Towards a Corpus-Based Study of Zimbabwean English: A State-of-the-Art Review and Implications for Further Research

Thadeus Marungudzi

Lecturer (Department of English and Media Studies, Great Zimbabwe University, Zimbabwe)

Abstract

This paper aims to review research done to date on the presence of the English language in Zimbabwe. Recent submissions by Kadenge and Nkomo (2011) indicate that the presence of English in Zimbabwe is a reality that Zimbabweans can only do well to put up with since it plays vital communication functions in the country. These authors recommend that it is a prudent compromise to nurture the Zimbabwean variety of English which captures the idiom, expression and spirit of the Zimbabwean. This paper thus aims to review current research on Zimbabwean English, preparatory to an analysis of the specific linguistic features of the variety. The paper reveals that there is scanty research on the phenomenon of Zimbabwean English and thus builds a case for further research in the variety, particularly research that adopts the corpus-based approach. It also emerges from this review that though there are some studies that have begun to make forays into the linguistic characteristics of Zimbabwean English, early research on the variety has had little to do with the linguistic aspects of the variety. The paper argues that exploring the linguistic characteristics of Zimbabwean English is an effective way of resolving controversies over the ontological status of one of the lesser-known varieties of English.

Key words*: World Englishes, Zimbabwean English, variety status, linguistic features, corpus approach*

Introduction

Apart from the political, socioeconomic and religious legacies of colonisation, the emergence of different varieties of English (known as new Englishes) across the globe has been and continues to be a salient aftermath of the era of colonisation. Also known as world Englishes, foreign English varieties (van Rooy 2011, Bolton 2005), or postcolonial Englishes (Schneider 2003, 2007, 2011) among other terms, these new Englishes show structural discrepancies with the so-called 'Standard English' varieties spoken in countries such as the U.S. and the U.K. (Studies by Gisborne (2000), Terblanche and Van Rooy (2006), Gut (2007), Schnell (2009), Haase, Schmied, Terblanche and Van Rooy (2010) detail the linguistic features of some of these new Englishes). These discrepancies, evincing a process of nativisation and indigenisation, are believed to be a result of contact between English and the subtrate languages (Gut 2011). It is interesting, if not ironic, that the process of indigenisation and nativisation of English 'is a product of the very recent past and not primarily of the colonial heritage of former colonies in the British Empire' (Schneider 2011:3).

It is significant, however, to note that the status and acceptability of these emerging Englishes as conventional varieties are riddled with controversy. There are varieties that seem to have achieved conventional variety status e.g. Black South African English, Indian English, Chinese English, Singapore English, among others. However, the jury is still out in regard to whether

these new Englishes warrant recognition as conventional varieties or are they mere interlanguages? This controversy could be partly a result of the fact that the linguistic features of such new Englishes have not yet been fully described. In cases where some studies of the features of these new varieties have been done, this has been done in a piecemeal way and the aim has been usually to compare the varieties to some vague standard (Van Rooy 2008). Until recently, the studies also relied largely on anecdotal evidence. Furthermore, the uncertainty surrounding the status of new Englishes emanates from the fact that assigning status to a particular language variety is premised on a complexity of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors (Gut 2011). In Schneider's (2003:252) view, the acceptance of a new English as a conventionalised norm is in reality a frequently disguised social group struggle.

In terms of the nature of the new varieties, Kortmann and Lunkenheimer (2012) in collaboration with some researchers across the world have begun an exploration of the linguistic characteristics and have so far reported on the features of some 74 varieties found in eight Anglophone world regions (Africa, Asia, Australia, British Isles, Caribbean, North America, Pacific, and the South Atlantic). However, as far as the Zimbabwean context is concerned, apart from the linguistic features of the historical L1 variety spoken by a white minority in Zimbabwe (see Fitzmaurice 2010), there is very scanty information on the variety spoken by black second language users of English in Kortmann and Lunkenheimer's (2012) enterprise. There is also nothing on the status of this variety.

In regard to the statuses of new varieties of English, Schneider (2003) postulates that different speech communities in the world are in different stages of his five-phase dynamic model of the evolution of new Englishes. The five phases include phase 1 (foundation), phase 2 (exonormative stabilisation), phase 3 (nativisation), phase 4 (endonormative stabilisation) and phase 5 (differentiation). Schneider also concedes, like Gut (2011) that the acceptability of new Englishes as conventional varieties hinges on a number of factors, some of which are non-linguistic.

Thus this paper seeks to establish the foundation for the study of the linguistic features and variety status of the English used by Black second language users in Zimbabwe (the focus of an upcoming paper) by reviewing existing work in this strand of research. The review seeks to contextualise the study of Zimbabwean English; firstly by detailing the sociohistorical circumstances around the advent of English in Zimbabwe and secondly by examining sociolinguistic and linguistic studies that have focused on the phenomenon of Zimbabwean English.

The history and status of English in Zimbabwe

Zimbabwe is a landlocked country found in the central part of southern Africa. It is bounded to the north by Zambia, to the east by Mozambique, to the south by South Africa and to the west by Botswana. All Zimbabwe's neighbours but one (Mozambique) are, like itself, former Anglophone colonies. There are a number of ethnolinguistic groups that make up the 14 million plus (according to the 2012 census report results) population of Zimbabwe, the major ones being Shona, Ndebele, Shangani/Tsonga, Venda and Tonga, but among them smaller groups consisting of, among others, European and Asian immigrants.

As in many other Anglophone countries, English came to Zimbabwe through the colonial expansion of the erstwhile British Empire through the British South Africa Company (BSAC). Though the territory north of South Africa had of course already been explored by hunters, prospectors and missionaries earlier (Hole 1936, Raftopoulos and Mlambo 2009) it was only in 1888 that Lobengula, the king of the Ndebele gave mining rights to Cecil John Rhodes leading eventually to the 'Pioneer Column' settling in present-day Zimbabwe post 1890, with the blessing of the British government.

As decolonisation set in in the early 1960s, local activism, strikes and riots culminated in a full-blown civil war in 1972 pitting the Rhodesian regime army and the national armies (ZANLA and ZIPRA) which were sponsored by the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Zimbabwe African Patriotic Union (ZAPU) political parties. In 1980 President Robert Mugabe of ZANU won general elections and proceeded in 1987 to unite ZANU and ZAPU into a new party ZANU-PF after some disturbances known as *Gukurahundi* (Raftopoulos and Mlambo 2009).

Raftopoulos and Mlambo (2009) report that Mugabe's popularity which had been on the decline since the 1990s resulted in a rejection of a constitution in which an extensive programme for land reform had been proposed and a narrow win for his party in the 2000 general elections despite the fast track land reform programme which had already started with his blessing in 1998. After the election, Mugabe embarked on the fast track land reform programme which saw the transfer of land owned by about 4000 farmers (out of 4500 farmers) to new black farmers resulting in the thawing of relations between Zimbabwe on one hand and Britain, US, IMF and UN and their allies on the other.

From then on, Zimbabwe's economic fortunes took a downturn as agricultural production, which had been the backbone of the economy kept underperforming. In the 2008 harmonised elections, Morgan Tsvangirai of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) narrowly beat President Mugabe, pulling out in a run-off called in June to find a clear winner, citing violence against his supporters. SADC then brokered talks that resulted in the formation of a Government of National Unity (GNU) with Mugabe as its President and Tsvangirai as Prime Minister (Fitzmaurice 2010). Having turned around the economic fortunes of the country, the GNU successfully spearheaded the writing of a new constitution which was believed to be a panacea for indisputable elections. ZANU-PF resoundingly won the 2013 general elections, a result that shocked the opposition and its supporters and brought the economy back into crisis again.

It is this long history that witnessed the vicissitudes through which the English language in Zimbabwe has passed, initially as a language of the colonial oppressor in the form of white settler farmers and subsequently as a second language widely spoken in Zimbabwe and a language of access. English got entrenched in the various functional domains of the country courtesy of the colonial and postcolonial period. The language was used in the domains that include government, law, media, education, business and technology. Thus, sociolinguistically, Zimbabwe, along with Zambia and Malawi, is a typical English as a Second Language (ESL) country with English firmly rooted (Schmied 1996).

Even after independence, Zimbabwe's linguistic dependence on English continued. Magura (1985:251) points out that English has remained a prestige variety which is now used to "convey and express local culture and traditions". This is despite the fact that out of Zimbabwe's population, only 2% is non-African i.e. white and Asian. Schmied (1996) estimates that only a third of the originally 250 000 strong native white English speakers are left. Fitzmaurice (2010) puts the figure at 25 000.

Despite incipient, if insincere anti-English sentiments, attitudes towards the English language have been consistently positive. One indication of this attitude is that despite recommendations, initially by Ngara (1982) and later by the *Nziramasanga Commission* in 1999 and many other language academics to use two major indigenous languages (Shona and Ndebele) as media of instruction in education, these recommendations have not been implemented. The media (both print and electronic) is also still dominated by English with only two or three publications in indigenous languages (See Magwa 2010a). Entry into higher education institutions or employment still requires a pass in English and a GCE Ordinary level certificate without English is deemed incomplete to date. The new 2013 Constitution of Zimbabwe made wry overtures to designate all Zimbabwean indigenous languages 'officially recognised languages' (whatever that means!) in order to bring them at par with English.

Also perceiving the serviceability of English for the ruling ZANU-PF party in the period 2000 - 2008, Ndhlovu (2011:108), in a paper that seeks to explore "the social capital of the English language" and the "context-specific factors that account for the preference for English in the midst of unprecedented ZANU-PF political vitriol against the English-speaking western world," notes that one element of the British colonial legacy that has been spared the populist political posturing about denunciation of all things western is the English language. Ndhlovu argues that English keeps receiving active propagation and promotion by the Zimbabwean government largely for the purposes of effective communication of ZANU-PF propaganda aimed at its English-speaking Western adversaries.

Thus in as far as Zimbabwean English is concerned, though in his 1988 publication, Kachru puts Zimbabwe in the extending circle, a comparison of the sociohistorical and functional circumstances (as chronicled above, and later in the foregoing discussion) of Zimbabwean English and Kachru's rubric for the outer circle would in fact place Zimbabwean English in the outer circle. The rubric for the outer circle is that it "includes countries where English is important for historical reasons and mostly spoken as a second language (e.g. the legacy of political expansion or colonisation by the British Empire) and where it plays a prominent role in national institutions" (Schreier 2009:19). Indeed Zimbabwean English can be labelled a lesser-known variety of English (LKVE) in Schreier (2009)'s terminology. An LKVE is a variety of English "that has so far received little or no attention at all in the research on English as a world language" (Schreier 2009:20).

Kadenge (2010:36) argues that the traditional argument that English is a colonial relic that should be ignored is no longer tenable given that English is the only official language that Zimbabweans as well as other Africans can effectively utilise when communicating with the outer world as they participate at international platforms.

Arguing that English in Zimbabwe should not be seen as a threat to the Zimbabwean indigenous languages, Kadenge and Nkomo (2011) however give a caveat that the language policy of Zimbabwe should foster the Zimbabwean variety of English but lament scanty research in the variety, a gap that the present article hopes to reduce.

Some studies on Zimbabwean English and their implications on future research

Schmied (1996) points out that there is a general scantiness of research on World Englishes in the former central Africa (Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe) in comparison to West and East Africa. However, to date, there are a number of studies that have been carried out on English in Zimbabwe, though largely not from a World Englishes perspective, most of them hooking themselves to the rather popular language policy/planning perspective (see for example, Hungwe (2007), Makanda (2009), Magwa (2010a), Magwa (2010b), Kadenge and Nkomo (2011), Kadodo, Kadodo, Bhala and Bhebe (2012), Chivhanga and Chimhenga (2013), Nhongo (2013), Maseko and Dhlamini (2014) Nkwe and Marungudzi (2015) and Kadenge and Mugari (2015). Due to space constraints these studies are not detailed here save to emphasise that they demonstrate that there is hardly any research on language planning and policy in Zimbabwe that does not implicate English. It is also important to emphasise that these studies show a general consensus that English has carved a formidable niche in the affairs of Zimbabwe, disadvantaging indigenous languages in terms of functional space, a matter that divides opinion among the scholars.

It is this dominance of the English language in Zimbabwe that raises the question of the nature of English used in the country. With such widespread use, has the English not been domesticated to reflect the linguistic and cultural traits of the Zimbabwean indigenous languages? If so in what ways and with what consequences on the relationship between Zimbabwean English and other new varieties of English on the one hand; and with the so-called Standard Englishes on the other? These are critical questions. However, before these questions can be answered, it is important to lay the foundation for their answering by reviewing the studies that have been carried out on the issue, which this paper aims to do.

Among the studies that have given attention to the phenomenon of Zimbabwean English are those that sought to explore the phenomenon from a sociolinguistic perspective and those that looked at the linguistic characteristics of the variety. These two types of studies are reviewed below. Studies that deal with the question of English in Zimbabwe from a sociolinguistic point of view are examined first.

Sociolinguistic studies on Zimbabwean English

Studies that adopt a sociolinguistic approach to the study of Zimbabwean English include those by Ngara (1982), Magura (1985), Makoni (1993) and Mlambo (2009). Ngara (1982) gives *inter alia* the historical exigencies surrounding the coming of the English language to Zimbabwe and the consequences of its interaction with Shona, one of the major languages spoken in Zimbabwe.

It is evident in Ngara's analysis that the functional status that English enjoys today is traceable to the language policies of the colonial settler regime, a point that is echoed by Hungwe (2007), Magwa (2010a), Magwa (2010b), Nhongo (2013) among others. For example, these policies 'imposed' English as the language of education, administration, parliamentary debates and the law. In terms of the more crucial question of the form of English used in Zimbabwe, Ngara (1982) indicates that there is clearly an identifiable variety of English spoken in Zimbabwe, particularly at the phonological level.

From a different perspective and taking Zimbabwean English as part of a broader variety of Southern African Black English, Magura (1985) sought to find out the form of English used in Zimbabwe taking the statement "Africans are creating out of English a language of their own: a language in actions using words that dart back and forth on quick-moving feet, virile earthy and garrulous" from Themba (1959) as a cue to research on the form of Southern African Black English. Magura finds out that the varieties of English spoken in Zimbabwe fit into Platt and Weber (1980)'s lectal range i.e. acrolect, mesolect and basilect (a point that is also made by Makoni (1993) as discussed below) and goes on to identify the groups that speak these different forms of English.

Another scholar who adopts a sociolinguistic approach to the study of Zimbabwean English is Makoni (1993). Kadenge (2010) claims that Makoni is the first researcher to address the question 'Is Zimbabwean English a new variety of English?' a question that touches on the ontological status not only of Zimbabwean English in particular but on World Englishes in general, and whose answer remains elusive to date.

Subjecting Zimbabwean English to the criteria that includes: the development of the variety through the educational system; use of the variety in a range of purposes such as letter writing, the writing of creative literature, parliamentary debates and media reporting; and the exhibition of 'localised' features in pronunciation, sentence structure and the lexicon, Makoni concludes that the variety of English spoken in Zimbabwe is not a new type of English, but a mere interlanguage. Makoni props this verdict with reference to the fact that the norms of accuracy and 'appropriacy' guiding Zimbabwean English are premised on native speaker standards, which is not the case in other types of new Englishes such as Nigerian English or Ghanaian English. Kadenge (2010: 38) rebuts this conclusion arguing that "to describe Zimbabwean English as an inter-language is a purist position that has been consistently rejected by the pragmatist school of thought; which argues that the varieties of English in the communities of the outer circle (Zimbabwe included) constitute different Englishes in their own right that express independent sociocultural identities and whose legitimacy owes no allegiance to the so-called native speaker norms". Kadenge's view is an affirmation of Kachru's pluricentric conceptualisation of global English and a rebuttal of Prator (1968) and Quirk's (1988) nativist monomodel position.

In 2009, the question of whether Zimbabwean English is a new English was taken up by Mlambo (2009). In his study, Mlambo addresses questions that include: Is there a Zimbabwean variety of English?, If so who speaks it?, Is English in Zimbabwe an interlanguage?, Are there many varieties of English in Zimbabwe which are pragmatically identifiable as Zimbabwean?, Does the most majority of Zimbabweans appear to speak an English which reflects the linguistic characteristics of Shona? Though Mlambo does not use corpus methods to find answers to these questions, he concludes (like Magura 1985) that "it is a fact that there are many varieties of

English which are pragmatically identifiable in Zimbabwe i.e. native variety, near-native variety, acrolect, mesolect and basilect.

It is evident from all the studies discussed in this section that attempts to answer the question of the ontological status of Zimbabwean English and the features of that variety have been approached from a sociolinguistic perspective and the research studies have yielded contrasting results; with the majority acknowledging the existence of a unique variety of Zimbabwean English (e.g. Ngara 1982, Magura 1985, Mlambo 2009) and others dismissing the variety the Quirk (1988) way (e.g Makoni 1993). It should also be pointed out that some of the studies (including those that acknowledge the existence of Zimbabwean English) have also made claims that are not detailed in terms of the linguistic features of Zimbabwean English, limited only to generalities and intuitive observations. This could be partly because the studies were not based on an empirical approach such as the corpus-based approach. It is my conviction that, to settle the question of the ontological status of Zimbabwean English more effectively, it is important to investigate the linguistic features of the variety and to employ an approach that includes the collection and analysis of oral and written texts by Black second language users of English in Zimbabwe. Though focusing largely on a single aspect of the language variety, Kadenge's studies discussed in the next section have begun to zero in on the linguistic features of Zimbabwean English.

Linguistic studies on Zimbabwean English

Among the studies that focus more on the linguistic features of the English spoken in Zimbabwe are those by Kadenge (2009), Kadenge (2010) and Fitzmaurice (2010. Fitzmaurice's study is not of much interest for the purposes of this paper since it focuses primarily on a fossilised variety of Zimbabwean English (better referred to as L1 Rhodesian English) which is no longer significantly spoken in Zimbabwe.

Kadenge (2009, 2010) explores the sociophonological characteristics of Zimbabwean English with a view to determining if these characteristics confirm the variety as a new type of English. Kadenge concludes that the phonological processes including substitution and underdifferentiation of monophthongs, glide epenthesis and glide formation are hallmarks of new African Englishes. It is against this background that Kadenge can be said to be coming close to granting Zimbabwean English variety status. In fact, Kadenge (2010:47) concludes that "based on the sociolinguistic status and localised phonological features of the English that is spoken in Zimbabwe, this study concludes that this distinct variety of English is legitimately 'owned' by Zimbabweans". However questions remain on who should ascribe variety status to a World English; is it language scholars, is it the speakers of the variety or is it the native speaker 'custodians' of the original version of the language?

Also, though the phonological level of the variety (that Kadenge focuses on) is perhaps the most illustrative of the identity of Zimbabwean English as a new variety of English, alone it does not provide conclusive evidence for the existence of Zimbabwean English. Kortmann and Lunkenheimer (2012) have compiled 235 features that cut across twelve different domains of grammar beginning from pronouns through to discourse organisation and word order, all of which (and arguably more) merit interrogation if we are to come up with better answers in terms

of the status and characteristics of language varieties. An interrogation of these features would be nigh impossible without a relevant and sizable corpus of naturally-occurring language data.

It has been noted that Kadenge's studies focus only on the phonological level of language (probably because that is the one that Ngara's (1982) earlier study hypothesises to be typically unique). Furthermore Kadenge's studies also use a very small and homogeneous research population of 25 university students. It is this writer's opinion that studies that seek to address questions of the ontological status and characteristics of Zimbabwean English should have a broader, more heterogeneous research population as well as ensure variety in terms of types of corpus, which should consist of both oral and written texts. Thus it is recommended that future research on Zimbabwean English should consider adopting the corpus approach (outlined in the section below) which ensures comprehensiveness and heterogeneity in terms of research population; and type and scope of texts.

Interestingly, a study that uses the corpus approach was carried out by Louw and Jordan at the University of Zimbabwe in 1993, but the purpose of the study was not to determine the variety status and characteristics of Zimbabwean English. The corpus used for the study only provided an accessible source of lexical items found in secondary schools and thus compiled four volumes of each of two book series for secondary English; namely Dawson's *Structures and Skills in English* and Grant *et al.*'s *English for Zimbabwe*: *An English course for secondary schools.* It can therefore be argued that this corpus is an example of a specialised corpus. Louw and Jordan (1993: 133) also point out that "the objective in loading the corpus of Zimbabwean secondary school materials was to provide a resource of interest to academics, language teachers and curriculum planners, psychologists, writers, publishers and those interested in specific areas such as research in reading". The corpus also gives instances of standard use of English and not the English as it is used by Black second language users and therefore would not reflect the typical ways in which English is used by Zimbabweans. However, Louw and Jordan's study remains interesting and relevant largely from a methodological point of view.

As indicated earlier, the present study seeks to make the point that the question of the nature and status of English in Zimbabwe can be better settled through a more scientific method which uses a broad corpus of oral and written texts of Zimbabwean English. The International Corpus of English (ICE) has suggested a workable *modus operandi* in the collection and analysis of language data which can be adopted albeit with modifications in the study of Zimbabwean English. The COBUILD corpus, the American National Corpus, the British National Corpus, the Cambridge English Corpus, the Corpus of Contemporary American English, the Tehran Monolingual Corpus and many other completed or evolving corpus projects also provide instructive models on corpus collection and analysis. There are also useful guidelines and caveats on the collection and analysis of language corpora in publications such as Wyne (2005), Baker (2006), O'Keeffe and McCarthy (2010), Heine and Narrog (2010), Adolphs and Carter (2013), among others.

This paper therefore recommends that in order to address issues of the identity, status and structural characteristics of Zimbabwean English, it is pertinent to probe beyond sociolinguistic introspection and to go beyond the phonological level when examining the linguistic features of the variety, both of which can be achieved through using a broader corpus modelled after other

international corpus projects that have been involved in the collection and analysis of language data.

Rationale for the corpus approach

Biber, Conrad and Reppen (1998:4) define a corpus-based approach as an approach to the study of language use that has the following characteristics:

- empirical, analysing the actual patterns of language use in natural texts
- utilises a large and principled collection of natural texts, known as a corpus as the basis for analysis
- makes extensive use of computers for analysis, using both automatic and interactive techniques
- depends on both quantitative and qualitative analytical techniques

Because it uses computers extensively, the corpus-based approach has the following advantages:

- computers make it possible to identify and analyse complex patterns of language use;
- allows the storage and analysis of a larger database of natural language that could hardly be dealt with by hand;
- provides consistent, reliable analyses because computers don't change their minds or get tired; and
- can be used interactively, allowing the human analyst to make difficult linguistic judgments while the computer takes care of record-keeping.

However, the goal of the corpus-based approach should not be simply to report quantitative findings, but "to explore the importance of these findings for learning about the patterns of language use" (Biber, Conrad and Reppen 1998:5). A corpus-based approach allows researchers to identify and analyse 'association patterns' i.e. the systematic ways in which linguistic features are used in association with other linguistic and non-linguistic features (Biber, Conrad and Reppen 1998:5).

Against this background, it can be observed in summing up that the chief advantage of harnessing corpus methods in investigating the identity, characteristics and variety status of Zimbabwean English or any other language or language variety is that the research findings on whatever theoretical or applied language-related problem would not be based on anecdotal evidence, introspection or sheer conjecture, but on a firm and verifiable premise.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to lay the foundation for the study of Zimbabwean English from Corpus Linguistics and World Englishes perspectives. This has been done through reviewing research that has been done on Zimbabwean English since the early 1980s, which research has been found to be quite sparse indeed. It has emerged from the review that scholars on English in Zimbabwe are not agreed on the ontological status of Zimbabwean English, giving credence to the conclusion that English in Zimbabwe has not been adequately explored, in contrast to neighbouring South Africa, for example, where extensive research on Black South African English has been done. It also emerged that, most of the research studies reviewed being of a

sociolinguistic inclination, very little light has been shed on the linguistic features of Zimbabwean English beyond the phonological features and dispersed observations on some discourse features based on sociolinguistic introspection. It is my conviction that an investigation of the linguistic features of a language variety, employed in cahoots with sociolinguistic introspection, puts us in a better position, not only to determine the ontological status of the variety but also to learn about its internal workings, giving us an opportunity to theorise more reliably about language in general. It is in this context that the paper recommends the corpus-based approach in future research dealing with Zimbabwean English.

References

Adolphs, S. and Carter, R. (2013). *Spoken corpus linguistics.* London: Routledge.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., and Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolton, K. (2005). Where WE stands: approaches, issues, and debate in world Englishes. *World Englishes* 24 (1), 69 – 83.

Gisborne, N. (2000). Relative clauses in Hong Kong English. *World Englishes* 19, 357 -371.

Fitzmaurice, S. (2010). L1 Rhodesian English. In D. Schreier, P. Trudgill, E.W. Schneider, and J.P. Williams (eds). *The lesser-known varieties of English: An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gut, U. (2011). Studying structural innovations in New English varieties. In J. Mukherjee and M. Hundt (eds). *Exploring Second Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a paradigm gap.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Haase, C., Schmied, J., Terblanche, L and Van Rooy, B. (2010). Register variation in African English: A multidimensional study. *English World-Wide* 31 (3), 311 – 349.

Heine, B and Narrog, H. (eds). (2010). *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hole, H.M. (1936). Pioneer days in Southern Rhodesia. *Journal of the Royal African Society* 35 (138), 37 – 47.
Hungwe, K. (2007). Language policy in Zimbabwean education: Historical antecedents and contemporary issues. *Compare* 37 (2), 139-145.

Kadenge, M. (2009). African Englishes: The indigenisation of English vowels by Zimbabwean native Shona speakers. *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 3 (1), 156 - 173.

Kadenge, M. (2010). Zimbabwean English: A sociophonological exploration. *South African Journal of African Languages* (1), 35 – 51.

Kadenge, M. and Nkomo, D, (2011). The politics of the English language in Zimbabwe. *Language Matters: Studies in the languages of Africa* 42 (2), 248-263.

Kadenge, M. and Mugari, V. (2015). The current politics of the African languages in Zimbabwe. *Per Linguam: A Journal for Language Learning* 31 (2), 21-32.

Kadodo, W., Kadodo, M., Bhala, T and Bhebe, C. (2012). The influence of teachers and students' language attitudes towards the use of Shona as medium of instruction in secondary schools. *International Journal of English and Literature* 3 (2), 32-39.

Kortmann, B., and Lunkenheimer, K. (eds). (2012). *The Mouton world atlas of variation in English.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Louw, W.E. and Jordan, J. (1993). Corpus of Zimbabwean English at the University of Zimbabwe computer centre. *Zambezia* XX (ii), 131-138.

Magura, B.J. (1985). Southern African Black English. *World Englishes* 4 (1), 251- 256.

Magwa, W. (2010a). Revisiting the language question in Zimbabwe: a multilingual approach to the language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 5 (2), 157-168.

Magwa, W. (2010b). The language question in the constitution reform process in Zimbabwe: A closer look at linguistic policies outlined in the Kariba draft document. *Zimbabwe International Journal of Languages and Culture* 1 (1), 7-18.

Makoni, S.B. (1993). Is Zimbabwean English a type of new English? *African Study Monographs* 14 (2): 97 - 107.

Maseko, B. and Dhlamini, N. (2014). Mother-tongue instruction for lower primary school level in Zimbabwe – A half hearted commitment to the development of her indigenous languages. *Journal of Education and Practice* 5 (6), 59-65.

Mesthrie, R. (2003). The world Englishes paradigm and contact linguistics: Refurbishing the foundations. *World Englishes* 22 (4), 449 - 467.

Mlambo, M. (2009). A survey of the language situation in Zimbabwe: Is there a Zimbabwean variety of English? If so, who speaks it? *English Today* 98 Vol. 25 (2), 18 - 24.

Ndhlovu, F. (2011). No to everything British but their language: Rethinking English language and politics in Zimbabwe (2000 - 2008). *Language, Society and Culture* 33, 108 - 119.

Ngara, E.A. (1982). *Bilingualism, Language Contact and Language Planning*. Gwelo: Mambo Press.

Nhongo, R. (2013). A National language policy for Zimbabwe in the Twenty-first century: Myth or reality? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 4 (6), 1208 – 1215.

Nkwe, T. and Marungudzi, T. (2015). Teachers' perspectives on the use of English as the medium of instruction in Zimbabwean secondary schools. *South African Journal of African Languages* 35 (1), 43-55.

O'Keeffe, A. and McCarthy, M. (2010) (eds). *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics.* London: Routledge.

Platt, J. and Weber, H. (1980). *English in Singapore and Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Prator, C. (1968). The British heresy in TESL. In J. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds) *Language problems in developing nations*. New York: John Wiley p459-476.

Quirk, R. (1988). The question of standards in international use of English In P.H. Lowenberg (ed) *Language spread and language policy*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. p229-241.

Raftopoulos, B and Mlambo, A. (2009). *Becoming Zimbabwe: A History from the Pre-colonial period to 2008.* African Books Collective.

Reppen, R. (2010). The basics of corpus design. In A. Okeeffe and M. McCarthy (eds). *The Routledge handbook of corpus linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.

Schmied, J. (1996). English in Zimbabwe, Zambia and Malawi. In V. de Klerk (ed). *Focus on South Africa*. J. Benjamins: University of Michigan.

Schnell, H. (2009). English in South Africa: Focusing on linguistic features of Black South African English. www.grin.com/e-book/128948/english... (Unpublished examination thesis, University of Duisburg-Essen).

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. (2011). *English around the world: An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schreier, D. (2009). Assessing the status of lesser-known varieties of English. *English Today* 25, 19-24.

Themba, C. (1959). Preface to *Darkness and light*. (Edited by P.Rutherford). London: Faith Press.

Terblanche, L. and Van Rooy, B. (2006). A corpus-based analysis of involved aspects of student writing. *Language Matters* 37 (2), 160 - 182.

Thondhlana, J. (2002).Using indigenous languages for teaching and learning in Zimbabwe. In *Indigenous languages across the community. Proceedings of the 7ᵗʰ Annual Conference on Stabilising Indigenous Languages* , Toronto, Canada, May 11-14, 2000).

Van Rooy, B. (2008). A multidimensional analysis of student writing in Black South African English. *English World-Wide* 29 (3): 268 - 305.

Van Rooy, B. (2011). A principled distinction between error and conventionalised innovation in African Englishes. In J. Mukherjee and M. Hundt (eds). *Exploring Second Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes: Bridging a paradigm gap.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wyne, M. (2005)(ed). *Developing linguistic corpora: A guide to good practice.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Zimbabwe National Statistics Agency. (2012). *Census 2012 National Report*. Harare: Central Census Office.