphasis should be placed on the modes of communication, especially computer-mediated ones, and their effects on the (uses of the) English language. These models should also be flexible enough to accommodate the new digital varieties that are likely to emerge in the near future as a consequence of technological advances.

2.2 Genres of expression

While it is not new that different genres affect the way globalized Englishes are used, it emerges from the contributions in this volume that certain genres so far relatively unexplored are pivotal in understanding how World Englishes are developing. Many of those are not currently represented in standard corpora such as the International Corpus of English, which makes it necessary for researchers interested in these genres to collect their own data (cf. van Rooy & Kruger this volume). In his chapter, Mair considers both elite and non-elite domains, thus recognizing the importance of "grassroots" usage (Schneider 2016) for the development of English as a global language, next to the long-recognized elitist genres and educated varieties that have been central in traditional models (see van Rooy & Kruger this volume). Among non-elitist genres, Mair mentions popular music in German, which has witnessed an increasingly deep "Anglicisation" through heavily mixed English-German language practices. Van Rooy & Kruger (this volume) investigate

online soapie forums, another non-elitist genre characterized by extensive mixing of multilingual repertoires. As for fanfiction writing, examined in Buschfeld et al.'s chapter, it is one of those genres that have developed thanks to the digital revolution (see Section 2.1) and have strongly favored the use of English.

Interestingly, the 21st century has not only seen the addition of new genres, never practiced before, but also the addition of existing genres to the repertoire of certain varieties of English. In particular, the varieties traditionally described as Expanding Circle Englishes have started to use English for certain (internal) functions that used to be fulfilled exclusively by local languages. This is very clearly the case in countries like Sweden, Finland or the Netherlands (see Edwards this volume). In this context, English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) should also be mentioned, as it can be used in many different discourse situations, which makes it possible to approach this variety from a multi-genre perspective, as advocated in Laitinen's chapter.

This diversification of the English language in terms of genres and its diffusion into new contexts of use (see Buschfeld et al. this volume) should be taken into account in the modeling process, together with the linguistic effects of these changes. Importantly, none of these genres should be excluded on the grounds that they represent grassroots usage. On the contrary, all domains and all registers should be considered, both elitist and non-elitist, both standard and non-standard, as they all have something to say about the linguistic reality of WEs in the 21st century.

2.3 Multilingual settings

Although exact figures are lacking, for obvious reasons having to do with the difficulty of making accurate estimates, it is usually considered that more than half of the world population is multilingual (cf. Siemund this volume). In addition to inherently multilingual settings, globalization trends as well as "increased currents of voluntary and forced migration" (Mair this volume) have given rise to new language contact situations, in which the English language plays a central role. As Mair (ibid.) points out in relation to Germany, "[t]he English language has become a key component in the linguistic ecology of a country which has become increasingly diverse and multilingual internally and increasingly connected globally".

These language contact situations have a considerable impact on the form of WEs. This impact can be very visible, as illustrated by code-switching, or it can be more subtle, as in the case of cross-linguistic influence from the mother tongue(s) / substrate language(s), which can materialize as frequency variation or differential preferences. While cross-linguistic influence has been investigated quite thoroughly for the Expanding Circle varieties, this is perhaps less true of the Outer Circle varieties. This can easily be explained by the usually more complex linguistic situation of the speakers of Outer Circle Englishes, the less detailed knowledge of most researchers about the substrate languages that may have influenced these English varieties, and the lack of rich metadata concerning the speakers whose production is included in current corpora. For the sake of simplicity, scholars may therefore have a tendency to "abstract away from (…) issues of language contact, happily comparing American English with Indian English, New Zealand English with Irish English, or Ghanaian English with Singapore English" (Siemund this volume). The ebb and flow of people and the resulting linguistic diversity of populations are unlikely to end soon. It is therefore crucial that, in the future, models of WEs should take up the issue of multilingualism more seriously and more consistently than has been the case so far.

2.4 Ideologies and identity construction

Identity construction is one of the core elements of Schneider's (2003, 2007) Dynamic Model. This underlines the close ties that exist between language and identity. By using a certain language variety, speakers can communicate their desire to be recognized as members of a given linguistic (and possibly cultural) community. As noted by van Rooy & Kruger (this volume), marked linguistic choices "become meaningful tools for identity expression". What seems to have changed over the last few years, however, is the nature of the identities that can be constructed through language. First, identity construction appears to be at work among a larger group of speakers, including people who originally used English for utilitarian purposes only, but who now see it as "an additional local language for creative self-expression and identity performance" (Edwards this volume). Second, identities tend to be less fixed and less stable than they used to be (van Rooy & Kruger this volume). Due to increased multilingualism (see Section 2.3), speakers often combine linguistic markers pointing to different identities, which yields hybrid types of identity (ibid.). Finally, it is not unusual for speakers nowadays to express an identity that does not match their cultural background, as illustrated by van Rooy & Kruger (this volume) for online soapie forums. This complexification of the linguistic identity and of its link with one's cultural background implies that more attention should be devoted to this issue in future language modeling.

3 Model-making in the 21st century: Looking forward

3.1 The communicative event as a possible 'focal point' for 21st-century models

Altogether, the various above-discussed aspects that characterize the dynamics of contemporary model-making in WEs research (i.e. modes of communication, genres of expression, multilingual settings, and ideologies and identity construction) clearly confirm the kaleidoscopic nature of World Englishes today. What is more, the contributions in the volume, collectively, point towards the need for scholars to begin to consider those characteristics simultaneously and to account for the possible effect(s) that those characteristics may have on one another as speakers are using the English language. Based on van Rooy & Kruger's (this volume) and Mair's (also this volume) studies, this new and unifying approach to the development of WEs (unifying in the sense that it brings together various facets of Englishes worldwide) would provide a way of improving on existing theoretical frameworks and a potentially fruitful approach to developing new ones. Put differently, the key to a better understanding of the development of Englishes today may lie in an understanding of how the various forces that cause English to develop interact and how, over time, the linguistic systems of Englishes reflect this interaction. As explained in van Rooy & Kruger (this volume) and as Mair (also this volume) suggests, the innovative aspect of this approach lies in that it would require analysts to grant communicative situations (or communicative events) a central place in the model-making process and to view such situations or events as catalysts for linguistic development. Based on Mair's and van Rooy & Kruger's contributions, it emerges that anchoring theoretical models within the frame of a communicative situation (rather than focusing on types of English speakers or developmental processes) not only provides a way to explore the functional forces that drive the development of WEs – an aspect that has so far remained uncharted – but also has the potential of offering a new 'take' on the development of WEs, namely one that

brings in several factors known to influence the development of Englishes and considers those factors simultaneously at a given moment in time within a communicative event.

Zooming on such events, or "communicative space", to use Mair's (this volume) terminology, allocating such space a central part in the model-making process would add a dimension to the theorizing of WEs that has so far rarely been accounted for in studies of Englishes worldwide. Communicative space assumes communicative needs that, according to van Rooy & Kruger (this volume), trigger "interpersonal communication [that] provides a highly valuable perspective on developmental patterns". More specifically, the interactive, multilingual communicative dynamics, which takes the form of a negotiation process between speakers, may be a central factor in the general evolutionary processes of Englishes. It is in this context that van Rooy & Kruger observe that "intersubjective alignment […] appears to be an important functional driver of use, contributing to the propagation of forms". What is crucial here, though, is that from a theorizing perspective, focusing on interpersonal communication and anchoring theoretical models in the communicative space incurs bringing together the linguistic, social, pragmatic, cultural, multilingual and communicative aspects of language use (and language development) that are known to influence language development and to consider those aspects at the same time in a unified fashion by accounting for their interconnectedness. Based on van Rooy & Kruger (this volume), this interconnectedness is a driving force beyond the structural development of Englishes. Indeed, according to the authors, speakers' knowledge of resources "includes knowledge of the sociolinguistic value of the elements and a sense of possible combinations with other elements". Van Rooy & Kruger add that

> From here, they [speakers] select elements which they assume to be understood by other users that they communicate with, and which fulfil a desired function within the communicative context of an online forum (van Rooy & Kruger, this volume).

Finally, van Rooy & Kruger point out that "[t]he selection of these resources emerges from the interplay between participants' exploitation of the conventions of the register of interactive online communication, and the ways in which they express complex local and global identity alignments". While, to some degree, the notion that speakers' global alignment triggers developmental patterns echoes Buschfeld et al.'s (this volume) view that intra- and international forces influence the way Englishes develop, an emphasis on communicative spaces to model WEs provides a way to address Gries et al.'s (this volume) concern that sociocultural models (such as Schneider (2007) and Moag (1982)) are not enough to explain the linguistic changes of WEs and there is a need to focus more on structural development.

3.2 The 21st century speaker within a 'communicative event' approach

In the above-described context, the importance of allocating a central part of our theories to the speaker is not only because, within a communicative space approach, he/she is a crucial negotiator but also because the traditional EFL/ESL user has become, in the 21st century, a *global communicator* whose language-related profile (i.e. education, attitudes towards English, functional use of English in various areas of life) is, in itself, a contributing driving force behind the development of WEs. In this context, should communicative events be considered a window into the development of WEs, then factoring in the rich and highly complex profile of WEs speakers is necessary. Indeed, today, the profile of English speakers has changed dramatically. For instance,

speakers are no longer restricted to one type of English input that would partly be determined by their location of residence and would thereby characterize the type of English they use. In our day and age, one can easily envisage a non-native English speaker to have developed, as a result of globalization, high geographical mobility and a complex language-related profile. More specifically, such a hypothetical speaker may come with, say, the profile of someone who started out by learning English as a foreign language but then traveled the world and became exposed to a range of English varieties (thereby blurring the line between an EFL and ESL status), and who is an active online blogger routinely communicating with speakers with various proficiency levels in English and from different native linguistic backgrounds. While this is not an uncommon profile for a 21st-century (non-native) English user, theoretical models with a focus on communicative events provide an opportunity to account simultaneously for the speaker's linguistic history, his/her attitudes towards English and the specific type of audience he/she is addressing during the communicative event. In this context, models anchored in the 'moment of communication' are likely to reflect, more than ever before, the intricate dynamics that lies behind the development of Englishes worldwide and that, as the contributions in this volume demonstrate, is stirred by linguistic, pragmatic, social, ideological and cultural forces, simultaneously. However, a major challenge for 21st-century model-making remains to determine how to empirically account for the mobility and the rich and complex language-related profile of English speakers. Finally, as we discuss in the next section, integrating these forces and how they interplay within communication situations bears important theoretical implications.

3.3 Implications of the 'communicative event' approach for the categorization of English varieties

Two aspects that are central to model-making in WEs are the categorization of English varieties and the notion of norm (i.e. against which (native) standard should EFL and ESL varieties be assessed to capture linguistic developmental patterns most efficiently). With regard to the former, the *categorization* of Englishes, existing literature shows that the categorization process is not, in itself, a straightforward exercise and models such as Kachru's (1985) Three Circles, Streven's (1980) world map of Englishes, McArthur's (1987) Circle of World English and Mair's (2013) world system of Englishes illustrate, with all their differences and among other models, the complexity of classifying Englishes effectively. With regard to Kachru's model specifically, while, today, the Three Circles model remains widely used, Buschfeld et al. (this volume) confirm the danger of nation-bound, static categorizations. This echoes on-going discussions on the ENL-EFL-ESL continuum over the past few years and the question whether or not the three types of varieties constitute distinct categories or whether they can be placed on a continuum of nativeness (see Mukherjee & Hundt (2011) for a collection of studies on the issue; see also Rautionaho et al. (2018)). Collectively, throughout the present volume, the contributions provide empirical evidence supporting the urgent need to let go of nation-bound theoretical frameworks.

Relating this discussion to the above-mentioned *globalized speaker*, the limitations of the ENL-EFL-ESL categorization are quite clear in that not only the boundaries of the three types of Englishes have, by now, widely been reported to be fuzzy but also, as Laitinen (this volume) stresses, ELF is a variety of English that needs to be accounted for in our model-making effort, thereby making the tripartite categorization obsolete. Bringing in ELF to the broader discussion of the categorization of English implies an inevitable and conscious move away from nation-bound theoretical models, as Laitinen (this volume) recommends. In this context, and in the spirit of including ELF in our attempt to best model Englishes in the 21st century, communicative space

approaches, by virtue of their focus on functional forces (and therefore their alignment with ELF research), would offer a promising modeling option for an integrated treatment of ENL, EFL, ESL and ELF, and one that accounts for the pragmatics of communication. This is an important point for, as Gilquin (this volume) reminds us, "[w]hile general linguistic models abstracting away from individual variation are certainly useful for the bird's-eye view they offer, we should not forget that ultimately, it is the language of *people* that these models seek to describe".

This focus on the *people* is also echoed in Mair (this volume) and his notion that people are the driving force behind linguistic developments across WEs (cf. Mair's distinction between elite and non-elite communities). Thus, to relate the current discussion to our earlier point on the usefulness of communicative space as an anchor for the theorizing process, such space is helpful because at its core is a negotiating speaker who is actively engaged with the process of linguistic development. Therefore, in this context, and beyond the question of the continuum, considering the contributions in the volume collectively, the question might arise whether, and to what extent, categorizing English varieties still has a place in contemporary modeling processes, as the individual profiles of globalized English speakers are becoming very hard to trace and as it is increasingly difficult to empirically control for the broad distinctions between EFL, ESL and ELF.

3.4 Implications of the 'communicative event' approach for the notion of norm

With regard to the second aspect central to the model-making process, the notion of *norm*, adopting unified theoretical models over nation-bound models or models focused on developmental processes raises the central question of what norm should be used and how scholars should control for it empirically. While traditionally British English has served extensively as the native yardstick to assess the degrees of development of ESL varieties from a historical norm, recent research increasingly shows how American-like linguistic patterns are gradually infiltrating non-native varieties. This has been shown in ESL varieties (specifically Singapore English; see Horch (2016) and Deshors & Gries (2016); see also Hundt (this volume) for possible traces of American English across a wider range of ESLs), but as Gilquin (this volume) shows, this infiltration is now also observed in EFL varieties that are closer to the UK than they are to the US. While future research should maintain a strong focus on assessing the influence of American English over different types of Englishes worldwide (as compared to British English), Gilquin's (this volume) and Hundt's (also this volume) contributions flag the danger of continuing to use a single native norm as a yardstick for the development of Englishes and question the usefulness of the notion of norm, as traditionally envisaged (i.e. one native English variety equals the normative standard). In other words, rather than assuming the norm to be a variety, perhaps in the 21st century the norm should be envisaged in terms of a collection of linguistic features. Put differently, as van Rooy & Kruger (this volume) ask, is the traditional norm shifting towards a common "core" as the normative standard? Importantly, this notion of a shifting norm, coupled with the above-discussed notion of the globalized speaker and communicative events as catalysts for linguistic change, raises the question whether, in our globalized world, the use of a 'static' normative standard (in the form of an English variety) – as opposed to a norm constantly *in the making* – constitutes a dangerous limitation for our modeling purposes. In other words, in light of the contributions in this volume, scholars should perhaps address the questions to what extent speakers are creating new norms as they are using the language, to what extent the norm has become (and therefore should be approached as) a collective norm (i.e. one that all speakers are contributing to/towards) and how this "standard

core" (van Rooy & Kruger, this volume) can be accounted for both theoretically and methodologically.

3.5 Methodological implications

In light of the above discussion on possible future directions for the theorizing of WEs, a few methodological considerations are in order. Indeed, a possible shift towards theoretical models that account for communication events would bear significant methodological implications concerning the type of (meta)data that would need to be collected as well as the type of methodological approaches that would need to be adopted to process those data. Overall, it emerges from several contributions in the volume (e.g. Mair's, van Rooy & Kruger's and Gries et al.'s studies) that existing corpora of WEs may be limited to model the development of Englishes in the 21st century. Assuming the above-discussed focal shift towards communicative events as catalysts of linguistic change, data of a type that is not available from existing corpora would be required. That is, large-scale data of online communication reflecting speakers' multilingual situations, large-scale data including more diverse genres of expression than are generally explored such as pop culture and song writing (cf. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the present chapter). What is more, this above-mentioned focal shift would affect the type of annotation taxonomies that tend to be adopted in WEs research. For instance, while, over the past fifteen years or so the greater majority of studies of WEs has been quantitative and corpus-based, for the most part, those studies have investigated WEs from a morpho-syntactic (and to a lesser extent lexical) perspective. A focal shift towards communicative events would necessarily require that scholars widen the scope of their annotation schemes so as to include information of a pragmatic and extra-linguistic nature. Ultimately, this focal shift would incur initiating new (corpus) data compilation projects with a view to diversifying our approaches to the development of WEs. Finally, returning to the notion of conducting studies aimed at assessing the interconnectedness of the linguistic, social, pragmatic, cultural, multilingual and communicative aspects involved in shaping World Englishes today, assessing this interconnectedness and the extent to which these diverse variables affect one another in speech production inevitably calls for the development of methodological techniques capable of handling richly annotated data. In that regard, Gries et al. (this volume) clearly illustrate the power of sophisticated statistical techniques and their potential for the model-making process. However, adopting such techniques will require analysts to develop necessary sophisticated practical and statistical knowledge of a higher standard than the current norm so as to ensure the development of theoretical models that truly reflect the complexity of the dynamics of WEs today. At a time when the development of English varieties worldwide involves a complex network of interconnected factors, it is crucial that analysts are equipped with state-of-the-art methodological tools that allow them to assess how the linguistic, social and pragmatic factors collectively shape Englishes worldwide. In the complex reality of the use of English today, the methodological approach we develop and the (statistical) technique we decide to apply have a crucial role to play in the model-making process of WEs, and the connection between, on the one hand, the model-making process and, on the other hand, the methodological designs scholars choose to adopt, should not be underestimated.

4 Concluding remarks

To briefly conclude, throughout the volume it has become clear that globalization is now an inevitable force that linguists have to reckon with as they continue to explore and model the developmental patterns of Englishes worldwide. Further, the contributions in the volume, taken together, have opened our eyes to the fact that 21st century theoretical models of WEs need to be, more than ever before, multifaceted in nature and should incorporate factors of language change that traditional early models did not include. In other words, it has become clear that in order to paint a faithful picture of the developmental patterns of Englishes, future theoretical models should broaden their analytical scope so as to include explanatory factors that previous models would have considered independently of one another. Further, more than *just* affecting the English language structurally and functionally, the contributions in this volume suggest that globalization is on its way to changing the way we, as scholars, conceive of the development of Englishes around the world and the factors that collectively stir linguistic change in a globalized and digitalized world. In light of this volume, a new generation of approaches to model-making in WEs research seems to have emerged – that is, approaches that reach beyond the mere structure of English varieties as linguistic systems and a primarily sociolinguistic perspective on developmental patterns and that, instead, aim at integrating pragmatic, social, attitudinal perspectives as well as modes of communication more tightly than ever before into the modeling process. Altogether, the different chapters provide ample evidence that in the 21st century model-making in WEs research has reached a turning point that promises not only a greater understanding of the driving forces that stir the development of World Englishes today, but also lead towards a better grasp of how those forces contribute to the broader processes of globalization and language change.

References

Coleman, J. 2014. Understanding slang in a global context. In *Global English Slang: Methodologies and Perspectives*, J. Coleman (ed), 1-14. London & New York: Routledge.

Deshors, S. C. 2014. A case for a unified treatment of EFL and ESL. A multifactorial approach. *English World-Wide* 35(3): 277–305.

Deshors, S. C. & S. T. Gries. 2016. Profiling verb complementation constructions across New Englishes: A two-step random forests analysis of *ing* vs. *to* complements. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 21(2): 192–218.

Friedrich, P. & Diniz de Figueiredo, E. H. 2016. *The Sociolinguistics of Digital Englishes*. London and New York: Routledge.

Görlach, M. 1990. The development of Standard Englishes. In *Studies in the History of the English Language*, M. Görlach (ed.), 9–64 Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Horch, S. 2016. Innovative conversions in South-East Asian Englishes. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research* 2(2): 278–301.

Kachru, B. B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In *English in the World. Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), 11–30 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for The British Council.

Mair, C. 2013. The world system of Englishes. Accounting for the transnational importance of mobile and mediated vernaculars. *English World-Wide* 34(3): 253–278.

McArthur, T. 1987. The English languages? *English Today* 3(3): 9–11.
Moag, R. F. 1982. The life cycle of non-native Englishes: A case study. In *The Other Tongue*, B. B. Kachru (ed.), 270–288. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Mukherjee, J. & S. T. Gries. 2009. Collostructional nativisation in New Englishes: Verb-construction associations in the International Corpus of English. *English World-Wide* 30(1): 27–51.
Mukherjee, J. & M. Hundt (eds). 2011. *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Rautionaho, P., Deshors, S.C. & Meriläinen, L. 2018. Revisiting the ENL-ESL-EFL continuum: A multifactorial approach to grammatical aspect in spoken Englishes. *ICAME Journal* 42: 41–78.
Schneider, E. W. 2003. The dynamics of New Englishes: From identity construction to dialect birth. *Language* 79(2): 233–281.
Schneider, E. W. 2007. *Postcolonial English. Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Schneider, E. W. 2016. Grassroots Englishes in tourism interactions. *English Today* 32(3): 2–10.
Simpson, J. 2002. Computer-mediated communication. *ELT Journal* 56(4): 414–415.
Strevens, P. 1980. *Teaching English as an International Language*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.