Linguistic innovations in EFL and ESL: Rethinking the linguistic creativity of non-native English speakers

Article · January 2016

READS
41

3 authors:

Sandra C. Deshors
New Mexico State University
15 PUBLICATIONS **40** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Sandra Götz
Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen
21 PUBLICATIONS **33** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Samantha Laporte
Université catholique de Louvain
7 PUBLICATIONS **9** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

[Paper to appear as the introductory chapter of a special issue of IJLCR on the theme of linguistic innovations in EFL and ESL; anticipated publication date: Fall 2016]

Linguistic innovations in EFL and ESL:
Rethinking the linguistic creativity of non-native English speakers

Sandra C. Deshors, Sandra Götz and Samantha Laporte

New Mexico State University / Justus Liebig University Giessen / Université catholique de Louvain

1. Introduction

The distinction between English as a native language (ENL), English as a second language (ESL) and English as a foreign language (EFL) has exerted an enormous influence on the modelling of Englishes worldwide (cf. Kachru 1982, 1985). In ENL and ESL contexts, English is used widely and 'naturally' for intranational purposes, while in EFL contexts English is taught and learned primarily as an international means of communication. In previous research, 'institutionalised' ESLs (such as Singaporean and Indian English; also referred to as New Englishes) and EFLs (such as French- and German-English interlanguages) have usually been treated as fundamentally different categories in different research paradigms. Despite an early call for a rapprochement

between EFL and ESL to "bridge the paradigm gap" (Sridhar & Sridhar 1986) between the two research areas, it was not until 2008 that corpus linguists met for the first time to discuss possible ways to bridge the gap and to set an agenda for the development of more integrated approaches to EFL and ESL (Mukherjee & Hundt 2011). Since then, corpus-based research in both learner and second-language Englishes has undergone a significant shift and increasing efforts have been dedicated to bringing together research on EFL and ESL. Already, this has led a number of analysts to suggest that "the distinction between EFL and ESL should be viewed as a continuum" (Gilquin & Granger 2011: 56; see also Nesselhauf 2009; Deshors 2014).

However, approaching linguistic innovations from the perspective of this continuum raises interesting questions and challenges that invite us to explore how innovative non-native English speakers actually are when using their L2, to what extent the EFL and the ESL speaker populations can be investigated contrastively when it comes to assessing their linguistic creativity, and how this creativity can be investigated using corpus data. While those questions certainly have a place in the wider discussion of how to bridge the paradigm gap, crucially, they are also opening up new directions for corpus-based research on learner Englishes as well as New Englishes. In an attempt to address those questions, we organized a pre-conference workshop on the occasion of the 36th ICAME conference at Trier University on May 27th 2015. Together, due to the variety of topics they cover, these papers portray innovations as being a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon. Ultimately, it is our hope that, collectively, those papers will provide an opportunity for scholars to pause and re-think what it means for language

learners and second language users to be innovative in their L2. With this purpose in mind, this introduction aims to take stock of linguistic innovations in two ways. First, by defining the notions of errors and innovations and, second, by considering how those notions have so far been approached in EFL and ESL (Section 2.1). We will particularly keep in mind the dividing line between what stands as an error and what counts as an innovation, which will lead us to discuss the status of English learners as innovative L2 users (Section 2.2). In the remainder of the introduction, we will discuss corpus resources and the types of corpora that are best suited to capture innovations (Section 3), consider the emergence and the development of innovations and how they can be best explained (Section 4). Finally, we will summarize to what extent innovations have been shown to differ, if at all, across the EFL and ESL speaker populations. Concretely, we will show how so far state-of-the-art research on linguistic innovations has helped us capture their structural variation patterns and how innovations are generally perceived (Section 5).

2. Errors vs. innovations

2.1 Where should we draw the line?

Although "[t]he line is thin between errors and creative uses" (Gilquin & Granger 2011:

72), the distinction between the notions of error and innovation is essential to understand whether and how New Varieties develop new conventions (Van Rooy 2011). However, despite the central aspect of this distinction in any discussion on linguistic creativity in L2, the dividing line between the two notions remains, to a large extent, very unclear. Throughout the literature, there is often an indeterminacy between what counts as an innovation and what is regarded as an error (Bamgbose 1998). As a result, it is somewhat difficult to assess, with precision, to what extent the deviation of a linguistic pattern from a native norm constitutes – or not – a characteristic feature of a particular type of non-native English (Hamid & Baldauf Jr 2013). Broadly, this lack of a clear-cut distinction between the two notions emerges from the fact that because they do not belong to the linguistic norm of the English language (Kachru 1982: 62), errors are generally considered unacceptable by native speakers. In addition, although innovations tend to be recognized as allowable deviations from the native English norm (Bennui 2013), there is, to date, no set criteria that objectively allow analysts to set errors and innovations apart. Further, in contrast with innovations that tend to result from a productive process and that, in that sense, are considered "systemic within a variety" (Kachru 1982: 62; see also Mollin 2006; Buschfeld 2013), errors tend to reflect gaps in a learner's knowledge (Ellis 1987).[1] Given this context, a main but yet unresolved issue that blurs a clear distinction between errors and innovations is how much deviation from

[1] While a discussion on the distinction between an error and a mistake is beyond the scope of this paper, we direct the reader to Corder (1967) for a summary of the features that characterize both phenomena. In a nutshell, Corder (1967) argues that errors result from a lack of L2 knowledge, that they are systematic, that learners are unaware of them and that they reflect deficits in a learner's competence. In contrast, mistakes tend to be slips of the tongue, temporary, often realized by learners who are able to fix them and they tend to merely reflect a performance phenomenon.

the norm is acceptable (Kachru 1982: 61-62).

Traditionally, in order to draw the line between errors and innovations, scholars have relied on theoretical frameworks such as Kachru's (1982) Three Circles Model. Broadly, the three concentric circles, the Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles, represent patterns of acquisition, functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages as well as types of spread (Kachru 1985). Concretely, the Inner Circle includes Englishes used as a mother tongue (e.g. Bristish English, American English, Australian English) and the Outer Circle is composed of Englishes used in former British and American colonies and which are acquired in a relatively naturalistic environment. In contrast, the Expanding Circle includes EFLs primarily learnt as a Lingua Franca in classroom settings. Importantly, the model assumes that EFL and ESL differ in that EFLs are intrinsically norm-dependent and ESLs are norm-developing. In other words, ESLs "have a potential to develop their own norms and standards which are generally accepted as being characteristic features of a 'new' English variety" (Mukherjee 2010: 219). According to Kachru (2006: 91), this process is made possible by the fact that "[t]he substrate languages and the target language enhance each other's style potential and release creative energies of a language in a unique way" (Kachru 2006: 91). In contrast, EFLs are norm-dependent in the sense that "foreign learners are bound to orient themselves towards exonormative standards set by speakers outside their own speech community" (Mukherjee 2010: 238).

The general reliance on Kachru's model has had two important repercussions in the way linguistic creativity has so far been approached in non-native Englishes: first, it

has triggered a division of innovations and errors primarily based on the institutional status of the EFL or ESL in which they occurred and second, resulting from this categorical division, it has encouraged a somewhat systematic labeling of potential linguistic innovations as deviations and thus, errors in EFL and as innovations in ESL. For instance, while Indian English has been shown to yield some of its most creative forms and structures on the lexico-grammatical level in speakers' innovative uses of prepositional verbs, ditransitive verbs and light-verb constructions (Mukherjee & Hoffmann 2006; Mukherjee 2010), within the paradigm of EFL research, linguistically very similar forms have mainly been associated with errors rather than innovations (see Mukherjee 2010). Thus, emerging from this distinction is the question whether (and if so to what extent) foreign language learners can (fully) receive any recognition for their linguistic creativity (Bamgbose 1998), given that their linguistic structures may coincide with those labeled as innovations in ESL (Edwards 2014a).

2.2 Towards a recognition of EFL users as innovative L2 speakers

As part of the on-going collective effort to bridge the paradigm gap, a handful of recent (corpus) studies have already begun to challenge the above-described dichotomy between errors and innovations as well as the general view that the distinction between innovations and errors should solely rely on institutional status (Bruthiaux 2003; Gilquin 2011; Laporte 2012; Li & Mahboob 2012; Deshors 2014; Edwards 2014a; Edwards & Laporte 2015; Gilquin 2015). Generally, this has been done in several

different ways: empirically, methodologically and theoretically. Empirically, a number of scholars have started to draw parallels between EFL and ESL (Nesselhauf 2009; Gilquin 2011; Götz & Schilk 2011; Davydova 2012; Laporte 2012; Deshors 2014; Edwards 2014a). In the case of Gilquin (2011: 5), for instance, it emerges that "some innovations are […] shared by World Englishes, as for example the phrasal verb *cope up (with)*, which is identified by Platt (1989) as a typical feature of Singapore English, but actually occurs in other indigenized varieties of English as well as in learner Englishes". Similarly, Laporte (2012: 285) finds that "prepositional uses are very prone to innovation, and this, across a wide range of non-native populations, be they ESL or EFL". Methodologically, sophisticated approaches to corpus analysis such as multifactorial approaches as illustrated in Deshors (2014), have demonstrated how rewarding regression modelling is when used to study EFL and ESL in a unified way and how such approaches should be considered in order to investigate more closely than ever the notion of error vs. innovation in EFL. Finally, at a more theoretical level, studies such as Bruthiaux (2013), Li & Mahboob (2012) or Mukherjee & Hundt (2011) have questioned the suitability of theoretical frameworks based on historical and geographical legacy to accommodate discussions of language varieties. Importantly, the above body of research has already started to change the way we collectively approach (advanced) EFL learners by attributing to the learners more creative abilities than before (Gilquin & Granger 2011). Two main contributing factors can explain this important shift, namely the recognition that (i) both EFL and ESL share a number of innovations (increasing the credibility of EFL learners in terms of their own ability to be creative in

their L2) and (ii) the fact that English is gradually playing an increasingly important role in identity construction and transcends its typical EFL functions. In this regard, Gilquin & Granger (2011: 75) present Tswana-English interlanguage as an interesting case of learner English that "shares features with both inner/outer circle varieties of English and […] varieties of the expanding circle" (see also Edwards (2014b) for an in-depth illustration of the case of English in the Netherlands). Crucially, with all the above-mentioned developments, scholars are now in a position to portray the creative potential of EFL learners with much sharper contours. Further, as a result of those developments, a range of 'new' research questions have started to emerge, such as: What do innovations look like in EFL and ESL? How do they compare and how are they perceived? How can we explain the emergence and development of innovations? How can corpora and corpus resources help us capture innovations? Ultimately, we consider these questions to be a valuable starting point to rethink the linguistic creativity of EFL and ESL users and we will address each of those questions in the remainder of this paper.

3. Exploiting corpus resources to capture innovations

Corpora represent a particularly rewarding data type for the study of innovations. Contrary to experimental data characteristic of the SLA paradigm, they offer access to contextualized and naturally produced language use that is representative of a particular

population. This makes corpora an ideal resource to uncover (potential) innovations. However, they only provide an indirect means towards identifying innovations: one first needs to unearth phenomena of interest and later, whatever feature a corpus reveals, it is ultimately the analysts' call to label a structure an innovation, an error or a mistake.

To capture the new structures that corpora (may) host, we need to find ways to best exploit the corpora at our disposal. This has often been done in a top-down fashion by taking a specific lexical item as a starting point to look for innovations (e.g. Nesselhauf (2009) selects a number of specific prepositional verbs and phraseological chunks). Other studies have however relied on a more data-driven approach by capitalizing on annotated data and using automatic procedures that allow less expected innovations to surface. For example, Mukherjee & Hoffmann (2006) make use of a part-of-speech (POS) tagged corpus to identify and retrieve new ditransitive verbs. Resorting to parsed data, Schneider & Zipp (2013) and Schneider & Gilquin (this issue) automatically retrieve a wide range of new prepositional verbs (e.g. *join into* in ICE-Fiji, or *study about* in ICE-India), thereby (i) complementing the limited set of new prepositional verbs previously identified via lexical searches and (ii) offering a better appraisal of verb-preposition combinations in the data at hand.

The question that arises after extracting 'new' structures is whether these structures qualify as innovations, for which systematicity is often considered a prerequisite (cf. Section 2). As low-frequency phenomena that exist alongside standard forms (Mukherjee 2010), innovations represent a significant challenge for corpus linguists, namely that of establishing which linguistic forms yield traces of systematicity

and are therefore likely to develop and ultimately qualify as full-fledged innovations. Just as some rare but conventional forms of British English appear only once (if at all) in the British component of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE-GB) (Greenbaum & Nelson 1996) or the *British National Corpus* (BNC 2007) (in morphology, for instance, a number of words ending with the suffix *–ness*, such as *overtness* or *effortlessness*, are hapax legomena in the BNC, but are recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED 2015) and are thus conventional forms), so it remains to be determined whether rare instances of 'new' structures are used systematically in the speech community. This is compounded by the fact that most available corpora of EFL and ESL are (i) of limited size and (ii) synchronic in nature, which makes it difficult to trace the evolution of innovations (Gilquin 2015). However, despite these hurdles, a number of (new) corpora make it possible, at least in part, to overcome these difficulties.

One of these corpora is the recently developed *Corpus of Global Web-based English* (GloWbE; Davies 2013). As a mega-corpus of 1.9 billion words collected from the web and representing English as used in twenty different countries (traditionally Inner and Outer Circle countries), it is a goldmine for research into innovations. If only by its size, this database makes it, at least to some extent, possible to verify the systematicity of features captured in smaller corpora. In addition, with data produced in the 2000s and collected in 2012, GloWbE also makes it possible to trace the evolution of innovations uncovered on the basis of smaller corpora that represent data from the

1990s, such as the ESL subcorpora of the *International Corpus of English* (ICE; Nelson 1996).[2]

However, beyond size, there are other important aspects of corpora that can help researchers capture innovations. As Mukherjee (2010) argues, newspaper corpora provide a different way of legitimating a form as an innovation. Given the acrolectal, highly monitored, and even norm-providing nature of newspaper language, even low-frequency structures can be identified, with relatively high confidence, as accepted forms and thereby labeled innovations (e.g. the verbs *explain, inform* or *remind* as new ditransitive verbs which occur only a few times in the Statesman corpus of Indian English). In a similar vein, Van Rooy & Kruger (this issue) use parallel corpora of edited and unedited versions of academic texts which, more than ever before, make it possible to trace the dynamic process of the emergence and acceptance of innovative linguistic structures.

Finally, corpus resources also play a crucial part in bridging the paradigm gap. One current challenge concerns data comparability between EFL and ESL. The price for high comparability is often a restriction to student writing due to the fact that most corpus data for EFL stem from the Learner Corpus Research framework. One notable exception is Edwards's (2014b) *Corpus of Dutch English* (CoDE), which is the first EFL corpus to follow the same design as the written component of the ICE and thereby covers a wide range of genres such as creative writing, written correspondence, and

[2] See Davies & Fuchs (2015) for a discussion of the pros and cons of this database, and responses by Mair (2015), Mukherjee (2015), Peters (2015) and Nelson (2015).

press reports and editorials. The development of CoDE is in line with the view that EFL speakers are users rather than merely learners (as is also core in the English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) framework). This view has led to the emergence of ELF corpora that represent a wider range of written and spoken registers (e.g. the *Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic settings* (ELFA 2008), *Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (VOICE 2009), *Corpus of Academic Spoken English* (CASE, forthcoming), the *Corpus of English in Finland* (Laitinen 2010), thus providing data that will make comparisons between ELF, EFL and ESL increasingly possible across a number of genres.

4. Explaining the emergence and development of innovations

A better understanding of innovations in non-native Englishes requires exploring the processes that lead to their emergence and later their adoption by a speech community. Croft (2000) proposes a usage-based theory of language change that offers an integrated explanation for these processes, irrespective of the status of a language in the speech community. In a nutshell, he argues that language change is the result of two distinct, but jointly required, mechanisms: (i) a mechanism for **innovation**, understood here as any "creation of novel forms in the language" (2000: 4), even if only ephemeral; and (ii) a mechanism for **propagation**, which is a selection mechanism that is largely driven by social forces and leads to the conventionalization of certain innovations. The following

sections respectively focus on each of these mechanisms and consider how they relate to innovations in EFL and ESL.

4.1 The emergence of innovations

According to Croft (2000: 8), any innovation involves some sort of restructuring between language form (or structure) and language function (or meaning). This restructuring process is rarely random or accidental. Rather, it is likely to occur with a certain systematicity as a result of intra- and extra-lingual processes. More specifically, the mechanism for innovation seems driven by a combination of (at least) (i) cognitive processes that lead to certain types of restructuring (e.g. analogy); (ii) language-internal structures and irregularities (e.g. *talk about* sth. vs. *discuss* ø sth.) that facilitate the emergence of certain innovations; and (iii) language contact and transfer from another language. While Croft identifies these processes as driving language change in general, that is, also in native-speaker settings, this section attempts to explain how these mechanisms operate to lead to innovations outside of L1 settings in particular.

A number of specific **cognitive processes** have been argued to underlie the emergence of innovations found in EFL and ESL. For instance, drawing on cognitive mechanisms identified in Second Language Acquisition, Williams (1987), and more recently Schneider (2012), list a number of processes that are likely to be shared by EFL and ESL speakers and to give rise to new forms. These are processes such as regularization (e.g. the use of the plural *mouses* instead of *mice*), redundancy (e.g.

redundant prepositions as in *enter into*), or simplification (omission of the noun plural marker *-s*).[3] Van Rooy (2011) argues that for such processes, EFL and ESL speakers are not qualitatively different from each other because in both settings, their cognitive representation is that of a second language. However, while there is certainly ground for shared cognitive processes, this common cognitive representation across EFL and ESL speakers might arguably be a relative rather than absolute one. For example, Szmrecsanyi & Kortmann (2011) test the hypothesis that EFL and ESL, due to similar cognitive processes of second language acquisition, are more analytical than ENL. They however find EFL to be significantly more analytical than ESL, which suggests some differences in terms of cognitive processes and leads the authors to even argue that EFL and ESL are "different animals" (2011: 175).

Interestingly, the above-mentioned cognitive processes are likely to interact with **language-internal configurations** that facilitate the emergence of new forms. That is, some irregularities in form and meaning intrinsic to (standard) English enhance the possibility for processes like regularization or analogy and thus favor particular kinds of innovations. The previously mentioned lexis-grammar interface (see Section 2) has been found to constitute a fertile breeding ground for innovations in non-native Englishes, exactly for this reason. One case in point is Mukherjee (2010) who shows how lexico-grammatical innovations such as new prepositional verbs, new light verb constructions and new ditransitive verbs are cases of what Mukherjee & Hoffmann (2006: 166) have

[3] As Schneider (2012) himself notes, these processes may well overlap: regularization can be construed as a special case of simplification, for example.

dubbed “semantico-structural analogy”. The term itself highlights the fact that there is a re-mapping between form and function by drawing on existing formal and semantic templates, that is language-internal structures. For example, the new light verb construction *have/take a glimpse* found in Indian English is based on the formal template of *catch a glimpse*, and the semantic template of *have/take a look*. Phenomena that arguably arise from the same process have also been identified in EFL, e.g. Nesselhauf (2005) finds *give a statement* in EFL data, which can be analysed as based on the formal template of *make a statement* and the semantic template of *give a speech*.

Finally, another important process that drives the emergence of innovations in non-native settings is that of **language transfer** or **substrate influence**. Non-native speakers, be they EFL or ESL, come with their L1-specific form-meaning structures that are likely to influence and interact with the above-mentioned forces, sometimes facilitating them, sometimes constraining them (Nesselhauf 2009). For example, Edwards & Laporte (2015: 21-22) show that there is an “intricate interplay between shared tendencies stemming from language internal (ir)regularities and L1 influence that accounts for pockets of idiosyncrasy in some varieties”. Such observations warrant further research to uncover how exactly these interact.

4.2 From emergence to conventionalization

The emergence of an innovation does not *per se* lead to its adoption or conventionalization. Following Croft’s (2000) account of language change, after a new

form is created, that form undergoes a process of **propagation**. In a nutshell, this process involves social forces that determine whether innovations are ultimately adopted, that is, whether they become systematic and conventionalized in a language community.

As pointed out above, these social considerations have been at the core of most studies focusing on ESL. For example, Schneider's (2003, 2007) Dynamic Model of the Evolution of New Englishes highlights how adopting innovations goes hand in hand with the social process of identity-construction and an increasingly endonormative attitude of speech communities. Importantly, different social forces can pull the fate of innovations in different directions. This is, for instance, illustrated by Rosen (2014, this issue), who shows how innovations in Jersey English are developing in response to antagonist social forces such as local identity on the one hand, and pressures of globalization, on the other. In addition to social factors, Schneider (2007: 110-112) adds that linguistic factors relating to the nature of innovations (such as markedness, transparency, regularity or salience of innovations) may also influence their propagation. For example, salient new features are more likely to spread and be adopted than non-salient ones.

When it comes to the conventionalization of innovations, such social factors have been argued to be at the root of the most important and long-lasting difference between EFL and ESL. According to Van Rooy (2011), (i) there is an identity dimension at play in ESL that is not present in EFL, (ii) there is greater opportunity for diffusion in ESL settings, and (iii) there is a more endonormative attitude in ESL, while

in EFL settings, speakers' attitude is largely exonormative (see also Section 5). Ultimately, for Van Rooy, these crucial differences are what lead to the spread and conventionalization of innovations in ESL settings and not in EFL ones.

However, the dynamics of English worldwide appear to be gradually changing in response to new forces of globalization. Edwards (2014b), for example, shows how in the Netherlands, an Expanding Circle nation, English adopts increasingly intranational functions (e.g. in education, advertising, or business) and is a means of identity expression among young Dutch people. Similarly, Schneider (2014: 24) notes that "[we] can observe many innovative uses and sociolinguistic settings in which English is […] 'crossing' clear-cut distinctions and traditional taxonomies, defying standard norm-orientations, and transcending boundaries of language and nation as distinct entities". Although it is reasonable to expect that these new dynamics of English are likely to affect the propagation and status of linguistic innovations worldwide, at this point it is too soon to anticipate how exactly these developments will manifest linguistically.

From the above considerations, it seems clear that the emergence and development of innovations is a dynamic process in which linguistic and ever-changing social forces play an important part. The complexity of this dynamic process, in our view, calls for sound (corpus) studies that provide an empirical basis for the investigation of innovations, but also highlights the imperative to abstract away from these empirical studies in order to be able to explain theoretically the emergence and the development of innovations that reflect both linguistic and social factors.

5. How are innovations perceived in research on EFL and ESL and what do they look like?

Until a few decades ago, there was a very conservative ENL-centered view on how non-attested uses are perceived and evaluated in research on ESL, as summarized by Schneider (2003: 239):

> In many statements on global Englishes there is an inherent but hardly visible tendency to regard and portray Britain and other ENL countries as the 'centers', thus entitled to establish norms of correctness, and, conversely, New Englishes as peripheral, thus in some sense deviating from these norms and, consequently, evaluated negatively.

This view has, however, drastically changed as to how deviations are perceived within ESL. A large body of research on ESL gives thorough empirical descriptions of innovative features in ESL varieties, which have mainly been interpreted as being signs of a variety to have reached the phase of "nativization" in variety formation. This phase is "the most important, the most vibrant one, the central phase of both cultural *and linguistic* transformation" (Schneider 2003: 247; our emphasis). In the ESL paradigm, then, linguistic innovations are essential for the "identity construction" (ibid.) of the speakers of a new English variety. Consequently, "New Englishes" emerge and gain acceptance only through the nativization of linguistic innovations in the respective variety. These innovations "for a time may occur or exist side by side with the

corresponding traditional forms, and eventually may become established as traditional themselves" (Andersen 1989: 11). In fact, in ESL, an innovation might be the result of the conventionalized use of what was initially an error (in the sense of a deviant use of the norm prevailing in a given speech community) over a long period of time and across a wide range of speakers in a given speech community. Ultimately, it is through the generalized use of an error that innovations gain acceptance and are considered to characterize individual ESL varieties (see also Section 4). In contrast, within the EFL paradigm, all kinds of deviations from native norms have been perceived and categorically classified either as idiosyncratic or systematic errors (cf. Section 2.2). This is mainly due to two factors: first, in EFL speech communities, the native speaker model is put forward by language politics as the (only) target in English language teaching, and, second, there is a tendency of learners of English themselves to aim for those norms (see, e.g. surveys by Mukherjee & Rohrbach 2006 and, more recently by Krenz 2015). In stark contrast to this, in established ESL speech communities such as India, adhering to native target norms is not propagated by language politicians and would be highly unnatural to ESL speakers, as it would seem rather "'foreign' – unnatural and affected – if they imitated BRP [i.e. British Received Pronunciation; SCD, SG, SL]" (Nihalani et al. 2004: 203). However, despite this background, in research on EFL, corpus linguists have recently started to pay attention to the use of innovative structures by EFL learners as well and the number of studies devoted to the subject has been increasing fast and steadily (see Section 2).

As speaker communities, non-native English users are likely to develop innovations at various linguistic levels. As Kachru (2006: 89) points out, some of the most creative innovations can be found in grammar, vocabulary, discourse strategies, and genres and styles. However, this list can easily be extended to studies describing innovations at the phonological level (e.g. D'Arcy 2005), at the semantic level (e.g. Robbin 2013), at the pragmatic level (e.g. Isingoma 2013), at the lexico-grammatical level (e.g. Schilk et al. 2012), etc. In what follows, we illustrate this with some selected examples of how innovative features at different linguistic levels have been described and perceived in previous EFL and ESL studies.

At the level of phonology, in EFL it has been noted that the interdental fricative /θ/ or /ð/ is often substituted either by /s, z/ or by /t, d/ (e.g. Yavaş 2009). The same phenomenon is described in various ESL varieties (e.g. Nihalani et al. (2004) for Indian English or Olajide & Olaniyi (2013) for Nigerian English). The difference between EFL and ESL does not lie in the formal realization of this feature, but in the perception and evaluation of its use: In EFL, this has been summarized as "interference" or (negative) "transfer" (Yavaş 2009: 177), whereas in ESL these substitutions are summarized as being "phonemic markers of identity" (Olajide & Olaniyi 2013: 284) that ESL speakers have in common "that supersedes L1 transfer" (Dako 2001: 26).

Lexical innovations have also been described in great detail in ESL. Typically, those innovations include borrowed and/or anglicized indigenous lexemes that refer to concepts for which no (British) English terms exist and thereby serve to "adapt to the socio-cultural reality in the country" (Dako 2001: 26). Studies that examine descriptions

of nativized indigenous lexemes in ESL include Dako (2001) on nativized "Ghanaianisms" found in Ghanaian English, Meyler (2007) on nativized lexemes from Sinhala or Tamil in Sri Lankan English, Nihalani et al. (2004) on nativized indigenous Indian English lexemes, to name but a few. Recently, research has become less intuition-based, as Bernaisch (2015), for example, takes a corpus-based approach to identifying lexemes that are exclusively used in English spoken in the South Asian region and that are not used in British English, i.e. *gram* (referring to chick peas), *rupee* (the currency in Sri Lanka) and *sari*/*saree* (the traditional female dress worn in South Asia) (Bernaisch 2015: 106-107). Other lexical innovations in ESL concern the use of English terms in a semantically extended or slightly shifted fashion (see Dako 2001). In contrast to research on ESL, research on EFL shows that learners rarely borrow lexical items from their native language to use them innovatively in their foreign language. This may be due to the fact that English does not serve intranational purposes in the EFL community and there is simply no need to use genuinely borrowed lexeme. However, EFL and ESL show many parallels when it comes to the formation of new words and the coining of new lexemes, which happens with great systematicity. This will be demonstrated by Callies (this issue), by Horch (this issue) and by Schneider & Gilquin (this issue).

One further innovative linguistic feature worth mentioning in this context is code-switching and code-mixing. These have so far mainly been investigated and documented as successful communication strategies in research on bilingualism (e.g. Grosjean 1989; Duran 1994) and second language acquisition (e.g. Söderberg Arnfast &

Jørgensen 2003), but we also find these in both ESL and EFL. Although the forms of code-switching and code-mixing are very similar in EFL and ESL, again, there is a difference in their interpretation and perception across the two non-native Englishes: When an EFL speaker resorts to their L1, this is typically treated as a communicative weakness or even a lexical error (e.g. in the EFL classroom; e.g. Berg 2013, S. Dose-Heidelmayer, personal communication, March 10, 2016); in ESL research, however, the functions and forms of code-switching and code-mixing are investigated intensively as contributing factors to the development of new dialects (e.g. "Hinglish, the code-switching between Hindi and English", Sailaja 2011: 473). Interestingly, despite this dichotomy in the way code-switching and code-mixing are approached across EFL and ESL, learner corpus research is nevertheless starting to witness a shift in scholars' perception of code-switching from communicative weakness to effective communicative strategy. This was recently documented in a study by Nacey & Graedler (2013) on Norwegian Learners of English and De Cock (2015) for French, Spanish, German and Italian Learners of English.

At the stylistic level, we find further illustrations of what can be classified – broadly speaking – as innovations in the sense of a restructuring in form-function mapping (see Croft 2000). Here, many ESL speakers "(continue to) use a stock of words which is either restricted to more formal contexts or considered to be rather archaic in the present-day usage of the erstwhile input variety, namely British English (BrE)" (Meyler 2007: xiv). For example, Bernaisch (2015) finds a significantly lower frequency of more formal lexemes in BrE compared to Indian and Sri Lankan English

(i.e. the South-Asian speakers prefer more formal variants than the British English speakers, such as *commence*, *purchase* or *refrigerator*). Similarly, Bernaisch (2015) also documents a frequent use of archaic markers, such as the use of *madam* as an address term. Although EFL learners have not been studied in as much detail as ESL speakers with respect to register and/or formality, it has nonetheless been recognized that, similarly to ESL users, English learners lack a nativelike "text-type sensitivity" (Lorenz 1999: 64) or "register awareness" (Gilquin & Paquot 2008). In other words, EFL yields many typically written features in their speech and typically spoken features in their writing.

At the level of pragmatics, particles and discourse markers provide an interesting case of shared innovations between ESL and EFL, particularly with regard to the creative use of discourse markers from the speakers' L1 when they speak English. Here, a very well-documented example is the use of *la/lah* in Singaporean English, an established ESL variety (Schneider 2007). It has been identified to be a solidarity marker between interlocutors as well as to be a pragmatically multifunctional marker (see Low & Deterding (2003) for a survey on previous studies). Similarly, EFL speakers have also been found to use discourse markers from their L1 when speaking English. For instance, French learners use *enfin*, *hein* and *allez,* Dutch learners of English *allez* or *nous*, and *ach* or *ja* has been documented in German EFL learners (e.g. Gilquin 2008). Again, the structural form of the innovative use is similar in EFL and ESL (i.e. the integration of discourse markers from the L1 when speaking English); however, their interpretation and perception is different. For instance, in EFL, "[i]f a

non-native speaker uses discourse particles incorrectly […] this may lead to misunderstandings" (Aijmer 2002: 3), whereas in ESL the focus is on the description of the innovative forms and functions as a sign of nativization (e.g. Low & Deterding 2003).

The lexis-grammar interface has been claimed to be particularly prone to display innovative forms in ESL. This is mainly due to the fact that "certain words but not others of the same word class prefer specific grammatical rules or patterns" (Schneider 2007: 83). That is, even though neither the patterns nor the words are new, "what is novel is the habitual association between them in specific varieties" (Schneider 2007). One very well researched case in point at the lexico-grammatical level is the use of phrasal verbs which have been claimed to be one of the most "notoriously challenging aspects" (Gardner & Davies 2007: 339) in EFL. As such, they have been the subject of a variety of EFL and ESL studies (e.g. Schneider 2004; Zipp & Bernaisch 2012; Gilquin 2015; Deshors 2016). Because they are relatively frequent, phrasal verbs with *up* have attracted much attention and constructions such as *cope up with* have been shown to appear both in ESL and EFL (cf. Zipp & Bernaisch 2012; Edwards & Laporte 2015; Gilquin 2015). However, Gilquin (2015) reports on other innovative uses that EFL and ESL do not share and that are characteristic of individual variety types of English, e.g. *meddle up* (in Singaporean English), *fashion (your jeans) up* (in German learner English) or *spray up* (in British English) are not shared between the three Englishes.[4]

[4] We are aware, however, that some potentially shared constructions might simply not be found in corpus research and thus similarities might simply go unnoticed, often due to the differences in corpus designs of

Ultimately, however, those uses show that the underlying processes for using the particles are shared and can serve to "testify to the common creative potential of both types of varieties" (Gilquin 2015: 107).

Focusing on comparable linguistic innovations across ESL and EFL, it emerges that main differences between the two Englishes do not lie in the formal realization of innovations, as they seem to be quite similar in EFL and ESL. Rather, those differences emerge in both the interpretation and the perception of these linguistic innovations: The predominant terms used in EFL research being "deviation" "misuse", "errors" or "non-attested", as compared to being markers of "nativization", "identity construction" or simply giving neutral descriptions of innovative forms and functions in ESL studies. However, more and more, studies are starting to not only show clear structural parallels between ESL and EFL (e.g. Callies or Koch et al. this issue) but also propose theoretical explanations of innovations in EFL (e.g. Callies or Schneider & Gilquin this issue). For EFL research, this is no trivial development as it suggests that innovative features are starting to be accepted by ENL-editors (as illustrated by Van Rooy & Kruger this issue in the context of South African English). Crucially, this might eventually lead to a significant change in the way EFL speakers are perceived; that is, as creative language users instead of 'defective native speakers'.

While, within the World Englishes community, "it took a great deal of persistence to convince linguists and educationists that the post-colonial grammars,

---

the corpora typically used for EFL-ESL comparisons (including different topics and compilation procedures).

lexicons and phonologies were worthy of study and not some deviation to be scrubbed away" (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 23), it is likely that more time will be needed until attitudes towards innovative EFL features begin to change in a similar vein. It is our hope that this special issue will contribute a (baby) step in this direction.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sebastian Hoffmann, Chair of the organizing committee of the ICAME 36 conference, for supporting our idea of a pre-conference workshop on the theme of *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Innovations in Non-native Englishes*. We are also very grateful to the participants and the audience of the workshop who all contributed to stimulating discussions. Thank you also to the editors of the IJLCR, Marcus Callies and Magali Paquot, who welcomed the idea of this special issue and who provided us with valuable feedback on this introductory chapter. Last but not least, we wish to thank all the reviewers and statistics advisor who generously contributed their time and expertise to this special issue.

References

Aijmer, K. 2002. *English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andersen, H. 1989. “Understanding linguistic innovations”. In L. E. Breivik & E. H. Jahr (Eds.), *Language Change: Contributions to the Study of its Causes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 5–27.

Bamgbose, A. 1998. “Torn between the norms: Innovations in World Englishes”, *World Englishes* 17(1), 1–14.

Bennui, P. 2013. “Some syntactic innovations in new literatures in English”, *International Journal of Linguistics* 5(5), 208–224.

Berg, N. 2013. *Codeswitching in ESL Teaching*. Degree project. University of Stockholm. Available at: https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:634259/FULLTEXT01.pdf (accessed March 2016).

Bernaisch, T. 2015. *The Lexis and Lexicogrammar of Sri Lankan English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

British National Corpus, version 3 (BNC XML Edition). 2007. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium.

Bruthiaux, P. 2003. “Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide”, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13(2), 159–178.

Buschfeld, S. 2013. *English in Cyprus or Cyprus English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

CASE. Forthcoming. *Corpus of Academic Spoken English*. Available at: http://www.uni-saarland.de/lehrstuhl/engling/case.html (accessed March 2016).

Corder, P. 1967. “The significance of learner’s errors”, *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5, 161-170.

Croft, W. 2000. *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman.

Dako, K. 2001. "Ghanaianisms. Towards a semantic and a formal classification", *English World-Wide* 21(2), 23–53.

D'Arcy, A. 2005. "The development of linguistic constraints: Phonological innovations in St. John's English", *Language Variation and Change* 17(3), 327–355.

Davies, M. 2013. Corpus of Global Web-Based English: 1.9 Billion Words from Speakers in 20 Countries. Available at: http://corpus2.byu.edu/glowbe/ (accessed November 2015).

Davies, M. & Fuchs, R. 2015. "Expanding horizons in the study of World Englishes with the 1.9 billion word Global Web-Based English Corpus (GloWbE)", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 1–28.

Davydova, J. 2012. "Englishes in the Outer and Expanding Circles: A comparative study", *World Englishes* 31(3), 366–385.

De Cock, S. 2015. "The use of foreign words in interviews with EFL learners: An effective communication strategy?" Paper presented at Learner Corpus Research 2015, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands, 11-13 September 2015.

Deshors, S. C. 2014. "A case for a unified treatment of EFL and ESL: A multifactorial approach", *English World-Wide* 35(3), 279–307.

Deshors, S. C. 2016. "Inside phrasal verbs constructions: A co-varying collexeme analysis of verb-particle combinations in EFL and their semantic associations", *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research* 2(1).

Duran, L. 1994. “Toward a better understanding of code switching and interlanguage in bilinguality: Implications for bilingual instruction”, *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students* 14, 69–88.

Edwards, A. 2014a. “The progressive aspect in the Netherlands and the ESL/EFL continuum”, *World Englishes* 33(2), 173–194.

Edwards, A. 2014b. *English in the Netherlands: Functions, forms and attitudes*. PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Edwards, A & Laporte, S. 2015. “Outer and Expanding Circle Englishes: The competing roles of norm orientation and proficiency levels”, *English World-Wide* 36(2), 135–169.

ELFA. 2008. *The Corpus of English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings*. Director: Anna Mauranen. Available at: http://www.helsinki.fi/elfa/elfacorpus (accessed March 2016).

Gardner, D. & Davies, M. 2007. “Pointing out frequent phrasal verbs: A corpus-based analysis”, *TESOL Quarterly* 41(2), 339–359.

Gilquin, G. 2008. “Hesitation markers across EFL learners: Pragmatic deficiency or difference?” In J. Romero-Trillo (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Corpus Linguistics: A Mutualistic Entente*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 119–149.

Gilquin, G. 2011. “Corpus linguistics to bridge the gap between World Englishes and Learner Englishes”, *Communicación en el siglo XXI* Vol. II:638–642. Available at:

http://dial.uclouvain.be/downloader/downloader.php?pid=boreal%3A112509&d

atastream=PDF_01&disclaimer=5dded109ee97b89072e796cddd5219c599cbdbd a547c241bb6bbe87d65203f8f (accessed October 2015).

Gilquin, G. 2015. "At the interface of contact linguistics and second language acquisition research: New Englishes and Learner Englishes compared", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 91–124.

Gilquin, G. & Granger, S. 2011. "From EFL to ESL: Evidence from the International Corpus of Learner English". In J. Mukherjee & M. Hundt (Eds.), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55–78.

Gilquin, G. & Paquot, M. 2008. "Too chatty: learner academic writing and register variation", *English Text Construction* 1(1), 41–61.

Götz, S. & Schilk, M. 2011. "Formulaic sequences in spoken ENL, ESL and EFL: Focus on British English, Indian English and learner English". In J. Mukherjee & M. Hundt (Eds.), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 79–100.

Greenbaum, S. & Nelson, G. 1996. "The International Corpus of English (ICE) Project", *World Englishes* 15(1), 3–15.

Grosjean, F. 1989. "Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person", *Brain and Language* 36(1), 3–15.

Hamid, M. O. & Baldauf Jr., R. B. 2013. "Second language errors and features of world Englishes", *World Englishes* 32(4), 476–494.

Isingoma, B. 2013. “Innovative pragmatic codes in Ugandan English: A relevance-theoretic account”, *Argumentum* 9, 19–31.

Kachru, B. B. 1982. “Models for non-native Englishes”. In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across cultures*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 48–74.

Kachru, B. B. 1985. “Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle”. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–30.

Kachru, B. B. 2006. *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Aberdeen and Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Krenz, J. 2015. *Attitudes of German University Students towards Varieties of English: An Empirical Study*. Unpublished B.A.-Thesis. University of Giessen.

Laitinen, M. 2010. “Describing ‘orderly differentiation’: Compiling the *Corpus of English in Finland*”, *English Today* 26(1), 26–33.

Laporte, S. 2012. “Mind the gap! Bridge between World Englishes and Learner Englishes in the making”, *English Text Construction* 5(2), 264–291.

Li, E. & Mahboob, A. 2012. *English Today: Forms, Functions, and Uses*. Hong Kong: Pearson Education.

Lorenz, G. 1999. *Adjective Intensification. Learners versus Native Speakers: A Corpus Study of Argumentative Writing*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Low, E. L. & Deterding, D. 2003. "A corpus-based description of particles in spoken Singapore English". In D. Deterding, E. L. Low & A. Brown (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on Grammar*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill, 58–66.

Mair, C. 2015. "Response to Davies and Fuchs", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 29–33.

Mesthrie, R. & Bhatt, R. M. 2008. *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meyler, M. 2007. *A Dictionary of Sri Lankan English*. Colombo: Mirisgala.

Mollin, S. 2006. *Euro-English: Assessing Variety Status*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Mukherjee, J. 2015. "Response to Davies and Fuchs", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 34–37.

Mukherjee, J. 2010. "Corpus-based insights into verb-complementational innovations in Indian English: Cases of nativised semantico-structural analogy". In A. N. Lenz & A. Plewnia (Eds.), *Grammar between Norm and Variation*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 219–241.

Mukherjee, J. & S. Hoffmann. 2006. "Describing verb-complementational profiles of new Englishes: A pilot study of Indian English", *English World-Wide* 27(2), 147–173.

Mukherjee, J. & Hundt, M. (Eds.) 2011. *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mukherjee, J. & Rohrbach, J.-M. 2006. "Rethinking applied corpus linguistics from a language-pedagogical perspective: New departures in learner corpus research".

In B. Kettemann & G. Marko (Eds.), *Planing, Gluing and Painting Corpora: Inside the Applied Corpus Linguist's Workshop*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 205–232.

Nacey, S. & Graedler, A.-L. 2013. "Communication strategies used by Norwegian students of English". In S. Granger, G. Gilquin & F. Meunier (Eds.), *Twenty Years of Learner Corpus Research: Looking back, Moving ahead*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 345–356.

Nelson, G. 2015. "Response to Davies and Fuchs", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 38-40.

Nesselhauf, N. 2005. *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nesselhauf, N. 2009. "Co-selection phenomena across New Englishes: Parallels (and differences) to foreign learner varieties", *English World-Wide* 30(1), 1–26.

Nihalani, P., Tongue, R. K., Hosali, P. & Crowther, J. 2004. *Indian and British English: A Handbook of Usage and Pronunciation*. Second edition. New Dehli: Oxford University Press.

Oxford English Dictionary (OED). 2015. Online version. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Available at: http://www.oed.com (accessed January 2016).

Olajide, S. B. & Olaniyi, O. K. 2013. "Educated Nigerian English Phonology as Core of a Regional 'RP'", *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 3(14), 277–286.

Peters, P. 2015. "Response to Davies and Fuchs", *English World-Wide* 36(1), 41–44.

Platt, J. 1989. "The nature of indigenized Englishes: Interference – creativity –

universals", *Language Sciences* 11(4), 395–407.

Robin, A. A. 2013. "Old words, new meanings: A survey of semantic change amongst Yoruba-English bilingual undergraduates", *Journal of Capital Development in Behavioural Sciences* 1, 55–79.

Rosen, A. 2014. *Grammatical variation and change in Jersey English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sailaja, P. 2011. "Hinglish: code-switching in Indian English", *ELT Journal* 65(4), 473–480.

Schilk, M., Bernaisch, T. & Mukherjee, J. 2012. "Mapping unity and diversity in South Asian English lexicogrammar: Verb-complementational preferences across varieties". In M. Hundt & U. Gut (Eds.), *Mapping Unity and Diversity World-Wide: Corpus-Based Studies of New Englishes*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 137–165.

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. 2012. "Exploring the interface between World Englishes and Second Language Acquisition – and implications for English as a Lingua Franca", *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca* 1(1), 57–91.

Schneider, E. W. 2014. "'Transnational Attraction': New reflections on the evolutionary dynamics of World Englishes", *World Englishes* 33(1), 9–32.

Schneider, G. & Zipp, L. 2013. “Discovering new verb-preposition combinations in New Englishes”, *Studies in Variation, Contacts and Change in English* 13. Available at: http://www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/13/schneider_zipp.pdf (accessed November 2015).

Söderberg Arnfast, J. & Jørgensen, N. 2003. “Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish”, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13(1), 23–53.

Sridhar, K. K. & Sridhar, S. N. 1986. “Bridging the paradigm gap: second language acquisition research and indigenized varieties of English”, *World Englishes* 5(1), 3–14.

Szmrecsanyi, B. & Kortmann, B. 2011. “Typological profiling: learner Englishes versus indigenized L2 varieties of English”. In J. Mukherjee & M. Hundt (Eds.), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 168–187.

Van Rooy, B. 2011. “A principled distinction between error and conventionalized innovation in African Englishes”. In J. Mukherjee & M. Hundt (Eds.), *Exploring Second-Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a Paradigm Gap*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 189–208.

VOICE. 2009. *The Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of English* (version 1.0 online). Director: B. Seidlhofer; Researchers: A. Breiteneder, T. Klimpfinger, S.

Majewski, M.-Luise Pitzl. Available at: http://voice.univie.ac.at (accessed March 2016).

Williams, J. 1987. "Non-Native Varieties of English: A special case of language acquisition", *English World-Wide* 8(2), 161–199.

Yavaş, M. 2009. *Applied English Phonology*. Malden: Blackwell.

Zipp, L. & Bernaisch, T. 2012. "Particle verbs across first and second language varieties of English". In M. Hundt & U. Gut (Eds.), *Mapping Unity and Diversity World-Wide: Corpus-based Studies of New Englishes*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 167–196.