

General assessment guidelines for ENG2163 World Englishes

Books

- Melchers, Gunnel & Philip Shaw (2019) [3rd edition] *World Englishes*. London & New York: Routledge.

Articles (available in Canvas)

- Aijmer, Karin (2018) 'Intensification with very, really and so in selected varieties of English', in S. Hoffmann, A. Sand, S. Arndt-Lappe & L.M. Dillmann (eds) *Corpora and Lexis*. Leiden/Boston: Brill/Rodopi. Pp. 106-139.
- BurrIDGE, Kate (2008) 'Synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in the Pacific and Australasia', in K. BurrIDGE & B. Kortmann (eds), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 583-600.
- Gonçalves, Bruno, Lucía Loureiro-Porto, José J. Ramasco & David Sánchez (2017) 'The fall of the empire: The Americanization of English'. MS.
- Kortmann, Bernd (2008) 'Synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in the British Isles', in B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 478-495.
- Lange, Claudia & Sven Leuckert (2020) *Corpus Linguistics for World Englishes*. London / New York: Routledge. Chapter 5 and 6.
- Meshtrie, Rajend. (2008) 'Synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in Africa and South and Southeast Asia', in R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 624-635.
- Nelson, Gerald (2006) 'World Englishes and corpora studies', in Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru & Cecil L. Nelson (eds.) *The handbook of World Englishes*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. Pp. 733-750.
- Schneider, Edgar W. (2008) 'Synopsis: morphological and syntactic variation in the Americas and the Caribbean', in E.W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Pp. 763-776.
- Tottie, Gunnel. (2009). 'How different are American and British English grammar? And how are they different?', in G. Rohdenburg & J. Schlüter (eds), *One Language, Two Grammars?* Cambridge: CUP. Pp. 341-363.

The exam (3-day take-home exam) tests the following learning outcomes as specified in the course descriptions:

Assessment guidelines:

This take-home exam consists of three questions. Pass marks are required on all parts. The first two count 20% each; the third – the corpus study – counts 60% towards the final mark. This should be reflected in the time and the number of pages dedicated to each question. The evaluation (and marking) of the candidate's performance on the exam follow the underlying principles regarding analytical skills, judgement and independent thinking, according to the general [evaluation criteria](#) specified by "Universitets- og højskolerådet".

The exam questions reflect the aims and learning outcomes as specified on the course page:

- know the differences and similarities between varieties of English around the world;
- be able to extract the relevant linguistic data from the International Corpus of English;
- be able to describe and analyse those data from a contrastive perspective;

- The language of the examination is English; the candidate should apply the conventions of academic writing and referencing.
- Both the language and the content of the paper count towards the final mark.
- Use of available secondary sources is recommended/required (course reading, course website, grammar books, dictionaries, etc.).
 - This also applies to the short answers in Questions 1 and 2; it is a big plus if examples from relevant secondary and/or primary sources (i.e. the ICE-corpus, if relevant) are used to demonstrate the phenomena under discussion. See below for some more specific guidelines for Q 1 and 2.
- The task in Question 3 – the corpus study – is wide in nature and it is to some extent up to the candidates to interpret, delimit and determine how they choose to solve it, although the steps in the investigation are outlined in the bullet points. The study requires engagement with more or less unspecified primary corpus data in order to carry out an original corpus study of different aspects of World Englishes. If the candidate draws on secondary sources outside the syllabus for these tasks, this could be rewarded, although it is not a strict requirement. The examiners will have to accept different interpretations, albeit within a scope relevant to the task.
- The paper (particularly the corpus study) should be written as a coherent text.

Specific guidelines (Spring 2022) (for Questions 1 and 2 only), pointing to relevant reading on the syllabus that the candidates may (if not should) refer to.

Question 1 (20%)

Define and discuss briefly **TWO** of the concepts in the list below, with reference to relevant literature on the subject. Illustrate with examples where relevant.

- a) English in South Africa: An inner or outer circle variety? (Expect ref to Melchers et al. 2019 §4.9 and §5.4 (5.4.2.1) + pp. 8-9 on Kachru's model; exemplify to illustrate reasons why)
- b) Invariant BE in World Englishes (Expect ref to Melchers et al. 2019: 77-82 + p. 77 (+ Schneider 2008 on AAVE and the Caribbean; give examples of invariant BE)
- c) Exonormative vs. endonormative stabilisation (Expect ref to Melchers et al. 2019: §3.3 and throughout the book; exemplify)
- d) The Irish after-perfect (i.e. the 'hot-news' perfect). (Expect ref to Melchers et al. 2019: §4.4.3 + Kortmann 2008: 479; give concrete examples)

Question 2 (20%)

Answer **EITHER** (a) **OR** (b)

- a) The four sentences below contain one or more linguistic features (grammar, spelling and vocabulary) that may identify them as instances of one of the following varieties of English: American English, British English, Irish English, Singaporean English. In each case, identify and describe these features (in linguistic terms) and state which variety is (most) typically associated with these features.

- i. Go where? Hey, wait for me lah! Don't start the celebrations without me! (SGP: Question words other than *why/how* not usually fronted; common to omit subject, inversion unusual in interrogative sentences (Melchers et al. 2019:163), and the discourse particle *lah*)
- ii. Let's ask your neighbour, shall we? (BrE: spelling: *-ou-* in *neighbour* (ref. Goncalves et al. 2017, use of tag questions common in BrE (ref. Tottie 2009) (bonus: relatively frequent use of modal *shall* – dealt with in corpus workshop)
- iii. Have ye ever been to the Blue Bell? There does be a live band every so often. (IrE: *ye*, sg. form of *you* (Melchers et al. 2019: 70) and habitual BE (Melchers et al. 2019: 71; Kortmann 2008: 480)
- iv. Mother suggested that she try to enjoy herself, saying, "you've done real good work". (AmE: use of mandative subjunctive (Melchers et al. 2019: 105); Adverb forms without *-ly* (Schneider 2008: 774)

b) Describe and exemplify two phonological features that distinguish Canadian and British English from one another and two phonological features that distinguish British English and Jamaican English from one another. (Refer to Melchers et al. 2019; various page references that specify characteristic phonological features of BrE, CanE and JamE. Include examples of these features.)

Grades are awarded according to the national qualitative descriptions of letter grades (<https://www.uio.no/english/studies/examinations/grading-system/index.html>):

Symbol	Description	General, qualitative description of evaluation criteria
A	Excellent	An excellent performance, clearly outstanding. The candidate demonstrates excellent judgement and a high degree of independent thinking.
B	Very good	A very good performance. The candidate demonstrates sound judgement and a very good degree of independent thinking.
C	Good	A good performance in most areas. The candidate demonstrates a reasonable degree of judgement and independent thinking in the most important
D	Satisfactory	A satisfactory performance, but with significant shortcomings. The candidate demonstrates a limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.
E	Sufficient	A performance that meets the minimum criteria, but no more. The candidate demonstrates a very limited degree of judgement and independent thinking.
F	Fail	A performance that does not meet the minimum academic criteria. The candidate demonstrates an absence of both judgement and independent thinking.