

World Englishes in the Media

Andrew Moody

28.1 Introduction

Sociolinguists have traditionally been reluctant, or at least hesitant, to draw linguistic data from the media in examination of linguistic variation. Given this general avoidance of data from the media, one might suppose that linguists would regard the mass media as one of the last places to find sociolinguistically relevant data demonstrating the depth and range of variation in World Englishes (WEs). In addition to the fact that media language is neither spontaneous nor naturally occurring – two features traditionally required for sociolinguistic data – the language of the media is also generally regarded as “standard English” and, as such, not normally expressive, or even tolerant, of variation. Consequently, variationist sociolinguists have come to regard the standard language as a “distractor” that masks or hides an individual speaker’s performance of their natural and unedited style of speech. Labov (1972) identified systematic patterns of “style shifting” between what he calls the “vernacular” and other forms of speech that are more monitored, depending on the formality of the interview context (pp. 208–209). Labov hypothesizes that a speaker’s shift between the vernacular and monitored speech is unavoidable and hence forms the “observer’s paradox” where the goal of sociolinguists is to observe the speech individuals use when they are not being observed. While Labov’s point in articulating the “observer’s paradox” is to demonstrate that an examination of the “pure vernacular” is impossible and that focus should instead be on the systematic style switching between perceived targets of “vernacular” and monitored speech, the emphasis on collecting “spontaneous” and “naturally occurring” data has been generalized into a dictum that virtually prohibits the examination of media language in variationist studies (see Chambers 1995; Tagliamonte 2006).

This bifurcation of the “vernacular” from “monitored speech” (usually operationalized as features that are more easily identified as

“standard”), however, produces a false dichotomy in sociolinguistics, namely the belief that vernaculars are authentic languages and standards are not. Bucholtz (2003) discusses the origin of the dichotomy of “authentic language” and “standard language” in romanticized notions that rural cultures and vernaculars were disappearing as a result of industrialization:

In its political guise, Romanticism sought to locate the underpinnings of the European nation in the spirit of its people – particularly the peasants whose culture supposedly remained untouched by urbanity. In its scholarly guise, Romanticism valorized the rural population as the authentic source of traditional cultural knowledge and practice, including language. Dialectology furthered both of these efforts. (p. 399)

Similarly, Coupland (2003: 418) complains that “sociolinguistics has invested very heavily – and arguably too heavily – in the view that some sorts of language and some sorts of speaker are authentic, and that it has thought them more valuable for being more authentic.”

Although a rich tradition of scholarship examining media language as a form of linguistic practice has developed in sociolinguistics, the literature tends to focus on features of discourse or pragmatics much more often than on variation in phonology or grammar, and, as Queen (2015) notes, to be more often descriptive of language in the news media than in the “narrative media” (p. 20). Indeed, Queen argues that the study of language in the news media is taken at the expense of language in the narrative media precisely because the narrative media are assumed to be less “authentic.” Noting the sociolinguistic value of scripted narrative media, Queen remarks that “the scripted media offer a fairly contained, and edited, microcosm of the places from which their plays come. In this sense, they are not more or less ‘real’ than the unscripted media” (p. 21). To the same degree, Lee and Moody (2012a) and Moody (2010) note that linguists have been reluctant to examine the languages of popular culture as media genres.

This chapter will strive to examine the various studies of media language that have been conducted from the WEs perspective. Although variationist sociolinguists tend to reject the study of media language as “inauthentic” varieties, the examination of media Englishes has become a staple component of descriptions of WEs and, as such, questioned the validity of claims that some languages are “authentic” and others are not. Instead, this chapter will demonstrate that “authenticity” is a feature of media Englishes that must be balanced against the “authority” of the standard language. Within this framework of thinking about media Englishes, then, the Three Circles of WEs varieties – the “Inner,” “Outer,” and “Expanding Circles” – show consistently different patterns of balancing concerns for “authenticity” and “authority” in media Englishes.

28.2 Prevalence of Media Studies in World Englishes

What exactly do we mean when we talk about “the media” and what justifies the discussion of media Englishes as functional varieties? As noted in the previous section, examination of the linguistic forms of a variety that appear within Inner, Outer, or Expanding Circle media is an accepted and somewhat expected feature of any description of a variety. Most of these descriptions focus on the free or low-cost broadcast and print media of radio, television, movies, newspapers, magazines, and so on. Within each one of these media genres, the value of any particular form is measured by the size of its audience. Hence radio and television stations spend great effort to compile reliable ratings data about the number of listeners or viewers. Likewise, newspapers and magazines measure success, vitality, and relevance with circulation and readership figures. Strong ratings or circulations figures, quite simply, are then easily translated into a price for advertising, where more expensive advertising is assumed to reach a greater number of individuals. This “profit-motivated” definition of the mass media describes the capitalistic practices of specific content providers (e.g. television or radio stations, newspapers, movie studios) and how they are able to offer free or low-cost content for mass consumption, and this model of consumption has functioned relatively well for a number of decades.

Although studies of media Englishes across multiple varieties of WEs are rare, descriptions of the roles, functions, and sometimes the forms of English in the media are a staple of descriptive work about individual varieties of WEs. These areal studies of English varieties typically include descriptions of English usage in mass media, and a review of these studies demonstrates how frequently media Englishes are described. Speech communities whose media are described in areal studies include Cameroon (Kouega 1999); China (Yong and Campbell 1995; Li 2012); Colombia (Martinez 2015); Costa Rica (Aguilar-Sanchez 2005); Ecuador (Alm 2003); Europe (Raedts et al. 2015); Finland (Leppanen 2007); France (Ruellot 2011); Ghana (Dolphyne 1997); Hong Kong (Luke and Richards 1982; Li 1999); Hungary (Petzold and Berns 2000); India (Dubey 1991; Philipson and Skutnabb-Kangas 1996); Iran (Baumgardner and Brown 2012); Japan (Dougill 1987); Jordan (Hamdan and Hatab 2009); the Maghreb (Battenburg 1996); Malawi (Matiki 2001); Mauritius (Foley 1995); Mexico (Baumgardner 1997); the Netherlands (Ridder 1995); Nigeria (Adekunle 1997); Pakistan (Abbas 1993); the Philippines (Dayag 2004); Russia (Ustinova 2005); Thailand (Masavisut, Sukiwat, and Wongmontha 1986); Tunisia (Battenburg 1997); and Turkey (Dogancay-Aktuna and Kiziltepe 2005). Each of these studies cites the local mass media as a source of data about the forms or functions of English varieties, and, as such, these studies document the rich variability of Englishes across varieties. At the

same time, however, the media are notorious users and promoters of standard English. There is, therefore, an interesting and useful contradiction within the role of the mass media. While local media content providers may sometimes promote the language forms that are “local” and unique to a particular variety of English, media language is also more generally committed to the promotion of global standards of intelligibility. The tension between these two commitments within media Englishes – a commitment to both local and global forms – is essentially what defines the “authority” and the “authenticity” of media Englishes.

28.3 “Authority” and “Authenticity” in Media Englishes

Norms, standards, and codification have always been at the center of our understanding of WEs. In a very early description of the concentric circle model of WEs, Kachru (1985) describes the Outer Circle as possessing two clearly different sets of norms. Kachru writes that, in Outer Circle societies, “there has been a conflict between linguistic norm and linguistic behaviour . . . [and the varieties] are both endonormative and exonormative” (p. 17). The WEs perspective is one that recognizes and validates the pluricentricity of English varieties, including standard and standardizing varieties as well as varieties that might be characterized as “vernaculars” in the Inner Circle, “nativized varieties” in the Outer Circle or “learner varieties” in the Expanding Circle. Media Englishes in all three circles, however, demonstrate a consistent tension between two complementary impulses in language: the projection of “authority” and the production of “authenticity.” Queen (2015) describes the sociolinguistic impact of the technological development of synchronized sound recording and moving pictures – a development that Bauman (2011) describes as having borrowed the authority of narrative storytelling into sound recordings – and the technological development of electronically broadcasting stories across commercialized networks. Queen (2015: 16) argues that the development and popularization of these technologies “linked authenticity and authority, especially in language, to the experience of consuming mass media products.” While this occurred in the early to mid-twentieth century in most Inner Circle societies of English users, the linking of “authority” and “authenticity” – and especially the authority and authenticity of *English* – is still in stages of progressive development in Outer and Expanding Circle communities of English users.

28.3.1 “Authority” in Media Englishes

Although the WEs perspective celebrates the pluricentricity of English varieties, the fact of the matter is that content providers in mass media are generally committed to ideologies that affirm and strengthen the

authority of standard languages, not the plurality of standards or varieties. McArthur (1997, 1999) and Gaskell (2000) each note that the degree of variation within the media internationally is relatively small because of the preference for what McArthur (1997) calls “International Standard English.” From a historical perspective, Herbert (1997) argues that this language of broadcast has become increasingly “egalitarian” over the twentieth century but that this development never challenged the authority of the standard. In particular, a number of writers note that American English (AmE) is especially prevalent within the mass media and that, internationally, norms in the media have been influenced by this one variety (see Swan and Urdang 1985; Urdang 1990; Rindal 2013). While indigenous norms define speech styles in Inner and Outer Circle societies (and even in some Expanding Circle societies), the fact of the matter is that endonormative variation – and especially nonstandard variation – rarely dominates media texts. In the Inner and Outer Circles standardized varieties tend to dominate the media, and, in the Expanding Circle, media texts are especially committed to standardized varieties that are exonor-mative; and this is precisely the reason why a number of scholars advocate the use of locally produced English-language media texts from the Outer or Expanding Circles as authentic teaching texts – because these texts reinforce external Inner Circle norms (see, for Indonesia, Smith 1991; for Japan, Tanaka 1995; and, for Pakistan, Baumgardner 1987).

The primary mechanism by which media languages project authority is the “standard language ideology” (SLI), a term that was formally introduced in Milroy and Milroy’s ([1985] 1999) definitive work on language standardization. While language ideologies are “sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (Silverstein, 1979: 193), the SLI functions specifically to preserve the authority of standard languages by obscuring the historical and sociological conditions that produce a standard language. While this happens most clearly in the written variety of standard English, Milroy and Milroy affirm that the SLI also works within the spoken standard. Not surprisingly, there is a particularly intimate connection between the development of standard languages and the media, and Milroy and Milroy note that “the media have successfully promoted an awareness of the standard spoken language (which is in fact popularly known as BBC English) without having much influence on the rate of adoption of that standard” (p. 25).

The close association of a standard language with the language of media is understandable; the impetus to codify English, both written and spoken standards, has historically come from the media (Millar 2012; Fitzmaurice 2000). Of course, media sources have played a role in all the processes of standardization (namely, *selection*, *restriction*, *elaboration*, and *codification*), but the final process of codification has historically been driven by the print media. During the stage of codification, texts of authority (e.g.

dictionaries, grammar books, learner materials) are produced to catalogue and formalize standard language forms, including pronunciations, word meanings and usages, punctuation, and grammatical usage. The standardization of Early Modern English (EModE) and Present-Day English (PDE) began (and, indeed, still continues) with the codification of standard English in print media. Beginning in the sixteenth century, printers began to use glossaries (i.e. lists of words), for example, to limit the number of variants in the spelling of various words, a purpose that is fundamentally consistent with one of the goals of standardization, to minimize the number of variants within the language (Leith 1983), and other forms of codification followed. Within the history of English, then, the publishing industry and related media were instrumental in developing codifications that defined the forms of standard English.

When English mass media were primarily in the form of print, the codification processes mainly applied to the written form of the language, and spoken varieties of English were allowed to diverge, develop, and thrive without much attention to the codification of spoken language. This, perhaps, explains in part how English developed as a pluricentric language during the colonial spread of the language in the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries. Although there was a single standard for written English, spoken varieties were allowed to diverge within the Inner and Outer Circles of WEs users. However, the early twentieth century saw the development of several media forms that were able to reproduce spoken languages, namely radio, phonographs, motion pictures (e.g. “talkies”), and, somewhat later, television. In North America, these new mass media genres drove the early adoption of the “Mid-Atlantic English” (MAE), an anglicized variety of AmE, as a spoken media standard (Labov 1998; Bolton 2010; Shytex BookVideo Training 2014). In the latter half of the twentieth century, the use of this specific dialect in spoken media began to decline as it was replaced by what is normally called “Broadcast Standard.” Within the Inner Circle varieties of Englishes, two dominant varieties have emerged: BBC English from the UK and Broadcast Standard English (BSE) from the USA. The role of the mass media in defining these spoken standards is profound and it is no coincidence that they take their names from the media where they are used (Schwyter 2016). However, the SLI entails a belief that the standard language has always existed in its current form and that it is a pure version of the language (especially when compared to nonstandard variants). The ideology functions explicitly to obscure the dynamic nature of the standardization processes and standard English projects the authority of the standard language into media texts by reinforcing a belief in the purity and immutability of standard English. The authority of the standard language varieties (BBC English and BSE) originating from the Inner Circle is especially clear in international media. For example, several scholars have noted the worldwide adoption of English as an *ex post facto* official language of the media (Tillman 1986) and there is

even some evidence that the promotion of English in the media represents a self-conscious expression of British (Howse 1979) or American (Demont-Heinrich 2008) hegemony in the developing world. It should also be mentioned here that there is some evidence that the dominance of English as an international media language may be responsible for language endangerment, loss of bilingualism, or loss of other languages within media domains (see, for Chamorro, Underwood 1989; for Danish Bilingualism, Christophersen 1991; for Diasporic Hindi, Pandharipande 2013; for European Spanish, Lujan-Garcia 2011; for Singlish, Rubdy 2001; and, for Turkmen, Sartor 2010).

28.3.2 “Authenticity” in Media Englishes

It was noted in Section 28.3.1 that, for much of the twentieth century, the “Mid-Atlantic English” (MAE) variety of AmE functioned as a media standard in North America, and particularly within the USA (Bolton 2010). This variety of English attempted to blend various features of British English as a prestige norm (most notably non-rhoticity) and, at the same, avoid many features of AmE that might be stigmatized (such as “*cot-caught* merger” or “intervocalic dental flapping”). The accent is still taught for use in theater and media performance training (Skinner 1990), but US BSE came to replace the MAE as a media standard as popular perceptions of MAE changed. The dialect retains some authority as a media variety, but principally just in the news media. As a language of “narrative media” (i.e. movies, television, radio dramas, etc.), MAE is frequently regarded as sounding “old-timey” and unlike contemporary ways of speaking (Drum 2011; Fallows 2015). In a word, the variety sounds “inauthentic” to contemporary AmE speakers.

Milroy’s (2000) description of how the SLI functions in Britain and the USA explains how the change from MAE to BSE was institutionalized within the media. The primary difference between the SLI in Britain and the USA is the way that a spoken standard language functions within the two societies. Milroy notes that the SLI in Britain places a great deal of emphasis on a spoken standard, and that the consequences of this emphasis is a drive to use standard pronunciation within a number of different functional domains: education, media, politics, and law, to name a few. One way to think of the spoken standard in Great Britain is as a “productive standard,” one that positively specifies the features of standard English pronunciation. Conversely, BSE is more of a “prohibitive standard,” not specifying the forms that must be used to be standard but instead defining a set of stigmatized forms that should be avoided when speaking BSE. These ideological differences between the ways that a spoken standard is perceived in the UK and the USA, then, create functional differences in how the standard languages appear in various media within the two societies. Both societies posit “authority” to

the standard languages when they are used in the media, but the complementary implementation of “authenticity” is relatively easier to produce within the spoken standard of US media, where broadcasters do not need to produce particular forms to be perceived as standard but must instead simply avoid those forms that are marked as “nonstandard.” Finally, it should be noted that the ideological differences between the UK and the USA primarily pertain to the functions of English as a spoken standard language; the written standard in both societies functions similarly without many differences in how it is implemented within the print media.

Within media languages, therefore, a complex set of oppositions operates to define a standard that evokes both “authority” and “authenticity.” Whereas MAE was able to evoke the authority of a standard language, it lacked authenticity, and the evolution of BSE effectively fulfilled the need for both authority and authenticity within a standard language. This is *not* to say that BSE is a more authentic language than BBC English, or that it might somehow have less authority. The media’s need to project both “authority” and “authenticity” will not allow content providers to choose one over the other. Instead, “authority” and “authenticity” are complementary concerns that are in tension with one another and this tension may express itself in a number of different ways within the media. The tension certainly accounts for the variability that Labov (1972) notes between the “vernacular” and “self-monitored” speech but it is not limited to these variabilities. This tension might be realized as a contrast between, say, the “global” norms of the standard language and “local” norms.

Coupland (2001) describes a consistent style switch in Welsh radio broadcasting that is likely driven by the tension between “authority” and “authenticity” but expressed in terms of “global” and “local” norms of English. Coupland observed that Welsh radio announcers would consistently perform an Americanized accent when they announce the songs that they are playing. This performance of AmE, Coupland argues, is prompted by the content of the program: entertainment favors AmE as a “standard language” in these radio stations and, by performing AmE, the radio announcer manufactures both the “authority” and the “authenticity” related to being a competent and popular disk jockey. However, when the announcers delivered local information like news or weather, they shifted into the local form of Welsh-accented English. Coupland call this switch between AmE and Welsh-accented “dialect stylization,” but it is related to a number of performative language strategies (e.g. audience design, crossing, and even code switching) that treat language performance as dynamic and interactive between multiple tensions and concerns.

How does Welsh DJs’ performance of AmE fulfill the need for authenticity of language forms on the Welsh radio? Barker and Taylor (2007) describes two types of “authenticity” that can be produced in popular

music: personal authenticity and cultural authenticity.¹ “Personal authenticity” refers to the language used when a performer is not trying to portray a character or alter ego, but themselves. While “personal authenticity” might appear to be related to the vernacular languages that dialectologists sought to isolate from monitored speech, in media texts the person is more closely related to what an audience actually knows about the individual. This means that the language variety related to “personal authenticity” must be performed in such a way that it manufactures authenticity that an audience will accept as accurately representing the person who is speaking. “Cultural authenticity” refers to the language used when a performer is trying to portray a character that is culturally appropriate to the media, genre, style, or register of the performance. This distinction between “personal” and “cultural authenticity” explains how the performance of both Welsh-accented English and AmE by the Welsh DJs is accepted by the listening audience as “authentic.” While Welsh-accented English is probably “personally authentic” to the DJs, AmE in most cases is *not* a personally authentic language. Instead, the “cultural authenticity” of the two performances is most relevant here. Welsh-accented English is culturally appropriate for announcements from the local calendar, or the weather, because it indexes local culture. Likewise, AmE is culturally appropriate for announcing playlists or banter about music because it indexes global entertainment (especially pop music) culture.

28.3.3 “Authority” and “Authenticity” in World Englishes

Although “authority” and “authenticity” are presented here as existing in constant tension with one another in the media across all English varieties, there does seem to be a general pattern of emphasis or development that is easily described within Kachru’s (1985) model of WEs varieties (i.e. “the Circles”). Kachru describes the defining features of the circles as their commitment to norms (whether they are “exonormative” or “endonormative”) and this particular feature of Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles influences whether a society’s mass media content providers are more committed to ensuring the “authority” of English within their mass media or to developing the “authenticity” of English. Likewise, the developmental stages of “exonormative stabilization” and “endonormative stabilization” described within Schneider’s Dynamic Model of postcolonial

¹ Barker and Taylor (2007) actually describe three types of authenticity but I have excluded from my discussion here the third type, representational authenticity. “Representational authenticity” refers to whether or not an artist is actually performing the work that is attributed to them. One of the better-known examples of a failure to produce “representational authenticity” is the musical performance attributed to the duet Milli Vanilli, who were sued for damages related to fraud when it was discovered that the two individuals who were represented as performing on their record did not actually perform the recordings. A more contemporary example of failure to produce “representational authority” is the hip-hop artist Drake, who was accused of using “ghost writers” to write rap lines (Britton 2015). See Moody (2012a) for a further discussion of how authenticity is manufactured within popular culture.

Englishes (Schneider 2007) are likely responsible, at least in part, for the differences observed within the Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circles.

The example of Welsh DJ speech (Coupland 2001) demonstrates how authenticity tends to be emphasized within Inner Circle varieties. The English used on the radio does not require much attention from the performers or the audience to accept its “authority,” and this is due in large to the fact that Inner Circle varieties are endonormative, that is, the norms for these varieties are indigenous to the communities. Consequently, there is more explicit emphasis on “authenticity” within the Inner Circle, and this is demonstrated on a societal level in the USA by the decline in the use of MAE in the last half of the twentieth century as an authoritative media standard and the concurrent shift toward the non-fixed BSE. Although MAE evoked the prestige and authority of British English with its adoption of features like non-rhotic vowels or fully articulated (i.e. non-flapped) intervocalic dentals stops, the variety did not authentically represent the English that was spoken by the majority of Americans. When MAE was no longer regarded as the primary prestige variety, the broadcast standard that emerged was one that was not necessarily fixed to a single set of pronunciations, but would allow expression of variation (i.e. “authenticity”) as long as variation avoided stigmatized forms (Milroy and Milroy 1999). In the Inner Circle of English users, therefore, there is a tendency to emphasize “authenticity” over the “authority” of an English variety.

Expanding Circle varieties are, by definition, exonormative English varieties and as such rely on norms from Inner Circle varieties. While there may be an emphasis on the “authenticity” of native languages in the Expanding Circle, English varieties are usually portrayed using the standard language to avoid any compromise of the “authority” of the standard. Moody (2006) and Moody and Matsumoto (2011), for example, examine various manifestations of English and English speakers on Japanese television within the genres of “language education” and “language entertainment” programs. In these programs, the portrayal of English – and especially the portrayal of Japanese English and Japanese speakers of English – is ideological and driven by the desire to present a specific set of positive characteristics of speakers and of speech. To this degree, English speech is often *not* authentic, but edited and manipulated in order to reinforce Inner Circle norms or to portray specific features of English or English speakers; and there is good reason to believe that this type of portrayal of English in the Expanding Circle takes place in other societies, too (Zhou and Moody 2017).

The pattern that emerges, then, is that Inner Circle Englishes are “endonormative” and the media in those societies consequently spend greater effort to portray the “authenticity” of English rather than the “authority” of the language. Expanding Circle Englishes, however, are “exonormative” and instead spend greater effort to ensure that the standard language is

delivered with “authority” – and variation that might portray authentic nonstandard usages in the Expanding Circle is frequently censored. The English varieties of the Outer Circle, as Kachru (1985) notes, are usually “mixed” in that both endonormative and exonormative varieties are used simultaneously in these societies (see the discussion in Section 28.3). A degree of mixing exists in all three circles, and this is because “authority” and “authenticity” are not necessarily emphasized in opposition to one another; the “authority” of the standard and the “authenticity” of the vernacular do not necessarily need to exclude one another. Yet linguistic practice in the Outer Circle, as Kachru (1985) notes, is in conflict with the espoused norms. Because Outer Circle societies have usually not completed the developmental stage “endonormative stabilization,” described as “phase four” of the Dynamic Model (Schneider 2007), both endonormative and exonormative varieties can be found within the media; and studies of media and popular culture in the Outer Circle demonstrate that both endonormative and exonormative varieties are used simultaneously. For example, see Lin (2012) for a discussion of hybridity in Hong Kong’s hip-hop music scene; see Moody (2012b) for a description of competing norms in print and radio advertising in Malaysia; and see Kirkpatrick and Moody (2009) for how two Outer Circle communities, Hong Kong and Singapore, present “authority” and “authenticity” very differently. Media Englishes within the Outer Circle of English users, then, are characterized by an equal emphasis on both “authority” and “authenticity.”

28.4 World Englishes Perspectives on Popular Culture and Media Englishes

Within WEs scholarship there has been growing scholarly attention given to forms of popular culture that rely on the mass media for their presentation and development. While much of the scholarship presents findings that are consistent with analyses of language outside of popular culture, the assessment of Englishes in the media challenges the dictum that sociolinguistic data should be “spontaneous and naturally occurring” (see Moody 2010 for a full discussion of the dictum and how it has shaped the selection of linguistic data). Many of these discussions of forms within the media simply demonstrate how discriminatory language attitudes – and, of course, prejudice against ethnicities, races, regions, etc. – are recreated within media portrayals of stigmatized individuals. Dissanayake (1986) argues that the imaginative portrayal of Indian culture and identity in the movie *A Passage to India* is unable to rise above stereotypes and clichés. Similarly, Chan (2000) argues that colonial stereotypes about Chinese identity dominated the late-colonial press in Hong Kong in the dates before the handover of the territory to Chinese (i.e. People’s Republic of China)

rule. Mesthrie (2002) offers a particularly trenchant analysis of “mock English” accents in a South African radio program and demonstrates how the stereotyped portrayal of Indian South African English enhances the power of socially dominant groups. Each of these studies examines English in the postcolonial Outer Circle of English users, and Lippi-Green (1997) demonstrates how Disney, among other media content providers, exploits stereotypes of American, British, and “foreign-accented” English speakers in their portrayal of villains, heroes, and characters that change from villainous to heroic. Martin (2002a) also examines the stereotyping of American and other English accents in French advertising and Lee (2014) examines attitudes toward English on Korean TV, arguing that ageist discrimination toward older Koreans as non-English users is frequently expressed.

While these studies use data from popular culture and the mass media to demonstrate that societal language attitudes and prejudices can be identified within popular culture, they represent just one approach to English in the media or popular culture that has been supported within the WEs research frameworks. General examination of language in advertising (Bhatia 1987, 1992, 2000, 2006; Bhatia and Ritchie 2004; Chen 2006; Martin 1998, 2002b, 2006), pop music (Chan 2009, 2012; Chik 2010; Kachru 2006; Lee 2006, 2007; Lin 2012; Moody 2012a; Moody and Matsumoto 2003; Ominiyi 2006; Wang 2006), television (Moody and Matsumoto 2011; Park 2004; Thompson 2012), linguistic landscapes (Dimova 2008; Bolton 2012), and popular culture (Lee 2004; Lee and Moody 2012b; Moody 2006, 2011, 2012b, 2013; Park 2009; Park and Wee 2012) has begun to form a rich tradition of scholarship within WEs.

These approaches to English in the media are informed by larger, more comprehensive rejections of subjectivist constructions of language and identity in recent sociolinguistic thought. These rejections instead emphasize the performative aspects of language and identity (see Bucholtz and Hall 2004; Hill 1999; Pennycook 2003; Rampton 1995, 1999). The emphasis on the performative aspects of language – especially when used to examine data from the mass media – rejects the dictum that sociolinguistic data be “spontaneous and naturally occurring” and instead looks for language that is “authentic.” There is a convincing argument to be made that the language of the media is intentionally designed to appeal to the greatest possible number of listeners, viewers, or readers. This intentional design of the mass media largely stems from the profit-oriented nature of the media; if language is inauthentic or if it fails to appeal to the public, the media content providers will not be able to earn from sponsorship or advertising. As a mechanism within capitalistic media systems, English functions internationally as a symbol of modernity in much of the Expanding Circle of English users: in Europe (Gerritsen et al. 2007); in Hungary (Petery 2011); in Italy (Vettorel 2016); in Korea (Baratta 2014); in Macedonia (Dimova 2012); and in Poland (Kasztalska 2014).

It should be further noted that “media language” has developed beyond the traditional media to include a number of new “social media” formats where Englishes can be explored. Many of the “content providers” of “new” or “social” media still work under the established paradigms to promote consumer (viewer, listener, reader) numbers in order to sell advertising within their media or the content. Nevertheless, much of the content in social media cannot yet be effectively sold to advertisers and there are frequent claims that the advent of “new” or “social media” has ushered in a new era where content is no longer directly linked to the motivations of sales and advertising.

The WEs commitment to examination of language in the media, therefore, derives from the paradigm’s acknowledgment of plurality within varieties of the language and pluricentricity of standards. Localization of the media does not simply apply to the content of advertising, radio, television, or popular culture; localization also influences and determines the linguistic forms that appear within the media. This process of localization, which Kachru (1986) calls the “nativization” of Englishes, introduces new linguistic forms that may develop into established media languages. This process of endonormative development of media languages not only takes place in the USA and the UK but has also been described in the Inner Circle media of Australian English (Leitner 1984), Irish English (O’Sullivan 2013), and New Zealand English (Stadler 2016). Development of endonormative media standards in Outer and Expanding Circle languages include Cameroonian Pidgin English (Sala 2009); China English (Guo and Huang 2002; Alvaro 2015); East African Englishes (Schmied and Hudson-Ettle 1996); Igbo English (Ezejideaku and Ugwu 2009); Nigerian English (Nwoye 1992); Nigerian Pidgin English (Agheyisi 1984, 1988; Munzali 1997; Deuber 2002); Pakistan English (Baumgardner 1990); South African Black English (Makalela 2013); and West African Englishes (Huber and Görlach 1996)

28.5 English as a Linguistic Resource in the Development of Other Media Languages

“Nativization” is a typical effect of endonormative development of English varieties in the Outer and Expanding Circles, but it is just one of the effects that Kachru (1986) describes in the diaspora of English. The second effect is the “Englishization” of other languages used in these societies. Within the WEs literature, a fair amount of attention has been paid to the effects of English in the media when it is multilingually used alongside other languages. In the Expanding Circle, where English does not replace the native language as the dominant media language, a number of studies observe the presence of various forms of influence from English on a number of different languages: European languages (James 2016); Finnish (Taavitsainen and Pahta 2008); French (Martin 2002a); Hong Kong

Chinese (Chan 2009); Indian Languages (Bhatia 1987; Kathpalia and Ong 2015); Japanese (Geist 1991); Polish (Griffin 1997); Russian (Ustinova and Bhatia 2005); Taiwan Chinese (Chen 2006); Tamil (Krishnasamy 2007); and Thai (Snodin 2014).

While language mixing is the most commonly reported way in which English affects other languages in the media, a number of scholars have argued that English loanwords are being borrowed into other languages primarily within the language of the mass media. The media typically provide a “channel” through which the loanwords become more widely recognized and used within broader domains. In no language has this process been as thoroughly examined as in Japanese. Haarmann’s (1989) and Loveday’s (1996) early work on the source of loanwords in Japanese each point to the mass media as a significant source for the transmission of English etymons, and Stanlaw (2004) draws a clear connection between English and the Japanese used in popular culture. Likewise, Takashi (1990) examines the language of advertising to suggest that loanwords are borrowed more quickly in this genre than in others. Seargeant (2005) echoes these claims in an examination of English loanwords in the Japanese mass media. Several studies suggest that the rate of borrowing from mass media is unusually high in other languages, too, especially Chinese (Kang 1999), European Spanish (Smith 1997), Italian (Gani 2007), Korean (Shim 1994), and Mexican Spanish (Baumgardner 1997).

28.6 Conclusions: Media and Acquisition of Englishes

This chapter on WEs in the mass media began with the statement that sociolinguists traditionally do not regard media language as the best genre to find evidence of sociolinguistic variation. Nevertheless, descriptive work within the WEs perspective does not shy away from media and popular culture genres when collecting data demonstrating nativization or Englishization across the three WEs “Circles”; to the contrary, some linguists go so far as advocating these genres as authentic sources of linguistic data (Rose 2001; Walshe 2017). How, then, are we to respond to the more traditional prohibitions of using linguistic evidence from the mass media?

Chambers (1998: 124) summarizes the difference between popular opinion about the effect of the media on language change and sociolinguists’ opinions:

Television is the primary hypothesis for the motivation of any sound change for everyone, it seems, except the sociolinguists studying it. The sociolinguists see some evidence for the mass media playing a role in the spread of vocabulary items. But at the deeper reaches of language change – sound changes and grammatical changes – the media have no significant effect at all.

Chambers really only allows the possibility for media to influence the spread of lexicon, and there is indeed a rich examination of language in the media for evidence of neologisms within the WEs literature. Some of the studies examine new words that have been generated in specific contexts, such as Staczek's (1993) examination of new words in the media coined during the Gulf War. Studies may also focus on specific Englishes, such as Grant's (2012) study of neologisms in New Zealand English media, or Donlan's (2016) examination of new Australian colloquialisms in online media. Research in WEs has seen more extended studies examining the development of the term *queer* in the mass media (Jacobs 1998) and in the meanings and uses of the word *harmonious* in Chinese political discourse (Alvaro 2016). These examinations of media influence on the development of new words is consistent with Chambers (1993), where only two possible effects of media on language change are conceded: (1) the diffusion of "catch-phrases" that "belong for the moment of their currency to the most superficial linguistic level" (p. 139) and (2) the diffusion of "tolerance toward other accents and dialects" (p. 139). Chambers (1993) concludes – and in doing so expresses the majority opinion – that "speakers on our mass media, seeking no response and evoking none, make no impression on our dialects" (p. 140).

Although this has been a majority opinion among most sociolinguists about working with media data for a long time, recent years, however, have seen a number of challenges to this majority opinion. Sharbawi and Deterding (2010: 121) hypothesize that one reason why Brunei English is rhotic derives from the fact that "Brunei English is at an earlier stage of development than Singapore English and so it is more susceptible to outside influences, particularly from American media." Likewise, Leppanen (2007) examines youth culture in Finland to conclude that media has dynamically shaped the way that teens interact in English. These findings are echoed by Grau's (2009) examination of youth exposure to English in Germany, where the researcher concluded that exposure to English inside and outside the classroom occurred with very little interaction between the two domains. Lawson (2014) and Stuart-Smith et al. (2013) both introduce the feature of TH-Fronting (i.e. [f] for /θ/ in words like "think") in Scottish English. Both essays attribute the change to influence from the media, but Stuart-Smith and colleagues' discussion of this variant (in addition to L-Vocalization of coda /l/ in words like "milk" or "people") is extensive in scope and meticulous in attribution of the changes' origins. With more detailed analyses like this, along with theoretical constructs that understand the role of identity performance, WEs may be able to help understand how popular culture and mass media texts function more specifically in dialect acquisition and language change.

References

- Abbas, Shemeem. 1993. The power of English in Pakistan. *World Englishes* 12(2): 147–156.
- Adekunle, Mobolaji. 1997. English in Nigeria: Attitudes, policy and communicative realities. In Ayo Bamgbose, Ayo Banjo and Andrew Thomas, eds. *New Englishes: A West African Perspective*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 57–86.
- Agheyisi, Rebecca N. 1984. Linguistic implications of the changing role of Nigerian Pidgin English. *English World-Wide* 5(2): 211–233.
- Agheyisi, Rebecca N. 1988. The standardization of Nigerian Pidgin English. *English World-Wide* 9(2): 227–241.
- Aguilar-Sanchez, Jorge. 2005. English in Costa Rica. *World Englishes* 24(2): 161–172.
- Alm, Cecilia Ovesdotter. 2003. English in the Ecuadorian commercial context. *World Englishes* 22(2): 143–158.
- Alvaro, Joseph James. 2015. Analysing China's English-language media. *World Englishes* 34(2): 260–77.
- Alvaro, Joseph James. 2016. Political discourse in China's English language press. *World Englishes* 32(2): 147–168.
- Baratta, Alex. 2014. The use of English in Korean TV drama to signal a modern identity. *English Today* 30(3): 54–60.
- Barker, Hugh and Yuval Taylor. 2007. *Faking It: The Quest for Authenticity in Popular Music*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Battenburg, John. 1996. English in the Maghreb. *English Today* 12(4): 3–14.
- Battenburg, John. 1997. English versus French: Language rivalry in Tunisia. *World Englishes* 16(2): 281–290.
- Bauman, Richard. 2011. The remediation of storytelling: Narrative performance on early commercial sound recordings. In Deborah Schiffrin, Anna De Fina and Anastasia Nylund, eds. *Telling Stories: Language, Narrative, and Social Life*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 23–43.
- Baumgardner, Robert J. 1987. Utilizing Pakistani newspaper English to teach grammar. *World Englishes* 6(3): 241–252.
- Baumgardner, Robert J. 1990. The indigenization of English in Pakistan. *English Today* 6(1): 59–65.
- Baumgardner, Robert J. 1997. English in Mexican Spanish. *English Today* 13(4): 27–35.
- Baumgardner, Robert J. and Kimberley Brown. 2012. English in Iranian magazine advertising. *World Englishes* 31(3): 292–311.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 1987. English in advertising: Multiple mixing and media. *World Englishes* 6(1): 33–48.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 1992. Discourse functions and pragmatics of mixing: Advertising across cultures. *World Englishes* 11(2–3): 195–215.

- Bhatia, Tej K. 2000. *Advertising in Rural India: Language, Marketing Communication and Consumerism*. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 2006. World Englishes in global advertising. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru and Cecil L. Nelson, eds. *The Handbook of World Englishes*, Oxford: Blackwell, 609–619.
- Bhatia, Tej K. and William C. Ritchie. 2004. Bilingualism in the global media and advertising. In Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie, eds. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 513–546.
- Bolton, Kingsley. 2010. Constructing the global vernacular: American English and the media. In Kingsley Bolton and Jan Olsson, eds. *Media, Popular Culture, and the American Century*. Stockholm: National Library of Sweden, 125–153.
- Bolton, Kingsley. 2012. World Englishes and linguistic landscapes. *World Englishes* 31(1): 30–33.
- Britton, Luke Morgan. 2015. Drake finally addresses ghostwriter claims: “Music can be a collaborative process.” *NME*, September 25. www.nme.com/news/music/drake-133-1222920
- Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3): 398–416.
- Bucholtz, Mary and Kira Hall. 2004. Language and identity. In Alessandro Duranti, ed. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 268–294.
- Chambers, J. K. 1993. Sociolinguistic dialectology. In Dennis R. Preston, ed. *American Dialect Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 133–164.
- Chambers, J. K. 1995. *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and Its Social Significance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chambers, J. K. 1998. Myth 15: TV makes people sound the same. In Laurie Bauer and Peter Trudgill, eds. *Language Myths*. London: Penguin Books, 123–131.
- Chan, Brian Hok-Shing. 2009. English in Hong Kong Cantopop: Language choice, code-switching and genre. *World Englishes* 28(1): 107–129.
- Chan, Brian Hok-Shing. 2012. English in Cantopop: Code-switching, pop songs and the local identity of Hong Kong Chinese. In Jamie Shinhee Lee and Andrew Moody, eds. *English and Asian Popular Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press. 35–57.
- Chan, Yuen-Ying. 2000. The English-language media in Hong Kong. *World Englishes* 19(3): 323–335.
- Chen, Cheryl Wei-Yu. 2006. The mixing of English in magazine advertisements in Taiwan. *World Englishes* 25(3–4): 467–478.
- Chik, Alice. 2010. Creative multilingualism in Hong Kong popular music. *World Englishes* 29(4): 508–522.
- Christophersen, Paul. 1991. A bilingual Denmark. *English Today* 7(3): 7–10.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2001. Dialect stylization in radio talk. *Language in Society* 30(3): 345–375.

- Coupland, Nikolas. 2003. Sociolinguistic authenticities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(3): 417–431.
- Dayag, Danilo T. 2004. The English-language media in the Philippines. *World Englishes* 23(1): 33–45.
- Demont-Heinrich, Christof. 2008. American “prestige press” representations of the global hegemony of English. *World Englishes* 27(2): 161–180.
- Deuber, Dagmar. 2002. “First Year of Nation’s Return to Government of Make You Talk Your Own Make I Talk My Own”: Anglicisms versus Pidginization in news translations into Nigerian Pidgin. *English World-Wide* 23(2): 195–222.
- Dimova, Slobodanka. 2008. English in Macedonian commercial nomenclature. *World Englishes* 27(1): 83–100.
- Dimova, Slobodanka. 2012. English in Macedonian television commercials. *World Englishes* 31(1): 15–29.
- Dissanayake, Wimal. 1986. Exotic Other: Western representation of India in English literature and film. *World Englishes* 5(2–3): 177–187.
- Dogancay-Aktuna, Seran and Zeynep Kiziltepe. 2005. English in Turkey. *World Englishes* 24(2): 253–265.
- Dolphyne, Florence. 1997. A note on the English language in Ghana. In Ayo Bamgbose, Ayo Banjo and Andrew Thomas, eds. *New Englishes: A West African Perspective*, Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 27–33.
- Donlan, Lisa. 2016. Researching the etymology of Australian English colloquialisms in the digital age: Implications for 21st century lexicography. *English Today* 32(3): 40–44.
- Dougill, John. 1987. English as a decorative language. *English Today* 12: 33–35.
- Drum, Kevin. 2011. Oh, that old-timey movie accent! *Mother Jones*, August 9. www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/08/oh-old-timey-movie-voice/
- Dubey, Vinod S. 1991. The lexical style of Indian English newspapers. *World Englishes* 10(1): 19–32.
- Ezejideaku, Emma and Esther N. Ugwu. 2009. Igbo English in the Nigerian video film. *English World-Wide* 30(1): 52–67.
- Fallows, James. 2015. That weirdo announcer-voice accent: Where it came from and why it went away. *The Atlantic*, June 7. www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2015/06/that-weirdo-announcer-voice-accent-where-it-came-from-and-why-it-went-away/395141/
- Fitzmaurice, Susan. 2000. *The Spectator*, the politics of social networks, and language standardisation in eighteenth century England. In Laura Wright, ed. *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 195–218.
- Foley, Joseph. 1995. English in Mauritius. *World Englishes* 14(2): 205–222.
- Gani, Martin. 2007. Anglicizing Italian. *English Today* 23(1): 40–41.
- Gaskell, Philip. 2000. Standard written English. *English Today* 16(1): 48–52.
- Geist, Kathe. 1991. English in Non-English-language films. *World Englishes* 10(3): 263–274.
- Gerritsen, Marinel, Catherine Nickerson, Andreu van Hooft, Frank van Meurs, Ulrike Nederstigt, Marianne Starren and Rogier Crijns. 2007.

- English in product advertisements in Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes* 26(3): 291–315.
- Grant, Lynn E. 2012. Culturally motivated lexis in New Zealand English. *World Englishes* 31(2): 162–176.
- Grau, Maike. 2009. Worlds apart? English in German youth cultures and in educational settings. *World Englishes* 28(2): 160–174.
- Griffin, Jeff. 1997. Global English Invades Poland. *English Today* 13(2): 34–41.
- Guo, Zhongshi and Yu Huang. 2002. Hybridized discourse: Social openness and functions of English media in post-Mao China. *World Englishes* 21(2): 217–230.
- Haarmann, Harold. 1989. *Symbolic Values of Foreign Language Use: From the Japanese Case to a General Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hamdan, Jihad M. and Wafa A. Abu Hatab. 2009. English in the Jordanian context. *World Englishes* 28(3): 394–405.
- Herbert, John. 1997. The broadcast voice. *English Today* 13(2): 18–23.
- Hill, Jane H. 1999. Styling locally, styling globally: What does it mean? *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 542–556.
- Howse, Hugh. 1979. BBC English by television and radio-news developments and new materials. *English Around the World* 20: 6–7.
- Huber, Magnus and Manfred Görlach. 1996. West African Pidgin English. *English World-Wide* 17(2): 239–258.
- Jacobs, Greg. 1998. The struggle over naming: A case study of “queer” in Toronto, 1990–1994. *World Englishes* 17(2): 193–201.
- James, Allan. 2016. From code-mixing to mode-mixing in the European context. *World Englishes* 35(2): 259–275.
- Kachru, Braj B. 1985. Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk and H. G. Widdowson, eds. *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–30.
- Kachru, Braj. B. 1986. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, Yamuna. 2006. Mixers lyricizing in Hinglish: Blending and fusion in Indian pop culture. *World Englishes* 25(2): 223–233.
- Kang, Jianxiu. 1999. English everywhere in China. *English Today* 15(2): 46–48.
- Kasztsalska, Aleksandra. 2014. English in contemporary Poland. *World Englishes* 33(2): 242–262.
- Kathalia, Sujata S. and Kenneth Keng Wee Ong. 2015. The use of code-mixing in Indian billboard advertising. *World Englishes* 34(4): 557–575.
- Kirkpatrick, Andy and Andrew Moody. 2009. A tale of two songs: Singapore versus Hong Kong. *ELT Journal* 63(3): 265–271.
- Kouega, Jean-Paul. 1999. Forty years of official bilingualism in Cameroon. *English Today* 15(4): 38–43.
- Krishnasamy, Kanthimathi. 2007. English in Tamil: The language of advertising. *English Today* 23(3–4): 40–49.

- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 1998. The three dialects of English. In Michael D. Linn, ed. *Handbook of Dialects and Language Variation* (2nd ed.). San Diego: Academic Press, 39–81.
- Lawson, Robert. 2014. “Don’t even [(theta)/f/h]ink about it”: An ethnographic investigation of social meaning, social identity and ((theta)) variation in Glasgow. *English World-Wide* 35(1): 68–93.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee. 2004. Linguistic hybridization in K-pop: Discourse of self-assertion and resistance. *World Englishes* 23(3): 429–450.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee. 2006. Crossing and crossers in East Asian pop music: Korea and Japan. *World Englishes* 25(2): 235–250.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee. 2007. I’m the illest fucka: An analysis of African American English in South Korean hip hop. *English Today* 23(2): 54–60.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee. 2014. English on Korean television. *World Englishes* 33(1): 33–49.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee and Andrew Moody. 2012a. Sociolinguistics and the study of English in popular culture. In Jamie Shinhee Lee and Andrew Moody, eds. *English in Asian Popular Culture* (Asian Englishes Today Series). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1–11.
- Lee, Jamie Shinhee and Andrew Moody, eds. 2012b. *English in Asian Popular Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Leith, Dick. 1983. *A Social History of English* (Language and Society Series). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Leitner, G. 1984. Australian English or English in Australia-Linguistic identity or dependence in broadcast language. *English World-Wide* 5(1): 55–85.
- Leppanen, Sirpa. 2007. Youth language in media contexts: insights into the functions of English in Finland. *World Englishes* 26(2): 149–169.
- Li, David C. S. 1999. The functions and status of English in Hong Kong: A post-1997 update. *English World-Wide* 20(1): 67–110.
- Li, Songqing. 2012. The use of English in China’s real estate advertising. *English Today* 28(3): 53–59.
- Lin, Angel. 2012. The hip hop music scene in Hong Kong: Hybridity and identity in youth culture. In Jamie Shinhee Lee and Andrew Moody, eds. *English in Asian Popular Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 59–73.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina. 1997. *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.
- Loveday, Leo. 1996. *Language Contact in Japan: A Socio-Linguistic History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lujan-Garcia, Carmen. 2011. “English invasion” in Spain: An analysis of toys leaflets addressed to young children: Do toy advertisements introduce Spanish children to English? *English Today* 27(1): 3–9.
- Luke, Kang-kwong and Jack C. Richards. 1982. English in Hong Kong: Functions and Status. *English World-Wide* 3(1): 47–64.

- Makalela, Leketi. 2013. Black South African English on the radio. *World Englishes* 32(1): 93–107.
- Martin, Elizabeth. 1998. The use of English in written French advertising: A study of code-switching, code-mixing, and borrowing in a commercial context. *Studies in the Linguistic Science* 28(1): 159–184.
- Martin, Elizabeth. 2002a. Cultural images and different varieties of English in French television commercials. *English Today* 18(4): 8–20.
- Martin, Elizabeth. 2002b. Mixing English in French advertising. *World Englishes* 21(3): 375–401.
- Martin, Elizabeth. 2006. *Marketing Identities Through Language: English and Global Imagery in French Advertising*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martinez, Francia. 2015. English in advertising in Colombia. *World Englishes* 34(4): 600–619.
- Masavisut, Nitaya, Mayuri Sukwiwat, and Seri Wongmontha. 1986. The power of the English language in Thai media. *World Englishes* 5(2–3): 197–207.
- Matiki, Alfred J. 2001. The social significance of English in Malawi. *World Englishes* 20(2): 201–218.
- McArthur, Tom. 1997. The printed word in the English-speaking world. *English Today* 13(1): 10–16.
- McArthur, Tom. 1999. English in the World, in Africa, and in South Africa. *English Today* 15(1): 11–16.
- Mesthrie, Rajend. 2002. Mock languages and symbolic power: The South African radio series “Applesammy and Naidoo.” *World Englishes* 21(1): 99–112.
- Millar, Robert McColl. 2012. *English Historical Sociolinguistics* (Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language – Advanced Series). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Milroy, Leslie. 2000. Britain and the United States: Two nations divided by the same language (and different language ideologies). *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 10(1): 56–89.
- Milroy, James and Lesley Milroy. [1985] 1999. *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Moody, Andrew. 2006. English in Japanese popular culture and J-pop Music. *World Englishes* 25(2): 209–222.
- Moody, Andrew. 2010. The Englishes of popular cultures. In Andy Kirkpatrick, ed. *The Handbook of World Englishes*. London: Routledge, 535–549.
- Moody, Andrew. 2011. Englishization in Japanese popular culture: Representation of ethnicity. In Kwok-kan Tam, ed., *Englishization in Asia: Language and Cultural Issues*. Hong Kong: Open University of Hong Kong Press, 183–206.
- Moody, Andrew. 2012a. Authenticity of English in Asian popular music. In Andy Kirkpatrick and Roland Sussex, eds., *English as an International*

- Language in Asia: Implications for Language Education*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media Dordrecht, 209–222.
- Moody, Andrew. 2012b. English in Southeast Asian pop culture. In Ee-Ling Low and Azirah Hashim, eds. *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 307–324.
- Moody, Andrew. 2013. Language ideology in the discourse of popular culture. In Carol A. Chapelle, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 5. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 3009–3011.
- Moody, Andrew and Yuko Matsumoto. 2003. “Don’t touch my moustache”: Language blending and code ambiguity by two J-pop artists. *Asian Englishes* 6(1): 4–33.
- Moody, Andrew and Yuko Matsumoto. 2011. The ideal speaker of Japanese English as portrayed in “language entertainment” television. In P. Seargeant, ed. *English in Japan in the Era of Globalisation*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 166–186.
- Munzali, Jibril. 1997. The elaboration of the functions of Nigerian Pidgin. In Ayo Bamgbose, Ayo Banjo and Andrew Thomas, eds. *New Englishes: A West African Perspective*, Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 232–247.
- Nwoye, Onuigbo. 1992. Obituary announcements as communicative events in Nigerian English. *World Englishes* 11(1): 15–27.
- Omoniyi, Tope. 2006. Hip-hop through the world Englishes lens: A response to globalization. *World Englishes* 25(2): 195–208.
- O’Sullivan, Joan. 2013. Advanced Dublin English in Irish radio advertising. *World Englishes* 32(3): 358–376.
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari. 2013. The language of Hinduism in the US diaspora. *World Englishes* 32(3): 417–428.
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul. 2004. “Baby, darling, honey!”: Constructing a competence of English in South Korean TV shows. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 47: 143–154.
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul. 2009. *The Local Construction of a Global Language: Ideologies of English in South Korea*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter .
- Park, Joseph Sung-Yul and Lionel Wee. 2012. *Markets of English: Linguistic Capital and Language Policy in a Globalizing World*. London: Routledge.
- Pennycook, Alastair. 2003. Global Englishes, Rip Slyme and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 7(4): 513–533.
- Petery, Dorottya. 2011. English in Hungarian advertising. *World Englishes* 30(1): 21–40.
- Petzold, Ruth and Margie Berns. 2000. Catching up with Europe: Speakers and functions of English in Hungary. *World Englishes* 19(1): 113–124.
- Phillipson, Robert and Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. 1996. Is India throwing away its language resources? *English Today* 12(1): 23–27.
- Queen, Robin. 2015. *Vox Popular: The Surprising Life of Language in the Media*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.

- Raedts, Mariet, Natalie Dupre, Jef Hendrickx and Sophie Debrauwere. 2015. English in television commercials in Belgium, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain. *World Englishes* 34(4): 576–599.
- Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.
- Rampton, Ben. 1999. Styling the other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 421–427.
- Ridder, Susan. 1995. English in Dutch. *English Today* 11(4): 44–50.
- Rindal, Ulrikke. 2013. Being “neutral”? English pronunciation among Norwegian learners. *World Englishes* 32(2): 211–229.
- Rose, Kenneth R. 2001. Compliments and compliment responses in film: Implications for pragmatics research and language teaching. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 39(4): 309–326.
- Rubdy, Rani. 2001. Creative destruction: Singapore’s Speak Good English Movement. *World Englishes* 20(3): 341–355.
- Ruellot, Viviane. 2011. English in French print advertising from 1999 to 2007. *World Englishes* 30(1): 5–20.
- Sala, Bonaventure M. 2009. Writing in Cameroon Pidgin English: Begging the question. *English Today* 25(2): 11–17.
- Sartor, Valerie. 2010. Teaching English in Turkmenistan. *English Today* 26(4): 29–36.
- Schmied, Josef and Diana Hudson-Ettle. 1996. Analyzing the style of East African newspapers in English. *World Englishes* 15(1): 103–113.
- Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schwytter, Jürg R. 2016. *Dictating to the Mob: The History of the BBC Advisory Committee on Spoken English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seargeant, Philip. 2005. Globalisation and reconfigured English in Japan. *World Englishes* 24(3): 309–319.
- Sharbawi, Salbrina and David Deterding. 2010. Rhoticity in Brunei English. *English World-Wide* 31(2): 121–137.
- Shim, Rosa Jinyoung. 1994. Englishized Korean: Structure, status, and attitudes. *World Englishes* 13(2): 225–244.
- Shytex BookVideo Training. 2014. Video Course: Do You Speak American? Part 1. www.youtube.com/watch?v=kcx7khan180
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer, eds., *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels, April 20–21, 1979: Including Papers from the Conference on Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR, April 18, 1979*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193–247.
- Skinner, Edith. 1990. *Speak with Distinction* (rev. ed.; with new material added by Timothy Monich and Lilene Mansell). New York: Applause Theatre and Cinema Books.
- Smith, Brian D. 1991. English in Indonesia. *English Today* 7(2): 39–43.
- Smith, Ross. 1997. English in European Spanish. *English Today* 13(4): 22–26.

- Snodin, Navaporn Sanpresert. 2014. English naming and code-mixing in Thai mass media. *World Englishes* 33(1): 100–11.
- Staczek, John J. 1993. The English language and the Gulf War: Corpus linguistics, variations, and word-formation. *World Englishes* 12(1): 15–24.
- Stadler, Stefanie. 2016. Televised political discourse in New Zealand. *World Englishes* 32(2): 243–260.
- Stanlaw, James. 2004. *Japanese English: Language and Culture Contact*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Stuart-Smith, Jane, Gwilym Pryce, Claire Timmins and Barrie Gunter. 2013. Television can also be a factor in language change: Evidence from an urban dialect. *Language* 89(3) 501–536.
- Swan, Michael and Laurence Urdang. 1985. Where is the language going? *English Today* 3: 6–10.
- Taavitsainen, Irma and Paivi Pahta. 2008. From global language use to local meanings: English in Finnish public discourse. *English Today* 24(3): 25–38.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2006. *Analysing Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Takashi, Kyoko. 1990. A sociolinguistic analysis of English borrowings in Japanese advertising texts. *World Englishes* 9(3): 327–341.
- Tanaka, Sachiko Oda. 1995. The Japanese media and English. *World Englishes* 14(1): 37–53.
- Thompson, Roger M. 2012. Colliding world-views: A night with Philippine television. In Jamie Shinhee Lee and Andrew Moody, eds. *English in Asian Popular Culture*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 77–102.
- Tillman, Frank. 1986. Film, thought and language *World Englishes* 5(2–3): 265–272.
- Underwood, Robert. 1989. English and Chamorro on Guam. *World Englishes* 8(1): 73–82.
- Urdang, Laurence. 1990. On observing World English. *English Today* 6(1): 11–16.
- Ustinova, Irina. 2005. English in Russia. *World Englishes* 24(2): 239–251.
- Ustinova, Irina P. and Tej K. Bhatia. 2005. Convergence of English in Russian TV commercials. *World Englishes* 24(4): 495–508.
- Vettorel, Paola. 2016. English in Italian advertising. *World Englishes* 32(2): 261–278.
- Walshe, Shane. 2017. The language of Irish Film. *World Englishes* 36(2): 283–299.
- Wang, B. P. Y. 2006. English mixing in the lyrics of mandarin pop songs in Taiwan: A functional approach. *NCYU Inquiry of Applied Linguistics*: 211–240.
- Yong, Zhao and Keith P. Campbell. 1995. English in China. *World Englishes* 14(3): 377–390.
- Zhou, Sijing and Andrew Moody. 2017. English in *The Voice of China*. *World Englishes* 36(4): 554–570.