Project Report:
"Skilled Migration and Global English:
Language, Development, and the African Professional"
Funded by the Worldwide Universities Network, Feb. 1, 2010 to Feb.1, 2011.

Lead PI: Suresh Canagarajah, Director Migration Studies Project, Penn State University, USA.
Co-PI's: Adrian Bailey, Leeds University, UK;
Frances Giampapa, Bristol University, UK;
Margaret Hawkins, University of Wisconsin, USA;
Ellen Hurst, University of Cape Town, South Africa;
Ahmar Mahboob, University of Sydney, Australia;
Paul Roberts, York University, UK;
Sandra Silberstein, University of Washington, USA[i].

1. Introduction:

This pilot study addresses a missing dimension of research and policy consideration in the migration-development nexus. The focus of our inquiry is how language skills facilitate success for skilled migrants in their professions in host communities and, in turn, influence productive contributions to their home communities. In more general terms, the study has implications for the communicative competences and resources skilled migrants require in order to engage productively in professional and development endeavours.

This study is important for several reasons. Though proficiency in the medium of communication in the host community is assumed to an asset according to human-capital orientations, language hasn't received in-depth exploration. The few studies we have are demographic. They show that there is a correlation between expertise in the dominant language and levels of success as measured by the income of migrants in the land of settlement (Adsera & Pytlikova, 2010; Bleakley & Chin, 2004; Chiswick & Miller, 1995, 2002, 2007; Dustmann, 1994; Dustman & van Soest, 2001 & 2002; Dustmann & Fabbri, 2003; Kossoudji, 1988). Such studies also show that those migrants whose native languages show the greatest distance from the languages of the host community are least successful in professional adjustment and success (see especially Adsera & Pytlikova, 2010). Needless to say, English is the assumed linguistic capital in such studies, given its global status in higher education, development, and professional communication. Besides, in most of the developed countries where migrants move to (such as UK, USA, Canada, or Australia), English is the native language. Research based on these orientations contribute to the popular discourses of Global English and lead to the frenzied acquisition of English language in many countries, as governments prepare their citizens for higher education and professional advancement and, in many cases, migration and remittances as the path to development.

Such studies and discourses miss the subtle tensions, conflicts, and variations in the migration-development nexus that we attempt to capture in our qualitative study. We list some of the complicating factors which motivated our research:
1. It is difficult to think of a single language as holding unqualified power as the language of success or progress in late modernity, even in such an obvious case as English. Communication in business, technology, and education is becoming more multilingual in traditionally English-dominant countries, such as UK or USA. Even if we concede that elite European languages have

an advantage over non-European languages, there are a range of languages required for diverse domains, challenging the notion that only English holds unqualified power.

2. Underneath the formal contexts of work and education, there are many informal domains of social and economic life that require an even greater repertoire of languages. In these domains, migrants interact in their local languages, often with their own community members from their home countries, sharing knowledge and information that contribute to their success in the new lands of settlement. These domains are also characterized by the superdiversity (Blommert, 2010) that features a mixture of languages and cultures and has transformed the linguistic landscape of traditional enclaves of elite languages in the West. To function in these domains, skilled migrants need a greater repertoire of languages, and not English alone.

3. English is itself not a monolithic language. It already has many indigenized varieties in the lands skilled migrants come from (i.e., Nigerian English, Kenyan English, and Ghanaian English, not to mention the different forms of creole). We have to consider how the Englishes skilled migrants bring with them relate to the varieties spoken in host communities. English in the host communities is also diversified (i.e., in the US, there are ethnic varieties such as Black English and Cajun English, not to mention regional varieties such as southern English and Brooklynese). We mustn't also ignore national varieties such as British English and Australian English. What tensions do skilled migrants experience in relation to the varieties they bring with them? How do they negotiate these varieties for professional success?

4. When we consider return migration and remittances, we should also address the ability of skilled migrants to communicate with members of their home communities for development work. However, a one-sided emphasis on English may lead to attrition in proficiency in local languages. Sometimes, this attrition takes place even before travel to destination countries. This loss will affect one's ability to undertake effective sharing of knowledge and resources in the home community. Also, in host communities, the children of many migrant families may lose their expertise in native languages as they adopt English (or other elite languages). This loss of proficiency in local languages may reduce the motivation of many families to return home to make contributions for development (see Hojat et al, 2010).

5. There are many problems with studies based on linguistic distance hypothesis (see Adsera & Pytlikova, 2010; Chiswick & Miller, 2004 for examples of such studies). That some languages are closer to others is difficult to measure and highly subjective. Studies in this tradition have vacillated in the measurement they use for their analysis, suggesting the difficulty involved. Furthermore, the fact that a language is distant to English doesn't mean that it causes special problems in learning. The reverse is often true—a language that resembles the target language can cause more confusions in learning because of similarities. We mustn't also ignore the creativity and agency of learners in mastering highly disparate languages. Furthermore, there are similarities (universals?) across languages and semiotic processes that facilitate learning. The influences of such factors on acquisition and usage cannot be assumed beforehand, but observed in actual social contexts.

6. A focus on language as a skill or a system to be mastered also misses many social and psychological factors that can impinge on learning, use, and performance. We mustn't ignore

that languages have implications for identity, relationships, and community membership. The prospect of a language to construct positive identities or maintain solidarity with one's preferred groups can contribute to strong motivation, investment, and ownership in the language. The reverse situation can have dire impacts on development work or professional success. For example, someone who succeeds professionally through the acquisition of English, but suffers community solidarity because of lack of communication with home community members, can lose the possibility of making positive contributions in development work at home, and also become unproductive professionally in the host community if he/she doesn't enjoy mental and social well being.

For the above reasons, we have to be mindful of the risks of glorifying English and consider multilingual repertoire building as a more promising avenue for success in all aspects of the migration-development nexus. Furthermore, we must develop an orientation to language as a mobile or portable resource with shifting values and indexicalities as migrants travel (Blommaert, 2010). Locally valued languages undergo changes in values and status as they are transported by migrants. Similarly, elite languages like English undergo changes in different settings and domains in migration. While the demographic and quantitative studies keep the languages studied static in status, composition, and valuation, we develop a more dynamic perspective on the mobility of language resources.

A particular problem in undertaking research of this nature is the compartmentalization of the academic fields. While the migration scholars who have attempted to address language bring somewhat superficial notions of language competence (e.g., Chiswick & Miller, 2004), the linguists who address the mobility of linguistic resources have filtered out the human and spatiotemporal dimensions to address the implications for the language system. As a result, the scholarly tools we have at our disposal don't reflect the synergy that could result from a constructive engagement with all fields. In undertaking this research, therefore, we have been mindful of reconstructing our theoretical apparatus and analytical tools to do justice to our focus of inquiry.

We focused on African professionals in this pilot study for special reasons. Available assessments of the extent of organization by different diaspora groups for development shows many African countries occupying a low level (Kuznetsov, 2006; Mercer et al, 2008). Compared to other professional diasporas from South Asia or Latin America, African skilled migrants are not well organized. Research also shows that migrants from Africa are among the most educated in the West, and yet poorly studied (Zeleza, 2004). Though we were motivated to focus on the African skilled diaspora for the above reasons, we see the relevance of our research questions and findings for other communities. We hope to expand the focus to other communities as a follow up to this pilot study in the future.

2. Subjects and Research Design:

The study focused on two sending countries (Uganda and South Africa) and different receiving countries (USA, UK, and Australia). However, the distinction between sending/receiving countries is fluid. South Africa, for example, receives skilled professionals from Nigeria, Zimbabwe, Uganda, and Kenya, while sending these migrants and local professionals to other developed countries. The receiving countries similarly send professionals to other countries in

the Northern hemisphere, not to mention other countries in Africa (i.e., not necessarily those that the migrants came from).

In general, our subjects came from sub-Saharan Africa, with a balanced representation from East, West, and southern Africa. The PI's chose a site close to their institution for data gathering purposes (i.e., Cape Town, South Africa; State College and Seattle, USA; Bradford, Bristol, and Sheffield, UK; and Sydney, Australia). The PI in Uganda chose subjects from a range of urban, semi-urban, and rural settings.

The pilot study involved a total of 65 participants (see Appendix 1). The objective was to obtain in-depth narratives and opinions. While some locations involved 10 or more subjects, others involved as few as a single subject or four subjects in order to gain narrative data in a case-study format. The qualitative data gathering method involved face-to-face, telephone, and email interviews. All face-to-face and telephone interviews (except for one, due to sensitive reasons involving citizenship) were audio recorded and later transcribed. Each interview ran for around 45 to 90 minutes.

The professionals come from a range of backgrounds: education (in State College and Cape Town), health care (Bradford and Sheffield, UK), and management (Bradford). The 18 interview questions (presented in appendix 2), adjusted minimally for context, focused on eliciting information on five over riding themes of importance to this project:
How does English shape the flow of skilled migrants and trajectories of migration?
In what ways does English shape the levels of success of skilled migrants?
How do skilled migrants negotiate their different English varieties with those in the host communities?
How do skilled migrants negotiate the tensions in identity deriving from different languages in relationships among themselves and with other communities?
Are there language-related tensions as skilled migrants undertake development efforts in their home countries?

In eliciting the data and analyzing them, the project drew from the multidisciplinary expertise represented by the PI's who come from applied linguistics, education, geography, migration studies, and sociolinguistics.

3. Site Reports:

a. <u>University of Cape Town</u>:
Interviews were conducted with academics working at the University of Cape Town (UCT) whose country of birth was an African country other than South Africa. The sampling technique was snowball sampling: i.e., the investigator initially approached foreign nationals that she knew professionally, and subsequently participants were asked to provide suggestions for other African academics that may be willing to participate. Thirteen interviews were conducted with academics in full time lectureships at the UCT who migrated from Zambia, Malawi, Ghana, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Kenya, Zimbabwe, and Uganda. Whilst a number of countries are represented, a majority of the participants were from Zambia (six in total). There were nine male and four female participants, which is not inconsistent with the gender representation of academics at the institution. Nine of the participants had PhDs whilst four had

Masters degrees; ages ranged from 29 to 58, and the designation of academics ranged from junior lecturers to professors. A broad spectrum of different disciplines and faculties were represented. Nearly all participants had undertaken some of their study abroad, either in the UK, North America, or northern Europe. Only two participants had traveled directly to South Africa from their country of birth, but both indicated the possibility for future professional migration.

Following is the profile of respondents:

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Age	40	47	52	46	52	50	29	34	46	30	58	36	39
Gender	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	F	F	M	F	F	M
Qual	PhD	PhD	PhD	PhD	PhD	PhD	MSc/MA	MA	PhD	Fellow	PhD	MPhil	PhD
Home country	Zambia	Malawi	Ghana	Zambia	Nigeria	DRC	Zambia	Zambia	Kenya	Zimbabwe	Zambia	Zambia	Uganda
Discipline	CEM	English	Politics	Chemistry	African studies	Info systems	Maths	Theatre & perform.	Comp. science	Actuarial science	Law	Gender institute	Architect-ure
Migration route	Zambia UK Namibia SA	Malawi USA SA	Ghana Japan Canada Lesotho SA	Zambia UK US SA	Nigeria UK SA	DRC Belgium DRC SA	Zambia SA	Zambia UK US SA	Kenya US SA	Zimbabwe SA	Zambia Germany SA	Zambia Southern Africa Norway SA	Uganda Germany Norway Uganda SA

The main findings from the interviews included evidence that particular migratory networks or routes are strengthened by specific funding bodies providing scholarships for institutions that use English as a medium of instruction, including some international programs that are based in countries where English is not a national language. Participants said that the choice of English medium was not a conscious strategy but admitted that language had likely affected their perceived options, as the majority of participants came from home countries where English was established as a national language during the colonial period. Excepting one participant from DRC, who cited French as the language of instruction, all participants were schooled in English. This may reflect the hiring policy of the UCT, an English medium, internationally-orientated, research-led institution, which therefore attracts academics with high English proficiency. A number of participants also mentioned that their parents worked in academic careers.

Participants spoke of the proximity of South Africa to their various home countries as an advantage over institutions outside the continent. Whilst many had worked abroad previously, they identified increased access to their home countries, and development opportunities for their home countries as benefits to living in South Africa (for example the ability to remit not just financially but also materially or through knowledge transfer). At the same time, they referred to South Africa as globally linked and resourced, while they saw their home countries as 'left out' of global networks.

They also described English as critical in accessing global resources. As described, most participants had gained their education in the English medium and were highly proficient. This level of proficiency gave them access to funding, publishing, and promotions. Those who were not so proficient in English said that this could negatively impact on their careers. A number of participants mentioned that students sometimes complained about their accents.

In the interview data there was a disjuncture between an intellectual/ professional language space and a home language space. The 'village' (the place that participants cited as home) emerged as the primary/ only site where home languages were spoken. Everywhere else the medium was

English. English adopted the role of a common medium of communication in many of the highly multilingual (previously British colonial) African countries that participants originated from. English is seen as a resource as well as a curse; some participants described their political opposition to colonialism, yet observed benefits to their proficiency in the globally dominant medium.

Some saw English as beneficial for developing countries due to access to information, while others said it was not neutral. They described how English was reserved for the 'privileged' or 'dominant' classes in their home countries. Those working in development spoke of the need for local languages in order to work with people at the local level who may not have access to English. Many regretted that their children, who had grown up in host countries, did not speak their home language(s).

No participants spoke of strong nationality networks within South Africa. Some had Africa-wide networks, but they were not language-based. It seemed that the strongest links in the academy were within disciplines, and not attached to nationality. In terms of remittances, most participants said they regularly remit money and sponsor siblings and other family through school either at home or in South Africa. Also, knowledge remittance takes place in a number of ways, notably through building research capacity (for example through the supervision of students of their nationality in South Africa or at a university in the home country) and through teaching and research links to the national university in the home country. Most participants planned to return to their home country sooner or later, often to undertake development activities, but a number also said that career or economic opportunities could tempt them to migrate elsewhere.

b. University of Wisconsin at Madison:
While South Africa is both a sending and receiving country, the PI from Madison focused on an African country that is largely sending, i.e., Uganda. The PI was interested in education in Uganda, and she wanted to understand how youth there are being academically prepared, and for what. She wanted to know how teachers and administrators—those involved in educational systems—view 'success' for students, what role emigration plays in a model of 'success,' and the relevance of English to that. It must be noted that education in Uganda is in the English-medium. The more focused questions were: What are the perceptions of Ugandan educators regarding the role of education and English in future life possibilities for their students? What are the beliefs of Ugandan educators regarding the role and importance of emigration, both personally and societally?

In order to explore these questions, the PI conducted a total of 9 interviews in Uganda. Her interviewees were 3 teachers, 3 school administrators, and 3 university professors, representing rural/urban/semi-urban dwellers. Three were male, 6 were female. Each subject was interviewed once for approximately 60 - 90 minutes. Questions addressed subjects' language and educational background; beliefs about language, education and emigration; and future hopes and dreams for themselves and their students. The interview also elicited narratives about experiences of selves and others living elsewhere. The main themes that emerged from the interviews were the following:

Coming to Be an Educator: For 8 of the 9 subjects, at least one parent was a teacher. Eight had other professional preferences, but either couldn't afford university tuition, or didn't have high enough marks to qualify.
What English is Used For: English is the language of schooling in Uganda, as per national policy. Thus all educated people speak English, and many professional positions require it. Many books and television shows (should one be able to afford television and books) are in English. English is also used in schools, communities and homes when people speak different languages, and a common language is needed for communication.
Importance of English: In addition to the above points, some participants mentioned 'international exposure,' and becoming 'global citizens.'
A Good Life: Most subjects felt that a good life meant contributing to the local community, and owning land. They wanted to travel, but not to leave Uganda permanently.
Imagined Spaces and Benefits (of Emigrating): All subjects believed that other places (primarily the UK and US) offer better education, better employment opportunities, and better standards of living.
Losses and Costs (of Emigrating): All subjects spoke of the pain of leaving family, and many reported stories of Ugandans having to work too long and hard in new homes. They felt the gains were not worth the costs.
Benefits for Uganda: All had stories of significant resources sent back to families and communities.
Returning: All subjects had an almost taken-for-granted assumption that those who emigrated did so to earn enough money to be able to return and buy land. Many told stories of those who did, and the only mention of others were of those who could not return for political reasons (but wanted to).

The study points to English and education being completely intertwined in Uganda, and together seen to determine 'success.' There are competing discourses regarding 'global' vs. 'local,' with global situated in the imaginary, and local situated in lived lives and realities, rooted in the importance of family and place, and bound by cultural norms and lenses. Interestingly, there is no visible 'global education' or multilingual discourses in schools, or link between immediate practices and imagined futures.

c. Leeds University:
The study site was South Yorkshire and the city of Sheffield. Recruitment of suitable respondents proved extremely difficult at first. However, the introduction of a community gatekeeper (a Zimbabwean who had worked previously with the co-PI) led to access to Zimbabwean-born professionals who had at some time worked in the health care sector. Of the fifteen subjects, ten were men. Interviews were conducted by the project researcher either face-to-face (7) or by email (8) and transcribed immediately. Following is the profile of respondents.

	25-30	**30-35**	**35-40**	**40-45**	**50+**
Male	**0**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**3**
Female	**2**	**0**	**1**	**1**	**1**

Interview Number	General Participant Information
One	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Female **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Nurse
Two	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Male **Age:** 30-35 **Occupation:** Health statistician
Three	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Male **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Private sector management
Four	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Female **Age:** 40-45 **Occupation:** Health sector professional
Five	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Male **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Healthcare
Six	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Male **Age:** 50+ **Occupation:** Priest
Seven	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Female **Age:** 45+ **Occupation:** Nurse
Eight	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Male **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Doctor
Nine	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Male **Age:** 50+ **Occupation:** Education
Ten	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Male **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Education
Eleven	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Male **Age:** 35-40 **Occupation:** Social work

Twelve	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Male **Age:** 30-35 **Occupation:** Social work
Thirteen	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Female **Age:** 25-30 **Occupation:** Social work
Fourteen	**Interview method:** Email **Gender:** Female **Age:** 25-30 **Occupation:** Student
Fifteen	**Interview method:** Face to face **Gender:** Male **Age:** 50+ **Occupation:** Public sector management

Themes
These are loosely ordered by the potential that further analysis of the pooled interviews could produce original empirical insights of value to theoretical debates.

English, Remitting, and Development: There was a sharp contrast in respondents' minds between sending resources to spur the development of Zimbabwe and fulfilling their obligations to kin and kith which arise as a result of extended family membership. The former type of remitting was almost always transacted using negotiations conducted in English. Thus English language was generally considered to be of some importance to the participants' generic development efforts. This could be because it had allowed them to find work in the UK and so secure money to send goods and materials home. Others felt that it had played a role in gaining levels of linguistic and social capital that could help to secure funding and implementation of development projects. The majority of respondents felt that English had an important role to play in their country's social and economic development. While some spoke of the relevance of local languages in re-emerging nationalisms (regionalisms?), another narration saw English as something that could bridge Zimbabwe's different local languages, providing some national unity as 'a glue that binds.'

However, for the interviewees, speaking Shona, Ndebele and other local languages remained important and the preferred language for their communication with family and communities in Zimbabwe. English language maintains its associations with authority and outsiders. As one interviewee put it: 'It is English after all, it came here by ship.' A proficiency in English could be a cause of tension between migrants and their contacts in Zimbabwe. For example, some interviewees said how forgetting a word or idiom in their local language could cause embarrassment: 'People [would] think you speak English all the time and call you a white man.'

The Role of English in Shaping Global Networks of Migration: At least in part as a result of this historical emphasis on English language in Zimbabwe's education system, moving to the UK

- sometimes via another anglophone country - was described as 'a natural destination' or 'a no brainer' for Zimbabwean migrants. The potential to earn better money was frequently cited as a significant factor in the decision to leave Zimbabwe. The UK was taken for granted as a destination for most participants because of their language proficiencies. Several participants pointed out that it wouldn't make sense 'to go where [they] didn't know the language.' Four moved to the UK via South Africa (citing family and business connections), one via Ireland (citing a more gentle asylum regime), one via Canada (where they had worked in health care), and one via Norway (where they had studied briefly as a student). The role of English in these migration channels/global networks seems implicit.

Speaking English, Gender, and Professional Success: English was widely recognized to be an important factor for achieving professional success, as it is the language spoken by the majority of those living and working in the UK. Many reported having to learn to negotiate between the English they had used in Zimbabwe, learning to cope with regional accents, and to 'mimic the English way of speaking.' Interviewees often commented on how they felt further pressure to demonstrate their language proficiency because of their identity as a migrant. Being asked to repeat themselves in conversation could be perceived as 'a subtle reminder that they are not English.' In this sense migrants' confidence in their clarity of communication or being understood can impact on professional success. Some respondents felt that their professional lives would be curtailed by their lack of confidence speaking English: 'I can't apply for manager roles because I can't speak like white people,' 'I am afraid to open my mouth [at work] because I am not confident talking to my colleagues and partners.' This appeared gendered, with those saying they were 'discouraged' being mostly women (see Kofman, 2007 for a recent article about the gendering of skill constructions).

Those who had enjoyed professional success in their careers often attributed this at least in part to their English proficiency – 'being fluent has opened doors', 'because I am fluent the sky is the limit.' Others voiced frustration that their English language proficiency had not allowed them to satisfy their career expectations. Some participants described how they had found themselves in employment where English proficiency was not valued – working in health and social care with other migrants who might be less fluent than themselves. Other interviewees suggested how possessing a good proficiency could serve to highlight other barriers to career progression, such as visa time-limits, age, or nationality. In some instances it was felt that these were prioritized over their language-proficiency.

English, Community Life, and Multiculturalism: If English was recognized by the interviewees to be of importance to their professional success, then in their family and social lives the preeminence of English was less secure. For all the participants speaking their 'own' language was an important part of their family and community relationships. In these settings Shona or Ndebele were spoken as much as possible and this bi- or multilingualism was seen as important. These languages were of significance to the participants' identity as Zimbabweans: '[English] will always be our second language,' 'why should we speak English when we are Zimbabweans?', 'it is one thing we can keep.' Others saw speaking both English and Shona/Ndebele as something that offered advantages to their family: 'the best of both worlds, [they] get to learn a leading world language whilst keeping part of who they are.' In relationships with other professionals and migrants in their communities, English was generally recognized to

be a helpful 'bridging language,' and a way of being mutually understood. In this, a soft multiculturalism (i.e., we are all from different places) was implicitly valued in creating a safe space for dialogue. Yet, the results also suggest that speaking English can also be a site of tension and a way of making social and class distinctions. For some participants, speaking English with family and other professional and community contacts could be used as a sign of their social mobility or professional success. Other participants however, described this in terms of a willful forgetting of their own language and their identity, of their 'trying to be more English than the English': 'all they do is talk and talk and brag about their mortgages.'

Policy and English Education in Zimbabwe: All of the participants conveyed the centrality of the English language to education in Zimbabwe. As one respondent put it: 'English is at the heart of Zimbabwean education.' As a result of the emphasis given to the English language in Zimbabwe's education system, most of the participants had been taught English from the beginning of their school education. Indeed, English was reported to have been given more space in the curriculum than other subjects. For many participants, all school subjects other than local languages were taught in English. Several interviewees recounted how even Shona or Ndebele (local languages) were taught in English from A-level. English proficiency (a grade of C or above at O- level) was reported to be essential for securing skilled employment in Zimbabwe: 'you couldn't do anything without English.' For the most part, participants felt that they had been given a good education in English. For some, it was something that made the Zimbabwean education system 'the best in Africa.'

The interviewees generally acknowledged that they had been able to benefit from the priority given to English by the Zimbabwean education system. This was considered to be of continued importance to the development of Zimbabwe. This importance was articulated in terms of both individual choice and opportunities – 'with English the world is in your hands' – as well as the country's economic growth – 'the teaching of English makes us known on the global map.' Some participants, however, drew attention to changes in the global economy and the decline of the UK as a global economic power. They suggested that a continued educational priority for English language could, in this economic context, be 'putting all eggs in one basket.' These respondents commented that there was a need for the 'Zimbabwean authorities to cast their gaze wider' and to give more prominence to other global languages (such as Chinese) in their education system, allowing them 'to tap into emerging markets'.

d. <u>York University</u>:
The immediate local context is not an obvious site for obtaining the data envisaged for the project. Aside from the University of York itself, York is not an obviously multicultural city and there is no medium or high profile African community. Within the University, the number of staff members or students of African origin is also comparatively small (compared, say, to those of Asian origin).

An early decision was therefore taken to focus on nearby Bradford (46 kilometers distant) as the best possibility for locating a suitable pool of informants. Contacts were established with the African Community Network in the North, based at the University of Bradford (<u>http://www.brad.ac.uk/africa/AfricanCommunityNetworkintheNorth/</u>). These led directly to the setting up of a few interviews, which, in turn led to more interviews via the 'snowball effect.'

The overall number of informants was eventually complemented by further contacts in Bradford, this time at the Bradford mosque. There were eventually eleven subjects who were interviewed.

The informants did not form a cohesive group in any sense. Some were in healthcare professions and had migrated to the UK as part of a UK-Government scheme to recruit in Anglophone African countries; others had migrated in order to attend Higher Education programs or to join family members in that situation; others were refugees. Most had grown up using English. Interviews with informants from Northern African states were not examined or included in the findings as they threw up quite different sorts of results, worthy of a separate study. The findings reported below include references to earlier research, carried out by the PI at the University of Hertfordshire, involving African healthcare professionals discussing their attitudes towards English in front of an audience of local, British colleagues.

The findings are organized according to the research-worthy questions posed as the grounding for the project:

How does English shape the flow of people and trajectories of migration?

For three interviewees it was a clear case that they had decided to migrate to the UK because of a shared language. They had made reasoned decisions, based on the knowledge that they would be in an English-speaking environment and, in one case, a British-English-speaking environment.

Others, however, were equally clear that a shared language had not been a deciding factor: work and study possibilities or hearsay information regarding relative ease of asylum processes had been more significant. An interesting response from one interviewee was that the similarity between education systems in her country and the UK had led her to make her choice.

All interviewees agreed that English is very important and many referred to their school experience, where achievement in English was of paramount importance. For interviewees referring to school experience in former British colonies, where the education system is partly or wholly based on the British system, it seems an easy transition to move from the importance of English language to an implicit message that the UK is an obvious destination for migration. An interviewee from Burundi, the only sub-Saharan migrant not from a former British colony, did not provide any similar evidence of the obviousness of the UK as a destination.

How do skilled migrants negotiate the different varieties of English that they speak with those in the host communities?

Many interviewees took the opportunity to attempt to gain the high ground in any potential negotiation of difference by affirming that their variety of English was more prestigious than much of what they heard around them. They claimed that they had learned Standard English (often referred to as ‘Queen’s English’ or ‘Oxford and Cambridge English’) and gave examples of words and phrases where Standard pronunciation differed from pronunciations they had been exposed to. The claim was often supported by interviewees praising highly their school systems and school experience.

The need for negotiation was therefore recognized, but there was a certain degree of rancor stemming from the perception that local interlocutors might be the ones needing to accommodate to Standard English rather than the migrants needing to take the subordinate role. Where negotiation was commented on in practical detail, it seemed that migrants found that repetition was mostly sufficient (albeit performed grudgingly); occasionally, they applied the 'let-it-pass' principle (Firth, 1996) and didn't press interlocutors on unintelligible items.

How do skilled migrants negotiate the tensions in identity deriving from different languages they speak in relationships among themselves and with other groups?

In considering their interface with the host community, migrants expressed tensions between their desire to hold on to aspects of their identity expressed through local English pronunciation and their desire to integrate by adopting host community phonological forms. While many participants were adamant about retaining their previously-acquired pronunciation skills, others seemed to want to perform in a local variety while retaining their own variety for future possible use.

When thinking about their interactions with members of African groups, interviewees reported that they often switched between English and another Lingua Franca such as Swahili or Krio. This was done in order to 'be more African' or simply as an expedient to smooth over communication issues. In one case, an interviewee reported that he introduced items from relevant African languages into his largely English speech when English just would not do.

Interviewees occasionally gave the impression that multilingualism, or the use of a multiplicity of language resources, is not to be valued and that monolingualism is the desired norm in the host communities.

e. Bristol University:
Bristol is England's sixth, and the United Kingdom's eighth most populous city, and the most populous city in South West England. According to the 2001 Census there are 2,310 Black and British Black Africans in the City of Bristol. This constitutes 0.6% of the entire population of the area. Approximately 51% are between the ages of 25 and 64. 63% of Black and Black British Africans in the city are identified as economically active, and 26% of them hold higher-level qualifications compared to 17.9% among the whole Bristol population.

The Bristol part of the project has so far collected data from four participants: 1) SK, male from Cameroon, is a teaching fellow and lecturer at a University in London. He identifies as a speaker of English, French as well as the local languages Ghomálá and Cameroonian Pidgin; 2) EM, male from Tanzania, is a teacher in Bristol. He identifies as a speaker of Kiswahili and other local Tanzanian languages – Kibena and Kogni, as well as English. He is married to another participant in the study (GHM); 3) GHM, female from the Seychelles and Uganda, is a retired senior manager in the educational sector in Bristol. She identifies her languages as English and Creole; 4) DM, male from Tanzania, is an educational Psychologist in Bristol. He is married to a British national. He identifies as a speaker of two local Tanzania languages – Kiswahili and Kigogo, as well as English. Language as a form of self-identification is important for all the

participants as it signals not only being from an African country, but the particular dialects also signal the particular communities and regions from where they have originated.

All of the participants have been or are currently educators (i.e., primary, secondary or university) or worked in an educational setting in the UK. Some have continued tertiary education in the UK, having completed a series of degrees in their native countries. Furthermore, some participants moved to other countries to continue their education before immigrating to the UK.

The skilled migrants in our dataset hail from a number of African communities (Tanzania, Cameroon, Seychelles, and Uganda) and their personal and professional trajectories indicate multiple moves to other countries before settling in the UK. Mobility due to civil unrest in their native country, personal desire to develop professional skills through education, and the possibility to gain entry to the UK through inter-marriage are factors impacting settlement in the UK. All participants are multilingual and they have suggested that language plays an important role in their lives in terms of their links to their networks in their native countries as well as the dominance of English for accessing employment and networks (i.e., either African or non-African) in the UK.

The key findings include:

- Long-term nature of the commitment to sustainable development through financial and material goods sent to the participants' home countries (e.g. construction of schools, wells, provision of teaching materials, sponsoring family members in full-time education). In some instances (for example with reference to DM) participants take on the 'role of expert' and in this case English plays a significant role in opening up access to information for the home country professionals.
- Regarding language, all of the participants received education in English (especially at secondary and tertiary level) prior to relocating to the UK, which allowed them to gain the desired forms of linguistic capital when accessing the labor market in the UK.
- The participants did not point to any language-related tensions in undertaking development efforts in their home countries. Instead, they signaled the multilingual nature of communication – the desire to "sound natural" through the use of local languages and dialects when talking to representatives of different linguistic communities in their home countries. The use of local languages and English in their home countries is dependent on the interlocutors—i.e., their relationship to them and the types of interactions. For example, engaging in work with other professionals may need both the local language and English. In the UK, strong ties to their ethnic communities are noted as related to language (i.e., the local languages in their native countries).
- Regarding mobility, most of the skilled migrants in our dataset relocated to other countries (including the US and Kenya) before they settled in the UK, suggesting flexibility and aspirations for a better life, a more successful career, and a better paid job.
- Moreover, before being able to access the labor market in the UK and secure graduate positions corresponding with their qualifications, all of the participants pursued additional education at UK higher education institutions. They all came with English as one of their languages and they have indicated the importance of being seen as 'competent' users of English,

and mentioned the currency that English holds as an 'asset and advantage' for allowing them to pursue their professional and personal goals in the UK.

- There are varied responses with regards to the transferability of skills, and knowledge being fully or partly utilized. What is significant here to explore are the ways in which participants such as GHM or EM have felt underutilized, and in what respect in relation to the employment histories. DM shows the significance placed on his multilingual skills and his ability as a 'cultural interpreter' in his current employment.

While the data set is small at this point, we do feel what is emerging from the responses provided from the 4 participants shows that there is no such thing as a 'perfect' transferability of skills – in fact context, age of migration, and the GDP of the sending country are definitely factors. This concurs with other studies that we have consulted. For example, Adsera & Pytlikova (2010) suggest that there is a significant difference in professional success between native and nonnative English speaking migrants. In their study they measured for the proximity between the native language(s) of the migrants and the language(s) spoken in the host country, suggesting that in fact most migrants choose English – and Spanish-speaking countries (followed by France, Germany and Portugal) as these languages are the most wide-spread and easiest to learn. Their findings seem to point to the theory of selective pragmatism by Dimmock & Ong Soon Leon (2010) as a potential framework for analysis.

f. University of Washington at Seattle:

The research team at the University of Washington interviewed four African skilled migrants who live in the Seattle area. Of the four participants, all were from Ethiopia, but of both Ethiopian and Eritrean ethnicity; three were male and one female. Participants' ages ranged from approximately 25-50 years, while the number of years since migration ranged from 5 to 30 years. Three of the participants were affiliated with the University of Washington in some capacity: one is a professor in the African Studies program, another a senior administrator in the Dental School, and a third a graduate of the College of Engineering. The fourth participant, who was located with the assistance of a community contact, is a nurse. The participants were recruited using an email recruitment flyer and snowball recruitment method that began with contacts at the university and, after locating and liaising with a community contact, extended into the wider local Ethiopian migrant community.

When collecting our data, standard methods for ethnographic interviews were followed. All participants were interviewed using a set of written questions common to all research teams, with the addition of exploratory questions asked by the interviewer when probing participants for further details. One participant, at his request, responded to the interview questions by email and did not respond to requests for a follow-up interview. Data from the remaining three participants was collected via oral interview: two face-to-face and one via telephone.

After the interviews were collected and transcribed, they were thoroughly read, with keywords and meaningful chunks highlighted and reflections on emerging themes and categories in relation to the research questions noted. These observations were then sorted into four preliminary categories: 1) the relationship between global English and participants' home country education; 2) language choice and attitudes; 3) transnational communication and development; and 4) the

relationship of pressures and conflicts on skilled migration and development flows. For each category, sub-categories were also identified.

In the first category, notable was participants' reports regarding access and inequalities in the relationship between global English and the Ethiopian education system: on the one hand, with English as a medium of instruction in Ethiopian schools, all school attending children had access to English language resources; however, on the other hand, material resources and perhaps instructional methods (according to one participant) limited the development of linguistic and pragmatic competencies while access to supplementary English-language instruction was limited in relation to local socio-economic strata.

Regarding language choices and development flows, participants showed a preference towards Amharic, the official language of Ethiopia, over English, with the possible suggestion that skilled migrants' maintaining of cultural ties through use of their home language is difficult to separate out from their contributions to development efforts, in particular flows of information. Perhaps complicating that, however, was participants' consensus regarding the difficulty of using Amharic in computer-mediated communication (CMC) due to transliteration issues, access to resources, and, in some instances, the education level and technical skills of communicants back in participants' home country. An additional sub-category of note in the preliminary data analysis may be the varying degree and effect among participants of pressures and conflicts on their education, migration, attitudes towards global English, and their participation in development efforts both within their communities in Seattle and in transnational flows back to Ethiopia.

While the analysis is still preliminary and the data set too small for extensive axial coding, these causal conditions and contextual factors (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) suggest the following possible correlation: professionals who, due to conflict in their home country, endured significant disruption to their education and/or professional trajectories tended to be less involved in development efforts in their home countries, both in terms of material and information flows. While this may be expected, the situation might also have been the reverse. Therefore, it might be interesting to see if similar potential correlations in the other data sets exist and compare them with these.

As a way of drawing together these preliminary findings, a list of other questions were developed as possible directions for extending the research initiative. They included the following:

- Do skilled migrants see global English as a network standard (Grewal, 2008), as part of a symbolic exchange (Lash, 2002), or something altogether different?
- How do their views on global English affect how they use it in development efforts in their home countries?
- How can this attitude be measured and, if relevant, factored into any determination of the way English shapes the trajectories of skilled migration and transnational development flows?
- Where do their views on Global English, as perhaps indicated in how they negotiate tensions among varieties in their countries of migration, fit into the larger dispositions or

tendencies that allow skilled migrants to reach varying levels of success in their countries of migration?

- Should the role of information and communication technologies (ICTs), perhaps specifically CMCs and social networking sites (SNSs), be considered when looking further at the way that Global English impacts the migration-development nexus?
- Can skilled migrants' diverse mobilities (Urry, 2010) be linked theoretically with the 'mobile' turn in language (Caron & Caronia, 2007) as an additional or potential means of locating language in the interstices of the migration-development nexus?

g. University of Sydney:

Australia has a defined category of 'skilled migration' in its immigration policy. However, only a small number of people from Africa (excluding South Africa) have migrated to Australia under this category. While there is a sizeable (English-speaking white) South African community in Australia, who qualify as skilled migrants, only a very small number of non-White people from Africa have managed to come to Australia as skilled migrants. There are two main reasons for this: 1) the traditional white-only policy, and 2) stringent English language requirements. We will briefly consider both of these aspects below before focusing on a (narrative) case study of a skilled migrant from Ghana.

Australia opened its doors to migration from non-white countries relatively late – in the late 1970s. Before this time, immigration to Australia was influenced by its white-only policy, which severely limited migration of non-white individuals from any part of the world to Australia. As a result of this, migration of (black) Africans to Australia only started after the white-only policy was abolished. Furthermore, many potential applicants from Africa were and are unable to meet the stringent requirements and verification processes set up by the Australian government. One of these requirements is that of the English language. The required expertise needs to be met before any application for skilled migration can be considered.

Australia's immigration policy requires people interested in migrating to Australia under the 'skilled migration' category to meet a minimum English language requirement. This policy underscores the importance given to the English language in migrating to Australia and indicates that all "skilled" migrants in Australia have appropriate language skills before they arrive to Australia. As such, Australia differs from other English speaking countries (such as the United States), where 'skilled migration' is not regulated in a similar fashion and where English is not a formally mandated pre-requisite to migration.

In the context of migration from Africa, such policies effectively limit skilled migration from non-English speaking African countries. Furthermore, even for people with English language skills, the requirements of demonstrating their English skills by taking an IELTS exam makes it difficult for them to take the test, and consequently, to secure skilled migration to Australia. The types of English African migrants bring them do not always predispose them to score well in IETLTS exam.

The influence of the above factors is reflected in the number of skilled migrants from various parts of Africa, as given in the figure below:

2.3. Settler arrivals by region of birth and eligibility category, July to December 2009

	Eligibility Category									
	Family	Skill				Special Eligibility	Human-itarian	Non-Programme Migration		
		GSM (a)								
		Sponsored	Indep-endent	ES (c)	Business		Refugee & SHP	NZ Citizen	Other	Total
North Africa & the Middle East										
North Africa	308	53	239	6	3	-	332	26	7	974
Middle East	1 148	172	811	57	25	1	1 364	115	36	3 729
Sub-Saharan Africa	1 284	1 329	1 855	395	373	4	1 838	270	9	7 357

Source: DIMA - Immigration update, July to December 2009

In addition to exploring the migration trends and policies in Australia, the PI interviewed one skilled migrant from Ghana for this pilot project. Edward (pseudonym) said that his life paths have been shaped by his language skills – both in writing and speaking. He believed that his ability in English has been a key asset in his academic and professional pursuits and that without his ability and knowledge of English he would not have been able to make it to Australia or to succeed here. Edward's observation sounds right given Australia's policy of testing people's English language skills before they are allowed to migrate. Without proficiency in English, Edward would not have been able to move to Australia as a skilled migrant.

Originally from Ghana, Edward migrated to Australia in the early 1990s. Edward had applied for immigration to Australia along with 10 of his friends, but none of his friends' applications were approved. Edward said that after his arrival in Australia, he was unable to get appropriate jobs in his preferred field (auto-mechanic), and so he decided to enroll in a degree program at a local university. He said that he was able to secure admission to the program and to graduate on time because of his proficiency in English, which he had gained in early education in Ghana. He said that while his English came at a cost of losing literacy in Twi, his mother tongue, he did not regret it because it gave him mobility. He believed that proficiency in English was essential for getting access to good education and jobs globally, and especially in Australia. He stated that having appropriate English language skills is a definite benefit for those who migrate to Australia.

The interview data corroborated our analysis of the policy documents and the migration figures. Edward's narrative and his English language proficiency show how language requirements for skilled migration to Australia relate to the chances of (non-white, non-English speaking) Africans to migrate to Australia. It also explains, to some degree, the low number of skilled migrants in Australia from Africa.

h. Penn State University:

Ten faculty members from a range of fields in the University were interviewed. All the subjects have PhD's. Six were females. A combination of oral interviews (with eight subjects) and email interviews (with two subjects) was conducted. The subjects were contacted through snowball sampling. A possible limitation of this method is that the scholars are largely from former British colonies, and they are mostly in the humanities/social sciences. The following table gives their

countries and areas of specialization. The table also indicates the subjects' attitudes towards return migration and reasons for coming to the US:

	Subject	**Field/department**	**Country of origin**	**Reason for migration to US**	**Intention to return home**
1	LB (male)	African-American Studies (Ph.D Geography)	Sierra Leone	education	no
2	TK (male)	African-American Studies (Ph.D Sociology)	Sierra Leone	education	no
3	MS (male)	Applied Linguistics (PhD Applied Linguistics)	Zimbabwe	employment	Open; no immediate plans
4	AM (male)	General & Academic Officers (PhD Engineering)	Nigeria	education	Open; no immediate plans
5	ML (female)	African-American Studies (Ph.D Political Science)	Kenya (born in India)	education	no
6	CA (female)	Dir Genl Admin & Planning (PhD Engineering)	Sierra Leone (born in England)	marriage	no
7	OI (female)	English Ph. D English)	Nigeria	education	no
8	BG (female)	Women's Studies (Ph. D English)	South Africa	Marriage	Open; no immediate plans
9	YV (female)	Curriculum & Inst. (Ph D in C & I)	Cameroon	first time: Education; second time: husband's job	No
10	DS (female)	Applied Linguistics/ African-American Studies (PhD Applied Linguistics	South Africa	Joining spouse	yes

The main findings are presented according to three themes: language practices, development work, and prospects for return migration.

Language practices:
The subjects mentioned that they were already proficient in English when they migrated to the West. There were benefitted by the fact that English was a medium of education and lingua franca for ethnic relations in their own countries. Therefore, they didn't have to formally learn English after they migrated. They were also not conscious of language proficiency shaping their career and migration decisions or trajectories. Even when their trajectories of migration were complicated, and they had to travel through intermediary countries, English helped them tremendously. They felt that the convergence of English with countries of intellectual and technological dominance helped them indirectly.

However, the subjects were also aware of the limitations of relying purely on English for development work. They needed proficiency in local languages to interact with family and acquaintances back home. Their multilingual competence enabled them to code switch into native languages when they interacted in diaspora and home community contexts. The multilingual skills they had developed in their everyday life helped them in these domains of interaction.

In the US, though they experience challenges in communication when they encounter a different variety of English, they accommodate and negotiate differences without serious problems. Their multilingual background and language awareness help them in this ability also. They don't usually undergo formal learning and training to negotiate the differences in English varieties in the host community. It was evident that they adjusted to dominant/elite varieties of English with a critical detachment. They affirmed their voices and maintained hybrid identities in their encounters with members of the host community.

Development work:
A majority of the subjects acknowledged that they are not undertaking any formal or community-wide development work in their home communities. The remittances of cash and material gifts are largely for their own families through informal channels. There was a similar personal dimension to their professional collaboration and knowledge remittance work. Though they do have academic connections with scholars at home, these networks largely served to get assistance for their own research or publishing work. Similarly, their connection with others in their profession from their home communities was personal in nature. Subjects mentioned that they these connections are to experience community and discuss personal issues of adjustment in their profession or to discuss news about events in their home communities. They didn't participate in these networks to undertake formal development work in their home communities. Zeleza (2004) suggests some reasons why African scholars may not undertake development work of the nature exemplified by Indian Silicon Valley IT professionals. He argues that Black professionals deal with more biases, which makes them focus more on their own professional survival and success, moving away from community work. He also argues that academics (especially in the humanities and social sciences), unlike professionals in other technical or professional fields, work in isolation and don't have the need to network for their own research and teaching purposes.

Return migration:
A majority of subjects said that they were not planning on returning to their home communities. Only one person strongly favors returning home as she is not yet in a tenure track appointment. The data reveals many possible reasons for this strong view against return migration. Some subjects pointed to the commitments towards their children and future of their family in the US. They mentioned that for the sake of their education and the wellbeing of their economic and social advancement they would not consider returning permanently to their home lands. There were other complicating factors. It emerged that most of the children speak only English at home. The family language also turned out to be English in most cases, as spouses were largely not from the same ethnic/language group. Some subjects mentioned that their lack of proficiency in home community (or African) languages was a deterrent against return, as their children would not be able to get an education or enjoy social life there. It is interesting that some other communities have also found that the maintenance of native language can influence the prospects of returning home. Studying the Iranian community, Hojat et al (2010) argue: "The immigrants' preference in using their native language serves as a ''pull'' factor that increases the probability of a desire to return to the country of birth" (p. 158).

The refusal to return home was also shaped by confusions about what "home" really meant. In families where spouses came from different countries and communities in Africa, subjects mentioned that they were not sure where they should return. More ironically, some considered another migrant nation as their home. For example, some considered as their home another African community where they had spent more years of their life in education (a Cameroonian in Nigeria), where they had spent some years as an intermediary point in their migration trajectory (UK on the way to USA), or where they had most of their family members (Canada). It was clear that diaspora life had created more networks, affiliations, and identities in spaces outside the African homeland in many cases. Many of our subjects were reconciled to this situation and asked why one should consider remittances to their home countries as the only valid form of development contribution. They argued that they were making more contributions to other chosen African communities (i.e., a Tanzanian who is doing social work among women in Sudan), to the imagined communities of globalization (i.e., with migrant students and scholars in American universities), and other communities with which they engaged in their professional capacity (i.e., in India or China).

The findings reveal the problems in formulating questions based on traditional paradigms. The use of the term "home" was problematized and interpreted differently by our subjects. Concepts like "brain drain" and "brain gain" are also problematized, as they are framed in reference to individual countries which lose or gain resources. The findings suggest the need to develop a more transnational perspective that acknowledges the fluidity in migrant pathways and knowledge circulation.

4. Emergent Themes

Though it is difficult to generalize across the different ethnic, language, and professional groups in our study, we venture to offer some of the emerging themes:

a. English certainly emerged as a language that was highly valued by our subjects and had aided their migration, educational advancement, and professional success. It was also striking that, in a

majority of cases, our subjects were not conscious of the connection between language and their migration or professional trajectory. The connection was implicit and unconscious. Furthermore, most of our subjects didn't have to get separate education or training in English after their migration to develop the communicative skills for the host community. This was so for two important reasons: i. higher education, technological progress, and professional advancement seem to align with English language globally. In other words, English language enables advances in education and progress today. English benefits from the communities and institutions which hold power in these domains. Many people think of this connection as natural, have internalized these connections, and align their education and career trajectories on proficiency in English. ii. Developing countries are also shaping their language-in-education policies in response to these geopolitical realities. Therefore, our subjects (even those in countries that were not former British colonies, such as Cameroon and Congo) were prepared by the educational system in their own countries to communicate in English.

b. Despite the acknowledgement of the high status of English in the migration-development nexus, the subjects held a critical attitude to English, as they had experienced certain tensions in social and communicative life. Their critical attitude was engendered by the following observations and experiences:

i. Their accents and varieties of English had been treated as inferior by "native speakers" in traditional English speaking countries. Despite a long history of speaking their own varieties of English in their own lands (i.e., Nigerian English, Ghanaian English), the skilled migrants were made to feel as if they were unproficient in English, weak in communication skills, or unintelligible. They got the impression that only speaking in the prestige/native varieties of English counted for proficiency and educational or professional success.

ii. They were aware of new opportunities and markets associated with other languages, especially Chinese. They realized that they were not competent in these languages. Many of them were critical of their home countries putting "all eggs into one basket" and ignoring other languages. While they saw the need for English, they also realized the need for a multilingual competence that emphasized the role of other languages in one's repertoire. They feared that the one-sided emphasis on English reduced the types of competence required for professional success and development work in contemporary situations.

iii. They realized the need to maintain proficiency in their local languages to communicate with members of their home communities, or to connect with diaspora subjects, in order to organize themselves and undertake development work. They were mindful that the use of English in these contexts constructed negative identities for them, prevented them from enjoying in-group solidarity, and made their development work ineffective. They needed the proficiency to code switch between English and diverse local languages in order to be effective in bonding with their home community members, develop respect and authority, and circulate knowledge and resources effectively.

iv. They saw the need to negotiate diverse varieties of English to communicate effectively in transnational contexts of the migration-development nexus. For many of our subjects, professional success and knowledge circulation work transcended the home/host country binary.

Their professional success in the West involved negotiating business with nationals from other countries beyond the host community. Similarly, their development work included contributions to other southern hemispheric countries beyond their home countries. For example, a Nigerian educational administrator in a US university had to travel to India and China to establish institutional connections and recruit students and faculty from there. He treated these visits and connections as part of his development work. He thus considered his contribution to knowledge circulation as covering diverse communities beyond his own (whether his home community of Nigeria or host community USA). He considered it an asset to be able to negotiate the Englishes spoken by nationals in India, China, and other countries. Similarly, other subjects in our study mentioned the need to work with migrants from other countries in their educational or employment contexts in the West. They valued the ability to negotiate the diverse varieties of English spoken by these ethnic groups as an asset.

v. Migration didn't involve a linear trajectory from home country to host country for many of our subjects. It involved temporary migration to other English speaking countries (i.e., UK, South Africa, Canada) and non-English speaking countries (i.e., Sweden, Germany, Malawi) before arrival in their current locations. English was helpful in these intermediate or transitory points of the migration-development nexus. However, subjects needed the facility to negotiate the local varieties of English valued here in addition to the other languages dominant in local contexts.

vi. Though people valued the role of English for instrumental purposes in the migration-development nexus, their emotional investments, identity representations, and community affiliations were tied to other varieties of English or other languages. Effective contributions to development and knowledge circulation involved constant negotiation between these various claims and bonds. For example, subjects from Sierra Leon who were working in the US valued British English over American English because of its colonial connections; they preferred krio for family interactions; and they used Sierra Leonian standard English for formal purposes in their local professional networks.

vii. Language needs are also complicated by the fact that family affiliations for our subjects go beyond the home/host community binary. Their diaspora relations cover families in other African, European, and North American countries. In fact, in many cases, spouses had divided national affiliations, as they came from different African countries themselves. From this perspective, "home" was decentered, deterritorialized, and imagined in unconventional ways. To negotiate family, personal, and professional connections in locations outside their home or host communities, our subjects needed more diverse varieties of English and/or other languages. Their development work was also conducted in these imagined "homes" where they enjoyed family and community relations. For this purpose too, they needed languages other than English and/or diverse varieties of English. For example, a Nigerian professional who lived and worked in USA, had more family connections in UK, considered UK her home (as she had lived most of her life there), and valorized British English over American English.

viii. The exaggeration of the role of English could affect the possibilities of return migration in subtle and ironic ways. Many migrant families had adopted English as their sole language of communication in English-speaking host communities. This was also due to the fact that spouses came from different African ethnic communities, and English was the common medium of

communication in the nuclear family. While the families were happy with their children's native proficiency in English, as it helped them succeed in host communities, this was also cited as an important reason why they were reluctant to migrate back to Africa or undertake development work there. They felt permanently rooted in the West because their children couldn't survive in the social and educational context of home countries if they returned. English was therefore a liability for return migration and knowledge circulation.

c. Though their educational backgrounds hadn't prepared them for some of the more complex communicative and social conditions they encountered in the migration-development nexus, our subjects drew from various forms of tacit knowledge, language awareness, negotiation strategies, and cosmopolitan attitudes they had developed in informal learning and socialization to negotiate these challenges. Many of them had developed these attitudes, awarenesses, and strategies (hereafter, dispositions) in the multilingual contexts of their home communities and diaspora life. These dispositions enabled some of them to respond to the unexpected communicative challenges they faced. The following are some ways in which our subjects responded to their linguistic conflicts and challenges in the migration-development nexus:

i. They expanded their repertoires in English by figuring out the rules and norms of the new varieties they encountered on a face-to-face, interpersonal level. They adopted "accommodation strategies" (Giles, 1984) to negotiate the varieties used by their interlocutors. Rather than being judgmental or sticking to their own varieties stubbornly, they figured out the norms of others and adjusted their own language to facilitate intelligibility. Much of this was learned and developed informally and "on the go." Our subjects gave many examples of how they had intuited from experience the comparisons between rules of the dominant varieties of English in their host communities and their own varieties. The way "water" was pronounced with a flap (American), stop (British), and retroflex (some African communities) was an observation many had made by themselves. The multilingual background of the subjects in their own communities had helped them develop these insights. These are the strategies they use in their multilingual home communities to negotiate diverse languages English varieties.

ii. In making these accommodations to others, our subjects maintained their voice and criticality. Though they gave in to the demands of the native English speakers to adopt their norms, as they were aware of the power difference and recognized the costs of ignoring the linguistic capital, they adopted more critical positions and attitudes privately. They felt that native speakers were stubbornly insisting on their own varieties as the norms for communication. They considered this attitude as deficient and limited. They considered their own ability to negotiate between varieties and develop an expanded repertoire a superior disposition. They held that communication is a "two-way process," where both interlocutors (regardless of the fact that they are native or nonnative) have to adopt accommodation strategies.

iii. Subjects adopted code switching strategies to shuttle between communities in their professional, family, and diaspora life. They displayed the facility to shuttle between the contextually preferred varieties of English (i.e., Standard British English for professional communication in formal/institutional contexts, krio with diaspora community, and locally respected educated varieties of Nigerian English with professionals of their country). In communication with their diaspora members or in home communities, they sometimes adopted

hybrid codes that simultaneously mixed four or five local languages. In this way, they adopted the identities that were preferred in the contexts of communication and interaction. They stood a better chance of local acceptance if they code switched to the preferred varieties for that context, rather than sticking to one variety of language.

iv. Our subjects took pride in their linguistic creativity to adopt new varieties, identities, and relationships as the situation and interlocutors demanded. An informant expressed how she could "go with the flow" and adjust to any group of students she found in her class in the United States when she taught them. She could adopt African American English and pass as an insider to that community; or relate to foreign students based on her familiarity with their English accents and languages. For her, linguistic competence depended on creatively adopting new speech patterns and, thus, constructing relevant new identities. Proficiency went beyond demonstrating mastery of standard American English alone.

v. Experiences such as the above, revealed the following dispositions that helped them deal with communication in the migration-development nexus: attitudes such as tolerance for variation; accommodation of the diversity of speech by the communities they engaged with as natural; values that were congenial to negotiating these differences and variations, such as patience, nonjudgementalism, collaboration, and solidarity with other migrants to help each other deal with their communicative challenges; a desire for voice and ownership in the languages of the host communities even if they were not their native languages.

vi. Through such dispositions, our subjects constructed hybrid identities and resisted one-sided assimilation to the norms of host communities. To some extent, our subjects already brought with them hybrid identities constructed through the multilingualism and multiculturalism in their home communities. They were prepared to develop these identities further through the experiences in the migration-development nexus.

vii. These dispositions were developed tacitly. The subjects didn't always have an explicit or theoretical knowledge about their communicative and negotiation practices. Also, these dispositions were not developed in formal institutions or pedagogical contexts. They were learned informally in everyday contexts. They were also developed from the dispositions migrants already brought from their own multilingual environments.

d. The orientation to language and communication that our subjects displayed differed from that of institutions (both nongovernmental and governmental). While these institutions adopted the human-capital discourse of formal competence in elite languages as desired skills, migrants valued the more subtle competencies such as communicative strategies, awarenesses, attitudes, and dispositions, which lie behind formal language systems. While institutions oriented to language as a product, migrants related to them as practices. While institutions treated languages as separate from each other and discrete entities, migrants treated languages as integrated systems, thus making up a continuum of repertoires. While institutions promoted host country native languages (such as English) as a linguistic capital, migrants treated multilingualism as a greater resource in the migration-development nexus. In other words, certain forms of tacit knowledge and dispositions that were extremely useful for migrants are yet to be recognized as capital (see Williams & Balaz, 2008).

e. Though the practices and assumptions of our subjects deviated from the human-capital discourses of governmental and non-governmental institutions, we realized that their orientation to multilingual repertoire represented benefits and advantages that were not appreciated. To develop technical expertise and knowledge in the North, migrants have to engage not only with dominant social groups in host communities (i.e., native speakers of American English) but also migrants from diverse other countries who speak other English varieties. To conduct their work in host communities effectively, migrants often have to interact with institutions and people in other northern and southern hemisphere countries, where languages other than English are spoken and the multilingual competencies are required. Furthermore, the chances of return migration and success in knowledge remittances are greater if migrants retain competencies in their native languages and have the ability to code switch. The effectiveness of knowledge circulation at home and other communities are enhanced if migrants are able to shuttle between contextually required languages. Diaspora networks are strengthened if migrants are able to switch into community languages and maintain healthy relationships and identities with their own members for professional and personal connections. For all these reasons, the discourses of global English and one-sided promotion of elite languages in the host country fail to deal with the complexity of the migration-development nexus. In fact, some development scholars treat language diversity as a problem (see Adsera & Pytlikova, 2010). They argue that it is language diversity (which they consider as fractious and polarizing) that contributes to migrants leaving their countries. Similarly, they consider language uniformity in host communities as a pull factor (as they argue that migrants prefer to go to these countries rather than those that are linguistically diverse as multilingualism requires too much learning and adjustment compared to dealing with a single dominant language). However, even developed countries like USA and UK have a lot of diversity that is often not acknowledged because of homogeneity discourses. Also, for migrants from the global South, multilingualism is not a problem but a resource that they already bring with them.

f. Through the lens of language, we develop a different perspective on the migration-development nexus. Our findings suggest a different framework for development work, trajectories of migration, and community relationships:

i. We find that a critical voice, thinking, and positioning are helpful in development work. They help migrants bring in new resources and knowledge from their own backgrounds to contribute to their expertise in the west. However, the dominant assimilationist orientation of the human-capital perspective assumes that it is those who assimilate to host country values and norms who can be most successful. Such an orientation may prevent migrants from critically orientating to the values and knowledge of host communities, or reconfiguring dominant practices in host communities from the resources they bring with them. One sided accommodation or total assimilation may not be desirable as there are resources and strengths migrants should retain both for knowledge remittance at home and knowledge application in host communities.

ii. We have to move beyond the lingering nation-state framework in development work. Development and remittances are measured in relation to contributions to host or home countries. For example, terms such as “brain drain” and “brain gain” assess these processes in relation to one’s native country. However, the contributions of our subjects go beyond

countries—whether home or abroad. They consider their contribution as extending to diverse migrant groups in the host countries (i.e., a Professor in an American university considers foreign students as recipients of her expertise and development work). They contribute to other countries in Africa (i.e., an expert from Cameroon does more development work in Nigeria, as her husband is from there and she had her higher education in that country, developing more professional connections there; similarly, a development worker from Tanzania conducts her work among women in Sudan, and considers them as the focus of her work). They look beyond their own countries and communities to engage in development work outside their continent (i.e., a Nigerian engineer mentioned that he has "graduated" to making contributions to the global community, involving people in China or India). In all these ways, development work adopts a more transnational scope, moving beyond host/home countries.

Furthermore, there are no clear winners or losers in the migration-development nexus as we see it. In the place of brain drain/gain metaphors (which assume one party losing and another party gaining), we have to adopt more fluid metaphors of circulation and sharing. Such metaphors would imply that there is no absolute or permanent locus for measuring gain or drain. Knowledge and resources are shared in a fluid manner in communities, with no specific origins or ending. From this perspective, even Logan's (2009) useful complication of the sending/receiving country binary doesn't go far enough. Though he shows how other intermediary communities can both produce and receive migrant expertise, we have to consider the production and reception of expertise as going beyond the nation-state and reaching communities within and between countries.

iii. We have to adopt a more complex notion of the knowledge that is involved or required in development work. Though K4D (or knowledge for development) has become a slogan in the migration-development scholarship, a focused orientation on knowledge is still lacking (see Williams & Balatz, 2008, for this critique). More importantly, while scholars and institutions focus on formal and institutionally accredited knowledge in their considerations, our research shows that we need a greater appreciation of tacit knowledge. It appears from our study that certain forms of tacit knowledge (comprising dispositions, awarenesses, attitudes, and strategies) play a constructive role in both applying one's knowledge in host communities and undertaking development work in home communities. Since these are not explicit or quantifiable, they have passed beneath the scholarly and demographic radar. The acquisition of such tacit knowledge also needs more focus. As we find from our subjects, these dispositions are acquired informally in everyday contexts and in noninstitutional settings. To help theorize this knowledge, we can adopt Evans' (2002) typology of competences. We list how this is relevant for the language competences our subjects bring with them:

- Content-related and practical competences: e.g., repertoires of languages, language awareness, and multilingual knowledge they bring with them;
- Attitudes and values: e.g., tolerance, patience, openness to negotiate language differences;
- Learning competences: i.e., openness to learning new languages and English varieties by employing their perceptiveness, problem solving procedures, and preferred learning strategies;

- Methodological competences: i.e., ability to use community support networks, informal institutions, and everyday resources for dealing with challenges with new languages, genres, and conventions;
- Social and interpersonal competences: e.g., ability to be consensus oriented and collaborative, and demonstrate solidarity in negotiating communicative challenges and differences with interlocutors.

5. Implications and Recommendations

Our study shows the importance of language in the migration-development nexus. It is intriguing that this important development and knowledge resource has been overlooked by scholars and institutions dealing with the subject. Language is a critical medium for negotiating relationships in both host and home communities. It is important for the social and psychological well being of migrants as they negotiate issues of identity and community membership in shifting contexts of work and life. More pertinently for development work, language helps migrants represent, explore, reconstruct, and disseminate relevant knowledge, values, and resources.

Considering the complexity of the transnational and cosmopolitan relations migrants have to negotiate in the migration-development nexus in late-modernity, we have to also adopt a more complex orientation to the language and communicative skills they need. As we demonstrated above, migrants need more than the much touted "global English" to negotiate these relationships. They have to also go beyond focusing on the dominant language of the host communities. As Williams & Balaz (2008, p.29) point out, "The classic human-capital perspective suggests that immigrants tend to adapt to their host countries via accumulating human capital. A critical element of human capital is fluency in the host country's language, which mediates their integration into that country's labor market." This perspective has led to a number of studies on the language fluency of migrant workers (which we listed in the introductory section). These studies typically focus on acculturation/assimilation as the hallmark of success. They also treat language acquisition and proficiency in terms of discrete and separate languages. The limitations of such approaches become evident in our study. Migrants need more than the language of the host country for effective development work. They require a repertoire. They need multilingual competence to negotiate relationships with diverse groups in the host communities, in home communities, and various transnational communities. Even if we narrow our focus to global English, we have to remember that this language constitutes diverse varieties, and migrants need the skills of negotiating the differences and tensions in different Englishes. The treatment of communicative skill as having to do with discrete and separate language systems prevents scholars from looking at the ways languages constitute a repertoire of integrated systems.

More importantly, the focus on formal proficiency and skills has prevented scholars and institutions from appreciating the importance of the more performative dispositions (i.e., language awareness, sociolinguistic attitudes, and negotiation strategies) as empowering resources. Developed in non-institutional and non-formal contexts, these dispositions help our subjects negotiate their communicative challenges. This finding is connected to the way skills and knowledge are treated in the migration-development nexus. Human-capital orientations prioritize quantifiable, formally recognized, certifiable, and objective skills, overlooking the more informal, tacit, and subtle resources. As Williams & Baraz (2008, p. 34) note, "Researchers

are still coming to terms with this different way of understanding skills, most notably through the notion of competences. Migration research, by and large, has lagged behind this paradigmatic shift." We have to develop an appreciation of these aspects of tacit knowledge and competences in the role they play in the migration-development nexus.

Our emphasis on multilingualism and tacit competencies derive from a different orientation to the locus of development work. We find that our focus has to move beyond a nation-state model to accommodate the transnational experiences and perspectives of our subjects. Their focus is not limited to either the home or the host country. Within the host community, skilled migrants engage in knowledge and development work with different ethnic and national groups. They connect with imagined communities beyond their countries of origin to enjoy diaspora and professional connections. Their knowledge and material remittance is not necessarily to their countries of birth, but other communities where they have developed family and professional affiliations. Even "diaspora" fails to capture the multifaceted imagined and cosmopolitan communities migrants construct in the migration-development nexus. To accommodate the diverse forms of acquisition, remittance, borrowings, and contributions migrants make, we have to also reconsider terms like "brain drain" and "brain gain." Knowledge and resources circulate fluidly, without clear identification about which nation gains or loses knowledge.

Based on these findings, we offer the following recommendations for various stakeholders:
a. governments of sending countries:
Currently, these governments are focusing their educational policy on developing a curriculum that would foster the knowledge and resources for their citizens to succeed in higher education and professional advancement in the West (see Lin & Martin, 2005). Late-modern globalization has trumped decolonization and generated a new lease on life for English in postcolonial communities. The development of proficiency in English holds an important place in this policy framework. However, our study shows that this may not be the best policy to adopt. Much more than English is required for successful knowledge development and remittance. Policy should focus on maintaining local languages and developing competence in lingua franca other than English for global development and education. This is not to ignore English, but adopt an additive pedagogy of increasing people's repertoires rather than limiting them.

A more challenging policy focus (to be discussed in section 6) is ways of inculcating the dispositions, awarenesses, attitudes, and strategies that go beyond formal competence in a language. These are the resources that help migrants handle the atypical communicative contexts they encounter in transnational relations. These are portable skills that can help them as they shuttle across communities during development work. They also help migrants deal with the challenges involved in the mobile languages and codes. When values and statuses of the languages they bring from one context change in another context, migrants have to resort to such disposition and strategies to handle their communicative challenges.

b. Governments of receiving countries:
There are also implications for the immigration policy of receiving countries. They have to move beyond assimilation models in their policy framework. As pointed out earlier, countries like Australia insist on English proficiency as a skill required for immigrants. Other countries, such as Canada, provide free English classes for migrants, based on the assumption that this is the

communicative medium that would help them succeed socially and materially in the new setting. Receiving countries should consider the multilingual negotiations required for successful development and knowledge transmission in today's world, not to mention the multilingual composition of their own communities. They should consider how they can inculcate and reward multilingual skills among migrants, including the languages they bring with them. In fact, the rich multilingual dispositions brought by migrants can help long-standing citizens of the country develop their own repertoire for today's multilingual and globalized world. Dominant communities should also learn to negotiate differences in language, rather than being biased and intransigent in the face of diversity.

More than assimilation, a critical disposition towards citizenship, identity, and community can be of tremendous help in development work. The attitudes and resources migrants bring can add a freshness and criticality that can engender social change and progress. In all this, receiving countries should remember that they have more to gain than simply the formal and quantifiable knowledge, skill, or expertise of the migrants. Migrants are also bringing languages, values, and competencies (often unquantifiable and tacit) that are passed on to native communities in equally tacit and informal ways.

c. Non-governmental organizations:
NGO's like the World Bank have shown an interest in organizing skilled diasporas and helping sending countries develop policies that favor knowledge and material remittance. However, presently, they have paid more attention to financial remittances and less to other concerns in the migration-development nexus. There has been inadequate effort to unpack the meaning and dynamics of knowledge for development. Our study shows that multilingual competences and dispositions are an important resource migrants bring to facilitate knowledge circulation. These dispositions are themselves a form of knowledge that needs to be fostered for enhancing development work. Furthermore, NGO's which currently promote English as the global linguistic capital, and fund developing countries to give importance to English in their educational policies, should note the limitations of this assumption. They should promote multilingual repertoires and the more process-oriented dispositions that enable negotiation.

NGO's also assume a nation-state framework for their development work and funding. They measure remittances in relation to countries which send and receive. They relate to knowledge diasporas in relation to people from specific countries rather than members from regions, religions, lifestyle, or discourse communities. The locus of development work is also considered in relation to the countries people come from. It is important to treat the migration-development nexus as fluid and transnational, as argued earlier.

Moreover, the focus on financial remittances is also making NGO's lose sight of other social dimensions that are integral to successful migrant contribution. Migrants face challenges of identity, community, and interpersonal relations, often tied to negotiating competing languages, in both migrant and domestic settings. The very concept of "home" raises questions for them, as they construct imagined communities for identification and affiliation. NGO's have to build support networks, counseling services, and information sources to help migrants negotiate these challenges. The knowledge migrants currently access from informal networks to negotiate social and communicative differences themselves need more formal and institutional assistance.

6. Future Research:

Our pilot study has helped us identify questions for further research in our ongoing efforts at data gathering and analysis. We would like to pursue the following questions:

- What strategies do skilled migrants use to negotiate the challenges they face with different varieties of English and multilingualism as they navigate relationships in family and work, in host, home, and transnational contexts?
- What attitudes, awarenesses, dispositions, values, and resources help skilled migrants communicate effectively in the migration-development nexus?
- What are the gender, class, and other social differences in the ways these communicative repertoires and resources are distributed across skilled migrants?
- How are these portable dispositions acquired and developed? In what contexts and how?
- Since we know that these dispositions are currently developed and transmitted through informal/personal/casual interactions and channels, we should move on to consider how they can be developed more formally and programmatically through institutional channels. This area of work involves collaborations across theory, policy, and pedagogy.

We conclude by reiterating the need for multidisciplinary ethnographic or qualitative work to address these emerging questions. As we focus on areas of language, communication, and knowledge, there is a need for scholars in linguistics, social sciences, education, and cultural studies to combine their resources for such a study. We need new paradigms that benefit from interdisciplinary knowledge. We also emphasize the need to elicit migrants' own perspectives on their communicative challenges, identity construction, diaspora affiliations, and dispositions. These are forms of knowledge that large scale demographic studies or data bases typically miss. The migration-development nexus is complex, evolving, and fluid. There is a need to construct better explanatory frameworks through multidisciplinary and multilocale studies such as this.

References:

Adsera, A. & Pytlikova, M. (2010). The role of language in shaping international migration: Evidence from OECD countries 1985-2006. www.cepr.org/meets/wkcn/2/2429/papers/Adserafinal.pdf. (Accessed 24 February 2011)

Bleakley, H. & A. Chin (2004). Language skills and earnings: Evidence from childhood immigrants. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84 (2), 481-496.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: CUP.

Caron, A. H., & Caronia, L. (2007). *Moving cultures: Mobile communication in everyday life* : McGill-Queen's University Press.

Chiswick, B.R. & P.W. Miller (2007). The international transferability of immigrants' human capital skills. IZA Discussion Papers 2670, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA). ftp://repec.iza.org/RePEc/Discussionpaper/dp2670.pdf. (Accessed 24 February 2011.)

Chiswick, B.R. & P.W. Miller (2002). Immigrant earnings: Language skills, linguistic concentrations and the business cycle. *Journal of Population Economics*, 15(1), 31-57.

Chiswick, B.R. & P.W. Miller (1995). The endogeneity between language and earnings. *Journal of Labour Economics*, 13 (2), 246-288.

Dimmock, C. & Ong Soon Leong, J (2010). Studying overseas: Mainland Chinese students in Singapore. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education,* 40(1), 25-42.

Dustmann, C. & A. van Soest (2002). Language and the earnings of immigrants. *Journal Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55 (3), 473–492.

Dustmann, C. & F. Fabbri (2003). Language proficiency and labour market performance of immigrants in the UK. *Economic Journal*, 113, 695-717.

Dustmann, C. (1994). Speaking fluency, writing fluency and earnings of migrants. *Journal of Population Economics*, 7, 133–56.

Evans, K. (2002). The challenge of "making learning visible": Problems and issues in recognizing tacit skills and key competences. In K. Evans, P. Hodkinson, & L. Unwin (eds.), *Working to Learn: Transforming learning in the workplace*, pp. 7-28. London: Kogan Page.

Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality. On "lingua franca" English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26, 237-259.

Giles, H. (Ed). (1984). The dynamics of speech accommodation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 46. (Special topic issue.)

Grewal, D. S. (2008). *Network power: The social dynamics of globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hojat, M., D, Foroughi, H. Mahmoudi, & F. Holakouee. (2010). A Desire to Return to the Country of Birth as a Function of Language Preference: An Empirical Study with Iranian Immigrants in the United States. *International Migration*, 48 (3), 158-173.

Kofman, E. (2007). The knowledge economy, gender and stratified migrations. *Studies in Social Justice, 1*, 122-135.

Kossoudji, S.A. (1988). The impact of English language ability on the labor market opportunities of Asian and Hispanic immigrant men. *Journal of Labour Economics,* 6(3), 205-228.

Kuznetsov, Y. (2006). *Diaspora networks and the international migration of skills*. Washington, D.C: World Bank.

Lash, S. (2002). *Critique of information*. London: Sage.

Lin, A & P. Martin (Eds.). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Logan, B. I. (2009). The reverse and return transfer of technology (RRTT): Towards a comprehensive model of the migration of African experts. *International Migration*, 47/4, 93-127.

Mercer, C., B. Page, & M. Evans. (2008). *Development and the African Diaspora*. London: Zed Books.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Urry, J. (2010). Mobile sociology. *British Journal of Sociology*, 61, 347-366.

Williams, A. M & V. Balaz. (2008). *International migration and knowledge*. London & New York: Routledge.

Zeleza, P. T. (2004). The African academic Diaspora in the United States and Africa: The challenges of productive engagement. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 24/1, 261-274.

Appendix 1: Table of Subjects and their Backgrounds

		No of subjects	Origin countries of the subjects	Primary languages	Professional background	Kinds of data elicited
1	University of Washington Seattle	4	Ethiopia	Amharic	Dental school administrator, African studies global health professor, engineer, nurse	Interviews: 2 face-to-face, 1 phone, 1 email
2	University of Leeds	13	Zimbabwe	Shona/ Ndebele & English	Health care workers	All face-to-face interviews
3	University of Bristol	4	Cameroon-1, Tanzania-2, Seychelles/ Uganda-1,	English French Ghomálá' Cameroonian Pidgin Kiswahili Kibena Kingoni Creole Kigogo	Teaching fellow & lecturer-1, teacher-1, educator-1, Educational psychologist-1	All email-interviews
4	U of Wisconsin-Madison	9	Uganda	Luganda Lukonzo	3-teachers, 3- administrators/ teachers, 3-university professors	All face-to-face interviews
5	University of Cape Town	13	Zambia, Malawi, Ghana, Nigeria, DRC, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Uganda	Tumbuka Manuka Lala-Bisa Ibo Swahili/ French English English/ Nyanja Kidabida Shona Tonga Saamia/ Luganda	Faculty in CEM, English, Politics, Chemistry, African studies, Info systems, Maths, Theatre & perform., Comp. science, Actuarial science, Law, Gender institute, Architecture	All face-to-face interviews
6	University of Sydney	1	Ghana	Twi	Lecturer	Face-to-face Interview

7	University of York	11	Zimbabwe, Kenya (2), Ghana, Malawi, Uganda, Burundi, Botswana, Egypt, Tunisia, Sudan	English French Arabic	Nurse (2), Statitstician, Ph D student (2), Social Worker, Office Manager, Textile Chemist, Director of economic development organization, Hotel manager	All face-to-face interviews
8	Penn State University	10	South Africa, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Kenya	Zulu, Krio, Yoruba, Swahili, Shona	Professors: 8; Administrators: 2	Interviews: 8 face-to-face, 2 email
Total		65				Interviews: Face- to-face: 57, Email:7, phone:1

Appendix 2:

Interview Questions for those in Receiving Countries:

1. What motivated you to migrate from your native country?
2. Presently, what forms of contact do you have with your native country—i.e., family , professional, friendship etc.? And what kinds of transactions do you engage in between both places—i.e., money, material goods, information, sponsoring family or acquaintances for work or studies in the host country?
3. To what extent did the educational system in your native country give importance to English language?
4. To what extent did you obtain additional instruction in English or other languages (outside the school) **before you migrated**, in preparation for education or employment?
5. To what extent did you obtain additional instruction in English or other languages **after you migrated**, in preparation for education or employment in the host country? What steps did you take?
6. To which countries did you go before you arrived here—and why? Did your English proficiency (or lack of it) influence you on the choice of the country you wanted to migrate to—and how?
7. Did your English proficiency (or lack of it) influence your career paths, professional aspirations, and goals? How?
8. Are your skills and knowledge fully utilized in your current job? If not, how would account for this under utilization? Why are you not able to be in a job that fits your expertise?
9. To what extent is a good proficiency in English important for your current profession?
10. How strong are your ties with other professionals from your native community who

are now living in the host country? Does language/communication have any bearings on this?
11. How strong are your ties with others in your profession (or other professionals in general) in your native community? Does language/communication have any bearings on this?
12. Do you face any tensions between the variety of English you speak and the varieties spoken in the host community? How do you handle/overcome these differences? What are the implications of this tension for your work and life?
13. Among the types of contact you have with your native community (mentioned in question 2), how much is targeted towards contributing to the development of your native community (i.e., Do you send cash or material contributions? Do you share knowledge and information for their development? Any other ways? And to whom exactly do you send these resources? What is your assessment of the way these resources are contributing to development?)
14. In what language do you communicate with people from your native country as you undertake professional connections or development efforts? Does your proficiency in English help or hinder you in your dealings with members of your home community? How do you deal with these challenges?
15. In your view, to what extent is English language important for the social and economic development of your native community? And is English important for the development work you are interested in doing on behalf of your community? How?
16. Based on your professional experience in the host country, would you say that your native country could have prepared you better for professional success through a different educational system? What kind of education and language teaching would have prepared you better for success?
17. What language do you use to communicate with each other in your family? Would you like this to be different? How?
18. Would you consider returning to your native community in the future? What would motivate you to do so?

Interview Questions for those in Sending Countries:

For everyone:

1. Can you tell me about your educational background?
2. Where, when and how did you learn English?
3. How did you come to be in the profession you are in?
4. Can you tell me about the places you have lived? (where, when, why)
5. What is the role of English in your life?
6. What are your future hopes and dreams?
7. Do you know (other) people who have emigrated from your country?
   - -Where did they go, and why?
   - -How did it benefit them?
   - -What were the (human and material) costs?
   - -Did anyone else benefit from their emigration?

8. In your view, to what extent is English language important for the development of your native community? How?

For teachers & faculty only:

1. What do you teach?
2. Who are your students?
3. What are you preparing them for?
4. What makes a "successful" student successful?
5. Why is education important?
6. What is the role of English in their educations, and in their lives?
7. What do you hope for the future of your students? Why? What will it take for them to achieve it?

[i] We thank the following research assistants for their help:
Maciej Kedzierski (Bristol); Moonde Kabinga and Ariella Diamond (Cape Town); Thom Sullivan (Leeds); Madhav Kafle (Penn State); Chris Featherman (University of Washington, Seattle); Wan Wan and Taha Rajib (York University).