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THE MOBILE GLOBAL WORLD

• The rich world: business, academia, entertainment
• The poor world: emigration, immigration, asylum seeking
• Digital communication devices in everyone’s pocket

  -> mobility and mobile communication permeate our lives
  -> Language mixing, multilingual practices
• English as the first **global** lingua franca
• Mobility as a paradigm shift in social sciences (Sheller & Urry 2006)
• Language contact a key factor in language change

• Periods of rapid social change and large-scale mobility associated with accelerated language change.

• Both relevant to English as a Lingua Franca
ENGLISH AS A GLOBAL LINGUA FRANCA:

WHAT HAPPENS TO A LANGUAGE WHICH

• spreads around the globe and gets into contact with virtually all other languages in the world?

• the vast majority of its speakers use it as an L2, and a minority as their L1?

• a large number of its speakers are highly mobile and in constant contact with speakers of a wide range of L2 varieties?
WILL ENGLISH LEAD TO HOMOGENEITY? (1)

English is not the first lingua franca…

…and not likely to be the last
Major lingua francas in history
Languages do not just unite…
… they also separate:

no other mammalian species
than humans has spread around the globe
maintaining genetic homogeneity

but at the same time unable to communicate with most others of the same species
Equatorial chatter

Languages seem to follow Rapoport’s rule, which holds that species richness is greatest at the equator and declines towards the poles, as this chart for North America shows.

Number of languages or species in a 1° latitude slice divided by the land area.

SOURCE: PASK, M. 2003. HUMAN LANGUAGE AS A CULTURALLY TRANSMITTED PHENOMENON.
- Quite unlikely that homogeneity would take over human language
- Lingua francas are needed for communicating across the diversity
WHAT IS ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA (ELF)?

• ELF is second language use (SLU)
• Distinct from learner language (LL) or SLA
• And distinct from L1 English (ENL)
• ELF much like dialect contact:
  speakers of mutually comprehensible varieties

• The ‘varieties’, lects, (Finglish, Swenglish, Chinglish, Dunglish…)

result from parallel cross-linguistic influence

➢ ‘similects’ (parallel lects)

• similects are parallel idiolects of speakers of a particular language background
  in another language they have all learned
Similects srise through L2 learning, but manifest themselves in use
ELF ‘lects’ are not dialects,
< dialects develop in interaction in (local) communities

Similects remain first-generation hybrids
- Do not diversify, change, develop dialects and sociolects…
- Embody language contact in individuals
Similects arise through L2 learning, but manifest themselves in use
ELF ‘lects’ are not dialects,
< dialects develop in interaction in (local) communities

Similects remain first-generation hybrids
- Do not diversify, change, develop dialects and sociolects…
- Embody language contact in individuals

Individuals are sites of language contact; Similects ≈ parallel idiolects
Similects rise through L2 learning, but manifest themselves in use
ELF ‘lects’ are not dialects,
< dialects develop in interaction in (local) communities

Similects remain first-generation hybrids
- Do not diversify, change, develop dialects and sociolects…
- Embody language contact in individuals

- -> **ELF is a second-order contact between similects**
  (including varieties and dialects of Englishes as L1)
THE CONCEPT OF ELF: COMPLEXITY

• ELF is complex in two senses:
  (1) complicated (as a ‘hybrid’ language)
  (2) a complex, dynamic system (multiple contact between similects)
• heterogeneous and variable, also unstable (‘fluid’)
• However, this is true of language overall

• ELF tends to increase variability in English

• This variability makes it more ‘diffuse’ (cf. LePage & Tabouret-Keller), and thus contrasts with the ‘focused’ nature of English as a national variety in countries like the UK and the US.
DATA FROM ELF CORPORATA AT HELSINKI UNIVERSITY

ELFA: English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings

WrELFA: Written English as a Lingua Franca in Academic Settings
THREE PERSPECTIVES

• Macro social
• Cognitive
• Micro social
Through the processes of APPROXIMATION and FIXING:

*Approximation* paves the way by opening up deep-rooted conventions;
(*put an end to it* -> *put the end on it*)

*Fixing* settles for new preferences
(*let me say some words about it*)

Diffused through interactions
MACRO-SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE: LANGUAGE
GROWING VARIABILITY THROUGH THE PROCESS OF **APPROXIMATION**

*Approximation* – rough equivalents of target elements recognizable on the basis of function, form, or meaning
• Morphological approximation and ‘overproductivity’

**SPOKEN**

we always must *interventer* and ask about alcohol is it it's not a matter of what we believe

*[it's here it says] E was always *combinated* with *</S7>*

**WRITTEN**

that's the window when Mecp2 is dramatically *upregulated* in the brain.

the number of dated landslides throughout the world increased *severalfold* and introduction of modern dating methods
Variable expressions for the same meaning

On the opposite, according to previous studies, AC can act as reaction site,

Opposite of some other studies,

In contrary to previous investigations on the topic,

...higher channel gradients, coarser sediments and contrary, pool-riffles had greater width/depth ratios
Sociolinguistic research suggests the consequence of extensive contact is simplification.

Trudgill (2011): (1) language contact and (2) adult SLA conducive to overall simplification.

Kusters (2003) looked at several language groups in a variety of sociolinguistic circumstances:

languages used as lingua francas are more amenable to simplification than those spoken in closed speech communities (cf. Milroy & Milroy (1985))
**APPROXIMATION TOWARDS SIMPLIFICATION**

- Regularisation of morphology
  Irregular and exceptional forms get proportionally rarer

**SPOKEN**

**Verbs**

*the petition that i have just er showed you*

*maybe these countries have lost they have…*

**Nouns** uncountable -> countable

*eac h sovereign state makes cooperations with each other and keeps their own independencies*
… improved the toughness and stabilities, but also show higher proton conductivity…

There are evidences that WBV training improves strength and power

the blend membranes were studied in details, which were considered to be suitable for PEMs materials

It strucked me that the few summaries I checked were very unstructured and short, unlike most summaries I see.
• Syntactic shortcuts

*After reported first* by Wainright et al. in 1995 [4], the application of PA-PBI has been extensively studied

…however the flight time was generally much *longer* that of direct transfer.

This complication *provokes that* the spillage factor *be* generally scaled from accurate calculations only made for some particular cases.
Fixing – the counterpart of approximation

settling on a preferred expression for a given meaning
were evaluated as stage "1", being broken by the valley, and, during high-magnitude floods, fluvially dominated channels. In recently prevails (Fig. 5). In area than other groups and form: W=3.228A0.20 (R2=0.49). With steeper resulted trend and Rivera-Utrilla et al., 2011). On the opposite, high occurrence on the opposite side, the flat and the new martyrs stood on the opposite, boulders with the opposite, relatively large, the opposite, the most downs on the opposite, very poor dep. on the opposite, bankfull depth on the opposite, lower calculating on the opposite, according to on the opposite side of the mark...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hit</th>
<th>KWIC</th>
<th>File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>their fermionic superpartners, <strong>so to say</strong>, and vice versa. The</td>
<td>BDIS_TRF19 copy.txt 18 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copenhagen and Paris, and <strong>so to say</strong> something about their</td>
<td>B11A copy.txt 10 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>based on love and cohabitation ( <strong>so to say</strong>, <strong>based on</strong> the</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>legal marriage itself has been, <strong>so to say</strong>, <strong>institutionalisation</strong></td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>different legal ways for the, <strong>so to say</strong> <strong>emptied</strong> of its pre</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>These Laws usually establish, <strong>so to say</strong>, <strong>non-marital</strong> impedi</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>conclusion is that from this -- <strong>so to say</strong> -- functional perspe</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>manus takes from Statilius are, <strong>so to say</strong> <strong>rare</strong> words, with</td>
<td>SSH65.txt 484 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>bear at the end, after some -- <strong>so to say</strong> <strong>less regular or le</strong></td>
<td>SSH65.txt 484 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>concept of sa-dpyad, that is -- <strong>so to say</strong> <strong>the traditional Ti</strong></td>
<td>UDEFS18A copy.txt 516 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>happen isn't in my toolbox, they perturb with their fingers</td>
<td>BDIS_TRF02 copy.txt 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>so to speak</strong> -- which make real -- <strong>so to speak</strong> the better</td>
<td>BDIS_TRF05 copy.txt 4 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>have a light shone on it, he is the Gauss of physics</td>
<td>'T B01C copy.txt 28 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>not an octave but a nonave, <strong>so to speak.</strong> Meanwhile I always</td>
<td>B03F copy.txt 43 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>after <strong>stumbling upon myself</strong>, <strong>so to speak.</strong> Reference</td>
<td>B06G copy.txt 68 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Markey's intellectual opponent, <strong>so to speak</strong> was Owen Jones who</td>
<td>B12G copy.txt 116 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>reference be put on the backburner, <strong>so to speak.</strong> So what has</td>
<td>B26B copy.txt 223 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>relationship with the church, <strong>so to speak.</strong> They hammered the</td>
<td>SSH58.txt 477 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>coherent -- in its own right, <strong>so to speak.</strong> Still, during the</td>
<td>SSH68.txt 487 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>performance reiterates <strong>so to speak</strong> the painting on the</td>
<td>SSH70.txt 489 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>KWIC</td>
<td>File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>their fermionic superpartners, so to say, and vice versa. The</td>
<td>BDIS_TRF19 copy.txt 18 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copenhagen and Paris, and in doing so to say something about their</td>
<td>B11A copy.txt 102 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>based on love and cohabitation ( so to say, based on the fact</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>legal marriage itself has been, so to say, &quot;emptied&quot; of its pre</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>different legal ways for the, so to say, &quot;institutionalisation</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>These Laws usually establish, so to say, &quot;non-marital&quot; imped</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>conclusion is that from this -- so to say -- functional perspe</td>
<td>SSH62.txt 481 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>enus takes from Statilius are, so to say, 'rare' words, with t</td>
<td>SSH65.txt 484 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>appear at the end, after some -- so to say -- less regular or le</td>
<td>SSH65.txt 484 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>except of sa-dpyad, that is -- so to say -- the traditional Ti</td>
<td>UDEFS18A copy.txt 516 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike structural simplification, little is being said about **lexical simplification**. Since lexis travels fast, it could just add to the lexical stores of languages in contact.

Lexical simplification observed in learner language:
   **usual explanation:** ‘imperfect learning’ of the L2

And in translations:
   **usual explanation:** ‘interference from source language’ into the L1
Unlike structural simplification, little is being said about lexical simplification. Since lexis travels fast, it could just add to the lexical stores of languages in contact. But different from a cognitive viewpoint? Lexical simplification observed in learner language usual explanation: ‘imperfect learning’ of the L2 and in translations. usual explanation: ‘interference from source language’ into the L1
Zipf (1935): the most frequent lexis accounts for a considerable part of any text mass
The Brown corpus: 135 most frequent words account for 50% of the data
ELFA: 44 most frequent words account for 50% of the data
Zipf (1935): the most frequent lexis accounts for a considerable part of any text mass

The Brown corpus: 135 most frequent words account for 50% of the data
ELFA: 44 most frequent words account for 50% of the data

But: mode and genre differences?
• the Brown corpus has a number of genres, and is essentially written
• ELFA is academic spoken
• So what about MICASE - academic (American) English speech?
## Shares of the Most Frequent Words in ELFA and MICASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>ELFA (ELF)</th>
<th>MICASE (ENL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 44</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 58</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 200</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MICASE more similar to ELFA than to Brown

- > Speech radically different from writing (cf Biber 2009; Dabrowska 2019)

- Even so, a notable difference remains between ELFA and MICASE

- > Therefore, we must conclude that

ELF leads to some lexical simplification.
MICASE more similar to ELFA than to Brown

- > Speech radically different from writing (cf Biber 2009)

- Even so, a notable difference remains between ELFA and MICASE

- > Therefore, we must conclude that

ELF leads to some lexical simplification.

- However, this levels out at 200-word rank (still very high)
- ->thus, heavy clustering among the very top frequency words only

The average person’s vocabulary size
From 20,000-35,000w upwards
COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE: THE INDIVIDUAL
If two competing systems are active in a speaker’s repertoire, a reasonable assumption could be that the best entrenched parts of each are likely to become more salient.
If two competing systems are active in a speaker’s repertoire, a reasonable assumption could be that the best entrenched parts of each are likely to become more salient.
If two competing systems are active in a speaker’s repertoire, a reasonable assumption could be that the best entrenched parts of each are likely to become more salient.

In productive cognitive terms, one of the consequences of language contact could account for the relative overrepresentation of the most frequent lexis of the language that is currently being used.
Second or additional languages tend to be more weakly entrenched than the first

-> processing should be **fuzzier** and manifest more **approximations** of target items.
APPROXIMATE MULTI-WORD UNITS OF MEANING

…to er throw some lights in female deputies
…talking of a process and the same way around but i think
…conflicts which is happens well right next doors
… small children who one of those days could be the grown ups

- Approximation in MWUs: overall shape, meaning and key elements intact
  -> less salient elements loosen up
MECHANISMS CAN BE SIMILAR TO HISTORICAL CHANGE

Blend:
…in fact behind the lines you could very well read that
(< between the lines + behind the scenes)

Back-formation:
bed sediments of headwater channels of Appalachian Mountains are strongly predisposed by an ultra-fine-scale dynamic equilibrium with bedrock erodibility (…variance in resistance of individual geological units was recognised as one of the downstream coarsening predisposition.)
Speakers tend to economise on their effort in expression given the constraints of working memory,
-> individuals settle on certain preferred expressions for given meanings

Hearers: weak entrenchment applies to the hearer too - approximate forms may not be harder to understand than precise forms,
a typical ELF hearer is not precisely attuned to Standard English but likely to rely on fairly fuzzy processing for sense-making

Such matching of cognitive processes is collaborative activity -> interactional consequences: acceptance of approximate forms in interaction.
MICRO-SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE: INTERACTION
Interaction is crucial to cognitive processing on account of

the fundamental altercentric orientation of the brain

the recency effect (Christiansen & Chater 2016),

the priming effect (Pickering & Garrod 2017).
Interaction is crucial to cognitive processing on account of

the fundamental altercentric orientation of the brain

the recency effect (Christiansen & Chater 2016),

the priming effect (Pickering & Garrod 2017).

Other humans are the most important environment for the brain (Hari 2007; 2016)
Interaction: resources speakers draw on to achieve mutual comprehension

Explicitation tendency in ELF

E.g. in negotiating topics, **fronting** (‘left dislocation’) particularly common

wealthy people they are opposed to this monopoly insurance system

or **tails** (‘right dislocation’)

this is our greatest problem the the regional tensions

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
Rephrasing

... because of the poor nutrition level this poor diet the whole standard of living was poor...

... I wouldn’t say that he was against it was just a question a matter of the time...
Innovations do not diffuse without interacting individuals.

Accounts of language change implicate accommodation as a key mechanism (Croft 2000: a response to speakers from outside one’s own community. Speakers compensate for the lack of common ground by adjusting their speech, e.g. by elaborating content or simplifying grammar (Giles & Smith 1979).
Innovations do not diffuse without interacting individuals.

Accounts of language change implicate accommodation as a key mechanism (Croft 2000: a response to speakers from outside one’s community). Speakers compensate for the lack of common ground by adjusting their speech, e.g., by elaborating content or simplifying grammar (Giles & Smith 1979).

Accommodation theory (Giles 1973; Gallois, Oggay & Giles 2005) is a pervasive feature in social interaction; Meltzoff & Brooks (2007: 152) state: The duplication of the action patterns, mannerisms, and gestures others use is part of the fabric of human communication. It runs in the background and fosters emotional cohesion in everyday interactions, oftentimes outside explicit awareness.
Cross-linguistic (‘between-language’) priming found in many studies.

Often structural,
Can be persistent,
Shares many properties with within-language priming.

So long as a speaker of one language can understand some utterances in a second language, those utterances might influence his or her native language (Pickering & Garrod 2017)

=> no absolute, vital difference between what are traditionally conceived of as languages – separate, distinct, with clearly demarcated boundaries.
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Cross-linguistic (‘between-language’) priming found in many studies.

Often structural,
Can be persistent,
Shares many properties with within-language priming.

So long as a speaker of one language can understand some utterances in a second language, those utterances might influence his or her native language (Pickering & Garrod 2017)

=> no absolute, vital difference between what are traditionally conceived of as languages – separate, distinct, with clearly demarcated boundaries.

If primed, speakers can accept and use what they have previously regarded as ungrammatical in their L1
S1: [yeah] from time to time I think er it kind of er, first this law for that you can register your er how you say your (S5: sort of partnership) partnership er I think er you cannot argue for too much in in in Finland you have to, go li- by [steps] (S5:[(it was)]) yeah (S5: yes) with small steps so [that you can]

S5: [was it] in this, er

S1: it was [together]

S5: [this spring], spring 2002 was it 2001 (S1:mhm) that it became possible in Finland that you can register you can’t [get] (NS2: [ah]) married and you can’t you can register yourself, to be partners [with]
S1: ...you can registrate your er how you say your...
S5:... you can register you can’t get married and you can’t you can register yourself ...
S5:... very much against this, er registration thing because ...
S3: ... between registration and marriage so
S5:... got the right to registrate so I suppose in another ten years ...
S1: ... er getting re- registrated was were kept together but then ...
S1: ...you can **registrate** your er how you say your...

S5: ... you can **register** you can’t get married and you can’t you can **register** yourself ...

S5: ... very much against **this**, er registration thing because ... 

S3: ... between **registration** and marriage so 

S5: ... got the right to **registrate** so I suppose in another ten years ... 

S1: ... er getting re- **registrated** was were kept together but then ...
S1: ...you can **registrate** your er how you say your...
S5:... you can **register** you can’t get married and you can’t you can **register** yourself...
S5:... very much against this, er registration thing because ... 
S3: ... between registration and marriage so
S5:... got the right to **registrate** so I suppose in another ten years ... 
S1: ... er getting re-**registrated** was were kept together but then ...
S1: ...you can register your er how you say your...
S5:... you can register you can’t get married and you can’t you can register yourself...
S5:... very much against this, er registration thing because ...
S3: ... between registration and marriage so
S5:... got the right to register so I suppose in another ten years ...
S1: ... er getting re-registered was were kept together but then ...

Uncertainty: safe option
S1: ...you can *registrate* your er how you say your...
S5:... you can register you can’t get married and you can’t yourself...
S5:... very much against this, er registration thing because ...
S3: ... between *registration* and marriage so
S5:... got the right to *registrate* so I suppose in another ten years ...
S1: ... er getting re-*registrated* was were kept together but then ...
S1: ...you can register your er how you say your...
S5: ... you can register you can’t get married and you can’t you can’t get married and you can’t register yourself ...
S5: ... very much against this, er registration thing because ...
S3: ... between registration and marriage so ...
S5: ... got the right to register so I suppose in another ten years ...
S1: ... er getting re-registered was were kept together but then ...
S1: ...you can register your er how you say your...
S5: ... you can register you can’t get married and you can’t register yourself ...
S5: ... very much against this, er registration thing because...
S3: ... between registration and marriage so
S5: ... got the right to register so I suppose in another ten years ...
S1: ... er getting re-registered was were kept together but then ...
One-off event (individual coinage)
Or encountered before?

Google search:
About 46 600 000 hits for *registrate*
About 700 000 000 for *register*

*registrate* represents 6.7% of *register’s* frequency
⇒Far more likely to encounter *register* than *registrate*

Well-established frequency effects would seem to suggest no change as a result
BUT
AN INDIVIDUAL’S EXPERIENCE IN A GIVEN ENVIRONMENT MAY BE
BIASED TOWARDS ONE OPTION

Dear All,

there is still some room.
Hopefully, one can still registerate, at least you can try.
yours

Registrate for Communications, Pitching and Branding Workshop on Nov 16

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
CONCLUSION

Language contact works at three levels:

• **Cognitive** processing
  • > affects search and salience, e.g. conventional preferences

• **Micro-social**: Social interaction
  • > explicitation tendencies

➢ **Macro-social** consequences: language change

**ELF:**
> wide range of features from different similects intermingling
-> we can expect considerable *variability* in speech forms and accents
ENGLISH TOMORROW?

Wipes out all other languages?

• Not likely: contact languages have their functions, other languages have theirs

• The interests of small and minority languages compatible with one major international lingua franca

• Reduces the chances of other large languages to maintain or gain a status as an international lingua franca

UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
• Still around in 200 years?

• Quite likely:
  strong momentum at present;
  ‘developing economies’ likely to use English amongst themselves
THE FUTURE OF GLOBAL ENGLISH?

• Mobile groups tend to be linguistic and cultural innovators
  • regionally
  • socially

• Norms tend to be shaped by elites

• International economic, political, academic elites are no longer Anglo-American

➢ English is in the hands of its non-native majority
THANK YOU!