**Morphological and Syntactic Feature Analysis of
Ugandan English: Influence from Luganda,
Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango**

Inaugural-Dissertation

zur

Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors der Philosophie

in der

Fakultät für Philologie

der

RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM

vorgelegt

von

Jude Ssempuuma

Gedruckt mit der Genehmigung der Fakultät für Philologie der Ruhr-Universität Bochum.

Referent: Prof. Dr. Christiane Meierkord

Korreferent: Prof. Dr. Ulrike Gut

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 27 Januar 2017

Table of Content

Acknowledgement.....	vii
List of tables and figures.....	viii
List of abbreviations.....	xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the problem.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the study.....	2
1.3 Research questions.....	2
1.4 Organisation of chapters	3
Chapter 2: Ugandan English as a Variety of English.....	5
2.0 Introduction.....	5
2.1 World Englishes and New Englishes.....	5
2.2 Postcolonial Englishes.....	7
2.3 Models of World Englishes.....	8
2.3.1 English as a Native, Second, and Foreign Language.....	8
2.3.2 Kachru's Three Circle Model of World Englishes.....	9
2.3.3 McArthur's Circle of World English.....	11
2.3.4 Schneider's Dynamic Model of World Englishes.....	11
2.3.5 Meierkord's Interaction across Englishes model.....	14
2.3.6 Mair's World System of Englishes.....	14
2.4 Ugandan English.....	14
Chapter 3: Language Situation in Uganda.....	17
3.0 Multilingualism.....	17
3.1 Multilingualism in Uganda.....	17
3.2 Major indigenous languages widely spoken in Uganda	19
3.2.1 Luganda.....	19
3.2.2 Runyankole-Rukiga.....	20
3.2.3 Acholi-Lango.....	20
3.3 English in Uganda.....	21
3.3.1 Promotion of English in the Uganda Protectorate.....	23
3.3.2 Status of English in independent Uganda.....	23
3.3.2.1 English as a second language.....	23
3.3.2.2 English as an official language.....	24

3.3.3 Functions of English in Uganda.....	26
3.3.3.1 English as medium of instruction.....	26
3.3.3.2 English as language of administration.....	30
3.3.3.3 English as lingua franca.....	30
3.3.3.4 English as language of media and literature.....	31
Chapter 4: Data and methodology.....	33
4.0 Introduction.....	33
4.1 Defining the variables.....	33
4.2 Quantitative method.....	33
4.3 Data.....	34
4.4 Informants.....	34
4.5 Data collection: Semi-structured interviews	34
4.6 Data analysis.....	35
4.7 Data quantification	36
Chapter 5: Left dislocation in Ugandan English.....	37
5.0 Introduction.....	37
5.1 Left dislocation in Standard English(es).....	38
5.2 Research on the use of left dislocation in World Englishes	44
5.2.1 Left dislocation in L1 varieties of English	44
5.2.2 Left dislocation in L2 varieties of English.....	46
5.2.2.1 Left dislocation in English L2 varieties in the Pacific and Asia.....	46
5.2.2.2 Left dislocation in English L2 varieties in Africa.....	47
5.3 Research on left dislocation in Ugandan indigenous languages.....	50
5.3.1 Left dislocation in Luganda.....	50
5.3.1.1 Subject left dislocation in Luganda.....	51
5.3.1.2 Object left dislocation in Luganda.....	53
5.3.1.3 Indirect object left dislocation in Luganda.....	56
5.3.2 Left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga.....	56
5.3.2.1 Subject left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga.....	56
5.3.2.2 Object left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga.....	57
5.3.3 Left dislocation in Acholi-Lango.....	58
5.3.3.1 Subject left dislocation in Acholi-Lango.....	58
5.3.3.2 Object left dislocation in Acholi-Lango.....	60
5.4 Analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English data.....	62

5.4.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1	64
5.4.1.1 Analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English among Luganda L1 speakers according to noun phrase function.....	64
5.4.1.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1 according to discourse function.....	67
5.4.1.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverbs among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	69
5.4.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	70
5.4.2.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 according to noun phrase function.....	71
5.4.2.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 according to discourse function	73
5.4.2.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	75
5.4.3 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	75
5.4.3.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 according to noun phrase function.....	76
5.4.3.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 according to discourse function.....	77
5.4.3.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	79
5.4.4 Comparison of left dislocation usage among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1s.....	80
5.4.5 Comparison of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other varieties of English.....	83
5.5 Conclusion.....	86
Chapter 6: Prepositions in Ugandan English.....	88
6.0 Introduction.....	88
6.1 Types of prepositions.....	88
6.1.1 Grammatical roles of prepositions.....	89
6.1.2 Syntactic relationship between prepositions and other grammatical categories.....	90
6.1.3 Types of prepositional meaning.....	92

6.1.3.1 Grammaticised and bound prepositions.....	93
6.1.3.2 Lexical meaning of prepositions.....	95
6.1.3.2.1 Location in space	95
6.1.3.2.2 Metaphorical or abstract use of the spatial prepositions.....	99
6.2 Variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions in World Englishes.....	102
6.2.1 The use of prepositions in English L1 varieties.....	102
6.2.2 The use of prepositions in English L2 varieties.....	107
6.3 Prepositions in Ugandan languages: Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi- Lango.....	110
6.3.1 Prepositions in Luganda.....	111
6.3.2 Prepositions in Runyankole-Rukiga.....	121
6.3.3 Prepositions in Acholi-Lango.....	125
6.4 Analysis of prepositions in Ugandan English.....	129
6.4.1 The distribution of prepositions in the Ugandan English data.....	129
6.4.2. Grammaticised and lexical prepositional meaning in Ugandan English.....	133
6.4.2.1.1 The use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1	133
6.4.2.1.2 The use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Runyankole- Rukiga as L1	137
6.4.2.1.3 The use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1	141
6.4.2.1.4 The use of the preposition <i>in</i> in Ugandan English.....	145
6.4.2.2.1 The use of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	147
6.4.2.2.2 The use of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Runyankole- Rukiga as L1	150
6.4.2.2.3 The use of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	152
6.4.2.2.4 The use of the preposition <i>at</i> in spoken Ugandan English.....	154
6.4.2.3.1 The use of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	157
6.4.2.3.2 The use of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Runyankole- Rukiga as L1	158

6.4.2.3.3 The use of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	159
6.4.2.3.4 The use of the preposition <i>on</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	161
6.4.2.4.1 The use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	162
6.4.2.4.2 The use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	165
6.4.2.4.3 The use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1..	167
6.4.2.4.4 The use of the preposition <i>to</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	170
6.4.2.5.1 The use of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	172
6.4.2.5.2 The use of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Runyankole- Rukiga as L1.....	174
6.4.2.5.3 The use of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	177
6.4.2.5.4 The use of the preposition <i>from</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	180
6.5. Conclusion.....	181
Chapter 7: The progressive aspect in Ugandan English.....	184
7.0 Introduction.....	184
7.1 The progressive aspect.....	185
7.1.1 Progressive forms.....	185
7.1.2 Semantic classes of verbs used with the progressive.....	186
7.1.2.1 Activity verbs	186
7.1.2.2 Communication verbs.....	187
7.1.2.3 Mental verbs.....	187
7.1.2.4 Occurrence verbs.....	187
7.1.2.5 Existence verbs.....	188
7.1.2.6 Causative verbs.....	188
7.1.2.7 Aspectual verbs.....	188
7.1.3 Uses of the progressive.....	188
7.2 Previous studies in the use of the progressive in World Englishes.....	193
7.3 The progressive aspect in Ugandan Languages: Luganda, Runyankole- Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.....	197
7.4 The progressive in spoken Ugandan English data.....	201
7.4.1 Progressive aspect in data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	201
7.4.2 Progressive aspect in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	206

7.4.3 Progressive aspect in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	212
7.4.4 The progressive aspect in spoken Ugandan English.....	217
7.5 Conclusion	228
Chapter 8: Conclusion, limitation of the study, and recommendation.....	231
Appendices.....	234
Bibliography.....	237

Acknowledgement

I am very grateful to all the people who have helped me in my academic studies and most especially during my PhD research activities. Your academic guidance as well as moral support and encouragement has enabled me complete my PhD Dissertation. I am indebted to my first supervisor Prof. Dr Christiane Meierkord, Chair of English Linguistics Department at Bochum University and my second supervisor Prof. Dr Ulrike Gut, Chair of English Linguistics Department at Westfälische Wilhelms University Münster for the academic guidance and encouragement throughout my PhD studies. I also acknowledge the advice and guidance from my colleagues Mrs Bridget Fonkeu and Mrs Stefanie Rottschäffer during my research writing process.

The data used in this study was collected in Uganda. My field work and data collection would not have been successful without the assistance and help of many people in Uganda. Not everybody can be mentioned here. However, some of them deserve mention for the key role they played during my stay in Uganda and in the process of data collection. I would like to express my gratitude to the following people; Rev Fr Joseph Bukoola, Rev. Fr Dr Herman Kituuma, Msgr. Henry Kyabukasa, Rev. Sr. Florence Babirye, Rev. Fr Charles Mulindwa, Rev. Fr Thomas Sserwadda, Rev. Fr Philip Ngendo, Mr Gonzaga Lukwago, Mr Francis Ssenyonga, Mr Peter Clever Kavuma, Mr Rogers Mutekanga, Mr Joseph Ssemukiine, Mr Gilbert Wachala, Mr James Jachani, Mr Jimmy Ojede, Mr Luke Zacky, Mr Daglas Ogwal, Mr Denis Odyek, Mr Isaac Oturi, Mr Leo Ocen, Mr Rigers Okello, Mr Ronald Ogango, Mr Tom Olak, Mr Anthony Ocire, Mr Walter Ochora, Mr Augustine Tumusiime, Mr Nestorio Nuwagaba, Mr Paul Mugabyomu, Mr Tobias Musinguzi, Mr Bruno Kyewoluhanga, Mr Conrad Atweire, Mr James Siliva, Mr Paul Byamugisha, Mr Edgar Tuyinamasiko, and Mr Joseph Muhamuza. Your practical assistance in the various ways has contributed greatly to the success of this study.

I am also grateful to my family; my wife, Bianca Ssempuuma and our children, Emily Nalugonzi, Lilian Nakabira, Henry Gyagenda, and William Bukoola, my parents Mrs Anna Maria Wasswa and Mr Remegio Wasswa and my parents-in-law Mrs Katharina Jordan and Mr Michael Jordan who have always supported me and prided in all my achievements. Finally, I would like to thank Dr Thomas Biermeier for reading through parts of my Dissertation and gave me useful comments and suggestions. However, I am solely responsible for any of the limitations in this PhD Dissertation.

List of tables and figures

Figure 7.4.1: The distribution of the 20 most frequently used verbs with the progressive among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1s.....	228
Table 5.4.1: The percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among seven English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	66
Table 5.4.2: The percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function among seven English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	68
Table 5.4.3: The percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	70
Table 5.4.4: The percentage of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	71
Table 5.4.5: Left dislocation according to discourse function among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	74
Table 5.4.6: The percentage of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	75
Table 5.4.7: The percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	76
Table 5.4.8: The percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	77
Table 5.4.9: The percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	79
Table 5.4.10: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase types in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous Ugandan as L1s.....	80
Table 5.4.11: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous L1s.....	82
Table 5.4.12: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous L1s.....	83
Table 5.4.13: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other varieties of English	83

Table 6.3.1: Realisation of the preposition <i>of</i> in concordance with noun classes in Luganda.....	112
Table 6.3.2: Realisation of the preposition <i>of</i> in concordance with noun classes in Runyankole-Rukiga.....	122
Table 6.3.3: Realisation of the applicative morpheme as an infix in Runyankole- Rukiga	125
Table 6.3.4: The English equivalents of some of the prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.....	129
Table 6.4.1: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the English data with speakers of Luganda as L1.....	130
Table 6.4.2: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	131
Table 6.4.3: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	132
Table 6.4.4: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in spoken Ugandan English data.....	132
Table 6.4.5: Raw frequencies and percentages of the use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	133
Table 6.4.6: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>in</i> to denote location among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	135
Table 6.4.7: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	136
Table 6.4.8: Raw frequencies and percentages of the use of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	138
Table 6.4.9: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>in</i> to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga L1.....	139
Table 6.4.10: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>in</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	141
Table 6.4.11: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>in</i> to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	144
Table 6.4.12: Raw frequencies and percentages of the meaning of the preposition <i>in</i> spoken Ugandan English data.....	145
Table 6.4.13: The percentages of the use of the preposition <i>in</i> to denote location in	

spoken Ugandan English data.....	146
Table 6.4.14: The percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>in</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	147
Table 6.4.15: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1	148
Table 6.4.16: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>at</i> to denote location among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	148
Table 6.4.17: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	151
Table 6.4.18: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>at</i> to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	152
Table 6.4.19: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>at</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	154
Table 6.4.20: The percentage of the meaning of the preposition <i>at</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	155
Table 6.4.21: The percentage of use of the preposition <i>at</i> to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data.....	156
Table 6.4.22: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>at</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	156
Table 6.4.23: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	158
Table 6.4.24: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	159
Table 6.4.25: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>on</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	160
Table 6.4.26. The percentage of the meaning of the preposition <i>on</i> in spoken Ugandan English data	161
Table 6.4.27: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>on</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	162
Table 6.4.28: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	163
Table 6.4.29: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	165

Table 6.4.30: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	166
Table 6.4.31: The Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	167
Table 6.4.32: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	168
Table 6.4.33: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	169
Table 6.4.34: The percentage of the preposition <i>to</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	170
Table 6.4.35: The percentage of the preposition <i>to</i> to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data.....	171
Table 6.4.36: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	172
Table 6.4.37: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	174
Table 6.4.38: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	176
Table 6.4.39: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>from</i> to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	177
Table 6.4.40: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>from</i> among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	178
Table 6.4.41: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition <i>from</i> to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	179
Table 6.4.42: Raw frequencies and percentages of the meaning of the preposition <i>from</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	180
Table 6.4.43: The percentage of the preposition <i>from</i> to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data.....	181
Table 6.4.44: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition <i>from</i> in spoken Ugandan English data.....	181
Table 7.4.1: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	201
Table 7.4.2: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of	

the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	202
Table 7.4.3: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.....	205
Table 7.4.4: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	206
Table 7.4.5: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	208
Table 7.4.6: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.....	211
Table 7.4.7: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	212
Table 7.4.8: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.....	214
Table 7.4.9: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the Acholi-Lango L1 data.....	217
Table 7.4.10: Frequencies of the progressive in the data of English speakers with the three L1s.....	218
Table 7.4.11: Frequencies of the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data and in other varieties of English	219
Table 7.4.12: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the spoken Ugandan English data.....	219
Table 7.4.13: The percentages of the use of the progressive forms by English speakers with the three L1s.....	221
Table 7.4.14: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the Ugandan, Nigerian and British English.....	221
Table 7.4.15: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of	

the various meanings of progressive constructions in the spoken Ugandan English data	222
Table 7.4.16: Relative frequencies per 1,000 words and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions across English speakers with the three L1s.....	224
Table 7.4.17: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data.....	226

List of abbreviations

AP => Adjective phrase

APPL => Applicative affix

AUX => Auxiliary

BBC => British Broadcasting Corporation

BSAfE => Black South African English

CONJ => Conjunction

DET => Determiner

EAfE => East African English

EFL => English as a foreign language

ENL => English as a native language

EOBLD => Emphatic oblique left dislocation

EOLD => Emphatic object left dislocation

ESL => English as a second language

ESLD => Emphatic subject left dislocation

FAL => Functional adult literacy

FL => Foreign language

FUT => Future

FV => Final vowel

GEN => Genitive

ICE-AUS => International corpus of English: Australia

ICE-GB => International corpus of English: Great Britain

ICE-EA(Ken) => International corpus of English: East Africa (Kenya)

ICE-HK => International corpus of English: Hong Kong

ICE-IND => International corpus of English: India

ICE-NIG => International corpus of English: Nigeria

ICE-NZ => International corpus of English: New Zealand

ICE-PHI => International corpus of English: Philippines

ICE-SA => International corpus of English: South Africa

ICE-SIG => International corpus of English: Singapore

IMPER => Imperative

InSAfE => Indian South African English

IOVI => Indirect object verb infix

IOVS => Indirect object verb suffix

IPP => Independent personal pronoun
 IV => Initial vowel
 JS => Jude Ssempuuma
 KenE => Kenyan English
 L1 => First language
 L2 => second language
 LD => Left dislocation
 LOC => Locative
 NCP => Noun class prefix
 NEG => Negative
 NP => Noun phrase
 OSLD => Obligatory subject left dislocation
 OVI => Object verb infix
 OVS => Object verb suffix
 PASS => Passive
 PERF => Perfect
 PLE => Primary leaving examination
 PL => Plural
 POSS => Possessive
 Prep => Preposition
 PRES => Present tense
 PROG => Progressive
 PP => Preposition phrase
 PST => Past tense
 REF => Referent
 REL => Relative
 SG => Singular
 StdEng => Standard English
 Suf => Suffix
 SVO => Subject verb object
 SVP => subject verb prefix
 SVS => Subject verb suffix
 UBOS => Uganda Bureau of Statistics
 UPE => Universal primary education

USA => United States of America

USE => Universal secondary education

VP => Verb phrase

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Introduction

As a country, Uganda derives its name from Buganda kingdom which became a British protectorate in 1900. It shares borders with Kenya in the East, Tanzania in the South, Rwanda in the South West, the Democratic Republic of Congo in the West, and South Sudan in the North. Currently, its population is estimated to be 34,856,813 people with almost 74.5 percent below the age of 25, making it one of the countries with the world's youngest population (Ugandan Bureau of Statistics 2015). Uganda is a multi-ethnic and multilingual country (cf. chapter 3. *Language situation in Uganda*). English is the co-official language together with Kiswahili and the main medium of instruction in the country. With an increase in the school enrolment because of the Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Secondary Education (USE) Act, the number of Ugandans who use a nativised Ugandan English variety is expected to increase tremendously. This nativised variety is influenced by different indigenous languages not only at the phonological level but also at the morphological and syntactic levels. The present study provides the description of the morpho-syntactic features of Ugandan English and explores the extent to which Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango influence the variation in the use left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect, the key linguistic features in this study.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Presently, the trend in the study of World Englishes is to describe and investigate features of national and local varieties. This involves “the recognition of diverse modern English varieties as legitimate, wherever they are spoken, as long as their speakers abide by some local communal norms” (Mufwene 2010: 43). Unlike other varieties of English, not much research has been carried out in respect to the variety spoken in Uganda. For instance, Ugandan English is not discussed in the compendia and handbooks of World Englishes, for example, Kortmann and Schneider (2004), Schneider (2007), Kirkpatrick (2007), and Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008). The political instability in the country in the 1960s, 1970s and in early 1980s almost paralysed all the institutions and thus making the collection of authentic data which could lead to a scientific description of this variety very difficult (cf. Schneider 2007: 189). Nevertheless, Ugandan English is briefly mentioned in McArthur (2002) and in Schneider (2011). Although in their discussion of East African English, Schmied (2008) and Wolf (2012) have included Ugandan English under East African English, the data used for their analysis, that is, the East Africa component of the *International Corpus of English* lacks data from Uganda. Moreover,

they claim that East African English is mainly influenced by Kiswahili, a language that lacks native speakers in Uganda. It must be noted, however, that Schmied (2006) and (2012) does address the influence of Luganda on Ugandan English because of its role as the *lingua franca*¹ of the capital city, Kampala and the language of wider communication² in the country.

Despite the scarcity of scholarly research in respect to Ugandan English, there are some book chapters (Ssempuuma 2012, Nelson and Hongtao 2012) as well as journal articles (Fisher 2000, Isingoma 2013, 2014) which have discussed features of Ugandan English. In addition, there are MA and PhD dissertations (Isingoma 2007 and Tukwasibwe 2014) which have investigated features of Ugandan English. Presently, to the best of my knowledge, no empirical research has investigated the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect in Ugandan English.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to systematically examine and analyse the morpho-syntactic features, focusing on the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect, in Ugandan English. This study uses authentic spoken English data produced by speakers whose first language (L1) is Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango respectively. It explores the influence of the indigenous Ugandan languages in the use of the above mentioned morpho-syntactic features in Ugandan English. In addition, it intends to widen the scope of research in this variety and thus make a significant contribution to research into varieties of English. Furthermore, the researcher hopes that the results of this study will enable Ugandans to appreciate the variety of English spoken in their country, because the results illustrate how the linguistics features under study are used similar to and different from Standard English. Lastly, it is hoped that this study will stimulate further research into this variety and the comparison of the linguistic features of Ugandan English with other varieties of English.

1.3 Research questions

This study is guided by the following research questions.

¹ *Lingua franca* is defined by Matthews (1997: 209) as “any language used for communication between groups who have other language in common” and by UNESCO (1968) quoted by Meierkord (2006: 1) as a language “used habitually by people whose mother tongues are different in order to facilitate communication between them”.

² Language of wider communication is defined by Barotchi (1994: 2211) as “a language that affords a means of communication beyond the local group to the national and international arenas”, and by Brutt-Griffler 2006: 690) as “a language that provides a mutually intelligible medium for speakers in multilingual societies”.

1. To what extent do the indigenous Ugandan languages (Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango) influence variation in the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect in Ugandan English?
2. To what extent does the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect in Ugandan English differs from Standard English (British and American)?
3. To what extent does the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect in Ugandan English differs from other second language (L2) varieties of English?

1.4 Organisation of the chapters

This book is divided into eight chapters. After this introduction chapter, chapter 2 “Ugandan English as a variety of English” gives a general discussion of the theoretical framework about studies into varieties of English and discusses the terminologies frequently used, that is, World Englishes, New Englishes, Global English, and Postcolonial Englishes. It continues to discuss some of the models which have been used in the description of varieties of English and presents where Ugandan English fits in each of these models. In addition, it discusses Ugandan English and presents reasons why this variety is the focus of this study. Furthermore, it points at some of the features of Ugandan English which have been analysed in previous studies.

Chapter 3 “Language situation in Uganda” gives an overview of the multilingual nature of the country which in a way necessitated English to be the co-official language of the country because of its neutral status. It also presents the three indigenous Ugandan languages, that is, Luganda, Runyakole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango, whose speakers serve as independent variables in this study. It gives the estimate number of speakers of these languages and mentions the areas or locations where they are spoken. It goes on to elaborate the introduction and promotion of the English language during the colonial era and after independence. Furthermore, it discusses the status of English as the co-official and second language in the country as well as its functions, that is, medium of instruction, language of administration, lingua franca, language of the media, and literature.

Chapter 4 “Data and Methodology” states the linguistic variables and the social variables used in the analysis. It elaborates on how data was collected and analysed in respect to the dependent variables under study in chapters 5, 6, and 7. It also presents the methods used in the analysis, that is, the quantitative method (in presenting the results and testing their significance).

Chapter 5 “Left dislocation in Ugandan English” starts off with an overview of the use of left dislocation in Standard English, world Englishes (both L1 and L2 varieties), and the use of this syntactic structure in the indigenous Ugandan languages (Luganda, Runkaynkole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango). This is followed by the analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English data in respect to noun phrase function, discourse function and in relation to co-referential pronouns. The results indicate that since the three indigenous languages have obligatory subject left dislocation, the frequent use of this structure in Ugandan English suggest possible substrate influence. It ends with the comparison of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other varieties of English.

Chapter 6 “Prepositions in Ugandan English” gives the definition and the grammatical roles of prepositions in Standard English. It discusses the variation in the use of prepositions in world Englishes and in the three indigenous Ugandan languages. It then analyses the most frequently used prepositions in the data. This is followed by the presentation of the grammatical and lexical prepositional meaning of the prepositions *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from* in respect to space, time, abstraction relations, as grammaticised prepositions, and in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. The results show that to a large extent, these prepositions are used as in Standard English to indicate space, time and abstract relations. Nevertheless, there are instances showing variation from Standard English which suggest possible substrate influence.

Chapter 7 “The progressive aspect in Ugandan English” begins with the discussion of the progressive aspect in Standard English, world Englishes, and in the three indigenous Ugandan languages. The results show that the meanings of the progressive are used with varying frequencies by speakers of three Ugandan languages. Most of the progressives refer to non-delimited habitual activities. This occurs more among speakers with Luganda L1 than with speakers of Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango L1. This seems to suggest possible substrate influence and gives an indication that Ugandan English may be heterogeneous at different levels.

Finally, chapter 8 “Conclusion” sums up the results of the study. It also presents the limitation of the study and points at further areas which could be of interest to researcher who are focusing their attention on Ugandan English.

Chapter 2: Ugandan English as a Variety of English

2.0 Introduction

The present study takes the feature-based approach to investigate some of the morphological and syntactic features of Ugandan English. In addition, it uses a variationist approach, introduced by William Labov in 1960s, which “commonly adopts a quantitative methodology, focusing on the frequency with which linguistic forms e.g. pronunciation or grammatical features occur across speakers, groups of speakers or speaking styles” (Swann et al. 2004: 323). According to Melchers and Shaw (2003: 13), “variation in world Englishes can be found at all levels of language, i.e. spelling, phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, the lexicon, and discourse”. Various studies such as Kortmann and Schneider (2004) have discussed variation in the English language, focusing on the phonological and morpho-syntactic features in different regions and countries. Most recently, Kortmann and Lunkenheimer (2012) provide *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English*, which presents a large-scale typological survey of morpho-syntactic variation in the Anglophone world where Ugandan English is part of the 18 indigenised L2 varieties of English. Similarly, Siemund (2013) takes a typological approach at the study of varieties of English.

This chapter reviews the three terms in the studies of varieties of English spoken as L2 worldwide, i.e. ‘World Englishes’, ‘New Englishes’, and ‘Postcolonial Englishes’. Each of these terms has been used variably by scholars in the field. The following sections elaborate on how these terms developed and have been used in the studies of varieties of English. In addition, it presents six out of several models used in describing World Englishes. Finally, it indicates where Ugandan English is positioned in this theoretical framework and in the models describing World Englishes.

2.1 World Englishes and New Englishes

Currently, there are various varieties of English spoken worldwide. World Englishes is one of the terms that have been used to describe these varieties. According to Bolton (2006: 240), this term “functions as an umbrella label referring to a wide range of differing approaches to the description and analysis of English(es) worldwide”. The concept of World Englishes evolved during the postcolonial period after the 1960s when unique linguistic features in institutionalised varieties of English in the former British and American colonies were recognised (Kachru 1997). The term World Englishes is attributed to Braj Kachru. It is used

largely to describe emerging localised³ or indigenised varieties of English which developed in former British and American colonies and protectorates (McArthur 1987). According to Bolton (2006: 240), this is the narrower sense of the term which is used to specifically refer to ‘New Englishes’ found in the Caribbean, in West African and East African societies as well as in Asian societies. The term New Englishes was proposed by Pride (1982) to refer to the use of English as a L2 in postcolonial countries in South Asia, South-East Asia, West Africa and East Africa. In their book, *The New Englishes*, Platt, Weber, and Ho (1984) suggest that the term ‘New Englishes’ should be used to describe varieties of English spoken in regions where English is not the native language of the majority of the people and where it has been acquired through the education system. They argue that this term should be reserved for varieties where English is used in a wide range of functions by the people in the country “as a regular language for communication in at least some areas of everyday activity” (Platt et al. 1984: 6). New Englishes are influenced by indigenous languages in the countries where they are spoken, for example, in Nigeria, India, Ghana, Kenya, Philippine, and Uganda, and therefore exhibit distinctive phonological, morphological, and syntactic features. Llamzon (1983) quoted by Bolton (2006: 240) remarks that the new varieties of English are “identifiable with reference to four essential sets of features: ecological, historical, sociological and culture”. In addition, Jenkins (2003: 2) observes that in these societies, English is used as “an official (i.e. institutionalised) second language in fields such as government, law, and education”.

The description of World Englishes discussed above excludes the use of English as L1 in Britain and the first diaspora⁴ and also in countries where it is used as a foreign language (FL), for example, in Europe and Japan where English users “speak English more frequently as a contact language among themselves than with native speakers of English” (Jenkins 2003: 4). In addition, it also excludes the scope of regional and social varieties of English spoken within traditionally English speaking nations, for instance, dialects in Southern England, Chicano, and African American Englishes in the United States of America and Cockney in Britain.

In its broadest sense, the term World Englishes refers to any regional or national variety of English spoken around the world (Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008). In this sense, the plural form

³ According to Kachru and Smith (2008: 60), localised varieties of English are not understood by outsiders especially in respect to vocabulary, pronunciation, and intonation since they are frequently used in local situations with different objectives.

⁴ The first diaspora includes countries such as United States of America, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. In these countries, “English developed independently of, and differently from English in Britain partly because of the original mixture of dialects and accents among the people who settled in these areas, and partly because of the influence of the languages of the indigenous population” (Jenkins 2003: 22).

‘Englishes’ is used “to stress the diversity to be found in the language today and to stress that English no longer has one single base of authority, prestige, and normativity” (Mesthrie and Bhatt 2008: 3). The broadest sense of World Englishes is also remarked by Sebba (2009: 405) when he writes that World Englishes “refers to a whole range of languages which are forms of, or related to, English. Among these are many geographical varieties of Standard English, but also other non-standard forms of English such as the Pidgin and Creole varieties spoken in certain countries”. In this broadest sense, English is used in various areas of human activities such as business correspondences, sports and games, academic conferences, university courses, international diplomacy, internet chatrooms, and discussion fora (Sebba 2009: 417).

World Englishes can also be distinguished from ‘World English’ where the latter refers to an idealised form of “an internationally propagated and internationally intelligible variety of the language, increasingly associated with the American print and electronic media” (Bolton 2003: 4). Similar terms for the singular World English include ‘International English’ and ‘Global English’ (Brutt-Griffler 2002 and Jenkins 2003). Furthermore, attempts have been made to describe a single English norm for a supranational region, for example, in Europe, with Euro-English (Jenkins, Modiano and Seidlhofer 2001, Modiano 2006, and Mollin 2006).

2.2 Postcolonial Englishes

The relevant socio-political factors determining the use of English in postcolonial societies have been undertaken by scholars such as Fishman who remark that “international sociolinguistic balance rests on three factors: (1) the spread of English, (2) the control of English, and (3) the fostering of vernacular language” (Fishman 1977: 335). Although English was introduced by its native speakers in the colonial and protectorate regions, in the postcolonial context, the spread of English seems not to be in any way directly fostered by the mother tongue world (cf. Fishman 1996). Postcolonial Englishes is a recent term established by Edgar Schneider (2007). He proposes that English varieties which have emerged in postcolonial contexts “are products of a specific evolutionary process tied directly to their colonial and postcolonial history” (Schneider 2007: 3). He goes on to argue that previously, varieties of English spoken in postcolonial contexts have been studied only individually; yet, because of their shared colonial history and emergence in contact settings, a single dynamic theory of dialect emergence in postcolonial contexts is warranted. The term postcolonial Englishes encompasses varieties grouped together based on shared historical circumstances, i.e., as products of 16th century British colonial expansion and later United States colonial expansion. “Postcolonial Englishes” differs from the narrow sense of “World Englishes” in that

it includes the first Diaspora varieties such as American English and Australian English. As Schneider argues, "it is not customary to view American English as a new or postcolonial English [...] but the difference to other Postcolonial Englishes is essentially one of colonization type and of a more prolonged time depth, not a matter of principle" (Schneider, 2007: 251).

Postcolonial Englishes as a term to describe varieties of English also has its limitations. For instance, it does not distinguish between former British protectorates and British colonies. In addition, it groups varieties of English based on their parallel history of emergence, an approach which may or may not be empirically supported. There is some evidence which proves that some postcolonial varieties share a similar course of emergence as assumed by Schneider's model. However, this does not apply to all postcolonial varieties of English (see section 2.3.4). "Postcolonial Englishes" points back in time, presupposing that a variety of English spoken in a postcolonial context must be understood largely, if not exclusively, from its history of emergence, that is, its colonial past.

2.3 Models of World Englishes

This section reviews six models used to describe the varieties of English worldwide. These include, the categorisation of varieties of English into three, that is, English as a Native Language (NL), English as a Second Language, and English as a Foreign Language by Quirk et al. (1972), the 'Concentric Circles model' by Kachru (1985, 1990), the 'Wheel Model' or 'Circle of World English' by McArthur (1987, 1998), the 'Dynamic Model' by Schneider (2007), Interaction across Englishes by Meierkord (2012), and World Systems of Englishes by Mair (2013).

2.3.1 English as a Native, Second, and Foreign Language

Since English is the most widely used language worldwide, Quirk et al. (1972) endeavoured to categorise its use in three primary categories, that is, as a native language, as a second language, and as a foreign language. They state that English is spoken as a native language in countries such as Britain, the United States, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the Caribbean and South Africa. English is used as a L2 in countries with "divergent backgrounds as the Philippines and Ethiopia" as "a language necessary for certain official, social, commercial, or educational activities within their country" (Quirk et al. 1972: 3). On the other hand, as a foreign language, English is "used by someone for communication across frontiers or with people who are not his countrymen: listening to broadcast, reading books, or newspapers, commerce or travel" (Quirk et al. 1972: 3).

The use of English as a native language has been discussed and the clarification of where it is used challenged by several scholars. This is mainly based on the fact that the use of English as a native language is not limited to the countries identified by Quirk et al. (1972). As Bloomfield (1933: 43) argues, “the first language a human being learns to speak is his native language; he is a native speaker of this language”. In countries such as Uganda, there are people who have learnt English as their native or L1. For instance, Ssempuuma (2012: 477) observes that “it is worth noting that there is a new generation of Ugandans who use English as a first language. This is the case mainly in Kampala where, in some homes, parents have made English the sole language of the family”. It is such cases of new speakers of English as a native language that have led to scholars like Kirkpatrick (2007: 5) to further categorise English as a native language into two varieties, that is, English native varieties to refer to the “traditional varieties of British, American, and Australian English” and the nativised varieties of English to refer to the “newer varieties that have developed in places where English was not originally spoken and which have been influenced by local languages and cultures”. The distinction between English as a native language and nativised language, according to Kirkpatrick (2007: 27) is that for the case of English as a native language, it is “the primary language of the great majority of the population”. For the case of Uganda, English is not the primary language of the majority of Ugandans. However, it is used as a L2 since it is the co-official language of the country and plays a very important role most especially in the capital city, Kampala. In the rural areas, English appears to have the status of a foreign language because it is not used normally in the daily life of the people although it is learned in school. The discussion above indicates that in Uganda, English is to a large extent used as a L2. However, the present state of language use in the country points at the use of English as a mother tongue, although the number of those who use it as a mother tongue seems to be very small at the present. The position of indigenous languages which are used by the majority of Ugandans also indicates the use of English as a foreign language most especially in the rural areas. In Uganda, English seems to be used as a native language, as a second language, and as a foreign language.

2.3.2 Kachru's Three Circle Model of World Englishes

The three circle model by Kachru (1985, 1990) is one of the earliest and, most probably, the most widely cited model of varieties of English. The 'Circles model' consists of three circles of English, the inner, outer, and expanding circles, representing different ways in which English has been acquired and is currently used around the world. The inner circle represent English spoken in the United Kingdom as well as in the first Diaspora, i.e. the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. The outer circle represents English-speaking

countries which were colonised by Britain and American and where English has become institutionalised. These countries include India, Singapore, Philippine, Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, and Nigeria. The expanding circle represents English spoken in countries which were not historically colonised by Britain and America. In such countries, English is learned as an additional, foreign language and recognised as an international language.

Kachru's model has attracted a number of criticisms. For instance, Melchers and Shaw (2003: 36) observe that the expanding circle “covers a wide range from countries like the Scandinavian ones where English is an everyday presence in the media and even on the street, to Russia and Japan, where actual use of spoken English is a remote and obviously foreign phenomenon”. In addition, they criticise Kachru's model for saying nothing about the amount of individual bilingualism in the classified countries and thus go on to argue that “since levels of literacy and completed primary education are low in some outer circle countries one could speculate that there are many rich expanding circle countries where knowledge of English is more wide spread than in some poor outer circle countries” (ibid 37).

Kachru's model also unintentionally generates the ideology of ‘nativeness’ and ‘standard language’. The vast majority of people in the inner circle countries have English as their mother tongue. The inner circle countries are treated as the most correct and hence to inspire speakers of English in the outer and expanding circles. However, native speakers of English are found in both the inner circle and outer circle countries (see 2.3.1). In the same way, non-native speakers of English are represented in both the inner circle and outer circle countries. For instance, Bauer (2002: 23) observes that “these days there are many people in countries like India and Singapore whose only language is English”. English is increasingly used as a L1 alongside indigenous languages in the outer circle countries most especially in urban areas.

Furthermore, the classification of varieties of English by historical circumstances assumes that the present-day structural variation and ideology of the English language could be understood in terms of historical events and in case of postcolonial nations, by postcolonial history. The circumstances motivating the acquisition and spread of English in countries included in the outer circle are not exclusively colonial. To a large extent, the acquisition and spread of English in the outer circle countries is motivated and promoted by governments formed after independence. For example, English is viewed as an International language and a language used in expressing an individual's or a group's social identity.

Finally, the model homogenises English speakers in a given nation and thus fails to discuss internal variation based on local, socially salient categories, and social groups. For instance, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 30) point out that, “Kachru does not overtly position social and ethnic varieties within inner circle countries”, for example, Chicano English in the United States of America.

2.3.3 McArthur’s Circle of World English

McArthur’s Circle of World English model (1987, 1998) has a wheel in the centre representing World Standard English. The second layer of the wheel represents regional standards such as American Standard English, Canadian Standard English, Caribbean Standard English, West, East and Southern African Standard(ising) English, South Asian Standard(ising) English, East Asian Standard(ising) English, Australia, New Zealand and South Pacific Standard English, and British and Irish Standard English. Whereas some varieties are illustrated to have already acquired ‘Standard’ status others are still in the process of making their varieties Standard. The outer layer of the circle represents both national varieties, for example, Ugandan English, Indian English, Japanese English, and Canadian English as well as local or societal varieties, for example, BBC English, Network English, Quebec English, and English English. Bauer (2002: 21) criticises McArthur’s model for not indicating “varieties spoken primarily by native speakers of English and varieties originally spoken by second-language learners of English”. The inclusion of national varieties such as Ugandan English in the outer circle wheel illustrates where Ugandan English is placed in this model. On the other hand, the inclusion of local and societal varieties such as BBC, Network, and Quebec English also provides room for local varieties of Ugandan English such as Luganda English, Runyankole-Rukiga English basing on the substrate influence from these indigenous Ugandan languages. As Ssempuuma, Isingoma and Meierkord (2016) have observed, Ugandan English appears to be a heterogeneous variety.

2.3.4 Schneider’s Dynamic Model of World Englishes

Schneider (2007: 14) criticises both Kachru’s model and McArthur’s model for being “superficial and fuzzy in their capacity for establishing categories of linguistic description and classification”. He argues that;

both have listed criteria for the inclusion of nations into one category or another, but in neither case has a listing of features been provided that convincingly serves to fit problematic cases like South Africa or Malaysia, and neither one has attempted to list all countries in a given category exhaustively (Schneider 2007: 14).

Schneider's dynamic model views the emergency of New Englishes following a uniform process which can be analysed in five stages, that is, foundation, exonormative stabilisation, nativisation, endonormative stabilisation, and differentiation. He argues that this process is based on two main factors. The first one is identity construction of 'us' and 'others' whereby 'us' refers to the settlers and 'others' to the indigenous community. The second factor is what he refers to as the strands of communicative perspective. This involves both the settlers' perspective strand and the indigenous population's perspective strand. These two strands can also be referred to as coloniser strand and colonised strand. Schneider argues that these two strand perspectives complement each other. These two groups of people experience a reconstruction of their identity at each of these five stages.

In the first stage which he calls the foundation, English is introduced to a country that was not English speaking before. This is done by foreigners to that country who might be colonisers, traders, missionaries or military personnel. During this stage, there is limited cross-cultural communication because the contact of foreigners with speakers of indigenous languages is restricted to a few people, normally the leaders of the indigenous communities. From the indigenous population's perspective strand, there is marginal bilingualism which develops among a very few people of the local population who act as translators and guides to the foreigners. At this stage the indigenous languages do not influence the English spoken by the settler community.

The second stage is exonormative stabilisation. During this stage, the settlers due to their political dominance begin to settle politically in their new environment. English following the external norm, that is, the written and spoken British English is used as the linguistic standard of reference by expatriates. The settler community also begins to adopt local vocabularies in their speech. From the indigenous population strand, bilingualism increases because of formal education and increased contact with the settler community. This stage is also marked by contact induced language changes such as code-alternation, code-switching and second language acquisition strategies.

The third stage is nativisation. This stage is marked by political and linguistic independence. During this stage, both the settler strand and the indigenous strand begin to work closely and directly together to gain both political and linguistic independence from the external British power and norms. The settler strand begins to incorporate some elements of the local culture in its identity construction like using local expressions and symbolism.

The fourth stage which is referred to as endonormative stabilisation is marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic norm. This comes as a result of locally linguistic self confidence after political independence. At this stage, the new community has the capacity to decide on language policy, for instance, the medium of instruction and the official language(s) of that particular country. Among the indigenous strand, the role of one's ethnicity and ethnic boundaries become less important and new identities are reconstructed mainly based on the education and employment opportunities. This new indigenous identity results in accepting local forms of English which is produced in literature and other media such as newspapers, radio and television broadcasts.

The last and fifth stage is differentiation. This stage marks the emergence of a new variety of a language as a uniting factor for the new politically and culturally independent community. Since there is no external political and ideological pressure, the focus then turns on the internal diversification and reconstruction of individual identity based on parameters such as age, gender, ethnicity, and social status. Regional and social dialects begin to emerge from the formerly emerged variety of English to show new group identities in the community. According to Schneider (2003: 253) the differentiation at this stage is more of regional than social variation because "in most societies some social variation is likely to have persisted throughout, but in a newly settled area there was no basis for regional speech distinctions to emerge up to that point".

Schneider's model has also received criticism. For instance, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 35) point out that in this model, the inclusion of countries such as Australia and New Zealand together with other ESL countries "seems unwarranted" since "the conditions surrounding the installation of dominions seems quite different from that of colonies and protectorates". In addition, they remark that Schneider's model conceives identity "as a public concept in terms of nationhood". They argue that this "downplays other aspects of identity like class and status, which in the Australian and other cases resulted in an early opposition between general, cultivated and broad colonial L1 Englishes". Furthermore, they express doubt whether Schneider's model can be applied to all varieties of English when they remark that since this model "grew out of an analysis of the Asia-Pacific region; it is not clear if the model applies as clearly to countries in Africa and South Asia".

Schneider's model assumes the prominent role of the settler population in shaping the variety of English in the respective countries. However, this seems not to have been the case as far as Ugandan English is concerned since the population of settler community was very much

limited in Uganda because of its protectorate status (cf. Meierkord, 2016a). Regarding the five phases, Ugandan English appears to be in its nativisation phase, whereby borrowing at the lexical level as well as phonological and syntactic influence from indigenous languages are characterising features of Ugandan English (cf. Isingoma, 2016a, 2016b, Meierkord, 2016a, 2016b, Ssempuuma, Isingoma and Meierkord, 2016).

2.3.5 Meierkord's Interaction across Englishes model

In the language contact situation, speakers of different languages or varieties of a language contribute to the feature pool⁵ in the form of phonological, lexical, morphological, and grammatical linguistic features. Meierkord (2012) argues that the use of English worldwide increasingly takes place between speakers of different varieties of English as 'Interaction across Englishes'. In the interaction, "participants use features of their various varieties" (Meierkord 2012: 62). She remarks that this frequently happens in situations where English is used as a lingua franca and that "all participants in the interaction may choose to adopt any of the linguistic features that they encounter in these interactions [...] such selection is, first of all a cognitive process taking place in the individual, but it is also constrained by social factors" (such as prestige, the forces of the linguistic market, and identity construction) (Meierkord 2012: 64-5).

2.3.6 Mair's World System of Englishes

The World System of Englishes by Mair (2013) includes both Standard and Non-Standard Englishes. His model is meant to illustrate the use of English "in domains beyond the post-colonial nation state" (Mair 2013: 253). He thus moves from the discussion of Englishes along the lines of uses and users to how various Englishes influence each other in the global era. He argues that "where the model genuinely breaks new ground is in shedding light on the differential power of non-standard varieties of English, particularly in the postcolonial world, in currents of migration and in the global media sphere" (Mair 2013: 262).

2.4 Ugandan English

Ugandan English is one of the indigenised varieties of English. Like most indigenised varieties, the day-to-day use of English in Uganda shows both phonological and morpho-syntactic features which deviate from Standard English (British and American).

⁵ In the feature pool, the linguistic features are in the process of competition and selection in that speakers select some features but not others (Mufwene 2001).

Compared to other indigenised varieties of English, Ugandan English has not been discussed in most compendiums and handbooks of World Englishes (see Chapter 1.2). However, as stated in chapter 1 section 2, Schmied (2006) and (2012) attempted to include data from Uganda in the discussion of East African English when he identifies the role of Luganda in influencing Ugandan English other than Kiswahili, which is the case in Kenya and Tanzania. From this point of view, although Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania share a long common Anglophone background, nevertheless, in each country, the variety of English is influenced by the first languages in the respective countries. For instance, whereas the consonants /r/ and /l/ are rendered as one and the same by many Bantu speakers, in Kenya, the Kikuyu clearly tend towards /r/ and the Embu tend towards /l/ (Schmied 2006: 193), on the other hand, in Uganda, the Baganda tend towards /l/ and the Banyankole tend towards /r/. Tukwasibwe (2014) observes lexical transfers from Luganda in Ugandan English such as *okwanjula* (traditional marriages introduction ceremony) like in example (2.4.1) and the use of conjunction such as *mbu* ‘that/ so I hear’ like in example (2.4.2).

(2.4.1) This year, he decided to have a kwanjula ceremony (Tukwasibwe 2014: 156)

(2.4.2) And remember not to keep it on your mouth mbu you need it, it is possible that he is
(Tukwasibwe 2014: 159).

Examples (2.4.1) and (2.4.2) indicate that Ugandan English is influenced by the indigenous Ugandan languages. This therefore points at the need to treat each variety of English in each of the three East African countries independently. Moreover, Gramley and Pätzold (1992: 323) indicate doubts whether one should talk of linguistic features of East African English. They argue that the different historical, political, and linguistic characteristics of these countries support no idea of East African English. For instance, whereas Kenyan and Tanzania Englishes are mainly influenced by Kiswahili, Ugandan English is on the other hand has been claimed to be mainly influenced by Luganda. Fisher (2000), for example, observes that:

English as used throughout the country is remarkably uniform in syntax and lexis. One influence predominates: the phonology of Luganda. The quasi-universality of Luganda as a market language throughout the country, and its prestige as the language of Kampala and the surrounding area, have created the fashion for pronouncing and using English as the Baganda do. If it is a correct assumption that Ugandan English is to large extent Luganda English, it can be argued that the indigenous variety of English has been most influenced by this particular Bantu language, i.e. not by Kiswahili or Kikuyu, and is therefore different because of its linguistic links with Luganda (Fisher 2000: 59)

Some of the features of Ugandan English include the use of English words with connotations different from main stream varieties such as British and American English varieties, for example, *eat* (v) meaning to embezzle (money) like in sentence “Certain ministers have eaten all the funds” and words directly translated from Ugandan languages, for example, proverbs such as “You never realise the importance of your bottoms until you sit on a pin” (Fisher 2000: 38). Other scholars who have discussed the features of Ugandan English in individual book chapters include Ssempuuma (2012), Nelson and Hongtao (2012), Isingoma (2013, 2014, 2016a and 2016b), Tukwasibwe (2014), Meierkord (2016b), and Ssempuuma, Isingoma and Meierkord (2016).

The present study provides further empirical evidence of some of the morpho-syntactic features of Ugandan English as the discussion in chapters 5, 6, and 7 reveal. Although these features appear to be global grammatical features, the local uses of such global grammatical features “provide us with interesting insights into the dynamics of inner and outer circle varieties of English” (Hundt, 2009: 287). In Uganda, the indigenous languages seem play a key role in characterising this variety. The next chapter discusses language situation in Uganda.

Chapter 3: Language Situation in Uganda

3.0 Multilingualism

Multilingualism as used in sociolinguistics refers to the ability to speak two or more languages. Malmkjaer (1991) distinguishes between individual and community multilingualism. Whereas he uses the term ‘individual multilingualism’ to refer to a person “whose linguistic ability in two (or more) languages is similar to that of a native speaker” (p. 57), community multilingualism or multilingual society is a situation “in which two or more languages are used by large groups of the population, although not all members of each group need be bilingual” (p. 64). However, Sridhar (1996) quoted by Wardhaugh (2006: 96) argues that “multilingualism involving balanced native like command of all the languages in the repertoire is rather uncommon”. Most of the multilinguals have varying degrees of command of the different repertoires. Wardhaugh (2006: 96) asserts that “the differences in competence in the various languages might range from command of a few lexical items, formulaic expressions such as greetings, and rudimentary conversational skills all the way to excellent command of the grammar and vocabulary and specialised register, and styles”. Other scholars such as Paulston (1994: 2630) define multilingualism as “the presence and use of two or more languages within a modern nation state”. Paulston’s definition is related to Malmkjaer’s community multilingualism. Laitin (1994) looks at multilingualism from a postcolonial country perspective. According to him, one key factor that accounts for multilingualism in such countries is the desire by postcolonial governments “to provide education to all citizens and colonial experience” (p. 2628). Crystal (1987) also remarks the importance of education in promoting multilingualism. For instance, he observes that “learning another language may be the only means of obtaining access to knowledge (p. 360), hence, the use of English as a language of education in many postcolonial countries. He further recognises culture as another factor that leads to multilingualism. This may occur when one community desires to identify with a particular ethnic culture or social group, thereby learning the language of that group.

3.1 Multilingualism in Uganda

According to Lewis et al. (2016), there are 41 individual languages in Uganda. They go on to report that of 41 languages, 39 are indigenous, 2 are non-indigenous, 5 are institutional, 26 are developing, 6 are vigorous and 2 are in trouble and 2 are dying. This report indicates that Uganda is a multilingual country according to the definition by Paulston (1994) pointed out in 3.1 above.

In Uganda, multilingualism also involves languages of refugee communities. According to Uganda Bureau of Statistics [UBOS] (2006a: 25) both Rwandese and Sudanese make up the highest percentage of immigrants to Uganda between 1991 and 2002. Whereas Rwandese make up 34 percent of the total immigrants in 1991 and reduced to 16 percent in 2002 after most of them had returned to Rwanda after the war in 1994, the percent of Sudanese immigrants increased from 22 percent in 1991 to 38 percent in 2002. The recent report indicates that there are more immigrants from The Democratic Republic of Congo making almost 34.3 percent of the total immigrants (UBOS 2006a: 27). These communities speak languages such as Kinyarwanda and Kiswahili in addition to the regional dominant languages such as Runyankole-Rukiga, Runyoro-Rutooro in the west, Luganda in the central, Acholi-Lango in the north and Alur in western Nile region.

Since independence, different governments have tried to promote Kiswahili both in schools and among the entire population. For instance, the Government White Paper (1992) states that:

Unlike English, Kiswahili is an indigenous East African language. It has a strong local and regional cultural base cutting across the whole of region. Therefore, the strengthening of Kiswahili as Uganda's main national language for official use and for national unity, will promote rapid and solid regional co-operation between Uganda and the neighbouring countries such as Kenya, Tanzania, Zaire, Rwanda and Burundi (The Government of Uganda 1992: 19)

Kiswahili is used as lingua franca in Tanzania and Kenya. Although the intention of promotion Kiswahili is a clear sign by the Ugandan government to promote African languages, however, the reality on the ground is different. The government has not yet indicated signs of implementing its policies. As Kasozi (2000: 26) observes "wishes will not have any effect in practice unless they are backed by a comprehensive policy for teaching the language, judicious allocation of resources for the purpose and a thorough restructuring of social rewards to favour Kiswahili instead of English". Nevertheless, it is used in some parts of eastern Uganda most especially in Malaba and Mbale. In addition, it is used in northern Uganda alongside the dominant regional language Acholi-Lango and Alur and taught in some schools.

European languages also contribute to multilingualism in the country. For instance, French and German are taught as foreign languages in secondary schools and at the university of Makerere and Kyambogo. However, English plays a key role in promoting multilingualism in the country. Since the colonial period, English has been promoted and adopted as the official language at independence. Presently, it is a co-official language in the country and spoken as L2

by speakers of various indigenous languages. As Mazrui/Mazrui (1996: 273) observe “the English language today is perhaps one of the most enduring legacies of Africa’s experience with British colonialism”. This legacy is clearly notable in Uganda where English is not only a medium of instruction from primary one in urban areas and in some rural areas but also a language of administration especially at the national level.

3.2 Major indigenous languages widely spoken in Uganda

The number of indigenous languages spoken in Uganda can be inferred from the different indigenous communities in the country. Whereas *The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995* reports 56 indigenous communities on the other hand, *The Constitution (Amendment) Act, 2005* mentions 65 indigenous communities. The indigenous Ugandan languages belong to the Niger-Congo and Nilo-Sahara language families. Whereas the Niger-Congo language system in Uganda is composed of one sub family, that is, Bantu family comprising of languages such as Luganda, Lunyoro, Runyankole, Lusoga, and Rutoro, the Nilo-Sahara are represented by two sub families of Nilotic languages such as Acholi, Lango, Dhopadhola, Ateso, Nkarimojong, and Suk and Sudanic languages such as Lugbara, Madi, and Kebu (Crystal 1987: 314; Simango 2001: 1967). The Bantu languages are spoken by majority of the people in central, eastern and western regions in Uganda (Nganda 1996: 82). This part discusses the three indigenous languages considered as independent variables in this study, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango which are spoken in central, western and northern Uganda respectively.

3.2.1 Luganda

Traditionally, Luganda is the native language of the Baganda (see Fallers 1964 and Roscoe 1965). Currently, the speakers of Luganda as a L1 do not necessarily belong to the Buganda tribe. Many non Baganda whose parents migrated to the central region have acquired Luganda as their L1. The population of Ugandans who speak Luganda as a L1 is estimated to be 4,130,000 (Uganda Bureau of Statistics 2002). Luganda is also used as a L2 with the number estimated to be 1,000,000 according to Lewis et al. (2016). The use of Luganda as a L2 is also emphasised by Mosha (1983: 506) when he observes that “Luganda has the largest number of speakers outside its tribal boundaries and at onetime it used to be the medium of instruction as well as a curriculum subject in many primary and junior secondary schools outside Buganda, particularly in the eastern region”. Those who use Luganda as a L2 include native speakers of Gwere, Kenye, Masaaba, Nyole, Ruuli, and Soga. It is therefore a language of wider communication and the de facto language of national identity in the country.

In the central region or Buganda, Luganda is used as language of instruction in primary schools except in the urban centres and taught in secondary schools and tertiary institutions. It is also used in poetry, magazines, newspapers, films, radio and television programmes.

The status and function of a language in a community can influence the use of such a language by people who speak various mother tongues. In Uganda, the culture and socioeconomic position of the Baganda has led to an increase in the number of speakers of Luganda as a L2 in the country. This illustrates how bilingualism and multilingualism is promoted among Ugandans since Luganda is a language of wider communication in the country (Mukama 1991 and Kasozi 2000). The prestige and power of Luganda in Uganda is explicitly underlined by Mazrui (1975: 89) when he states that “historically widespread and used as a trade language throughout southern Uganda, Luganda is a native language of a powerful ethnic group (Baganda)”. In addition, it is a lingua franca of Kampala, the capital city of Uganda.

Linguistically, Luganda is one of the agglutinative languages whose words are built up from a stem with prefixes or suffixes added. According to Musoke (1986:1), this makes Luganda tense forms rather peculiar, in comparison with the English tenses. For instance, it marks tenses using formative prefixes, sometimes called tense markers in Luganda Grammar books.

3.2.2 Runyankole-Rukiga

Runyankole-Rukiga is a Bantu language of the interlacustrine group spoken by the Banyankole and Bakiga as a L1. According to Lewis et al. (2016) the population of Banyankole and Bakiga is estimated to be 2,330,000 and 1,580,000 respectively (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2006b).

Currently, Runyankole-Rukiga is spoken in the districts of Rubirizi, Buhweju, Isingiro, Mitooma, Sheema, Mbarara, Ntugamo, Kabale, Ibanda, Kiruhura, Rukungiri, Bushenyi, and Kanungu. There are other districts in Uganda where Runyankole-Rukiga is spoken alongside Luganda. These districts include Lyantonde, Sembabule, Mubende, Kamwenge and Rakai (Natumanya 2012: 2).

3.2.3 Acholi-Lango

Acholi-Lango is a member of the Lwo subgroup of the Western Nilotic languages belonging to the Nilo-Saharan language family (Noonan 1981: 1). This language group is spoken as a L1 by the Acholi and Langi people whose population is estimated to be 1,170,000 and 1,490,000 respectively (Lewis et al. 2016). Acholi-Lango is spoken as a L2 by the Kumam and Ruuli

ethnic groups in northern Uganda. This language is used in northern Uganda in the districts of Apac, Lira, Gulu, Oyam, Dokolo, Moroto, Kotido, and Kamuli.

3.3 English in Uganda

Having been introduced by the British missionaries, traders and colonial administrators in Uganda, English has become one of the main languages in the country. Like in other former British colonies, in Uganda, English is discussed and understood as part of postcolonial Englishes or New Englishes. According to Kachru (1992), such countries are referred to as the *second Diaspora* of the English language. He distinguishes it from the *first Diaspora* which includes varieties of English in countries like the USA and Canada where the majority of English speakers do use it as their L1. Most of the speakers of English in the first Diaspora emigrated from Britain and other European countries. The spread of English in the second Diaspora is characterised by a change in the sociolinguistic profile because it came into contact with “sociocultural and historical contexts traditionally not associated with the English language” (Kachru 1992: 230). For example, in the case of Uganda, it interacted with genetically and culturally unrelated major language families such as Bantu and Nilotic. In Uganda, English was not only taught by native speakers from Britain and Canada i.e. members of the Church Missionary Society and Mill Hill Society respectively but also by non-native speakers from other European countries, for instance, the French Catholic Missionaries who controlled education in the southern and western part of the protectorate.

In the beginning, the spread of English in Uganda was very slow in pace because the British language policy preferred using an African lingua franca to promoting English. This policy was in conformity with the British paternalistic linguistic ideology of dual mandate outlined by Lord Lugard. According to Mazrui/Mazrui (1996: 273) this dual mandate advocated that “the British had a duty to facilitate the ‘civilisation’ and ‘modernisation’ of Africans while at the same time safeguarding the integrity of their cultures and identities”. Linguistically, this mandate meant providing Africans access to the English language in such a regulated manner as not to endanger political stability or impede the development and growth of more local languages. For example, Mazrui/Mazrui (1996: 273) remark that the Phelps-Stokes Commission Report in 1925 argued that “while ‘natives’ should not be denied the opportunity to acquire the English language, they have an inherent and inalienable right to their mother tongues”. The British colonial administrators preferred the promotion of Kiswahili, the lingua franca in East Africa, to English. According to Kasozi (2000: 25) it was Sir William Gowers, Uganda governor from 1925 to 1932 who took very drastic measures to promote

Kiswahili in his effort to make East Africa one political unit comprising of Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar. As Mazrui (1975) observes, the promotion of Kiswahili was mainly due to organisation purposes. For instance, he states that:

On adopting Swahili as the language of the armed forces, this would eliminate the problem of each linguistic community producing its own officers and non-commissioned officers. An Acholi could command an army consisting of Akamba, Baganda, and Wadigo. Both boundaries between tribes and boundaries between colonies within the same region would no longer need to be constraining factor in recruitment (Mazrui 1975: 129)

However, its promotion in the Uganda protectorate faced resistance from the Baganda and missionaries. For instance, whereas the Baganda viewed Kiswahili as a rival to their native language, Luganda, the Missionaries distrusted Kiswahili since they considered it an Islamic language (Mazrui 1975: 139).

Schmied (2008: 152) remarked on the slow promotion of English in Uganda when he observes that in East Africa, despite British colonial rule, “colonial language policy was not simply pro-English and more complex than is often assumed”. A trio language policy was enforced by colonial administrators. In Uganda, this language policy advocated the use of the local (tribal) mother tongues, the African lingua franca, usually Luganda and occasionally Kiswahili, and English for local, intra-territorial and international communication respectively. Before the end of World War II, English usage was concentrated and limited to elite communities or circles and colonial administrators “to regulate communication within the administrative, legal, and education system” (Schmied 2008: 152). For example, Sir Johnson one of the Governors in the Uganda Protectorate quoted by Low and Pratt (1970: 180) asserts that “I want their boys to learn English so that they may take the place of the Indian clerks in the government offices. I want some of the boys to grow up to be honest, just and wise chiefs who may eventually assist the Queen’s Governor in the government of the country”.

English remained a dominant language at the higher level of administration, for example, as the only official language of higher courts. However, Kiswahili, Luganda and other Ugandan languages prevailed in the lower administrative echelons. Before World War II, English and Ugandan languages complemented each other as languages of administration in the Uganda protectorate. As Mazrui/Mazrui (1996: 274) observe “if the body that made the law, the legislative, was the domain of the English language, the institutions charged with the enforcement of the law, like the police, the prison, and the army, were heavily dependent on the local lingua franca, Kiswahili (or Luganda)”.

3.3.1 Promotion of English in the Uganda Protectorate

The promotion of English in Uganda was first advocated by different groups in the country, led by the Baganda during the colonial period. They looked at English as a language that would enable them to acquire knowledge and modern skills through which new technologies that led to the industrial revolution in Europe were expressed. They therefore demanded the use of English other than Kiswahili for both administrative and educational purposes. For example, Sserwaniko Kkulubya in his defence for the use of English in Uganda quoted in Low (1971: 90) argued that ““as a second language to be learned [. . .] what second language do you think is preferred? English, of course my Lord, which is the key to everything””.

In Uganda, British administrators abandoned the promotion of Kiswahili after World War II. Backed by the USA, their language policy from 1948 to 1962 was to promote English throughout the protectorate. For instance, Kasozi (2000: 25) remarks that the change in language policy in favour of English was “to create a class of English speakers in the former colonies who would willingly collaborate with the Western capitalism”. After World War II the USA with its political and economic power became the leading country in promoting the spread of English and supported the fight for independence in African countries that were still under European colonial rule. In their strategy to control various parts of the world, both Britain and the USA used the English language as a primary tool of communication, administration, elitism, and eventually linguistic control. In the last years of colonial administration the British gave the English language both status and functional power, most especially among the elite. As Kachru 1992 observes:

The elite saw English as a window to the scientific and technological developments of the Western world. They wanted to partake of the bounty that the industrial revolution had made possible for Europe. Additionally, English was considered a great literary resource that opened the door through translations to the rich literary traditions of other European languages such as French, German, and Russian (Kachru 1992: 233-4)

3.3.2 Status of English in independent Uganda

The status of English evolved from being a language of communication among the colonial administrators and the elite during the colonial period to English as second language and the co-official language of the country after independence.

3.3.2.1 English as a second language

According to Mesthrie (2008a: 23) the status of English as a L2 is achieved when access to it is sufficient to produce “a stable second language used in formal domains, like education and government”. Gramley and Pätzold (1992: 314) also argue that a L2 is “enforced by the power of the state and its institutions”. Here, English as a L2 is used by a majority of the people who speak it as a second or third language. In most of the cases, English as a L2 is used by communities of non-native speakers to communicate with other non-native speakers. They come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Since 1962 when Uganda became independent, the use of English in the education system has been maintained. Currently, many Ugandans who have gone through the education system have English as their L2.

3.3.2.2 English as an official language

As a language of the coloniser, the choice of English as the official language of Uganda at independence was not an easy one. As Piron (2001: 2485) observes, choosing an official language “appears to be a taboo”. He remarks that before a decision is made, which language should have the official status, “options are defined and researched; costs are estimated; advantages and disadvantages are compared; political, economic and other consequences are pondered; mechanisms are foreseen to evaluate the impact of the new policy after a define time”. Some of the reasons for the choice of English as an official language of Uganda at independence are given in a speech by Milton Obote, the first Prime Minister of Uganda. He states that:

Our present policy as government is to teach more and more English in schools. [. . .] We say this because we do not see any possibility of our being able to get English known by half the population of Uganda within the next fifteen years. English, therefore, remains the national language in Uganda when at the same time it is a language that the minority of our people can use for political purposes to improve their own political positions. Some of our people can use it in order to improve their economic status (Obote 1975: 210 -1)

The statement by Obote indicates that the criteria remarked by Piron were put into consideration before the choice of English as the official language of the country was reached. Furthermore, Piron identifies five methods or approaches that apply for the choice of a common language of communication. In their order of frequency at the global scale, he names these approaches or methods as;

- (1) the use of a few “working” or “official” languages, with interpretation of oral exchanges and translation of documents (the *Oligolingual* system);

- (2) the use by all of the same national language, usually English (the *ethnolingual* system);
- (3) the use of all the languages of participants, with interpretation and translation in all of them (the *omnilingual* system);
- (4) the use of an “interlanguage”, i.e. an interethnic language that has never been the language of a given people (the *interlingual* system);
- (5) the use of the language of all participants without interpretation and translation (Piron 2001: 2485).

Of the five linguistic approaches usually applied in choosing an official language, the fourth, interlingual system, is the one that appears to have been used for the case of Uganda. First and foremost, English is not a language of any of the indigenous society or community in Uganda. Secondly, the interlingual approach avoids a feeling of discrimination in the population. Piron (2001: 2487) contends that under this system, “all participants use a language they have studied in a limited and relatively equivalent duration whatever the native language”. He goes further to note that “since no one is using his mother tongue, no one enjoys any superiority just for belonging to this or that people”. English therefore became a link language in a multilingual Ugandan society and in Kachru’s words “contributed to the creation of a cross-linguistic and cross-cultural network of people who began to use it in the domains of science, technology, military, regional business, and creative writing” (Kachru 1992: 234). Although very few Ugandans could speak English at independence and only 21 percent of the general population could hold a conversation in it ten years later, nevertheless, English was still considered the only official language of the country (Ladefoged *et al.* 1972: 25). In 1995, *The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995*, further confirmed the status of English by declaring it the only official language. Ten years later, through *The Constitution Amendment Act, 2005*, Kiswahili became the second official language of Uganda (The Government of Uganda, 2005: 4). Presently, English is the co-official language of Uganda together with Kiswahili.

The status of English as a second language and co-official language in Uganda was therefore determined by the political decision which declared it the official language (and since 2005 the co-official language) of the country and enforced its use in the education system. The political decision was based on the fact that it is a neutral language that promotes national unity, a language of science and technology, has teaching materials in form of books, and its use in international communication, trade and diplomacy.

This section has illustrated that although the British offered the seeds of English in the country, factors leading to its growth, spread, and use were provided by Ugandans. Most important is the status given to it by postcolonial Ugandan governments as the co-official language of the country and provided means of enforcing its learning and use among Ugandans. This confirms the observation by Schmied (2008) that “the expansion of English down the society hierarchy began mainly at the end of colonial rule with the democratisation and expansion of education” (p.153). The next section discusses the functions of English in Uganda.

3.3.3 Functions of English in Uganda

Generally speaking, language is used to communicate ideas. We can use it to exchange facts and opinions, express emotions in social interaction like in greetings, and express our identity. This section discusses why and how the English language is chosen as a communicative media in Uganda. In a multilingual country like Uganda, the choice of language depends on many factors. For instance, Crystal observes that:

the choice of language will vary depending on the type of person addressed (e.g. member of family, schoolmates, colleagues, superiors, friends, shopkeepers, officials, transport personnel, neighbours), and on the location or social setting (e.g. a family may vary their language use depending on whether they are at home, in the street, or in church; at the office, someone may talk to a colleague in language X, but over lunch talk to the same person using language Y (Crystal 1987: 362).

As illustrated in section 3.3, in Uganda, English has both Second language and Official language statuses. These two statuses greatly determine its functions in the country. Like in other postcolonial countries, English, as a Second language, has four vital domains of function identified by Kachru, namely;

an instrumental function as a tool for imparting specialised education e.g. science technology, a regulative function in the higher courts and in pan-regional and national administration, an interpersonal function as a link language across linguistic ethnic, and religious groups, and an imaginative and innovative function in developing local literatures in English (Kachru 1992: 241).

This section discusses how English fulfils these four functions in Uganda.

3.3.3.1 English as medium of instruction

The status of a language in the education system of a country is important in determining its function and spread. As observed in section 3.2, the British administrators invested more in the English language after World War II. In 1948, it was introduced as a subject in grade five and replaced all local languages as medium of instruction in secondary schools (Ladefoged et al. 1972: 91). In addition, Ladefoged et al (1972: 93) further remark that after World War II, Kiswahili was eventually phased out of the school system since it had no native speakers in the country. However, Kabwegyere (1974: 218) argues that the replacement of Kiswahili by English was a British colonial move “intended to minimise intra-African contact at the level of the masses as a way of weakening the nationalist struggle against colonialism”. The introduction of English in the primary school system is defended by Hattersley, a missionary educationist when he remarks that:

As these boys are expected to become the leaders of the country, it is necessary also to give them an all-round education. As some hope to enter the ministry and some to become school masters, it is most necessary to make English the second feature. We have no desire to anglicise the boys, but English must be taught, and taught well, in order to open to them the vast library existing in our language. It is not only impossible but inadvisable to attempt to translate to any extent text-books for scholastic work. All higher education should be conducted in English. When a number become proficient it will be no longer necessary for English missionaries to spend their time in making translations of necessary books into Luganda (Hattersley 1968: 171).

The reason why Hattersley refers to boys and not girls in the above quotation is because the first schools in the country were run by missionaries who concentrated on the education of boys and not of girls. For example, whereas Bukalasa seminary (1893), Namityango (1902) were founded by the White Fathers and Mill Hill Fathers respectively for sons of catholic chiefs, Mengo High school (1903) and King’s College Buddo (1905) by the Church Missionary Society for sons of protestant chiefs and the Buganda royal family. The first girl’s school, Gayaza High school, was founded in 1905 for daughters of leading Protestants in the country. This was followed by the education of catholic girls at Bwanda (1911) by the White Fathers (Paige 2000: 34). The missionaries therefore pioneered education and the spread of English in Uganda. As Sir Albert Cook quoted in McGregor (1967: 2) reports “all these educational efforts were being made nearly twenty years before the government took up the question of education and every form of early ‘western’ education in Uganda from 1877 was missionary”.

In 1956, the first school to have English as a language of instruction from the first year of primary education was established at Entebbe. Since Entebbe was still the capital of Uganda

protectorate, it provided the first multilingual environment in which Ugandans coming from different parts of the country worked at different ministerial departments. As Ladefoged et al. (1972: 93) observe fluency in English was the main admission criterion in this school. This meant that parents had to provide their children with private tutoring in English to prepare them for entry into this school.

When Uganda got her independence, the policy of using mother tongue as language of instruction in primary schools was adopted by the postcolonial government. English was still introduced as a subject in primary five and was a language of instruction in secondary schools and other levels of education. However, after the 1966 crisis that led to the abolition of the first postcolonial government built on federal system, the new republican government (1967) made the teaching of English compulsory beginning from primary one. English was made the only medium of instruction at all educational levels in the country. In addition, English speaking by pupils and students was enforced in schools whereby the use of vernaculars was punishable. This policy was maintained until 1992 when the use of mother tongues in education was encouraged.

Although the Uganda Government White Paper (1992: 16) stated that the mother tongue should be used as a medium of instruction in all educational programs up to primary four and from primary five onwards, English should be the medium of instruction in rural areas (McGregor 2000: 7), in reality, English is used from primary one onwards. The multilingual situation in the country makes code switching in classroom a reality. Moreover, not all languages in the country have been codified and have enough teaching materials and teachers. The situation of using any mother tongue is even made worse by the fact that pupils have to answer all primary leaving examinations (PLE) in the English language. This leaves teachers with no other option than using English as the language of instruction right from the first level of primary education. The use of English other than mother tongues in primary schools is remarked by Nyquist (1999) quoted by Brock-Utne (2001) when she observes that:

Observations in primary schools showed that most of the teaching was done in English. The learning materials for the teachers and students were all in English, including teacher guides for mother tongue teaching. The teacher I spoke to said that they were told that English should be the medium of instruction from P.1 [. . .] because of the final exams, we have to use English a lot (Brock-Utne 2001: 127).

Being a neutral language in Uganda, English has more chances of being adopted as a medium of instruction than any of the indigenous Ugandan languages. From the point of view

of parents, for example, English effectively controls entry into successive levels of Uganda's highly competitive educational system. In addition, the mobility of Ugandans in search for jobs leaves no room for parents to have their children educated in a specific mother tongue because if they are transferred to another part of the country, their children will then have to learn a new language before they can follow instruction in that language. Furthermore, they believe that the earlier children learn to speak English the better they become part of the big English speaking population worldwide. English language is also supported by the USA and Great Britain, for example, Rhoda Nsibambi (2000: 18) reports that from Britain and the USA that Uganda gets "sponsors for facilitating the teaching of English: USAID, ODA, CfBT, British Council, and USIA".

The Uganda government has prioritised educating its citizens. For instance, the Uganda Constitution 1995 stipulates three educational objectives:

- (i) The State shall promote free and compulsory basic education.
- (ii) The State shall take appropriate measures to afford every citizen equal opportunity to attain the highest educational standard possible.
- (iii) Individual, religious bodies and other non government organisations shall be free to found and operate educational institutions if they comply with the general educational policy of the country and maintain national standards.

In 2005, the mother-tongue-based thematic curriculum was introduced to enable children learn in their mother tongues or in languages that are familiar to them. With the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997 and Universal Secondary Education (USE) in 2007, the government has fulfilled its educational objectives. In addition, the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development has introduced the Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) programme as a means of giving literacy skills to older people who did not get a chance of going through formal education. The three programmes UPE, USE, and FAL demonstrates government's commitment in putting into practise article 30 and 34 (2) of the Constitution, that is, the right to basic education for every Ugandan. The three programmes also reveal an increase in the number of school enrolment. For example, with the inception of UPE primary school enrolment increased from 3.1 million in 1996 to 5.3 million in 1997. Furthermore, in 2002, a total of 6.2 million persons aged 6 years and above were enrolled in primary school (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2006b). An increase in the number of pupils and students enrolled in both primary and secondary schools implies an increase in the number of people who can express themselves in the English language both in speech and writing. The function

of English in the education system therefore plays an important role in determining its function in other domains such as administration and media.

3.3.3.2 English as language of administration

The use of English in education has empowered a great number of Ugandan with both spoken and written competence in the language. However, unlike the function of English in education which is wide spread throughout the country, the use of English in administration is still limited to the higher institutional levels of the government. The situation described in the colonial period still exists. In the lower levels of administration, the different vernaculars are used. The use of English in the higher government institutions is declared by law, for example, the Constituent Assembly Statute (Uganda Government, 1993, Section 4) stated that “the proceedings and recording of the Assembly shall be in English”. In addition, English is the only medium of communication in the Ugandan Parliament. In order to safeguard English as the only language to be used in Parliament, the Constitution of Uganda (1995) stipulates that any member of parliament must have an educational level equivalent to advanced level of secondary education. This means that every member of Ugandan parliament has had at least 13 years of English as a second language. Although English is the co-official language since 2005 it is still the *de facto* language of government communication especially in the written form.

3.3.3.3 English as lingua franca

The status of English as second language has created a sizeable number of speakers who use it as a lingua franca in their daily communication. Crystal (1992: 230) defines a lingua franca as “an auxiliary language used to permit routine communication between groups of people who speak different native languages”. He goes on further to remark that ‘lingua francas’ are very common in heavily multilingual regions such as West and East Africa. In Uganda, English is used as a lingua franca most especially in urban areas among Ugandan and Ugandan and foreigners. The events that lead to use of English as lingua franca include, home or residential environment, work places especially in trade and business transactions. The elites also use English at conferences and workshops.

Most especially in urban areas, people of different linguistic backgrounds both from within and outside the country are neighbours in the residential areas. They therefore use English as a medium of communication. English is also a lingua franca in the home environment, for instance, as a result of intermarriages, for example, when a mother is a *Muganda* and the father an *Acholi*. Whereas the Baganda speak Luganda as their mother

tongue, the Acholi and Langi speak Acholi-Lango as their mother tongue. English is therefore a neutral language in which the two can communicate to each other.

Apart from the home environment English is also used as a lingua franca in trade and business transactions. Globalisation has brought business people from countries such as India, South Africa, and China to invest in Uganda. English still plays the role of medium of communication between these foreign business people and Ugandan. For instance, in 2008, I observed that in shops owned by Indians in Kampala, the shop proprietors who are Indians use English to communicate to the shop attendants who were Baganda. The shop attendants then communicated in Luganda to the customers who could not express themselves in the English language. In big super markets like *Shoprite*, English is the main language used because the majority of the people who do shopping in such super markets are foreigners (tourists and expatriates) and the Ugandan elites.

English remains the lingua franca in areas such as conferences and workshops organised by both national and international organisations in the country. For instance, English was the language used during the *Buganda Conference 2009* at Hotel Africana, Kampala. Since this was a conference organised by the Baganda and as illustrated above that Luganda is the widely spoken language in the country, one would have expected Luganda to be the medium of communication at this conference. However, although the topics of debate at the conference discussed the issues concerning Buganda and the Baganda, participants were from all parts of the country, hence the use of English other than Luganda.

English remains the lingua franca of the elites and with an increasing number of its speakers due to government educational programmes such as UPE and USU it is extending its influence to other areas that were previous limited to indigenous language. For instance, there is an increasing use of English in the music and entertaining industry, an area that was dominated by Luganda. For example, Ugandans have started producing movies in the English language. Some of the Ugandan movies in English include *Hidden Truth*, *Murder in the City*, and *The Honourable 2008*. In addition, English is the medium of communication during the Pearl of Africa Music Award festivals in Kampala.

3.3.3.4 English as language of media and literature

As the number of Ugandans who can read and write in English increases, English seems to dominate the print media. *The Newvision* (www.newvision.co.ug) and *The Monitor* (www.monitor.co.ug) are two daily news papers published in the English language. In addition,

there are also two weekly news papers in the English language, The Observer (www.observer.co.ug) and The Independent (www.independent.co.ug). Many Ugandans prefer buying newspapers as reading materials since they are cheaper than books. Moreover, newspapers contain current issues covering a wider range of topics. For instance, Crystal (1987: 388) observes that “the world of modern newspapers and magazines publishing presents a wider range of linguistically distinctive varieties than any other domain of language study”. For example, within the pages of a daily paper there will be categories such as *news, reports, editorial, comments, imaginative articles, reviews, letters, cartoons dialogues* and *many kinds of advertising*. Apart from newspapers there is a wide range of books by Ugandan authors published in the English language. The main Ugandan publisher, *Fountain Publishing Co.*, for example, publishes a lot of educational materials in the English language. *Femrite*, an association of Uganda women writers is another publishing company that focuses on the creative skills of writing in the English language (Tumusiime 1999: 43).

English is also used as a media language on radio and television stations. Whereas on most of the radio stations, local languages take the lion’s share of the air time, television stations are dominated by English. Most of the television stations are located in Kampala. They include; *Uganda Television, Lighthouse Television, Wavah Broadcasting Services, TV Africa*, and *Multichoice Uganda*. Apart from Uganda Television which is state owned by the government, the other four are privately owned and broadcast in English. Radio stations that broadcast in English include; *BBC World Service, Capital Radio, East African Radio, Greater African Radio, Green Channel, Impact FM, Power FM*, and *Voice of Africa*.

This chapter has discussed the multilingual nature of the Ugandan community. It has revealed the different languages spoken in the country. In addition, it has elaborated on the three indigenous languages which are taken as the independent variables in this study in relation to the dependent linguistic variables. In addition, has discussed the introduction and promotion of English in the Uganda protectorate. Furthermore, it has described its current status and elaborated on its function of English in the country. The next chapter describes the data and methodology used in this study.

Chapter 4: Data and methodology

4.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with method related issues in the study. It begins by defining the variables to be investigated. This is followed by the description of the method employed in the study, that is, quantitative method. It then describes the instruments and techniques of data collection (digital audio recording of semi-structured interviews). The informants and their sociolinguistic factors to form the independent variables which correlate with the dependent linguistic variables are then described. The process of data transcription is also discussed. Lastly, the methods of data analysis –quantification, presentation and interpretation conclude the chapter.

4.1 Defining the variables

In our use of language, we have multiple ways of expressing ourselves, which is, saying the same thing differently. Although such variation might be considered accidental and transitory, to a large extent, this choice is either rule governed or influenced by various factors. Making “a choice between two or more distinct but linguistically equivalent variants represents the existence of a linguistic variable” (Watt 2007: 3). This chapter begins by indentifying the linguistic variables in this study. As Gordon (2007: 19) remarks, defining linguistic variables to be investigated is one of the crucial steps undertaken in the early stages of any variationist analysis research. This importance is also echoed by Moyer (2008: 29) when she emphasises that “a researcher should decide early on whether to concentrate on one or on several specific aspects of the language (phonetics /phonology, morphology, syntax, conversation, semantics, pragmatics) she or he wishes to study.” This study explores the uses of the morpho-syntactic features in Ugandan English. These include left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect. These three linguistic variables are the dependent variables to be tested in respect to the independent variables Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango structures.

4.2 Quantitative method

After defining the dependent and independent variables in this study, I then go on to discuss the method used in the investigation. As Moyer (2008: 27) has noticed, “studies of groups and communities can be undertaken with a quantitative or qualitative research design”. She goes on to remark that the analysis of dependent and independent variables require quantitative research methods. This is because “quantitative research is concerned with the collection and analysis of data in numeric form [which JS] also generally rely on large-scale representative

samples of data that are processed statistically”. This point is also asserted by Dörnyei (2007: 24) when he states that “quantitative research involves data collection procedures that result primarily in numerical data which is then analysed primarily by statistical methods”. The use of left dislocation constructions, prepositions, and the progressive is quantified using percentages, nominalised frequencies and the difference in the use of these linguistic features tested using the log-likelihood test to examine their statistical significance and overuse in one data relative to the other data.

4.3 Data

The spoken Ugandan data used for the analysis was compiled between 2012 and 2014. It consists of 74,545 words of orthographic transcription of semi-structured interviews produced by 23 Ugandan graduates and undergraduates: 7 Luganda L1 speakers (29,100 words), 7 Runyankole-Rukiga L1 speakers (18,610 words) and 9 Acholi-Lango L1 speakers (26,835 words).

4.4 Informants

The speakers are university undergraduates and graduates aged between 18 years and 30 years with the exception of only one Luganda speaker aged 82 years who was taught English by native speakers during the colonial era. This implies that the rest, that is, 22 informants have learned the English language from non-native speakers, that is, Ugandans who speak English as a second language. Although they have Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as their L1, they have been exposed to the English language through the education system. They were born 20 years after independence since Uganda got her independence in 1962. These informants spoke only their mother tongue and English. Permission to do fieldwork at university and schools was sought and granted. Participants gave their consent before the interviews were recorded. They also introduced me to other contact persons who through the ‘snowball technique’ were extremely useful in mobilising those who share the same mother tongue to participate in the research.

4.5 Data collection: Semi-structured interviews

Interviews were intended to elicit samples of speech from informants which were as casual and spontaneous as possible. Codo (2008: 160) suggests that in order “to encourage informants to talk extensively, interviews must be designed in ways that facilitate the elicitation of longish pieces of discourse, such as narratives, descriptions, or accounts of some kind”. Semi-structured interviews were used with guiding questions that would lead interviewees to talk

freely. Informants talked at length and the interviews length ranged between 30 minutes to 60 minutes. This emphasises what Llamas (2007: 15) observes that “a more common technique of eliciting samples of speech data is through the sociolinguistic interview”. Likewise, Crowley (2007: 108-9) remarks that, the recording of spoken texts “is essential for a detailed understanding of the grammar of a language, as well as for understanding how sentences are linked in discourse”. In addition, Sealey (2010: 63) asserts that “it is possible to analyse almost anything an interviewee says from a linguistic point of view: that is, to identify the sounds, words and grammatical structures that occur in the speech of the interviewee”. A digital voice recorder with a SD card was used to record the interviews. The recorded semi-structured interviews were stored on the computer and transcribed orthographically. As Turell and Moyer (2008: 193) remark, “transcription is the process of representing oral language with orthographic conventions”. After removing the speech of the interviewer, the data was compiled according to L1 of the informants that is Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango in order to ascertain the exact number of words per each L1 group.

4.6 Data analysis

The data was analysed according to the three linguistic variables, that is, left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive constructions. The occurrence of left dislocation constructions was investigated manually. The analysis explores the extent speakers of Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango use left dislocation according to noun phrase, discourse function, and in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb. A total of 387 left dislocation constructions are therefore analysed, that is, 152 in the Luganda L1 data, 131 in the Runyankole-Rukiga L1 data, and 104 in the Acholi-Lango L1 data.

With regard to prepositions the data was searched with WordSmith software to identify the occurrence of 23 prepositions in the Ugandan data, namely; *in, of, to, for, from, at, with, on, up, by, about, around, among, over, into, off, under, within, down, near, onto, inside, and round*. As the discussion of the use of prepositions in world Englishes in section 7.2 reveals, these are the main prepositions that are reported to be used differently from Standard English. In addition, section 7.3 shows how very few prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango have various English equivalents. The raw figures and the percentages illustrate which of the 23 prepositions are the most frequently used in the Ugandan data. The analysis then proceeds to investigate the grammatical and lexical meaning of five of the most frequently used prepositions in the Ugandan data (*in, at, on, to, and from*) in order to illustrate possible substrate influence from Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.

In respect to the progressive constructions, the data was searched with WordSmith software for constructions of a form BE + a word ending in *-ing* with a maximum of three intervening words. In addition, using the search **ing* and the advanced search L1 (first word left of **ing*), the omission of the auxiliary in the progressive constructions was identified. Constructions with incomplete sentences that obscured the classification of the *-ing* constructions were removed manually. Furthermore, constructions involving the form *be + going to + infinitive* such as *Even if you are going to be engineer, you are going to study engineering in English* were excluded from the analysis since they do not indicate the progressive form. A total of 617 progressive constructions (including 4 cases involving the omission of the auxiliary, 3 by speakers of Runyankole-Rukiga L1 and 1 by speaker of Acholi-Lango L1) were therefore analysed, that is, 223 in the data by speakers of Luganda L1, 172 in the data by speakers of Runyankole-Rukiga L1, and 222 in the data by speakers of Acholi-Lango L1.

4.7 Data quantification

Watt (2007: 6) remarks that “much of the value of the sociolinguistic variable in language research lies in its potential for quantifying patterns of variation”. In order to understand whether the difference in the use of the three linguistic features under study is significant among speakers of the three L1s, a log-likelihood calculator created Andrew Hardie has been used. It is available online at <http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/sigtest/>. There is a significant difference between the groups if the p-value is below the cut-off which is $p = 0.05$. The result is significant at the 5 percent level ($p = 0.05$), 1 percent level ($p = 0.01$), 0.1 percent level ($p = 0.001$), and 0.01 percent level ($p = 0.0001$). The log-likelihood and effect size calculator created by Rayson and Garside available online at <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html> is used to identify the overuse (+) or underuse (-) in one corpus (data) relative to the other.

Chapter 5: Left dislocation in Ugandan English

5.0 Introduction

Left dislocation is a syntactic construction whereby a noun phrase or a prepositional phrase is put in an initial position with a corresponding pronoun or adverb occupying its relevant position in a sentence. In Standard English⁶, this syntactic construction is observed to be more common in colloquial or informal than formal contexts (Greenbaum 1996: 230). Studies in English as a second language have remarked that left dislocation is common and frequently used in spoken English (c.f. Mbangwana, 2008; Huber and Dako, 2008; Mesthrie and Bhatt, 2008; Burridge, 2008; Mugler and Tent, 2008). Although Schneider (2008a: 29) argues that left dislocation constitutes “elements of informal English presumably British-delivered, in many countries around the globe”, other scholars, for instance, Bokamba (1982: 83) and Huber and Dako (2008: 377) argue that the use of this syntactic construction –most especially in L2 varieties of English on the African continent –is a result of cross-linguistic interference from indigenous languages which have the same syntactic structure. For example, in the subject-verb agreement system of Bantu languages, a subject-prefix obligatorily occurs with a finite verb when the subject is a full lexical noun. This chapter therefore intends to investigate the potential cross-linguistic interference in the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English from the three indigenous Ugandan languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango, which use subject-prefix, object-infix and -suffix to agree with the subject or a topicalised object predicate.

This chapter is divided into four sections. Section one shows the use of left dislocation in Standard English(es). This includes an overview of the definition and descriptions of left dislocation, its grammatical construction and syntactic categorisation, and the various functions it serves in discourse. Section two reviews research on left dislocation in world English(es) by looking at various case studies in different varieties of English. Section three highlights how left dislocation is used in the three Ugandan indigenous languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango. The focus is put on the syntactic categorisation of left dislocation in respect to noun phrase function and their discourse function. Section four analyses the use of left dislocation in Uganda English data. It quantitatively shows how speakers of Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango employ left dislocation

⁶ By Standard English I refer to Standard British and American English.

constructions in respect to noun phrase function, discourse function and in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverbials.

5.1 Left dislocation in Standard English(es)

Trask (1997: 128) defines left dislocation as a “construction in which a noun phrase is moved at the beginning of a sentence, with its ordinary position being filled by a pronoun”. Using a different phrasing, Crystal (2008: 273) defines it as “a type of sentence in which one of the constituents appears in initial position and its canonical position is filled by a pronoun or a full lexical noun phrase with the same reference”. Quirk et al. (1985:1310) observe that left dislocation is a feature of informal spoken English and used “where a noun phrase is positioned initially and a reinforcing pronoun stands proxy for it in the relevant position in the sentence”. This is illustrated in examples (5.1.1) and (5.1.2) where the noun phrases *your friend John* and *that play* are reinforced by the pronouns *him* and *it* respectively.

(5.1.1) **Your friend John**, I saw him here last night.

(5.1.2) **That play**, it was terrible. (Quirk et al. 1985: 1310)

Carter and McCarthy (2006: 193) use the term *header* to refer to left dislocation. Although they acknowledge the use of left dislocation instead of header in other grammar books, they prefer to use the term *header* for left dislocation arguing that the word dislocation “suggests that a very common spoken structure is odd or is in some sense in the wrong place”. They continue to assert that in spoken English, there is no left or right. However, like Quirk et al. (1985), Trask (1997), and Crystal (2008), they remark that a header “most typically consists of a noun phrase followed by one or more pronouns which refer back to the noun phrase”. For instance, in example (5.1.3) the noun phrase *that leather coat* is followed by the pronoun *it*.

(5.1.3) **That leather coat**, it looks really nice on you. (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 193)

Extraposition is another term used by Netz and Kuzar (2007) to refer to left dislocation. In fact, they report that the term *extraposition* was first used by Jespersen (1933). They describe an extraposition construction to be one in which “a word or group of words is often paced by itself, outside the sentence proper, in which it is represented by a pronoun” (Netz and Kuzar 2007: 309). They report that Jespersen used example (5.1.4) to show *extraposition* in which the noun *Charles Dickens* is outside the sentence and represented by the pronoun *he*.

(5.1.4) **Charles Dickens**, he was a novelist! (Netz and Kuzar 2007: 309)

Whereas Netz and Kuzar (2007) and Carter and McCarthy (2006) prefer to use *extraposition* and *header*, in this study, the term left dislocation is also used to refer to extraposition and header as used by Carter, McCarthy, Netz and Kuzar.

Left dislocation differs from other types of dislocation such as topicalisation whereby “some part of a sentence is made with a topic, usually by placing it at the beginning” (Trask (1997: 221). Example (5.1.5) illustrates such a construction in which the noun phrase *this book* is topicalised or fronted.

(5.1.5) **This book** I can’t recommend. (Trask 1997: 221-2)

In the ordinary construction, *this book* would appear in its normal object position following the order word sentence structure of the English language, that is, subject, verb and object (SVO). There are however authors who use the term ‘left dislocation’ to also refer to ‘topicalisation’. For instance, Beal (2008: 398) observes that “left dislocation in Northern dialects as in colloquial English generally, is used for topicalisation”. Whereas Beal uses the term left dislocation to also refer to topicalisation in L1 varieties of English, there are other authors who do the same in L2 varieties of English. For instance, Huber and Dako (2008: 376) remark that in Ghanaian English, “left dislocation is realised through topicalisation and focus construction” as expressed in examples (5.1.6) and (5.1.7). However, they also acknowledge that “left dislocation is also achieved through pronominal apposition, that is, the insertion of a copy pronoun of the noun phrase” as in example (5.1.8).

(5.1.6) **After church** I’ll come. (Huber and Dako 2008: 376)

(5.1.7) **That teacher** in Achimota, is he your uncle? (Huber and Dako 2008: 376)

(5.1.8) **That woman**, she cheated me. (Huber and Dako 2008: 376)

Topicalisation or fronting as described by Trask (1997) is similar to what Birner and Ward (1998) refer to as *preposing constructions* in English. They describe a preposing sentence as a type of sentence “in which a lexically governed phrasal constituent (NP, AP, PP, VP) appears to the left of its canonical position typically sentence –initial” (Birner and Ward 1998: 3). They emphasise that in a preposing construction “the argument of the verb appears to the left of its canonical position, typically but not always sentence-initial, leaving its canonical position empty” (Birner and Ward 1998: 2-3). They, thus, argue that the distinction between preposing construction and left dislocation is marked syntactically. Whereas in preposing constructions the fronted constituent leaves its canonical position empty, in left dislocation, a co-referential pronoun “with the marked constituent appears in that constituent’s canonical

position” (Birner and Ward 1998: 5). This is illustrated in example (5.1.9) in which the direct object pronoun *them* is co-referential with the sentence-initial constituent *gallstones* and the subject pronoun *it* is co-referential with the noun phrase *a nervous breakdown*.

(5.1.9) I bet she had a nervous breakdown. That’s not a good thing. **Gallstones**, you have them out and they’re out. But **a nervous breakdown**, it’s very bad. (Birner and Ward 1998:5)

The syntactic distinction between left dislocation and topicalisation is also reported by Crystal (2008: 273) who observes that “in transformational grammar, left dislocation sentences have been contrasted with topicalisation sentences”. The former are analysed as base-generated and the latter as involving movement. In addition, he remarks that in left dislocation, the canonical position of the constituents that appear in the initial position is “filled by either a pronoun or a full lexical phrase with the same reference” as in example (5.1.10), in which the proper noun *John* is filled with the pronoun *him* or a full lexical noun *the old chap*.

(5.1.10) **John**, I like him/the old chap. (Crystal 2008: 273)

The syntactic description of left dislocation given by Birner and Ward (1998) and Crystal (2008) above is in line with that reported by Geluykens (1992). According to Geluykens (1992: 18), left dislocations involve “sentences with a pro-form, preceded by a noun phrase which has the same reference as the following pronoun”. He continues to name the syntactic categories involved in left dislocation construction. He calls the noun phrase preceding the main clause the *Referent* (REF), the main clause itself the *Proposition* (PRO), and the pronominal element in the proposition the *Gap* (GAP) (Geluykens 1992: 18-19). Other scholars such as Biber et al. (2010) have used different terminologies to describe the main categories or constituents involved in left dislocation. For instance, the terms *co-referent pronoun* and *preface* are preferred by Biber et al. (2010: 956). These correspond to what Geluykens (1992) refers to as *gap* and *referent* respectively. Biber et al. (2010: 957) also remark that “prefaces may precede both declarative and interrogative clauses”.

Apart from naming the constituents in left dislocation, Geluykens further remarks that syntactically, left dislocation is a “combination of a complete clause, complete in the sense that all the argument slots of the verbal predicate are filled, and a bare noun phrase, that is, a noun phrase which is not the argument in another clause” (Geluykens 1992: 19). Furthermore, he points out that the “most important characteristic of left dislocation is the particular relationship between the gap and the referent which is semantic in nature”. This means that the two constituents –the gap and referent –are co-referential. More still, he observes that the ‘gap’ “is

usually one of the core arguments of the proposition” and can either be the subject or object in a two-place predicate as illustrated in (5.1.11) where the gap is a subject –represented by the pronoun *he* and in (5.1.12) where the gap is an object –represented by the pronoun *them*.

(5.1.11) **Steve**, he likes beans.

(5.1.12) **Beans**, Steve likes them. (Geluykens 1992: 19).

Biber et. al. (2010) note that there is variation in the relationship between the preface and the clause it is attached to. As the quotation from Geluykens (1992) above has illustrated, the gap may be a subject or an object. Biber et. al. (2010: 957) also point out that “in many cases, the preface is co-referent with a subject pronoun with a co-referential subject pronoun” as in (5.1.13), (5.1.14), and (5.1.15) where *she*, *it* and *he* are co-referential subject pronouns respectively or “an object pronoun with a co-referential object pronoun” as in (5.1.16) and (5.1.17) where *her* is the co-referential object pronoun.

(5.1.13) **Sharon** she plays bingo on Sunday night.

(5.1.14) **All that money**, I mean, in the end is it worth rescuing.

(5.1.15) **That crazy Siberian**, what’s his name, he got one of the best houses in town.

(5.1.16) Well **Bryony** it seemed to be a heavy cold that was making her feel miserable.

(5.1.17) But **Anna-Luise** –what could have attracted her to a man in his fifties? (Biber et. al. 2010: 957)

Apart from being a subject and an object, Geluykens (1992) remarks that the gap can be an oblique such as the locative like in (5.1.18) represented by *there*, and a possessive of the subject as represented by *his mother* in (5.1.19).

(5.1.18) **This cupboard**, Steven put the beans there.

(5.1.19) **Steven**, his mother likes beans. (Geluykens 1992: 20)

The semantic co-referentiality between the gap and the referent in left dislocation constructions is also noted by Hewings and Hewings (2006). In example (5.1.20) below, they show how the subject pronoun *she* is semantically co-referential with the noun phrase *a friend of mine*.

(5.1.20) Well **Sharon**, where I’m living, **a friend of mine**, she’s got her rail card and ...

(Hewings and Hewings 2006: 97)

Netz and Kuzar (2007), –using the term *extraposed* to refer to left dislocation as already explained above –reveal that “the extraposed referent could be any sentence constituent: a subject, an object, or an adjunct”. They assert that the “great majority of Extrapositions (left

dislocation) involve an extraposed subject and a small minority of sentences involve an extraposed object” (Netz and Kuzar 2007: 318). They argue that this could be because in the English language, “objects are rarely placed in the initial position regardless of the occurrence of a resumptive element”.

Carter and McCarthy (2006) using the term *header* to refer to left dislocation, also mention that “headers commonly refer to the subject, object, object complement or prepositional complement”. In example (5.1.21), (5.1.22), (5.1.23), and (5.1.24), the subject, object, object complement, and prepositional complement left dislocation are represented by *he*, *him*, *that* and *her* respectively.

(5.1.21) **Owen** he’s my favourite nephew.

(5.1.22) **Joe**, I’ve never seen him at a single football match this season.

(5.1.23) “**The Great Maurice**”, they used to always call him that, didn’t they?

(5.1.24) **Anita**, you should at least feel sorry for her. (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 193)

Carter and McCarthy (2006: 193) further observe that “headers (left dislocation) may also be non-finite clauses” as examples (5.1.25) and (5.1.26) in which the non-finite clauses *going round museums and art galleries* and *walking into that room* have *it* as a co-referential pronoun in both sentences.

(5.1.25) Going round museums and art galleries, it’s what my mum and dad like doing.

(5.1.26) Walking into that room, it brought back a load of memories. (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 193)

In addition, they note that “headers may also occur in interrogative clauses” as in example (5.1.27) and (5.1.28) in which the noun phrase *your sister* and the clause *that new motorway they were building* co-refer to the pronouns *she* and *it* in the interrogative clauses respectively.

(5.1.27) **Your sister**, is she coming too?

(5.1.28) **That new motorway they were building**, is it open yet? (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 194)

Left dislocations can be analysed or identified by looking at the basic sentence types. Since left dislocation most frequently appears in spoken language –informal and colloquial English (Givón (1983: 347) –which are mainly dialogues or conversations (Hewings and Hewings 2006: 97), they are represented in declarative sentence types which function as statements in actual discourse than in other sentence types. However, there are cases where left dislocation is used in other sentence types such as interrogation as examples (5.1.27) and

(5.1.28) above have illustrated. The use of left dislocation in interrogative sentences is also observed by Quirk et al. (1985: 1416) as in example (5.1.29) illustrates.

(5.1.29) **The book** I lent you –have you finished **it** yet? (Quirk et al. 1985: 1416)

According to Geluykens (1992: 23), “the majority of left dislocations are indeed statements in conversations involving more than one participant”. He therefore argues that “left dislocations could be uttered by more than one person”. In addition, he remarks that “given the turn taking nature of conversation, the referent and proposition of left dislocation might be in different turns” (Geluykens 1992: 25).

Studies in the use of left dislocation have also investigated the function of this syntactic construction in the English language. For instance, Rodman (1974) and Gundel (1985) argue that left dislocation serves to introduce new entities into the discourse. This is supported by Carter and McCarthy (2006: 193) who remark that left dislocation “helps to provide orientation to the listeners, who then more easily identify the main topic. They often lead the listener from given to known information to new topical information”. The function of left dislocation as strategy to link both new and old information is underlined by Hewings and Hewings (2006) when they assert that

It is apparent that speakers use the available slot to flag a variety of items of information that will be helpful to the listener in identifying participants, in linking current topics to already mentioned ones, in reactivating old topics and generally anchoring the discourse (Hewings and Hewings 2006: 98).

The above point of view is also shared by Gregory and Michaelis (2001: 1670) who observe that left dislocation may be viewed as a “topic establishing device”. In the same respect, Biber et al. (2010: 956) state that “the discourse functions of dislocation may be seen as primary concerned with information flow and emphasis”. Geluykens (1992: 158) argues that “the primary function of left dislocation is ‘referent -high lightening’”. However, Prince (1997: 120) refutes this when he asserts that “no single function can in fact account for all the left dislocation data in English”. She identifies three different form-function of left dislocation as simplifying discourse processing, triggering a(po)set inference and amnestying an island violation”. Whereas simplifying discourse processing involves introducing new information in the discourse, the other two types –triggering a a(po)set inference and amnestying an island violation –involve discourse old information (Prince 1997: 24).

This section has reviewed research on left dislocation in Standard English. It has identified how this syntactic construction is used in Standard English (Grammar books) and noted how it is defined in English linguistic dictionaries. In addition, this section has outlined the distinction between left dislocation and topicalisation mentioning both similarities and differences in these two constructions as used in spoken Standard English. The grammatical categorisation and syntactic constructions of left dislocations has been identified and examples illustrating how the co-referential pronouns can help us identify left dislocation referring to subject, object, locative, possessive also given. The second section reviews research on left dislocation in World Englishes from a morphological and syntactic perspective.

5.2 Research on the use of left dislocation in World Englishes

After giving a definition and description of left dislocation in Standard English, the next section discusses an overview of research on left dislocation in World Englishes. It reviews various case studies on the topic in both English L1 and L2 varieties worldwide. The first part discusses left dislocation in English L1 varieties and the second part covers the use of this phenomenon in English L2 varieties.

5.2.1 Left dislocation in L1 varieties of English

North America, the British Isles, and Australia are the major English L1 regions in the Anglophone world. These three regions are the focus of L1 variation in the use of left dislocation in this study. Although North America and the British Isles are taken as the major English L1 Anglophone regions in the world, the use of English varies in each region. For instance, in the British Isles, we have the English dialects in North of England and Scottish English. Left dislocation has been reported to be used in colloquial Standard English (British and American). This is illustrated in examples (5.2.1) and (5.2.2) for British English and in example (5.2.3) for American English as reported by Biber et al. (2010).

(5.2.1) **This little shop** –it's lovely (BrE)

(5.2.2) **Those marks and Sparks bags**, can you see them all? (BrE)

(5.2.3) You know, **the vase**, did you see it? (AmE) Biber et al. (2010: 1074)

The use of left dislocation in colloquial American English is also reported by Murray and Simon (2008) as examples (5.2.4) and (5.2.5) reveal.

(5.2.4) Yeah, **my brother**, he dropped outa school again.

(5.2.5) **Ted's cousin**, he really messed up bad this time. (Murray and Simon 2008: 408)

Left dislocation reported by Biber et. al. (2010) and Murray and Simon (2008) represent subject left dislocation marked by the co-referential pronouns *it* in (5.2.1), *he* in (5.2.4) and (5.2.5), and object left dislocation marked by the co-referential pronouns *them* in (5.2.2) and *it* in (5.2.3). Whereas (5.2.1), (5.2.4) and (5.2.5) represent left dislocation in declarative sentences, (5.2.2) and (5.2.3) illustrate the use of left dislocation in interrogative questions.

Left dislocation is not only used in colloquial British and American English but also in various dialects of these languages. For instance, Beal (2008) remarks that “left dislocation in Northern dialects as in colloquial English generally, is used for topicalisation [...] this forms part of a wider tendency of the dialect speakers to state what is of prime concern initially” (Beal 2008: 398). She illustrates this in the use of subject left dislocation in a declarative sentence, as in (5.2.6) marked by the co-referential pronoun *they* for the noun phrase *Coffee beans*.

(5.2.6) **Coffee beans**, they used to dry them outside. (Beal 2008: 398)

Montgomery (2008) also reports the use of left dislocation in Appalachian English as in examples (5.2.7) and (5.2.8). These two examples represent subject left dislocation in declarative sentences marked by co-referential pronouns *they* and *it* respectively.

(5.2.7) **The hunters** that went the other way into the mountain, they’d killed them turkeys.

(5.2.8) **The bear**, it made a pass towards him. (Montgomery 2008: 465)

Likewise Miller (2008) observes the use of left dislocation in Scottish English. For instance, he points out that “left dislocation is not primarily associated with planning problems, it occurs frequently with simple noun phrases with no pause between the noun phrase and the clause” (Miller 2008: 320). He continues to assert that “the noun phrase may be introduced in an existential clause” as in (5.2.9), “the initial noun phrase can be quite complex” as in (5.2.10), “or may be separated from the main clause by a subordinate clause” as in (5.2.11).

(5.2.9) **And there’s one girl** she’s a real extrovert.

(5.2.10) **Well another Maths teacher that I dinnae get** he must he corrected my papers.

(5.2.11) **But a lot of people**, although they didnae have a gift, it was a coin that they would give them. (Miller 2008: 320)

Although Biber et al. (2010) and Murray and Simon (2008) report the use of left dislocation in American English, Schneider (2008a: 29) argues that “minor syntactic patterns” such as left dislocation “are not even distinctly American but constitute elements of informal English presumably British-delivered, in many countries around the globe.” He therefore

asserts that the use of such syntactic patterns reveals not one's regional whereabouts but his or her social background (Schneider 2008a: 29). Since English was first spread on the North American continent as L1 language, it sound correct to argue that the syntax structures such as left dislocation as used in spoken colloquial British English were also transferred to and used in the informal American English. The use of left dislocation in Scottish and Appalachian English has further confirmed that this syntactic phenomenon is common in dialects of English L1 varieties. Left dislocation is however not limited to informal and colloquial spoken British and American English but is also as Kortmann (2008: 490) reports "currently used in many varieties". The next section discusses the use of left dislocation in L2 varieties of English.

The left dislocation construction is also reported for English L1 varieties in the Australian region. For instance, Burridge (2008: 592) asserts that "the Aboriginal English exhibit 'highly topic-oriented structures such as left dislocation'" as in the example (5.2.12). She goes on to note that "while these constructions are typical of spontaneous spoken language generally it is the relative frequency and the special combination of these features that make this variety different from others".

(5.2.12) **The policeman**, he heard this banging. (Burridge 2008: 592)

5.2.2 Left dislocation in L2 varieties of English

English L2 varieties are spoken worldwide. This part discusses research on the use of left dislocation in English L2 varieties starting with those in the Pacific and Asia regions and then the African continent.

5.2.2.1 Left dislocation in English L2 varieties in the Pacific and Asia

In discussing the use of left dislocation in English L2 varieties in the Pacific and Asia regions, this study look at case studies of this phenomenon in Hawaii Creole, Fiji English and Butler English. Sakoda and Siegel (2008: 541) report the use of left dislocation in Hawaii Creole as subject, object, and locative markers as in (5.2.13), (5.2.14), and (5.2.15) respectively.

(5.2.13) Mai fada, hi no laik go wrk

'**My father**, he didn't like to go to work'

(5.2.14) Dis wan ai wen bai om Longs

'**This one** I bought it at Longs'

(5.2.15) Dis glove, you try bend um no can

'**This glove** if you try to bend it you can't'

Mugler and Tent (2008: 561) indicate that the use of left dislocation in Fiji English seems to be more frequent than in other varieties because this phenomenon is “reinforced by a similar structure in Fijian, which has a pronominal subject co-referent with the subject noun phrase not only when this noun phrase is fronted but also when the sentence follows the more common verb-object-subject order.” They go on to remark that “pronominal copying also occurs in relative clauses which include a resumptive pronoun with the same referent as the relative pronoun (as in Fijian), for instance, in (5.2.16) with the pronoun *it* as the resumptive pronoun.

(5.2.16) You know **the software** that I left it in the box that I left it on your desk.

Unlike in English L1 where left dislocation is reported to be used only in colloquial and informal spoken English, in Fiji English, this construction is also used in formal and written form as example (5.2.17) from *Fiji Times* illustrates.

(5.2.17) There is **another burst** which we are still trying to locate it (Fiji Times 7/3/2003).

Mugler and Tent (2008: 561)

Apart from the Pacific region, left dislocation is also observed in Asian English L2 varieties. For instance, Hosali (2008: 574) remarks that in Butler English pronouns *he/she* and *they* are used to mark left dislocation as in (5.2.18), (5.2.19), and (5.2.20) below.

(5.2.18) Hosali Sahib he know.

(5.2.19) Eve, she go this side.

(5.2.20) But British people, they are paying him eh good salary. (Hosali 2008: 574)

Other English Creole and varieties of English in the Pacific region which are reported to use left dislocation syntactic construction include Jamaican Creole, Belize Creole, Gullah (Schneider 2008b: 770).

In the Pacific and Asian regions, left dislocation is reported to be used beyond the informal setting. Furthermore, its frequent usage which is reported to be more than in the English L1 varieties is assumed to be as a result of cross linguistic interference from local languages which have the same linguistic structure, for example, Fijian for Fiji English. In addition, the examples given have demonstrated the variation in the syntactic category of left dislocation –subject, object, locative –and the variation in the types of pronouns used, that is, *he*, *she*, and *they* to mark the co-referential pronoun. After discussing left dislocation in English L2 varieties in the Pacific and Asian region, I now turn to the use of this construction in English L2 varieties on the African continent.

5.2.2.2 Left dislocation in English L2 varieties in Africa

Like in L2 varieties of English in the Pacific and Asia, left dislocation construction is reported to be widely used in English L2 varieties in Africa than in English L1 varieties. For instance, McArthur (2002: 269) remarks that “the use of resumptive pronoun subjects is common in African English” as in (5.2.21) and (5.2.22) below, in which *she* and *he* are the co-referential pronouns of *my daughter* and *my father* respectively.

(5.2.21) **My daughter** she is attending that school.

(5.2.22) **My father** he is very tall. (McArthur 2002: 269)

In addition, Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 81) distinguish the use of left dislocation in English L1 and English L2 varieties when they assert that in New Englishes, its usage is extended to “a wider range of grammatical and formal contexts, and with a possibly higher frequency of occurrence”. Reports of frequent usage of left dislocation in English L2 varieties on the African continent include, Bamgbose (1982: 155) and (Alo and Mesthrie 2008:335) for Nigerian English, Huber and Dako (2008: 376) for Ghanaian English, Mbangwana (2008: 425) for Cameroonian English, Schmied (2008: 455-6) for East African English, Gough (1996: 61), De Klerk (2006: 140) and Mesthrie (2008b: 498) for Black South African English.

Apart from just mentioning the frequent use of left dislocation in English L2 varieties in Africa, some scholars have tried to find explanations for the common usage of this construction. For instance, Bokamba (1982: 83) observes that “a related deviation is the interposing of an independent subject pronoun between a subject noun and its verb. Such a phenomenon is often observed in the English speech of Bantu language speakers.” He further argues that “the most probable source of this deviation is the redundancy found in the subject-verb agreement system of Bantu languages, whereby a subject prefix obligatorily occurs with a finite verb whether or not the subject noun surfaces” (p. 83). The influence of local African languages is also noted by Huber and Dako (2008: 377) when they remark that “spoken Ghanaian English is also marked by frequent presence of topicalisation, most of which are borrowed from local Ghanaian languages”. In the same vein, Gough (1996) emphasises the cross linguistic interference that involves both African languages and English learnt in school when he points out that;

the explanation for the use of left dislocation in BSE appears to be both through native – language transfer (which explains their specific African quality) as well as universal features relating to language learning (which explains their similarities with other new Englishes generally) rather than with either of these exclusively (Gough 1996: 61).

The use of left dislocation in formal contexts is also observed in English L2 varieties on the African continent. Such formal contexts include interview setting as the extract from the speech of a black South African university undergraduate in (5.2.23) below;

(5.2.23) Q: You say Christianity is going strong amongst Black South Africans, and people are modifying it more and more?

A: I think people are modifying more and more especially when it comes to Africans. Eh, the largest part of South African population okay its Africans, but now we find Christian denominations like, for instance, LCC of which most, I mean, scholars as such, those who are doing religion or anthropology, sociology, historians, they call it “African Independent Churches”. So I don’t call them.... Or most of African students, we don’t call them “African Independent Churches”, we say “African Indigenous.... or Indigenous African Churches”. We think that that is the right word to use. So **people**, they are modifying according to their understanding of of of religion. I mean somebody who is White, Christianity means something different to what it means to me (Mesthrie 1997: 126).

Like in English L1 and English L2 varieties in the Pacific and Asia, English L2 varieties in African employ left dislocation with subject, object, locative, and genitives. In addition, Bokamba (1982: 83) observes that African English is also characterised by “the occurrence of resumptive anaphoric pronouns in non-subject relativisation.” He further argues that “relative clauses with resumptive pronouns are a typological characteristic of many African languages”, hence, “one finds them in West African and East African English as well” (Bokamba 1982: 84). This is illustrated, for instance, by Mbangwana (2008) in (5.2.24), (5.2.25) and (5.2.26) where resumptive pronouns in Cameroonian English are used.

(5.2.24) There are **some students** who I am teaching them to write.

‘There are some students whom I am teaching to write’

(5.2.25) **What** men can do, women can do, women can do it better.

‘What men can do, women can do better’

(5.2.26) **The area** where we find the capital there today is Yaounde

‘The area where we find the capital is Yaounde’. (Mbangwana 2008: 425)

Research on left dislocation in World Englishes has revealed the use of this syntactic construction in both English L1 and English L2 varieties. Whereas in the L1 varieties, its usage is mainly reported in informal and colloquial spoken contexts, studies of this

phenomenon in English L2 varieties have exhibited variation in its usage. These include, for instance, more frequent usage which is not limited to the informal and colloquial language contexts but also extended to formal contexts (cf. Mesthrie 1997: 126). The occurrence of left dislocation structure in the African languages has been mentioned as one of the possible influence of left dislocation structure in African varieties of English. The next section discusses cases of left dislocation in the three main Ugandan local languages in order to ascertain the extent to which the use of this construction in Ugandan English is a result of substrate influence.

5.3 Research on left dislocation in Ugandan indigenous languages

An overview of left dislocation in world Englishes in section 5.2 has mentioned some of the similarities and differences in the use of this syntactic construction in both English L1 and English L2 varieties. Most notable are the reasons given to explain the frequent use of left dislocation in English L2 varieties not only in informal but also in formal contexts. For instance, Bokamba (1982: 83) pointed out that this phenomenon is common in the subject-verb agreement of Bantu languages in Africa, whereby “a subject prefix obligatorily occurs with a finite verb whether or not the subject noun surfaces”. This section, aims at showing how left dislocation is expressed in the three Ugandan indigenous languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango. It examines left dislocation in these three languages in respect to the noun phrase function and discourse function. Each sentence in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango is followed by a glossing⁷ to enable the reader who is unfamiliar with the syntax of these languages to have a better understanding of their structure.

5.3.1 Left dislocation in Luganda

⁷ The abbreviations used in the glossing in the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango sentences are provided here: APPL => Applicative affix, CONJ => Conjunction, FUT => Future, GEN => Genitive, PST = Past, IMPER => Imperative, IV=> Initial vowel, LOC => Locative, NCP => Noun class prefix, NCP.PL => Noun class prefix plural, NCP.SG => Noun class prefix singular, NEG => Negative, PASS => Passive, PERF => Perfect, PREP => Preposition, Prep.suf => Prepositional suffix, PRES => Present tense, PST => Past tense marker, PROG = Progressive, POSS = Possessive, REL = Relative pronoun, DET = Determiner, PRS = Present, IPP = Independent personal pronoun, 1PL.OVI => First person plural object-verb-infix, 1PL.SVP => First person plural subject-verb-prefix, 1SG.SVP => First person singular subject-verb-prefix, 1PL.SVS = First person plural subject-verb-suffix, 1SG.IPP = First person singular independent personal pronoun; 1SG.OVS = First person singular object-verb-suffix, 1PL.IPP = First person plural independent personal pronoun; 1SG.OVI = First person singular object-verb-infix, 2SG.IPP = Second person singular independent personal pronoun; 2SG.SVP = Second person singular subject-verb-prefix, 2SG.OVS = Second person singular object-verb-suffix, 2PL.IOVS = Second person plural indirect object-verb-suffix, 3PL.OVS = Third person plural object-verb-suffix, 3PL.OVI => Third person plural object-verb-infix, 3PL.SVP => Third person plural subject-verb-prefix, 3SG.OVI => Third person singular object-verb-infix, 3SG.SVP => Third person singular subject-verb-prefix, 3SG.OVS = Third person singular object-verb-suffix, 3SG.REL => Third person singular relative, 3SG.IPP = Third person singular independent personal pronoun, 3SG.IOVI = Third person singular indirect object-verb-infix

Luganda is an agglutinative language which builds its words on stems with prefixes, infixes, and suffixes. Unlike English where the subject and object of a verb are separate words, in Luganda, the subject, object, and indirect object normally have concord subject-verb-prefix, object-verb-infix, and indirect-verb-infix that are added to the verb-stem, thus, allowing left dislocation construction as examples in sections (5.3.1.1, 5.3.1.2, and 5.3.1.3) illustrate. In Luganda, the noun plays a prominent role in the sentence in that all words related to it must be brought into agreement with it using concord prefixes (Ashton et al. (1954: 23). The use of a noun together with a concord prefix on a verb results in a left dislocation construction in this language.

As indicated in various examples in section 5.1 and 5.2, both subject and object left dislocation can be clearly identified by looking at the copied pronouns which are co-referential to the fronted noun phrases. According to Chesswas (1967: 1), Luganda has three forms of pronouns; (i) a form that stands on its own, (ii) a form that is used as a subject to a verb, (iii) a form that is used as an object. In this study, the self-standing pronouns are referred to as *independent personal pronouns* (IPP). The form that is used as a subject to a verb is referred to as *subject-verb-prefix* (SVP). The form that is used as an object to the verb is called the *object-verb-infix* (OVI).

5.3.1.1 Subject left dislocation in Luganda

Luganda has subject left dislocation which serve two functions, that is, the *obligatory subject left dislocation* and the *emphatic subject left dislocation*. The obligatory subject left dislocation is used when the subject of the sentence is a noun other than a pronoun (subject-verb-prefix). This noun must have a subject-verb-prefix attached to the verb-stem for that sentence to be grammatically correct. The deletion or omission of the subject-verb-prefix produces an ungrammatical sentence. The subject-verb-prefix must also agree with the subject noun phrase in number and class⁸. The use of the obligatory subject left dislocation in the Luganda language is exemplified in (5.3.1) below.

⁸ Noun classes and their concord prefixes in Luganda (Ashton et al. 1954: 24)

Class Prefixes	Concord prefixes	Concord Prefixes	Concord Prefixes
Roots and Stems used as Nouns	Roots and Stems used as Adjectives	Numerals	Pronominal Roots, Verbs and Particles -A, -E, -O

(5.3.1) Abantu balikisoma

A-ba-ntu **ba-li-ki-soma**

IV-NCP.PL-person 3PL.SVP-FUT-3SG.OVI-read

‘**The people they** will it read’

(The people will read it) (Kirwan and Gore 1951: 4)

In example (5.3.1), the subject-verb-prefix *ba-* (they) is co-referential to the noun subject *abantu* (people), thus, illustrating an obligatory subject left dislocation in the Luganda language. If the subject-verb-prefix *ba-* (they) is deleted or omitted, the sentence produced would be ungrammatical, as illustrated in (5.3.2). Whereas in the English language, the omission of a copy pronoun *they* produces a grammatical sentence, this is not the case in the Luganda language as the ungrammatical sentence in (5.3.2) illustrates. This therefore confirms the obligatory function of left dislocation in Luganda when the subject of the sentence is a noun other than a pronoun.

(5.3.2) *Abantu likisoma

***A-ba-ntu** li-ki-soma

IV-NCP.PL-person FUT-3SG.OVI-read

Sing-	Plur.	Sing-	Plur.	Sing-	Plur.	Sing-	Plur.
Omuntu (Man)	Abantu	Mu-	ba-	o-	ba-	o-	ba-
Omuti (tree)	emiti	Mu-	mi-	gu-	e-	gu-	gi-
Ekintu (thing)	ebintu	Ki-	bi-	ki-	bi-	ki-	bi-
Ente (cow)	ente	n-	n-	e-		e-, gi-	zi-
Olunaku (day)	ennaku	lu-	en-	lu-		lu-	zi-
Erinnya (name)	amannya	li-	ma-	li-	a-	li-	ga-
Akaana (small child)	obwaana	ka-	bu-	ka-	bu-	ka-	bu-
Oguntu (giant)	agantu	gu-	ga-	gu-	ga-	gu-	ga-
Okutu (ear)	amatu	ku-	ma-	ku-	a-	ku-	ga-
Otuzzi (drop of water)		tu-		tu		tu-	
Obuntu (humanity)		bu-				bu-	
Okulima (cultivate)		ku-				ku-	

‘The people will it read’

The obligatory subject left dislocation can also be used with an independent personal pronoun if the subject noun must be emphasised. In this case, the independent personal pronoun is put before the subject noun as in example (5.3.3).

(5.3.3) Bo abantu balikisoma

Bo **a-ba-ntu** **ba-li-ki-soma**
 IPP IV-NCP.PL-person 3PL.SVP-FUT-3SG.OVI-read
 ‘**For them the people they** will it read’

The emphatic subject left dislocation can also be used with a subject pronoun (subject-verb-prefix) of the sentence. This involves an independent personal pronoun put before the subject pronoun. This type of left dislocation which involves a pronoun as subject of the sentence is optional and is used only “if it is wished to emphasise the subject” (Chesswas 1967: 2). Examples (5.3.4) and (5.3.5) from Chesswas (p. 2) show the use independent personal pronouns to emphasise the subjects on both sentences.

(5.3.4) Nze nkola

Nze **n-kola**
 1SG.IPP 1SG.SVP-PRS-do
 ‘**I (me) I** do’
 (I do)

(5.3.5) Ggwe okola

Ggwe **o-kola**
 2SG.IPP 2SG.SVP-PRS-do
 ‘**You you** do’
 (You do)

In (5.3.4) and (5.3.5), the subject-verb-prefixes *n-* (I) and *o-* (you) are co-referential to the independent personal pronouns *nze* (I or me) and *ggwe* (you) respectively. Since *n-* and *o-* are both subject-verb-prefixes, the type of dislocation is therefore a subject left dislocation.

5.3.1.2 Object left dislocation in Luganda

Apart from the subject left dislocation, there is also an object left dislocation in the Luganda language. The object left dislocation construction involves both topicalisation and pronominalisation processes. For instance, Walusimbi (1996: 20) states that in Luganda, topicalisation obligatorily requires pronominalisation, that is, object agreement. This is also

remarked by Pak (2007: 5), who observes that, in Luganda “in left dislocation, there is an obligatory object prefix between tense and the verb root”. Examples (5.3.6) and (5.3.7) illustrate how topicalisation of the object obligatorily requires pronominalisation, thus leading to an object left dislocation construction. Sentence (5.3.6) has no left dislocation because the subject is not a noun but a pronoun –in Luganda, marked by the subject-verb-prefix *tw-* (we). Both the direct and indirect objects are in their normal positions in this sentence. However, when the direct object is topicalised as indicated in (5.3.7), it must obligatorily have a concord object-verb-infix. Topicalising an object in the Luganda language leads to object left dislocation as in (5.3.7) whereby the object-verb-infix *-bi-* (them) which stands between the past tense marker *-a-* and the verb root *-wa* (give) is co-referential to the topicalised object noun phrase *ebimuli* (flowers).

(5.3.6) Twawa omusomesa ebimuli

Tw-a-wa omusomesa **ebimuli**

1PL.SVP-PST-give the teacher flowers

‘We give the teacher flowers’

(We gave the flowers to the teacher)

(5.3.7) Ebimuli twabiwa omusomesa

Ebimuli tw-a-**bi**-wa omusomesa

Flowers 1PL.SVP-PST-3PL.OVI-give teacher

‘**Flowers** we gave them to the teacher’

The use of object left dislocation in Luganda is to make emphasis of the verbal predicate. This can be illustrated in example (5.3.8) and (5.3.9) below.

(5.3.8) Ekitabo nakigula

E-ki-tabo n-a-**ki**-gula

IV-NCP.SG-book 1SG.SVP-PST-3SG.OVI-buy

‘**The book** I it bought’

(I bought the book)

(5.3.9) Ebitabo abantu balibisoma

E-bi-tabo **a-ba-ntu** **ba-li-bi-soma**

IV-NCP.PL-book IV-NCP.PL-person 3PL.SVP-FUT-3SG.OVI-read

‘**The books the people** they will it read’

(As for the book, people will read)

Example (5.3.8) reveals object left dislocation in which the object-verb-infix *-ki-* (it) is co-referential to the topicalised noun *ekitabo* (book). In (5.3.9) we have both subject and object left dislocation in the same sentence. On the one hand, the subject-verb-prefix *ba-* (they) is co-referential to the noun *abantu* (people), on the other hand, the object-verb-infix *-bi-* is co-referential to the noun *ebitabo* (books).

Hyman and Katamba (2010: 42) also show how object left dislocation is constructed in Luganda in which the object-verb-infix is obligatorily positioned between the tense marker and the verb-stem. This is illustrated in (5.3.10) in which the object-verb-infix *-mu-* (him) which is co-referential to the proper noun *Mulondo*, stands between the past tense marker *-a-* and the verb stem *-laba* (see). Again, example (5.3.10) shows subject left dislocation in which the subject-verb-prefix *ba-* (they) is co-referential to the noun phrase *abalimi* (farmers).

(5.3.10) Abalimi Mulondo amangwaago baamulaba

A-ba-limi **Mulondo** amangwaago **ba-a-mu-laba**

IV-NCP.PL-farmer Mulondo suddenly 3PL.SVP-PST-3SG.OVI-see

‘The farmers Mulondo suddenly they him saw’

(Suddenly, the farmers saw Mulondo). (Hyman and Katamba 2010: 42)

5.3.1.3 Indirect object left dislocation in Luganda

In addition to the subject and object left dislocation discussed above Luganda also has indirect object left dislocation (Ssekiryango 2006: 71). Such a construction is exemplified in (5.3.11) below.

(5.3.11) Taata abaana ssente azibawadde

Taata **abaana** **ssente** **a-zi-ba-wa-dde**

Father the children money 3SG.SVP-3SG.OVI-3SG.IOVI-give-PRF

‘Father the children money he it them give’

(The father has given money to the children)

Example (5.3.11) indicates the three types of left dislocation that can be found in the Luganda language, that is, subject, object and indirect object left dislocations. The subject left dislocation is represented by the subject-verb-prefix *a-* (he) which is co-referential to the noun phrase *taata* (father). The object left dislocation is represented by the object-verb-infix *-zi-* (it), which is co-referential with the noun phrase *ssente* (money). The indirect object left dislocation is marked by the indirect object-verb-infix *-ba-* (them), which is co-referential with the noun phrase *abaana* (children). Ssekiryango (2006: 70) remarks that in Luganda, “the NP that

occupies the position closest to the verb has to be the Beneficiary or the Recipient”. This criterion helps to identify which object-verb-infix concords with which topicalised object in case the two objects belong to the same noun class and number. When the topicalised noun phrases *abaana* and *ssente* (children and money respectively) are deleted and the subject noun *taata* (father) pronominalised, we remain with an oneword sentence which has a subject, a verb, an object and an indirect object as in (5.3.12) below. Like the object left dislocation the use of indirect object left dislocation is to emphasise the topicalised indirect object.

(5.3.12) Azibawadde

A-zi-ba-wa-dde

3SG.SVP-3Pl.OVI-3PL.IOVI-give-PRF

‘She/he them them give’

(She/he has given them to them)

The discussion of left dislocation in the Luganda languages has shown the different types of left dislocation according to noun phrase function and also explained their discourse function. The use of the obligatory subject left dislocation in case the subject of the sentence is a noun is a regular syntactic construction in Luganda. This leads me to the second part to review left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga.

5.3.2 Left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga

This section discusses subject and object left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga.

5.3.2.1 Subject left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga

Like Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga is agglutinative, in that it builds its words by adding prefixes and suffixes to the stems of their verbs. For instance, Morris and Kirwan (1957: xviii) note that “the subject and object of a verb, its tense and sometimes adjective and adverb, all separate words in English, can be affixed to the verb-stem in the same way, and the subject and object prefixes vary according to their class of the noun they represent”. Left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga is observed by Taylor (1985: 41) when he writes that in Runyankore-Rukiga, “since the personal pronoun prefix is normally present in the first instance where there is a noun subject, and after where there is a noun object (always being present where object precedes verb), it is not surprising that this prefix recurs with every verbal occurrence”. Examples (5.3.13) and (5.3.14) show obligatory subject left dislocation in which the subject-verb-prefix *a-* (he) is co-referential to both a common noun *omushaija* ‘man’ and a proper noun *Mugasho*.

(5.3.13) Omushaija anaaba

O-mu-shaija a-naaba

IV-NCP.SG-man 3SG.SVP-wash

‘**The man** he washes’

(The man washes)

(5.3.14) Mugasho agyenda

Mugasho a-gyenda

Mugasho 3SG.SVP-leave

‘**Mugasho** he is leaving’

(Mugasho is leaving).

Runyankole-Rukiga also has subject left dislocation intended to emphasise the subject. This appears when the subject is a pronoun as in example (5.3.15) in which the independent personal pronoun *uwe* (he or for him) is used to emphasize the subject-verb-prefix *ya-* (he). The use of subject left dislocation to mark emphasis is observed by Morris and Kirwan (1957: 128) when they remark that Runyankole-Rukiga has independent personal pronouns which are used “to emphasise either the subject or object of the sentence.”

(5.3.15) Uwe yaakikora

Uwe ya-a-ki-kora

3SG.IPP 3SG.SVP-PST-3SG.OVI-do

‘**He** he did it

(He did it)

5.3.2.2 Object left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga

As Morris and Kirwan (1957) have indicated above, Runyankole-Rukiga also allows left dislocation with noun phrase functions such as object and possessive. Such types of left dislocation serve to emphasise the object of the sentence as examples (5.3.16), (5.3.17) and (5.3.18) reveal.

(5.3.16) Itwe tuli baserukale b’Omukama

Itwe tu-li ba-serukale b’o Mukama

1PL.IPP 1PL.SVP-be NCP.PL-guards NCP.POSS-king

‘**We** we are **the guards of** the king’

(We are the guards of the king)

(5.3.17) Nyowe otambuza

Nyowe o-ta-**m**-buuza
 1SG.IPP 2SG.SVP-NEG-1SG.OVI-greet
 ‘**I (me)** you don’t **me** greet’
 (You don’t greet me)

(5.3.18) Emperie yagireeta

Emperie y-a-**gi**-reeta
 Goat 3SG.SVP-PST-3SG.OVI-bring
 ‘**The goat** he **it** brought’
 (He brought the goat)

In example (5.3.16), we have a possessive left dislocation marked by *b’o-* (of) that co-refers to the noun phrase *baserukale* (guards). In (5.3.17) and (5.3.18), we have an object left dislocation in which the object-verb-infix *-m-* (me) and *-gi-* (it) are co-referential to the independent personal pronoun *nyowe* (I or me) and noun phrase *emperie* (goat) respectively.

Runyankole-Rukiga like Luganda has obligatory subject left dislocation. Other types of left dislocation such as object and possessive are intended to emphasize the object or subject of the sentence. Emphatic subject dislocation is also used when the subject of the sentence is a pronoun rather than a noun. The next section discusses left dislocation in Acholi-Lango.

5.3.3 Left dislocation in Acholi-Lango

Acholi-Lango is agglutinative languages with subject prefixes and object suffixes (Grannis 1970: 50). These two languages have the same independent personal pronouns which are referred to by Crazzolara (1955: 65) as *absolute personal pronouns*. Like in the discussion of left dislocation in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga above, the use of the independent personal pronouns illustrates how left dislocation is used in Acholi-Lango.

5.3.3.1 Subject left dislocation in Acholi-Lango

Like in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga, Acholi-Lango also has the obligatory subject left dislocation construction in which the subject noun is followed by a subject-verb-prefix. For instance, Crazzolara (1955: 67) remarks that in Acholi, “prefixes are indispensable for the conjugation of the verb. They keep their place even after the absolute pronoun”. However, he notes that “the third person prefix and suffix is omitted in the present tense. The prefix *e* of 3rd person singular is added in all tenses in indirect speech when it represents the same subject as that of the introductory main clause. After a noun subject *o-* has to be added in the past tense”. Apart from the obligatory subject left dislocation, Noonan (1992: 151) observes that Lango has

“a special construction for topicalising noun subjects.” Furthermore, he remarks that “in this construction, the pronoun *en* (he, she, it) or *gin* (they) is placed in sentence initial position followed by the noun subject”. Such a construction is similar to what we have referred to as emphatic subject left dislocation with a noun other than a pronoun as subject of the sentence in both Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga. Examples (5.3.19) and (5.3.20) from Noonan (1992) illustrate how the obligatory subject left dislocation is used to emphasise the subject by putting the independent personal pronoun *gin* (they) and *en* (he) before the common noun *rwodi* (kings) and the proper noun *Okello* respectively. The obligatory subject left dislocation is presented by the subject-verb-prefix *te-* (they) in (5.3.19) and *o-* (he) in (5.3.20) which co-refer to *rwodi* and *Okello* respectively. The use of personal pronoun to add emphasis in Acholi is also observed by Malandra (1955: 30) when he states that “in a sentence having already the noun subject, the personal pronoun may be accordingly added for emphasis”.

(5.3.19) *Gin rwodi tetek*

Gin rwodi te-tek
3PL.IPP kings 3PL.SVP-strong
‘**They kings they** are strong’
(Kings are strong/powerful)

(5.3.20) *En Okello odok*

En Okello o-dok
3SG.IPP Okello 3SG.SVP-goback-PERF
‘**He Okello he** went back’
(Okello went back). (Noonan 1992: 151)

Besides the obligatory subject left dislocation, Crazzolara (1955: 65) observes that in Acholi, the independent personal pronoun can be used to indicate left dislocation as a means to emphasise the personal pronoun. He remarks that “normally the short pronoun prefixed to a verb is sufficient to show the subject, if however, the subject has to be stressed the absolute form is added in front of the verb”. Example (5.3.21) demonstrates how the independent personal pronoun *An* (I) is used to emphasise the subject-verb-prefix *a-* (I).

(5.3.21) *An akugo bur*

An a-kugo bur
1SG.IPP 1SG.SVP-dig-PERF hole
‘**I I** dug a hole’
(I dug a hole)

Likewise, Carollo (1991: 20) observes the use of subject left dislocation in Lango which involves the independent personal pronouns and subject verb prefixes as in (5.3.22) and (5.3.23).

(5.3.22) *In ipwonyowa*

In **i**-pwonyo-wa
 2SG.IPP 2SG.SVP-teach-PST-1PL.OVS
 ‘**You you** taught us’
 (You taught us)

(5.3.23) *En omotogi*

En **o**-moto-gi
 3SG.IPP 3SG.SVP-greet-PST-3PL.OVS
 ‘**He he** greeted them’
 (He greeted them)

In (5.3.22), the subject-verb-prefix *i-* (you) is co-referential with the independent personal pronoun *In* (you). In (5.3.23), the subject left dislocation is marked by the subject-verb-prefix *o-* which is co-referential to the independent personal pronoun *en* (he).

5.3.3.2 Object left dislocation in Acholi-Lango

Acholi-Lango has left dislocation construction with direct object, indirect object and possessive as noun phrase function. Again like in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga, object, indirect object and possessive left dislocation involve both topicalisation and pronominalisation processes. The function of these types of dislocation is to emphasise the topicalised object. For instance, Noonan (1992) observes that in Lango;

A topicalised NP is always interpreted as definitive or generic. Further, it is interpreted as the topic or orientation of the sentence, a role otherwise played by the subject [...] only one NP per sentence can be topicalised. This NP can be a direct object or indirect object, an object of a preposition, an associative NP or even an NP in a subordinate clause. [...] when the topicalised NP is an object of a preposition, a benefactive or an associative NP, a pronominal copy must be left in the original position. (Noonan 1992: 150)

In example (5.3.24), we have an object left dislocation in which the object *lion* is topicalised with a co-referential pronoun *it* occupying its position in the sentence. In example (5.3.25), we have possessive left dislocation *his knife* co-referring to the topicalised object *Okello*. In

(5.3.26) we have indirect object left dislocation in which the topicalised pronoun *you* co-refers to the pronoun *you* in the sentence. Lastly, in (5.3.27), we have object left dislocation whereby the topicalised pronoun *I/me* co-refers to the pronoun *me* in the sentence.

(5.3.24) Abwor rwot tamo ni eneko

Abwor rwot ta-mo ni e-nek-o

Lion king 3SG.SVP-think-hab COMP 3SG.SVP-kill-PERF-3SG.OVS

(**The lion** the king he thinks that he has killed it). (Noonan 1992: 150)

(5.3.25) Okello oneno palaanere

Okello o-neno palaan-ere

Okello 1SG.SVP-see-PERF knife-3SG.Ass

(**Okello**, I saw his knife). (Noonan 1992: 150)

(5.3.26) Yin dako omiyi dyel

Yin dako o-mi-yi dyel

2SG.IPP woman 3SG.SVP-give-PERF-2SG.OVS goat

‘**You** the woman she has given you a goat’. (Noonan 1992: 151)

(5.3.27) An loca omena

An loca o-mena

1SG.IPP man 3SG.SVP-see-PERF-1SG.OVS

‘**I/me** man he has seen me’. (Noonan 1992: 165)

However, Noonan (1992: 151) remarks that when the topicalised noun phrase is a human or non-human third person direct object or indirect object, no pronominal copy is left in its position in the sentence. This is demonstrated in examples (5.3.28) and (5.3.29) below.

(5.3.28) Loca kec anekko tutwal

Loca kec an-ekko tutwal

Man hunger 3SG.SVP-kill-PROG very + much

‘**The man** hunger it is killing very much’

(The man is very hungry) (Noonan 1992: 151)

(5.3.29) Apwo atin oneno

Apwo atin o-neno

Hare child 3SG.SVP-see-PERF

‘The hare the child he has seen’

(The hare was seen by the child). (Noonan 1992: 151)

English L1 varieties. Cross-linguistic interference from indigenous languages was mentioned as the main reason explaining the frequent occurrence of left dislocation in these varieties. For example, it was argued that speakers of English as a second language tend to transfer the grammar of their mother tongue to English. This can therefore explain variation in grammatical constructions used both in English L1 and L2 varieties. Section 5.3 illustrated the use of left dislocation in three indigenous Ugandan languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango. This section revealed how these agglutinative Bantu and Nilotic languages use left dislocation constructions according to noun phrase and discourse function.

The hypothesis guiding this analysis is therefore that native speakers of these indigenous Ugandan languages transfer left dislocation constructions to Ugandan English, which they speak as a second language. The analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English data therefore explores the extent to which English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1 use left dislocation according to noun phrase and discourse function. In addition, it reveals the use of left dislocation among English speakers with these three indigenous Ugandan languages as L1 in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverbs. Furthermore, it compares the use of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1. Lastly, it compares the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other English varieties.

Left dislocation is described as a syntactic construction, whereby, “a noun phrase is positioned initially and a reinforcing pronoun stands proxy for it in the relevant position in the sentence” (Quirk et al. 1985:1310). In the analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English, this study employs the term *preface* to refer to the noun phrase preceding the main clause and *co-referential pronoun* to the reinforcing pronoun that stands proxy for the preface in the relevant position in the main clause as described by Biber et al. (2010). As the analysis reveals, the prefaces involve a noun phrase such as *these people* as in example (5.4.1) or a prepositional phrase like *for me* or *for us* as in examples (5.4.2) and (6.4.3) below. The co-referential pronouns to the preface in examples (5.4.1), (5.4.2), and (5.4.3) are *they*, *we* and *I* respectively. In all the examples involving left dislocation usage presented in the analysis the prefaces are *italicised* and co-referential pronouns are underlined.

(5.4.1) *These people* they get things from Kampala.

(5.4.2) *For us* we had plans for you.

(5.4.3) *For me* I take leadership as a service.

However, cases involving repeated pronouns as in examples (5.4.4) and (5.4.5) have not been analysed as left dislocation constructions. I have taken such cases to be instances of hesitation, as it is usually the case in spoken discourse for a speaker to repeat words in order to find the right words to use in a sentence.

(5.4.4) Yes **I I I** can't I can't tell fact but I can **I I** make an assumption.

(5.4.5) So when they came **they they** also had to train those natives they found and good enough **they they** trained those in Buganda.

This section is divided into five sub-sections. Sub-sections one, two and three analyse left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1 respectively. Sub-section four compares how left dislocation is employed by English speakers with these three indigenous languages as L1. Lastly, sub-section five compares the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other English varieties.

5.4.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Unlike English where the subject and object of a verb are separate words, in Luganda, the subject, direct object, and indirect object normally have concord *subject-verb-prefix*, *direct object-verb-infix*, and *indirect object-verb-infix* that are added to the *verb-stem*, thus, allowing left dislocation construction. The prominent role of the noun in a sentence in Luganda discussed in section 5.3.1 revealed how the different types of left dislocation are constructed according to the noun phrase function, for instance, subject and object left dislocation types. These types of left dislocation according to noun phrase function are also related to the discourse function of left dislocation. For instance, the subject left dislocation can have both an obligatory and an emphatic discourse function. Whereas the obligatory subject left dislocation is employed in instances where the subject of the sentence is a noun, the emphatic subject left dislocation is used when the subject of the sentence is a pronoun. The emphatic use of left dislocation construction is also noted in direct object and indirect object left dislocations which both involve topicalisation and pronominalisation processes. The analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1 therefore looks at the use of left dislocation in regard to noun phrase function and discourse function. Additionally, it discusses left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1 in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb.

5.4.1.1 Analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English among Luganda L1 speakers according to noun phrase function

Table 5.4.1 presents the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among seven Luganda L1 speakers of English. Apart from speaker 1 who never used any form of left dislocation, the other six speakers all used any form of left dislocation construction. I would like to note here that speaker 1 (84 years) was educated and had contact with native speakers of British English. The other six speakers (aged between 19 to 29 years) have been educated by Ugandans who use English as a second language. Subject left dislocation was the most frequently used type of noun phrase function among all the six speakers. For instance, speaker 6 used it in 100 percent of all cases, the highest frequency. The lowest frequency of subject left dislocation was with speaker 2 with 61.5 percent. In total, the frequency of subject left dislocation among seven Luganda L1 speakers is higher than that of object and oblique left dislocation, that is, 82.2 percent. The Luganda L1 speakers further show frequent use of left dislocation construction in general. For instance, 5.2 left dislocation constructions per 1000 words used among seven Luganda speakers is a clear mark of the frequent use of left dislocation construction in Ugandan English. This frequency appears to show the extent to which the Luganda language influences the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English.

The following examples (5.4.6), (5.4.7), (5.4.8), (5.4.9), (5.4.10), and (5.4.11), show the use of subject left dislocation with speakers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 respectively. These examples portray a construction of subject left dislocation similar to that used in subject left dislocation construction in the Luganda language discussed in section 5.3.1.1. The preface; *these people, these other people, we staff members, we the Baganda, the ladies, and those business men/those business people* in examples (5.4.6), (5.4.7), (5.4.8), (5.4.9), (5.4.10), and (5.4.11) have co-referential pronouns *they, they, we, we, they, and they* respectively, which show the structure of *subject-verb-prefixes* to the *subject noun phrases* in the Luganda language. These examples therefore illustrate the possible transfer of left dislocation construction in Ugandan English from Luganda among English speakers with Luganda as L1.

(5.4.6) Then also **these people** they get things from Kampala.

(5.4.7) And then **these other people** they would speak to them in English as a way of communication but then they would reply in Luganda.

(5.4.8) But **we staff members** we are above the law.

(5.4.9) But **we the Baganda** we are lazy to learn their languages.

(5.4.10) So the money is collected all over many people even on the side of the man these days **the ladies** they can contribute money for the introduction ceremony.

(5.4.11) **Those business men those business people** they make sure that they learn more more

languages.

Table 5.4.1: The percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among seven English speakers with Luganda as L1

Noun phrase LD function	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
Subject	0	61.5	94.1	90	85.7	100	94.7	82.2
Object	0	34.6	5.9	10	14.3	0	5.3	16.4
Oblique	0	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	1.3
Total	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
LD per 1000 words	0	8.1	3.1	6.3	10	6.7	6.6	5.2
Number of LD	0	52	17	30	7	8	38	152

In addition, table 5.4.1 also shows that speakers 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 used object left dislocation. Examples (5.4.12), (5.4.13), (5.4.14), (5.4.15) and (5.4.16) which reveal the use of object left dislocation among these speakers illustrate a similar syntactic construction represented in object left dislocation in the Luganda language. For instance, these examples show the topicalisation of the objects *Luganda*, *the head teachers*, *the youths*, *Runyankole*, and *that one* with their co-referential pronouns *it*, *them*, *them*, *it*, and *that* retaining their original position in the sentence. This is similar to what happens in the object left dislocation in Luganda, whereby the topicalisation of the object necessarily requires the pronominalisation of the object, that is, by inserting of an *object-infix* which agrees and corresponds with the topicalised or fronted object to the verb stem. The similarity in the structure of object left dislocation both in the Luganda language and Ugandan English spoken by English speakers with Luganda as L1 can therefore show the extent to which the grammar of Luganda influences the grammar of Ugandan English.

(5.4.12) From my experience, I would say like this, **Luganda**, for most businessmen you have to be knowing it.

(5.4.13) **The head teachers**, they tell them how to run their schools and institutions.

(5.4.14) **The youths I** hear them singing some of the some of the songs.

(5.4.15) **Runyankole**, in case if an example of Kinyamasika, I don't think that if I am to become a priest I will go to work in that place, so I don't think I need to learn it.

(5.4.16) So **that one** for me I don't see any problem with that.

The oblique left dislocation is also used by speaker 2, as example (5.4.17) below indicates. Like the object left dislocation which involves both the topicalisation and

pronominalisation processes in the Luganda language, the topicalised oblique *in Alukulum* has a corresponding oblique adverb of place *there*. This again, can further illustrate how the Luganda language accounts for cross-linguistic interference in the grammar of Ugandan English.

(5.4.17) **In Alukulum**, all the cultures in Uganda are there.

5.4.1.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda as L1 according to discourse function

Since it has been noted above that in Luganda, the types of left dislocation according to noun phrase functions are also related to their discourse functions, I now go ahead to analysis the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English among English speakers with Luganda as L1 according to discourse function. The discourse function of left dislocation to be analysed here therefore include; *obligatory subject left dislocation* (OSLD), *emphatic subject left dislocation* (ESLD), *emphatic object left dislocation* (EOLD) and *emphatic oblique left dislocation* (EOBLD).

Table 5.4.2 illustrates that the obligatory subject left dislocation is the most frequently used among the six speakers. For instance, the total frequency of obligatory subject left dislocation is 49.3 percent. In addition, four speakers used it with a frequency higher than 50 percent with the highest frequency recorded by speaker 5, that is, 71.5 percent. Examples (5.4.18), (5.4.19), (5.4.20), (5.4.21), (5.4.22) and (5.4.23) illustrate the use of obligatory subject left dislocation with speakers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 respectively. These examples illustrate how the six English speakers with Luganda as L1 add the co-referential pronouns; *they*, *it*, and *he* immediately after full subject noun phrases: *mathematics*, *biology*, *chemistry* and *physics*; *my parish*; *the Baganda*, *Runyoro*, *Rutoro and Luganda*; *Luganda*; and *a student*, a structure that is similar in the Luganda language, whereby the *subject-verb prefix* must obligatorily be added to the verb-stem for a sentence to be grammatically correct. The use of such syntactic construction can therefore be viewed as an influence of the grammar of their mother tongue, Luganda.

(5.4.18) **Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry and Physics** they are all compulsory subjects.

(5.4.19) **My parish** it had celebrated a 100 years.

(5.4.20) So ah **the Baganda** they have I think they have a neutral accent.

(5.4.21) But **Runyoro, Rutoro and Luganda** they are there are not much different according to me.

(5.4.22) We cannot attribute authority to our mother tongues like **Luganda** it can only work in

Uganda but beyond Uganda it cannot.

(5.4.23) But now you find that **a student** he studies from primary one up to senior six in universal education and afterwards someone goes to the university with that poor quality education.

Table 5.4.2: The percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function among seven English speakers with Luganda as L1

Discourse function of LD	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
OSLD	0	42.3	52.9	63.3	71.4	62.5	39.5	47.4
ESLD	0	19.2	41.2	36.7	14.3	37.5	55.3	34.9
EOLD	0	34.6	5.9	10	14.3	0	5.3	16.5
EOBLD	0	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	1.3
Total	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of LD	0	52	17	30	7	8	38	152

The emphatic subject left dislocation is also used with a frequency of 34.9 percent. Of the six speakers who used both the obligatory and the emphatic subject left dislocation, it is only speaker 7 who used emphatic subject left dislocation more than the obligatory subject left dislocation, that is, 55.3 percent. Examples (5.4.24), (5.4.25), (5.4.26), (5.4.27), (5.4.28) and (5.4.29) below reveal the use of the emphatic subject left dislocation with speakers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 respectively. The subject personal pronouns; *we*, *they*, and *I*, are emphasised by the prepositional phrases involving personal pronouns that correspond to the subject pronouns, that is, *for us*, *for them*, and *for me*. These examples represent the construction of emphatic subject left dislocation identical to that illustrated in the Luganda language in section 5.3.1.1, whereby an independent personal pronoun is put before the subject pronoun of the sentence. They therefore point to the possible influence of the Luganda grammar in the construction of emphatic subject left dislocation in Ugandan English.

(5.4.24) **For us** we understand what the word he has added there.

(5.4.25) So **for them** they are very reluctant to learn languages.

(5.4.26) But all the same whether I am elected by the staff or by the students **for me** I take leadership as a service.

(5.4.27) **For me** I think that is a title attributed to her but again if we come into marriage I am superior to her.

(5.4.28) Well **for me** I don't see that the population of Uganda is high it is not really high.

(5.4.29) For me even if I go and I don't know their language **for them** they have already learnt mine.

Like in the Luganda language, table 5.4.2 furthermore reveals that it is the obligatory and emphatic subject left dislocation discourse function that are frequently used among English speakers with Luganda as L1. This can therefore explain the possible mother tongue interference in the use of this syntactic construction in Ugandan English by English speakers with Luganda as L1.

The percentage of the emphatic object left dislocation and emphatic oblique left dislocation of 16.5 percent and 1.3 percent respectively corresponds to the object and oblique noun phrase left dislocation types in table 6.4.1. Examples (5.4.30), (5.4.31), (5.4.32) and (5.4.33) illustrate the use of emphatic object left dislocation with speakers 2 and 4 respectively.

(5.4.30) So **that word**, the first time I heard it, I thought that may be the man was joking.

(5.4.31) **Joseph Chameleon, that Mayanja**, with some songs, people love him so much.

(5.4.32) But in one way or the other, that is a call that culture is pulling us back and **that rigidity** still we need it also to shape our conduct.

(5.4.33) **Lugbara**, yeah I picked interest in it.

The use of left dislocation construction according to noun phrase type and discourse function above has explored the extent to which the grammar of Luganda can account for cross-linguistic interference in the grammar of Ugandan English. The next section analyses left dislocation construction in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1.

5.4.1.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverbs among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1

Table 5.4.3 illustrates the use of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb among seven English speakers with Luganda as L1. This table shows that pronoun *they* (*them*) was the most frequently used co-referential pronoun among the four speakers, that is speakers 3, 4, 5, and 7 with the frequencies; 70.6 percent, 33.3 percent, 42.9 percent and 44.7 percent respectively. In general, pronoun *they* also emerged as the most frequently used co-referential pronoun among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1 with 39.5 percent. However, speakers 2 and 6 used pronoun *it* more than the other pronouns with a frequency of 40.4 percent and 50 percent respectively. The Pronoun *it* is also the second most frequently

used co-referential pronoun among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1 accounting for 23.7 percent. Pronoun *I* is the third most frequently used accounting for 23 percent. The other pronouns represent frequencies below 10 percent. The following examples (5.4.34), (5.4.35), (5.4.36), (5.4.37), (5.4.38), (5.4.39) and (5.4.40) show the use of left dislocation in relation to the six pronouns and one adverb of place, that is, *I*, *we*, *you*, *they*, *he*, *it*, and *there* respectively.

(5.4.34) At home we Luganda but actually **for me** I would not support that children are taught in their mother tongues.

(5.4.35) But **for me** I can support English because **for us Ugandan** we don't have a national language.

(5.4.36) So we called him for a meeting that **you man** are you really a Muganda?

(5.4.37) So again I heard the government introduced the system of umh Thematic System that is where **children from nursery to primary four** they are taught in their mother tongues or languages.

(5.4.38) But **for him** he was saying 'daughter' ah I don't know whether that is to do with the accent or grammar.

(5.4.39) In Uganda I believe **Luganda** it is the most widely spoken and then apart from that then English.

(5.4.40) **In Alukulum**, all the cultures in Uganda are there.

Table 5.4.3: The percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns and adverb among the seven English speakers with Luganda as L1

Co-referential pronoun	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
I	0	13.5	11.8	20	28.6	37.5	39.5	23
we	0	1.9	5.9	23.3	14.3	0	2.6	7.2
You	0	3.8	0	3.3	0	0	2.6	2.6
They	0	32.7	70.6	33.3	42.9	12.5	44.7	39.5
He	0	3.8	0	3.3	0	0	2.6	2.6
She	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
It	0	40.4	11.8	16.7	14.3	50.0	7.9	23.7
There	0	3.8	0	0	0	0	0	1.3
Total	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

5.4.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

This section shows the extent to which the Runyankole-Rukiga language can account for cross-linguistic interference of left dislocation construction in Ugandan English, spoken by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. Section 5.3.2 revealed how Runyankole-Rukiga allows left dislocation construction involving both the subject and object noun phrase types. These two types of left dislocation also correspond to the discourse functions, that is, obligatory subject left dislocation, emphatic subject left dislocation, and emphatic object left dislocation. The first analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 looks at the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function. This is followed by the discussion of left dislocation according to discourse function. The analysis of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronoun then closes this section.

5.4.2.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 according to noun phrase function

Table 5.4.4 represents left dislocation construction according to noun phrase function among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 5.4.4: The percentage of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Noun phrase LD function	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
Subject	82.4	90	83.3	66.7	94.4	98	76.5	90.1
Object	17.6	10	16.7	33.3	5.6	2	23.5	9.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
LD per 1000 words	6.3	11	5.8	4.5	14.9	9.1	3	7.04
Number of LD	17	20	6	3	18	50	17	131

This table shows that the subject left dislocation is the frequently used noun phrase left dislocation type among all the seven speakers with frequencies above 50 percent. In total, the subject left dislocation accounted for 90.1 percent of left dislocation per noun phrase function. Of the seven speakers, it is speaker 6 who used it with the highest frequency, that is, 98 percent. The object left dislocation accounted for just 9.9 percent. Considering left dislocation usage per total number of sentences among the seven speakers, table 5.4.4 illustrates the frequent use of this syntactic feature among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 with 10.8 percent. This high frequency of left dislocation usage above 10 percent is a clear indication that the Runyankole-Rukiga language, to some extent, cross-linguistically

influences left dislocation construction in Ugandan English. This is further supported by the high frequency of left dislocation of 7.04 when one considers the use of left dislocation among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 per 1000 words used. The high frequency of left dislocation among Runyankole-Rukiga L1 speakers is a clear indication that these speakers to a greater extent transfer the structure of left dislocation used in their mother tongue in Ugandan English which they speak as a second language.

The following examples (5.4.41), (5.4.42), (5.4.43), (5.4.44), (5.4.45), (5.4.46) and (5.4.47) illustrate the use of subject left dislocation with speakers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 respectively. In these examples, the co-referential pronouns *they*, *it*, and *we* correspond to the prefaces *the parents*, *the pupils*, *the universal primary education*, *for them*, *Abwiru*, *for us the Bakiga*, and *the Banyankole*. The use of these co-referential pronouns show the same syntactic structure of subject left dislocation as in Runyankole-Rukiga discussed in section 5.3.2.1, in which the *subject-verb-prefix* which concords with the subject noun phrase are attached to the verb stem. The use of the subject left dislocation in Ugandan English among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 therefore indicates the extent to which the Runyankole-Rukiga cross-linguistically influences left dislocation in Ugandan English.

(5.4.41) Normally, **the parents** they have those meetings they do things locally.

(5.4.42) **The pupils** they are studying in boarding schools so time for sharing is very little or it is not there at all.

(5.4.43) **The universal primary education** it to some extent is good.

(5.4.44) They were so proud and now is that **for them** they still stick on power on kingship.

(5.4.45) You know that shows how **Abwiru** they don't want again that king from a very small clan, Abahima.

(5.4.46) Like **the Banyankole** they pronounce r r but like **for us the Bakiga** we don't pronounce that where it is l or what but say like for when you are saying Mbarara they put that thing.

(5.4.47) Because the way **the Banyankole** they speak their language.

Apart from the subject left dislocation, English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 also used left dislocation involving a topicalised object with a corresponding pronoun maintained in the position normally occupied by the object. The object left dislocation as examples (5.4.48), (5.4.49), (5.4.50), (5.4.51), (5.4.52), (5.4.53), and (5.4.54) used with speakers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 respectively, reveals the same structure of object left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga. In these examples, we see the topicalisation of the objects; *the local*

people, women emancipation, Runyoro-Rutoro, Luganda, me, Rukiga, and Baganda with their corresponding object pronouns; *them, it, and me*, being maintained in their normal positions in the sentences. This is similar to the object left dislocation in Runyankole-Rukiga which involves both the topicalisation and pronominalisation processes. This is therefore another indication to confirm the extent to which the indigenous Ugandan languages cross-linguistically influence the syntax of Ugandan English.

(5.4.48) **The local people** I interact with them.

(5.4.49) So **women emancipation** I see it growing up.

(5.4.50) **Runyoro-Rutoro, that one**, I cannot speak but I I I listen to it.

(5.4.51) **Luganda**, I do not understand it very well.

(5.4.52) **Me** what inspired me to join a seminary.

(5.4.53) They say ah **Rukiga**, we don't like that, **Rukiga** we don't need even to to know about it.

(5.4.54) But **Baganda** somehow you find them there.

5.4.2.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 according to discourse function

The subject and object types of left dislocation discussed in the above section 5.4.2.1 can also be viewed in respect to their discourse functions. For instance, the subject left dislocation involves both the obligatory and emphatic discourse functions. Whereas the obligatory subject left dislocation has a pronoun used after a noun subject, without which, the sentence would be ungrammatical in the Runyankole-Rukiga language, the emphatic subject dislocation is used in a sentence with a pronoun as the subject. Although a sentence with a pronoun as subject does not need a corresponding pronoun, however, in order to emphasis the subject, an independent pronoun is always used, which leads to left dislocation construction. In Runyankole-Rukiga, the use of obligatory subject left dislocation is more frequent than the emphatic subject left dislocation. As Taylor (1985:41) observed, the obligatory subject left dislocation requires a subject-verb-prefix, that is, a co-referential pronoun to both common and proper nouns. Table 5.4.5 shows that English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 use the obligatory subject left dislocation more often than the other types of left dislocation discourse functions, that is, the emphatic subject left dislocation and emphatic object left dislocation. The 60.6 percent total of obligatory subject left dislocation indicates that English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 most frequently used the obligatory subject left dislocation. This could therefore be another indication pointing at how Runyankole-Rukiga cross-linguistically influences left

dislocation construction in Ugandan English. The emphatic subject left dislocation is also used more frequently than the emphatic object left dislocation with a total frequency of 29.9 percent.

The following examples show the use of left dislocation according to discourse function among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga L1. For instance, whereas examples (5.4.55), (5.4.56), (5.4.57), and (5.4.58) illustrate the use of obligatory and emphatic subject left dislocation in the same sentence, examples (5.4.59), (5.4.60) and (5.4.61) show how the emphatic subject left dislocation is employed. In addition, examples (5.4.62) and (5.4.63) show the use of emphatic object left dislocation.

(5.4.55) So **the parents for them** they organise the occasion.

(5.4.56) Yes **the teachers umh some of them** they are reluctant.

(5.4.57) **The pupils themselves** they see education as if it is useless.

(5.4.58) So when they use this native language Luganda, **we people** we shall feel that it is our own language and we shall be patriotic on it.

(5.5.59) Eh even **for us** we say omuhandiishi.

(5.4.60) Eh I just **for me** I just liked the language.

(5.4.61) They just go there for two hours and say ah ah maama, **for me** I won't dig anymore.

(5.4.62) **Central Uganda** I see it as if it was as if it was near.

(5.4.63) **The local people** I have interactions with them because I am actually a curia president of the legionary.

Table 5.4.5: Left dislocation according to discourse function among the seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Discourse function of LD	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
OSLD	44.4	85	50.0	33.3	77.8	58.5	47.4	58.8
ESLD	38.9	5	33.3	33.3	16.7	39.6	31.6	31.3
EOLD	16.7	10	16.7	33.3	5.6	1.9	21.1	9.9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of LD	17	20	6	3	18	50	17	131

After analysing the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function and discourse function, I now come to the analysis of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

5.4.2.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Of all the seven co-referential pronouns that indicated left dislocation construction, pronoun *they (them)* registered the highest score of 54.2 percent. This is followed by pronoun *it* and *I (me)* with 19.1 percent and 14.5 percent respectively. The other four pronouns, that is, *we (us)*, *you*, *he (him)*, and *she (her)* were used with a frequency rate lower than 10 percent. The following examples (5.4.64), (5.4.65), (5.4.66), (5.4.67), (5.4.68), (5.4.69) and (5.4.70) illustrate the use of left dislocation with the seven co-referential pronouns, *I (me)*, *we (us)*, *you*, *they (them)*, *he (him)*, *she (her)* and *it* respectively.

(5.4.64) But it was nice staying in such environment and **for me** I focused basically on my studies.

(5.4.65) So the the they normally say when you hear them because **some of us** we have heard them.

(5.4.66) From there he changed my attitude and said **you man** you come you be diocesan.

(5.4.67) **The youths** they used some words to mean other things.

(5.4.68) But for Ankole, they didn't **the Omugabe or the king** there he stopped ceasing he is there but not recognised.

(5.4.69) Saying that **for her** she was favoured by the president.

(5.4.70) **This phenomenon** it has also grabbed the inte- the what, the minds of the older people.

Table 5.4.6: The percentage of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among seven English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Co-referential pronoun	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Total
I	23.5	5	33.3	0	11.1	13	23.5	14.5
we	5.9	0	0	0	0	8	0	3.8
You	5.9	0	0	0	5.6	0	11.8	3.1
They	52.9	60	16.7	66.7	55.6	60	41.2	54.2
He	0	0	0	0	11.1	4	0	3.1
She	0	5	0	0	0	4	0	2.3
It	11.8	30	50	33.3	16.7	12	23.5	19.1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

5.4.3 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

This section analyses the use of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Like the analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, this section also discusses the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function, discourse function and in relation to co-referential personal pronouns.

5.4.3.1 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 according to noun phrase function

The presentation of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 in table 5.4.7 indicates that subject left dislocation is the most frequently used type accounting for 93.3 percent. The object left dislocation accounts for 6.7 percent. No oblique left dislocation was found among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. It is therefore not indicated in the table.

Table 5.4.7: The percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase function among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Noun phrase LD function	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Sp.8	Sp.9	Total
Subject	100	100	92.9	90	100	57.1	100	100	86.7	93.3
Object	0	0	7.1	10	0	42.9	0	0	13.3	6.7
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
LD per 1000 words	2.5	6.1	3.5	4.7	2.2	1.6	4.2	5.7	8.8	3.9
Number of LD	13	17	14	10	3	7	12	13	15	104

It is interesting to note that speakers 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 used 100 percent subject left dislocation. Although speakers 3, 4, 6, and 9 used object left dislocation the percentage is quite low compared to that of subject left dislocation as table 5.4.7 reveals. The relative frequency of left dislocation per a 1000 words which is 3.9 is a clear indication that left dislocation is often used by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Since left dislocation is used in Acholi-Lango languages (see section 5.3.3), the frequent use of this syntactic structure in Ugandan English points at the possible transfer of this structure from Acholi-Lango language. Examples (5.4.71), (5.4.72), (5.4.73), (5.4.74), (5.4.75), (5.4.76), (5.4.77), (5.4.78), and (5.4.79) show the use of subject left dislocation with speakers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 respectively.

(5.4.71) **So for me** I would advocate for government to establish institutions not to concentrate the industries and other sectors within only the capital city.

(5.4.72) So I know very much that **human beings for us** we like enjoying life.

(5.4.73) You know even **we men** we are also failing in other areas.

(5.4.74) So after that one, **this fellow priest** he always come and then he talk to us then we share.

(5.4.75) Then **teachers**, of course they ready to lender the service to the to the to the pupils or students.

(5.4.76) **The current way of academic in Uganda**, it is growing somehow.

(5.4.77) And **the parents of such children** they think ok they hear that free ok it is a free thing.

(5.4.78) I would at least say **the private schools** at times they could perform well.

(5.4.79) **Most of those schools** they will be lacking those things.

In addition, example (5.4.80), (5.4.81) and (5.4.82) shows the use of object left dislocation with speaker 3, 6, and 9 which like in the Acholi-Lango language, involves the topicalisation of the object, *PRDP*, *the UPE system* and *this programme* whose pronoun, *it*, is retained in its usual position in the sentence.

(5.4.80) **PRDP** really I have failed to define it really.

(5.4.81) So probably **the UPE system** you have just heard of it yeah.

(5.4.82) Yeah so **this programme** at first I criticised it.

5.4.3.2 Analysis of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 according to discourse function

The use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function is also related to the discourse function of left dislocation in the Acholi-Lango language. For instance, whereas the subject left dislocation can have both an obligatory and emphatic discourse functions, on the other hand, the object left dislocation has only an emphatic discourse function (see section 5.3.3.1 and 5.3.3.2). Table 5.4.8 shows the variation in the use of subject left dislocation in respect to discourse function with the nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

Table 5.4.8: The percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Discourse function of LD	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Sp.8	Sp.9	Total
OSLD	30.8	35.3	57.1	60	100	0	66.7	69.2	60	50.9
ESLD	69.2	64.7	35.7	30	0	54.1	33.3	30.8	26.7	42.3
EOLD	0	0	7.1	10	0	42.9	0	0	13.3	6.7

Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of LD	13	17	14	10	3	7	12	13	15	104

Regarding the discourse function, most of the left dislocations occur with the obligatory subject left dislocation which accounts for 50.9 percent. This is followed by the emphatic subject left dislocation with 42.3 percent. The emphatic object left dislocation accounts for only 6.7 percent. Among the individual speakers, speakers 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 used the obligatory subject left dislocation more than the emphatic subject left dislocation. Only speakers 1, 2, and 6 used the emphatic subject left dislocation more than the obligatory subject left dislocation.

Examples (5.4.83), (5.4.84), and (5.4.85) illustrate the use of the emphatic subject left dislocation with speakers 1, 2, and 3 respectively. In example (5.4.83), we see the use of *for me* to emphasise the personal pronoun *I*, which is the subject of the sentence. This construction is similar to what Crazzolara (1955: 65) observed in the Acholi-Lango language that “the independent personal pronoun can be used to indicate left dislocation as a means to emphasise the personal pronoun”. In examples (5.4.84) and (5.4.85), we also observe the use of the personal pronouns *us* and *we* respectively to emphasise the noun subjects *human beings* and *men* which already have the obligatory subject co-referential pronoun *we* similar to the *subject-verb-prefix* in the Acholi-Lango language.

(5.4.83) Like now **for me** I haven’t qualified as a secondary education teacher.

(5.4.84) So I know very much that **human beings for us** we like enjoying life.

(5.4.85) You know even **we men** we are also failing in other areas.

In table 5.4.8, we further observe the use of the obligatory subject left dislocation with 8 speakers. Examples of obligatory subject left dislocation are represented in (5.4.86), (5.4.87) and (5.4.88) below. The obligatory subject left dislocation in these examples has preface, *those girls*, *the major seminaries* and *these people* and the co-referential pronoun *they* that portrays the same structure of obligatory subject left dislocation in the Acholi-Lango language. The use of both the emphatic and the obligatory subject left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 reveals a similar construction of emphatic and obligatory subject left dislocation as in their mother tongue. This seems to indicate the extent to which their mother tongue cross-linguistically influences left dislocation construction in Ugandan English.

(5.4.86) **Those girls** really they luck role models given the communication system which is poor in the villages.

(5.4.87) **The major seminaries** they are only four.

(5.4.88) I think **these people** they deserve an increment in their pay.

5.4.3.3 Analysis of Left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Pronoun *they* is the most frequently used co-referential pronoun among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 speakers accounting for 38.5 percent. It is followed by pronoun *I* which accounts for 36.5 percent. Left dislocation is also relatively used with pronouns *we* and *it* which make up 10.6 percent and 9.6 percent respectively. The pronouns *you*, *he*, and *she* rarely occur with left dislocation as their percentages of 1.9, 1.9, and 1 as table 5.4.9 illustrates.

Table 5.4.9: The percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns among nine English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Co-referential pronoun	Sp.1	Sp.2	Sp.3	Sp.4	Sp.5	Sp.6	Sp.7	Sp.8	Sp.9	Total
I	61.5	58.8	28.6	40	0	28.6	33.3	30.8	13.3	36.5
we	15.4	5.9	7.1	0	0	28.6	8.3	7.7	20	10.6
You	7.69	0	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.9
They	15.4	35.3	35.7	20	66.7	14.3	33.3	61.5	66.7	38.5
He	0	0	7.1	10	0	0	0	0	0	1.9
She	0	0	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
It	0	0	7.1	30	33.3	28.6	25	0	0	9.6
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

The examples (5.4.89), (5.4.90), (5.4.91), (5.4.92), (5.4.93), (5.4.94), and (5.4.95) illustrate the use of left dislocation among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 speakers in relation to co-referential personal pronouns *I*, *we*, *you*, *they*, *he*, *she*, and *it* respectively.

(5.4.89) Yes **for me** I will say it has really reduced it.

(5.4.90) So **for us** we we are from West Nile region.

(5.4.91) **For you** you don't speak it.

(5.4.92) It is strange but true you find **these people** they are striving at least to get something like coins.

(5.4.93) **This man** he if he was pronouncing some words I could miss a lot but gradually I caught up with the...

(5.4.94) **This woman** she has less time for the school.

(5.4.95) I agree with Denis, **the most widely spoken local language** in Uganda at hand now it is Luganda.

5.4.4 Comparison of left dislocation usage among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1

This section compares the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase types, discourse function and in relation to the co-referential personal pronouns among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1. It begins with the comparison of left dislocation in respect to noun phrase function as represented in table 5.4.10 below.

Table 5.4.10: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation according to noun phrase types in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous Ugandan languages as L1s

	Luganda		Runyankole-Rukiga		Acholi-Lango		Total	
Noun phrase LD	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Subject LD	125	82.2	118	90.1	97	93.27	340	87.86
Object LD	25	16.4	13	9.9	7	6.73	45	11.63
Oblique LD	2	1.3	0	0	0	0	2	0.52
Total	152	100	131	100	104	100	387	100
LD per 1000 words	5.22		7.04		3.88		5.19	

As table 5.4.10 illustrates, most of the left dislocation constructions involve subject left dislocation in Ugandan data accounting for 87.86 percent. This type of left dislocation is the most frequently used in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, where it has a share of 93.27 percent, and in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1, where it has a share of 90.1 percent and 82.2 percent respectively. The high share and frequency of left dislocation observed among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1 seems to indicate possible substrate influence, since in these three languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango, subject left dislocation is widely used unlike in Standard British and American English. The subject left dislocation is considerably more used among English speakers with Acholi-Lango than English speakers with Luganda as L1, although the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.2$). This type of left dislocation is used considerably more frequently among English

speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1.

In addition, table 5.4.10 illustrates the share of object left dislocation in the spoken Ugandan English data, which accounts for 11.63 percent. This type of left dislocation is considerably used in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1, where it has a share of 16.4 percent, in comparison to 9.9 percent and 6.73 percent in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1. This type of left dislocation is considerably more often used among English speakers with Luganda as L1 than English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 and among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. The difference between English speakers with Luganda as L1 and English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 is statistically very significant ($p = 0.002$). Likewise, the difference between English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 and English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 is statistically significant ($p = 0.03$). Although object left dislocation is overused in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.5$). Left dislocation rarely occurs with oblique construction which accounts for only 0.52 percent. It is only rarely observed among English speakers with Luganda as L1.

The significant test shows that left dislocation according to noun phrase function occurs more in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 than in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 data. The difference is statistically significant ($p = 0.02$). Likewise, the use of left dislocation according to noun phrase function occurs more in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than in that of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 with a difference which is statistically very significant ($p = 0.00005$). Left dislocation according to noun phrase function is also overused in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 with a difference which is statistically significant ($p = 0.01$).

Regarding the use of left dislocation according to discourse function, the obligatory subject dislocation (OSLD) is the most frequently used type with 52.19 percent in the Ugandan English data as illustrated in table 5.4.11. The OSLD is the most frequently used type among English speakers with the three indigenous L1s with 58.78 percent, 50.96 percent and 47.36 percent, that is, Runyankole-Rukiga, Acholi-lango and Luganda L1 respectively. The OSLD is overused in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango and Luganda as L1 with differences which are statistically

significant ($p = 0.00003$ and $p = 0.002$). However, although OSLD is overused in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to that of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.2$).

Table 5.4.11: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation according to discourse function in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous L1s

Discourse function of LD	Luganda		Runyankole-Rukiga		Acholi-Lango		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
OSLD	72	47.37	77	58.78	53	50.96	202	52.19
ESLD	53	34.87	41	31.29	44	42.31	138	35.66
EOLD	25	16.45	13	9.92	7	6.73	45	11.63
EOBLD	2	1.32	0	0	0	0	2	0.52
Total	152	100	131	100	104	100	387	100

Furthermore, table 5.4.11 shows that the emphatic subject left dislocation (ESLD) has the second highest frequency among the use of left dislocation according to discourse function in all three speaker groups, with a share of 35.66 percent. Although the ESLD is overused in the data of English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to Acholi-Lango, the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.6$ and $p = 0.2$). Likewise, it is overused in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1. However, the difference is statistically not significant ($p = 0.4$).

Table 5.4.12 illustrates the use of left dislocation in relation to co-referential personal pronouns in Ugandan English data. Most of the left dislocation constructions occur with the pronoun *they* which accounts for 44.19 percent of all the left dislocation constructions in the data. Among English speakers with the three L1 groups, left dislocation with the co-referential personal pronoun *they* is more frequent in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga L1 (54.19 percent) than in that of English speakers with Luganda as L1 (39.47 percent) and Acholi-Lango (38.46 percent) L1. The second most frequently used co-referential personal pronoun is *I* which has a share of 23.77 percent. Left dislocation with this co-referential pronoun occurs more in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (36.54 percent) than in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 (23.02 percent) and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (14.5 percent). In the third position, is the occurrence of left dislocation with pronoun *it* which has a share of 18.35 percent. The use of the co-referential personal pronoun *it*

occurs more in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 (23.68 percent) than in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (19.08 percent) and Acholi-Lango as L1 (9.62 percent). Left dislocation also occurs with the pronoun *we* which accounts for 6.98 percent. This co-referential personal pronoun occurs more in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (10.57 percent) than in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 (7.24 percent) and Runyakole-Rukiga as L1 (3.82 percent). Furthermore, table 5.4.12 illustrates how left dislocation rarely occurs with the pronouns *you*, *he*, and *she*.

Table 5.4.12: Raw frequencies and percentages of left dislocation in relation to co-referential pronouns in the data of English speakers with the three indigenous L1s

Co-referential Pronoun	Luganda		Runyankole-Rukiga		Acholi-Lango		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
I	35	23.03	19	14.5	38	36.54	92	23.77
We	11	7.24	5	3.82	11	10.57	27	6.98
You	4	2.63	4	3.82	2	1.92	10	2.59
They	60	39.47	71	54.19	40	38.46	171	44.19
He	4	2.63	4	3.05	2	1.92	10	2.59
She	0	0	3	2.29	1	0.96	4	1.03
It	36	23.68	25	19.08	10	9.61	71	18.35
There	2	1.32	0	0	0	0	2	0.52
Total	152	100	131	100	104	100	387	100

5.4.5 Comparison of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other varieties of English

The analysis of left dislocation in spoken Ugandan English shows that this construction occurs with a frequency of 5.19 per 1,000 words, and thus more frequently used than in British English 0.16 and Indian English 1.42 (cf. Lange 2012: 160) as table 5.4.13 illustrates.

Table 5.4.13: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of left dislocation in Ugandan English and other varieties of English (Indian and British cf. Lange 2012: 160).

LD Construction	Ugandan data			ICE-Indian data			ICE-Britain data		
	n	freq.	%	n	freq.	%	n	freq.	%
Subject LD	340	4.56	87.86	276	1.26	89.03	28	0.14	87.5
Object LD	45	0.6	11.63	28	0.13	9.03	4	0.02	12.5
Adverbial LD	2	0.03	0.52	6	0.03	1.94	0	0	0

Total	387	5.19	100	310	1.42	100	32	0.16	100
-------	-----	------	-----	-----	------	-----	----	------	-----

As the data presented by Lange (2012) indicate, left dislocation is used both in English L1 and L2 varieties. Schneider (2008b: 770) argues that “left dislocation or double subject construction is a universal strategy in spontaneous spoken language, presumably a focusing device”. However, the discussion of left dislocation construction in the Bantu and Nilotic languages families in Uganda (section 5.3) has shown that left dislocation is used not only for focusing device but can have other discourse functions such as the obligatory and emphatic subject left dislocation in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango languages. The high frequency of left dislocation in Ugandan English seems to point at the substrate influence from the indigenous Ugandan languages which have this syntactic construction.

The influence of indigenous languages in the grammar of English L2 varieties has been observed by Schmied (2012: 240) when he states that “many EAfE grammar features have multiple explanations (like transfer from African languages and overgeneralisation of intralanguage patterns”. The influence of Ugandan indigenous language on left dislocation constructions in Ugandan English is also similar to the way local Ghanaian languages influence left dislocation in Ghanaian English as reported by Huber and Dako (2008: 377). Further L1 influence in the use of the left dislocation construction in English L2 varieties has been reported by Bokamba (1982: 83). The discussion of left dislocation in the three Ugandan indigenous languages in section 6.3 and the analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English in this section clearly confirm Bokamba’s observation. De Klerk (2006: 140) also remarks the use of left dislocation in Xhosa English that show a similar structure to the cases of left dislocation in Ugandan English discussed above. However, the examples of emphatic subject dislocation she represents are different from the emphatic subject left dislocation discussed in Ugandan English. What she refer to as emphatic subject left dislocation in the examples (5.4.96) and (5.4.97) below are considered obligatory subject left dislocation in this study.

(5.4.96) **People**, they steal, they use some securities like us like police, you see.

(5.4.97) Ja because **some people** they got may be some plans.

The use of left dislocation in Ugandan English is similar to what has been reported in other English L2 varieties. For instance, Schmied (2012: 243) remarks that “in general, word order in EAfE is much more flexible and can be used to express emphasis and focus more readily than in StE (in this respect it can be seen as closer to colloquial spoken English)”. The analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English has revealed that the obligatory subject left

dislocation is the most frequently used type in Ugandan English as far as the discourse function of left dislocation is concerned. This confirms the observation by Schmied (2012: 243) regarding the use of left dislocation in EAfE that “a special case of information processing is double pronouns or pronoun appositions, i.e. a personal pronoun does not have the usual anaphoric function of linking sentences but of repeating a noun (phrase) in the same sentence”. He goes on to remark the distinction in the use of left dislocation in Standard English and East African English when he states that “in standard English, pronoun apposition is perfectly acceptable when the previous noun phrase is introduced by *as for*, as far as NP is concerned”, like in examples (5.4.98) and (5.4.99) below “when speakers seem to hesitate or have lost the thread of their sentence copying a pronoun may help the listener to process the message; East African English seems to be more liberal as far these rules are concerned, at least in speech” (p. 243).

(5.4.98) **As for the calcium in home**, it plays two important roles.

(5.4.99) **As for me and my house**, we declared war on poverty.

The analysis of left dislocation in Ugandan English has illustrated that this syntactic construction has varying structures in Ugandan English and English L1 varieties. For instance, Schmied (2012) writes that;

Pronoun copying occurs in oral English after long and complex subjects involving prepositional constructions, infinitives or relative clauses. Redundant pronouns can be found within relatives when personal pronouns take up the head of a relative construction and when possessive pronouns pre-modify the head of a relative construction, (i.e. the possessive pronoun and the relative clause subject refer to the same person, as in my book that I read) (Schmied 2012: 242).

Although in the Ugandan English data, the emphatic subject left dislocation involved the use of prepositional constructions such as *for me*, *for us*, and *for them*, the majority of left dislocation used involved the obligatory subject left dislocation without long and complex subjects like in example (5.4.100) presented by Schmied (2012: 242). Most of the subject left dislocation in Ugandan English involved simple rather than long and complex subjects, hence, indicating the variation in the use of left dislocation construction in Ugandan English and English L1 varieties.

(5.4.100) So **human being in the first time of his existence**, he found that he was subjected to the work.

Whereas there seems to be a clear distinction in the use of left dislocation in Ugandan English and English L1 varieties, the structure and frequency of left dislocation in Ugandan is similar to what has been reported in English L2 varieties. For instance, Mbangwana (2008: 425) observes that “as is common in many varieties of African English, left dislocation is a regular feature of Cameroon English”. In addition, Huber and Dako (2008: 377) remark that “spoken Ghanaian English is also marked by the frequent presence of topicalisation, most of which are borrowed from local Ghanaian languages”. As noted in section 5.1, Huber and Dako (2008: 376) use topicalisation also to refer to left dislocation. They also state that in Ghanaian English, left dislocation constructions involving the first person singular are very common. In Ugandan English, most of the left dislocation constructions occur with the co-referential pronoun *they* (44.19 percent) followed by *I* (23.77 percent). The findings in Ugandan English are similar to what De Klerk (2006: 140) observes in Xhosa English whereby the co-referential pronoun *they* is more used than other pronouns.

Although the frequent use of left dislocation has been reported in many English L2 varieties, few studies have so far been conducted to ascertain the how frequent this syntactic construction is really used in these varieties. For instance, in his discussion of Standard East African English, Schmied (2012: 239) states that “East African tendencies in morphology and syntax can also be found in other parts of Africa and even beyond, in so-called New Englishes and even in some L1 varieties in Britain, America or Australia”. He then goes on to observe lack of empirical studies that represent the actual use of these morphological and syntactic tendencies when he writes that “frequency, consistency, systematicity and developmental, regional and social distribution over various spoken and written text types are a matter for further research”. This study has therefore addressed the pending issues in the analysis of various syntactic features of English L2 varieties, by providing the frequency of occurrence of left dislocation usage in Ugandan English. The frequency of left dislocation in Ugandan English can therefore be compared with some studies that have been conducted in English L2 varieties. For instance, the dominant use of subject left dislocation in Ugandan English is similar to what Mesthrie (1997: 127-8) observed in the use of left dislocation in South African Black English. For example, he states that “the left dislocation with subject was dominant over other functions such as direct object and locative”. Likewise, Lange (2012: 160) report indicates more use of subject left dislocation than object and adverbial left dislocation in ICE-India and ICE-Britain.

5.5 Conclusion

Whereas left dislocation is used in L1 English varieties in the colloquial register as discussed in section 5.2.1, the analysis of this syntactic construction in Ugandan English has explored the extent to which this feature is used among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1. This chapter has shown that these speakers not only frequently use left dislocation but also illustrated the extent to which their mother tongues can account for the possible influence of this syntactic construction in Ugandan English, since similar constructions are found in their mother tongues, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango. The comparison of left dislocation in other English varieties has demonstrated that there is variation in the structure and discourse function of left dislocation in English L1 varieties and Ugandan English. There appears to be similarity in the structure and discourse functions of left dislocation in both Ugandan English and other English L2 varieties. However, the frequency of left dislocation in Ugandan English seems to be overwhelmingly higher from that reported in the studies in other English L2 varieties.

Chapter 6: Prepositions in Ugandan English

6.0 Introduction

A preposition is an indeclinable grammatical category in the English language. According to McArthur (1992: 801), the English word *preposition* was first used in Middle English as *preposicioum*, which was a loan translation of the Latin word *prepositio*. The Latin term *prepositio* was also a loan translation from the Greek word *prosthesis*, which means ‘putting before’. In English, prepositions therefore belong to the traditional word class or parts of speech which “relate two linguistic elements to each other and that generally precede the word which they govern” (Chalker and Weiner 1998: 310). The Greek meaning of the word preposition has been maintained up to date. This is illustrated in various studies that have discussed this topic. For instance, Malmkjaer (1991: 478) points out that “a preposition is an indeclinable part of speech that is put before others, either next to them or forming a composite with them”. In the same line, Crystal (2008: 383) states that preposition is “a term used in the grammar classification of words, referring to the items which typically precede noun phrases (often single nouns or pronouns) to form a single constituent of structure”. However, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 603) go beyond the traditional description of the word preposition and define it as “a relatively closed grammatically distinct class of words whose most central members characteristically express spatial relations or serve to mark various syntactic functions and semantic roles”. As parts of speech, prepositions belong to the group that are classified as closed, since, as McArthur (1992: 801) observes, “a few new prepositions ever enter a

language”. In the same vein, Trask (1999: 245) asserts that “English possesses a smallish class of words called prepositions”. Unlike other parts of speech, for example, nouns, verbs, and adjectives, in the English language, prepositions are not inflected.

6.1 Types of prepositions

Prepositions can be divided into two types, that is, simple and complex prepositions. Simple prepositions consist of one word. These are predominantly short words and most of the common English prepositions belong to this type (cf. Quirk et al., 1985: 665, Chalker and Weiner 1998: 310, and Carter and McCarthy 2006: 313). Examples of simple prepositions which are very common include; “*about, above, across, after, along, around, as, at, before, below, beside, between, by, down, for, from, in, into, like, near, of, on, onto, over, past, since, till, then, through, to, under, until, with, without*” (see Peters 2004: 438). However, some authors such as McArthur (1992: 801) indicate that within the simple prepositions, we can also have examples of compound prepositions. This happens when two prepositions are used as one, for instance, *in* and *to* as in *into* and *on* and *to* as in *onto*. He, however, goes on to note that:

Such forms are primarily conventions of writing and print and may vary according to the kind of English; BrE generally has *on to* and AmE *onto*. Forms like *into*, *on to/onto*, and *out of* are all compound in speech, because of their rhythm and stress, the first preposition is stressed (*into*), and the second is usually reduced. This point is reflected in the non-standard spelling of *out of* (will you get outa here?) where *a* stand for *of* reduced to *schwa* (McArthur 1992: 801).

In addition, he observes that simple prepositions are one or two syllable words which are traditionally referred to as *the prepositions proper* (McArthur 1992: 801).

Apart from simple prepositions, the English language also has complex prepositions. This type of prepositions consists of more than one word. Quirk et al. (1985: 669) note that “complex prepositions may be subdivided into two-and three-word sequences”. In addition, they observe that in a two-word sequence, the first word is an adverb, adjective, or conjunction, and the second word a simple preposition such as *for, from, to, of, or with*, for example, *regardless of, except for* and *according to*. However, in a three-word sequence, the first and third words are prepositions and the second or the middle word is a noun. Examples of the three-word sequence complex prepositions include; *in view of, in terms of, in favour of, in accordance with, in front of, by means of, in addition to* and *in line with* (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 669, McArthur 1992: 801, Chalker and Weiner 1998: 310 and Crystal 2008: 383). Furthermore, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 617-8) observe that whereas many complex prepositions consist of a preposition plus a noun, for example, *in person* and *on purpose*, there are some which

consist of a preposition plus a determinative plus a noun, for example, *in a word* and *on the spot*. They go on to discuss the use of complex prepositions as idiomatic and fossilized expressions in the English language (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 617-624).

6.1.1 Grammatical roles of prepositions

Prepositions can be analysed according to their grammatical roles. In this case, they are used to express a variety of syntactic and semantic relationships between noun, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and clauses. For instance, Crystal (2008: 383) states that prepositions combine with noun phrases and clauses to form prepositional phrases. He goes on to note that the prepositional phrase or prepositional group can then be described in terms of its distribution. For example, syntactically, its position in the sentence in relation to other grammatical categories or semantically, expressing possession, direction, and place. The following section discusses the syntactic relationship between prepositions and other grammatical categories. In addition, it also discusses the types of prepositional meaning in English.

6.1.2 Syntactic relationship between prepositions and other grammatical categories

In the English language, prepositions play an important role by linking the grammatical categories in phrases, clauses and sentences. Their role is emphasised by Malmkjaer (1991: 204) when he states that the loss of the case system in the English language led to “the extensive and frequent use of prepositions and a more rigid word order to designate the relationships formerly employed by case functions”. In addition, he argues that in the English language, “the more extensive use of prepositions also became an important factor in signaling subject, object, and verb relationships” (ibid 204).

Syntactically, prepositions are governed by words or phrases referred to as *prepositional complements* or *object of preposition*. The syntactic role of a preposition in a sentence is described by Quirk et al. (1985: 657) when they state that “in the most general terms, a preposition expresses a relation between two entities, one being that represented by the prepositional complement, the other by another part of the sentence”. Similarly, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 603) point out that one of the most important properties of prepositions which distinguish them from lexemes of other categories is that “the most central prepositions can take noun phrase complements. [...] more generally, most prepositions licence a complement of one kind or another”. Usually, prepositional complements are noun phrases, for example, *in the end*, *on the table* and *before the war*. The fact that prepositional complements are mainly noun phrases is emphasised by Trask (1997: 175) and Peters (2004: 438). They state

that in a sentence, prepositions combine with a noun phrase to form a prepositional phrase. In addition, Trask (1999: 245) asserts that “a preposition has only one major property”, that is, “combining with a following noun phrase –its object- to form a larger syntactic unit –a prepositional phrase”. Examples of prepositional phrases include: *of the students*, *in the box*, *under the bed*, *to London*, and *in front of our house*. In these examples, the prepositions *of*, *in*, *under*, *to*, and *in front of* are followed by prepositional complements *the students*, *the box*, *the bed*, *London*, and *our house*, which are noun phrases.

Although Trask (1999) indicates that prepositions are mainly followed by noun phrases, however, other authors such as Quirk et al. (1985: 657), Chalker and Weiner (1998: 311), and Carter and McCarthy (2006: 314) point out that the prepositional complements are not necessarily noun phrases. They argue that the prepositional compliments can also be other parts of speech, such as adjectives and adverbs like *in short*, *before long*, *by then*, *until now*, *at first*, nominal *wh*-clauses like *from what he said*, *to where they last met* or a nominal –ing clause like *by signing a peace treaty*. However, Quirk et al. (1985: 658-9) remark that in the English language, central prepositions cannot have a complement with: (i) a *that*-clause (ii) an infinitive-clause, and (iii) a subjective case form of a personal pronoun. This idea is also shared by McArthur (1992: 802). They therefore conclude that, although *that*-clauses and infinitive clauses frequently have a nominal function in other respects, they do not occur as prepositional complements in the English language. This makes the use of a *that*-clause, infinitive clause and a subjective case a form of a personal pronoun as complement of a preposition to produce ungrammatical sentences as illustrated in examples (6.1.1), (6.1.2) and (6.1.3) respectively.

(6.1.1) *He was surprised at that she noticed him.

(6.1.2) *He was surprised at to see her.

(6.1.3) *He was surprised at she. (McArthur 1992: 802).

According to Chalker and Weiner (1998: 311), prepositional phrases have two main functions. Firstly, they can act as adverbials, as in example (6.1.4) and secondly, as post modifiers in noun phrases, as in example (6.1.5) below.

(6.1.4) Come into the garden, Peter.

(6.1.5) Elizabeth is the queen of England. (Chalker and Weiner 1998: 311)

Emphasising the function of prepositions which distinguishes them from other grammatical categories, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 603) maintain that “all prepositions can head PPs functioning as non-predicative adjunct; many can also head PPs in complement function”.

Furthermore, they state that prepositions can also be distinguished from other grammatical categories through their property as modifiers. For instance, they observe that “a subset of prepositions are distinguished by their acceptance of such adverbs as *right* and *straight* as modifiers” (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 603).

Although in the English language prepositions are mainly followed by the prepositional complements, there are some instances in which the preposition is not followed by its complement. This syntactic structure of the preposition is called ‘preposition stranding’ (Trask 1997: 175). Such constructions are common in interrogative sentences which begin with *wh-words*. For instance, in examples (6.1.6) and (6.1.7), the prepositions *to* and *at* are stranded in the interrogative sentences.

(6.1.6) Who were you talking to?

(6.1.7) What are you getting at?

Preposition stranding can also be used in declarative sentences which lack grammatical complement (McArthur 1992: 802). This is illustrated in examples (6.1.8), (6.1.9), (6.1.10), and (6.1.11) in which the prepositions *from*, *in*, *about*, and *at* are stranded. In addition, McArthur (1992: 802) points out that, traditionally, preposition stranding was described “as more or less ungrammatical” with sentences constructions avoiding prepositional stranding being preferred.

(6.1.8) The Guy I bought my car from.

(6.1.9) The bed hadn’t been slept in.

(6.1.10) It hardly bears thinking about.

(6.1.11) He is nothing to look at.

Relative clauses are the other syntactic constructions involving the use of prepositional stranding. However, McArthur (1992: 802) claims that such constructions are less formal in the English language. Thus, example (6.1.12) in which the preposition *in* is followed by the *wh*-clause is more formal than example (6.1.13), which involves the use of preposition stranding. Furthermore, he points out that the use of prepositional stranding in relative clauses poses a challenge not only to non-native English speakers but also to English native speakers. The challenge involves either the use of prepositional stranding when a preposition has already been used in a sentence in which it is followed by a *wh*-clause, as in example (6.1.14), or the omission of a preposition at the end of the sentence involving a relative clause, as in example (6.1.15).

(6.1.12) This is the house in which she lived.

(6.1.13) This is the house (that) she lived in.

(6.1.14) He is the person to whom you have to give it to.

(6.1.15) He is the person you have to give it.

There are some prepositions whose function overlaps with other parts of speech. For instance, *since* can function as a preposition in *since the war*, as an adverb as in *I haven't seen you since* and a conjunction as in *since the war ended* (Chalker and Weiner 1998: 311). In the following part, I discuss the types of prepositional meaning.

6.1.3 Types of prepositional meaning

According to Downing and Locke (2006: 547), the prepositional meanings can be divided into two types. Whereas the first type includes *grammaticised* and *bound* prepositions, the second type includes *lexical* and *free* prepositions. Whereas the grammaticised and bound prepositions are determined by the verb, noun, or adjective preceding them, the lexical and free prepositions are chosen freely, for instance, to indicate location or the extension of location meaning to time.

6.1.3.1 Grammaticised and bound prepositions

In the English language the grammaticised and bound prepositions are complementation of verbs (prepositional verbs and phrasal prepositional verbs), nouns, and adjectives. As complements of verbs, nouns or adjective, these prepositions are more closely related to the preceding verb, noun or adjective which determine their choice than to the prepositional complements (Quirk et al. 1985: 657).

When used as complements of verbs, grammaticised prepositions are referred to as prepositional verbs or phrasal prepositional verbs (Quirk et al. 1985: 1150ff). Phrasal prepositional verbs consist of a verb and two particles, the first an adverb and the second a preposition. This is illustrated in examples (6.1.16) and (6.1.17) below in which *up* is the adverb and *with* and *to* are the prepositions complementing the verbs *come* and *faced* respectively.

(6.1.16) Have the police come up with anything yet?

(6.1.17) The labour Party, among others, has not faced up to this reality (Greenbaum 1996:

In the case of a prepositional verb, it is a preposition that comes before its complement (see example 6.1.18). This is different from the phrasal verb, which is followed by an adverb and can be moved more freely (Greenbaum (1996: 282). Whereas in example (6.1.18) *looked at* is a prepositional verb, in examples (6.1.19) and (6.1.20), *looked up* is a phrasal verb because the particle *up* can be moved freely. In (6.1.19) it is put before the object and in (6.1.20) it is put after the object. Prepositional verbs can further be distinguished from phrasal verbs. For instance, Greenbaum (1996: 282) points out that the adverb particle normally cannot precede the object if it is a personal pronoun. For this reason, *looked at* in (6.1.21) is a prepositional verb and not a phrasal verb.

(6.1.18) I looked at the words [prepositional verb]

(6.1.19) I looked up the words [phrasal verb]

(6.1.20) I looked the words up [phrasal verb]

(6.1.21) I looked at them [prepositional verb]. (Greenbaum 1996: 282)

Traditionally, prepositional verbs and phrasal verbs belong to particle verbs. According to Biber et al. (1999: 405), particle verbs can be distinguished from lexical and free prepositions (free combinations) by using the *wh*-question test. With particle verbs, the *wh*-questions are typically formed with *what* or *who*, as in example (6.1.22). In contrast, with free combinations, the same test yields questions formed with *where* or *when*, as in example (6.1.23).

(6.1.22) He believes in God. *Who* does he believe in? [prepositional verb]

(6.1.23) He lives in Uganda. *Where* does he live? [free combination (location meaning)]

The English language has some verbs which require prepositional complements. Such verbs determine which preposition must follow them; hence, different verbs require different prepositions (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 314). For instance, the verbs *look* and *confine* require different prepositions *after* and *in* respectively, as examples (6.1.24) and (6.1.25) illustrate.

(6.1.24) They will have to look after their father.

(6.1.25) You should learn to confide in your fruits.

Downing and Locke (2006: 554) also acknowledge that some prepositions are controlled by certain verbs. For instance, whereas *at* is the preposition controlled by verbs such as *laugh*, *look*, *glance*, *gaze*, *stare*, *aim*, and *shoot*, *in* is used with the verbs *believe*, *confide*, *trust*, *engage*, *interest*, and *succeed*. Likewise, whereas *on* is the preposition selected by the verbs *agree*, *rely*, *count*, *concentrate*, *depend*, *feed*, and *spend*, the preposition *from* is used with

verbs of preventing such as *keep*, *discourage*, *exclude*, *exempt*, *prevent*, and *restrain*. The complementation of verbs by prepositions is also discussed by Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 653-661). They illustrate how the prepositions *at*, *by*, *for*, *from*, *in*, *of*, *on*, *to*, and *with* are complemented by verbs. In the same vein, Peters (2004: 438) also observes that certain verbs select particular prepositions. For instance, whereas the verb *compare* takes the prepositions *with* or *to*, the verb *differ* takes the prepositions *from* or *to*. However, he remarks that there is a variation in the use of prepositions governed by certain verbs. For example, the verb *fill* takes the preposition *in* in British English and the same verb takes the preposition *out* in American English. This variation is illustrated in examples (6.1.26) and (6.1.27). Furthermore, he goes on to show the variation in the use of prepositions in British and American English; whereby in British English certain verbs such as *cater*, *protest*, *provide*, and *write* take prepositions *for*, *against*, *with* and *to* but in American English, the prepositions are omitted.

(6.1.26) Peter was asked to fill in the Visa form (British English).

(6.1.27) Peter was asked to fill out the Visa form (American English). (Peters 2004: 438)

The grammaticised prepositions are not only complements of verbs but also of nouns and adjectives (Quirk et al. 1985: 711-12). This is illustrated in example (6.1.28), in which the preposition *for* is the complement of the adjective *sorry*.

(6.1.28) I'm sorry for his parents. (Quirk et al. 1985: 657)

Downing and Locke (2006: 547) state that “nouns which take prepositional complements are related to cognate verbs”. For example, the noun *reliance* takes the preposition *on*. This noun is related to the cognate verb *rely*, which also selects *on* as its complement. Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 654-661) remark that a good number of nouns select particular prepositions as their complement. For example, the preposition *to* is selected by nouns such as *burden*, *entrance*, and *hindrance*; the preposition *on* is selected by nouns such as *ban*, *expenditure*, *improvement*, and *attack*; the preposition *in* is selected by the nouns *confidence*, *dealer*, and *interest*; and the preposition *from* is selected by nouns such as *abstention*, *freedom*, and *protection*. Similarly, adjectives such as *kind*, *similar*, and *susceptible* select the preposition *to* as their complement, and others such as *different*, *free*, and *immune* select *from* as their complement.

6.1.3.2 Lexical meaning of prepositions

Peters (2004: 438) states that “the basic role of a preposition is to detail the position of something, its physical location or direction, or a more abstract relationship to other things”.

Likewise, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 647-8) observe that the meaning of most of the central prepositions in English denotes location. They emphasise that this concerns “either location or change of location or extensions of those notions into dimensions of time, or notions derived more broadly from them through other metaphors”. The meaning of a preposition to denote location or change of location is further emphasised by Malmkjaer (1991: 480) who asserts that a preposition “is often said to be used to indicate directionality or place”. Furthermore, Carter and McCarthy (2006: 313) points out the relational meaning of prepositions in respect to time and space between two or more things or people. For instance, in (6.1.29) and (6.1.30) the preposition *in* is used to indicate location and time respectively.

(6.1.29) John met Sarah in the park.

(6.1.30) John met Sarah in the morning.

6.1.3.2.1 Location in space

In the description of the lexical meaning of prepositions in respect to spatial relationship, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 648) state that “typically, one entity is taken as a reference point (or area) with respect to which another is located. The reference point is called landmark and the item whose location or movement is specified is called the trajectory”. This view is supported by Lindstromberg (1998: 13) when he points out that the lexical meaning of prepositions can be seen in respect to the landmark which can be seen as space, surface, and point.

Downing and Locke (2006: 547-8) observe that “the most basic prepositional meanings have to do with location in space”. This includes: (i) a point in space where the preposition *at* is used, for example, *at home*, *at the cinema*, *at the supermarket*, and *at work*; (ii) contact with the surface in which the preposition *on* is used, for example, *on the floor*, *on the compound*, and *on the map*; (iii) containment in which the preposition *in* is used, for example, *in the universe*, *in the world*, *in France*, and *in the garden*. In addition, Quirk et al. 1985: 673) argue that “when we use a preposition to indicate space, we do so in relation to the dimensional properties, whether subjectively or objectively conceived, of the location concerned”. This involves prepositions indicating location such as *at*, *in* and *on* as well as those indicating a change of location such as *from*, *to*, *into*, and *onto*.

As a preposition indicating location, *at* is “used when attendance at the typical function of the premises is implied (e.g. *at the cinema* in order to see a film; *at church* to attend a religious service), or when the speaker is not at the same location as the Figure” (Downing and

Locke 2006: 548). According to Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 654), “the core lexical meaning of *at* expresses location in a specific geographical position conceived as a point in the plane”.

They go on to emphasise that:

the preposition *at* provides a particularly clear example of the processes of abstraction involved in the expression of spatial relationships. The function of *at* is to describe two entities as having precisely the same spatial location, each entity being construed as a point. This means that some degree of idealisation is inevitably inherent in its use (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 650).

The choice of either the preposition *at* or *in* to refer to location depends on the conception of the landmark, which can be viewed either as a point or a containment. Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 650) illustrate how the distance between the speaker and the landmark plus abstraction help us to determine the choice of either the preposition *at* or *in*. In the example (6.1.31) the use of *in* other than *at* is appropriate if the speaker is outside the supermarket. He thus perceives the supermarket as container. However, if the speaker is far away from the supermarket, *at* other than *in* becomes appropriate, as in example (6.1.32). This is because the farther away we are from the objects in our visual field the smaller their images become. This then appropriates our viewing them as points.

(6.1.31) John is in the supermarket.

(6.1.32) John is at the supermarket. (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 650)

The meaning of the preposition *in* in respect to space implies containment. For instance, *in* is used for sizable territories such as *continents*, *countries*, *provinces*, and *cities* that are perceived as areas other than points, as in example (6.1.33) in which *Uganda* is a geographical area. Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 649) point out that “whereas *in* prototypically denotes a relation in which the trajectory is a physical object completely contained within a clearly bounded landmark, there are many cases in which the notion of containment applies only loosely”. This view is also shared by Downing and Locke (2006: 548). In example (6.1.34) only a part of the trajectory, that is, *flowers* are contained within the confines of the landmark, *the vase*. Furthermore, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 649) observe that there are instances in which *in* is used, although “the boundaries of the landmark do not manifest themselves in the kind of concrete physical form characteristic of a prototypical container such as a building”. For instance, in example (6.1.35), the landmark *tree* does not portray characteristics of a prototypical container.

(6.1.33) Mukasa lives in Uganda.

(6.1.34) Namusoke put the flowers in the vase.

(6.1.35) Lutaaya gazed at the birds in the tree.

The preposition *on* is used to denote physical contact between the trajectory and the landmark with the landmark located below the trajectory and supporting it (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 650). For instance, in example (6.1.36) *the court* is the landmark on which the children are playing. In example (6.1.37), *the compound* is the landmark that supports the pupils. Both the *court* and the *compound* are surfaces, hence the use of the preposition *on*. Furthermore, Downing and Locke (2006: 549) point out that the contact of the trajectory with the landmark that supports it can either be on the horizontal or vertical plane, as illustrated in examples (6.1.38) and (6.1.39).

(6.1.36) The children are playing on the court.

(6.1.37) The pupils are walking on the compound.

(6.1.38) There is a book on the table.

(6.1.39) There is a map on the wall.

Apart from indicating location in space, prepositions also denote change of location. This involves a movement from the *source*, that is, the initial location and the *goal* which is the final location. Whilst the source is typically marked by the prepositions *from*, *out*, and *off*, the goal is many times marked by the prepositions *to*, *onto*, and *into* (Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 656 and Downing and Locke 2006: 549). For instance, in example (6.1.40) *Mombasa* is the source from where the Ugandan coffee is shipped and *Hamburg* is the goal or the final location. The meaning of the preposition *from* to denote the initial location is also emphasised by Lindstromberg (1998: 39) when he writes that “*from* is used to describe a path in terms of its starting point”, that is, the location or position of the trajectory in respect to the landmark.

(6.1.40) Ugandan coffee is shipped from Mombasa to Hamburg.

To is another preposition that indicates a change in location. According to Lindstromberg (1998: 28), the central meaning of the preposition *to* “is to specify the end point of a path”. This is illustrated in example (6.1.41). He goes on to note that “*to* is neutral about whether a path stops at the surface or edge of a landmark or whether it crosses this edge or boundary”, as illustrated in examples (6.1.42) and (6.1.43) (cf. Lindstromberg 1998: 28)

(6.1.41) My sister went to the cinema last Sunday.

(6.1.42) She went to the tree and touched it.

(6.1.43) She went to the library this morning.

The prepositions *to* can also be used to indicate the end point of the path or goal. Tyler and Evans (2005: 149) argue that the preposition *to* can be used to denote location or position. In that case, *to* is used to indicate a locational sense. They argue that in such an instance, *to* denotes “a relation in which the trajectory is located with respect to the landmark, but the trajectory is not orientated towards the landmark”. For instance, in (6.1.44) the preposition *to* illustrates the position or location of *Mukasa* in relation to my position in the photo, that is, on the right side.

(6.1.44) Looking at this photo, you see that Mukasa is standing to my right.

The prepositions *to* and *into* are main English prepositions implying a goal in physical movement. They are generally accompanied by verbs of dynamic motional meaning such as *go*, *move*, and *fly*, as in example (6.1.45). Although these two prepositions indicate destination, they nevertheless differ in meaning. For instance, Lindstromberg (1998) states that *into* “means specifically that the path does cross the surface or boundary of the landmark” (p. 28). However, the preposition *to* “specifies the endpoint of a path” (p.27).

(6.1.45) Nalule flew to London with her parents.

There are also instances in which the prepositions *in* and *on* are used to indicate both position and destination. Quirk et al. (1985: 673), for instance, observe that in colloquial English, the prepositions *in* and *on* “may be used for both position and destination when *onto* and *into* make an unnecessary emphasis on the combination of destination plus dimension”, as in examples (6.1.46) and (6.1.47) below.

(6.1.46) The child fell on the carpet.

(6.1.47) The boy put his hand in the pocket.

In addition, Quirk et al. (1985: 675) point out restrictions on the interchangeability of the preposition *on* with *onto* and *in* with *into* most especially in British English when they state that, “most verbs of motion such as *walk*, *slide*, *swim*, require *onto* and *into* for declinational meaning”. In example (6.1.48), for instance, *in* implies being inside the building and in example (6.1.49) *into* implies moving from outside the building. However, causative verbs such as *place*, *stand*, *lay*, and *sit* usually permit combinations both with and without *to*, *onto*, and *into*, as example (6.1.50) illustrates.

(6.1.48) Don't run in the school.

(6.1.49) Don't run into the school.

(6.1.50) She put the typewriter case on(to) the top shelf and the key in(to) the drawer.

Furthermore, Quirk et al., (1985: 676) observe that the context in which *on* (surface) and *in* (area) are used determines the interpretation of the semantic relationship between the preposition and its complement. For instance, in example (6.1.51) the noun phrase *the field* implies a surface, hence the use of preposition *on*. However, in example (6.1.52), the noun phrase *the field* implies an enclosed area of land, and thus, *in* is the appropriate preposition preferred in this context.

(6.1.51) The players were practicing on the field.

(6.1.52) The cows were grazing in the field.

6.1.3.2.2 Metaphorical or abstract use of the spatial prepositions

The spatial meaning of the prepositions *at*, *in*, *on*, *to*, and *from* discussed above can be metaphorically extended to refer to time and other abstractions. For instance, Quirk et al. (1985) write that:

Many place prepositions have abstract meanings which are clearly related, through metaphorical connection, to their locative uses. Very often prepositions so used keep the grouping (in terms of similarity or contrast of meaning) that they have when used in a literal reference to place. This is often true for example of temporal usage (Quirk et al. (1985: 685).

The prepositions *at*, *in*, *on*, *from* and *to* are used differently to communicate temporal meaning. Quirk et al. (1985: 687) point out that when used as prepositions of time, they are “to some extent parallel to the same items as positive prepositions of position”. However, they remark that “in the time sphere there are only two dimension-types viz., point of time and period of time”. Therefore, they argue that whereas the prepositions *at*, *in*, and *on* are used to answer the question *when an event took place*, the prepositions *from* and *to* answer the question *how long an event took place* (Quirk et al. 1985: 689).

There are differences in the metaphorical use of the prepositions *at*, *in*, and *on*. For instance, Lindstromberg (1998: 68) observes that the preposition *at* carries meaning related to time with very small time units, e.g. *at 15:30*. In addition, Quirk et al. (1985: 688) point out that the preposition *at* is also used idiomatically for holiday periods, e.g. *at the weekend*, *at Christmas* and *at Easter*. Furthermore, Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 654) assert that the preposition *at* “extends metaphorically into temporal meaning, with the progress of time conceptualized as a one-dimensional line, allowing it to be used for exact times corresponding to points at certain distances along the line e.g. *at three o'clock*”. However, if the unit of time is very large, the preposition *in* is preferred, e.g. *in summer* or *in the 21st century*. With middle

sized units of time, *on* is used, e.g. *on Thursday the 14th September 2014* and *on the following day* (Lindstromberg 1998: 68 and Quirk et al. 1985: 688). They also note that the meaning of the prepositions *from* and *to* in respect to time occurs when these two prepositions are used as a pair, as in example (6.1.53) below.

(6.1.53) We attended the conference from morning to evening.

In the English language, there are instances when a preposition of time is omitted. In such cases, the time adverbial takes the form of a noun phrase instead of a prepositional phrase. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 692) prepositions of time are omitted immediately before the deictic words such as *last*, *next*, *this*, *that* and *before* and quantitative words *some* and *every* in noun phrases. For instance, prepositions of time are absent in the noun phrases immediately before *last* in example (6.1.54), *next* in example (6.1.55), *some* in example (6.1.56) and *every*, as in example (6.1.57).

(6.1.54) John visited his parents last Sunday.

(6.1.55) We shall discuss the work plan next week.

(6.1.56) You might meet her some day.

(6.1.57) We go for holidays every summer.

Furthermore, prepositions are omitted in nouns which have *last*, *next* or *this* as an element of their meaning. This can be illustrated in examples (6.1.58) and (6.1.59) in which the preposition of time is absent. Quirk et al. (1985: 693) note that “the prepositions which are absent in point in time expressions seem to be restricted to *at*, *on*, *in*, *before* and *since*.”

(6.1.58) He called his parents today/yesterday.

(6.1.59) I will talk to him tomorrow.

The metaphorical extension of the location meaning of prepositions is not only applied to temporal meaning but also to abstract landmarks. In such cases, “the preposition usually has a meaning similar or identical to a/the meaning it has when the landmark refers to a physical object or place” (Lindstromberg 1998: 12-13). According to Quirk et al. (1985: 686), the metaphorical extension includes: (i) enclosure (abstract inclusion) e.g. *in books/plays*, *in/out of the race*, *in a group/party*, (ii) destination (abstract condition or circumstance) e.g. *he got into difficulties/trouble*, *debt/a fight*, (iii) position (membership or participation) e.g. *in the army*, *on the board/committee/project* (iv) starting point/destination (originator/recipient) e.g. *a letter/present from Browning to his wife*. The metaphorical extension of spatial prepositions to abstractions is also discussed by Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 659). For instance, they

observe that the preposition *on* is used metaphorically in noun phrases “indicating ongoing actions or states e.g. *on fire*, *on the march*, and *on your guard* and reason e.g. *on her advice*”.

There are other prepositions that indicate meaning other than location. Prepositions can also have other meanings such as agency, instrument, and possession. For instance, the prepositions *by*, *with*, and *of* denote *agent*, *instrument*, and *possession*, as used in examples (6.1.60), (6.1.61), and (6.1.62) respectively.

(6.1.60) The parents appreciated the work done by the teachers.

(6.1.61) She cut her birthday cake with a knife.

(6.1.62) A friend of our parents welcomed us at the Airport.

In addition, Lindstromberg (1998: 221-2) states that the preposition *for* “does not characterize a spatial relationship”. Instead, *for* can be used to ear-mark the subject by assigning it to a landmark for *use*, *consumption*, or *possession*, as in (6.1.63) or to allocate emotion, when it “is used after a few emotion words as *love*, *pity*, *care*, *contempt*, *disdain*, *hatred*, *loathing* and *sorry* in order to show to whom or to what the relevant emotion is allocated”, as in (6.1.64).

(6.1.63) This piece of cake is for Jane.

(6.1.64) I really feel sorry for that guy. (Lindstromberg 1998: 221-2)

This section has reviewed prepositions in Standard English. It has given the definition and origin of prepositions as one of the grammatical categories that fall under closed words. It has further distinguished the two main types of prepositions used in the English language. Lastly, it has discussed the grammatical roles of prepositions and looked at the syntactic and semantic relations they share with other grammatical categories. The next section reviews the use of prepositions both in L1 and L2 varieties of English.

6.2 Variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions in World Englishes

Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 73) have given various studies that have reported variability in the use of prepositions in English varieties in Africa, America and India. This section discusses variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions both in English as L1 and L2 varieties. The first part reviews variation in the use of prepositions in English L1 varieties in the British Isles and North America. This is followed by a look at studies which have discussed variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions in English L2 varieties in Africa and Asia.

6.2.1 The use of prepositions in English L1 varieties

The first part of this section discusses variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions in English L1 varieties. Studies in English L1 varieties have reported different uses of prepositions that vary from Standard English. For instance, Filppula (2008: 354) observes that there are prepositional usages in Irish English that not only vary from other regional dialects but also from Standard English. He argues that this variation can be explained “by the prominent role that prepositions play in Irish syntax”. This means that “meanings which in other languages, including Standard English, are expressed by verbs, adjectives or adverbs are often rendered by various types of prepositional phrases in Irish” (p. 97). For example, he points out that there are three ways in which the preposition *on* varies in Irish English from Standard English. Firstly, *on* is used “in contexts which imply a disadvantage of some kind or another from the point of view of the speaker or other person”, as in example (6.2.1). Secondly, *on* is used “to express various physical and mental sensation, state or processes”, as in example (6.2.2). Thirdly, *on* is used “to express possession of an inherent physical property of a person or some other referent”, as in example (6.2.3).

(6.2.1) One year then he took the haft of them on me.

(6.2.2) And this blacksmith was running to and Begor, the breath was getting short on him (he was getting short of breath).

(6.2.3) All the cattle had the horns on them that time. (Filppula (2008: 354-5))

In addition, Filppula (2008) also observes variation from Standard English in the use of the prepositions *in* and *with* in Irish English. He states that in Irish English the preposition *in* “has developed several usages which are distinctive of Irish English”. He demonstrates this with the use of the prepositional phrase *in it*, as in example (6.2.4). Furthermore, he points out that *in* can also be used to “express some inherent quality or property of something”, as in example (6.2.5). Regarding the use of the preposition *with*, he shows that it can be used for expressions of duration of a state or an activity whereby it has “the temporal meaning *for*, for the duration of or time ago”, as in examples (6.2.6).

(6.2.4) But she learned the deaf and dumb alphabet out of Moore’s Almanac that there used to be in it at the time and...

(6.2.5) Do you have to train them [i.e. sheep-dogs] especially for this purpose or? Well, you do, ah, if it is in a dog he will train himself, if the goodness is in ‘im.

(6.2.6) I didn’t hear him playing with years an’ years. May be he isn’t able to play all now (I haven’t heard him playing for years and years). (Filppula 2008: 355)

A variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions is also reported in East Anglian English. Trudgill (2008: 411) reports the replacement of the prepositions *to* and *at* to denote location with the preposition *round*, as illustrated in (6.2.7) and (6.2.8) below. In addition, he points out that the use of *to* as a preposition of direction or goal in Standard English is replaced with the prepositions *down* and *up* in Anglian English, like in the examples (6.2.9) and (6.2.10). Furthermore, he observes that in East Anglian English, the preposition *on* is used where Standard English prefers the preposition *of*, as in example (6.2.11).

(6.2.7) Are you comen round John's? (to John's place)

(6.2.8) I was round John's (at John's place)

(6.2.9) I'm goen down the city (to Norwich from the suburbs)

(6.2.10) I'm goen up the city (to Norwich from the country)

(6.2.11) There was a couple on 'em (of them). (Trudgill 2008: 411)

The use of the preposition *on* instead of *of* as in Standard English is also reported in South West English dialects. For instance, Wagner (2008: 430) remarks that “the preposition *on* is used in places where we might have expected *of* mainly in front of the unstressed pronouns 'en (him), it and 'em (them)” as in examples (6.2.12) and (6.2.13). She goes on to mention that some prepositions such as *up*, *down* and *over* are used where Standard English would prefer the prepositions *to* and *at*. She argues that the variation in the choice of these prepositions can be inferred from the geographical meaning in the region. For example, whereas *over* is used “for nearby towns and villages”, as in the example (6.2.14), *up* and *down* are used following the path of the sun, that is, East and West for the prepositions *up* and *down* respectively, as in the examples (6.2.15) and (6.2.16).

(6.2.12) He eat eleven on 'em.

(6.2.13) ...give us haft on it.

(6.2.14) No, that was (name) over Downby, that was another. . .

(6.2.15) Yes, there was one or two down Zennor. I can mind –now hold on a minute. They had one down Zennor, and when [name]'s brother [name] came over Tree to live –that's below the hotel here...

(6.2.16) He went up Stroud district... (Wagner 2008: 431)

Discussing the use of prepositions in Northern dialects of the British Isles, Kortmann (2008: 489) reports the preposition *down* is used instead of *in* or *to*, as in the example (6.2.17), *off* or *with* instead of agentive *by*, as in the example (6.2.18), and *off* instead of *from*, as in

example (6.2.19). In addition, he points out that in the Northern dialects, the prepositions *to* and *of* are omitted in double object constructions, as illustrated in example (6.2.20). Similarly, reporting on the omission of Standard English prepositions in English L1 varieties, Melchers (2013) and Penhallurick (2013) state that this feature is neither pervasive nor extremely rare both in Orkney and Shetland English and Welsh English respectively.

(6.2.17) He works down Manchester.

(6.2.18) I won't do nothing unless I get paid for it. Not off my mam and dad anyway.

(6.2.19) My sister tapes some canny songs off the charts.

(6.2.20) So, she won't give us [to] it. (Kortmann 2008: 489)

The different use of prepositions has also been reported in the English varieties in North America. Murray and Simon (2008: 422) observe that in colloquial American English *to* is substituted for *at*, as in the examples (6.2.21) and (6.2.22). In addition, they point out the omission of Standard English prepositions in colloquial American English, as the examples (6.2.23) and (6.2.24) illustrate.

(6.2.21) Sorry, there's no one to [at] home.

(6.2.22) They all jumped him to [at] once.

(6.2.23) Let's go over [to] the church a little early.

(6.2.24) He woulda been 78 [on] his next birthday. (Murray and Simon 2008: 422)

Writing on the use of prepositions in Newfoundland English, Clarke (2008: 504) reports that, "a common feature among urban and rural Newfoundlanders of all social classes and regions is the use of *to* as a stative as well as a dynamic preposition". In such instances, Newfoundlanders use the preposition *to* where Standard English would prefer the preposition *at*, as in the examples (6.2.25), (6.2.26), and (6.2.27). In addition, she observes that the preposition *to* is also used where Standard English would prefer a zero preposition, as in the example (6.2.28). Furthermore, she points out that the preposition *into* is used with a stative meaning, as in the example (6.2.29). However, she notes that this usage is "more restricted in its social distribution". She also points out the frequent absent of the prepositions *to* and *in* after directional prepositions such as *down*, *up*, and *over*, like in the example (6.2.30).

(6.2.25) He sat to the table.

(6.2.26) They knocked to the door.

(6.2.27) Next thing I was to the rock.

(6.2.28) Stay where you're to.

(6.2.29) This bottle has a cork stopper into it.

(6.2.30) Down little Harbour. Clarke (2008: 504)

In Bahamian English, the preposition *to* is used where Standard English would prefer: (i) *on* as in the example (6.2.31), (ii) *in* as in the example (6.2.32), (iii) *from* as in the example (6.2.33), and (iv), *over* or *during* as in the example (6.2.34) (Reaser and Torbert 2008: 601). However, they note that the omission of prepositions such as *to*, as in the example (6.2.35), is a feature of Afro-Bahamian English other than Anglo-Bahamian English. The omission of Standard English prepositions in Bahamian English is further reported by Reaser and Torbert (2013). Similarly, Collins and Peters (2013) and Quinn (2013) also report the omission of Standard English prepositions in Australian English and New Zealand English respectively. They acknowledge that this feature is neither pervasive nor extremely rare in these two varieties of English.

(6.2.31) Put them to your feet.

(6.2.32) He lives to Marsh Harbour.

(6.2.33) They do it to Marsh Harbour more than they do from here (they hunt more from Marsh Harbour).

(6.2.34) My granddaughter has been here to Christmas.

(6.2.35) They go [to] Marsh Harbour. (Reaser and Torbert 2008: 601)

Chicano English⁹ is another English variety in North America that exhibits variation in the use of the prepositions *in* and *on*. This variation seems to be an influence from the Spanish language. For instance, Bayler and Ana (2008: 580) argue that “the use of prepositions is one area of Chicano English where Spanish influence seems likely. The nonstandard use of *in* and *on* [...] appears superficially at least to originate in the fact that in Spanish both meaning are expressed by *en*”. Examples (6.2.36) and (6.2.37) illustrate that the prepositions *in* and *on* in Chicano English are used differently from Standard English.

(6.2.36) And we used to go stand in the porch because they never used to let us in the house.

You used to stand in the porch and look at the t.v. through the window.

(6.2.37) We start on July. (Bayler and Ana 2008: 580)

⁹Bayler and Ana (2008: 572) define Chicano English “as an ethnic variety of English spoken by people who acquired English as their first language, who acquired English and Spanish simultaneously, or who began to acquire English when they enrolled in elementary school, usually around the age of 5, well before the end of the critical period for second language acquisition”.

White South African English also uses prepositions differently from Standard English. Bowerman (2008: 476) observes that the use of the preposition *by* instead of *near*, *at*, and *with* as in Standard English is frequent among the speakers of White South African English. Examples (6.2.38), (6.2.39), and (6.2.40) illustrate such variation from Standard English in the use of the preposition *by*. He argues that this variation is an indication how Afrikaans influences White South African English. He further asserts that the substitution of *for* with *of* is another aspect in which Afrikaans influences South African English (Bowerman 2008: 476).

(6.2.38) I live by the station (near).

(6.2.39) I left by my friend's house (at).

(6.2.40) He stays by his parents (with). (Bowerman 2008: 476)

As mentioned in section 6.1.3, in Standard English prepositions are grammaticised when they are used as complements of verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Studies in English L1 varieties have reported variation from Standard English in the use of grammaticised prepositions. Hundt et al. (2008: 326) observe that there are “regional differences in the use of prepositions after *different*”. In Standard English, *different* is complemented by the preposition *from*. Although this variant is preferred in British, American, and New Zealand English, *different than* is also used in American English. Hundt et al. (2008) point out that *different than* is an American variant which is avoided in spoken British and New Zealand English. In addition, they note that whereas in British English the verbs *protest* and *appeal* “both typically take prepositional objects as their complements”, in American English, “both verbs can be used without the preposition” (Hundt et al. 2008: 326). The variation from Standard English in the use of grammaticised prepositions is also reported in Australian English. Collins and Peters (2008: 353) state that “despite the preference for *different from* over *different to* expressed in some Australian usage books (e.g. Hudson 1993, *Modern Australian Usage*), Australians seem to prefer *different to* at least in informal registers”. In addition, they observe that “data from the ACE Corpus suggest the relative unacceptability of *different to* in written texts. There, *different from* outnumbers *different to* in the ratio 6:1” (Collins and Peters 2008: 353). Furthermore, they point out that the use of the American variant *than* after *different* is still small in Australian English. The following part discusses variation in the use of prepositions in English L2 varieties.

6.2.2 The use of prepositions in English L2 varieties

The variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions has also been observed in English L2 varieties. For instance, Schmied (2008: 456) remarks that “the most frequent

English prepositions *of* and *in* (at the expense of other more special *into*) occur significantly more frequently in East African than in British English”. In the same vein, in her discussion of prepositional usage in Kenyan English, Mwangi (2004: 27) points out that there appears to be no distinction between the prepositions of location and direction. She observes that the preposition *in* is used with “stative as well as dynamic verbs to express both location and direction”. This is illustrated in example (6.2.41), where the preposition *in* is used instead of *to* and *onto*, which would be preferred in Standard English. In addition, Mwangi also reports that, instead of using the preposition of direction *onto*, Kenyans prefer to use the preposition of location *on*. She argues this variation from Standard English in the use of location and direction prepositions in Kenyan English can be explained in two ways. Firstly, this could be due to generalisation and simplification strategies Kenyans use in the process of acquiring English as a L2. Secondly, she argues that this could be an influence from indigenous Kenyan languages which make no distinction between location and direction prepositions. For example, whereas the prepositional suffix *-ni* in Kiswahili means *in* and *into* and in certain contexts *on* and *onto*, the prepositional suffix *-ni* in Kikuyu is used for both location and direction. Mwangi (2004: 28) therefore argues that “the overlap functions of the English prepositions of location and direction in Kenyan English could therefore be due to the carrying-over into English of prepositional patterns in local languages that are spoken widely in Kenya”. This argument is also supported by Schmied (2008: 457) who comments that besides analogy, interference from African languages is possible, since their prepositional system is relatively simple and thus polysemous. For example, one basic location preposition in the Kiswahili prepositional phrase *mwituni* can be translated as *at*, *to*, *in*, *inside*, *by*, *near*, *next to*, and *from the forest*. Similarly, Mwangi (2004: 28) observes the replacement of prepositions *at* and *on* with *in* in Kenyan English in phrases such as *in the conference* and *in the coast*, as illustrated in the examples (6.2.42) and (6.2.43) below. In the same vein, Schneider (2007: 196) remarks the use of the preposition *in* instead of *on*, *at*, and *to* in Kenyan English.

(6.2.41) ... but let us take the length and the width of Zanzibar Island and the people who are there. What do you think if there are so many people just coming in the country?

(6.2.42) I believe this should have been somewhere in the coast

(6.2.43) Earlier the co-ordinator of the workshop told the minister that the workshop would reflect on key issues that would be discussed in the Cairo conference. (Mwangi 2004: 27-8)

In Indian English, prepositions are also often used differently from Standard English. According to Sailaja (2009: 61) the trend seems to be the “literal translations of the corresponding structures in Indian languages”. This includes the use of prepositions *to*, *on*, and *for* instead of *for*, *at*, and *to* respectively, as the examples (6.2.44), (6.2.45), and (6.2.46) show.

(6.2.44) What did you do to us?

(6.2.45) I got angry on him.

(6.2.46) You are entitled for free tickets. (Sailaja 2009: 61)

The influence of Afrikaans on South African English in the use of prepositions is reported by McCormick (2008: 530), when she asserts that “the prepositions used in English sentences are often direct translations of those that would appear in the equivalent Afrikaans sentences”. This includes the use of prepositions *from*, *with*, *in*, *for*, *in* instead of *of*, *for*, *at*, *of*, and *into*, as in Standard English and Cape Flats English respectively. This is shown in the examples (6.2.47), (6.2.48), (6.2.49), (6.2.50) and (6.2.51).

(6.2.47) She did take photos from us.

(6.2.48) They phoned me with my birthday.

(6.2.49) On school he was in Afrikaans class.

(6.2.50) You see, they were very scared for the police.

(6.2.51) We didn't ask to come in this world. (McCormick 2008: 530)

The omission of Standard English prepositions appears to occur in many L2 varieties of English. For instance, whereas Huber (2013) and Taiwo (2013) allege that this feature is neither pervasive nor extremely rare in Ghanaian English and Nigerian English respectively, Mesthrie (2013b) and Bobda (2013), claim that this feature exists but is extremely rare in Black South African English and Cameroonian English respectively.

The variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions in English L2 varieties also occurs with grammaticised verbs. In Kenyan English, studies have reported certain verbs which take different prepositions other than those expected in Standard English. For instance, whereas in Standard English the verbs *attach* and *concentrate* take the prepositions *to* and *on* respectively, in Kenyan English these verbs can be used with the preposition *with* (Schneider 2007: 196). In the same vein, Schmied (1991: 67-9) points out that in East African English, verbs such as *participate*, *switch*, and *derive* are used with the prepositions *with*, *out* and *from* instead of *in*, *off*, and *of* as in Standard English respectively. In their discussion of the use of particle verbs (which also include prepositional verbs) in African Englishes, Nelson and

Hangato (2012: 206) found out that the use of particle verbs in Ugandan English is similar to L1 varieties in respect to the relative frequencies of the particle verb types and to their frequency of use in various registers. However, they observe “structural innovation” in the use of particle verbs in Ugandan English. This involves the use of “unusual combinations of verbs and particles, but with a meaning which is readily understandable” (Nelson and Hangtao 2012: 207). Examples of variants of prepositional verbs and phrasal prepositional verbs in Ugandan English include; *result into*, *request for*, *demand for*, *oblige to*, *culminate into*, *end up into*, and *look forward for*.

The use of prepositional verbs differently from Standard English has also been reported in West African English varieties. For instance, in their discussion of the use of prepositional verbs in Nigerian English, Alo and Mesthrie (2008: 335) mention three ways in which the variety differs from Standard English. The first case involves “the addition of a preposition” e.g. *cope up for* for *cope* and *discuss about* for *discuss*. The second case involves the absence of a preposition where Standard English requires one, e.g. *dispose* for *dispose of*, *operate* for *operate on*, and *reply* for *reply to*. The third set involves the use of a different preposition from that of Standard English, e.g. *congratulate for* for *congratulate on*. The use of prepositional verbs in English L2 varieties differently from Standard English has also been acknowledged by Mesthrie and Bhatt (2008: 72). For instance, they remark that in West African English, *result* takes the preposition *into* instead of *in* as in Standard English. In addition, they observe the omission of prepositions in prepositional verbs. For example, *for* is omitted in *apply* in Indian English and *with* is omitted in *provide* in East African English. Furthermore, they note the use of non-prepositional verbs, for instance, *discuss about* instead of *discuss* in West African English, Singaporean English and Indian South African English and *emphasise on* instead of *emphasise* in Singaporean English and Indian South African English.

Preposition stranding is another area in which prepositions are used differently from Standard English. For instance, in constructions involving relative clauses, Mbangawana (2008: 419) observes that unlike in other varieties of English in which preposition stranding is used, the tendency in Cameroonian English is to delete such prepositions. This can be illustrated in examples (6.2.52), (6.2.53), and (6.2.54).

(6.2.52) He is being followed by an old man which the name is not given [to]

‘He is being followed by an old man whose name is not given’

(6.2.53) There is a certain girl that we were in Bamenda together [with]

‘There is a certain girl together with whom we were in Bamenda’.

(6.2.54) We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy [of]

‘We have produced an album which we want you to buy a copy of’. (Mbangwana 2008: 419)

The discussion of the use of prepositions in World Englishes has revealed variability both in English L1 and L2 varieties. The main factor explaining the variability in preposition usage both in first and second English language varieties has been the influence of the syntax of regional varieties and that of the indigenous languages where English is used as a L2. The geography and mental concept of the people has also been mentioned as another factor pointing to the variation in the use of prepositions of location and direction. The next section investigates the use of prepositions in three Ugandan indigenous languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.

6.3 Prepositions in Ugandan languages: Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango

This section discusses the use of prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango. It is therefore divided into three sections. The first part shows the types of prepositions in the Luganda language and how they are used to give syntactic and semantic meaning. The second part discusses the use of prepositions in Runyankole-Rukiga. It also describes their syntactic and semantic meanings. The last part discusses the use of prepositions in the Acholi-Lango language. In addition, it explains how most of the prepositions in this language acquire their meaning from body parts.

Since all the three languages have very few prepositions compared to the English language, the equivalent of the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango prepositions in English is provided. Each sentence in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango is followed by a glossing¹⁰ to enable the reader who is unfamiliar with the syntax of these languages to have a better understanding of their structure.

6.3.1 Prepositions in Luganda

¹⁰ The abbreviations used in the glossing in the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango sentences are provided here: APPL => Applicative affix, CONJ => Conjunction, FUT => Future, GEN => Genitive, IMPER => Imperative, IV=> Initial vowel, LOC => Locative, NCP => Noun class prefix, NCP.PL => Noun class prefix plural, NCP.SG => Noun class prefix singular, NEG => Negative, PASS => Passive, PERF => Perfect, PREP => Preposition, Prep.suf => Prepositional suffix, PRES => Present tense, PST => Past tense marker, 1PL.OVI => First person plural object-verb-infix, 1PL.SVP => First person plural subject-verb-prefix, 1SG.SVP => First person singular subject-verb-prefix, 3PL.OVI => Third person plural object-verb-infix, 3PL.SVP => Third person plural subject-verb-prefix, 3SG.OVI => Third person singular object-verb-infix, 3SG.SVP => Third person singular subject-verb-prefix, 3SG.REL => Third person singular relative

Prepositions are used to show the relation of nouns or pronouns with other words in a sentence. Literature on Luganda grammar indicates that the Luganda language has very few clear prepositions. For instance, Ashton et al. (1954: 414-5) observe that “beyond the $-a^{11}$ of relationship, it is doubtful if Luganda has any true prepositions”. The $-a$ of relationship is equivalent to the English preposition *of*. In Luganda, the realisation of this preposition varies and concords with the noun class of the possessed object and not with the possessing noun. This is illustrated in example (6.3.1) and (6.3.2), in which the $-a$ of relationship *bya* and *lya* agree with the noun class of the possessed objects $-bi-$ and $-lu-$, for both *ebitabo* (‘books’) and *olulimi* (‘tongue’) respectively. Using the $-a$ of the relationship of the possessing noun produces an ungrammatical sentence in Luganda. Thus, sentence (6.3.3) and (6.3.4) are ungrammatical since the $-a$ of the relationship of the possessing nouns *omuyizi* (‘student’) and *omwana* (‘child’) belong to the noun class (*o*)*mu-* with their concord genitive or possessive preposition being *wa*. Table 6.3.1 shows the realisation of the possessive preposition *of* in concordance with the noun class in Luganda.

(6.3.1) Ebitabo by’omuyizi

E- bi -tabo	bya	o-mu-yizi
IV-NCP.PL-book	of.GEN	IV-NCP.SG-student
‘The books of the student’		
(The student’s books)		

(6.3.2) Olulimi ly’omwana

O- lu -limi	lya	o-mw-na
IV-NCP.SG-tongue	of.GEN	IV-NCP.SG-child
‘The tongue of the child’		
(The child’s tongue)		

(6.3.3) *Ebitabo w’omuyizi

E- bi -tabo	wa	o- mu -yizi
IV-NCP.PL-book	of.GEN	IV-NCP.SG-student

(6.3.4) *Olulimi w’omwana

O- lu -limi	wa	o- mw -ana
IV-NCP.SG-tongue	of.GEN	IV-NCP.SG-child

Table 6.3.1: Realisation of the preposition *of* in concordance with noun classes in Luganda

¹¹ the $-a$ of the relationship is equivalent to the English possessive preposition *of* that shows the relationship between the possessed and the possessing noun.

(They arrived at Kampala in the morning)

(6.3.6) Basisinkanye e Masaka

Ba-a-**sisinkan**-ye **e** **Masaka**

3PL.SVP-PST-**meet**-PERF **at** **Masaka**

‘They have met at Masaka’

(They met at Masaka)

(6.3.7) Agenze e Mmengo

A-**gen**-ze **e** **Mmengo**

3SG.SVP-**go**-PERF **to** **Mmengo**

‘He/she has gone to Mmengo’

The preposition *e* is not limited to spatial relation to indicate the goal or destination; it can also be used to indicate time. In such cases, *e* has the English equivalent of the preposition *in* as in example (6.3.8) or *zero* as in example (6.3.9) below.

(6.3.8) Omusomesa bamusisikanye e kawungeezi

O-mu-somesa ba-mu-sisikan-ye **e** **kawungeezi**

IV-NCP.SG-teacher 3PL.SVP-3SG.OVI-meet-PERF **in** **evening**

‘The teacher they him/her have in the evening’

(They met the teacher in the evening)

(6.3.9) Omusomesa bamusisikanye ggulo

O-mu-somesa ba-mu-sisikan-ye **ggulo**

IV-NCP.SG-teacher 3PL.SVP-3SG.OVI-meet-PERF **yesterday**

‘The teacher they him/her have met yesterday’

(They met the teacher yesterday)

In Luganda prepositions are also formed using stative verbs and their prepositional¹² verb indicated by the applicative¹³ affix. In Luganda, prepositional verbs convey “the idea of an English preposition –*on*, *at*, *in*, *for*, and *from*” (Kirwan and Gole 1951: 77). In example

¹² The term prepositional verb is used by scholars on the Luganda language such as Pilkington, 1892, Crabtree, 1902, Kirwan and Gole 1951, Ashton et al. 1954, and Chesswas 1967.

¹³ According to Crystal (2008: 30), “an applicative affix on the verb encodes as objects a range of roles, such as benefactive and locative. The construction can be analysed as a type of voice, in which the focus is on the types of object rather than on the relationship between subject and object. Applicatives are widely found in Bantu languages”.

(6.3.10) the prepositional verb *–wandiikira* (‘write for’) contains the applicative affix *–ira* which conveys an idea different from the verb *–wandiika* (‘write’).

(6.3.10) Yatuwandiikira ebbaluwa

Y-a-tu-wandiik-**ira** ebbaluwa

PST.3SG.SVP-1PL.OVI-write-**APPL for** letter

‘He us wrote **for** letter’

(He wrote a letter for us)

The applicative affix is determined by vowel harmony¹⁴. For instance, if the last vowel of the root of the verb is *a*, *i*, or *u*, for example, *lima* (‘cultivate’ or ‘dig’) the applicative affix of the verb is then *–ira*, i.e. *limira* (‘cultivate/dig for or in’). However, if the last vowel of the root of the verb is *e* or *o*, for example, *soma* (‘read’ or ‘study’) the applicative affix is then *–era*, i.e. *somera* (‘read/study for or at’). The allomorphs */-ir-/* and */-er-/* are the common forms of applicative morphemes in Luganda. The use of the applicative affix has three functions: (i) to express action done in a place, (ii) to express absolute completeness when followed by the adverb *ddala* (iii) to supply the verb with a prepositional meaning (cf. Pilkington, 1892, Crabtree, 1902, Kirwan and Gole 1951, Ashton et al. 1954, and Chesswas 1967). In example (6.3.11) the stative verb *soma* (‘read/study’) together with its applicative affix is used to indicate prepositional relation of location. In this case, the applicative affix *–era* of the verb *soma* (‘study’) represents the prepositional meaning of place, that is, *at*.

(6.3.11) Petero asomera Bukalasa

Petero a-som-**era** Bukalasa

Peter 3SG.SVP-study-**APPL** Bukalasa

‘Peter he studies at Bukalasa’

(Peter studies at Bukalasa)

According to Murphy (1972: 235), the locative noun class *–ku-* is used as a preposition to give the English preposition meaning of place, that is, *to* as in example (6.3.12) and *on* as in example (6.3.13). In addition, *ku* can also be used as a preposition of time, thus, giving the English prepositional meaning *in* as in example (6.3.14) and *on* as in example (6.3.15). Furthermore, Murphy (1972) points out that *ku* is used in combination with other adverbials such as *lwa* (‘behalf’) *ku lwa* to form prepositions of reason or condition meanings (‘on behalf

¹⁴ According to Katamba (1989: 211) vowel harmony is “a process whereby within certain designated domain, usually the word, and all vowels are required to share one or more phonological properties”.

of', 'because of', and 'for the reason of'). This view is also supported by Ashton et al. (1954: 414-5). The use of *ku* with other adverbials to produce prepositions of reason and condition is illustrated in example (6.3.16).

(6.3.12) Omuyizi agenda ku ssomero

O-mu-yizi a-genda **ku ssomero**

IV-NCP.SG-pupil 3SG.SVP-go **to school**

'The pupil goes/is going to school'

(6.3.13) Ekitabo kiri ku mmeeza

E-ki-tabo ki-ri **ku mmeeza**

IV-NCP.SG-book 3SG.SVP-be **on table**

'The book it is on the table'

(The book is on the table)

(6.3.14) Ebigezo babikoze ku makya

E-bi-gezo ba-bi-ko-ze **ku makya**

IV-NCP.PL-exam 3PL.SVP-3PL.OVI-do-PASS **in morning**

'The exams they them have done in the morning'

(They have done the exams in the morning)

(6.3.15) Omusawo ajja ku Lwokusooka

O-mu-sawo a-jja **ku lwokusooka**

IV-NCP.SG-doctor 3SG.SVP-come **on Monday**

'The doctor he/she comes on Monday'

(The doctor comes on Monday)

(6.3.16) Omukulu w'essomero yazzeemu ebibuuzo ku lwa basomesa

O-mu-kulu wa essomero y-a-zzeemu e-bi-buuzo

ku lwa ba-somesa

IV-NCP.SG-head of.GEN school PST-3SG.SVP-answer IV-NCP.PL-question

on behalf of NCP.PL-teacher

'The head of the school he/she answered the questions on behalf of the teachers'

(The headmaster/headmistress answered the questions on behalf of the teachers)

Chesswas (1967: 114) observes that in some instances, *ku* is used to indicate the meaning of the English preposition *on* when it is followed by the pronoun. In such

constructions, *ku* is converted into *ko* as the suffix of the verb and the pronoun is inserted as an object to the verb as in example (6.3.17).

(6.3.17) Entebe agitudeko

E-n-tebe a-**gi**-tu-de-**ko**

IV-NCP.SG 3SG.SVP-**3SG.OVI**-seat-PASS-**on**.PREP

‘The chair he/she it is seated on’

(He/she is seated on the chair)

There are other instances in which *ku* is used as a preposition of relationship and adverbial formatives to give varying prepositional meanings such as *on*, *at*, *to the side of* and *besides* (Ashton et al. 1954: 414-5). For instance, in example (6.3.18) the use of *ku* in combination with adverbial formative *mabbali* (‘at/to the side’) and the possessive preposition *of* represent the English preposition *besides*. In addition, *ku* can also be used to emphasise the place *at*, *in*, or *on* where the action is performed or has to be performed. In such constructions *ku* is used together with the verb with the applicative affix, as example (6.3.19) illustrates. The purpose of such a construction is to emphasise the means of transport to be used, that is, the bicycle and not any other means. The emphasis is indicated by the use of a double preposition, that is, the preposition attached to the verb form implied by the applicative affix *-ira* and the preposition governing the object noun phrase *ku gaali* (‘on bicycle’). As has already been mentioned, one of the three functions of the applicative affix is to supply the verb with a prepositional meaning.

(6.3.18) Omwaana ayimiridde ku mabbali g’ennyumba

O-mwa-ana a-yimiri-dde **ku mabbali** **ga**

e-nnyu-mba

IV-NCP.SG-child 3SG.SVP-stand-PERF **on at/to the side of**.GEN

IV-NCP.SG-house

‘The child he/she has stood on at/to the side of the house’

(The child has stood besides the house).

(6.3.19) Tambulira ku gaali

Tambul-**ira** **ku** gaali

IMPER.move-**APPL on** bicycle

‘Move on on bicycle’

(Ride on a bicycle)

In Luganda, the locative noun class marker *-mu-* when used as a preposition has the English equivalent *in*, *to*, *inside*, and *among*. Murphy (1972: 347) points out that *mu* is used “with reference to space, time, manner or other relationships”. As a spatial preposition, *mu* can be used to indicate destination in case it is used with dynamic verbs of motion such as *genda* (‘go’) as in example (6.3.20). In such a case *mu* has a meaning equivalent to the English preposition *to* which points at the destination of the movement. *Mu* is also used with reference to *manner* or *way* the action is being or has been done. In such situations, it has the English equivalent of the preposition *in*. This construction involves the use of *mu* together with the applicative affix of the verb, that is, *-era* or *-eza*, as examples (6.3.21) and (6.3.22) illustrate. In both examples (6.3.21) and (6.3.22), the use of a double preposition marked by the applicative affixes *-era* and *-eza* (meaning ‘on’) and the preposition *mu* (on) is to emphasise the way and manner in which traders travelled to the town and where one is supposed to carry on his or her discussions. Kirwan and Gole (1951: 77) observe that the use of the applicative affix of the verb followed by *mu* implies that the verb contains “an idea slightly beyond the one implied by the simple verb”, in this case *genda* (go) and *teesa* (discuss). The ideas beyond the simple verbs are *gendera* (go in by) and *teeseza* (discuss in).

(6.3.20) Abasuubuzi baagenda mu kibuga.

A-ba-suubuzi ba-a-**genda** **mu** kibuga

IV-NCP.PL-trader 3PL.SVP-PST-**go to** town

‘Traders they went to town’

(Traders went to town)

(6.3.21) Abasuubuzi baagendera mu baasi mu kibuga

A-ba-suubuzi ba-a-gend-**era** **mu** baasi mu kibuga

IV-NCP.PL-trader 3PL.SVP-PST-**go-APPL in** bus to town

‘Traders they went in in the bus to the town’

(Traders went by bus to the town)

(6.3.22) Teeseza mu lukiiko

Tees-**eza** **mu** lukiiko

IMPER.discuss-**APPL in** council

‘Discuss in in council’

(Discuss in council)

Chesswas (1967: 114) note that *mu* can also be used as a preposition to mean *in*. In this case, *mu* is suffixed to the verb and the pronoun inserted as an object of the verb. This is

illustrated in example (6.3.23), in which *mu* is suffixed to the verb *soma* (read) and the pronoun *ki* represented as object-verb-infix.

(6.3.23) Ekitabo yakisomamu.

E-ki-tabo y-a-**ki**-soma-**mu**.

IV-NCP-book PST-3SG.SVP-**3SG.OVI**-read-**Prep.Suf**

‘The book he/she it read in’

(The book he/she read in it)

Luganda has no specific prepositions marking *onto* and *into*, as used in English respectively. Instead, the applicative affix plus preposition *mu* are used. This is shown in example (6.3.24) and (6.3.25), in which *mu* is used for both surface and area respectively. Although the noun phrase *kisaawe* (sports ground) and *nnimiro* (field) refer to both *surface* and *area* respectively, in Luganda the preposition *mu* is used for both contexts. In addition, the verbs change to the applicative affix *-ira*. The use of the applicative affix can indicate both the English meaning *in* and *into* respectively, as example (6.3.26) illustrates. Using the simple verb form *-dduka* (‘run’) gives the opposite meaning in Luganda because the verb *-dduka* (‘run’) requires the preposition *from*, as example (6.3.27) shows.

(6.3.24) Abaana bazanyira mu kisaawe

A-ba-ana ba-zany-**ira** **mu** kisaawe

IV-NCP.PL-child 3PL.SVP-play-APPL in field

‘The children they play **in** the field’

(The children are playing on the field).

(6.3.25) Ente ziriira mu nnimiro

E-n-te zi-ri-**ira** **mu** nnimiro

IV-NCL.PL-cow 3PL.SVP-graze-**APPL in** field

‘Cows they are grazing/graze **in** the field’

(Cows are grazing in the field).

(6.3.26) Abaana baddukira mu nyumba

A-ba-ana ba-dduk-**ira** **mu** nyumba

IV-NCP.PL-child 3PL.SVP-run-APPL **mu** nyumba

‘The children they run **in/into in** house’

(The children are running in/into the house)

(6.3.27) Abaana badduka mu nyumba

A-ba-ana ba-**dduka** **mu** nyumba
 IV-NCP.PL-child 3PL.SVP-**run** **from** house
 ‘The children they run from house’
 (The children they run from the house)

It is also worthy to note that in Luganda there is no distinction in the use of preposition *in* and *at* in respect to the location as a point or area. Instead, the preposition *mu* is used for both perspectives, like Makerere University as example (6.3.28). In addition, the preposition *mu* is also used for buildings in both their institutional and functional aspect as in example (6.3.29) and in their three dimensional structure like in example (6.3.30), where English would prefer the prepositions *at* and *in* respectively. In Luganda, reference to the three dimensional structure is indicated by the use of the applicative affix *-era* plus the preposition *mu*.

(6.3.28) Ali mu Makerere Yunivasite

A-li **mu** **Makerere Yunivaasite**
 3SG.SVP-be **in/at** **Makerere University**
 ‘He/she is in/at Makerere University’
 (He/she is in/at Makerere University)

(6.3.29) Akola mu ggwanika ly’ebitabo

A-kola **mu ggwanika** **lya** **e-bi-tabo**
 3SG.SVP-work **in** **store** **of.GEN** **IV-NCP.PL-book**
 ‘He/she works in/at the store of books’
 (He/she works at the book store)

(6.3.30) Akolera mu ggwanika ly’ebitabo

A-kol-**era** **mu ggwanika** **lya** **e-bi-tabo**
 3SG.SVP-work-**APPL** **in** **store** **of.GEN** **IV-NCP.PL-book**
 ‘He/she works **in in** **bookstore**’
 (He/she works in the bookstore).

Although Luganda has very few prepositions in comparison to the English language, Ashton et al. (1954: 414-5) argue that other equivalent of English prepositions can be represented in Luganda by:

- (a) phrases built on the *-a* of the relationship and adverbial formatives such as *ku mabbali ga* (on at/to the side of beside), *emabega wa* (at behind of behind), *mu maaso ga* (in front of),

waggulu wa (from above of), *kumpi na* (near of), and *mu kifo kya* (in place of). This is illustrated in examples (6.3.31) in which *emabega wa* (behind) is used.

(6.3.31) Yimirira emabega w'oluggi

Yimirira **e-mabega** **wa** **o-lu-ggi**
 IMPER-Stand **at-behind** **of.GEN** **IV-NCP.SG-door**
 'Standa at behind of the door'
 (Stand behind the door)

(b) the use of certain verbs in the infinitive such as *okuva* (to come from) and *okutuuka* (to arrive) as in example (6.3.32).

(6.3.32) Abaana banawummula okuva leero okutuuka mu mwezi ogujja

A-ba-ana ba-na-wummula **okuva** leero **okutuuka** mu mwezi ogujja
 IV-NCP.PL-child 3PL.SVP-FUT-rest **from** today **up to** in month **coming**
 'The children they will rest from today up to in month coming'
 (The children will have holidays from today till the coming/next month).

(c) the use of phrases *eri...* (to there, i.e. to) in the imperative as in example (6.3.33) and *eteri or awatali...* (to not there, i.e. without) in the interrogative as in example (6.3.34) and imperative as in example (6.3.35) below.

(6.3.33) Genda eri omwami

Genda **e-ri** o-mwa-mi
 IMPR.go **LOC.to-there** IV-NCP.SG-chief
 'Go to there the chief'
 (Go to the chief)

(6.3.34) Ayinza atya okukisala awatali kambe?

A-yinza atya oku-ki-sala **a-wa-ta-li** ka-mbe?
 3SG.SVP-can how to-3SG.OVP-cut 3SG.REL-**where-NEG-be** NCP.SG-knife?
 'He/she can how to it cut it where no is knife?'
 (How can he/she cut it without a knife?)

(6.3.35) Taakole awatali mpeera.

Ta-a-kol-e **a-wa-ta-li** m-peera
 NEG-3SG.SVP-do/work-PERF **3SG.REL-where-NEG-be** NCP.SG-reward
 'No he/she done/worked it where no is reward'
 (He won't work without a reward)

Using the conjunction *na* (and) to connect the instrument with an active verb as in example (6.3.36), Murphy (1972: 404) observes that *na* or *n'* (before a vowel) means (with) thus, “denoting instrument or association”. He continues to observe that “sometimes, *na* alternates with *ne*. When *na* means *with* it is replaced by *ne* if the verb is positive”. This can be illustrated in example (6.3.37) and (6.3.38).

(6.3.36) Ekibe yakikuba n'omuggo

E-ki-be y-a-ki-kuba **na** **o-mu-ggo**
 IV-NCP.SG-hyena PST-3SG.SVP-3SG.OVP-strike **CONJ.and IV-NCP.SG-stick**
 ‘The hyena he/she it struck with the stick’
 (He/she struck the hyena with the stick)

(6.3.37) Agenda ne Petero

A-genda ne Petero
 3SG.SVP-go and Peter
 ‘He/she is going with Peter’

(6.3.38) Tagenda na Petero

T-a-genda na Petero
 NEG-3SG.SVP-go and Peter
 ‘Not he/she go and Peter’
 (He/she is not going with Peter)

The discussion of prepositions in Luganda has shown that this language has very few clear prepositions in comparison to the English language. It has also revealed how the equivalents of English prepositions are expressed in Luganda. The next section discusses how prepositions are used in Runyankole-Rukiga.

6.3.2 Prepositions in Runyankole-Rukiga

Runyankole-Rukiga like Luganda does not have many prepositions. In addition, the prepositional meanings are expressed differently in comparison to the English language. For instance, Taylor (1985: 181-2) points out that “in Runyankole-Rukiga, prepositions are invariable and do not agree with the noun phrases they govern. They have no particular grammatical effects”. The exception to this is the *-a* (of) which agrees with the possessed object but not with the noun governed, i.e. the possessor. This is illustrated in examples (6.3.39) and (6.3.40) in which the possessive prepositions *wa* and *ba* concord with the noun class marker *mu-* and *ba-* of the possessed objects *omuhuruzi* (warrior) and *abahuruzi*

(warriors) respectively and not the possessor, that is, *Ankole*. According to Taylor (1985: 180), the most common preposition in Runyankole-Rukiga is the possessive *-a*, (of), which links nouns together. In addition, he observes that “the possessive particle *-a* can be regarded as a simple preposition, in that it is not compounded” (Taylor 1985: 181).

(6.3.39) Omuhuruzi w’ Ankole

O-**mu**-huruzi **wa** Ankole

IV-**NCP.SG**-warrior **of.GEN** Ankole

‘Warrior of Ankole’

(Ankole’s warrior)

(6.3.40) Abahuruzi b’ Ankole

A-**ba**-huruzi **ba** Ankole

IV-**NCP.PL**-warrior **of.GEN** Ankole

‘Warriors of Ankole’

(Ankole’s warriors)

Commenting on the use of the preposition *of* in Runyankole, Morris and Kirwan (1957: 46) state that “the preposition ‘of’ is formed by attaching the correct prefix to *-a*. This *-a* is replaced by an apostrophe when followed by a word beginning with *a*, *e*, or *o*. Since most nouns have an initial vowel, this is the more common form”. Table 6.3.2 illustrates the forms of the *-a* (of) preposition according to noun classes in Runyankole-Rukiga.

Table 6.3.2: Realisation of the preposition *of* in concordance with noun classes in Runyankole-Rukiga

Noun class number	Noun class	Possessive/genitive ‘preposition <i>of</i> ’	Example	Gloss
1	(o)-mu-	(o)wa	Omuntu	Person
2	(a)-ba-	(a)ba	Abantu	People
3	(o)-mu-	(o)gwa	Omuti	Tree
4	(e)-mi-	(e)ya	Emiti	Trees
5	(e)-ri-	(e)rya	Eriisho	Eye
6	(a)-ma-	(a)ga	Amaisho	Eyes
7	(e)-ki-	(e)kya	Ekitabo	Book
8	(e)-bi-	(e)bya	Ebitabo	Books
9	(e)-n-	(e)ya	Ente	Cow
10	(e)-n-	(e)za	Ente	Cows
11	(o)-ru-	(o)rwa	Orurimi	Tongue

12	(a)-ka-	(a)ka	Akasyo	Knife
13	(o)-tu-	(o)twā	Oturo	Sleep
14	(o)-bu-	(o)bwa	Obushera	Porridge
15	(o)-ku-	(o)kwa	Okuguru	Leg
16	(a)-ma-	(a)ga	Amaguru	Legs

Apart from expressing prepositional meaning using the possessive particle *of*, Runyankole-Rukiga also has other simple prepositions such as *aha* and *omu* that indicate location. *Aha* has the equivalent of the English prepositions *on*, *at*, *near*, or *around*. As a spatial preposition, *aha* is used to refer to the position where an object is located. It is derived from the locative noun class *-ha-*. This is illustrated in example (6.3.41), in which *aha* can have the English equivalent (*near*, *at*, and *on*). The preposition *omu* is taken from the locative noun class *-mu-* denoting an inside-location. It therefore has the English equivalent (*in* and *into*), as examples (6.3.42) and (6.3.43) demonstrate. Taylor (1985: 181) observes that “before pronominal and proper names without initial vowels” *aha* and *omu* take longer forms *ahari* and *amuri* respectively.

(6.3.41) Twareeba ente aha rwigī rw’eifumbiro.

Twa-reeba e-n-te **aha** rwigī rwa eifumbiro
 1PL.SVP-see IV-NCP-cow (**near, at, on.PREP**) door of.GEN kitchen
 ‘We see the cow near/at/on the door of the kitchen’
 (We see the cow at, near the kitchen door)

(6.3.42) Enjubu eri omu maizi

E-n-jubu e-ri **omu** maizi
 IV-NCP:SG-Hippo 3SG.SVP-be **in/into.PREP** water
 ‘A hippo is in/into water’
 (The hippo is in water)

(6.3.43) Abagyenyi bakataahamu omu nju

A-ba-gyenyi ba-kataaha-mu **omu** n-ju
 IV-NCP.PL-visitor 3PL.SVP-PST-enter-LOC **into.PREP** NCP-house
 ‘Visitors they entered in into house’
 (The visitors entered into the house)

In Runyankole-Rukiga, prepositions are also formed by using derived verbs, that is, the prepositional verb or applicative affix of the verb. Morris and Kirwan (1957: 116), for instance, note that in Runyankole, prepositional verbs are used “to convey the idea of the English

preposition *for, on, at, and in*". In example (6.3.44) the applicative affix *-ira* when added to the verb *gura* ('buy') provides the prepositional verb *buy for*. Morris and Kirwan (1957: 117) also remark that "many verbs some of which contain in themselves an idea of motion, are normally followed by *aha* or *omu* and therefore do not require the prepositional form". This is demonstrated in example (6.3.45). They point out that "such verbs may however take the prepositional form if followed by an idea slightly beyond the one implied by the single verb". This is illustrated in example (6.3.46), in which the prepositional verb *-gyendera* (travel in) has a slightly different idea from the simple verb *-gyenda* (go/travel). The use of applicative form with some verbs leads to an entirely opposite meaning from the simple verb. For instance, whereas the verb *-binga* means (drive away/out) the prepositional verb *-bingira* means (drive in /into). Examples of the prepositional verbs with their respective applicative affixes are given in table 6.3.3.

(6.3.44) Abashomesa baagurira omwana ebitabo

A-ba-shomesa ba-a-gur-**ira** o-mw-na e-bi-tabo
 IV-NCP.PL-teacher 3PL:SVP-PST-buy-**APPL** IV-NCP.SG-child IV-NCP.PL-book
 'The teachers they bought **for** the child the books'
 (The teachers bought books for the child)

(6.3.45) Akaza omu kajagiro

A-kaza **omu** ka-jagiro
 3SG.SVP-go **to.PREP** NCP.SG-market
 'He is going to the market'
 (He is going to the market)

(6.3.46) Mugisha yagyendera omu baasi

Mugisha y-a-gyend-**era** **omu** baasi
 Mugisha 3SG.SVP-PST-go/travel-**APPL on.PREP** bus
 'Mugisha he went/travelled on bus'
 (Mugisha went by bus)

Table 6.3.3: Realisation of the applicative morpheme as an infix in Runyankole-Rukiga (cf. Natumanya 2012: 27)

Verb stem	Gloss	Prepositional verbs	Gloss	Applicative affixes
-heza	-finish	-hereza	-finish for	-re-
-batiza	-baptise	-batiriza	-baptise for	-ri-
-ikiriza	-believe	-ikiririza	-believe for/in	-ri-
-taza	-disagree	-tariza	-disagree on	-ri-

-tooza	-search	-tooreza	-search from	-re-
-tiiza	-borrow	-tiiriza	-borrow for	-ri

This section has shown that the expression of prepositional meaning in Runyankole-Rukiga is almost similar to that in Luganda. This concerns mainly the use of prepositional verbs which require varying prepositions depending on the context of space and time and noun phrase that govern them. It has also illustrated how various English prepositions can be expressed by one or a few prepositions in Runyankole-Rukiga. The next section discusses the use of prepositions in Acholi-Lango language.

6.3.3 Prepositions in Acholi-Lango

Acholi-Lango also has very few prepositions compared to the English language. This small set of true prepositions include the following; *I* (on, at, in, about, to, from), *bot* (to, at, with), *me* (for), *pi* (because of), *te* (under), *tu* (towards), *ka* (at, to, from, by, instead of), *kede or ke* (with), *ginni* (with), *ki* (to, with), and *pa* (of) (cf. Crazzolaro 1955, Malandra 1955, Savage 1956, and Noonan 1981). Noonan (1981: 78) observes that there is variation in the use of the preposition *I*. For example, whereas *I* is used with noun phrases that refer to non-humans, it cannot be used with noun phrases that refer directly to humans. With noun phrases referring to humans, “*kom* (body) is used as the object of *I* together with the appropriate noun or pronoun as its inalienable possessor”. Syntactically, prepositions in Acholi-Lango are followed by their noun phrase object or by prepositions inflected for pronominal objects. However, in prepositional phrases involving the preposition *I*, the prepositional phrases may consist of *I* followed by a second preposition and then by the object (Noonan 1981: 78-9). This is illustrated in example (6.3.47), where the preposition *I* is followed by the preposition *bot* (‘t’o) and the object *dako* (‘woman’) and in (6.3.48) where the preposition *I* is followed by the preposition *te* (under) and then the object *yat* (branch). Moreover, Noonan (1981: 79) observes that “*I* combines with body part nouns and locational nouns to form locative expressions”. This is shown in examples (6.3.49), (6.3.50), (6.3.51), and (6.3.52), in which *I* is combined with the body parts *wi* (head), *dog* (mouth), *kor* (chest), and *yi* (stomach) to form locative expressions *on top of*, *on the edge of*, *against*, and *into or out of* respectively. Malandra (1955: 127) points out that *I* is derived from the body part *ic* (belly), which gives it the prepositional meaning *in*, *inside*, *within*, and *from within*. Acholi-Lango has other prepositions which are derived from body parts. These include, *dog* (mouth) meaning *along*, *gec* (back) meaning *behind*, *wi* (from *wic*, head) meaning *on*, *upon*, *on the top*, (cf. Malandra 1955, Crazzolaro 1955, Savage 1956, and Noonan 1981).

(6.3.47) Loca owoto okko I bot dako

Loca o-wot-o okko **I bot dako**
 Man 3SG.SVP-walk-PERF completely **at to woman**
 ‘The man walked after the woman’

(6.3.48) Dako oboe I te yat

Dako o-bo-e **I te yat**
 Woman 3SG.SVP-move-PERF **at under branch**
 ‘The woman walked under the branch’

(6.3.49) I wi bakoi

On head box
 ‘**on top of** the box’

(6.3.50) I dog kulu

On mouth river
 ‘**on the edge of** the river’

(6.3.51) I kor ot

On chest house
 ‘**Against** the house’

(6.3.52) I yi ot

At stomach house
 ‘**into, out of** the house’. (Noonan 1981: 79)

I can also be used to indicate location and direction. For instance, Noonan (1981: 85) observes that “with the exception of expressions formed with *te* (under), location expressions formed with prepositional phrases all involve the preposition *I*. These expressions with *I* may be simple prepositional phrases when they mean *in* or *at*”. This is illustrated in example (6.3.53) and (6.3.54). Noonan (1981: 86) also observes that “when the sense of the verb supplies the direction, or where the direction is supplied from the previous discourse or known to the discussants, simple prepositional phrases with *I* are used”. For instance, in examples (6.3.55), (6.3.56) and (6.3.57) we have the use of the preposition *I* where verbs indicating direction *–ring* (run), *–bin* (come), and *–obo* (move) are employed respectively. In situations when the place to which one is moving is known or familiar, for instance, home or village, the preposition *I* may be omitted, as in example (6.3.58). However, if the place one is going to or moves to is not familiar or known to him, then the preposition *I* is used, as in example (6.3.59). In cases when emphasis of the direction needs to be specified for clarity, *tu* (towards) or a

combination of prepositions are employed. For instance, the prepositions *tu* (towards) plus *bot* (to) and *I* (at) plus *te* (under) are used, as in examples (6.3.60) and (6.3.61) respectively.

(6.3.53) An dang atie I cukul

An dang a-tie **I cukul**
 I also 1SG.SVP-be **in school**
 ‘I am also **at school**’

(6.3.54) Wan ocemo I ot cem

Wan o-cem-o **I ot cem**
 We 1PL.SVP-eat-PERF **in house food**
 ‘We ate **in a restaurant**’

(6.3.55) Ico oringo I ot

Ico o-ring-o **I ot**
 Man 3SG.SVP-run-PERF **to the house**
 ‘The man he has run **to the house**’
 (The man has run **to the house**)

(6.3.56) Dako obino I paco

Dako o-bin-o **I paco**
 Woman 3SG.SVP-come-PERF **(to, from) village**
 ‘The woman she has come **to/from the village**’
 (The woman has come **to/from the village**)

(6.3.57) Dako oboe I ot

Dako o-bo-e **I ot**
 Woman 3SG.SVP-move-PERF **through house**
 ‘The woman she has moved **through the house**’
 (The woman has moved **through the house**)

(6.3.58) Loca owoto Gulu

Loca o-wot-o **Gulu**
 Loca 3SG.SVP-go-PERF **Gulu**
 ‘The man he has gone **to Gulu**’
 (The man has gone **to Gulu**)

(6.3.59) Loca owoto I Dubai

Loca o-wot-o **I Dubai**
 Man 3SG.SVP-go-PERF **to Dubai**

‘The man he has gone **to Dubai**’

(The man has gone **to Dubai**)

(6.3.60) Loca owoto tu bot rwot

Loca o-wot-o tu **bot** **rwot**

Man 3SG.SVP-walk-PERF **towards to king**

‘The man he has walked **towards the king**’

(The man has walked **towards the king**)

(6.3.61) Abwor oboe I te yat

Abwor o-bo-e **I te** **yat**

Lion 3SG.SVP-move-PERF **at under branch**

‘The lion it has moved **under the branch**’

(The lion has moved **under the branch**). (Noonan 1981: 86)

The Acholi-Lango prepositions *ka*, which has the English equivalents *from*, *to*, *at*, and *bot*, which has the meaning *to*, *at* and *with*, are used as prepositions indicating direction when used with verbs of motion. Savage (1956: 50) points out that when *ka* is used after verbs of motion it has the English equivalent of *to*, *from*, and *at* which indicates staying at the place of actions. *Bot* is used as a preposition with verbs of motion directed to or from human beings or staying with a person (Savage 1956: 70). However, Crazzolara (1955: 151) remarks that the use of *bot* is not only limited to human beings but can also be used with other living things such as animals. From this we can conclude that whereas the preposition *ka* is used in reference to the direction to and from non-living things, the preposition *bot* is used in reference to the direction towards or from living things.

Like in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga, Acholi-Lango also has very few clear prepositions. Many English prepositions are expressed using one or a few prepositions in Acholi-Lango. Unlike Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga which form prepositional meanings using prepositional verbs Acholi-Lango does not have applicative affixes which are the key element in the formation of prepositional verbs in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga. Most of the prepositions in Acholi-Lango are derived from body parts from which they get their meaning.

In general, the discussion of prepositions in these three Ugandan languages has revealed that most English prepositions can be represented by few prepositions in these languages. Table 6.3.4 summaries the prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango discussed in this section with their English equivalents. As the speakers of these three

languages learn the English prepositions, it is most likely that they use them differently from Standard English since the various English prepositions are expressed by one or two prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango. This can therefore be the reason to explain the variation in the use of preposition in Ugandan English. The next section discusses the use of prepositions in Ugandan English.

Table 6.3.4: The English equivalents of some of the prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango

Luganda	English equivalents	Runyankole-Rukiga	English equivalents	Acholi-Lango	English equivalents
-a of relationship	of	-a of relationship	of	pa	of
e	at, to, in	aha	on, at, near, around	I	on, at, in, about, to, from
ku	on, in, to, onto	omu	in, into, on	bot	to, at, with
mu	in, at, in, into, inside, among			kede	with
				ki	to, with

6.4 Analysis of prepositions in Ugandan English

This section explores the occurrence of 23 prepositions in the Ugandan data and then investigates the grammatical and lexical meaning of five of the most frequently used prepositions in the Ugandan data in order to illustrate possible substrate influence from Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.

6.4.1 The distribution of prepositions in the Ugandan English data

The first set of analysis explores the occurrence of the 23 prepositions in the Ugandan data, namely; *in, of, to, for, from, at, with, on, up, by, about, around, among, over, into, off, under, within, down, near, onto, inside, and round*. As the discussion of the use of prepositions in world Englishes in section 6.2 indicated, these are the main prepositions that were reported to be used differently from Standard English. In addition, section 6.3 has shown how very few prepositions in Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango have various English equivalents. This part therefore intends to show which of these prepositions are most frequently used among the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango speakers of Ugandan

English. The raw figures and the percentages illustrate which of the 23 prepositions are the most frequently used in the Ugandan data.

The discussion of prepositions in Luganda in section 6.3.1 indicated that this language has very few prepositions that have various English equivalents. Table 6.4.1 shows an overview of the use of the 23 prepositions among the Luganda L1 speakers. As can be seen from this table, the preposition *in* is the most frequently used among the Luganda L1 speakers with 601 raw figures and accounting for 26.16 percent of the total number of the raw figures. It is interesting to note that in this data only three prepositions of location, that is, *in*, *at*, and *on* are among the ten most frequently used prepositions, with the percentages of 26.16, 6.1, and 3.22 respectively. Other prepositions of location such as *near*, *under*, and *inside* are rarely used. Whilst the prepositions indicating change of location, *to* and *from* are among the ten most frequently used prepositions with 12.02 and 7.31 percent respectively, the prepositions *into*, *onto*, and *off* are rarely used. From this table, we also see that the prepositions *of*, *for*, *with*, *up*, and *by* belong to the ten most often used prepositions among the Luganda L1 speakers of Ugandan English.

Table 6.4.1: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the English data with speakers of Luganda as L1

Prepositions	Number	Percentage	Prepositions	Number	Percentage
in	601	26.16	among	23	1.00
of	441	19.20	over	10	0.44
to	276	12.02	into	8	0.35
for	225	9.80	off	8	0.35
from	168	7.31	under	4	0.17
at	140	6.10	within	4	0.17
with	108	4.70	down	3	0.13
on	74	3.22	near	3	0.13
up	63	2.74	onto	0	0
by	59	2.57	inside	0	0
about	50	2.18	round	0	0
around	29	1.26	Total	2,297	100

The distribution of the 23 prepositions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 is represented in table 6.4.2. It can be seen in this table that the preposition *in* is the most frequently used among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 with 309

occurrences and accounting for 25 percent of the total number of occurrences. This table is quite revealing in several ways. First, it shows that regarding the prepositions of location, only *in*, *at*, and *on* are among the ten most frequent prepositions in comparison to *under*, *near*, and *inside* which are rarely used. Second, in respect to the prepositions indicating change of location, only *from* and *to* appear in the ten most frequently used preposition, while *into*, *off*, and *onto* are rarely used. Third, the prepositions *of*, *for*, *with*, *about*, and *up* are among the ten most frequently used prepositions among English speakers with the Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 6.4.2: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Prepositions	Number	Percentage	Prepositions	Number	Percentage
in	309	25	into	7	5.66
of	219	17.72	down	6	0.49
from	133	10.76	under	4	0.32
for	120	9.72	among	3	0.24
to	118	9.55	off	3	0.24
at	68	5.50	within	3	0.24
on	60	4.85	over	2	0.16
with	55	4.45	near	2	0.16
about	47	3.80	round	1	0.08
up	40	3.24	onto	0	0
by	25	2.02	inside	0	0
around	11	0.89	Total	1,236	100

Turning to English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, table 6.4.3 shows the distribution of the 23 prepositions with these speakers. From this table we see that the preposition *in* is the most frequently used among these speakers with 556 raw frequencies and accounting for 23.88 percent of the total number of the occurrences. This table also reveals that the prepositions of location i.e. *in*, *at*, and *on* are among the ten most frequently used prepositions in the data. Other prepositions of location such as *near*, *under*, and *inside* are rarely used. In addition, in respect to the prepositions indicating location, whereas the prepositions *to* and *from* are included in the ten most frequently used prepositions, *into*, *off*, and *onto* are rarely used. Furthermore, the prepositions *of*, *for*, *with*, *up*, and *by* are among the ten most frequently used prepositions among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

Table 6.4.3: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Prepositions	Number	Percentage	Prepositions	Number	Percentage
in	556	23.88	into	14	0.60
of	482	20.70	over	12	0.52
to	280	12.03	off	12	0.52
from	208	8.93	down	12	0.52
for	199	8.55	around	10	0.43
at	170	7.30	among	6	0.26
with	127	5.46	under	6	0.26
on	83	3.57	near	3	0.13
up	65	2.79	onto	1	0.04
by	37	1.59	inside	1	0.04
about	27	1.16	round	0	0
within	17	0.73	Total	2,328	100

Putting together the occurrence of the prepositions among the three groups of speakers, we see that the most ten frequently used prepositions in the Ugandan data are *in*, *of*, *to*, *for*, *at*, *with*, *on*, *up*, and *about*, as illustrated in table 6.4.4 below.

Table 6.4.4: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 23 prepositions in spoken Ugandan English data

Prepositions	Number	Percentage	Prepositions	Number	Percentage
in	1466	25.01	among	32	0.55
of	1142	19.48	into	29	0.49
to	674	11.50	over	24	0.41
for	544	9.28	within	24	0.41
from	509	8.68	off	23	0.39
at	378	6.45	down	21	0.36
with	290	4.94	under	14	0.24
on	217	3.70	near	8	0.14
up	168	2.87	onto	1	0.02
about	124	2.12	inside	1	0.02
by	121	2.06	round	1	0.02
around	50	0.85	Total	5,861	100

Having illustrated the use of the 23 prepositions in the Ugandan data, I now turn to the analysis of prepositional meaning of five of the ten most frequently used prepositions. These are the prepositions indicating location and change of location, namely *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from*.

This part also illustrates the extension of their locative meaning to metaphorical and abstract relations. In addition, the analysis shows how they are used as grammaticised prepositions, that is, as complements of verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Furthermore, the next part shows how these five are used in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. Examples from the data illustrate how these prepositions are used similar to and differently from Standard English.

6.4.2. Grammaticicised and lexical prepositional meaning in Ugandan English

This sections explores the use of the prepositions *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from* in Ugandan English. The analysis takes the following steps. First, it shows the distribution of the meaning of each of the five prepositions among the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango speakers. Second, it illustrates the use of each of the five prepositions either to indicate location or change of location. Third, it shows how each of the five prepositions is used as a grammaticised preposition.

6.4.2.1.1 The use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Table 7.4.5 illustrates the distribution of the preposition *in* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1. From this table, we see that this preposition is frequently used to indicate spatial relation. This makes up 38.27 percent (230 out of 601 instances) in the data. The second most frequent use of this preposition occurs when it is used to denote abstract relations, which accounts for 29.62 percent (178 out of 601 instances) in the data. The use of *in* as a grammaticised preposition comes third as the most frequent use of this preposition in the data and accounts for 15.81 percent (95 out of 601 instances). The lowest occurrences of *in* in the data involve its use to denote relation in time and in idiomatic and fossilised expressions, which account for 7.49 percent and 8.82 percent respectively.

Table 6.4.5: Raw frequencies and percentages of the use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>in</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	230	38.27
Relation in time	45	7.49
Abstract relations	178	29.62
As a grammaticised preposition	95	15.81
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>in</i>	53	8.82
Total	601	100

Although the preposition *in* is to a large extent used like in Standard English, there are some instances which indicate deviation from Standard English. For instance, regarding its use

to indicate relation in time, 97.78 percent (44 out of 45 instances) shows similar usage like in Standard English, as exemplified in (6.4.1), (6.4.2), and (6.4.3). In contrast, only 2.22 percent (1 out of 45 tokens) show deviation from Standard English. This involves the use of *in* instead of *on*, as represented in (6.4.4).

(6.4.1) So I started learning the language interacting with the local people in the evening.

(6.4.2) In the morning up to lunch, after lunch eh then we were free to speak the vernacular.

(6.4.3) And so I had to go back again to Kabuwoko to be prepared and that was in the year 1943

(6.4.4) Yeah I was born in 18 I mean 1986 in October 29th.

Likewise, whereas 97.75 percent (174 out of 178 instances) indicates the use of the preposition *in* to denote abstract relations like in Standard English as in (6.4.5) and (6.4.6), only 2.24 percent (4 out of 178 instances) show deviation from Standard English. This involves the use of *in* instead of *at* as in (6.4.7).

(6.4.5) My father is a peasant farmer and he is doing well in the in the farming section.

(6.4.6) So we are not so perfect even in the local language and still we are learning also another foreign language.

(6.4.7) I think I got a distinction one in O-level.

Furthermore, all the 53 occurrences pointing at the use of the preposition *in* in idiomatic and fossilised expressions are identical to Standard English. This is illustrated in (6.4.8), (6.4.9), and (6.4.10), in which the fossilised expressions *in fact*, *in charge of*, and *in front of* are used.

(6.4.8) In fact, it has been that is why they have even invited some Nigerians to help in the film industry in Uganda.

(6.4.9) My first appointment has been at Villa Maria parish where I am acting as the Father in charge of schools.

(6.4.10) They would be able to like learn how to speak in front of the public.

As illustrated in table 6.4.5, the preposition *in* is used most often to indicate relation in space. Table 6.4.6 illustrates the use of this preposition to express location meaning similar to and different from Standard English.

Table 6.4.6: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *in* to denote location among English speakers with Luganda as L1

The use of the preposition <i>in</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
--	--------	------------

<i>in</i> as in Standard English	195	84.78
<i>in</i> instead of <i>at</i>	31	13.48
<i>in</i> instead <i>to</i>	4	1.74
Total	230	100

In table 6.4.5 we see that the preposition *in* is used to denote location relation like in Standard English accounting for 84.78 percent, as illustrated in examples (6.4.11), (6.4.12), and (6.4.13).

(6.4.11) Kitabi seminary is in Bushenyi district but of Mbarara archdiocese.

(6.4.12) Luganda is the most spoken language here in Uganda.

(6.4.13) I tried my best to learn something and also to coup up with the environment in the north.

However, there are cases in which *in* is used to indicate locative relation, which differs from Standard English usage. This involves the use of *in* instead of *at*, which accounts for 13.48 percent as in (6.4.14), (6.4.15), and (6.4.16). As pointed out in section 6.1.3.2.2.1 and illustrated in the examples (6.1.31) and (6.1.32), in Standard English, the choice of either the preposition *at* or *in* to refer to location is determined by the distance between the speaker and the landmark. Since the speakers of the sentences in (6.4.14), (6.4.15), and (6.4.16) are very far away from the landmarks *Kitabi seminary* and *St John's*, *St Henry's College Kitovu*, and *Uganda Martyrs Kigo nursery school*, the preposition *at* is the most appropriate in such sentences since the long distance between the speakers and the landmarks necessitates viewing these landmarks as points other than containments.

(6.4.14) Then I went for my vacation for one year, I was teaching Latin in Kitabi seminary and St John's.

(6.4.15) So the teachers who were teaching in St Henry's College Kitovu had some of their children there.

(6.4.16) I attended my nursery in Uganda Martyrs Kigo nursery school.

In addition, 1.74 percent shows the use of *in* instead of *to*, as illustrated in examples (6.4.17) and (6.4.18). Again here, as pointed out in section 6.1.3.2.2.1, the verbs of dynamic motional meaning such as *go*, *move*, and *fly* require prepositions of destination such as *to* or *into*. In examples (6.4.17) and (6.4.18) the landmarks *Uganda Martyr's Alukulum National Seminary* and *the piggery* are destinations of the speaker since the dynamic and motional verb *go* is used.

The use of *in* instead of *to* therefore shows deviation from Standard English use of this preposition among English speakers with Luganda as L1.

(6.4.17) Then on 22nd August 2008, I went for my Philosophical studies in Uganda Martyr's Alukulum National Major Seminary in Gulu.

(6.4.18) I was going in the piggery.

The analysis of the use of the preposition *in* to indicate location among English speakers with Luganda as L1 has shown that this preposition is overwhelmingly used as is the case in Standard English. However, there are some deviations from Standard English which could be explained as a possible influence from the Luganda language. For instance, in section 6.3.1, it was pointed out that the Luganda language has very few prepositions in comparison to the English language. Furthermore, it was illustrated that the Luganda locative prepositions *e* and *mu* have the English equivalent *at* and *to*, *in*, and *to*. Furthermore, examples (6.3.20) and (6.3.22) illustrated how the Luganda preposition *mu* can be used to mean the English prepositions *to* and *in* respectively.

Apart from its lexical meaning to denote location, *in* can also be used as a grammaticised preposition. Here, it is used as a complement of verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Table 6.4.7 illustrates the distribution of the grammaticised preposition *in* similar to and different from Standard English.

Table 6.4.7: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>in</i>	Number	Percentage
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	43	45.26
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	44	46.32
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	8	8.42
Total	95	100

From table 6.4.7, we see that 46.32 percent involves the use of *in* as a complement of a verb different from Standard English. For example, in (6.4.19) and (6.4.20), the verb *translate* has *in* as its complement instead of *into* as in Standard English. In the same vein, in example (6.4.21), the verb *work* is used with the preposition *in* as its complement instead of *with* as in Standard English.

(6.4.19) But the constitution is written in English though it can be translated also in other local languages.

(6.4.20) So I preached in Luganda and then she translated in Acholi.

(6.4.21) I liked it very much also building a spirit of working in my team members.

There are cases where the grammaticised preposition *in* is used similar to Standard English. For instance, 45.26 percent indicate its use as a complement of a verb like in Standard English, as shown in examples (6.4.22) and (6.4.23), in which the verbs *interest* and *engage* select the preposition *in* as their complement. Likewise, 8.42 percent indicate its use as a complement of nouns like in example (6.4.24), in which the noun *trust* is complemented by the preposition *in*.

(6.4.22) So the moment they would get interested in business then they would learn Swahili

(6.4.23) I appreciate that women should get engaged in the country affairs.

(6.4.24) Yes because I am going to work for them and it is my subjects who put trust in me as they feel that I could work for them.

The discussion of the grammaticised use of the preposition *in* has indicated that almost half of the occurrences show variation from Standard English use of prepositional verbs and the other half similar to Standard English. A deviation from Standard English seems to point at L1 influence. Although the Luganda language has prepositional verbs, however, their structures differ from Standard English (cf. section 6.3.1). For instance, whereas in the Luganda language, the prepositional verbs are marked by the applicative affixes, in the English language, various verbs select various prepositions to form the prepositional verb meaning. Due to the fact that there are very few prepositions in the Luganda language which have various English equivalents, the English speakers with Luganda as L1 seem to be challenged in employing the English prepositional verbs. This leads me to the discussion of the meaning of the preposition *in* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

6.4.2.1.2 The use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Table 6.4.8 presents the distribution of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Runyakole-Rukiga as L1. It shows that 44.98 percent use of the preposition *in* refers to spatial relations. This implies that the use of the preposition *in* to indicate spatial relations is the most frequent meaning of this preposition in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. The second most frequent use of the preposition *in* refers to abstract relations. This makes up 32.36 percent of the total number of the preposition *in* in the data. The lowest number of occurrences of *in* in the data includes its use in idiomatic and fossilised expressions,

as a grammaticised preposition and relation in time, which account for 11 percent, 7.44 percent, and 4.21 percent respectively.

Table 6.4.8: Raw frequencies and percentages of the use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>in</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	139	44.98
Relation in time	13	4.21
Abstract relations	100	32.36
As a grammaticised preposition	23	7.44
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>in</i>	34	11
Total	309	100

The use of the preposition *in* to denote abstract relations is to a large extent used, just like in Standard English, as exemplified in (6.4.25), (6.4.26), and (6.4.27). This accounts for 97 percent (97 out of 100 instances) of the abstract relation meaning of this preposition in the data. Only 3 percent (3 out of 100 instances) shows deviation from Standard English. In these instances, the preposition *in* is used instead of *at*, as illustrated in (6.4.28) and (6.4.29).

(6.4.25) So we are in the dot com era those students many of them have gone to school

(6.4.26) You find she is in trouble because they feared to tell her about sex, she never got sex education actually.

(6.4.27) So you just share with someone who was a year ahead of you in marriage

(6.4.28) They are not qualified teachers and they have taken this policy to be like if you are a student a pupil in primary level, there is no repeating so at the end of the year everybody in a class goes into another what in another class.

(6.4.29) Ah I was at first I was at I was about you know I was still in O-level in senior three there.

The preposition *in* is also used in idiomatic and fossilised expressions which are headed by this preposition, for instance, *in order to* as in (6.4.30), *in actual fact* as in (6.4.31), and *in that case* as in (6.4.32). All the 34 instances in which the preposition *in* is used in idiomatic and fossilised expressions are similar to Standard English.

(6.4.30) When the teachers try to punish them may be in order to get some information to grab something in class.

(6.4.31) They say may be I have been having a commitment when in actual fact she has been

doing other things.

(6.4.32) In that case you are luck.

Likewise, all the 13 instances involving the use of the preposition *in* to indicate relation in time are similar to Standard English usage. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.33), (6.4.34), and (6.4.35) below.

(6.4.33) In the recent years he was helping them more but for them they wanted more than that.

(6.4.34) The man is there may be he is a businessman and to one at seven in the evening he is already at home.

(6.4.35) I come from Kabale diocese, Bukyinda parish, then I was born in 1986.

There are 23 instances where the preposition *in* is used as a grammaticised preposition. Whereas 95.65 percent (22 out of 23 instances) involve prepositional verb meaning similar to Standard English as in (6.4.36) in which the verb *interest* selects *in* as its complement, 4.35 percent (1 out of 23 instances) shows deviation from Standard English use of a prepositional verb as example (6.4.37), in which the verb *dress* is complemented by the preposition *in*.

(6.4.36) So now the Abwiru they are not interested in any more in kingdomship.

(6.4.37) Because they actually put in some sweet words to make those vulgar that vulgar language somehow clean because you saying am going someone says can I dress in your shoes

As mentioned above, the use of the preposition *in* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 many times relates to spatial relations. Table 6.4.9 shows the distribution of this preposition to indicate location similar to and different from Standard English.

Table 6.4.9: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *in* to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga L1

The use of the preposition <i>in</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
<i>in</i> indicating location as in Standard English	116	83.45
<i>in</i> instead of <i>at</i>	14	10.07
<i>in</i> instead of <i>to</i>	8	5.76
<i>in</i> instead of <i>into</i>	1	0.72
Total	139	100

From table 6.4.9, it is clear that the preposition *in* is most frequently used to indicate location like in Standard English. This makes up 83.45 percent of all the use of the preposition *in* to express location, as illustrated in (6.4.38), (6.4.39), and (6.4.40).

(6.4.38) Then I joined St Adrian seminary it is found in Kabale district from senior one to senior four.

(6.4.39) In the village, you find people some some people end up saying it is a school because there are very many students there.

(6.4.40) The problem is most common in rural areas, in towns in the town they have tried to come up but in the rural areas, it is worse.

However, there are instances revealing deviation from Standard English use of the preposition *in* to indicate relation in space. For instance, 10.07 percent involves the use of *in* instead of *at*, as illustrated in examples (6.4.41) and (6.4.42). As pointed out in section 6.1.3.2.2.1, if the speaker is very far from the landmark he or she views it as a point other than containment. Since the speakers of the sentences (6.4.41) and (6.4.42) are far away from the landmarks *the saloon* and *Kalungu GTC* respectively, in Standard English, the preposition *at* other than *in* would be the preferred choice.

(6.4.41) You are already you don't have time to talk to, you are in the saloon.

(6.4.42) I normally go to do some pastoral work in Kalungu GTC.

In addition, 5.76 percent involve the use of *in* instead of *to* like in examples (6.4.43), (6.4.44), and (6.4.45). In these examples, the use of the verb *to go* necessitates perceiving the landmarks *these towns*, *a serious joint*, *a university or any other institutions* as destinations. In these examples, the use of the preposition *to* would be the preferred preposition than the preposition *in*.

(6.4.43) When you go even to go in these towns like Masaka you find they are many people who are Bakiga, Banyoro.

(6.4.44) They use Luganda of course, now the joints also differ, if you go in a serious joint like Serena for instance or Hotel African, English is being spoken.

(6.4.45) So for me after senior six I decided to join directly without going in a university or in any other institution.

Furthermore, there is only one occurrence, which makes up 0.72 percent as in (6.4.46), in which the preposition *in* is used instead of *into* as in Standard English. Although both the prepositions *to* and *into* indicate destination, like in example (6.4.46), the preposition *into*

would be the preferred preposition other than *to*. As Lindstromberg (1998: 149) points out, the difference between the two prepositions is that “whereas *into* means specifically that the path does cross the surface or boundary of the landmark, in contrary, *to* specifically means endpoint”. The landmark *villages* implies that the path crosses more than one village hence not specifying the end point and thus making the use of *into* the preferred preposition in Standard English.

(6.4.46) If you go deep in villages they have not qualified teachers.

As the discussion of the use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Runyakole-Rukiga as L1 has shown, this preposition is used like in Standard English, to a large extent. However, the data has also revealed that there are instances in which the use of this preposition deviates from Standard English. Most of the deviations involve the use of *in* instead of *at* to indicate relation in space and with abstract relations. This can be seen as an influence from the Runyakole-Rukiga language, which has very few prepositions compared to the English language (cf. section 6.3.2). For instance, the locative prepositions in Runyakole-Rukiga, that is, *aha* and *omu* can have the English preposition equivalents *near*, *at*, *on*, *in*, *into*, and *onto*. Likewise, the Runyakole-Rukiga language does not make a distinction which prepositions should be used to indicate position or destination. This seems to suggest the influence from Runyakole-Rukiga in the use of *in* instead of *to* and *into* among English speakers with Runyakole-Rukiga as L1. As illustrated in examples (6.3.42) and (6.3.43) (cf. section 6.3.2), in Runyakole-Rukiga, *omu* is used to indicate both location and change of location, that is, position and destination. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

6.4.2.1.3 The use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Table 6.4.10 shows an overview of the distribution of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. It can be seen from this table that most occurrences of this preposition refer to spatial relation and abstract relation meanings, which make up 42.45 percent and 34.53 percent respectively.

Table 6.4.10: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>in</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	236	42.45
Relation in time	39	7.01
Abstract relations	192	34.53

As a grammaticised preposition	32	5.76
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>in</i>	57	10.25
Total	556	100

Before discussing the use of the preposition *in* to indicate relation in space where most of the variations from Standard English occur, I would like to point at other meanings of this preposition in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. As pointed out above, the use of the preposition *in* to indicate abstract relations is the second most often used meaning of this preposition in the data. It is interesting to note that 97.39 percent (187 out of 192 instances) indicate usages similar to Standard English. For instance, in (6.4.47) and (6.4.48) the landmarks *the community* and *the local language* are abstractions denoting containment hence the choice of the preposition *in*. In contrast, the deviation from Standard English involves the use of the preposition *in* where the landmark denotes a point other than containment. For instance, in (6.4.49) the landmark *A-level* is a point which in Standard English would be linked by the preposition *at* other than *in*. The deviation from Standard English use of this preposition to denote abstract relations accounts for only 2.6 percent (5 out of 192 instances).

(6.4.47) It tends to look at general aspects in the community, there is no kind of specialisation, specialisation now comes at a higher level.

(6.4.48) Now when they say from nursery up to P4 they should be teaching in the local language now these three years here it will not be easy for that person to learn the English language.

(6.4.49) There is a programme that government has come up with; they call it quarter system, nine best performers in A-level in that district.

The third most frequent use of the preposition *in* occurs with idiomatic and fossilised expressions. This accounts for 10.25 percent of the total number of the preposition *in* in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. All the 57 occurrences show fossilised expressions headed by the preposition *in*. For instance, in (6.4.50) and (6.4.51) the expressions *in terms of* and *in other words* are headed by the preposition *in*.

(6.4.50) I think the government is trying is trying and that is basically in terms of giving them leadership position in the system.

(6.4.51) So there is no failing in other words so you are promoted.

The preposition *in* is also used to indicate relation in time, which makes up 7.01 percent of this preposition in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. It is interesting to note

that the use of this preposition to imply this meaning is overwhelmingly similar to Standard English. For instance, although 92.31 percent (36 out of 39 instances) show the use of the preposition *in* to indicate relation in time similar to Standard English as in (6.4.52) and (6.4.53), only 7.69 percent (3 out of 39 instances) shows deviation from Standard English, in which the preposition *in* is used instead of *on*, as examples (6.4.54) and (6.4.55) illustrate.

(6.4.52) I was born in the year 1986.

(6.4.53) Then in the year 2003, I joined a secondary school ah which is called Akokoro
secondary school after which I completed my O-level from there in 2006.

(6.4.54) am from Lira diocese particularly from Apac district and Apac parish as well eh I
was born in the year 1980 in December 20th

(6.4.55) Ok my name is [...], I was born in 8th June 1988 at a place called Baara.

The grammaticised use of the preposition *in* has the lowest number of occurrences in the data. It accounts for just 5.76 percent. Most of the occurrences in this category, that is, 53.13 percent (17 out of 32 instances) involve prepositional verb meaning similar to Standard English. For instance, in (6.4.56) and (6.4.57) the verbs *participate* and *involve* both select the preposition *in* as their complement.

(6.4.56) So which means even if we recruit them even if we allow them to participate in
politics, they will perform well.

(6.4.57) What I have seen is the reason as to why may be some people are not getting jobs is
most of these offices now they have taken they are now eh too much involved in
nepotism.

There are instances in which the grammaticised use of the preposition *in* differs from Standard English. This involves the use of prepositional verbs differently from Standard English and it accounts for 46.88 percent (15 out of 32 instances). This is illustrated in examples (6.4.58) and (6.4.59).

(6.4.58) For the seminary, they say those people are special that is why they always come
dress in that way.

(6.4.59) And not in that field where they are supposed to work they are recruited in that job.

As pointed out above, I now turn to the discussion of the use of the preposition *in* to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Table 6.4.11 reveals the distribution of the preposition *in* to indicate spatial relation similar to and different from Standard English.

Table 6.4.11: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *in* to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

The use of the preposition <i>in</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
<i>in</i> as in Standard English	209	88.56
<i>in</i> instead of <i>at</i>	25	10.59
<i>in</i> instead <i>into</i>	2	0.85
Total	236	100

From table 6.4.11, we see that 88.56 percent indicate the use of this preposition to express location similar to Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.60), (6.4.61), and (6.4.62), in which the landmarks *Uganda*, *Kampala*, *the towns*, and *the villages* are geographical areas which denote containment.

(6.4.60) Because entirely I have studied in Uganda.

(6.4.61) There are some secondary schools in Kampala which are paying even one million per term.

(6.4.62) So in the towns and in the city centres the women are playing great role of being model to the girls that is why perhaps we see the number of girls studying in the town over weighs those ones in the villages.

The deviation from Standard English involves first and foremost, the use of *in* instead of *at* accounting for 10.59 percent. For instance in (6.4.63), (6.4.64), and (6.4.65) the landmarks *the taxi park*, *Ggaba*, *Otologanga Boys Primary School* and *Paida Secondary School* are perceived as points other than containments since, as pointed out in section 6.1.3.2.2.1, if the speaker is very far from the landmark he or she views it as a point other than containment.

(6.4.63) Ah most especially in the taxi park they use Luganda.

(6.4.64) The first born is a deacon now in Ggaba.

(6.4.65) I studied my primary school in a school called Otologanga Boys Primary School and my secondary school I studied in Paida Secondary School.

In addition, 0.85 percent involves the use of *in* instead of *into*, as exemplified in (6.4.66). In this example, the preposition *into* would be the preferred preposition since the verb *go* implies destination and that the path does cross the surface or boundary of the landmark villages (cf. Lindstromberg 1998: 149).

(6.4.66) When you go deep in the villages, those girls really they lack role model given the communication system which is poor in the villages.

The discussion of the use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 has revealed that, to a large extent, this preposition is used like in Standard English. However, there are instances in which the use of this preposition deviates from Standard English. These deviations have been reported in the meaning of the preposition *in* to indicate location, abstract relations and relation in time where *in* is used instead of *at*, *on*, and *into*. The deviation from Standard English can be seen as a possible influence from Acholi-Lango. For instance, in section 6.3.3 it was pointed out that in the Acholi-Lango language, preposition *I* has the English equivalents *on*, *at*, *in*, *about*, *to*, and *from*. In addition, the Acholi-Lango language has no prepositional verbs. The selection of the appropriate prepositions in prepositional verb meanings seems to be a big challenge among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. This is because, as pointed out above, 48.88 percent of the grammaticised uses of the preposition *in* indicate deviation from Standard English. This implies that most deviations from Standard English use of the preposition *in* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 is reported in the grammaticised use of this preposition. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *in* in Ugandan English.

6.4.2.1.4 The use of the preposition *in* in Ugandan English

From table 6.4.1 it is clear that the preposition *in* is used to express relation in space in the Ugandan English data, which accounts for 41.27 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The second most frequent use of the preposition *in* involves abstract relations, which accounts for 32.06 percent. This is followed by the use of the grammaticised use of this preposition *in*, which accounts for 10.23 percent. The lowest occurrences of the preposition *in* in the data occur in idiomatic and fossilised expressions and in expressions of time relations, which account for 9.82 percent and 6.62 percent respectively.

Table 6.4.12: Raw frequencies and percentages of the meaning of the preposition *in* spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning the preposition <i>in</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	605	41.27
Relation in time	97	6.62
Abstract relations	470	32.06
As a grammaticised preposition	150	10.23
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>in</i>	144	9.82
Total	1,466	100

As mentioned above, in the spoken Ugandan English data, the preposition *in* is most frequently used to indicate spatial relations. Table 6.4.13 shows the similarity to and difference from Standard English in the use of the preposition *in* to denote spatial relations among English speakers with the three L1s. Interestingly, this table shows that the preposition *in* is most frequently used as in Standard English, which accounts for 85.95 percent in the Ugandan English data. Comparing the use of this preposition among English speakers with the three L1s, table 6.4.13 shows that its use to indicate location similar to Standard English is higher among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (88.56 percent) than among English speakers with Luganda as L1 (84.78 percent) and English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (83.45 percent).

Notwithstanding the high use of the preposition *in* to express location relations similar to Standard English, there are also cases that represent deviation from Standard English usage. This involves the use of *in* instead of *at*, which accounts for 11.57 percent in the Ugandan English data and 13.48 percent, 10.07 percent and 10.59 percent among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1 respectively. In addition, the preposition *in* is used instead of *to*, which accounts for 1.98 percent in the Ugandan English data. This deviation is reported more among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (5.76 percent) than English speakers with Luganda as L1 (1.74 percent). Interestingly, this deviation is not reported among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Furthermore, the difference from Standard English in the use of the preposition *in* to indicate spatial relation involves the use of *in* instead of *into*. This accounts for 0.49 percent in the Ugandan English data. This deviation is reported in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (0.85 percent) and in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (0.72 percent) but not in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.

Table 6.4.13: The percentages of the use of the preposition *in* to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data

The use of the preposition <i>in</i> to express location	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
<i>in</i> as in Standard English	84.78	83.45	88.56	85.95
<i>in</i> instead of <i>at</i>	13.48	10.07	10.59	11.57
<i>in</i> instead of <i>to</i>	1.74	5.76	0	1.98
<i>in</i> instead of <i>into</i>	0	0.72	0.85	0.49
Total	100	100	100	100

In the Ugandan English data, variation from Standard English is many times noticed in the grammaticised use of the preposition *in*. As table 6.4.14 reveals, whereas 54.67 percent indicates the use of the preposition *in* as a complement of verbs similar to Standard English, 40 percent indicate deviation from Standard English. It is interesting to note that among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, 95.65 percent accounts for the use of the preposition *in* as a complement of verbs like in Standard English and only 4.35 percent show deviation from Standard English. The deviation from Standard English use of prepositional verbs is frequently noticeable among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (46.88 percent) and English speakers with Luganda as L1 (46.32 percent). It is interesting to observe that only English speakers with Luganda as L1 used *in* as a complement of a noun similar to Standard English, which accounts for 8.42 percent of the grammaticised use of this preposition.

Table 6.4.14: The percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition *in* in spoken Ugandan English data

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>in</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	45.26	95.65	53.13	54.67
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	46.32	4.35	46.88	40
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	8.42	0	0	5.33
Total	100	100	100	100

6.4.2.2.1 The use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

The distribution of the preposition *at* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 is presented in table 6.4.15. This table shows that the preposition *at* is frequently used to express relation in space. This accounts for 49.29 percent (69 out of 140 instances) of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The second most frequently used meaning of the preposition *at* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 involves idiomatic and fossilised expressions, which accounts for 18.57 percent (26 out of 140 instances) of all the occurrences in the data. The grammaticised use of this preposition is the third most frequently used meaning, which makes up 13.57 percent (19 out of 140 instances) of all the occurrences in the data. This is followed by the use of the preposition *at* to indicate time relations accounting for 12.86 percent (18 out of 140 instances) of all the occurrences in the data. The lowest occurrences of the preposition *at* in the data occur with its meaning to indicate abstract relations. This makes up 5.71 percent (8 out of 140 instances) of all the occurrences in the data.

Table 6.4.15: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>at</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	69	49.29
Relation in time	18	12.86
Abstract relations	8	5.71
As a grammaticised preposition	19	13.57
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>at</i>	26	18.57
Total	140	100

All the uses of the preposition *at* to indicate relation in time, abstract relation and its use in idiomatic and fossilised expressions show similarity to Standard English usage. Examples (6.4.67), (6.4.68), and (6.4.69) illustrate the use of this preposition to indicate relation in time, abstract relation, and in fossilised expressions respectively.

(6.4.67) Then at the end of 1959 eh was ordained priest ordination in on 6th of November 1959.

(6.4.68) Then another challenge is that they do not know basically what they should know at certain levels.

(6.4.69) So I learnt the language and at least I know how to converse in Runyankole.

The deviation from Standard English in the use of the preposition *at* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 occurs in its meaning to indicate spatial relations and as a grammaticised preposition. Table 6.4.16 shows the distribution of the preposition *at* to indicate spatial relations.

Table 6.4.16: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *at* to denote location among English speakers with Luganda as L1

The use of the preposition <i>at</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
Location as in Standard English	51	73.91
<i>at</i> instead of <i>in</i>	11	15.94
<i>at</i> instead of <i>on</i>	4	5.80
<i>at</i> instead of <i>to</i>	3	4.35
Total	69	100

From this table, we see that 73.91 percent represent the use of the preposition *at* similar to Standard English. This is exemplified in (6.4.70) and (6.4.71).

(6.4.70) We have cows at home.

(6.4.71) So our father was full time at home though our mother was at work.

There are instances in which the use of the preposition *at* to indicate location deviates from Standard English. This includes the use of *at* instead of *in*, which accounts for 15.94 percent, as indicated in table 6.4.16. In the examples (6.4.72) and (6.4.73), the speakers are at the same location as figure or landmark, that is, *Katigondo* and *Bukalasa* respectively as indicated by the adverb of place *here* where the interview was conducted. In Standard English, the preposition *in* would be preferred other than the preposition *at* (cf. section 6.1.3.2.1).

(6.4.72) I am now here at Katigondo national major seminary.

(6.4.73) So I was not used to this environment because here at Bukalasa we were around 285.

In addition, the preposition *at* is also used instead of *on* among English speakers with Luganda as L1. This accounts for 5.8 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition to indicate spatial relations. For instance, in (6.4.74) the landmark *the table* would be preceded by the preposition *on* in Standard English. As Pullum and Huddleston (2002: 650) pointed out, the preposition *on* is used to denote physical contact between the trajectory and the landmark with the landmark supporting the trajectory.

(6.4.74) What they would do is to write your name at the table where you sit.

Furthermore, the preposition *at* is used instead of *to*. This accounts for only 4.35 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition to indicate location. For instance, in examples (6.4.75) and (6.4.76), the verbs *went* and *come back* are dynamic verbs, which would dictate the use of the preposition *to* with the landmarks *Morry and Paul nursery school* and *Kitabi seminary* in Standard English.

(6.4.75) Then early, I went at Morry and Paul, my nursery school, ah next to Kitovu hospital.

(6.4.76) So I used to be going there every Thursdays then I come back on Saturdays at Kitabi seminary.

The use of the grammaticised preposition *at* similar to Standard English includes its complement to verbs as in (6.4.77) and to adjectives as in (6.4.78). These account for 52.63 percent (10 out of 19 instances) and 10.53 percent (2 out of 19 instances) of the grammaticised use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda as L1 respectively.

(6.4.77) You go to a person thinking that you are going to speak English then looking at you he starts Luganda exactly then you switch off to Luganda.

(6.4.78) So that is where you find that these pupils are good at English.

The deviation from Standard English occurs with complement of verbs as in (6.4.79), which accounts for 36.84 percent (7 out of 19 instances) of all the grammaticised use of the preposition *at*.

(6.4.79) Oh I like listening at Gospel music and country music.

The discussion of the use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda as L1 has shown that this preposition is many times used to indicate spatial relations and in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. Regarding its use to indicate spatial relations, most of the instances show similarity to Standard English usage. It has also been reported that some instances show deviation from Standard English usage. The main deviation involves the use of *at* instead of *in*. The reason for the deviation from Standard English use of the preposition *at* could be an influence from the Luganda language, which has very few prepositions compared to the English language. As was pointed out in section 6.3.1, the locative prepositions in Luganda, that is, *e* and *mu* can have different equivalents in the English language, that is, *at*, *in*, *into*, and *on*. As far as the grammaticised use of the preposition *at* is concerned, more than 50 percent indicate the use of prepositional verbs, as in Standard English. However, there are cases where the use of prepositional verbs with the preposition *at* deviates from Standard English. The deviation from the Standard English use of the prepositional verbs with the preposition *at* suggests a possible influence from the Luganda language. For instance, whereas in the Luganda language, the prepositional verbs are marked by the applicative affixes, in the English language, various verbs select various prepositions to form the prepositional verb meaning (cf. section 6.3.1). This leads me to the discussion of the meaning of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

6.4.2.2.2 The use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

The distribution of the preposition *at* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 is illustrated in table 6.4.17 below.

Table 6.4.17: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>at</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	30	44.12
Relation in time	13	19.12

Abstract relations	2	2.94
As a grammaticised preposition	3	4.41
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>at</i>	20	29.41
Total	68	100

This data reveals that most occurrences of this preposition involve relation in space, which accounts for 44.12 percent. This is followed by the use of the preposition *at* in idiomatic and fossilised expressions, which accounts for 29.41 percent. The third most frequent use of the preposition *at* involves relation in time and it makes up 19.12 percent of all the occurrences. *At* is rarely used as a grammaticised preposition and to indicate abstract relations with only 3 and 2 occurrences respectively. Of the three occurrences indicating the use of the preposition *at* as a grammaticised preposition, 2 occurrences indicate *at* as a complement of verbs as in (6.4.80) and 1 occurrence shows the use of *at* as a complement of an adjective as in (6.4.81).

(6.4.80) Because from behind when I would look at the priests I say these are the people really the role models.

(6.4.81) Yeah I can I am not very good at Runyoro.

The three grammaticised uses of the preposition *at* reveal similarity to Standard English usage. Likewise, all the occurrences involving the use of the preposition *at* to indicate relation in time, abstract relations, and in idiomatic and fossilised expressions are similar to Standard English usage. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.82), (6.4.83), and (6.4.84) for relation in time, abstract relation, and fossilised expressions respectively.

(6.4.82) They want their money at the end of the month.

(6.4.83) At primary seven questions will be asked in English.

(6.4.84) Yeah those two at least Luganda and Kiswahili.

Regarding the use of the preposition *at* to express location in space, most of the occurrences are similar to Standard English, as table 7.4.18 reveals. This accounts for 76.67 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *at* to express location in space, as exemplified in (6.4.85). However, there are cases where *at* is used differently from Standard English. This includes the use of *at* instead of zero (no preposition) as in (6.4.86) and the use of *at* instead of *to* as in (6.4.87). These two cases which show deviations from Standard English account for 16.67 percent and 6.67 percent respectively. Whereas in example (6.4.86) the landmark *home* is perceived as a destination other than a point because of the verb *go*, which indicates movement and (which) in Standard English would take the preposition *to* but with the

landmark home, no preposition is used. In example (6.4.87), the landmark *school* is a destination other than a point because of the verb *come*, which in Standard English would take the preposition *to*.

(6.4.85) When they are at home they don't teach them.

(6.4.86) But when they go at home you find they are using English words talking to the to their elders.

(6.4.87) Even the headmaster finishes a week or some days without coming at school.

Table 6.4.18: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *at* to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

The use of the preposition <i>at</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
Location as in Standard English	23	76.67
<i>at</i> instead of <i>zero</i>	5	16.67
<i>at</i> instead of <i>to</i>	2	6.67
Total	30	100

The data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 has shown that the preposition *at* is frequently used to indicate relation in space. In addition, the analysis of the use of this preposition has revealed that this preposition is to a great extent used as in Standard English. The variation from Standard English use of the preposition *at* occurs in spatial relations. The next part discusses the use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

6.4.2.2.3 The use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Table 6.4.19 shows the use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. From this data we see that most occurrences occur with the use of this preposition in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. This accounts for 67.06 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data, as exemplified in (6.4.88) and (6.4.89) in the expressions *at least* and *at first* respectively. It is interesting to note that the use of the preposition *at* in fossilised expressions takes more than 50 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data.

(6.4.88) Umh personally some I don't speak fluently but at least I can speak five.

(6.4.89) Yeah so this programme at first I criticised it.

Whereas the use of the preposition *at* to denote spatial relation accounts for 15.88 percent, 26 occurrences out of 27 show the use of this preposition like in Standard English. For instance, in example (6.4.90), the landmark *the border* is a point which requires the use of the preposition

at in Standard English. Only one occurrence shows deviation from Standard English use of the preposition *at* to indicate spatial relation. This involves the use of *at* instead of *zero*, as exemplified in (6.4.91). Here, the landmark *home* is perceived as a destination other than a point because of the verb *come* which in Standard English would take the preposition *to*, but with the landmark *home*, no preposition is used.

(6.4.90) And they produce it in a large amount both from Congo because we are at the border.

(6.4.91) So even if they come at home they would speak in Swahili.

All the 12 uses of the preposition *at* to indicate relation in time are similar to Standard English, as example (6.4.92) illustrates. They account for 7.06 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *at* in the data among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

(6.4.92) Because teacher may even come at eleven and writes that he arrives at he reached at eight in the morning.

Of the 9 occurrences indicating the use of the preposition *at* as a grammaticised preposition, 8 occurrences involve the use of *at* as a complement of verbs like in Standard English. For example, in (6.4.93) the verb *look* selects the preposition *at* as a prepositional verb. There is only one case which shows deviation from Standard use of prepositional verb. This is illustrated in (6.4.94), in which the verb *strive* is used with the preposition *at*.

(6.4.93) But when you look at the central the western part of Uganda going to the southern part...

(6.4.94) So for us every time we go we would strive at hard to learn like the English words.

The lowest number of occurrences of the preposition *at* involves its use to indicate abstract relations. They account for 4.71 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. All the eight occurrences in this category are similar to Standard English. This is exemplified in (6.4.95), in which the abstract landmark *the foundation level* is perceived as a point and thus necessitates the selection of the preposition *at* like in Standard English.

(6.4.95) Now if you put weak people at the foundation level, make sure you are going to raise something which is not good also.

Table 6.4.19: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>at</i>	Number	Percentage
-----------------------------------	--------	------------

Relation in space	27	15.88
Relation in time	12	7.06
Abstract relations	8	4.71
As a grammaticised preposition	9	5.29
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>at</i>	114	67.06
Total	170	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 has revealed that this preposition is many times used in fossilised expressions. The second most frequent use of the preposition *at* in the data involves spatial relations. The analysis has also shown that to a great extent English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 overwhelmingly use *at* as in Standard English. This brings me to the comparison of the use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1.

6.4.2.2.4 The use of the preposition *at* in spoken Ugandan English

Table 7.4.20 reveals that in the spoken Ugandan English data, the preposition *at* is half of the time used in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. This accounts for 49.69 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The explanation for the excessive use of the preposition *at* in fossilised expressions in the Ugandan English data seems to be an influence from the considerable occurrence of this category among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, where its use accounts for 67.07 percent in comparison to English speakers with Luganda as L1 18.57 percent and English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 29.41 percent. The second most frequently used meaning of the preposition *at* in Ugandan English involves its relation to space, which makes up 39.13 percent of all the occurrences in the data. The meaning of the preposition *at* to denote spatial relations is used among English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (49.29 percent and 44.12 percent respectively) more often than English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (15.88 percent). The third most frequently used meaning of the preposition *at* in the Ugandan English data refers to relation in time. This accounts for 13.35 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. Among the three groups, English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 use this prepositional meaning most frequently with 19.12 percent. They are followed by English speakers with Luganda as L1 with 12.86 percent. The lowest number of occurrences of this prepositional meaning is among English speakers with the Acholi-Lango as L1 with 7.06 percent. The grammaticised use of the preposition *at* in the Ugandan English data accounts for

9.63 percent of all the occurrences with the highest percentage represented by English speakers with Luganda as L1 (13.57 percent), which is more than the percentages of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (4.41 percent) and English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (5.29 percent) together.

Table 6.4.20: The percentage of the meaning of the preposition *at* in spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning the preposition <i>at</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Relation in space	49.29	44.12	15.88	39.13
Relation in time	12.86	19.12	7.06	13.35
Abstract relations	5.71	2.94	4.71	5.59
As a grammaticised preposition	13.57	4.41	5.29	9.63
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>at</i>	18.57	29.41	67.06	49.69
Total	100	100	100	100

The comparison of the use of the preposition *at* to denote location among English speakers with the three L1s is represented in table 6.4.21. From this table, we see that to a large extent this preposition is used like in Standard English. For instance, whereas English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 use it 100 percent, English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 use it with 73.91 percent and 76.67 percent respectively. The variation from Standard English in the use of the preposition *at* to denote spatial relation most overwhelmingly occurs among English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. For instance, whilst among English speakers with Luganda as L1, the variation involves the use of *at* instead of *in* (15.94 percent), with English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, the variation involves the use of *at* instead of *zero* prepositions (16.67 percent). In addition, whereas the use of *at* instead of *on* only occurs in the data among English speakers with Luganda as L1 (5.8 percent), the use of *at* instead of *to* occurs both in the data of English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, with 4.35 percent and 6.67 percent respectively.

The discussion above shows that the preposition *at* to denote spatial relation is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English. It is interesting to note that the variation from Standard English is reported only among English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. Also worth noting is the exclusive use of *at* instead of *in* and *at* instead of *on*

among English speakers with Luganda as L1 whereas *at* instead of *zero* is used among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga.

Table 6.4.21: The percentage of use of the preposition *at* to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data

The use of the preposition <i>at</i> to express location	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
<i>at</i> as in Standard English	73.91	76.67	100	80.16
<i>at</i> instead of <i>in</i>	15.94	0	0	8.73
<i>at</i> instead of <i>to</i>	4.35	6.67	0	3.97
<i>at</i> instead of <i>zero</i>	0	16.67	0	3.97
<i>at</i> instead of <i>on</i>	5.80	0	0	3.17
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 6.4.22 compares the grammaticised use of the preposition *at* among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1. This table reveals that among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, the preposition *at* is used only as a complement of verbs like in Standard English, that is, 100 percent. Among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, most of the grammaticised uses of the preposition *at* represent its use as a complement of verbs similar to Standard English (66.67 percent). In addition, English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 also use the preposition *at* as a complement of adjectives similar to Standard English usage (33.33 percent). Among English speakers with Luganda as L1, 52.63 percent represent the use of the preposition *at* as a complement of verbs similar to Standard English, whilst 36.84 percent show the use of the preposition *at* as a complement of verbs different from Standard English. English speakers with Luganda as L1 also use the preposition *at* as a complement of adjectives. This accounts for 10.53 percent of the grammaticised use of the preposition *at* in the data of this group. In the spoken Ugandan English data, the analysis reveals that *at* is frequently used as a complement of verbs, as in Standard English. The variation from Standard English accounts for 22.58 percent and is reported only in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.

Table 6.4.22: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition *at* in spoken Ugandan English data

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>at</i>	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	52.63	66.67	100	67.74

Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	36.84	0	0	22.58
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	10.53	33.33	0	9.68
Total	100	100	100	100

6.4.2.3.1 The use of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Table 6.4.23 presents the distribution of the preposition *on* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1. It can be seen from this table that the preposition *on* is frequently used as a grammaticised preposition, accounting for 52.7 percent of all the occurrences in the data. This is followed by the use of the preposition *on* to indicate abstract relations, as exemplified in (6.4.96). This usage accounts for 21.62 percent. In the third position is the use of *on* to express relation in time as in (6.4.97), which accounts for 10.81 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *on* in the data. The use of the preposition *on* in idiomatic and fossilised expressions like in (6.4.98) accounts for 9.46 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The lowest number of occurrences involves the use of the preposition *on* to indicate spatial relations. Examples (6.4.99) and (6.4.100) and account for 5.41 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *on* in the data.

(6.4.96) Because the most teachers in private schools they are not just on pressure but they want to to bring quality of education to their students.

(6.4.97) I was born on 22nd September 1988 at Bisanje parish.

(6.4.98) In the first place I feel great joy and on the other hand I am challenged.

(6.4.99) We used to call Kawooloobe we go about six about twenty students playing on the court.

(6.4.100) I went to Nswanjere junior seminary in Kampala archdiocese on Mityana road.

Variation from Standard English only occurs with the grammaticised use of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Luganda as L1. Out of the 39 occurrences of the grammaticised use of the preposition *on* in the data, 30 occurrences (76.92 percent) involve the use of *on* as a complement of verbs, like in Standard English. For instance, in (6.4.101) the verb *base* selects *on* as its complement. In addition, 5 occurrences (12.82 percent) involve the use of the preposition *on* as a complement of nouns, like in Standard English, for example, in (6.4.102) where the noun *emphasis* selects *on* as its complement. There are 4 occurrences which show variation from Standard English usage. These involve the use of the preposition *on* as a complement of a noun as in (6.4.103), which accounts for 10.26 percent of all the grammaticised uses of this preposition in the data.

(6.4.101) and the staff basing on the names of the students have written

(6.4.102) We should put emphasis on the grammar.

(6.4.103) Yeah because I have a live example on one of my brothers.

Table 6.4.23: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>on</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	4	5.41
Relation in time	8	10.81
Abstract relations	16	21.62
As a grammaticised preposition	39	52.70
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>on</i>	7	9.46
Total	74	100

6.4.2.3.2 The use of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

The distribution of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 in table 6.4.24 reveals that this preposition is many times used as a grammaticised preposition, accounting for 38.33 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. Out of the 23 occurrences indicating the grammaticised use of the preposition *on*, 14 occurrences (60.87 percent) represent its use as a complement of verbs like in Standard English. This is exemplified in (6.4.104) where the verb *focused* selects the preposition *on* as its complement. However, there are 6 occurrences (26.09 percent) in which the preposition *on* is used as a complement of a verb differently from Standard English. Examples (6.4.105) and (6.4.106) illustrate how the preposition *on* is used as a complement of the verbs *listen* and *happen* instead of the preposition *to*. There are 3 occurrences, that is, 13.04 percent where the preposition *on* is used as a complement of a noun like in Standard English. This is illustrated in example (6.4.107), in which the noun *emphasis* selects the preposition *on* as its complement.

(6.4.104) I focussed on my spiritual part of it.

(6.4.105) But if they are not willing there is nothing nothing can happen nothing can happen on them.

(6.4.106) By listening on that on that programme on some radios they have that that kind of programme.

(6.4.107) They are also favouring the pupils to put their emphasis on studies.

The preposition *on* is also used to indicate abstract relations. This accounts for 36.67 percent of all the occurrences in the data. The use of this preposition to indicate abstract relations is similar to Standard English usage, as examples (6.4.108) and (6.4.109) illustrate.

(6.4.108) Where we studies it is a minor seminary just on the foundation of the church.

(6.4.109) Well after senior six you are not considered to join a public university on government sponsorship.

The use of the preposition *on* in idiomatic and fossilised expressions like in (6.4.110) accounts for 13.33 percent. Furthermore, the preposition *on* is also used to express relation in time as in (6.4.111) and accounts for 10 percent of all the occurrences in the data. There is however, only one occurrence in the data where *on* is used to indicate spatial relation. As example (6.4.112) indicates, the use of the preposition *on* deviates from Standard English usage since the dynamic verb *go* requires the preposition *to* other than *on*.

(6.4.110) I must say it was challenging and on the other side very interesting

(6.4.111) I was born in 1986 on the 31st of July.

(6.4.112) I wish if I had may be if I had gone on the university I would have taken either Law or Journalism, Mass communication.

Table 6.4.24: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>on</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	1	1.67
Relation in time	6	10
Abstract relations	22	36.67
As a grammaticised preposition	23	38.33
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>on</i>	8	13.33
Total	60	100

6.4.2.3.3 The use of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Table 6.4.25 represents the distribution of the use of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. This table shows that the preposition *on* is most frequently used as a grammaticised preposition accounting for 62.65 percent (52 out of 83 instances) of all the occurrences. All the 52 grammaticised uses of this preposition indicate prepositional verb

meaning (complement of verbs) similar to Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.113), (6.4.114), and (6.4.115), where the verbs *depend*, *comment*, and *base* select the preposition *on* as a complement.

(6.4.113) Ok it depends on the kind of personality.

(6.4.114) Yeah I will first comment on the issue of universal secondary education.

(6.4.115) I just want to add something on that, me I also agreeing with my brothers basing on a practical example.

The use of the preposition *on* to express abstract relations like in example (6.4.116) makes up 22.89 percent of all the occurrences. This preposition is also used in idiomatic and fossilised expressions like in the example (6.4.117). The fewest occurrences of the preposition *on* in the data among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 involve its use to indicate relation in space as in (6.4.118) and time as in (6.4.119). These relations account for 3.61 percent and 2.41 percent respectively. All the uses of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 are similar to Standard English.

(6.4.116) I got admission to go to university on government scholarship at the same time got admission to join the seminary.

(6.4.117) Then on top of that, most of the pupils actually sometimes they performance can also, I can say it depends on the mind set of someone.

(6.4.118) On the map of the country.

(6.4.119) I was born on the 5th of May 1986 which means am twenty five years, a quarter of a century in other words.

Table 6.4.25: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *on* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>on</i>	Number	Percentage
Relation in space	3	3.61
Relation in time	2	2.41
Abstract relations	19	22.89
As a grammaticised preposition	52	62.65
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>on</i>	7	8.43
Total	83	100

6.4.2.3.4 The use of the preposition *on* in spoken Ugandan English data

Table 6.4.26 reveals that in the Ugandan English data the preposition *on* is frequently used as a grammaticised preposition, accounting for 52.54 percent of all the occurrences in the data. This is followed by its use to indicate abstract relation, which makes up 26.27 percent of all the occurrences in the data. The lowest use of the preposition *on* occurs with its use to indicate spatial relation accounting for 3.69 percent of all the occurrences in the data. In addition, table 6.4.27 also reveals that among English speakers with the three L1s, the preposition *on* is frequently used as a grammaticised preposition. However, the percentage of the grammaticised preposition *on* is higher among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (62.65 percent) and English speakers with Luganda as L1 (52.7 percent) than among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (38.33 percent). English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 use it more to indicate abstract relations (38.33 percent) and in fossilised expressions (13.33 percent) than English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (22.89 percent and 8.43 percent) and English speakers with Luganda as L1 speakers (21.62 percent and 9.46 percent) respectively. Regarding its meaning to indicate relation in time, the preposition *on* is used more among English speakers with Luganda as L1 (10.81 percent) and English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (10 percent) than among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (2.41 percent).

Only 1 occurrence out of 8 indicates the use of the preposition *on* to denote location which deviates from Standard English. This involves the use of *on* instead of *to* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. The other 7 occurrences, that is, 4 in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 and 3 in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 illustrate usages similar to Standard English.

Table 6.4.26: The percentage of the meaning of the preposition *on* in spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning the preposition <i>on</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Relation in space	5.41	1.67	3.61	3.69
Relation in time	10.81	10	2.41	7.37
Abstract relations	21.62	36.67	22.89	26.27
As a grammaticised preposition	52.70	38.33	62.65	52.54
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>on</i>	9.46	13.33	8.43	10.14
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 6.4.27 shows the grammaticised use of the preposition *on* in the Ugandan English data. We see that to a large extent the grammaticised preposition *on* is used as a complement of verbs similar to Standard English, accounting for 84.21 percent. The highest percentage occurs in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, where its use accounts for 100 percent. The variation from Standard English occurs only in the data of English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, where 10.26 percent and 26.09 percent indicate its use as complement of verbs different from Standard English respectively.

Table 6.4.27: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition *on* in spoken Ugandan English data

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>on</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	76.92	60.87	100	84.21
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	10.26	26.09	0	8.77
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	12.82	13.04	0	7.02
Total	100	100	100	100

6.4.2.4.1 The use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

As can be seen from the data in table 6.4.28, most of the occurrences of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Luganda as L1 occur with the grammaticised use of this preposition (47.83 percent) and with spatial relation indicating destination (38.41 percent). All the 106 occurrences of the preposition *to* to indicate destination are similar to Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.120), (6.4.121), and (6.4.122) below where the dynamic verbs *come* and *go* are used.

(6.4.120) In April they were looking for a teacher of Latin, so they came to Bukalasa.

Bukalasa advised them that the only student we had we sent him to Kitabi seminary, so they came to Kitabi.

(6.4.121) I had to leave Kalisizo and go to Kabuwoko again because when I decided I wanted to come to the seminary, you couldn't come, you couldn't come to a seminary from a primary school that was not at the church, and so I had to go back again to Kabuwoko to be prepared.

(6.4.122) I went to Bright Grammar boarding primary school in Nyendo

The use of the preposition *to* to indicate an end point of a period (from ... up to) as in (6.4.123) and (6.4.124) accounts for 6.16 percent. In addition, 4.71 percent show the use of the preposition *to* to denote duration (from to), as in examples (6.4.125) and (6.4.126).

(6.4.123) Then I studied there from primary one up to primary four.

(6.4.124) When I was in senior from senior three up to senior six I was the capital of basketball here in Bukalasa.

(6.4.125) Yeah they should use I think they should use the a vernacular language for at least for around three classes from primary one to primary three and then they can use English.

(6.4.126) I went to St Paul Kitovu primary school from 1993 to 1996.

Furthermore, 2.89 percent (8 out of 276) of all the occurrences of the preposition *to* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 indicate spatial relation. Of the 8 occurrences, only 2 represent the use of the preposition *to* to indicate position as in Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.127) and (6.4.128). Of the remaining 6 occurrences, 4 represent the use of *to* instead of *in* as in (6.4.129) and 2 occurrences represent the use of *to* instead of *at* as in (6.4.130).

(6.4.127) So I am next to two sisters.

(6.4.128) I went to a nursery school ah for at least for only three months; it was called Morry and Paul next to Kitovu hospital.

(6.4.129) Because for the Nigerian films they have an image some teaching stories according to our African context may be to America, to Britain, so they have to play it in English.

(6.4.130) In 2007, I went to Kisubi minor seminary for my A-level and I did PCB/Latin after that I decided to continue my studies of priesthood to the major seminary.

Table 6.4.28: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Luganda as L1 s

Meaning the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Destination	106	38.41
Position	8	2.89
Duration (from to)	13	4.71
Ending point of a period (from ... up to)	17	6.16
As a grammaticised preposition	132	47.83
Total	276	100

As mentioned above, most of the occurrences of the preposition *to* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 involve the grammaticised use of this preposition. Table 6.4.29 shows the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* in the data. This table reveals that most of the grammaticised uses of the preposition *to* indicate its use as a complement of verbs as in Standard English, accounting for 81.81 percent. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.131), (6.4.132) and (6.4.133), where the verbs *compare*, *talk*, and *speak* select the preposition *to* as their complement.

(6.4.131) Am from mhm quite a little family compared to families around.

(6.4.132) I greet them in English and talk to them in English.

(6.4.133) Then these other people, they would speak to them in English as a way of communication but then they would reply them in Luganda.

The preposition *to* is also used with complement nouns and adjectives similar to Standard English usage, accounting for 4.55 percent and 3.79 percent respectively. In examples (6.4.134) and (6.4.135) the nouns *danger* and *candidates* and the adjective *faithful* select the preposition *to* as their complement.

(6.4.134) If someone cannot be faithful to his partner; so that is, which is a danger to the population of Uganda or the future of Uganda.

(6.4.135) The school I think in Uganda it has the highest number of candidates to priesthood.

There are some cases where the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* deviates from Standard English. This involves its use as a prepositional verb and accounts for 9.85 percent (13 out of 132) of all the grammaticised use of this preposition in the data. This is illustrated in (6.4.136) and (6.4.137), where the verbs *hear* and *continue* are used with the preposition *to* instead of *from* and *with* respectively like in Standard English.

(6.4.136) It may be a political problem according to what I hear to history, when these people the wars we have had, people had a mentality that Swahili is a language for soldiers.

(6.4.137) I had a great passion to becoming a doctor but when in senior five I was seeing all that as nothing and I felt the vocation of continuing to priesthood.

Table 6.4.29: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	108	81.81

Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	13	9.85
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	6	4.55
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	5	3.79
Total	132	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Luganda as L1 has revealed that to a large extent this preposition is used like in Standard English (93.12 percent). The deviation from Standard English accounts for 6.88 percent and it involves spatial relation where *to* is used instead of *in* and *at* and as a grammaticised preposition to complement verbs where *to* is used instead of *from* and *with*. The variation from Standard English suggests possible substrate influence since the Luganda language does not distinguish between prepositions of location and destination. In addition, the formation of prepositional verbs in Luganda is different from the English language which might explain the challenge English speakers with Luganda as L1 have in acquiring English prepositional verbs. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

6.4.2.4.2 The use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Table 7.4.30 illustrates the distribution of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. This table shows that most of the occurrences of the preposition *to* involve its use as a grammaticised preposition. This accounts for 50 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The second most frequent use of the preposition *to* refers to its meaning to denote destination. This accounts for 33.05 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. It is interesting to note that all the 39 occurrences indicating the use of the preposition *to* to express destination are similar to Standard English. This is exemplified in (6.4.138) and (6.4.139), where the dynamic verb *go* takes the preposition *to*.

(6.4.138) Then from here I will continue to the other stage, that is, I will go either to Ggaba or to Kinyamasika.

(6.4.139) Once after my senior six in vacation, I went to Kampala, I lived there for about eight years then it was my first time when I going to Kampala, it was my first time to leave my district.

The preposition *to* is also used to indicate an end point of a period. This accounts for 8.48 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data, like in (6.4.140) and (6.4.141). In

addition, *to* is used to indicate duration. This accounts for 5.93 percent of all the occurrences in the data, like in (6.4.142).

(6.4.140) I studied from Mulumba primary school in Kanungu district for my P1 up to P3.

(6.4.141) That is how they had inspired their life how they live their aims and objectives I was so inspired even up to now I still like their life.

(6.4.142) I joined the seminary from senior one to senior six.

The lowest percentage of occurrences of the preposition *to* involves its use in idiomatic and fossilised expressions, as exemplified in (6.4.143). This accounts for only 2.54 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *to* in the data.

(6.4.143) Ok according to me, the universal primary education it to some extent is good.

Table 6.4.30: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Destination	39	33.05
Duration (from ... to)	7	5.93
Ending point of a period (from up to)	10	8.48
As a grammaticised preposition	59	50
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>to</i>	3	2.54
Total	118	100

The distribution of the grammaticised preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 is presented in table 6.4.31. From this table, we can see that most of the grammaticised use of this preposition involves its use as complement to verbs as in Standard English, which accounts for 86.44 percent. For instance, in examples (6.4.144), 6.4.145, and (6.4.146) the verbs *listen*, *open*, *talk*, and *root* select *to* as their complement.

(6.4.144) You would even feel ashamed of listening to what she is saying.

(6.4.145) I think it can be done because they should be open to them because the parents first of all they feel shy and when you are an outsider talking to somebody....

(6.4.146) You say may be do this today I want to play football because they have been rooted to these western things like music, you hardly find them doing cultural things like may be going to dig.

The preposition *to* is also used to complement nouns and adjectives as in Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (6.4.147) and (6.4.148), where the noun *challenge* and the adjective *disastrous* select *to* as their complement respectively.

(6.4.147) It is a very very big challenge even to the elders who do not know English.

(6.4.148) Because per now even from the UPE schools someone who studies English from P1 to P7 he fails to interpret the question, now they are saying from P1 to P4, only Runyankole, it would be very disastrous to our pupils.

Table 6.4.31: The Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	51	86.44
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	4	6.78
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	4	6.78
Total	59	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 has shown that it is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *to* with regard to English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

6.4.2.4.3 The use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

The distribution of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 is represented in table 6.4.32. This table reveals that this preposition is many times used as a grammaticised preposition, which accounts for 51.07 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The second most frequent use of the preposition *to* is to indicate destination, accounting for 38.93 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. It is interesting to note that all the 109 occurrences of the preposition *to* indicating destination are similar to Standard English usage, as examples (6.4.149), (6.4.150), and (6.4.151) illustrate.

(6.4.149) There after I went to Kyambogo University where I did a Bachelor in Education, Bachelor degree in education from Kyambogo university.

(6.4.150) So I had to make a choice by then; I first chose to go to the university.

(6.4.151) You are recommending this child to go to school.

The use of the preposition *to* to indicate an end point of a period accounts for 5.36 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. This is illustrated in (6.4.152) and (6.4.153). In addition, *to* is also used to indicate duration, accounting for 3.57 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data like in (6.4.154) and (6.4.155).

(6.4.152) ... and that talent is developed and that person continues to study along that trend up to the level of becoming a professor in that field.

(6.4.153) Actually personally I never knew I would make it make it even up to this stage.

(6.4.154) Yeah it was a course of three years that was from 2009 to 2012.

(6.4.155) I started primary from Kuswinyi Primary School a school called Kuswinyi Primary School in Nebbi where I studied from primary one to primary seven.

There are 2 occurrences where the preposition *to* is used to express position. These 2 cases show deviation from Standard English. For instance, whereas in (6.4.156) the preposition *to* is used instead of *at*, in (6.4.157) the preposition *to* is used instead of *with*. Only 1 occurrence shows the use of the preposition *to* in idiomatic and fossilised expressions. This is illustrated in (6.4.158).

(6.4.156) So I had to resume to Kitante for one year.

(6.4.157) Yeah when am speaking I prefer to use English, that is, if am speaking to someone who doesn't know English but if am conversing to my tribe mate

(6.4.158) Yeah to some extent, so in the towns and in city centres the women are playing great role of being model to the girls.

Table 6.4.32: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Destination	109	38.93
Position	2	0.71
Duration (from ... to)	10	3.57
Ending point of a period (... up to)	15	5.36
As a grammaticised preposition	143	51.07
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>to</i>	1	0.36
Total	280	100

As mentioned above, most of the occurrences of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 occur with the grammaticised use of this preposition. Table

6.4.33 shows the distribution of this preposition in the Acholi-Lango data. This table reveals that to a large extent the preposition *to* is used as a complement of verbs like in Standard English, accounting for 74.12 percent of all the grammaticised uses of this preposition in the data. This is illustrated in (6.4.159) where the prepositional verbs *attend to* is used.

(6.4.159) Yeah she is a mother, fine but though she has to attend to her children but she has to remember that the profession she has taken demands her a lot.

The deviation from Standard English use of prepositional verbs accounts for 10.49 percent of all the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* in the data. This is exemplified in (6.4.160), in which the verb *accept* does not require a preposition as its complement and in (6.4.161), in which the verb *ask* has the preposition *to* as its complement instead of the preposition *for* like in Standard English.

(6.4.160) As I told you, not all the schools or areas are accepting to this idea.

(6.4.161) You will find the first thing they ask to the qualification, that you must be fluency in the English.

Apart from being used as a complement of verbs, the preposition *to* is also used to complement nouns and adjectives. Whereas its use to complement nouns accounts for 9.09 percent, like in (6.4.162), in which the noun *attention* selects *to* as its complement, its use to complement adjectives accounts for 6.29 percent, like in (6.4.163), in which the adjective *advantageous* selects the preposition *to* as its complement.

(6.4.162) If these people pay much attention to teachers, I think these people would give even much attention to our children in schools.

(6.4.163) I think your coming here it is also more advantageous to us.

Table 6.4.33: Raw frequencies and percentages of the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i>	Number	Percentage
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	106	74.12
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	15	10.49
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	13	9.09
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	9	6.29
Total	143	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *to* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 has shown that to a large extent this preposition is used like in Standard English (88.11

percent). The deviation from Standard English accounts for 11.88 percent and it involves the grammaticised use of this preposition to complement verbs (10.49 percent) and the use of *to* instead of *at* and *with* (1.39 percent). The variation from Standard English suggests possible substrate influence since the Acholi-Lango language has no prepositional verbs. Therefore English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 seem to have difficulty acquiring the English prepositional verbs. In addition, the Acholi-Lango language has very few prepositions which can have many English equivalents.

6.4.2.4.4 The use of the preposition *to* in spoken Ugandan English data

In the Ugandan English data, the preposition *to* is half of the time used as a grammaticised preposition. As table 6.4.34 reveals this account for 49.56 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The second most frequent use of the preposition *to* is to indicate destination. This accounts for 37.69 percent of all the occurrences of the preposition *to* in the data. Among English speakers with the three L1s, the use of the preposition *to* as a grammaticised preposition is more evident among speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (51.07 percent) and speakers with Luganda as L1 (50 percent) than speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (47.83 percent). In addition, the percentage of the preposition *to* to denote destination is nearly the same among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (38.93 percent) and English speakers with Luganda as L1 (38.41 percent) in comparison to that among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (33.05 percent). It is also interesting to note that the use of the preposition *to* to express position, which deviates from Standard English, occurs only among English speakers with Luganda as L1 (2.89 percent) and English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (0.71 percent) and not among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 6.4.34: The percentage of the preposition *to* in spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning the preposition <i>to</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Destination	38.41	33.05	38.93	37.69
Position	2.89	0	0.71	1.48
Duration (from ... to)	4.71	5.93	3.57	4.45
Ending point of a period (... up to)	6.16	8.48	5.36	6.23
As a grammaticised preposition	47.83	50	51.07	49.56
Idiomatic and fossilised expressions headed by the preposition <i>to</i>	0	2.54	0.36	0.59
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 6.4.35 compares the use of the preposition *to* to indicate location among English speakers of the three L1s. From this table we see that the preposition *to* is most frequently used to indicate destination as in Standard English with the highest occurrences (100 percent) reported in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. English speakers with Luganda and Acholi-Lango as L1 also overwhelmingly used the preposition *to* to indicate destination like in Standard English with 92.98 percent and 98.19 percent respectively. Although there are very few occurrences indicating the use of the preposition *to* to indicate position among English speakers with Luganda and Acholi-Lango as L1, the majority of these occurrences suggest a deviation from Standard English. For instance, whereas among English speakers with Luganda as L1, only 2 occurrences indicate the use of the preposition *to* to denote position as in Standard English, 6 occurrences show the deviation from Standard English, that is, the use of *to* instead of *in* and *to* instead of *at*. Among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, the 2 occurrences indicating position both deviate from Standard English.

Table 6.4.35: The percentage of the preposition *to* to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data

The use of the preposition <i>to</i> to express location	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
Destination as in Standard English	92.98	100	98.19	96.21
Position as in Standard English	1.75	0	0	0.76
Position <i>to</i> instead of <i>in</i>	3.51	0	0	1.52
Position <i>to</i> instead of <i>at</i>	1.75	0	0.9	1.14
Position <i>to</i> instead of <i>with</i>	0	0	0.9	0.38
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 6.4.36 shows that in the spoken Ugandan English data, the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* is overwhelmingly used to indicate a complement of verbs like in Standard English. This accounts for 79.34 percent of all the grammaticised use of this preposition in the data. 8.38 percent indicate variation from Standard English in the use of the preposition *to* as a prepositional verb. In addition, 6.89 percent and 5.39 percent indicate the use of this preposition to complement nouns and adjectives respectively.

The use of *to* as a prepositional verb is more conspicuous among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (86.44 percent) than English speakers with Luganda as L1 (81.81 percent) and English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (74.12 percent). Deviation from Standard English use of *to* as a prepositional verb occurs more clearly among English speakers

with Acholi-Lango as L1 (10.49 percent) than English speakers with Luganda as L1 (9.85 percent).

Table 6.4.36: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition *to* in spoken Ugandan English data

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>to</i>	Luganda	Runyankole- Rukiga	Acholi- Lango	Total
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	81.81	86.44	74.12	79.34
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	9.85	0	10.49	8.38
Complement of noun as in Std Eng	4.55	6.78	9.09	6.89
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	3.79	6.78	6.29	5.39
Total	100	100	100	100

In Ugandan English, it appears that the preposition *to* is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English. This could be due to the fact that the data used includes only university graduates and undergraduates whose level of English proficiency is higher than that shown among other members of society who speak English as a L2. In addition, the data was compiled at the national seminary where English is used as a lingua franca among students who speak different mother tongues. Nevertheless, the analysis has shown some variation from Standard English usages which include the prepositional verbs and the use of the preposition to denote position. These variations seem to be an influence from substrate languages as the explanations above have tried to reveal. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *from* in the Ugandan English data.

6.4.2.5.1 The use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

The distribution of the preposition *from* in the Luganda L1 data in table 6.4.37 shows that this preposition is many times used to indicate a source of location. This accounts for 50.59 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. Interestingly, 82 out of 85 occurrences, that is, 96.47 percent shows the use of the preposition *from* to indicate a source of location as in Standard English, as illustrated in examples (6.4.164), (6.4.165), and (6.4.166).

(6.4.164) I went to we entered a little bit in Congo from Mpungwe there.

(6.4.165) You find a person is from Rwanda but he is called Kimbugwe.

(6.4.166) In the first people from Buganda used to speak English very well, but people from the east speak the language very well.

Of the 3 occurrences which show deviation from Standard English use of the preposition *from* to indicate a source of location, 2 occurrences, that is, 2.35 percent involve the use of *from* instead of *at* as in (6.4.167) and only 1 occurrence (1.18 percent) involves the use of *from* instead of *in* as in (6.4.168). This reveals that the use of the preposition *from* to indicate a source of location is overwhelmingly used as in Standard English among English speakers with Luganda as L1.

(6.4.167) But not Banyoro Batoro who study from that seminary, they are mostly Baganda because in the central region we have more than five dioceses which send their seminarians to study from Kinyamasika.

(6.4.168) You would find around may be three percent of the population from Villa Maria parish are pupils from Villa Maria parish but the rest are from other parts of the diocese.

The preposition *from* is also used to indicate a source which is not a location. This accounts for 19.64 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. All the 33 occurrences representing this category are similar to Standard English, as exemplified in (6.4.169), (6.4.170), and (6.4.171).

(6.4.169) I wonder how Bukalasa tunes the same students from different backgrounds, from different family settings.

(6.4.170) So you would see dances from different cultures.

(6.4.171) But that is very wrong as far as Ganda culture is concerned even if you are coming from the same clan or we are of the same totem.

The use of the preposition *from* to denote a starting point of a period, as in (6.4.172) and (6.4.173), accounts for 13.69 percent of all the occurrences in the data.

(6.4.172) Because you can even see that someone speaks English from primary one to primary seven.

(6.4.173) I learnt English language right from my primary level I can even say from nursery.

The grammaticised use of the preposition *from* makes up 13.1 percent (22 out of 168) of all the occurrences in the data. Out of the 22 occurrences, 12 (54.54 percent) involve prepositional verbs like in Standard English, as in (6.4.174), in which the verb *distract* selects the preposition *from* as its complement. 9 occurrences (40.91 percent) involve the use of the preposition *from* as a complement of adjectives like in Standard English as in (6.4.175), in which the adjective *different* selects the preposition *from* as its complement. Only 1 occurrence

(4.55 percent) shows deviation from Standard English use of prepositional verbs. This is exemplified in (6.4.176).

(6.4.174) Where everything that happens is destructive and distracts you from from your studies.

(6.4.175) I believe that Uganda has to be the same. Ugandan English has to be different from British English.

(6.4.176) But currently you see that someone studies from universal primary education were teachers are under paid.

The lowest number of occurrences of the preposition *from* in the data involves its use to denote duration in time. This accounts for 2.98 percent of all the occurrences in the data, as illustrated in (6.4.177) and (6.4.178).

(6.4.177) I joined St Kizito Minor Seminary Nandele which is in Kasana Luwero from 2003 up to 2008.

(6.4.178) After that, I went to Bukalasa Seminary for six years from 1997 to 2002.

Table 6.4.37: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Luganda as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>from</i>	Number	Percentage
Source location	85	50.59
Source other than location	33	19.64
Duration in time	5	2.98
Starting point (from ... to)	23	13.69
As a grammaticised preposition	22	13.10
Total	168	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *from* in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 has shown that this preposition is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English (97.64 percent). The deviation from Standard English usage accounts for 2.38 percent. This involves the use of the preposition *from* to indicate a source of location and the grammaticised use as a complement of a verb. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

6.4.2.5.2 The use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Table 6.4.38 shows the distribution of the preposition *from* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. From this table, we see that most of the occurrences involve the use of *from* to indicate location. This accounts for 59.39 percent of all occurrences of the preposition *from* in the data. This is followed by the grammaticised use of this preposition accounting for 15.04 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. Of the 20 occurrences representing the grammaticised use of the preposition *from*, 14 occurrences (70 percent) indicate its use as a prepositional verb like in Standard English. This is illustrated in (6.4.179), (6.4.180), and (6.4.181) where the verbs *deviate*, *break*, and *hinder* select the preposition *from* as their complement respectively.

(6.4.179) They have tended to deviate from the cultural standards which were there before.

(6.4.180) Many of them either they are they have broken from their families.

(6.4.181) I don't think there is anything that is going to hinder me from becoming a priest.

There are 2 occurrences (10 percent) which show deviation from Standard English use of *from* in a prepositional verb. This is illustrated in (6.4.182) in which the meaning of the verb *to hear*, which has a similar meaning as the prepositional verb *listen to*, is used with the preposition *from*. Likewise, in example (6.4.183) the preposition *from* is used where Standard English would prefer no preposition after the verb *to be*.

(6.4.182) When they are at home, they don't want to hear from their parents.

(6.4.183) They were given and it was from his opinion.

Furthermore, the grammaticised preposition *from* is also used as a complement of adjectives. This makes up 20 percent (4 out of 20) of all the grammaticised uses of this preposition in the data. For instance, in (6.4.184) the adjective *different* selects the preposition *from* as its complement like in Standard English.

(6.4.184) I think it is different from that of the Baganda.

The preposition *from* is further used to show relation which indicates a source that is not a location as in (6.4.185) and (6.4.186). This accounts for 14.29 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. The lowest number of occurrences of the preposition *from* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 involves its use to indicate a starting point of a period as in (6.4.187) and (6.4.188). This makes up 11.29 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data.

(6.4.185) They have got some enlightenment from their friends may be but when they go at home you find they are using English words talking to the to their elders.

(6.4.186) And that also brings a problem that means students will not grab much from the books from what they have taught.

(6.4.187) But they have a system whereby from P1 up to P4 they study Runyankole as a subject.

(6.4.188) Now they are saying from primary one up to primary four, only Runyankole it would be very disastrous to our pupils.

Table 6.4.38: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning of the preposition <i>from</i>	Number	Percentage
Source location	79	59.39
Source other than location	19	14.29
Starting point of a period (from ... to)	15	11.29
As a grammaticised preposition	20	15.04
Total	133	100

The distribution of the preposition *from* to denote location is presented in table 6.4.39. Out of the 79 occurrences, 67 (84.81 percent) show the use of the preposition *from* to indicate source of location like in Standard English, as illustrated in examples (6.4.189) and (6.4.190).

(6.4.189) When they had passed afterward after the elections they tried to sit down as the Member of Parliament from Kabale district.

(6.4.190) It is the same as those from Bunyoro.

There are 12 occurrences which indicate deviation from Standard English. Whereas 8 occurrences (10.13 percent) involve the use of the preposition *from* instead of *in* as in (6.4.191) and (6.4.192), 4 occurrences (5.06 percent) involve the use of the preposition *from* instead of *at* as in (6.4.193) and (6.4.194).

(6.4.191) Even the woman who is working as the local leader from the district is driving herself may be she is working in the at the district offices.

(6.4.192) Because per now, even from the UPE schools, someone who studies English from primary one to primary seven he fails to interpret the question.

(6.4.193) I attended my primary school from the UPE school called St Boniface primary school, then A-level and O-levels from Nyakazo secondary school.

(6.4.194) Then I start I attended my primary school from a UPE school called Kabusho primary school.

Table 6.4.39: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *from* to denote location among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

The use of the preposition <i>from</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
Source of location as in Standard English	67	84.81
<i>from</i> instead of <i>in</i>	8	10.13
<i>from</i> instead of <i>at</i>	4	5.06
Total	79	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *from* in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 has shown that this preposition is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English (89.47 percent). The deviation from Standard English usage accounts for 10 percent. This involves the use of the preposition *from* to indicate source of location and the grammaticised use as a complement of a verb. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

6.4.2.5.3 The use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

The distribution of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 is presented in table 6.4.40. This table shows that this preposition is frequently used to indicate location, accounting for 53.85 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition in the data. This is followed by the grammaticised use of *from* which accounts for 18.27 percent. All 38 occurrences indicate a prepositional verb meaning similar to Standard English. This is illustrated in (6.4.195), (6.4.196), and (6.4.197) in which the verbs *suffer*, *deviate*, and *benefit* select the preposition *from* as their complement.

(6.4.195) We suffered mainly from the effects of the Lord Resistance war.

(6.4.196) So they were trying to deviate from the cultural system.

(6.4.197) They will get the money that can help them pay their children in good schools and in that way the children will also get chances to to to to benefit from the government merit sponsorship.

The preposition *from* is also used to indicate a starting point, accounting for 17.31 percent of all the total number of this preposition in the data as in (6.4.198), (6.4.199) and (6.4.200). In addition, the preposition *from* is used to indicate sources which do not refer to location. This accounts for 5.77 percent of the total number of *from* in the data as in (6.4.201), (6.4.202, and (6.4.203). The least frequent occurrences of *from* in the data refer to duration in time. This

accounts for 4.81 percent of the total number of this preposition in the data as in (6.4.204) and (6.4.205).

(6.4.198) We have to tress it right from the the school; university is still a long way but what about now from senior one or from primary one?

(6.4.199) So I prefer I myself that at least children should be taught with a local language from primary one to primary three there.

(6.4.200) Now when they say from nursery up to P4 P3 or P4 they should be teaching in the local language now these three years here it will not be easy for that person to learn the the language.

(6.4.201) But maybe now I am getting experience from the pastoral work that we are doing meeting people and what.

(6.4.202) The person is going should just be taught in English it is just because at home he already knows and he is getting those words from the people who know it.

(6.4.203) They feel that what we get is from the government.

(6.4.204) It was from 1996 up to 2002 when I completed my primary education.

(6.4.205) Some some pupils would keep quite from morning to sunset just because they cannot manage it.

Table 6.4.40: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *from* among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning the preposition <i>from</i>	Number	Percentage
Location meaning	112	53.85
Source other than location	12	5.77
Duration in time	10	4.81
Starting point (from ... to)	36	17.31
As a grammaticised preposition	38	18.27
Total	208	100

Table 6.4.41 shows the distribution of the preposition *from* to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. This table reveals that 75.89 percent indicates the use of *from* to express source of location similar to Standard English. This is illustrated in (6.4.206), (6.4.207), and (6.4.208) below.

(6.4.206) So if the district needs a lawyer this man from the central region should be sent there to work in that district or this man from west Nile region should be sent there to

work as a lawyer.

(6.4.207) Kampala is the capital city and many people come from different places.

(6.4.208) Yeah, for a case of local language, then to what extent is it spoken in Uganda, it depends on the region. Personally like for us we are like from the north people from the north, we use also our local language.

There are cases in which the use of the preposition *from* to indicate location deviates from Standard English. This includes the use of *from* instead of *in* as in (6.4.209) and (6.4.210), which accounts for 11.61 percent of all the occurrences of this preposition to denote location. In addition, the use of *from* instead of *at* as in (6.4.211) and (6.4.212) accounts for 8.04 percent. Furthermore, there are 5 occurrences (4.46 percent) where the preposition *from* is used in situations where Standard English would use no preposition at all, as in (6.4.213) and (6.4.214).

(6.4.209) ...and they produce it in a large amount both from Congo because we are at the border.

(6.4.210) So it shows that people have seen the quality of education from Uganda that is why they have flocked in.

(6.4.211) 2002, I joined Pokeya national Pokeya Minor Seminary then finished senior six from that school.

(6.4.212) We used to pray from the chaplaincy of Mulago hospital.

(6.4.213) Some other pupils from the lower classes are studying from under the trees.

(6.4.214) Yes please thank you once more there is one question I would like to ask from you.

Table 6.4.41: Raw frequencies and percentages of the preposition *from* to denote location among English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

The use of the preposition <i>from</i> to express location	Number	Percentage
Source location as in Standard English	85	75.89
<i>from</i> instead of <i>in</i>	13	11.61
<i>from</i> instead of <i>at</i>	9	8.04
<i>from</i> instead of <i>zero</i>	5	4.46
Total	112	100

The analysis of the use of the preposition *from* in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 has shown that this preposition is overwhelmingly used like in Standard English (87.02 percent). The deviation from Standard English usage accounts for 12.98

percent. This involves the spatial meaning of this preposition. The next section discusses the use of the preposition *from* in Ugandan English.

6.4.2.5.4 The use of the preposition *from* in spoken Ugandan English data

Table 6.4.42 shows that the preposition *from* is frequently used to indicate location in Ugandan English data accounting for 54.22 percent of the total number of this preposition in the data. It is followed by the grammaticised meaning which accounts for 15.72 percent. In addition, 14.45 percent indicate the use of *from* to indicate a starting point. Furthermore, 12.57 percent show the use of *from* to point at the source which is not a location. The least frequent occurrences of *from* (2.95 percent) involve its relation to duration in time.

Table 6.4.42: Raw frequencies and percentages of the meaning of the preposition *from* in spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning the preposition <i>from</i>	Number	Percentage
Source location	276	54.22
Source other than location	64	12.57
Duration in time	15	2.95
Starting point (from ... to)	74	14.54
As a grammaticised preposition	80	15.72
Total	509	100

Table 6.4.43 shows the distribution of the preposition *from* to indicate location in the spoken Ugandan English data. From this table we see that in Ugandan English, this preposition is overwhelmingly used to denote source of location as in Standard English. This accounts for 84.78 percent of the total number of this preposition in the data. Among English speakers with the three L1s, the use of the preposition *from* to indicate source of location as in Standard English is used more frequently among speakers with Luganda as L1 (96.47 percent) and speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (87.34 percent) than speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 (75.89 percent). In addition, table 7.4.43 also reveals deviation from Standard English use of *from* to denote spatial relation. This involves the use of *from* instead of *in*, the use of *from* instead of *at*, and the use of *from* instead of *zero*, which account for 7.97 percent, 5.43 percent, and 1.81 percent respectively. Comparing the deviation from Standard English use of this preposition among English speakers with the three L1s, table 6.4.43 shows that all the three deviations mentioned above occur more conspicuously among speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 6.4.43: The percentage of the preposition *from* to denote location in spoken Ugandan English data

The use of the preposition <i>from</i> to express location	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
Source of location as in Standard English	96.47	84.81	75.89	84.78
<i>from</i> instead of <i>in</i>	1.18	10.13	11.61	7.97
<i>from</i> instead of <i>at</i>	2.35	5.06	8.04	5.43
<i>from</i> instead of <i>zero</i>	0	0	4.46	1.81
Total	100	100	100	100

Regarding the grammaticised use of the preposition *from* in Ugandan English, table 6.4.44 shows that 80 percent involves its complement of verbs (prepositional verb) like in Standard English. This is followed by its use to complement adjectives, which accounts for 16.25 percent of all the grammaticised use of this preposition in the data. The deviation from Standard English involves its complement to verbs, which accounts for 3.75 percent of all the grammaticised use of this preposition.

A comparison of the grammaticised use of the preposition *from* among English speakers with the three L1s reveals that speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 use it as a complement of verbs like in Standard English (100 percent) more often than speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (70 percent) and speakers with Luganda as L1 (54.54 percent). The deviation from Standard English involves its use to complement verbs, which only occurs with speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 (10 percent) and speakers with Luganda as L1 (4.55 percent).

Table 6.4.44: The percentage of the grammaticised use of the preposition *from* in spoken Ugandan English data

Grammaticised use of the preposition <i>from</i>	Luganda	Runyankole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango	Total
Complement of verb as in Std Eng	54.54	70	100	80
Complement of verb diff. from Std Eng	4.55	10	0	3.75
Complement of adj. as in Std Eng	40.91	20	0	16.25
Total	100	100	100	100

6.5. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the use of the main prepositions in Ugandan English. The first section reviewed the use of prepositions in Standard English. This included the definition of preposition, the types of prepositions in English, i.e. simple and complex preposition. It also

discussed the grammatical roles and meanings of prepositions, i.e. as grammaticised prepositions complementing verbs, nouns, and adjectives and their lexical meaning, i.e. spatial relation, abstract relation, and time relation. The second section discussed variation from Standard English in the use of prepositions both in English L1 and L2 varieties. Substrate influence was suggested as the main factor explaining such variation. The third section reviewed the use of prepositions in the selected Ugandan languages, i.e. Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango. This section showed that these languages have very few prepositions which have many equivalents of prepositions in the English language. In addition, it was indicated that although Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga languages have prepositional verbs, their structure is different from that of English prepositional verbs. In both Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga prepositional verbs are indicated by the applicative affix which conveys the idea of the English prepositions *on*, *at*, *in*, *for*, and *from*. Furthermore, it was pointed out that Acholi-Lango has no prepositional verbs.

The fourth section analysed the use of prepositions in Ugandan English. It first explored the use of the 23 prepositions in the data, i.e. *in*, *of*, *to*, *for*, *from*, *at*, *with*, *on*, *up*, *by*, *about*, *around*, *among*, *over*, *into*, *off*, *under*, *within*, *down*, *near*, *onto*, *inside*, and *round*. These are some of the prepositions which were reported to be used differently from Standard English both in English L1 and L2 varieties. The findings showed that the ten most frequently used prepositions in Ugandan English are *in*, *of*, *to*, *for*, *from*, *at*, *with*, *on*, *up*, and *about*. The analysis then investigated the use of five of the ten most frequently used prepositions in Ugandan English, i.e. *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from* to explore how they are used differently from Standard English and thus indicate possible substrate influence for such variations.

The analysis has revealed that these five prepositions are overwhelmingly used like in Standard English. This could be explained by the type of data used for the analysis which was produced by university graduates and undergraduates who most of the time use English in their day to day communication. It is possible that if the data contained speakers of Ugandan English who frequently use their mother tongues in their daily communication such as business people, nurses, farmers and politicians, the results would have been different. Nevertheless, the findings indicated cases which show variation from Standard English use for these five prepositions. For instance, for the preposition *in*, the variations include the use of *in* instead of *at*, *in* instead of *to*, and *in* instead of *into*. It is interesting to note that in Ugandan English the percentage of *in* instead of *at* (11.74 percent) is higher than that of *in* instead of *into* (0.49 percent). This finding shows that in Ugandan English the variation in the use of the preposition *in* to denote location frequently involves *at* other than *into*, as Schmied (2008: 456) has argued

that *in* is used at the expense of more special *into*. Since the conclusion by Schmied was based on Kenyan and Tanzanian data, the results from Ugandan data show that Ugandan English to some extent differs from the other East African varieties of English. The variation in the use of the preposition *at* many times occurs with the lexical meaning where *at* is used instead of *in*, *to*, *zero*, and *on* to denote location. For the preposition *on* the variation from Standard English frequently occurs as a grammaticised preposition where it is used as a complement of verbs among English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 and not English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Regarding the preposition *to*, variation occurs in its lexical meaning, i.e. use of *to* instead of *in* and *at* to indicate location and as a grammaticised preposition to complement verbs. Lastly, variation in the use of the preposition *from* involves its lexical meaning where it is used instead of *in* and *at*.

The variation from Standard English use of prepositions *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from* to denote spatial relation and as grammaticised prepositions suggest possible L1 influence in Ugandan English. As already indicated in section 6.3, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango have very few prepositions which have several equivalent prepositions in the English language. Secondly, variation in the use of these prepositions could be due to generalisation and simplification strategies Ugandans use in the process of acquiring English as a L2.

Chapter 7: The progressive aspect in Ugandan English

7.0 Introduction

Aspect is a grammatical category which refers to a speaker's or writer's perspective of time (Greenbaum 1996: 81). Carter and McCarthy (2006: 411) state that in English "aspect is concerned mainly with how the speaker perceives the duration of events, and how different events relate to one another in time". In addition, Greenbaum and Nelson (2002: 56) remark that aspect is "indicated by a combination of auxiliary and verb form". The English language has two aspects, that is, the progressive and the perfect aspects. According to Binnick (2006: 250), the distinction between the progressive and perfect aspects is that whilst the progressive

represents “an eventuality as duration”, the perfect represents “it as a durationless atom”. This distinction is illustrated in (7.1.1) and (7.1.2) which represent the perfect and progressive aspects respectively.

(7.1.1) At noon, Susan won the marathon.

(7.1.2) At noon, Susan was winning the marathon. (Binnick 2006: 250)

Aspect is different from tense. Whilst aspect refers to “a system where the basic meanings have to do with the internal temporal constituency of the situation”, tense applies “to a system where the basic or characteristic meaning of the term is to locate the situation, or part of it, at some point or period of time” (Huddleston 2002: 116-7). There are two tenses in English, that is, the present and past tenses. Downing and Locke (2006: 352) remark that the present tense has two meanings. The first meaning “is to locate a situation holding at the present moment” (p. 352). They go on to state that “this may be an instantaneous event” as in (7.1.3), “a state which hold over time” as in (7.1.4) or “a habitual occurrence” as in (7.1.5).

(7.1.3) I promise to wait.

(7.1.4) Jupiter is the largest planet.

(7.1.5) He works in an office. (Downing and Locke 2006: 352)

The second meaning of the present tense involves reference to past and future events as in (7.1.6) and quotative as in (7.1.7).

(7.1.6) This man comes up to me.

(7.1.7) I don’t believe it. (Downing and Locke 2006: 352)

The past tense also has two meanings. Whereas the first meaning “refers to a definite event or state that is prior to utterance time”, the second meaning “refers to a present event or state as hypothetical”, as in (7.1.8) (Downing and Locke 2006: 352).

(7.1.8) If I were you.

There is no future tense in English. However, future events are marked by different forms some of which are explained in detail in part 7.1.5.

7.1 The progressive aspect

The progressive aspect “indicates a happening in progressive at a given time” (Quirk et al. (1985: 197). In addition, Carter and McCarthy (2006: 224) state that the progressive is used “to indicate that something is ongoing, unfinished, or that it is extended but not temporary”. They go on to remark that “it may indicate that something is/was/will be already in progress when

something else happens/happened”. The temporal properties of durativity, unboundedness, and dynamicity have been referred to by Binnick (2006: 250) as the terms that have defined the progressive aspect, traditionally.

7.1.1 Progressive forms

In the English language, the progressive aspect can be realised in the present tense, past tense, the perfect, with modal verbs, lexical-modal verbs, and in the active and passive voices (Downing and Locke 2002: 368). In the present tense, the progressive is constructed with the auxiliary form of *be*, that is, *am*, *is*, and *are* plus the *-ing* participle of the verb as in (7.1.9), (7.1.10), and (7.1.11).

(7.1.9) I am reading a novel.

(7.1.10) Richard is playing football.

(7.1.11) They are dancing.

In the past tense, the progressive is realised with the past tense form of the auxiliary *be*, that is, *was* and *were* plus the *-ing* participle of the lexical verb. Leech (2007: 81) writes that the meaning of the past progressive is to describe an event, activity or a situation “in progress at a definite time in the past” as in (7.1.12).

(7.1.12) The children were playing all morning.

In addition, Downing and Locke (2002: 372) point out that the past progressive also “provides a temporal frame without time boundaries around some point of time”, as in (7.1.13) “or some bounded act or event”, as in (7.1.14).

(7.1.13) At half-past six, crowds were pouring into the stadium.

(7.1.14) When we stopped at the shop, Peter was looking at us.

The progressive is also realised in the present perfect and past perfect tenses. According to Leech (2007: 93), the present perfect progressive involves “a verb construction which combines the present tense with the perfect and progressive construction: *has/have been + -ing* form”. He goes on to remark that “this combines the idea of past with present relevance, with the idea of going on over a (limited) period”, as in (7.1.15), where the focus is on the present result of a past activity or as in (7.1.16), where the focus is on the continuation of the activity up to the present time (Leech 2007: 93).

(7.1.15) I’m tired I have been working all day.

(7.1.16) We have been waiting around for hours. (Leech 2007: 93)

The past perfect progressive is formed by the past tense of the verb *has/have*, the past participle of the verb *to be* and the progressive construction, that is, *had + been + -ing* form. This is illustrated in example (7.1.17).

(7.1.17) By the time the train arrived, John was asleep, since he had been waiting for hours.

Carter and McCarthy (2006: 306) mention some instances in which the progressive combines with the infinitive of the auxiliary verb *be*. Downing and Locke (2002: 368) refer to this construction as “lexico-modal + progressive” as in (7.1.18). They also remark that the progressive can be realised in the structure modal + progressive as in (7.1.19), in which the modal verb *will* is used to indicate an ongoing activity in the future.

(7.1.18) He is bound to be writing.

(7.1.19) He will be writing.

7.1.2 Semantic classes of verbs used with the progressive

In English, there are three basic types of verbs, lexical, auxiliary, and modal verbs. This section deals with lexical verbs which, according to Carter and McCarthy (2006: 227), “have meanings denoting actions, events and states and belong to an open class”. These verbs, which are used with the progressive aspect, come from different semantic domains. Biber et al. (1999: 471) observe that such verbs “include dynamic verbs marking physical or communication activities and stative verbs describing physical situations and mental, attitudinal, and perceptual states”. Below is the description of semantic domains of verbs that occur with the progressive aspect.

7.1.2.1 Activity verbs

Activity verbs “primarily denote actions and events that could be associated with choice and so take a subject with the semantic role of agent” (Biber et al. 1999: 361). This point is also remarked by Collins (2008: 234) when he states that activity verbs “denote events controlled typically by a volitional agent”. He also observes that “those which denote an activity that characteristically has duration”, such as *chase, shop, march, dance* “tend to occur more commonly with the progressive than those which denote an instantaneous action such as *throw, shut, smash, swallow*” (p. 234). Further examples of activity verbs include, *bring, buy, come, go, leave, move, open, run, take, and work*.

7.1.2.2 Communication verbs

Communication verbs such as *announce, explain, speak, suggest, talk, tell* and *write* express activities involving spoken and written communication (Biber et al. 1999: 362). Those which

express activities that are typically durative such as *chat*, *joke* and *talk* are more common with the progressive than those that do not, such as *exclaim*, *reply* and *thank* (Collins 2008: 234).

7.1.2.3 Mental verbs

Mental verbs express various types of perception e.g. *see*, *hear*, *smell*, *taste*, *feel*, cognition e.g. *know*, *think*, *understand*, *recognise*, and emotion e.g. *dislike*, *hate*, *detest*, *love* (Downing and Locke 2002: 365). Those which take the progressive are “determined by the degree to which their meaning is dynamic or stative” (Collins 2008: 234). Those which deliberately refer to performed perception or cognition, e.g. *watch* as in (7.1.20) are compatible with the progressive. Smith (1983: 497) argues that progressive statives which “present a state as an event, endowing the state with the properties of events. The relevant properties of events seem to be activity and successive stages, which together constitute the dynamics that, differentiate events from states”.

(7.1.20) I was watching your map. (Collins 2008: 235)

However, those which normally have an inert, experiential, stative sense, e.g. *hear*, *feel*, *assume*, *wonder* “are considerably restricted in their capacity to combine with the progressive aspect, and when they do so specific semantic dimensions associated with progressive aspectuality will be foregrounded” (Collins 2008: 235).

7.1.2.4 Occurrence verbs

Occurrence verbs such as *become*, *change*, *develop*, *grow*, *increase* and *occur* “report events that occur independently of volitional activity” (Collins 2008: 236). These verbs have inherent durative sense and therefore are readily compatible with the progressive.

7.1.2.5 Existence verbs

According to Collins (2008: 236) existence verbs can be categories into two. The first category “concerns with a state of existence or stance e.g. *exist*, *live*, and *stay*”. Such verbs occur with the progressive, which suggest temporariness or limited duration as in (7.1.21) and (7.1.22). Biber et al. (1999: 471) observe that “some of the most common verbs occurring with progressive aspect are of this type”.

(7.1.21) I’ve been living in Australia for last eleven years. (Collins 2008: 236)

(7.1.22) I was sitting in my office smoking one of James’ cigarettes. (Biber et al. (1999: 471)

The second category is concerned with “relationships, either those between entities e.g. *contain, include, involve* and *represent* or those between entities and descriptions e.g. *be, seem, appear*” (Collins 2008: 236). These verbs rarely occur with the progressive.

7.1.2.6 Causative verbs

Causative verbs indicate that “a person or inanimate entity brings about a new state of affairs” (Collins 2008: 236). Such verbs include *cause, enable, force, allow, help, let, require* and *permit*. These verbs rarely occur with the progressive.

7.1.2.7 Aspectual verbs

Aspectual verbs characterise “the stage of progress of an activity” and rarely occur with the progressive (Collins 2008: 236). These verbs include *begin, continue, finish, keep, start, and stop*.

Biber et al. (1999: 473) observe that there are two ways of distinguishing verbs that occur with the progressive aspect. The first category includes verbs which mainly occur with the progressive aspect. These verbs “typically take a human subject as agent, activity controlling the action (or state) expressed by the verb”. Other verbs which rarely occur with the progressive, “take a human subject as experience, undergoing but not controlling the action or state expressed by the verb”. The second category includes verbs which describe action, state or situation as prolonged. Others verbs which rarely occur with the progressive refer to an action which is immediate and a state which is not normally a continuing process.

7.1.3 Uses of the progressive

The basic or core meaning of the progressive aspect is to indicate an ongoing happening at the time of reference. Kirk (2015: 92) refers to this as ‘the event or activity progressive’ which occurs “with dynamic, durative, telic verbs that refer to an accomplishment, with reference to a situation which the progressive marks as ongoing, whether transitional, activity or process”, as in (7.1.23) which represents an ongoing activity.

(7.1.23) I mean you’re reminded all the time that you’re reading a novel. (Kirk 2015: 92)

Apart from the basic meaning of the progressive there are other additional meanings or uses of the progressive which have been identified and described in English. For instance, Quirk et al. (1985: 199) remark that the progressive is used with habitual limited activities to imply that “the repetition takes place over a limited period”, as in (7.1.24). Greenbaum (1996: 276) calls this ‘recurrent progressive’ whereby the progressive “refers to a set of recurrent

events that are viewed as in progress over a limited period of time”. Kirk (2015: 92) refers to this use as ‘habitual bounded progressive’ in which the progressive “marks the referred-to-action as incomplete, with the implication that its duration will only involve a limited period of time”.

(7.1.24) The professor is typing his own letters while his secretary is ill. (Quirk et al. 1985: 199)

There are other uses of the progressive referred to as ‘special uses’ because “the meanings they convey amount to something beyond aspect” (Leech et al. 2009: 119). These include, for instance, the use of the progressive to refer to events which will happen in the future or were to happen in the future in the past, as in (7.1.25) and (7.1.26) (Quirk, et al. 1985: 210). Greenbaum (1996: 277) states that this use of the progressive refers to “future scheduled events”. The use of the progressive to indicate events to happen in the future is further remarked by Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 171), Greenbaum and Nelson (2002: 59), and Leech et al, (2009: 131).

(7.1.25) Are you going to the meeting (tomorrow)?

(7.1.26) They were getting married the following spring. (Quirk, et al., 1985, p. 210)

Normally, the progressive does not occur with stative verbs. However, when combined with a basic stative expression, it adopts a dynamic meaning involving an agentive activity or behaviour, as in (7.1.27). The use of the agentive stative progressive has been observed by Binnick, (2006: 250), Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 53), Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 167), and Leech (2004: 30). According to Gut and Fuchs (2013: 245), the type of behaviour marked by the agentive stative progressive is limited in duration. In addition, Kirk (2015: 94) observes that the agentive stative progressive has “the implicative that the activity is being deliberately undertaken or acting a part”.

(7.1.27) The children are being difficult. (Binnick 2006: 250)

The progressive can also be used with mental verbs such as *hope* and *wonder* for politeness purpose, as in (7.1.28) and (7.1.29) (Greenbaum 1996: 277). The use of the politeness progressive is also noted by Quirk et al. (1985: 210) when they observe that the progressive “may be used with the attitudinal past tense or the present tense, to refer tentatively to a present wish or attitude”. They go on to note that “particularly when combined with the attitudinal past, such forms enable us avoid the impoliteness which might well result from expressing one’s attitude too directly”.

(7.1.28) I'm hoping to find out if there is a bus service. (Greenbaum 1996: 277)

(7.1.29) I was wondering if you could help me. (Quirk et al. 1985: 210)

There are some contexts in which the progressive is used to express “an attitudinal nuance such as condescension, annoyance or amusement” (Leech et al. 2009: 134). According to Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 167), this use of the progressive occurs with ‘serial states’ which “tend to be accompanied by an emotive overtone, usually of disapproval, when emphasised by such adjuncts as *always*, *continually*, *constantly*, *everlastingly*, *forever*, *perpetually*”, as in (7.1.30). Kirk (2015: 98) refers to this use of the progressive as the ‘attitudinal progressive’.

(7.1.30) He's always losing his temper. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 166)

Leech et al. (2009: 134) observe that the interpretive progressive have been identified by a number of linguists. This use involves “the clause containing the progressive can be employed to interpret - or give meaning to - a situation with which the addressee is assumed to be familiar, either because it is mentioned explicitly [...] or inferrable from the context” (p. 134). This is illustrated in (8.1.31).

(7.1.31) In joining the Euro we might be giving away our sovereignty. (Leech et al. 2009: 134)

According to Collins (2008: 240), the interpretative progressive is used in contexts to “foreground an interpretation or explanation of what somebody says or what someone does”. The use of the interpretative progressive in English is also observed by Kirk (2015: 98) when he writes that the interpretative progressive “is a pragmatic, non-aspectual expression of a speaker’s concern with explaining, clarifying or interpreting what someone has just said”.

The progressive also occurs with dynamic, punctual, atelic verbs to indicate punctual progressive usage, as in (7.1.32). Gut and Fuchs (2013: 245) observe that with the punctual progressive the meaning implies “a series of repetitions that is incomplete”.

(7.1.32) She was nodding. (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 166)

Furthermore, the progressive can be used with a subject pronoun that has generic reference, as in (7.1.33). Kirk (2015: 98) remarks that, the generic progressive occurs “with a subject pronoun that has generic reference, often in if-clauses, in the progressive marks the heuristic nature of the utterance”.

(7.1.33) When it gets to petrol bombing, I think you are talking about a different category from breaking windows. (Leech et al. 2009: 131)

There are situations where the progressive may also be used to refer to “a fairly recent communicative happening” (Leech 2004: 32). According to Kirk (2015: 99), this is the ‘resultative progressive’ which is used to refer to “an action which has been completed and with a focus on the outcome which has resulted from the activity”. He goes on to note that with the resultative progressive, there is an implicature of recency which is sometimes indicated explicitly by adverbs such as *just* and *the other day*, as in (7.1.34).

(7.1.34) I was just talking to students about that today. (Kirk 2015: 99)

The progressive is also used to indicate that “the action will take place ‘as a matter of course’ in the future”, as in (7.1.35) (Quirk et al. 1985: 210). According to Quirk et al. (1972: 89), the ‘future-as-a-matter-of-course’ involves *will/shall* + *BE+V-ing* whereby “the use of this combination avoids the interpretation (to which *will*, *shall* and *be going to* are liable) of volition, insistence”.

(7.1.35) I’ll be seeing you next week. (Quirk et al. 1985: 210)

Scholars such as Kranich (2010: 32.35) and Mair (2012: 816-822) have observed an increase in the use of the progressive form in Present-Day English in constructions they have referred to as the ‘extended use of the progressive’. For instance, the progressive is used with verbs denoting mental state such *understand*, as in (7.1.36).

(7.1.36) Why are you not understanding this already. (Gut and Fuchs 2013: 254)

In addition, the progressive is used with unlimited states whereby the verb *have* is used with unlimited duration sense, as in (7.1.37). Van Rooy (2014: 167) remarks that “such instances may be regarded as superfluous morphology from the perspective of Inner Circle varieties”.

(7.1.37) You know even the white people the black the green and the yellow people mm they are having their ancestors. (Van Rooy 2014: 167)

Furthermore, the extended use of the progressive involves the stative use of dynamic verbs, such as *come*, as in (7.1.38) to denote a person’s origin (Paulasto 2014: 262). Gut and Fuchs (2013: 254) refers to this as the extended use of the progressive “with nonagentive stative verbs”, as in (7.1.39). This use of the progressive is referred to as ‘the non-agentive stative progressive’ by Kirk (2015: 95).

(7.1.38) Then I would love to know more about your uh [...] you said you are coming from Vellore. (Paulasto 2014: 262)

(7.1.39) Why did you say I am owing you #800,000,00? (Gut and Fuchs 2013: 254)

More still, extended use of the progressive occurs with non-delimited habitual activities in which the progressive is used with “the absence of explicit or implied temporal delimiter such as these days” (Sharma 2009: 181). The non-delimited habitual use of the progressive is also observed by Paulasto (2014: 257) as example (7.1.40) illustrates. The use of the progressive to refer to habitual activities is also noted by Meierkord (2012: 125), as in (7.1.41) below.

(7.1.40) They were ever such nice people, very nice people. He was coming to the post here, okay, he was calling in then and having a chat, you know, he was ever so nice.
(Paulasto 2014: 257)

(7.1.41) I’m in Khayelitsha, and there I’m travelling by bus, it’s a bus from there to town and I’m changing from town to Sea Point uh, to take another bus it’s two buses.
(Meierkord 2012: 125)

The extended meaning of the progressive also occurs with the persistive meaning where the progressive form is used with the adverb *still*, as in (7.1.42). Van Rooy (2006: 45) writes that the persistive or persistitive denotes “an activity that started in the past and is ongoing at the time of reference”.

(7.1.42) I am still writing. (Van Rooy 2014: 160)

This section has reviewed the meaning of aspect and the definition of the progressive aspect in English. With examples, it has illustrated the progressive form, semantic classes of verbs used with the progressive and the basic or core use of the progressive, special uses, and extended uses of the progressive in the English language. The next section discusses the attestation of the progressive in World Englishes.

7.2 Previous studies in the use of the progressive in World Englishes

The progressive has been examined in a number of studies of World Englishes. The corpus-based studies use both diachronic and synchronic approaches to examine the frequency and use of the progressives in spoken and written English. Using the LOB and Brown corpora and their parallels FLOB and Frown, Mair and Hundt (1995) identify an increase in the frequency of the progressive in the ‘press’ category. Likewise, Smith (2002) who examined the British written corpora LOB and FLOB basing on the four written corpora used by Mair and Hundt reports similar findings. In her examination of the progressive in Modern English using the written registers of the ARCHER-corpus, Kranich (2010: 153) reports an increase in the use of the progressive with stative verbs from 9 per cent in the first half of the 20th century to 13 per cent in the second half. In their analysis of essays and exam scripts from ENL and ESL varieties,

Hundt and Vogel (2011: 156) observe that “in ESL corpora, unusual combinations of the progressive with stative verbs are relatively rare”. They go on to assert that “in fact, we found none in the Philippine and Malaysia student essays and only a few in the Singaporean and Kenyan corpora” (p. 156). Analyzing the progressive in spoken and written English, Biber et al. (1999: 461-475) observe that only 5 to 10 per cent of all verbs in English are marked for progressive aspect. In addition, they report that the progressive occurs more frequently in conversations and fiction than in academic writing and news. Furthermore, they note that in conversations, “most progressive verb phrases are in the present tense (70 percent) while in fiction, most progressive verb phrases are in the past tense (70 percent)” (p. 471). More still, they report that “50 percent of verbs occurring with the progressive refer to physical or communication activities” (p. 471). Leech et al. (2009: 122-141) using the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB) report that the progressives are more frequent in informal texts (e.g. phone-calls, social letters and informal conversations) than in formal texts (e.g. academic writing and student essays). In addition, Leech et al. (2009: 124) report five main diachronic trends in the use of the progressive in British and American English, namely; (a) statistically significant increase of the progressive in the present tense in both in written British and American English (b) an increase in present progressive active and passive voices in British English and present progressive active voice in American English (c) a decline in the use of the past progressive active voice in British English and passive voice in American English (d) the growth in progressives in combination with modal auxiliaries (modal + progressive) in British English (e) few occurrences of the most complex parts of the paradigm, containing three or more auxiliaries, for example, *will be taken, must have been being considered*.

In his analysis of the progressive using the International Corpus of English (ICE) collection: ICE-GB, ICE-AUS, ICE-NZ, ICE-PHI, ICE-SIG, ICE-HK, ICE-IND and ICE-EA(Ken) Collins (2008: 247) reports that “in all the nine Englishes examined the progressive is approximately twice as common in speech as in writing”. In addition, he observes that in all varieties examined the progressive is “more common in news than in academic prose” with the exception of Philippine English where it is “more common in fiction than in news” (p. 248). Furthermore, he reports that “the most frequently occurring of the special uses, the ‘futate’, displays a strong preference for speech over writing” (p. 248). Likewise, Van Rooy (2014) investigated the progressive aspect in three outer circle varieties of English (Indian, Kenyan, and Black South African English). He reports that “progressives occur more frequently in spoken data than in written data, and IndE has fewer progressives overall than KenE, which in turn remains behind BSAfE” (Van Rooy 2014: 163).

There are other corpus-based studies which have examined the use of the progressive in individual second varieties of English. The attention has been focussed on the extended use of the progressive. For instance, Filppula (2008: 332) points out that Irish English uses the progressive form with stative verbs denoting intellectual states like *believe* and relational verbs like *belong*. Apart from the use of the progressive with stative verbs Filppula (2008: 333) also observes the use of the progressive with habitual activities in Irish English. He argues that the varying usage of the progressive forms in Irish English can be explained by the general increase in the use of the progressive in the English language and the possible substrate influence from Irish (p. 334). The extended use of the progressive in Irish English has also been examined by Wilson and Millor (2013: 278) when they write that “the progressive form occurs more frequently in Irish English than in Standard British English, especially with stative verbs, including those of inert cognition and perception [...] and verbs of having and being”.

The extended use of the progressive has also been reported in indigenised English L2 varieties. In the Pacific/Asian second language varieties, Balasubramanian (2009: 90) reports the use of the progressive with stative verbs in Indian English. For instance, in his analysis, he found that out of the 24 verbs in the progressive, 9 of them were stative verbs. He further remarks that out of the 93 stative progressives, 50 involved the verb *have*, in the construction such as *were having*. The use of the progressive with stative verbs in Indian English is also observed by Sharma (2009). Likewise, Hundt and Vogel (2011: 157) observe the occurrence of the progressive with stative verbs in Singapore English. The co-occurrence of the progressive with habitual activities has been reported in L2 varieties of English in the Pacific and Asian regions. For instance, in their examination of past and progressive in Indian English, Sharma and Ashawini (2010) report that in their data, 63.7 percent of the progressive forms were used to carry habitual meaning. They argue that in Indian English, the progressive form covers a range of different imperfective aspects similar to those represented in indigenous Indian languages.

There are also studies of the extended use of the progressive in indigenised L2 varieties of English on the African continent. For instance, De Klerk (2006: 141) points at the use of stative verbs such as *believe* and *hate* in Black South African English with the progressive. In Nigerian English, the extended use of the progressive with stative verbs is reported by Alo and Mesthrie (2008: 325) when they write that in Nigerian English “the distinction between stative and non-stative verbs is overridden”. They argue that the use of the progressive construction with stative verbs in Nigerian English might be an influence from the Nigerian first languages where verbs of perception “freely take the progressive”. In the same line, Gut and Fuchs (2013:

254) observe a frequent use of the progressive construction with non agentive stative verbs in Nigerian English. The extension of the progressive form to stative verbs is also observed in East African varieties of English. Schmied (2008: 452) for instance remarks that “extended forms (BE + Verb + -ing construction) are used frequently and do not necessarily imply StE (progressive) meaning: This affects the distinction between the non-stative and the stative use of verbs”.

In his analysis of the progressive aspect and stative verbs in L2 varieties of English, Van Rooy (2014: 166) remarks that his findings support the general consensus in the literature that the progressive is more frequently used with stative verbs in L2 varieties of English than in L1 varieties of English. Unlike the deductive approach taken in the analysis of the progressive aspect in previous studies, Van Rooy (2014: 161) employs an inductive, usage-based approach which describes “the meanings of the progressive form in context and derive a proper characterisation of the construction from there”. He therefore identifies three main semantic categories that represent “the meanings that the progressive construction conveys when used with stative verbs” (2014: 166). These include: (a) temporary state, (b) on-going state, and (c) unlimited state.

The extended use of the progressive form in L2 varieties of English in Africa is not limited to stative verbs. Gut and Fuchs (2013: 253), for instance, found out that the progressive with habitual durative meaning represents the largest group of extended usage in Nigerian English. Likewise, Mesthrie (2008c: 502) writes that in South African Indian English, “be + -ing is extended to habitual senses, usually expressed in Standard English by the present tense”. The use of the progressive with habitual durative is also reported in East African English. For instance, Schmied (2006: 197) remarks that in East African English “the continuous forms (BE + VERB + -ing) are overused, i.e., not necessarily with StE ‘progressive’ meaning”. The use of the progressive form with habitual sense is further reported in Black South African English (Makelela 2004 and Van Rooy 2006). For instance, Makalela (2004: 359) argues that this extended use of the progressive could be explained by L1 influence, for example, in Bantu languages, there is no conceptual distinction of the present time in terms of habituality and progressiveness. Other studies that have reported the extended use of the progressive to stative verbs and habitual activities in L2 English varieties in Africa include Mesthrie (2008b), Siebers (2007), Minow (2010), and Meierkord (2007 and 2012).

Apart from the extended use of the progressive with stative verbs and to habitual contexts, there are other constructions involving the progressive in English L2 varieties in

Africa. Mesthrie (2008c: 502), for instance, writes that in Indian South African English (InSAfE)¹⁵, “be + -ing occurs in a number of contexts beyond (and in addition to) the usual progressive in Standard English”. For example, in InSAfE, the present progressive is used instead of the past progressive in historic present narrative contexts as in (7.2.1). In addition, the present progressive is used instead of the present perfect progressive as in (7.2.2) (Mesthrie 2013c: 244). He further points out that in InSAfE narratives “the conversational historic progressive is used more than the past progressive” (p. 251). He argues that whereas the historic progressive uses the present progressive form to create the foreground effect, the past progressive has the effect of background.

(7.2.1) I m suffering here now and the pain is getting worse. ‘I was suffering [from chest pain] and the pain was getting worse’.

(7.2.2) I m staying this house seven years. ‘I’ve been staying in this house for seven years’
(Mesthrie, 2013c: 244).

The extended use of the progressive to stative verbs and habitual contexts are among the features examined in the *World Atlas of Varieties of English* in which the extension to stative verbs is rated higher (63 percent attestation) than the extension to habitual contexts (49 percent attestation) (Kortmann and Lunkenheimer 2013). A look at the four indigenized L2 varieties of English reveals varying values for these two features. For instance, whereas in Ugandan English (Ssempuuma 2013), the extension of the progressive to stative verbs is rated as existing but extremely rare, in Kenyan English (Buregeya 2013), Indian English (Sharma 2013), and Black South African English (Mesthrie 2013b) this feature is rated as pervasive or obligatory. The extension of the progressive to habitual contexts is rated as neither pervasive nor extremely rare in both Ugandan and Kenyan English and as pervasive or obligatory in both Indian and Black South African English. The above studies have pointed at the influence of the substrate L1 languages as the main factor explaining the extended use of the progressive in second varieties of English.

The discussion of the use of the extended use of the progressive form in both L1 and L2 varieties of English have pointed at the influence of the substrate L1 languages as the main factor for this phenomenon. This is supported by Winford (2013: 222-3), who states that “tense/aspect categories such as perfect and progressive are more idiosyncratic in nature, since they are shaped by substrate influence in a process of contact-induced grammaticalisation”.

¹⁵ InSAfE is a language shift variety.

She goes on to argue that “the mechanism of change underlying this process is imposition, which involves assigning semantic and structural properties of an L1 category to an L2 lexeme via analogy” (Winford, 2013: 223). Furthermore, she remarks that “the mechanism comes into play during the language production process itself, when speakers draw on their knowledge of a more dominant language in producing a less dominant one” (Winford, 2013: 240). This point of view is supported by Mufwene (2013: 218) who states that in L2 varieties of English, the indigenous languages “do not exert identical substrate influence on the relevant indigenised varieties. [...] it is individual speakers interacting in specific ecologies that drive language change, as they set their emergent idiolectal characteristics in competition with each other”.

The next section discusses the progressive aspect or its equivalent in the three Ugandan indigenous languages, that is, Acholi-Lango, Luganda, and Runyankole-Rukiga. This serves as background information in exploring the extent to which these substrate languages influence the extended use of the progressive in Ugandan English.

7.3 The progressive aspect in Ugandan Languages: Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango

The perception of tense and aspect in Luganda differs from that in Standard English. Ashton et al. (1954: 123) state that in Luganda the present tense has no tense infix marker and apart from expressing an action in progress at the time of speaking, the present tense may also imply a habitual or repetitive action. In addition, Musoke (1986: 9) observes that in Luganda the present tense is formed by adding a subject prefix to the verb stem. In Standard English, the progressive is used to mark ongoing events and activities at the time of reference and for habitual bounded events marked as ongoing but occur repeatedly for a limited time, normally marked by adverbials such as *these days*. For habits which are not temporary limited, the simple tense is used rather than the progressive. In Luganda, there is no distinction on the inflection of the verb to mark events and activities ongoing at the time of reference, habitual bounded events and habits that are not temporary limited. This is illustrated in examples¹⁶ (7.3.1), (7.3.2), and (7.3.3) with the morpheme glossing explained.

(7.3.1) Mugisha alya obulo.

Mugisha	<u>a-ly-a</u>	o-bulo
Mugisha	3SG-eat-FV	IV-millet bread

¹⁶ The following glosses are used in the examples: 3SG = 3rd person singular, 3PL = 3rd person plural, AUX = auxiliary, FV = final vowel, IV = initial vowel (cf. Mchombo: 1993), and PROG = progressive

‘Mugisha he is eating millet bread’

(7.3.2) Mugisha alya obulo, ennaku zino.

Mugisha a-ly-a o-bulo, e-nnaku zino.

Mugisha 3SG-eat-FV IV-millet bread, IV-days these

‘Mugisha he is eating millet bread, these days’

(7.3.3) Mugisha alya obulo.

Mugisha a-ly-a o-bulo

Mugisha 3SG-eat-FV IV-millet bread

‘Mugisha he eats millet bread’

Furthermore, Ashton et al. (1954), Chesswas (1967), and Musoke (1986) point out that, activities which start in the past and continue to the present and are implied by the *still* tense in Luganda. The *still* tense is formed by attaching the tense infix marker *-kya-* between the subject prefix and the verb stem. The *still* tense is used to make emphasis of the event and activity which is still ongoing as in (7.3.4) or state still observed or felt as in (7.3.5) at the time of reference.

(7.3.4) Enkuba ekyatonnya.

E-nkuba e-kya-tonny-a

IV-rain 3SG-STILL-rain-FV

‘Rain it is still raining’

(7.3.5) Abantu bakyakkiriza mu Katonda

A-bantu ba-kya-kkiriz-a mu Katonda

IV-people 3PL-STILL-believe-FV in God

‘People they still believe in God’

Nurse (2003: 98-9) asserts that the *still* tense in Bantu languages is equivalent to the persistent progressive in the English language, which indicates that the action or state is still in progress and is indicated lexically but not grammatically by an adverb such as ‘still’.

In Runyankole-Rukiga, the *present indefinite* and the *present imperfect* tenses are the equivalent of the English present simple and present progressive tenses respectively (Morris and Kirwan 1957: 5-6). Whereas the present indefinite tense is used for actions carried out habitually and has no marking, the present imperfect tense, is used for activities in progress and is marked by prefixing *ni-* to the subject prefix on the verb stem (Morris and Kirwan 1957: 82). This implies that activities in progress and habitual activities are expressed differently in the

two Bantu languages, Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga. Runyankole-Rukiga distinguishes the use of the progressive and the habitual activities that are not temporary like in Standard English. This is illustrated in the examples (7.3.6), (7.3.7), and (7.3.8) below. However, like Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga also has the *still* tense, which is marked by the infix *-ki-* inserted after the subject prefix (Morris and Kirwan 1957: 87).

(7.3.6) Mugisha nialya oburo.

Mugisha	ni-a-ly-a	o-buro
Mugisha	PROG-3SG-eat-FV	IV-millet bread
'Mugisha he is eating millet bread'		

(7.3.7) Mugisha nialya oburo, biro binu.

Mugisha	ni-a-ly-a	o-buro,	biro binu
Mugisha	PROG-3SG-eat-FV	IV-14-millet bread,	days these
'Mugisha he is eating millet bread'			

(7.3.8) Mugisha alya oburo.

Mugisha	a-ly-a	o-buro
Mugisha	3SG-eat-FV	IV-millet bread
'Mugisha he eats millet bread'		

In Acholi-Lango, the verb is inflected for three aspects, perfective, progressive, and habitual but not for tense (Noonan 1981: 32). Whereas the progressive aspect describes processes and events, the habitual aspect describes states and events (Noonan 1981: 34). He goes on to state that the progressive and habitual aspects can have a past, present or future interpretation depending on the context. Acholi-Lango uses the auxiliary *týe* 'be' and a progressive marker *a-* and *ka-* to the main verb in Acholi and Lango respectively¹⁷. This confirms what Crazzolara (1955: 115) points out that both the progressive and habitual bounded aspects are formed by the verb prefix *a-* in Acholi and *ka-* in Lango. The distinction between the progressive and habitual bounded progressive can be marked by adverbs of time such as *aman* 'now' and *dikdik* 'usually' or *ikareni* 'these days' (Carollo 1991: 55). Acholi-Lango distinguishes the progressive, habitual bounded progressive and habitual unlimited aspects like in Standard English. This is illustrated in examples (7.3.9), (7.3.10), and (7.3.11). In example (7.3.11) there is no auxiliary and no progressive marker, which indicates that this is

¹⁷ The Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga sentences and the morpheme glossing were provided by Isingoma Bebwā after consulting the native speakers of these languages. The same applies to the slight difference between Acholi and Lango regarding the progressive marking using *a-* and *ka-* prefixes respectively.

the present simple tense used to mark habitual unlimited events and activities. The tone used on the verb changes from the one used in the sentences marking the progressive indicating ongoing event and activity and habitual bounded progressive.

(7.3.9) Mugisha t́ye á-càmò kwon kal.

Mugisha	t́ye	á-càmò	kwon kal
Mugisha	AUX(be)	PROG-eat	bread millet
'Mugisha is eating millet bread'			

(7.3.10) Mugisha t́ye á-càmò kwon kal, ikareni.

Mugisha	t́ye	á-càmò	kwon kal, ikareni
Mugisha	AUX(be)	PROG-eat	bread millet, these days
'Mugisha is eating millet bread'			

(7.3.11) Mugisha cá mó kwon kal.

Mugisha eats bread-millet
'Mugisha eats millet bread'

This section has discussed the progressive aspect in the three Ugandan languages. It has illustrated that although Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga are Bantu languages, there is a distinction between these two languages as far as the marking of aspect on ongoing events and habitual activities is concerned. Runyankole-Rukiga, like Acholi-Lango, distinguishes between aspectual marking on ongoing events and habitual unlimited activities like in Standard English. Only Luganda does not show this distinction. The distinction between Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango is that Acholi-Lango uses the auxiliary *t́ye* (be) which is missing in Runyakole-Rukiga. The next section analyses the use of the progressive in Ugandan English spoken data.

7.4 The progressive in spoken Ugandan English data

This section discusses the use of the progressive in Ugandan English. In the first part it discusses the use of the progressive by English speakers with the three Ugandan L1s. This is followed by the analysis of the progressive in Ugandan English in comparison to other varieties of English. In addition, it compares the uses of the progressive between the three speaker groups and explores possible substrate influence in the use of the progressive constructions.

7.4.1 Progressive aspect in data of English speakers with Luganda as L1

In the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1, the progressive construction occurs with a frequency of 7.66 per 1,000 words. Table 7.4.1 shows the raw frequencies, relative frequency

(per 1,000 words), and the percentage of all progressive constructions in the data, representing present progressive, past progressive, present perfect progressive, present progressive passive, past progressive passive, and modal verbs + progressive.

Table 7.4.1: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1

Construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
Present tense active	168	5.77	75.34
Present tense passive	3	0.1	1.35
Past tense active	49	1.68	21.97
Past tense passive	0	0	0
Present perfect	3	0.1	1.35
Past perfect	0	0	0
Modal verb + progressive present tense	0	0	0
Modal verb + progressive perfect aspect	0	0	0
Total	223	7.66	100

Most of the progressive constructions occur in present tense active voice as in (7.4.1) and (7.4.2). This makes up 75.34 percent of all progressive constructions. The progressive constructions in the past tense active voice as in (7.4.3) and (7.4.4) are the second most frequent occurrences with 21.97 percent of all progressive constructions. The progressive construction in the present tense passive voice and present perfect each occurs with 1.35 percent of all progressive constructions as in (7.4.5) and (7.4.6) respectively. There is no progressive construction in the past tense passive voice and modal verb + progressive in the Luganda L1 data. The findings in table 7.4.1 therefore clearly indicate that English speakers with Luganda as L1 most frequently use the progressive with present tense predicates.

(7.4.1) So we are not so perfect even in the local language and still we are learning also another foreign language.

(7.4.2) Eh so it is according to the target of somebody, that is, he is targeting the central then he will sing in Luganda when he is targeting the north alone then he will sing in Luo.

(7.4.3) ... after which I went for my pastoral spiritual year experience was helping at Bukalasa minor seminary to teach and also to do some other activities that were given to me.

(7.4.4) So people could perform well, people were flourishing if you can say and after the after the university people were graduating quality degrees diplomas and so on.

(7.4.5) ... those child when they are being taught well English they can be good speaker they are fluent when they are being taught well.

(7.4.6) ... but people of all long have been just singing Ashawa Ashawa without knowing the meaning of the song.

The progressive is also analysed according to the meaning or uses indicated by the progressive constructions. Table 7.4.2 shows the meaning or the uses of the progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.

Table 7.4.2: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1

Meaning of the progressive construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
The event or activity progressive	44	1.51	19.73
The habitual bounded progressive	31	1.07	13.90
The future progressive	10	0.34	4.48
The agentive stative progressive	6	0.21	2.69
The politeness progressive	1	0.03	0.45
The interpretative progressive	37	1.27	16.59
The generic progressive	7	0.24	3.14
The future as matter of course progressive	0	0	0
The mental state progressive	2	0.07	0.9
The unlimited state progressive	7	0.24	3.14
The non-agentive stative progressive	6	0.21	2.69
The non-delimited habitual progressive	71	2.44	31.84
The persisitive progressive	1	0.03	0.45
The punctual progressive	0	0	0
Total	223	7.66	100

From table 7.4.2 we see that the Standard English use of the progressive also occurs in the data English speakers with Luganda as L1. For instance, the event or activity progressive as in (7.4.7) and (7.4.8) makes up 19.73 percent of all the uses of the progressive in the data.

(7.4.7) For the case of the Baganda, I will not talk for others, so I am talking on my behalf.

(7.4.8) No, I don't, you are making I know that you are making this research but I don't know anyone who has done it before you.

This is followed by the habitual bounded progressive as in (7.4.9) and (7.4.10) which occurs with 13.9 percent of all the uses of the progressives in the data.

(7.4.9) Now these days currently my father is reminding me about that small drum and I am looking for where it is I want to get it as a remembrance.

(7.4.10) This kind of tradition is becoming modernised these days.

The progressive is also used for special uses as in Standard English. Most of the special uses of the progressives occur with the interpretative meaning as in (7.4.11) and (7.4.12). This makes up 16 percent of all the meanings of the progressives in the data.

(7.4.11) So you have to use English so that all these people understand what you are communicating.

(7.4.12) You know when you are building a house and the foundation is shaking then you cannot establish a firm umh building.

This is followed by the future progressive as in (7.4.13) accounting for 4.48 percent of all the progressive meanings in the data. The generic and agentive stative progressives as in (7.4.14) and (7.4.15) make up 3.14 percent and 2.69 percent of the total uses of the progressives respectively. The progressive is rarely used to indicate politeness with only one occurs as in (7.4.16).

(7.4.13) Then I told my daddy that I am going to the seminary.

(7.4.14) But then they should know their own language their mother tongue, if they do not know then they are losing the opportunity of learning their own language.

(7.4.15) So those are the schools that are doing well.

(7.4.16) He was saying daughter he was dictating notes so the daughter there was I was wondering what is he meaning.

The progressive is further used with 'extended uses'. Most frequencies of the progressive in this category refer to the non-delimited habitual progressive accounting for 31.84 percent of all the progressive constructions as in (7.4.17) and (7.4.18).

(7.4.17) Umh what I think is that most people most traders are from the central that is one, then I mean those who are selling some good merchandise are from the central.

(7.4.18) When you go to Kikuubo in Kampala you find many Banyankole many tribes but they are speaking Luganda.

The second most frequent extended use of the progressive refers to unlimited states as in (7.4.19) and (7.4.20). This meaning of the progressive makes up 3.14 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.19) Those are the people who like those Nigerian films most and are the people who are having the money to buy the films.

(7.4.20) Well for me I don't see that the population of Uganda is high, it is not really high but the problem in Uganda we are having today it is a problem of corruption. That is the problem we are having but land is still there.

The third most frequently used extended use of the progressive is the non-agentive stative progressive as in (7.4.21) and (7.4.22) which makes up 2.69 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.21) They were there but again many musicians were coming from this side from central region.

(7.4.22) When you speak the some one from America you hear that his umh accent or flow his English is quite different from the one who is coming from England.

The progressive is rarely used with mental states as in (7.4.23) and with the persistive meaning as in (7.4.24).

(7.4.23) Of course as human being you must have reason to why you are deciding to choose such a vocation.

(7.4.24) So we are not so perfect even in the local language and still we are learning also another foreign language.

The analysis of the use of the progressive meaning in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 has revealed that the progressive constructions are used with the meanings similar to those identified in Standard English as well as the extended uses identified in other second varieties of English discussed in section 7.2. The results show that the non-delimited progressive is the most frequently used meaning of the progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1. It is followed by the interpretative progressive (special use of the progressive). The basic meaning of the progressive aspect that is referring to ongoing happenings at the time of reference is the third most frequently used progressive meaning. The extension of the progressive to stative verbs is rarely used among English speakers with Luganda as L1. The overwhelming uses of the non-delimited progressive suggest a possible substrate influence English speakers with Luganda as L1 encounter in learning the use of the progressive aspect.

As it was discussed in section 8.3, Luganda does not make a distinction between the progressive and habitual marking.

This leads us to the analysis of the types of verbs that are most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda L1. A total of 87 lexical verbs are used with the progressive in the data¹⁸.

Table 7.4.3: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Speak	13	5.83	Take	3	1.35
Go	12	5.38	Be	3	1.35
Come	12	5.38	Have	3	1.35
Do	11	4.93	Communicate	3	1.35
Say	9	4.04	See	3	1.35
Talk	5	2.24	Ask	3	1.35
Teach	5	2.24	Use	3	1.35
Work	4	1.79	Bring	3	1.35
Try	4	1.79	Help	3	1.35
Fail	4	1.79	Call	3	1.35

Table 7.4.3 represents the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1. These verbs are used at least three times and make up 109 progressive tokens. They therefore account for 48.88 percent of all the progressive forms in the data. These verbs are grouped in five types, namely; (i) activity verbs referring to activities and physical events (*doing, going, bringing, teaching, working, using, and helping*) with 41 tokens; (ii) communication verbs referring to communication acts (*speaking, saying, talking, asking, and calling*) with 33 tokens; (iii) mental verbs referring to mental attitudinal states or activities (*trying, failing and seeing*) with 11 tokens; and lastly (iv) existence verbs referring to static situations (*being and having*) with 6 tokens. There are four verbs which occur more than 10 times with the progressive. Of these four verbs *speaking* has the highest number of tokens (13), hence accounting for 5.83 percent of all progressive forms. It is followed by *going* and *coming* which account 5.38 percent respectively and *doing* which account for 4.93 percent.

¹⁸ Appendix 1 lists all verbs alongside their respective number of tokens and percentage per the total number of progressive tokens in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1.

The analysis of the progressives in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1 has shown that in terms of progressive forms, most of the progressives occur in the present tense active voice. With regard to the uses of the progressive, the event and activity progressive is used more than the habitual bounded progressive. In addition, the special uses of the progressive are overwhelmingly used with the interpretative meaning. Furthermore, the extended uses occur overwhelmingly with habitual activities which are not temporarily limited (the non-delimited habitual progressive. Lastly, the activity verbs are the semantic class of verbs that are frequently used with the progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1. After exploring the use of the progressive aspect among English speakers with Luganda as L1, I now turn to the analysis of the progressive aspect among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

7.4.2 Progressive aspect in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Table 7.4.4 shows the distribution of the progressive according to the progressive forms in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, that is, present tense active voice, present tense passive voice, past tense active voice, past tense passive voice, present perfect, and past perfect.

Table 7.4.4: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
Present tense active	141	7.58	81.97
Present tense passive	1	0.05	0.58
Past tense active	25	1.34	14.54
Past tense passive	1	0.05	0.58
Present perfect	3	0.16	1.74
Past perfect	1	0.05	0.58
Modal verb + progressive present tense	0	0	0
Modal verb + progressive perfect aspect	0	0	0
Total	172	9.24	100

There are a total of 172 progressive constructions in this data. Most of the progressive constructions occur in the present tense active voice as in (7.4.25) and (7.4.26). This makes up 81.97 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.25) Because most of the Baganda I have met it I can you find you are speaking

Runyankole someone is not understanding you but for them when they speak Luganda, you understand.

- (7.4.26) If Omunyororo is speaking and you are Omukiga you understand, if Omunyakole is speaking and you are Omukiga you understand, if you are from Bunyororo and Omukiga is speaking you understand.

The progressive in the past tense active voice as in (7.4.27) and (7.4.28) accounts for 14.54 percent of all the progressive constructions.

- (7.4.27) Umh well the experience ah I must say it was challenging and on the other side very interesting to see the perception of what people have of a secular university.

- (7.4.28) So they were saying that he was doing things for Catholics, he was giving donation to churches of the Catholic faith.

However, the progressive construction rarely occurs in the present tense passive voice, past tense passive voice, present perfect, and past perfect which account for 0.58 percent, 0.58 percent, 1.74 percent, and 0.58 percent respectively. Examples (7.4.29), (7.4.30), (7.4.31), and (7.4.32) illustrated the use of the progressive with present tense passive voice, past tense passive voice, present perfect, and past perfect respectively.

- (7.4.29) Actually the big people those who have big jobs they are being given a lot of money and the teachers are just there starving which is little money that cannot even sustain them.

- (7.4.30) There is a friend who was being given away and we went there.

- (7.4.31) When they come home they use words they say may be I have been having a commitment when in actual fact she has been doing other things.

- (7.4.32) The man is there may be he is a businessman and to one at seven in the evening he is already at home and the woman comes, I had been having commitments what and what may be she has been in his in her own ways meeting other men.

There is no progressive construction with modal verbs + progressive in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. The analysis of the progressive forms above indicates that English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 most frequently use the progressive in the present tense active voice form.

The progressive is also analysed according to the meaning or uses indicated by the progressive constructions. Table 7.4.5 shows the meaning or the uses of the progressive in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 7.4.5: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Meaning of the progressive construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
The event or activity progressive	29	1.56	16.86
The habitual bounded progressive	15	0.81	8.72
The future progressive	1	0.05	0.58
The agentive stative progressive	2	0.11	1.16
The politeness progressive	0	0	0
The interpretative progressive	58	3.12	33.72
The generic progressive	8	0.43	4.65
The future as matter of course progressive	0	0	0
The mental state progressive	4	0.22	2.33
The unlimited state progressive	10	0.54	5.81
The non-agentive stative progressive	0	0	0
The non-delimited habitual progressive	41	2.2	23.84
The persisitive progressive	2	0.11	1.16
The punctual progressive	2	0.11	1.16
Total	172	9.24	100

From table 7.4.5 we see that the progressive is also used as in Standard English. For instance, the event or activity progressive as in (7.4.33) and (7.4.34) makes up 16.86 percent of all the uses of the progressive in the data.

(7.4.33) They had a youth conference so I was representing the youth from my parish.

(7.4.34) Well like when you were giving us the lecture there up you I think you heard you witnessed from...

The habitual bounded progressive as in (7.4.35) and (7.4.36) makes up 8.72 percent of all the uses of the progressives in the data.

(7.4.35) They would hear they would be telling them but nowadays you find an uncle or an aunt is telling a student or a son eh a son anyway.

(7.4.36) From there she gave up she went to the other lady whom the the minister was saying they don't vote for.

Regarding the special uses of the progressive, most of the frequencies occur with the interpretative meaning as in (7.4.37) and (7.4.38). This makes up 33.72 percent of all the progressive constructions in the data.

(7.4.37) St Cecilia eh Villa Maria is also trying but the rest are turning up and then the standard is not good.

(7.4.38) He is a good MP because he is trying to improve the performance by bringing the exams to the primary students from P1, P3 to P7.

The generic progressive as in (7.4.39) and (7.4.40) makes up 4.65 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.39) But if you come here you find that you are starving.

(7.4.40) So they use age mates and friends they confine it among their worker mates umh if you are doing masters, student mates, if you are neighbour in a neighbourhood.

The agentive stative progressives as in (7.4.41) and the future progressive as in (7.4.42) is used rarely by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, with only 2 and 1 occurrences respectively.

(7.4.41) Actually it is being torpid.

(7.4.42) Eh the university student is coming tomorrow so they kind of chase you.

The extended use of the progressive most frequently occurs with 'non-delimited habitual progressive' accounting for 23.84 percent of all the progressive constructions as in (7.4.43) and (7.4.44).

(7.4.43) Ok mainly not that they are not proud but you find a person the work of a person the work which a person is doing it is sort of sort of a shame you find he is vending these Bubanda.

(7.4.44) There are some many people who come from this end they go to the villages for example. They are working there. They are constructing roads cultivating bananas.

The second most frequent extended use of the progressive refers to unlimited states as in (7.4.45) and (7.4.46). This meaning of the progressive makes up 5.81 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.45) I was he was being my friend, we kept in touch.

(7.4.46) Because in Uganda we are having a lot of languages, we are having a lot of languages, however somebody may study all and gets them but it is not easy for the

westerners to use other languages.

The third most frequently used extended use of the progressive is the mental state progressive as in (7.4.47) and (7.4.48) which makes up 2.33 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.47) He was on the side of the Protestant and they were hating this MP Chris Banyomozi.

(7.4.48) Actually they have even trying I am hearing that they are trying to make it also a national language but I don't know whether it will be possible.

The extended use of the progressive is rarely used with the persistive meaning as in (7.4.49) and with the punctual progressive as in (7.4.50).

(7.4.49) Yeah some people might have bias because onetime I was at school when I was still studying history I was told that the Baganda used to to have problems with Batoro.

(7.4.50) I remember, one student was told to leave the court because he was sneezing during the game.

The analysis of the use of the progressive meaning by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 has revealed that the progressive constructions are used with the meanings similar to those identified in Standard English as well as the extended uses identified in other second varieties of English discussed in section 7.2. The results show that the interpretative progressive (special use) the most frequently used meaning of the progressive. It is followed by the non-delimited progressive. Although Runyankole-Rukiga does the marking of the progressive equivalent to Standard English and thus distinguishes the progressive from the habitual aspect, the results show that English speakers with Runkyankole-Rukiga as L1 used more non-delimited habitual progressive than the event or activity progressive. The results do not support substrate influence from Runyankole-Rukiga. The next part discusses the types of verbs most frequently used with the progressive.

There are 63 lexical verbs used with the progressive in the Runyankole-Rukiga L1 data¹⁹. Table 7.4.6 represents the 20 most frequent verbs used with the progressive. Only four verbs are used with the progressive more than ten times. These include the verbs, *speaking*, *doing*, *talking*, and *saying* accounting for 13.37 percent, 6.39 percent, 5.81 percent, and 5.81 percent respectively.

Table 7.4.6: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

¹⁹ Appendix 2 lists all verbs alongside their respective number of tokens and percentage per the total number of progressive tokens in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Speak	23	13.37	Help	4	2.33
Do	11	6.39	Take	4	2.33
Talk	10	5.81	Have	4	2.33
Say	10	5.81	Mean	4	2.33
Tell	8	4.65	Use	4	2.33
Be	6	3.49	Come	3	1.74
Teach	5	2.91	Study	3	1.74
Try	4	2.33	Give	3	1.74
Work	4	2.33	Chat	2	1.16
Go	4	2.33	Bring	2	1.16

Of the 20 lexical verbs most frequently used with the progressive, there are 54 tokens with the communication verbs *speaking*, *talking*, *saying*, *telling*, and *chatting*, observed with Runyankole-Rukiga L1 speakers. They therefore make the most frequently used verb type in the data. They are followed by activity verbs such as *doing*, *teaching*, *going*, *taking*, *coming*, *working*, *helping*, and *studying* with 38 tokens. In the third position are the existence verbs like *being* and *having* with 10 progressive tokens. There are 8 tokens with mental verbs *trying* and *meaning*. There is one causative verb, which is, *using* with 4 tokens.

The analysis of the progressives in the Runyankole-Rukiga data has revealed that with regard to the progressive forms, most of the progressives occur in the present tense active voice. In terms of the uses of the progressive, the event and activity progressive is used more than the habitual bounded progressive. In addition, the extended uses of the progressive are overwhelmingly occur with interpretative meaning. Furthermore, the extended uses occur with habitual activities which are not temporarily limited (the non-delimited habitual progressive). Finally, the communication verbs are the semantic class of verbs that are most frequently used with the progressive by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. This leads me to the discussion of the progressive aspect in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

7.4.3 Progressive aspect in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Table 7.4.7 shows the distribution of the progressive forms in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, in respect to present progressive, past progressive, present perfect progressive, present progressive passive, past progressive passive, and modal verbs + progressive.

Table 7.4.7: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
Present tense active	164	6.11	73.87
Present tense passive	11	0.41	4.96
Past tense active	34	1.27	15.32
Past tense passive	3	0.11	1.35
Present perfect	8	0.3	3.60
Past perfect	0	0	0
Modal verb + progressive present tense	1	0.04	0.45
Modal verb + progressive perfect aspect	1	0.04	0.45
Total	222	8.27	100

From table 7.4.7, we see that the progressive construction most frequently occurs in the present tense active voice. This category makes up 73.87 percent of all progressive constructions as illustrated in (7.4.51) and (7.4.52).

(7.4.51) Now the government pays the child because the government wants the best, are you seeing? He is investing. How about my father who is digging in the garden in the village? Can he really invest in my education so much that I can also get the 25 points that the government can take over?

(7.4.52) So this is the thing which is going to bring the level of education down, this is what I am seeing.

The progressive constructions in the past tense active voice, accounts for 15.32 percent of all the progressive constructions, as in (7.4.53) and (7.4.54).

(7.4.53) Now I started learning Alur, as I was learning Alur, of course I was continuing now from primary one up to P7 in the same school.

(7.4.54) Ah like for instance when I was for my O-level there used to be a teacher who grew up in Buganda and this man he if he was pronouncing some other words I could miss a lot but gradually I caught up with the with the system and could pick him.

The use of the progressive in the present tense passive voice, as in (7.4.55) and (7.4.56), accounts for 4.98 percent of all the progressives.

(7.4.55) Then a teacher who is labouring in the class to teach the future MPs, to teach the

future lawyer is being paid two hundred and fifty. Giving the increasing cost of living there I would support the idea of the teacher demanding for their increment in salary.

(7.4.56) Because you will find that the students themselves they are just being taught how to pass the papers.

In addition, the progressive in the present perfect, as in (7.4.57) and (7.4.58), accounts for 3.62 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.57) Government is spending a lot of money on what I may term as non-productive ventures, government like hiring, I have been reading on the news, we have been seeing that hiring lawyers of which each day a lawyer would be paid sixteen million.

(7.4.58) So all along I have been seeing how he was acting and how he was handling some of the cases at home.

There is one occurrence of the progressive with modal verbs in the present tense and perfect tenses. Each of these occurrences account for 0.45 percent and are illustrated in (7.4.59) and (7.4.60) respectively. There is no progressive construction in the past perfect. The findings in table 7.4.7 therefore indicate that English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 to a great extent use the progressive in the present tense active voice.

(7.4.59) Now the whole truth is that people from Kenya and Tanzania majority of them are struggling to learn English then the people of will be struggling to learn Kiswahili.

(7.4.60) If they say they are contributing that little amount it is not worth for the government to do such instead of the government to some of those making those little contributions they would have been piling that money somewhere then they could just donate and build classes.

The progressive is also analysed according to the meaning or uses indicated by the progressive constructions. Table 7.4.8 shows the meaning or the uses of the progressive in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

Table 7.4.8: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Meaning of the progressive construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
The event or activity progressive	72	2.68	32.43
The habitual bounded progressive	6	0.22	2.70
The future progressive	3	0.11	1.35
The agentive stative progressive	0	0	0

The politeness progressive	0	0	0
The interpretative progressive	57	2.12	25.68
The generic progressive	13	0.48	5.86
The future as matter of course progressive	1	0.04	0.45
The mental state progressive	13	0.48	5.86
The unlimited state progressive	2	0.08	0.90
The non-agentive stative progressive	8	0.3	3.60
The non-delimited habitual progressive	42	1.57	18.92
The persisitive progressive	4	0.15	1.80
The punctual progressive	1	0.04	0.45
Total	222	8.27	100

Table 7.4.8 shows that most of the progressive meaning is similar to that described in Standard English. The event or activity progressive which is the basic function of the progressive aspect in Standard English as in (7.4.61) and (7.4.62) makes up 32.543 percent of all the uses of the progressive in the data.

(7.4.61) You may go and study abroad like you are studying in Germany at the moment.

(7.4.62) Ok thank you very much ah to begin with me myself here I am telling you my experience. I was born in in Nebbi which is in Alur land.

The habitual bounded progressive as in (7.4.63) and (7.4.64) is rarely used relative to the event progressive and makes up only 2.7 percent of all the uses of the progressives in the data.

(7.4.63) Now I am getting experience from the pastoral work that we are doing meeting people and what.

(7.4.64) Like nowadays, people are now advising advancing in education.

With regard to the special uses of the progressive, most of the frequencies occur with the interpretative meaning as in (7.4.65) and (7.4.66). This makes up 25.68 percent of all the progressive constructions in the data.

(7.4.65) I would say Kiswahili because of the fact that the government is trying to create this regional you know unity, East African Unity.

(7.4.66) I was saying because I was trying to criticise the education system of this curriculum.

The generic progressive as in (7.4.67) and (7.4.68) makes up 5.86 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.67) They have to prove they have to compete with the men if they are looking for a emancipation why are they then chewing inability in the academic field?

(7.4.68) Now if they say they are contributing that little amount it is not worth for the government to do such.

The future progressive as in (7.4.69) and the future as a matter of course progressive as in (7.4.70) are particularly infrequent by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, with only 3 and 1 occurrences respectively.

(7.4.69) The inequalities is coming ok let me say may be the difference is coming in the sense that those who have got less points but they are on government ah sponsorship.

(7.4.70) Now the whole truth is that people of people from Kenya and Tanzania majority of them are struggling to learn English then the people of Uganda will be struggling to learn Kiswahili.

With regard to the extended uses of the progressive constructions, most of the frequencies occur with the non-delimited habitual progressive accounting for 18.92 percent of all the progressive constructions as in (7.4.71) and (7.4.72).

(7.4.71) We see that most families where the parents especially the women are working their children somehow also going higher with their education.

(7.4.72) In Lira I see good teachers are teaching in big schools like Lacor College, Comboni College.

The second most frequent extended use of the progressive refers to mental states as in (7.4.73). This meaning of the progressive makes up 5.86 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.73) Ah for me personally I was knowing you before because I talked the Rector talked about you to me so I was knowing who you are except you were not knowing who I am.

The third most frequently used extended use of the progressive is the non-agentive state progressive as in (7.4.74) and (7.4.75) which makes up 3.6 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.74) So now still that creates the imbalance because those are coming from up countries like Nebbi.

(7.4.75) Let us try to see from which background are you coming from, is it a third world school, is it a first world school?

The progressive with the persistive meaning as in (7.4.76) makes up 1.8 percent of all the progressive constructions.

(7.4.76) Now we are still struggling with academic and up to now.

Rarely used extended uses of the progressive are the unlimited state progressive and the punctual progressive as in (7.4.77) and (7.4.78) respectively.

(7.4.77) The children who go to first world schools come from rich families whose parents are having money to pay for their school fees.

(7.4.78) When you go like to this IDPs (Internally Displaced People's camps). Some people are sleeping outside the tents. The children they are coughing the whole night. The situation is very bad.

The analysis of the use of the progressive meaning in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 has shown that the progressive constructions are used with the meanings similar to those identified in Standard English as well as the extended uses identified in other second varieties of English discussed in section 7.2. The results reveal that most of the progressive meanings occur with the event or activity progressives. Since Acholi-Lango marks progressive as in Standard English, the higher frequency of progressives similar to Standard English use could be explained as a substrate influence in the use of the progressive by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. In addition, the second most frequent use involves the interpretative progressive which is one of the special uses of the progressive discussed in section 7.2. The third most frequently used progressive is the non-delimited habitual progressive which follows in the category of the extended uses of the progressive. This leads me to the discussion of the types of verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

There are 88 lexical verbs used with the progressive in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1²⁰. Of the 20 most frequently used verbs with the progressive the verbs with more than ten tokens are; (i) *trying* (19 tokens), (ii) *being* (14 tokens), (iii) *saying* (11 tokens), and (iv) *working* (11 tokens). The 20 most frequently used verbs together have a total of 138 progressive tokens hence they count for 62.16 percent of all the progressive

²⁰ Appendix 3 lists all verbs alongside their respective number of tokens and percentage per the total number of progressive tokens in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1.

constructions in the data. These 20 verbs are categorised into four verb types. Of the 20 lexical verbs most frequently used with the progressive, the activity verb (*working, doing, studying, teaching, growing, learning, paying, fighting, and making*) has the highest number of tokens (49). The mental verb type (*trying, seeing, and knowing*) with 28 tokens, are the second frequently used. The communication verbs (*saying and speaking*) have 19 tokens.

Table 7.4.9: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the Acholi-Lango L1 data

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Try	19	8.56	Teach	5	2.25
Be	14	6.31	Get	5	2.25
Say	11	4.95	Grow	5	2.25
Work	11	4.95	Learn	4	1.80
Come	9	4.05	Pay	4	1.80
Go	8	3.60	Know	3	1.35
Speak	8	3.60	Fight	3	1.35
Do	8	3.60	Make	3	1.35
Study	6	2.70	Take	3	1.35
See	6	2.70	Use	3	1.35

7.4.4 The progressive aspect in spoken Ugandan English

Dörnyei (2007: 214) writes that in quantitative analysis measure of variability “provides indices of how dispersed or varied the scores are in the data set”. Table 7.4.10 represents the distribution of the progressive construction among English speakers with the three indigenous Ugandan L1s. The variation of the number of occurrences of the progressive constructions across these speakers is not statistically significant. The log-likelihood test p-values are above the cut-off which is $p < 0.05$. Nevertheless, the log-likelihood test shows overuse of the progressive constructions among English speakers with Acholi-Lango L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda as L1, overuse among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda as L1, and over use among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. Since both Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga have progressive marking similar to Standard English as discussed in section 8.3, this suggests a possible substrate influence in the use of more progressive constructions among English speakers with, whose L1 has a similar progressive marking than one which does not have progressive marking, that is, Luganda.

Table 7.4.10: Frequencies of the progressive in the data of English speakers with the three L1s

Indigenous L1	Data size	Raw frequency	Frequency per 1,000 words
Luganda	29,100	223	7.66
Runyankole-Rukiga	18,610	172	9.24
Acholi-Lango	26,835	222	8.27
Total	74,545	617	8.28

Several studies have explored the use of the progressive in different varieties of English. Table 7.4.11 compares the use of the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data and the spoken data of other varieties of English, that is, conversations in category S1A from ICE-GB, ICE-EA(Ken), ICE-IND, ICE-PHI, and ICE-HK as reported by Collins (2008: 228-9), ICE-SA (cf. Van Rooy 2006), ICE-NIG (cf. Gut and Fuchs 2013), Xhosa English (De Klerk 2006 and Siebers 2007) as well as Black South African English (Meierkord, et al. 2009, reported in Minov 2010). The log-likelihood tests indicate overuse of the progressive in spoken Ugandan English data relative to the spoken data ICE-GB, ICE-IND, ICE-PHI, and ICE-SA. However, the progressive is less frequent in Ugandan English than in the ICE-EA(Ken), ICE-HK, ICE-NIG and the data for Xhosa English and Black South African English. It is interesting to note that apparently other varieties which have Bantu language substrates have higher frequencies of the progressive construction than the Ugandan English data. This could be because participants in the Ugandan data were university graduates and undergraduates. The frequencies could have been different if participants with secondary school education level were included. The log-likelihood tests show that the difference is significant between Ugandan English and Kenyan English at 0.01 percent level ($p = 0.0001$), Indian English at 1 percent level ($p = 0.01$), South African English at 0.01 percent level ($p = 0.0002$), Xhosa English at 0.01 percent level ($p = 0.0001$ for both data sets) and Black South African English at 0.1 percent level ($p = 0.001$). However, the difference is not significant between Ugandan English and British English ($p = 0.2$), Philippine English ($p = 0.9$), Singaporean English ($p = 0.1$), Hong Kong English ($p = 0.3$), and Nigerian English ($p = 0.5$).

Table 7.4.11: Frequencies of the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data and in other varieties of English

Variety and corpus size	Raw frequency	Frequency per 1,000 words
Ugandan English (Present study; 74,545)	617	8.28
ICE-GB (60,000)	459	7.65

ICE-EA (Kenya) (60,000)	636	10.60
ICE-IND (60,000)	428	7.13
ICE-PHI (60,000)	495	8.25
ICE-SIN (60,000)	448	7.47
ICE-HK (60,000)	523	8.72
ICE-SA (206,451)	1,233	5.97
ICE-NIG (136,754)	1,166	8.53
Xhosa English (De Klerk; 540,000)	5,273	9.76
Xhosa English (Siebers; 74,890)	1,029	13.74
Black South African English (85,431)	959	11.23

Table 7.4.12 shows the use of the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data according to the progressive forms. This table reveals that most of the progressive constructions occur in the present tense active voice. These progressive forms make up 76.66 percent of all progressive constructions. This is followed by the progressive in the past tense active voice with 17.50 percent of all the progressive constructions. The progressive in the present tense passive voice accounts for 2.43 percent and the progressive in the present perfect make up 2.27 percent of all the progressive constructions. The progressive rarely occurs in past tense passive voice. These constructions account for 0.65 percent of all the progressives. The progressive construction is used once in the past perfect, modal verb + progressive present tense, and modal verb + progressive perfect aspect.

Table 7.4.12: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the spoken Ugandan English data

Construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
Present tense active	473	6.35	76.66
Present tense passive	15	0.2	2.43
Past tense active	108	1.45	17.50
Past tense passive	4	0.05	0.65
Present perfect	14	0.19	2.27
Past perfect	1	0.01	0.16
Modal verb + progressive present tense	1	0.01	0.16
Modal verb + progressive perfect aspect	1	0.01	0.16
Total	617	8.28	100

The comparison of the progressive forms as used by English speakers with the three L1s is represented in table 7.4.13. From this table, we see that all speakers to a large extent used the progressive in the present tense active voice. The log-likelihood tests indicate an overuse of the progressive in the present tense active voice by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda as L1 with a significant difference at 1 percent level ($p = 0.01$). In addition, the present tense active voice is overused by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 though the difference is statistically not significant since the p-value ($p = 0.06$) is above the cut-off p-value ($p = 0.05$). Furthermore, the present tense active voice is overused by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda as L1. Again, this difference is statistically not significant since the p-value ($p = 0.06$) is above the cut-off p-value ($p = 0.05$). With regard to the progressive in past tense active voice, the log-likelihood test indicates an overuse by English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to English speakers with Runyankole and Acholi-Lango as L1 and an overuse by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. The progressive in present tense passive voice is overused by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 and the difference is statistically significant at 1 percent level ($p = 0.01$). The present tense passive voice is overused by English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. However, the difference is not statistically significant ($p = 0.5$). The present perfect progressive is overused by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 relative to English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1 even though the difference is statistically not significant ($p = 0.3$ and $p = 0.1$ respectively). The present perfect is also overused by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 relative to English speakers with Luganda as L1. This difference is also not statistically significant ($p = 0.6$). There are few occurrences of the modal verb plus progressive present tense and modal verb plus progressive perfect forms reported only by English speakers with the Acholi-Lango as L1.

Table 7.4.13: The percentages of the use of the progressive forms by English speakers with the three L1s

Progressive forms	Luganda	Runkyakole-Rukiga	Acholi-Lango
Present tense active	75.34	81.97	73.87
Present tense passive	1.35	0.58	4.96
Past tense active	21.97	14.54	15.32

Past tense passive	0	0.58	1.35
Present perfect	1.35	1.74	3.60
Past perfect	0	0.58	0
Modal verb + progressive present tense	0	0	0.45
Modal verb + progressive perfect aspect	0	0	0.45
Total	100	100	100

Table 7.4.14 compares the progressive form constructions in Ugandan English and other varieties of English, that is, Nigerian English and British English (cf. Gut and Fuchs 2013: 250). Although in all the three varieties of English, the progressive is most frequently used with the present tense active voice, the percentage in the Ugandan English (76.66 percent) is higher than that reported in Nigerian English (72.3 percent) and British English (61 percent). The percentage of the progressive in the past tense active voice is higher in the British English (23.6 percent) than in Ugandan English (17.5 percent). In addition, the percentage of the progressive in the present perfect is higher in Nigerian English (5 percent) and British English (5 percent) than in Ugandan English (2.27 percent). The same applies to the progressive form, modal verb + progressive present tense, which is higher both in Nigerian English (5.9 percent) and British English (5.1 percent) than in Ugandan English (0.16 percent).

Table 7.4.14: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various progressive constructions in the Ugandan, Nigerian and British (Gut & Fuchs 2013) English

Construction	Ugandan English			Nigerian English			British English	
	n	freq.	%	n	freq.	%	freq.	%
Present tense active	473	6.35	76.66	3,478	3.99	72.3	3.03	61
Present tense passive	15	0.2	2.43	157	0.18	3.3	0.18	3.6
Past tense active	108	1.45	17.50	608	0.7	12.6	1.18	23.6
Past tense passive	4	0.05	0.65	15	0.02	0.3	0.04	0.9
Present perfect	14	0.19	2.27	240	0.28	5	0.25	5
Past perfect	1	0.01	0.16	24	0.03	0.5	0.04	0.8
Auxiliary	1	0.01	0.16	283	0.32	5.9	0.26	5.1
+ progressive present								
Auxiliary	1	0.01	0.16	8	0.01	0.2	0	0.03
+ progressive perfect								
Total	617	8.28	100	4,813	5.52	100	5.03	100

Table 7.4.15 illustrates the uses or meaning of the progressive constructions in spoken Ugandan English data. It includes the basic or core uses of the progressive (the event or activity progressive and habitual bounded progressive), special uses (future progressive, future as a matter of course progressive, agentive stative progressive, politeness progressive, interpretative progressive, and generic progressive), and the extended uses (mental state progressive, unlimited state progressive, non-agentive stative progressive, non-delimited habitual progressive, persistive progressive, and punctual progressive).

Table 7.4.15: Raw frequencies, relative frequencies per 1,000 words, and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions in the spoken Ugandan English data

Meaning of the progressive construction	Number	Frequency	Percentage
The event or activity progressive	145	1.95	23.50
The habitual bounded progressive	52	0.7	8.43
The future progressive	14	0.19	2.27
The agentive stative progressive	8	0.11	1.29
The politeness progressive	1	0.01	0.16
The interpretative progressive	152	2.04	24.64
The generic progressive	28	0.38	4.54
The future as matter of course progressive	1	0.01	0.16
The mental state progressive	19	0.26	3.08
The unlimited state progressive	19	0.26	3.08
The non-agentive stative progressive	14	0.19	2.27
The non-delimited habitual progressive	154	2.07	24.96
The persistive progressive	7	0.09	1.14
The punctual progressive	3	0.04	0.49
Total	617	8.28	100

With regard to the basic or core meaning of the progressive, whilst the event or activity progressive makes up 23.5 percent of all progressive constructions, the habitual bounded progressive accounts for 8.43 percent of all the uses of the progressive constructions in the data. Among the special uses of the progressives, the interpretative use leads with 24.64 percent. It is followed by the generic and future progressives, which account for 4.54 percent and 2.27 percent respectively. The agentive stative use makes up 1.29 percent of all the progressive constructions. The progressive rarely occurs with politeness use and with the future as a matter of course meaning. The extended uses of the progressive make up 35.01 percent of all the progressive constructions in the data. The non-delimited progressive has the highest frequency in this category and accounts for 24.96 percent of all the progressive constructions in

the data. The extension of the progressive to mental states accounts for 3.08 percent. Likewise, the progressive with unlimited states accounts for 3.08 percent. The non-agentive stative progressive makes up 2.27 percent of all the progressives in the data. The progressive with persistive meaning accounts for 1.14 percent and lastly the progressive with punctual verbs accounts for 0.49 percent.

The use of the special uses of the progressive has been reported both in L1 and L2 varieties of English. For instance, Collins (2008: 241) compares the use of four special uses of the progressive in the International Corpus of English ('ICE') collection: ICE-GB, ICE-AUS, ICE-NZ, ICE-PHI, ICE-SIG, ICE-HK, ICE-IND, and ICE-EA(Ken). The comparison of the four special uses of the progressive (interpretative, attitudinal, politeness, futurate, and future as a matter of course in the spoken Ugandan English data and the report by Collins (2008) indicate that the percentage of the interpretative use is higher in Ugandan English data than ICE-NZ, ICE-SIN, and ICE-HK. It is however lower than ICE-AUS, ICE-GB, ICE-EA(Ken), ICE-IND, and ICE-PHI. The attitudinal meaning is not used at all in the spoken Ugandan English data but used in ICE-NZ, ICE-EA(Ken), ICE-IND, ICE-PHI, ICE-SIN, and ICE-HK. In addition, the percentage of the politeness meaning is lower in Ugandan English data than in ICE-AUS, ICE-GB, ICE-IND, ICE-EA(Ken), ICE-PHI, ICE-SIN, and ICE-HK but higher than ICE-NZ. The futurate and future as a matter of course use is lower in Uganda English than in other varieties.

Section four illustrated the marking of aspect on ongoing events and habitual activities among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1. Although Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga are both Bantu languages, it is English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1 which distinguishes between aspectual marking on ongoing events and habitual unlimited activities as in Standard English. Only Acholi-Lango uses the auxiliary *týe* (be) to mark the progressive as in Standard English. It is therefore interesting to note how English speakers with the three L1s use the progressive meaning as discussed in section 7.2.

Table 7.4.16: Relative frequencies per 1,000 words and percentages of the various meanings of progressive constructions across English speakers with the three L1s

	Luganda		Runyankole-Rukiga		Acholi-Lango	
Meaning of the progressive	freq.	%	freq.	%	freq.	%
The event or activity progressive	1.51	19.73	1.56	16.86	2.68	32.43

The habitual bounded progressive	1.07	13.90	0.81	8.72	0.22	2.70
The future progressive	0.34	4.48	0.05	0.58	0.11	1.35
The agentive stative progressive	0.21	2.69	0.11	1.16	0	0
The politeness progressive	0.03	0.45	0	0	0	0
The interpretative progressive	1.27	16.59	3.12	33.72	2.12	25.68
The generic progressive	0.24	3.14	0.43	4.65	0.48	5.86
The future as matter of course progressive	0	0	0	0	0.04	0.45
The mental state progressive	0.07	0.9	0.22	2.33	0.48	5.86
The unlimited state progressive	0.24	3.14	0.54	5.81	0.08	0.90
The non-agentive stative progressive	0.21	2.69	0	0	0.3	3.60
The non-delimited habitual progressive	2.44	31.84	2.2	23.84	1.57	18.92
The persistive progressive	0.03	0.45	0.11	1.16	0.15	1.80
The punctual progressive	0	0	0.11	1.16	0.04	0.45
Total	7.66	100	9.24	100	8.27	100

As table 7.4.16 illustrates, the event and activity progressive is relatively used by English speakers with the three L1s with normalised frequencies 2.68, 1.51, and 1.56 with Acholi-Lango, Luganda, and Runkyankole-Rukiga respectively. This basic meaning of the progressive is used more by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by English speakers with Luganda as L1 with a significant difference at 1 percent level ($p = 0.002$) and by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 with a significant difference at 1 percent level ($p = 0.01$). Although the event and activity progressive is used more by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than by English speakers with Luganda as L1, however, the difference is not significant ($p = 0.89$). The overuse of the basic function of the progressive by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 in comparison to its use by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1 seems to indicate a possible substrate influence since the progressive aspect in Acholi-Lango is used with the auxiliary and progressive marking similar to Standard English. Likewise, English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 which marks progressive use the event and activity progressive more than English speakers with Luganda as L1 which does not have progressive marking.

There is more use of the habitual bounded progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1 than by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 with a significant difference

at 0.1 percent level ($p = 0.0004$). The habitual progressive is also used more by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 with a significant difference at 1 percent level ($p = 0.005$). The difference between the use of the habitual bounded progressive by English speakers with Luganda and Runyakole-Rukiga as L1 is not significant ($p = 0.36$) even though it is used more by speakers with Luganda as L1 than by speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

From table 7.4.16 we see that the interpretive progressive has the highest frequency among the specialised uses of the progressive in the data of English speakers with three L1s. This meaning of the progressive is used significantly more by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than by English speakers with Luganda as L1 at 0.01 percent level ($p = 0.00001$) and by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 at 5 percent level ($p = 0.04$). Although the interpretive progressive is used more by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by English speakers with Luganda as L1, the difference is not significant ($p = 0.13$).

Of the six extended uses of the progressive, the non-delimited habitual progressive has the highest frequency in all the three speaker groups with normalised frequency per 1000 words of 1.57 by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, 2.44 by English speakers with Luganda as L1, and 2.20 by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 as illustrated in table 3. This meaning of the progressive is used by speakers with Luganda as L1 more than by speakers with Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. However, the difference is only significant between those with Luganda and Acholi-Lango as L1 at 5 percent level ($p = 0.02$) and insignificant between those with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 ($p = 0.6$). It is used more by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 even though the difference is insignificant ($p = 0.12$). The overuse of the non-delimited habitual progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1 in comparison to English speakers with Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 could be an influence from Luganda which does not indicate a distinction between ongoing events or activities and habitual activities.

The mental state progressive is used more by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. However, the difference is only significant between speakers with Acholi-Lango and Luganda as L1 at 1 percent level ($p = 0.002$) and insignificant between speaker with Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 ($p = 0.13$). The mental state progressive is also used by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 more than by English speakers with Luganda as L1.

However this difference is insignificant ($p = 0.17$). The use of the unlimited state progressive is only significant between speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1 at 1 percent level ($p = 0.002$) where it is overused by speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. Though the difference between speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1 is insignificant ($p = 0.09$), it is used more by speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 than by speakers with Luganda as L1. The difference between the uses of unlimited state progressive is insignificant between English speakers with Luganda and Acholi-Lango as L1 ($p = 0.1$) though it is overused by speakers with Luganda as L1. The non-agentive stative progressive is used only by English speakers with Acholi-Lango and Luganda as L1. Although it is overused by speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, the difference between those with Acholi-Lango and Luganda as L1 is insignificant ($p = 0.49$). The persistent progressive is observed among English speakers with all the three L1s but the difference is not significant. However, it is overused by speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. The punctual progressive is rarely used occurring only once by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 and twice by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga. Although the difference between the two languages is insignificant ($p = 0.7$), it is overused by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1.

Table 7.4.17 represents the raw frequencies and percentages of the verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data. From this table we see that the progressive is most frequently used with the verb *speaking* which accounts for 7.18 percent (44 out of 613 occurrences). The other 9 verbs that are used with the progressive include; *doing*, *saying*, *trying*, *going*, *coming*, *being*, *working*, *teaching*, and *talking* which account for 4.89 percent, 4.89 percent, 4.41 percent, 3.92 percent, 3.92 percent, 3.75 percent, 3.09 percent, 2.45 percent, and 2.45 percent respectively.

Table 7.4.17: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive in the spoken Ugandan English data

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Speak	44	7.18	Take	10	1.63
Do	30	4.89	Using	10	1.63
Say	30	4.89	Study	9	1.47
Try	27	4.41	See	9	1.47
Go	24	3.92	Tell	8	1.31
Come	24	3.92	Have	7	1.14
Be	23	3.75	Help	7	1.14

Work	19	3.09	Get	5	0.82
Teach	15	2.45	Grow	5	0.82
Talk	15	2.45	Learn	4	0.65

Figure 7.4.1 shows the 20 verbs most frequently used with the progressive among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1. It is interesting to note the variation in the use of the progressive with the various verbs by English speakers with the three L1s. For instance, whereas the verb *speaking* is the most frequently used with the progressive by speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Luganda as L1, the verb *trying* is the most frequently used by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1. In addition, whilst the verb *saying* is among the five most frequently used verbs with the progressive in all the data of English speakers with the three L1s, the verb *coming* appears only in the data of English speakers with Luganda and Acholi-Lango as L1 and the verb *doing* only in the data of English speakers with Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. It is also interesting to see that among English speakers with Luganda as L1, the verbs *studying*, *telling*, *getting*, *growing*, and *learning* do not appear among the most frequently used verbs with the progressive. Likewise, among English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1, the verbs *seeing*, *getting*, *growing* and *learning* are not part of the most frequent verbs used with the progressive. For English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1, the verbs *talking*, *telling*, *having*, and *helping* are not among the most frequent verbs with the progressive.

Figure 7.4.1: The distribution of the 20 most frequently used verbs with the progressive among English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1

7.5 Conclusion

The analysis of the progressive aspect in spoken Ugandan English has shown that the progressive is used with the basic meaning of the progressive aspect, special uses and extended uses which have also been reported in other varieties of English. The findings have revealed that the basic meaning of the progressive, which is, marking of an ongoing event or activity at the time of reference, is overused by English speakers whose L1 language has progressive marking similar to Standard English (Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga) than by English speakers with Luganda as L1 which does not have a progressive marking. This finding seems to support substrate influence in Ugandan English. For instance, Sharma (2009) argues that Hindi substrate influence in Indian English which requires obligatory marking of the imperfective is the reason for the higher frequency of progressives in Indian English in

comparison to Singapore English. The findings reveal that Ugandan English is not a homogenous variety. The claim that Luganda provides its main substrate influence requires further investigation

With regard to the extended uses of the progressive, the findings show that the progressive constructions occur mainly with habitual activities which are not limited by time. This appears to contradict the widely observed tendency in World Englishes to extend the progressive form to statives rather than habitual aspects where the extension to stative verbs is rated higher (63 per cent attestation) than the extension to habitual contexts (49 per cent attestation) (see Kortmann and Lunkenheimer 2013). This finding confirms Ssempuuma (2012) rating of the extended use of the progressive to habitual contexts which he rated as neither pervasive nor extremely rare in Ugandan English. There is an overuse of the non-delimited habitual progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to English speakers with Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1. Since Luganda makes no distinction between progressive and habitual aspects, the overuse of this meaning by English speakers with Luganda as L1 suggest a possible substrate influence whereby English speakers with Luganda as L1 seem to find it difficult to distinguish between the progressive and habitual aspects in the English language.

In addition, the progressive is extended to persistive meaning which is called the ‘still tense’ in Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga (see section 4). The use of this meaning has been reported in Setwana English by Van Rooy (2006) and in Nigerian English by Gut and Fuchs (2013: 262). The extension of the progressive to persistive meaning is rarely used in Ugandan English. It is however interesting to note that it is used more by English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1 than by English speakers with the two Bantu languages as L1.

Furthermore, the progressives occur with special uses. In terms of frequency, the special uses occurred with interpretative progressives. This could be explained by the nature of the data which was collected using semi structured interviews in which the speakers expressed their opinion and reasons to defend their arguments. This seems to agree with the observation by Gut and Fuchs (2013: 261) regarding an increasing frequency of the progressive constructions in commentaries broadcast interviews and discussions in Nigerian English that “this relative overuse of the progressive seems to be mainly restricted to what we referred to as opinion-expression or persuasive text types”.

Finally, the analysis of the progressive aspect in spoken Ugandan English has shown that progressives occur with a frequency of 8.28 per 1,000 words, and thus more frequently

than in British English and South African English and in the L2 varieties Indian and Singaporean English. The progressive is almost equally frequent as in Philippine English. The progressive is significantly less frequent in Ugandan English than in Black South African English and Xhosa English. Furthermore, it is also less frequently used in Ugandan English than in Hong Kong and Nigerian English although these differences are not statistically significant.

Chapter 8: Conclusion, limitation of the study, and recommendation

In chapter 2, Ugandan English as a variety of English, it was illustrated that Ugandan English is part of the World Englishes, New Englishes and Postcolonial Englishes, the main terms used to describe varieties of English. Like other New Englishes and Postcolonial Englishes, this variety is influenced by indigenous languages as the analysis of the use of left dislocation, prepositions and the progressive aspect in chapters 5, 6, and 7 have revealed.

In relation to the six models reviewed in chapter 2, Ugandan English is mainly used as a second language. However, there is a group of Ugandans who use English as their first or native language. In addition to that, in the rural areas, it appears that many, who have acquired the English language through education, use it as a foreign language. In this respects, all the

three categorisation of speakers of English, according to Quirk et al. (1972), are represented in Uganda. Relating to Kachru's three circle model, Ugandan English belongs to the outer circle since English is institutionalised as the official language of the country and the main medium of instruction. Regarding McArthur's wheel circle model, Ugandan English is on the outer layer which represents national varieties of English. In Schneider's dynamic model, Ugandan English seems to be at the nativisation stage as chapters 5, 6, and 7 have illustrated, whereby the use of these features show variation from native varieties such as Standard British English and thus point to substrate influence from indigenous Ugandan languages. The variation in the use of left dislocation, prepositions and the progressive aspect in chapters 5, 6, and 7 by English speakers with Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango as L1 further illustrated how features from different L1 languages in Uganda might help in the development of a new variety of English, hence illustrating how Meierkord's model can be used to describe the emergency of Ugandan English. In Uganda, English is not only learned in school but also through constant contact with the language through mass media.

This study has identified three features of Ugandan English by investigating specifically how the use of left dislocation, prepositions *in*, *at*, *on*, *to* and *from* and the progressive aspect differ from Standard English. The analysis of these features in chapters 5, 6, and 7 has illustrated the extent to which the use of these syntactic features could point to substrate influence from L1 languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango in Ugandan English.

Regarding the use of left dislocation, chapter 5 has revealed that this linguistic feature occurs in Ugandan English with a frequency of 5.19 per 1,000 words. This frequency is higher than that reported in other varieties such as British English (0.16 per 1,000 words) and Indian English (1.42 per 1,000 words). The high frequency of left dislocation in Ugandan English is a clear indication that left dislocation is a feature of Ugandan English, even though it is also used in other varieties. Schneider (2008b: 770) argues that "left dislocation or double subject construction is a universal strategy in spontaneous spoken language, presumably a focusing device". Although Schneider's argument seems to hold water, the analysis of this linguistic structure in Ugandan English has shown that it is used not only for focusing purpose but also for other discourse functions, for instance, the obligatory and emphatic functions, most especially with subject left dislocation constructions. Since the obligatory and emphatic subject left dislocation are also used in the Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango languages, the high frequency of left dislocation constructions in Ugandan English suggest possible substrate influence from these L1 languages.

The results of this study confirm the observation by Bokamba (1982: 83) who states that “left dislocation is often observed in the English speech of Bantu language speakers e.g. in Kenya, Tanzania, and Zambia”. His argument that “the most probable source of this deviation is the redundancy found in the subject-verb agreement system of Bantu languages, whereby a subject prefix obligatorily occurs with a finite verb whether or not the subject noun surfaces” hold water for Ugandan English. The findings of this study have shown that left dislocation is not only used by English speakers with Bantu languages as L1 (Luganda and Runyankole-Rukiga) but also by English speakers with a Nilo-Saharan language as L1 (Nilotic language i.e. Acholi-Lango), which also has left dislocation construction as chapter 5.3.3 illustrates.

The review of prepositions in the three indigenous Ugandan languages, that is, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango in chapter 6.3 revealed that there are fewer prepositions in these languages than in the English language. The analysis of five frequently used prepositions in Ugandan English i.e. *in*, *at*, *on*, *to*, and *from* has shown that these prepositions are overwhelmingly used like in Standard English to indicate relation in space. Nevertheless, the results show instances where the use of these prepositions deviates from Standard English. It is these cases of deviation that characterise the use of these prepositions as features of Ugandan English. The variation from Standard English in the use of these prepositions to denote spatial relation and as grammaticised prepositions suggest possible substrate influence since as already mentioned above, Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango have very few prepositions which have several equivalent prepositions in the English language. It is also possible that the variation in the use of these prepositions is due to generalisation and simplification strategies Ugandans use in the process of acquiring English as a L2.

The results of the use of the progressive aspect in Ugandan English have shown that it is used to imply the basic or core meaning of the progressive as well as with special uses and extended uses. The use of the basic meaning of the progressive by English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga and Acholi-Lango as L1 (which mark the progressive as in Standard English) more than by English speakers with Luganda as L1 (which does not have progressive marking) points to possible substrate influence. This situation is similar to what Sharma (2009) has observed in Indian English. Likewise, the overuse of the non-delimited habitual progressive by English speakers with Luganda as L1 relative to English speakers with Acholi-Lango and Runyankole-Rukiga as L1 is another possible indication of substrate influence in the use of the progressive aspect in Ugandan English since Luganda does not distinguish between progressive and habitual aspects. It appears that English speakers with Luganda as L1 find

difficult to distinguish between the progressive and the habitual aspect constructions in the English language.

Compared to other varieties of English, the progressive occurs more frequently in Ugandan English than in British, South African English, Indian, and Singaporean English. However, it is significantly less frequent in Ugandan English than in Black South African English, Kenyan English, and Xhosa English.

The analysis of the use of left dislocation, prepositions, and the progressive aspect in this study is based on spoken Ugandan English data. Future research in the use of these features in this variety of English should consider data from written texts. The consideration of only spoken data for the analysis of these features is one of the limitations of this study. In addition, all the informants in the study are males which indicate that this study does not represent how both males and females use these features. Nevertheless, the results of this study present a milestone in the study of the features of Ugandan English by providing results based on authentic spoken data of how Ugandans use the English language.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 87 lexical verbs used with progressive in the data of English speakers with Luganda as L1

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Speak	13	5.83	Become	1	0.45
Go	12	5.38	Care	1	0.45
Come	12	5.38	Build	1	0.45
Do	11	4.93	Abuse	1	0.45
Say	9	4.04	Remind	1	0.45
Talk	5	2.24	Distort	1	0.45
Teach	5	2.24	Capture	1	0.45
Work	4	1.79	Fade	1	0.45
Try	4	1.79	Pull	1	0.45
Fail	4	1.79	Start	1	0.45
Take	3	1.35	Modify	1	0.45
Be	3	1.35	Promote	1	0.45
Have	3	1.35	Hide	1	0.45
Communicate	3	1.35	Wonder	1	0.45
See	3	1.35	Slap	1	0.45
Ask	3	1.35	Dig	1	0.45
Use	3	1.35	Move	1	0.45
Bring	3	1.35	Debate	1	0.45

Help	3	1.35	Accuse	1	0.45
Call	3	1.35	Improve	1	0.45
Study	2	0.90	Argue	1	0.45
Learn	2	0.90	Oppose	1	0.45
Pay	2	0.90	Finance	1	0.45
Make	2	0.90	Follow	1	0.45
Play	2	0.90	Joke	1	0.45
Look	2	0.90	Form	1	0.45
Put	2	0.90	Report	1	0.45
Retard	2	0.90	Turn	1	0.45
Complete	2	0.90	Interest	1	0.45
Leave	2	0.90	Brainstorm	1	0.45
Target	2	0.90	Loose	1	0.45
Welcome	2	0.90	Promise	1	0.45
Produce	2	0.90	Command	1	0.45
Struggle	1	0.45	Shake	1	0.45
Tell	1	0.45	Prevail	1	0.45
Give	1	0.45	Decide	1	0.45
Pick	1	0.45	Buy	1	0.45
Read	1	0.45	Appreciate	1	0.45
Stay	1	0.45	Instruct	1	0.45
Act	1	0.45	Consider	1	0.45
Offer	1	0.45	Flourish	1	0.45
Prepare	1	0.45	Graduate	1	0.45
Dictate	1	0.45	Sing	1	0.45
Sell	1	0.45	Total	223	100

Appendix 2: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 65 lexical verbs used with progressive in the data of English speakers with Runyankole-Rukiga as L1

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Speak	23	13.37	Pass	1	0.58
Do	11	6.39	Face	1	0.58
Talk	10	5.81	Look	1	0.58
Say	10	5.81	React	1	0.58
Tell	8	4.65	Socialise	1	0.58
Be	6	3.49	Vend	1	0.58
Teach	5	2.91	Construct	1	0.58
Try	4	2.33	Sell	1	0.58
Work	4	2.33	Survive	1	0.58
Go	4	2.33	Starve	1	0.58
Help	4	2.33	Train	1	0.58
Take	4	2.33	Deplete	1	0.58
Have	4	2.33	Spoil	1	0.58
Mean	4	2.33	Post	1	0.58
Use	4	2.33	Hear	1	0.58
Come	3	1.74	Care	1	0.58
Study	3	1.74	Cry	1	0.58
Give	3	1.74	Will	1	0.58
Chat	2	1.16	Disrespect	1	0.58
Bring	2	1.16	Upgrade	1	0.58
See	2	1.16	Join	1	0.58
Play	2	1.16	Feel	1	0.58
Share	2	1.16	Write	1	0.58
Put	2	1.16	Build	1	0.58

Become	2	1.16	Drive	1	0.58
Challenge	2	1.16	Abuse	1	0.58
Get	1	0.58	Punish	1	0.58
Make	1	0.58	Investigate	1	0.58
Live	1	0.58	Hate	1	0.58
Perform	1	0.58	Beat	1	0.58
Call	1	0.58	Total	172	100
Understand	1	0.58			

Appendix 3: Raw frequencies and percentages of the 88 lexical verbs used with progressive in the data of English speakers with Acholi-Lango as L1

Verb	Number	Percentage	Verb	Number	Percentage
Try	19	8.56	Act	1	0.45
Be	14	6.31	Frustrate	1	0.45
Say	11	4.95	Advance	1	0.45
Work	11	4.95	Advise	1	0.45
Come	9	4.05	Introduce	1	0.45
Go	8	3.60	Interplay	1	0.45
Speak	8	3.60	Criticise	1	0.45
Do	8	3.60	Offer	1	0.45
Study	6	2.70	Run	1	0.45
See	6	2.70	Attend	1	0.45
Teach	5	2.25	Stop	1	0.45
Get	5	2.25	Call	1	0.45
Grow	5	2.25	Prepare	1	0.45
Learn	4	1.80	Affect	1	0.45
Pay	4	1.80	Touch	1	0.45
Know	3	1.35	Pray	1	0.45
Fight	3	1.35	Claim	1	0.45
Make	3	1.35	Contribute	1	0.45
Take	3	1.35	Keep	1	0.45
Use	3	1.35	Sit	1	0.45
Help	3	1.35	Pronounce	1	0.45
Invest	2	0.90	Talk	1	0.45
Play	2	0.90	Adopt	1	0.45
Struggle	2	0.90	Bring	1	0.45
Tell	2	0.90	Ail	1	0.45
Advertise	2	0.90	Meet	1	0.45
Live	2	0.90	Continue	1	0.45
Strive	2	0.90	Understand	1	0.45
Sound	2	0.90	Pass	1	0.45
Give	2	0.90	Face	1	0.45
Perform	2	0.90	Miss	1	0.45
Fail	2	0.90	Terrorise	1	0.45
Have	2	0.90	Recommend	1	0.45
Converse	2	0.90	Send	1	0.45
Pick	2	0.90	Look	1	0.45
Read	2	0.90	Die	1	0.45
Stay	1	0.45	Operate	1	0.45
Pile	1	0.45	Range	1	0.45
Displace	1	0.45	Dig	1	0.45
Carry	1	0.45	Increase	1	0.45
Accept	1	0.45	Labour	1	0.45
Top	1	0.45	Spend	1	0.45

Express	1	0.45	Load	1	0.45
Committee	1	0.45	Dictate	1	0.45
Handle	1	0.45	Total	222	100

Bibliography

- Alo, M. A. & Mesthrie, R. 2008. 'Nigerian English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 323-339.
- Ashton, E. O., Mulira, E. M. K., Ndawula, E. G. M., & Tucker, A. N. 1954. *A Luganda Grammar*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Balasubramanian, C. 2009. *Register Variation in Indian English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bamgbose, A. 1982. 'Standard Nigerian English: Issues of identification.' In B. Kachru (ed.),

- The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 99-111.
- Barotchi, M. 1994. 'Lingua franca.' In R. E. Asher (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 2211.
- Bauer, L. 2002. *An Introduction to International Varieties of English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bayley, R. & Ana, O. S. 2008. 'Chicano English: Morphology and syntax.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americans and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 572-590.
- Beal, J. 2008. 'English dialects in the north of England: Morphology and syntax.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 373-403.
- Biber, D., Johanson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (eds). 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow/Essex: Longman.
- Biber, D., Johanson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (eds). 2010. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. 8th edition. Harlow: Longman in Pearson Education.
- Binnick, R. 2006. 'Aspect and aspectuality.' In B. Aarts & A. McMahon (eds.), *The Handbook of English Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 244-268.
- Birner, B. J., & Ward, G. 1998. *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bobda, A. S. 2013. 'Cameroon English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/43>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Bokamba, E. 1982. 'The africanisation of English.' In B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp. 77-98.
- Bolton, K. 2003. *Chinese Englishes: A Sociolinguistic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolton, K. 2006. 'World Englishes today.' In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. Nelson (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 240-270.
- Bowerman, S. 2008. 'White south African English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 472-487.
- Brock-Utne, B. 2001. 'Education for all – in whose language.' *Oxford Review of Education*, 27 (1), 115-134.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. 2002. *World English: A Study of Its Development*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Brutt-Griffler, J. 2006. 'Languages of wider communication.' In K. Brown (ed.), *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 690-697.
- Buregeya, A. 2013. 'Kenyan English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer. (eds), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/46>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Burridge, K. 2008. 'Snopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in the Pacific and Australasia.' In K. Burridge & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 583-600.
- Carollo, B. 1991. *A Practical Lango Grammar and Dictionary*. Trieste: University of Trieste Press.
- Carter, R. & McCarthy, M. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Compressive Guide; Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press.
- Chalker, S. & Weiner, E. 1998. *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chesswas, J. D. 1967. *The Essentials of Luganda*. 4th edition. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, S. 2008. 'Newfoundland English: Morphology and syntax.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 492-509.
- Codo, E. 2008. 'Interviews and questionnaires.' In L. Wei & M. Moyer (eds.), *Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 158-176.
- Collins, P. 2008. 'The progressive aspect in world Englishes: A corpus-based study.' *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 28(2), 199-216.
- Collins, P. & Peters, P. 2008. 'Australian English: Morphology and syntax.' In K. Burridge & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 341-361.
- Collins, P. & Peters, P. 2013. 'Australian English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/59>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Crabtree, W. A. 1902. *Elements of Luganda Grammar: Together with Exercises and Vocabulary*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Crazzolara, P. 1955. *A Study of the Acoli Language: Grammar and Vocabulary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Crowley, T. 2007. *Field Linguistics: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. 1992. *An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. 6th edition. Malden: Blackwell.
- De Klerk, V. 2006. *Corpus Linguistics and World Englishes: An Analysis of Xhosa English*. London: Continuum.
- Downing, A. & Locke, P. 2002. *A University Course in English Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Downing, A. & Locke, P. 2006. *English Grammar: A University Course*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Dörnyei, Z. 2007. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fallers, L. 1964. *The King's Men: Leadership and Status in Buganda on the Eve of Independence*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Filppula, M. 2008. 'Irish English: Morphology and syntax.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 328-360.
- Fisher, A. E. C. 2000. 'Assessing the state of Ugandan English.' *English Today*, 16(1), 57-61.
- Fisher, P. 2000. 'English in Uganda: Of standard and standards.' In K. Parry (ed.), *Language and Literacy in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers, pp. 34-40.
- Fishman, J. 1977. 'English in context of international societal bilingualism.' In J. Fishman, R. Cooper & A. Conrad (eds.), *The Sociology of English as an Additional Language*. Rowley MA: Newbury House, pp. 329-336.
- Fishman, J. 1996. 'Introduction: Some empirical and theoretical issues.' In J. Fishman, A. Conrad & A. Rubal-Lopez (eds.), *Post-Imperial English*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 3-12.
- Geluykens, R. 1992. *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: On Left-*

- dislocation in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1983. 'Topic continuity in spoken English.' In T. Givón (ed.), *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 347-363.
- Gordon, M. 2007. 'Techniques of analysis.' In C. Llamas, L. Mullany & P. Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge, pp. 19-27.
- Gough, D. 1996. 'Black English in South Africa.' In V. De Klerk (ed.), *Focus on South Africa*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 53-78.
- Gramley, S. & Pätzold, K. 1992. *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge.
- Grannis, O. C. 1970. *Relative Constructions in Acholi: A Transformational Analysis*. Kampala: Makerere University.
- Greenbaum, S. 1996. *The Oxford English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenbaum, S. & Quirk, R. 1990. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Greenbaum, S. & Nelson, G. 2002. *An Introduction to English Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Longman.
- Gregory, M. & Michaelis, L. 2001. 'Topicalization and left-dislocation: A functional opposition revisited.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 1665-1706.
- Gundel, J. 1985. 'Shared knowledge and topicality.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9, 83-107.
- Gut, U. & Fuchs, R. 2013. 'Progressive aspect in Nigerian English.' *Journal of English Linguistics*, 41(3), 243-267.
- Hattersley, C. W. 1968. *The Baganda at Home: With 100 Pictures of Life and Work in Uganda*. London: Cass.
- Hewings, A. & Hewings, M. 2006. *Grammar and Context: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.
- Hosali, P. 2008. 'Butler English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 563-577.
- Huber, M. & Dako, K. 2008. 'Ghanaian English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 368-380.
- Huber, M. 2013. 'Ghanaian English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/39>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Huddleston, R. 2002. 'The verb.' In R. Huddleston & G. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 71-212.
- Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, N. 1993. *Modern Australian Usage*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Hundt, M. 2009. 'Global feature – local norms? A case study on the progressive passive.' In T. Hoffmann & L. Siebers (eds.), *World Englishes – Problems, Properties and Prospects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 287-308.
- Hundt, M., Hay, J., & Gordon, E. 2008. 'New Zealand English: Morphology and syntax.' In K. Burridge & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 305-340.
- Hundt, M. & Vogel, K. 2011. 'Overuse of the progressive in ESL and learner Englishes –fact or fiction?.' In J. Mukherjee & M. Hundt (eds.), *Explaining Second Language Varieties of English and Learner Englishes*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 145-65.
- Hyman, L. & Katamba, F. 2010. 'Tone, syntax, and prosodic domains in Luganda.' *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 27-56.

- Isingoma, B. 2007. 'A linguistic analysis of a non-native variety of English: The case of Ugandan English.' Unpublished Master's thesis. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Isingoma, B. 2013. 'Innovative pragmatic codes in Ugandan English: A relevance-theoretic account.' *Argumentum*, 9, 19-31.
- Isingoma, B. 2014. 'Lexical and grammatical features of Ugandan English.' *English Today*, 30(2), 51-56.
- Isingoma, B. 2016a. 'Lexical borrowings and calques in Ugandan English.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 149-172.
- Isingoma, B. 2016b. 'The use of ditransitive constructions in Ugandan English.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 201-226.
- Isingoma, B. & Meierkord, C. 2016. 'Introduction: Ugandan English –challenges to, and food for, current theories.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-15.
- Jenkins, J., Modiano, M. & Seidlhofer, B. 2001. 'Euro-English.' *English Today*, 17(4), 13-19.
- Jenkins, J. 2003. *World Englishes. A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Jespersen, O. 1933. *Essentials of English Grammar*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- Kabwegyere, T. 1974. *The Politics of State Formation: The Nature and Effects of Colonialism in Uganda*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Kachru, B. 1985. 'Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle.' In R. Quirk, H.G. Widdowson, & Y. Cantu (eds.), *English in the World. Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-30.
- Kachru, B. 1990. *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Function and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. 1992. 'The second diaspora of English.' In T. W. Machan & C. Scott (eds.), *English in Its Social Contexts: Essays on Historical Sociolinguistic*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 230-252.
- Kachru, B. 1997. 'World Englishes and English-using communities.' *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 66-87.
- Kachru, Y. & Smith, L. 2008. *Cultures, Contexts, and World Englishes*. New York: Routledge.
- Kasozi, A. B. K. 2000. 'Policy statements and the failure to develop a national language in Uganda: A historical survey.' In K. Parry (ed.), *Language and Literacy in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers, pp. 23-29.
- Katamba, F. 1989. *An Introduction to Phonology*. London: Longman.
- Kirk, J. 2015. 'The progressive in Irish English.' In P. Collins (ed.), *Grammatical Change in English World-Wide*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 87-118.
- Kirkpatrick, A. 2007. *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirwan, B. E. R. & Gole, P. A. 1951. *Elementary Luganda*. Kampala: Uganda Bookshop.
- Kortmann, B. 2008. 'Synopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in the British Isles.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 478-495.
- Kortmann, B. & Schneider, E. W. (eds.). 2004. *A Handbook of Varieties of English*. Volume 1: *Phonology* and Volume 2: *Morphology and Syntax*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Kortmann, B. & Upton, C. (eds.). 2008. *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kortmann, B. & Lunkenheimer, K. (eds.). 2012. *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kortmann, B. & Lunkenheimer, K. (eds.) 2013. *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English [eWAVE]* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at < <http://ewave-atlas.org/>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Kranich, S. 2010. *The Progressive in Modern English: A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization and Related Changes*. Amsterdam: Radopi.
- Ladefoged, P., Glick, R. & Cripser, C. 1972. *Language in Uganda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laitin, D. D. 1994. 'Multilingual states: Language policies and political implications.' In R. E. Asher & J. M. Y. Simpson (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 2625-2630.
- Lange, C. 2012. *The Syntax of Spoken Indian English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leech, G. 2004. *Meaning and the English Verb*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
- Leech, G. 2007. *A Glossary of English Grammar*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Leech, G., Hundt, M., Mair, C., & Smith, N. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. F. & Fennig C. D. (eds.). (2016). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Nineteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online at <<http://www.ethnologue.com>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Lindstromberg, S. 1998. *English Prepositions Explained*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Llamas, C. 2007. 'Field methods.' In C. Llamas, L. Mullany, & P. Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge, pp. 12-18.
- Llamzon, T. 1983. 'The status of English in metro Manila today.' *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 14(2).
- Low, A. D. 1971. *The Mind of Buganda: Documents of the Modern History of an African Kingdom*. London: Heinemann.
- Low, A. D. & Pratt, C. R. 1970. *Buganda and British Overrule: 1900- 1955; Two Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mair, C. & Hundt, M. 1995. 'Why is the progressive becoming more frequent in English? A corpus-based investigation of language change in progress.' *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 43, 111-122.
- Mair, C. 2012. 'Progressive and continuous aspect.' In R. Binnick (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 803-827.
- Mair, C. 2013. 'The world system of Englishes: Accounting for the transnational importance of mobile and mediated vernaculars.' *English World Wide*, 34(3), 253-278.
- Makalela, L. 2004. 'Making sense of BSAE for linguistic democracy in South Africa.' *World Englishes*, 23(3), 355-366.
- Malandra, A. 1955. *A New Acholi Grammar*. Nairobi: The Eagle Press.
- Malmkjaer, K. (ed.). 1991. *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Matthews, P. H. (ed.). 1997. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mazrui, A. A. 1975. *The Political Sociology of the English Language: An African Perspective*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Mazrui, A. M. & Mazrui A. A. 1996. 'A tale of two Englishes: The imperial language in post-colonial Kenya and Uganda.' In J. Fishman, A.W. Conrad & A. Rubal-Lopez, (eds.), *Post-Imperial English: Status Change in Former British and American Colonies, 1940 – 1990*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 271-302.

- Mbangwana, P. 2008. 'Cameroon English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 417-427.
- McArthur, T. 1987. 'The English language?' *English Today*, 9(11), 9-11.
- McArthur, T. 1998. *The English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McArthur, T. (ed.). 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McArthur, T. 2002. *The Oxford Guide to World English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- McCormick, K. 2008. 'Cape Flats English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 521-534.
- McGregor G. P. 1967. *King's College Budo: The First Sixty Years*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- McGregor G. P. 2000. 'National policy and practice in language and literature education: Some reflections from Africa.' In K. Parry (ed.), *Language and Literacy in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers, pp. 6-13.
- Mchombo, S. A. (ed.). 1993. *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI.
- Meierkord, C. 2006. 'Introduction.' In C. Meierkord (ed.), *The Sociolinguistics of Lingua Franca Communication: Standardization and Self-Regulation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-8.
- Meierkord, C. 2007. 'Standards and norms in interactions across second language Englishes: The case of South Africa.' In S. Volk-Birke & J. Lippert (eds.), *Anglistentag 2006 Halle*. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, pp. 331-340.
- Meierkord, C. 2012. *Interactions across Englishes: Linguistic Choice in Local and International Contact Situations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meierkord, C. 2016a. 'A social history of English(es) in Uganda.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 51-71.
- Meierkord, C. 2016b. 'Diphthongs in Ugandan English: Evidence for and against variety status and interactions across Englishes.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 121-147.
- Meierkord, C., Minov, V., & Morreira, K. 2009. *The Corpus of Black and Coloured South African English in Contact*. Bochum: Ruhr-University of Bochum.
- Melchers, G. 2013. 'Orkney and Shetland English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/1>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Melchers, G. & Shaw, P. 2003. *World Englishes: An Introduction*. London: Arnold.
- Mesthrie, R. 1997. 'A sociolinguistic study of topicalisation phenomena in South African Black English.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Englishes Around the World: Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 119-140.
- Mesthrie, R. 2008a. 'Introduction: Varieties of English in Africa and South and South East Asia.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and South East Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 23-31.
- Mesthrie, R. 2008b. 'Black South African English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie, (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 488-500.
- Mesthrie, R. 2008c. 'Indian South African English: Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 501-520.

- Mesthrie, R. 2013a. 'Transfer and contact in migrant and multiethnic communication: The conversational historical *be* + *-ing* present in south African Indian English.' In D. Schreier & M. Hundt (eds.), *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 242-257.
- Mesthrie, R. 2013b. 'Black South African English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at < <http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/49>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Mesthrie, R. & Bhatt, R. M. 2008. *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mesthrie, R., Bowerman, T., & Toefy, S. 2013. 'Cape Flats English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/76>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Miller, J. 2008. 'Scottish English: Morphology and syntax.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 299-328.
- Minow, V. 2010. *Variation in the Grammar of Black South African English*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Modiano, M. 2006. 'Euro-Englishes.' In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru, & C. Nelson (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 223-239.
- Mollin, S. 2006. *Euro-English: Assessing Variety Status*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Montgomery, M. 2008. 'Appalachian English: Morphology and syntax.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 428-467.
- Morris, H. F. & Kirwan, B. E. R. 1957. *A Runyankole Grammar*. Kampala: The Eagle Press.
- Mosha, M. 1983. 'Loan-words in Luganda: A search for guides in the adaptation of African languages to modern conditions.' In I. Fodor & C. Hagege (eds.), *Language Reform: History and Future*. Louvain: Helmut Buske Verlag, pp. 505-521.
- Moyer, M. G. 2008. 'Research as practice: Linking theory, method, and data.' In L. Wei & M. Moyer (eds.), *Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 18-31.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2010. 'Globalisation, global English, and world Englishes: Myths and facts.' In N. Coupland (ed.), *The Handbook of Language and Globalisation*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 31-55.
- Mufwene, S. S. 2013. 'Driving forces in English contact linguistics.' In D. Schreier & M. Hundt (eds.), *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 204-221.
- Mugler, F. & Tent, J. 2008. 'Fiji English: Morphology and syntax.' In K. Burridge & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 546-567.
- Mukama, R. G. 1991. 'Getting Ugandans to speak a common language: Recent developments in the language situation and prospects for the future.' In B. H. Holger & M. Twaddle (eds.), *Changing Uganda: The Dilemmas of Structural Adjustment and Revolutionary Change*. Kampala: Fountain Press, pp. 334-350.
- Murphy, J. D. 1972. *Luganda-English Dictionary*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of American Press.
- Murray, T. & Simon, B. L. 2008. 'Colloquial American English: Grammatical features.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 401-427.

- Musoke, K. 1986. *Tense Formation in Luganda and Some Problems Related to Learning English*. Kampala: Uganda Bookshop Press.
- Mwangi, S. 2004. 'Prepositions vanishing in Kenya.' *English Today*, 20 (1), 27-32.
- Natumanya, M. 2012. 'Morpho-phonological and syntactic patterns of Runyankole-Rukiga applicative constructions.' Unpublished Master's thesis. Trondheim: Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
- Nganda, C. N. 1996. *Primary Education and Social Integration: Ethnic Stereotypes in the Uganda Basic Text Books*. Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies 38.
- Nelson, G. & Hongtao, R. 2012. 'Particle verbs in African Englishes: Nativization and innovation.' In M. Hundt & U. Gut (eds.), *Mapping Unity and Diversity World-Wide*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 197-214.
- Netz, H. & Kuzar, R. 2007. 'Three marked theme constructions in spoken English.' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 305-335.
- Noonan, M. P. 1981. *Lango Syntax*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Noonan, M. P. 1992. *A Grammar of Lango*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nsibambi, R. 2000. 'A language policy for national integration: Facilitators and inhibitors.' In K. Parry (ed.), *Language and Literacy in Uganda*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers, pp. 16-22.
- Nurse, D. 2003. 'Aspect and tense in Bantu languages.' In D. Nurse & G. Philippson (eds.), *The Bantu Languages*. London. Routledge, pp. 90-102.
- Nyquist, A. 1999. 'Challenges facing the instructor in the COPE (Complementary Opportunity for Primary Education) centres: A focus on the para-professional education programme.' Thesis for the Candi. Polit. Degree in Education. University of Oslo: Institute for Education Research.
- Obote, M. A. 1975. 'Language and national identification: Appendix a.' In A. A. Mazrui *The Political Sociology of the English Language: An African Perspective*. The Hague: Mouton, 210-215.
- Paige, J. R. 2000. *Preserving Order amid Chaos: The Survival of Schools in Uganda, 1971 – 1986*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Pak, M. 2007. 'Relative clauses without CPs in Luganda.' *Western Conference on Linguistics*. 1-10.
- Paulston, C. B. 1994. 'Multilingualism.' In R. Asher (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 2630-2632.
- Paulasto, H. 2014. 'Extended uses of the progressive form in L1 and L2 Englishes.' *English World-Wide*, 35(3), 247-276.
- Penhallurick, R. 2013. 'Welsh English .' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/5>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Peters, P. 2004. *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pilkington, G. L. 1892. *A Handbook of Luganda*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Piron, C. 2001. 'Choosing an official language/ Wahl einer Amtssprache.' In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of The Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 2484-2493.
- Platt, J., Weber, H., & Lian, H. M. 1984. *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Pride, J. B. 1982. 'The appeal of new Englishes.' In J. B. Pride (ed.), *New Englishes*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, pp. 1-7.
- Prince, E. F. 1997. 'On the functions of left dislocation in English discourse.' In K. Akio (ed.), *Directions in Functional Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 117-143.
- Pullum, G. & Huddleston, R. 2002. 'Prepositions and prepositional phrases.' In R. Huddleston & G. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 597-661.
- Quinn, H. 2013. 'New Zealand English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/64>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Reaser, J. & Torbert, B. 2008. 'Bahamian English: Morphology and syntax.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 591-608.
- Reaser, J. & Torbert, B. 2013. 'Bahamian English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/23>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Rodman, R. 1974. 'On left dislocation.' *Papers in Linguistics*, 7 (3), 437-466.
- Roscoe, J. 1965. *The Baganda: An Account of their Native Beliefs and Customs*. London: Longman.
- Sailaja, P. 2009. *Indian English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sakoda, K. & Siegel, J. 2008. 'Hawai i Creole: Morphology and syntax.' In K. Burridge & B. Kortmann (eds.), *Varieties of English 3: The Pacific and Australasia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 514-545.
- Savage, G. A. R. 1956. *The Essentials of Lwo (Acoli)*. Kampala: East African Literature Bureau.
- Schmied, J. 1991. *English in Africa*. London: Longman.
- Schmied, J. 2006. 'East African Englishes.' In B. Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. Nelson (eds.), *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 188-202.
- Schmied, J. 2008. 'East African English (Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania): Morphology and syntax.' In R. Mesthrie (ed.), *Varieties of English 4: Africa, South and Southeast Asia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 451-471.
- Schmied, J. 2012. 'Standards of English in East Africa,' In R. Hickey (ed.), *Standards of English: Codified Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-255.
- 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. 2008a. 'Introduction: Varieties of English in the Americas and the Caribbean.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-33.
- Schneider, E. W. 2008b. 'Synopsis: Morphological and syntactic variation in the Americas and Caribbean.' In E. W. Schneider (ed.), *Varieties of English 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 763-776.
- Schneider, E. W. 2011. *English Around the World: An Introduction*. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press.
- Sealey, A. 2010. *Researching English Language: A Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge
- Sebba, M. 2009. 'World Englishes.' In J. Culpeper, F. Katamba, P. Kerswill, R. Wodak & T. McEnery (eds.), *English Language: Description, Variation, and Context*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 404-421.
- Sharma, D. 2009. 'Typological diversity in new Englishes.' *English World-Wide*, 30(2), 170-195.
- Sharma, D. 2013. 'Indian English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/52>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Sharma, D. & Ashawini, D. 2010. 'A new methodology for the study of aspect in contact: Past and progressive in Indian English.' In J. A. Walker (ed.), *Aspect in Grammatical Variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 111-130.
- Siebers, L. 2007. 'Morphosyntax in Black South African English: A sociolinguistic analysis of Xhosa English.' PhD dissertation. Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.
- Siemund, P. 2013. *Varieties of English: A Typological Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simango, S. R. 2001. 'East Africa/Ostafrika.' In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1964-1971.
- Smith, C. S. 1983. 'A theory of aspectual choice.' *Journal of the Linguistic Society of America*, 59 (3), 479- 501.
- Smith, N. 2002. 'Ever moving on? The progressive in recent British English.' In P. Peters, P. Collins & A. Smith (eds.), *New Frontiers of Corpus Research*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 317-330.
- Sridhar, K. K. 1996. 'Societal multilingualism.' In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 47-70.
- Ssekiryango, J. 2006. 'Observations on double object construction in Luganda.' In O. Arasanyin & M. Pemberton (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 66-74.
- Ssempuuma, J. 2012. 'Ugandan English'. In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English*, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 475-482.
- Ssempuuma, J. 2013. 'Ugandan English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<https://ewave-atlas.org/languages/47>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Ssempuuma, J., Isingoma, B. & Meierkord, C. 2016. 'The use of the progressive in Ugandan English.' In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (eds.), *Ugandan English: Its Sociolinguistics, Structure and Uses in a Globalising Post-protectorate*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 173-199.
- Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R. 2004. *A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Taiwo, R. 2013. 'Nigerian English.' In B. Kortmann & K. Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Online at <<http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/41>> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- Taylor, C. 1985. *Croom Helm Descriptive Grammar: Nkole-Kiga*. London: Croom Helm.
- The Government of Uganda. 1992. *Education for National Integration and Development*.

- Government White Paper on the Education Policy Review Commission*. Entebbe: Government Printers.
- The Government of Uganda. 1995. *Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995*. Kampala: State House Uganda.
- The Government of Uganda. 2005. *The Constitution (Amendment) Act, 2005*. Kampala: Parliament of the Republic of Uganda.
- Trask, R. L. 1997. *A Student's Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Arnold.
- Trask, R. L. 1999. *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge.
- Trudgill, P. 2008. 'The dialect of East Anglia: Morphology and syntax.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 404-416.
- Tukwasibwe, C. 2014. 'The influence of indigenous languages on Uganda English as used in the media.' PhD dissertation, University of Rhodes.
- Tumusiime, J. 1999. 'Uganda's book industry on the way back.' In E. Breitingner (ed.), *Uganda: The Cultural Landscape*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers, pp. 37-46.
- Turell, M. T. & Moyer, M. 2008. 'Transcription.' In L. Wei & M. Moyer (eds.), *Research Methods in Bilingualism and Multilingualism*. Malden: Blackwell, pp. 192-213.
- Tyler, A. & Evans, V. 2005. *The Semantics of English Prepositions: Spatial Scenes, Embodied Meaning and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. 2002. *Uganda Population and Housing Census Main Report*. Kampala: Uganda Bureau of Statistics.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. 2006a. *The 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census, Population Size and Distribution*. Kampala, Uganda.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. 2006b. *The 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census, Education and Literacy*. Kampala, Uganda.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. 2015. 'National population and housing census 2014: Provisional results.' Online at <http://www.ubos.org/onlinefiles/uploads/ubos/NPHC/NPHC%202014%20PROVISIONAL%20RESULTS%20REPORT.pdf> (Accessed November 5, 2018).
- UNESCO. 1968. 'The use of vernacular languages in education.' In J. A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 688-716.
- Van Rooy, B. 2006. 'The extension of the progressive aspect in Black South African English.' *World Englishes*, 25(1), 37- 64.
- Van Rooy, B. 2014. 'Progressive aspect and stative verbs in outer circle varieties.' *World Englishes*, 33(2), 157-172.
- Wagner, S. 2008. 'English dialects in the Southwest: Morphology and Syntax.' In B. Kortmann & C. Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 417-439.
- Walusimbi, L. 1996. *Relative Clauses in Luganda*. Köln: Rüdiger.
- Wardhaugh, R. 2006. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. 5th edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Watt, D. 2007. 'Variation and the variable.' In C. Llamas, L. Mullany & P. Stockwell (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. London: Routledge, pp. 3-11.
- Wilson, J. & Millor, S. 2013. 'English in Ireland.' In T. Hopkins, K. Decker & J. McKenny (eds.), *World Englishes 1: The British Isles*. London: Bloomsburg, pp. 265-287.
- Winford, D. 2013. 'Substrate influence and universals in the emergence of contact Englishes: Re-evaluating the evidence.' In D. Schreier & M. Hundt (eds.), *English as a Contact Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 222-241.
- Wolf, H. -G. 2012. 'East and west African Englishes: Differences and commonalities.' In A. Kirkpatrick (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, London: Routledge. pp. 197-211.

Lebenslauf

Name: Jude Ssempuuma
Geboren am: 10.10.1977
Ort: Masaka, Uganda

Studium

- 01.10.2009 – 31.03.2017 Ruhr-Universität Bochum: **Promotion** Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Christiane Meierkord. Titel der Dissertation: *Morphological and Syntactic Feature Analysis of Ugandan English: Influence from Luganda, Runyankole-Rukiga, and Acholi-Lango.*
- 01.04.2006 – 30.09.2008 Universität Bayreuth: Master-Studiengang **Intercultural Anglophone Studies (MAIAS)**
Schwerpunkt: **English Linguistics**
Masterarbeit: *Luganda-English Code Switching among the Baganda in Uganda.*
- 01.10.2007 – 31.07.2008 Universität Southampton (United Kingdom): Master-Studiengang **Transnational Studies**
Schwerpunkt: **Research Skills, Problematising the National, Language, Discourse, and Identity.**
- 15.08.1996 – 30.05.1999 Makerere Universität (Uganda): Bachelor-Studiengang **Philosophie**
Katigondo National Major Seminary (Uganda): Diplom-Studiengang **Philosophie und Religion Wissenschaft.**

Berufserfahrungen/Akademische Laufbahn

- seit Oktober 2018 Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter am Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Susanne Mülheisen, Universität Bayreuth
- Sommersemester 2018 Lehrauftrag am Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Susanne Mülheisen, Universität Bayreuth.
- 01.04.2017 – 31.08.2017 Akademischer Rat (Vertretung für Herrn PD Dr. Eric Anchimbe) am Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Susanne Mülheisen, Universität Bayreuth
- 01.10.2009 – 31.03.2017 Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter am Englischen Seminar der Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Christiane Meierkord. Tätigkeitsbereiche: Forschung und Lehre, Mentor für Anglistik-Studierende, Mitarbeit bei der Korpus-Erstellung des ICE Uganda.

10.10.2008 – 24.02.2009	Lehrtätigkeit (English Fach) Holy Family Bukalasa Seminary Gymnasium (Masaka, Uganda)
01.10.2006 – 01.10.2007	Studentische Hilfskraft am Lehrstuhl für Englische Sprachwissenschaft bei Prof. Dr. Susanne Mülheisen, Universität Bayreuth.
Juni 1999 – April 2001	Lehrtätigkeit (English Fach) St Denis Makondo Gymnasium (Masaka, Uganda).

Schule

Januar 1990 – April 1996	Bukalasa Seminary Gymnasium(Masaka, Uganda); Abschluss: Abitur (Leistungskurse: Economics, Geographie, und Mathematik)
Februar 1983 – Nov.1989	St Philip Kyanukuzi Grundschule (Masaka, Uganda).

Zusatzqualifikationen

Research School	Teilnahme an Workshops, Kolloquien und Konferenzen, um das <i>RUB Research School Certificate</i> zu erlangen (Ruhr-Universität Bochum).
Oktober 22 - 24, 2014	<i>Optimizing Writing Strategies for Publishing Research in English for Doctoral Researchers from the Life Science, Natural Sciences and Engineering.</i>
September 23 - 25, 2014	<i>How to write your PhD thesis effectively in humanities and social sciences.</i>
November 26 – 28, 2013	<i>Clear and Competent: Scientific Presentation for Doctoral Fellows from the Humanities and Social Sciences.</i>
Juli 23 – 24, 2013	<i>Leadership Skills for Doctoral Researchers from all Sections.</i>
Juli 18 – 19, 2013	<i>The academic career search in the English world.</i>

Sprachen

Luganda, Englisch, und Deutsch als Fremdsprache.

EDV

MS-Office (Word, Outlook, PowerPoint, Excel), Smartboard.