Regional Variations in English: A Synthesis of Global Diffusion and Local Divergence

[1] Ilaha Karimova

Abstract. This article explores the dynamic landscape of regional variation in English, tracing its development from the three historical diasporas to its present status as a globally distributed set of highly diversified varieties. Using Kachru's Three Concentric Circles model as a foundational framework, the study also critically engages with contemporary post-varieties perspectives, which have emerged in response to the sociolinguistics of globalization and digital communication.

Corpus-based and dialectological findings are synthesized across major variables, with particular attention to phonological features such as rhoticity, which function as strong indicators of historical diffusion timing and social differentiation. The study additionally examines morphosyntactic distinctions, noting that grammatical differences—such as regional contrasts between the Present Perfect and the Simple Past—often represent stable variation patterns, rather than mere remnants of older colonial norms .

The analysis highlights a persistent tension between forces of convergence, such as dialect levelling and standardization pressures, and forces of divergence, including nativization processes and contact-induced innovation. Ultimately, understanding regional English varieties requires an appreciation of both macro-sociolinguistic mechanisms and the micro-level sociophonetic functions of variation in shaping local linguistic identities.

Keywords; *English variation; sociolinguistics; World Englishes; phonological change; grammatical variation; contact linguistics; post-varieties.*

1. Introduction: Defining the Scope of Global English Variation

1.1 The Global Footprint and Historical Diffusion of English

English occupies a unique position in the early twenty-first century as the world's most widely used language, functioning not only as an official medium in numerous sovereign states but also as the primary linguistic vehicle driving globalization and transnational communication (Crystal, 2003). This unprecedented geographical spread traces directly to the expansion of the British Empire beginning in the seventeenth century, which disseminated the language across all continents (Crystal, 2003).

---

[1] Karimova, I. Master's Student, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: ilahakarimova22@gmail.com. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5334-5066

These sociohistorical processes laid the structural foundation for the emergence of distinct regional varieties.

Subsequent contact between English and indigenous languages stimulated the creation of locally stable and functionally independent varieties—collectively labeled **World Englishes** (Kachru, 1985). As a result, studying regional variation in English requires a sociolinguistic framework that moves beyond traditional monolingual standards such as Received Pronunciation to recognize the legitimacy and systematic value of localized forms (Milroy & Milroy, 2012).

The present research synthesizes contemporary academic findings on regional variation, demonstrating how the chronology of settlement, social stratification, and intense multilingual contact has shaped the globally distributed forms of English. The findings indicate that the global English system exists in a state of *dynamic equilibrium*, wherein forces promoting convergence and divergence continually interact to maintain shifting patterns of linguistic structure (Maguire, 2010).

1.2 The Paradox of Globality and Fragmentation

The worldwide spread of English generates a fundamental paradox: the linguistic demands of globalization simultaneously promote **homogenization** and **fragmentation**. While international commerce, academia, and diplomacy necessitate standardization for broad intelligibility, the sheer scale and local embeddedness of English use require the language to adapt into context-specific, often innovative forms (O'Regan, 2014).

This structural tension—between universal communicative needs and localized linguistic realities—functions as a central engine of continuous variation. English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) encourages global convergence, yet adoption within the Outer and Expanding Circles inevitably produces nativization and divergence (Seargeant & Tagg, 2011). Thus, global English operates under a persistent sociolinguistic tension between **macro-utility** and **micro-identity**, shaping the evolution of regional forms.

2. Theoretical Frameworks: Diffusion and Variation Models

2.1 Kachru's Three Concentric Circles Model

The sociohistorical diffusion of English is most widely interpreted through **Kachru's Three Concentric Circles**, which categorizes varieties according to their historical foundation and functional status (Kachru, 1985). This framework provides a critical starting point for understanding global divergence (Sultana, 2019).

- **Inner Circle** territories (e.g., UK, USA, Canada, Australia) belong to the first diaspora and function as *norm-providing* environments. Varieties here are traditionally considered standard, with research often focusing on internal dialectological change (Braber et al., 2024; Rosewarne, 2024).

- **Outer Circle** territories (e.g., India, Singapore, South Africa), emerging from the second diaspora, maintain English as an institutionalized L2. These are *norm-developing* contexts where English varieties have undergone systematic nativization (Bekker, 2012).

- **Expanding Circle** territories (e.g., China, Greece, Europe) include contexts where English is used as a foreign language. These varieties remain *norm-dependent*, though their dominant functional role as ELF suggests increasing detachment from Inner Circle standards (O'Regan, 2014).

2.2 The Challenge to Norm Authority and the Post-Varieties Approach

Although historically influential, Kachru's model has attracted critique for its nation-state focus and limited ability to capture fluid patterns emerging from globalization and digital communication (Sultana, 2019). A central conceptual shift involves recognizing that Outer Circle varieties have become increasingly norm-developing, challenging the long-held assumption that Inner Circle speakers maintain exclusive authority over linguistic correctness (Milroy & Milroy, 2012).

As linguistic authority decentralizes, Inner Circle varieties are reinterpreted as *one English among many*, reflecting the socio-political consequences of English's global dispersal (Straaijer, 2024).

Digital communication further stretches traditional boundaries. Seargeant and Tagg (2011) introduce a post-varieties approach, arguing that computer-mediated discourse produces hybrid, transient, and fluid forms of English that no longer fit neatly into national categories. This perspective encourages a shift from fixed linguistic norms toward an analysis of multilingual repertoires and interactional choices that speakers make in real time (Urla & O'Toole, 2022).

Table 1. Kachru's Three Concentric Circles of English

Circle	Defining Status	Example Territories	Primary Linguistic Dynamic
Inner Circle	Norm-Providing (ENL)	UK, USA, Australia, Canada, New Zealand	Internal variation; dialect levelling
Outer Circle	Norm-Developing (ESL)	India, Singapore, South Africa	Nativization; contact-induced change (Bekker, 2012)
Expanding Circle	Norm-Dependent (EFL)	China, Greece, most of Europe	English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) (Seargeant & Tagg, 2011)

3.0 Phonological Divergence: Accents and Sociohistorical Mechanisms

Phonology provides some of the clearest and most socially meaningful evidence of regional variation in English, with specific features serving as indicators of historical diffusion, social stratification, and processes of identity formation.

3.1 Rhoticity, Social Stratification, and Colonial Timing

Rhoticity—the preservation or deletion of post-vocalic /r/ in forms such as *farmer* or *butter*—is widely recognized as one of the most important variables for classifying English varieties (Villalón, 2022). Varieties such as American English (AmE), Canadian English (CanE), and Irish English are

predominantly rhotic, whereas Received Pronunciation (RP), Australian English (AusE), New Zealand English (NZE), and South African English (SAE) are non-rhotic (Bekker, 2012).

This divergence is strongly connected to historical diaspora timing and shifting prestige orientations. Although all English accents were rhotic until the early Modern English period, post-vocalic /r/ began disappearing in Britain during the eighteenth century—a change driven by social prestige that eventually came to define high-status metropolitan speech (Villalón, 2022).

This chronology forms the core mechanism explaining colonial divergence:

1. **Rhotic Englishes** (AmE, CanE) were transplanted during the seventeenth century or earlier—**before** the rise of non-rhoticity in Britain—therefore preserving the earlier rhotic form.

2. **Non-rhotic varieties** (AusE, SAE) developed later, in nineteenth-century colonies—after non-rhoticity had become the prestige norm in southern England.

Rhoticity therefore operates not merely as a phonological descriptor but as a sociohistorical proxy, fossilizing the timing of colonial settlement into persistent regional norms. The contrast between AmE and BrE rhoticity is thus a direct linguistic residue of social change in eighteenth-century Britain.

Rhoticity also encodes powerful social-class meanings, especially in England and the United States (Villalón, 2022). In the U.S., rhoticity gained prestige after World War II due to media influence, contrasting with the lingering prestige associations of non-rhoticity in some British elite contexts. Contemporary sociophonetic studies show that rhoticity continues to decline among many working-class British adolescents, confirming its status as an active variable of social differentiation (Urla & O'Toole, 2022).

3.2 Vowel Shifts and Splits: The TRAP–BATH Vowel

Vowel systems offer another robust avenue for examining regional phonological divergence (Singh & Sharma, 2020). A particularly significant example is the TRAP–BATH Split, which distinguishes varieties that maintain a phonemic difference between the short vowel /æ/ (TRAP) and the long, back vowel /ɑ:/ (BATH). This split characterizes Southern British English, Australian English, and South African English, but is absent from most North American and Northern English dialects, which uniformly employ /æ/ (Braber et al., 2024).

Dialectological research highlights the intricacies of internal variation even within Britain. Recent work in the East Midlands demonstrates its role as a transitional linguistic region: the TRAP–BATH distinction is inconsistently applied, reflecting the area's position between the split-preserving South and the split-neutral North (Braber et al., 2024). The persistence of this boundary, even amid other widespread changes, illustrates how certain phonemic patterns resist large-scale diffusion and remain regionally stable.

3.3 Dynamic Phonetic Change: Glottalization and Flapping

Contemporary phonetic phenomena underscore the ongoing dynamism of English variation. T-Glottalization, in which /t/ is realized as a glottal stop [ʔ] or a pre-glottalized [ʔt] (e.g., *butter* → [bʌʔə]), has become increasingly widespread across the British Isles, especially in Scotland and South East England (Rosewarne, 2024).

Research indicates that T-glottalling originated in working-class London speech but has spread across neighboring regions through dialect levelling and geographical diffusion (Blaxter & Coates, 2019). Sociolinguistically, it functions as a salient marker of urban youth identity, often adopted despite prescriptive stigma. Its rapid expansion illustrates that linguistic prestige operates locally: the feature's social value within youth culture can outweigh traditional, standard-language ideologies.

By contrast, many North American and Australian varieties display T-Flapping, where /t/ and /d/ are neutralized into an alveolar tap [ɾ] in intervocalic positions (e.g., *little*, *ladder*). This process is also reported in Singapore English, particularly in compound numbers and across word boundaries, where it sometimes indexes sociolectal prestige (Urla & O'Toole, 2022).

Table 2. Key Phonological Variables, Distribution, and Sociolinguistic Context

Variable	Description	Typically Rhotic	Typically Non-Rhotic	Sociolinguistic Context
Rhoticity (/r/ post-vocalic)	Preservation or deletion of post-vocalic /r/.	American, Canadian, Irish English (Villalón, 2022)	British (RP), Australian, South African English	Linked to historical diaspora timing (pre/post-18th century). Indexes class mobility and social differentiation (Villalón, 2022).
TRAP–BATH Split	Contrast between /æ/ and /ɑ:/.	Absent in most North American Englishes	Present in Southern British, Australian, South African English (Braber et al., 2024)	Defines major phonemic boundaries; stable even in transition zones such as the East Midlands.
T-Glottalization	Replacement of /t/ with [ʔ] or [ʔt].	Rare or contextual in North America	Common across UK varieties, especially Scotland and SE England (Rosewarne, 2024)	Dynamic urban change linked to youth identity, dialect levelling, and resistance to prescriptive norms.

4.0 Morphosyntactic and Lexicogrammatical Divergence

Morphosyntactic and lexicogrammatical differences constitute some of the most stable forms of regional variation in English. Unlike phonological shifts—often subject to rapid diffusion—grammatical contrasts typically persist over long periods and reflect deeper historical, social, and contact-based processes. These distinctions are especially prominent when comparing Inner Circle varieties and become even more pronounced in contact-shaped Outer Circle Englishes.

4.1 Aspectual Choice: Present Perfect versus Simple Past

One of the most widely recognized grammatical contrasts between British English (BrE) and American English (AmE) concerns the distribution of the Present Perfect (PP) and the Simple Past

(SP) with recent or unspecified past events, especially when accompanied by adverbs such as *just*, *yet*, and *already* (Hundt & Smith, 2007). BrE typically employs the PP (*I have just finished my homework*), whereas AmE frequently uses the SP (*I just finished my homework*), a divergence often cited as a canonical illustration of transatlantic grammatical variation.

Historically, this difference was explained through the Colonial Lag hypothesis, which suggested that AmE had preserved older grammatical patterns from seventeenth-century English, prior to the full stabilization of PP/SP distinctions (Hundt & Smith, 2007). However, contemporary corpus-based research complicates this interpretation. While BrE indeed employs the PP more frequently overall, long-term corpus comparisons (e.g., LOB/Brown families) indicate that the variation represents a stable, regionally anchored distinction, not merely a residual effect from earlier English (Hundt & Smith, 2007).

Moreover, the distribution of aspect is not uniform across adverbials or registers. AmE shows a strong preference for SP with *already*, yet PP remains dominant with *yet* in spoken AmE. These nuances emphasize that grammatical divergence is not strictly binary, but shaped by register, discourse context, and shifting norms within each variety (Hundt & Smith, 2007).

4.2 Agreement Patterns with Collective Nouns

Another robust morphosyntactic variable involves agreement with collective nouns such as *committee, family,* or *government*. BrE often allows for notional (plural) agreement, focusing on the individual members (*The government are meeting*), whereas AmE strongly favors grammatical (singular) agreement (*The government is meeting*) (Maguire, 2010).

Historical corpus research adds an important corrective to simplistic Colonial Lag assumptions. Studies of nineteenth-century usage reveal that BrE initially led the shift toward singular agreement, while AmE—often assumed to be more conservative—shifted later but more abruptly, eventually surpassing BrE in its preference for singularity (Maguire, 2010). These findings demonstrate that grammatical evolution is non-linear and feature-specific, shaped by internal developments rather than consistent or unidirectional retention or innovation across varieties.

Collectively, the patterns of aspectual choice and collective noun agreement highlight that regional grammatical divergence arises from independent trajectories of change, influenced by social norms, prescriptive pressures, and language contact within each variety.

4.3 Lexicogrammatical Nativization in Outer Circle Englishes

In Outer Circle Englishes, lexicogrammatical divergence is often driven by contact-induced change, where English interacts with local languages, producing distinctive structural and pragmatic features (Kachru, 1985).

Indian English (IndE)

As one of the world's largest institutionalized ESL varieties, with an estimated 128 million users (Crystal, 2003), IndE displays extensive nativization in its lexicogrammar and discourse practices.

Earlier descriptions tended to rely on qualitative impressions, but recent corpus-based studies provide systematic documentation of its distinctive features, including aspectual patterns, complementation structures, and idiomatic extensions shaped by Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages (Robinson, 2024).

Singapore English (SgE)

SgE exhibits high levels **of pragmatic, lexical, and grammatical nativization, influenced primarily by Southern Chinese varieties and Malay. Typical features include:**

- **Borrowings** such as *kiasu*

- **Cultural semantic extensions** (e.g., *aunty* as a kinship-based vocative)

- **Frequent use of discourse particles** (*lah*, *lor*), central to interpersonal meaning

- **Direction verb neutralization**, producing patterns like *Can you bring me there?* (Seargeant & Tagg, 2011)

These features serve essential communicative functions in the local ecology, positioning SgE as a fully independent, norm-developing variety, not a deviation from Inner Circle models.

South African English (SAE)

SAE reflects historical interaction with Afrikaans and multiple African languages. Lexical innovation (e.g., *robot* for traffic light) and syntactic patterns found in written White South African English (WSAfE) demonstrate contact-induced restructuring, especially in areas such as **reported speech** (Bekker, 2012; Urla & O'Toole, 2022).

Table 3. Core Grammatical Divergence (British English vs. American English)

Variable	British English Norm	American English Norm	Status of Variation
Present Perfect Aspect	Preferred with *just, yet, already* (e.g., *I have just eaten*)	SP commonly used (e.g., *I just ate*) (Hundt & Smith, 2007)	Stable regional difference; not a simple Colonial Lag phenomenon.
Collective Noun Agreement	Tendency toward **notional (plural)** agreement (e.g., *The team are playing*)	Strong preference for **grammatical (singular)** agreement (e.g., *The team is playing*) (Maguire, 2010)	Complex historical trajectory: AmE initially lagged but later accelerated the shift toward singularity.
Lexical/Preposition Use	*at the weekend, different from/to*	*on the weekend, different than/from* (Clopper & Pisoni, 2006)	Minor but highly salient lexicogrammatical differences.

5.0 The Dynamic Future of English Variation: Convergence, ELF, and Post-Varieties

Regional English variation is highly dynamic and continually reshaped by globalization, technological innovation, and patterns of socio-spatial mobility. These forces introduce both **centripetal pressures** (promoting convergence and standardization) and **centrifugal pressures** (promoting divergence and

localization). The result is a system in which English evolves through ongoing tension between unifying global functions and diversifying local identities.

5.1 Dynamic Equilibrium and Socio-Spatial Mobility

The current trajectory of English variation aligns with the theoretical concept of dynamic equilibrium, in which a linguistic system maintains overall stability by continually balancing innovation and preservation (Maguire, 2010). Rather than shifting uniformly in one direction, English responds to multiple, often competing influences.

Convergence pressures are visible in large-scale dialect leveling, such as the rapid diffusion of T-glottalization across the UK, where urban centers—especially London—serve as hubs for youth-led phonological innovation (Braber et al., 2024; Blaxter & Coates, 2019). These features spread through dense social networks, popular media, and increased interregional exposure, reinforcing supralocal norms.

Conversely, divergence pressures can be observed in the resilience of entrenched phonemic boundaries. The persistence of the TRAP–BATH split in the UK's East Midlands, despite southern influence, demonstrates how certain features remain resistant to external diffusion (Braber et al., 2024). Youth-driven lexical creativity and localized slang similarly reinforce regional identity, continually generating new points of differentiation (Rosewarne, 2024).

The role of geographical mobility has become increasingly significant. As Clopper and Pisoni (2006) show, exposure to multiple dialects enhances an individual's ability to perceive, categorize, and socially interpret regional accents. Increased mobility thus acts as a catalyst for both the recognition and spread of innovative forms. This interaction between macro-mobility and micro-level perception underscores the sociophonetic pathways through which change propagates within and across communities.

5.2 Standardization, ELF, and the Digital Shift

Standardization remains a long-standing force in shaping English, driven by institutional codification, prescriptive norms, and educational policy (Straaijer, 2024; Milroy & Milroy, 2012). Yet the global linguistic reality complicates any notion of a singular, authoritative standard.

Outer Circle Englishes increasingly act as norm-developing varieties, asserting linguistic autonomy and challenging Inner Circle norm-provision (Kachru, 1985; Sultana, 2019). This decentralization undermines the traditional assumption that correctness flows from metropolitan centers. Instead, English functions today through plural, often competing, centers of authority.

The rise of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) further weakens prescriptive boundaries. ELF research highlights communicative effectiveness, intelligibility, and negotiation of meaning—not conformity to Inner Circle phonology or grammar—as the core drivers of international communication (O'Regan, 2014). This functional reorientation reflects a global context where non-native speakers now outnumber native speakers and where pragmatic success outweighs prescriptive uniformity.

Even more transformative is the influence of computer-mediated discourse (CMD). As Seargeant and Tagg (2011) argue, English used on social media platforms often transcends fixed variety labels, producing hybrid, fluid, and rapidly shifting linguistic practices. The "post-varieties" approach (Seargeant & Tagg, 2011) posits that:

- Individual multilingual speakers draw from transnational repertoires;

- Digital genres shape linguistic choices more strongly than geography;

- English online is best understood through network analysis, not nation-state categories.

Research in online multilingual communities (e.g., Thai, Filipino, and South African contexts) demonstrates that linguistic innovation now stems from social networks, peer groups, and digital identities, rather than colonial history or territorial boundaries (Urla & O'Toole, 2022). Thus, the explanatory center of variation continues to shift from geographic regions toward socially mediated, technologically enabled forms of interaction.

6. Conclusion

The global variability of English emerges from the intertwined effects of historical diffusion, social differentiation, and technological transformation. While foundational models such as Kachru's Three Circles remain important for understanding the macro-history of English distribution, contemporary variation increasingly requires frameworks that incorporate contact linguistics, sociophonetics, ELF pragmatics, and digital communication.

Phonological divergence—such as differences in rhoticity—demonstrates how the timing of diasporas and shifting prestige norms in Britain shaped durable regional standards across the English-speaking world (Bekker, 2012; Villalon, 2022). Morphosyntactic analyses, including aspectual choice and collective noun agreement, reveal that grammatical variation follows independent, feature-specific pathways, resisting simple explanations like colonial lag (Hundt & Smith, 2007; Maguire, 2010).

In the present era, English exists in a state of dynamic equilibrium, balancing global forces promoting convergence (mobility, media, standardization) with local sociolinguistic pressures driving divergence (nativization, identity marking, contact-induced change). The growing influence of ELF and CMD challenges traditional notions of fixed varieties and demands new analytical approaches emphasizing fluid repertoires and network-based interactions.

Future research must continue expanding empirical foundations through large-scale corpora, computational modeling, dialectometric analysis, and sociophonetic experimentation. As English continues to evolve within hyper-mobile, digitally mediated contexts, understanding its variation requires models that recognize not only its global reach but also the diverse, locally meaningful identities constructed through its use.

References

Allen, M. (2020). *Textbook on criminal law.* Oxford University Press.

Bekker, I. (2012). The story of South African English: A brief linguistic overview. *International Journal of Language, Translation and Intercultural Communication, 1*, 139–150. https://doi.org/10.12681/ijltic.16

Braber, N., Halfacre, C., & Jansen, S. (2024). The stability of the trap-bath split in the East Midlands. *Journal of English Linguistics, 52*(4), 275–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/00754242241286946

Blaxter, T., & Coates, R. (2019). The TRAP-BATH split in Bristol English. *University of Cambridge Repository.* https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.42257

Clopper, C. G., & Pisoni, D. B. (2006). Effects of region of origin and geographic mobility on perceptual dialect categorization. *Language Variation and Change, 18*, 193–221. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394506060091

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Hundt, M., & Smith, N. (2007). The present perfect in British and American English: Has there been any change, recently? *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 12*(3), 329–363.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk & H. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

Maguire, W. (2010). The past, present and future of English dialects: Quantifying convergence, divergence and dynamic equilibrium. *Language Variation and Change, 22*(1), 69–104. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394510000013

Milroy, J., & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in language: Investigating Standard English* (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203124666

O'Regan, J. P. (2014). English as a Lingua Franca: An immanent critique. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(5), 533–552. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt045

Öztürk, A. (2024). Problems with the right to legitimacy. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum, 1*(1), 180–186. https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.010240767

Robinson, D. R. (2024). World Englishes and sociolinguistic variation. (Article in progress). https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12695

Rosewarne, J. B. (2024). What is Australian slang? Is it really slang? *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 44*(4). https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2024.2447286

Seargeant, P., & Tagg, C. (2011). English on the Internet and a 'post-varieties' approach to language. *World Englishes, 30*(4), 548–561.

Singh, A. K., & Sharma, V. (2020). Vowel variation between American English and British English. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 9*(1), 350. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n1p350

Straaijer, R. (2024). Language standardization. *Oxford Bibliographies.* https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199772810-0250

Sultana, R. (2019). Kachru's Three Concentric Circles Model of English Language: An overview of criticism. *English Language Teaching, 13*(1), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n1p85

Urla, A., & O'Toole, K. (2022). Towards an updated dialect atlas of British English. *Journal of Linguistic Geography, 10*(1), 46–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/jlg.2022.2

Van Herk, H., & Tagliamonte, S. (2010). *The English language in Canada: Status, history and comparative analysis.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511781056

Villalon, C. (2022). Rhoticity in English: A sociolinguistic study and a review of relevant literature. *Frontiers in Sociology, 7*, 902213. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.902213

Young, R., & Rasinger, S. (Eds.). (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of language standardization.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108559249.001