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* Introduction

Introduction to Sociolinguistics
Content

The first session of the course will provide basic literature and concepts in sociolinguistics. Definitions and areas that are related to the study of Sociolinguistics will also be looked into - some to be discussed in more detail than others. The primary areas that this course will cover are the following:

(i) **Language and its functions in society**
- standard language
- dialects and language varieties
- diglossia/polyglossia
- language survival: maintenance, shift, revival, death
- Pidgins and creoles

(ii) **Bilingualism/multilingualism**
- types of bilingualism
- diglossia with/without bilingualism
- neither diglossia nor bilingualism
- code-switching/code-mixing
- lexical borrowing/coinage

(iii) **Language and education**
- language policy
- language for academic/occupational purposes
- language planning/implementation

(iv) **Language, thought, and culture**
- Sapir-Whorf hypothesis
- restricted and elaborated code
- non-verbal language
- secret language, argot
- male/female language

(v) **Language and society in Malaysia**
- linguistic situation in Malaysia
- vernacular languages
- relationship between Bahasa Melayu and English
Students' Responsibilities

1. To read the required text and other reading assignments
2. To give a critical review of selected articles whenever required
3. To send in assignments on time failing which you will automatically be
   given a grade lower than what you deserve for every assignment sent in
   late.

OVERVIEW OF COURSE CONTENT

What is sociolinguistics?

The word sociolinguistics is made up of two words; society and
linguistics (or language). We can define sociolinguistics as the study of
language in relation to society - that is, what language is to society, how it is
used by that society, for what purpose, and why. Since sociolinguistics is
about language and how it is related to society, we will also have to look at
issues such as how language is “preserved” or maintained so that it will not
die, how it is enriched through the number of words borrowed or “coined” by
its users so that they may express ideas, share thoughts, or explain things
around them easily and effectively. At the same time, we will also have to look
at how language is taught or learned by the young people in that society; not to
mention the effect that language policies may have on the strength and/or
weakness of particular languages within a society.

Question:
Apart from what have been said concerning sociolinguistics, can you think of
other things that we can associate with language and society?
Yes, sociolinguistics is also about how people who have mastery over two or more languages use them in their everyday conversation; what society thinks of them and what the users themselves feel about this ability of speaking in more than one language or code. What about dialects? Are the Perak, Negeri Sembilan, Kelantan, or Kedah dialects different languages, or are they only varieties of the same language—Bahasa Melayu? What then is Bahasa Melayu Baku?

Question:

_________  ___________  ___________, are dialects, but

_________  ___________  ___________  are varieties of Bahasa Melayu.

You are right if you say that all of them are dialects and that they are also varieties of Bahasa Melayu. Bahasa Melayu Baku is also a dialect that has been selected and given the status of a standard language, or the high variety—that is, a language which is to be used for all formal functions, spoken and written, and the variety that will be taught in schools. But who decides which register to choose to be the standard code? Society, of course. However, the process that a variety undergoes to achieve that standard status is long. We will discuss this when we come to the next class module.

Question:

What other names can we use to talk about “language”?

_________  ___________  ___________.

In peninsular Malaysia, we have a wonderful opportunity to hear other languages being spoken alongside Bahasa Melayu—the different Chinese dialects, different Indian dialects, different varieties of English, and many other minority languages. In East Malaysia, Sabah and Sarawak, many other ethnic languages which the majority of peninsular Malaysians have never heard of, are being spoken everyday. In all this, much word or lexical borrowing takes place. This is a natural phenomenon because people do not want to waste time and energy to think and find words to describe things as their description can be easily borrow from another language. Sometimes, these things are not even part of their lives or culture but come from outside.
their country. And these borrowings are especially prominent within the context of our national language, Bahasa Melayu Baku. So, words for fruits such as “cherries”, “strawberries”, “apples”, and many others are borrowed straight from another language. So do words for music; “rap”, “rock”, “blues” borrowed from the West.

Question:
Can you list other words that we have borrowed from another language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used in English:</th>
<th>Used in Bahasa Melayu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g. “bungalow” (from Hindi “bangla”; Gujarati “bangalo”)</td>
<td>e.g. “kot” (from English “coat”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used in any Chinese dialect</th>
<th>Used in any Indian dialect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used in any Sabah/Sarawak language?</th>
<th>Used in other languages?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the people in Malaysia are bilinguals, some multilinguals. These are people who can speak two or more languages. Thus, it is quite common to hear people using two or different languages during the course of a conversation. For example, a Malay speaking to another Malay may use both English and Bahasa Melayu in his/her conversation. A Chinese, on the other hand, may use a Chinese dialect, English and/or Bahasa Melayu in his/her conversation with another Chinese speaker. The same holds true for an Indian speaker speaking to another Indian listener. More interestingly though is a situation when two interlocutors from different language
backgrounds switch or mix languages. Why do they do this, and does the occurrence of code-mixing or code-switching rampant in Malaysia?

When we talk about language, we will also inadvertently wonder how language is learned. What kind of language is acquired and what is learned? Where is this language acquired/learned, and for what purpose? Is there a difference between the language learned/acquired by youngsters who grow up in the rural and urban areas? Will the language they learn/acquire affect the way they think? Is there a difference between the language used by men and women? How different are they?

These are but some of the issues that we will look into to understand the control that society has over language and, to a certain extent, the people who use it. Or, is it language that exerts control over the people who use it? These are but some of the question that will be posed and studied in this course. There are others which we will address as they come. At the same time, we will also come to realize that similar things are happening in other countries all over the world. After all, the use of language for communicative purposes is universal, isn't it? We are not the only country that has different ethnic communities using their own ethnic languages to speak, share ideas, read, and write. Linguistics differences and difficulties that we may claim to have are also there in other parts of the world. If sociolinguistics is about society and the language or languages it uses, then it is about any society anywhere on this earth and how it uses the language or languages which are at their disposal is basically what sociolinguists are interested in.
Section One
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Section requirement:

Read the following articles in *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* by McKay & Hornberger - referred to from now onward as *SLT*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Name of Articles</th>
<th>Name of authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 46</td>
<td>Language attitudes, motivation, and standards.</td>
<td>Mary McGroarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>151 - 194</td>
<td>Regional and social variation</td>
<td>John R. Richford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>195 - 217</td>
<td>Pidgins and creoles</td>
<td>Patricia C. Nichols</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language and its functions in society

Sociolinguistics looks at the relationship between language and society, and sociolinguists seek to understand why people speak differently in different social contexts. They are also concerned with identifying the social functions of language and the ways it is used to convey social meaning. Thus by studying the way people use language in different social situations provides sociolinguists a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community.

Example 1

Faizal: Hi Robert
Robert: Hi. You are late.
Faizal: Yeah, that stupid, cranky Biology teacher kept us back again.
Robert: Mr Bala is here.
Faizal: What? Where is he?
Faizal is talking to his close friend, Robert. Look at the words he uses to describe his teacher. Would he use the same words to describe the Biology teacher, if he had known that he could hear him? The way people talk is influenced by the social context in which they are talking. The same message may be expressed differently to different people. Leaving the school compound Faizal had run into the school principal.

Example 2

Faizal: Good evening, sir.
Principal: Why are you still here?
Faizal: Mr Foo kept us in, sir.

Q 1. Why do we say the same thing in different ways?

Identify the words in examples 1 and 2 which reflect the fact that Faizal’s relationship with Robert is a friendly one compared to his relationship with the principal.

Q 2. What does this suggest about the significance of words?

Can you give other examples where people use different words in different settings?

The fact that we use different words for different occasions suggests that there are levels of word-appropriateness. We also use different sentence structures to fit the social context we are in. For example, in Malaysia, we sometimes hear this:
Example 3

Speaker 1: Hey, you Ah Fook's sister-ah?
Speaker 2: Ahuh!

Example 4

Speaker 3: Hello. Are you Ah Fook's sister?
Speaker 2: Yes. (or Yes, I am).

Q 3. Why is there a difference between Speaker 1 and speaker 3's style of questioning?

Standard Language and Dialects

Example 5

In northern Norway there is a village which has become famous among sociolinguists because the language used by the villagers was described in great detail by two sociolinguists in the late 1960s. It is called Hemnesberget and all the villagers know and use two distinct kinds of Norwegian. There is the local dialect which is called Ranamål (mål is the Norwegian word for 'language'), and then there is the standard dialect or standard Norwegian, Bokmål (literally 'book-language'). Bokmål is used by the teachers in school. It is the language of the textbooks and after a little exposure it is the variety of Norwegian that the pupils use to discuss school topics in school too. Bokmål is used in church services and sermons. It is used when people go into the local government offices to transact official business. It is used on radio and television. And it is used to strangers and visitors from outside Hemnesberget. So what does that leave for Ranamål?
Ranamål is what people speak to their family, friends and neighbours most of the time. It is the local dialect and it signals membership in the local speech community. People use Ranamål to each other at breakfast, to local shopkeepers when buying their newspapers and vegetables, to the mechanic in the local garage, and to the local people they meet in the street. A local person who used Bokmål to buy her petrol would be regarded as 'stuck up or 'putting on airs'.

In the example above, two dialects are mentioned. Ranamål, the local dialect differs from Bokmål, the standard dialect, in a number of ways. Each has its own pronunciation features and each dialect has distinctive word-forms or morphological features. The reason why people choose Ranamål as opposed to Bokmål are similar to the reasons that lead people to select Mr Bala as opposed to that stupid, cranky, Biology teacher. Factors such as who is being talked to, where and for what reasons are important. There is another factor which may also be relevant, namely the topic of a discussion. It is clearly illustrated in Hemnesberget in the linguistic behaviour of university students who tend to switch dialect when they discuss certain topics. They generally use Ranamål in the village, like everyone else, when they come home during vacations, but when they begin to discuss national politics with each other, it was found they tended to switch unconsciously to Bokmål. The topic was one they associated with discussions outside the village in the standard dialect, so they switched to the linguistic forms they would normally use to discuss it.

Q4. Do you experience the same thing within your own group of friends or families? When and why?

This linguistic variation involved in Hemnesberget is not different in kind from the variation which distinguished Faizal's choice of words and the forms of sentences he uses when he spoke to Robert and the Principal of his
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school. And the reasons for the choice of one dialect rather than another involve the same kind of social considerations - the participants, the social setting, and the topic or purpose of the interaction. Sociolinguists use the term variety (or sometimes code) to refer to any set of linguistic forms used according to social factors. Variety is a sociolinguistic term referring to language in contact. A variety is a set of linguistic forms used under specific social circumstances, i.e. with a distinctive social distribution. Variety is therefore a broad term which includes different accents, different linguistic styles, different dialects and even different languages which contrast with each other for social reasons. It is a very useful sociolinguistic term because it is linguistically neutral and covers all the different realizations of the abstract concept 'language' in different social contexts.

Example 6

In a mountain village, Sauris, in north-east Italy, a sociolinguist reported in 1971 that the adults were all trilingual. Before 1866 the village had been part of the Austrian empire, and its villagers all spoke German. In the late 1960s they still used a German dialect in the home, and to neighbours and fellow villagers. They also used the regional language, friulian, with people from the surrounding area outside the village, and the young men, in particular, tended to use it to each other in the pub. These men had gone to secondary school together in Ampezzo, a nearby town, and Friulian had become for them a language of friendship and solidarity. Italian was the language people used to talk to those from beyond the region, and for reading and writing. Because their village was now part of Italy, Italian was the language of the church and the school.

In this example the different linguistic varieties used in Sauris are distinct languages. They are distinguishable from each other in their sounds, their grammar and their vocabulary. Italians from outside the area would not be able to understand the German dialect, nor even the Friulian. They are also distinguishable by the way they are used - their social
distribution is different. the local people select the appropriate variety for any particular interaction according to similar social factors to those identified in earlier examples: who they are talking to, in what kind of setting, and for what purposes. using German in the pub is not appropriate, for example, though it has been done. One angry woman used German very effectively to berate her husband for ending up in the pub when he was supposed to be at the dairy with their milk, making cheese. her use of German isolated him from his friends in the pub and emphasized her point that he was neglecting his domestic responsibilities. People may manipulate the norm to make a point or create a special effect.

On the whole people acquire their knowledge of varieties and how to use them appropriately in the same way that they acquire their knowledge of most other aspects of language - by extensive exposure and a process of osmosis. More formal varieties, especially distinctive written varieties, may involve more conscious learning but most varieties in a person’s linguistic repertoire are acquired with little conscious effort.
Read the article “Regional and social variation” by John R. Rickford on pages 151 - 194 (34 pages minus References) and respond to the questions given below. Provide examples wherever necessary. Of great importance, however, is that you must try to connect whatever you have read in this module, your own experiences, and those in the text together.

Answer the following questions. Your response should be type-written, double-space in Times New Roman 12-font size (or nearest equivalent in other fonts) and kept in a folder. This folder will not be passed up to the instructor but will be used to place all your written responses to questions following specific chapters read in Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching (SLT). Please keep your folder carefully as you might be required to hand it in during the last face-to-face session for grading purposes.

**ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS**

Question 1:
How many dialects of your own language can you find in your own town/city?

Question 2:
From your knowledge of the various dialects of your own language, is it possible for you to draw a dialect map of your town/city/state? Will this be based on lexical, phonological, or grammatical features alone?

Question 3:
What can we say as the main reason for understanding dialects within the context of the younger and older students in schools or colleges in the different states in Malaysia? How will this understanding help you as teachers?
Section Two
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Section requirement

Read the following articles in *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* by McKay and Hornberger - referred to from now onward as *SLT*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Name of articles</th>
<th>Name of authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>47-70</td>
<td>Societal multilingualism</td>
<td>Kamal K.Sridhar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>71-102</td>
<td>World Englishes</td>
<td>Kachru &amp; Nelson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

In this section, we will look at some definitions of bilingualism, multilingualism, and other aspects connected to the topic on bilingualism. In *SLT* (pp.47-102), Kamal Sridhar and Braj Kachru & Cecil Nelson discuss aspects on societal multilingualism and the different varieties of English around the world. Their discussion on each of these topics, however, is rather brief. What I have done here is to take some interesting articles from another book *Bilingualism: Basic Principles* written by Baetens Beardsmore in 1982, to supplement what is already given in your text book. Some of the articles are taken verbatim, some have undergone certain minor changes. Nonetheless, I hope these articles which I have synthesized into a longer article for your reading will be useful to you in further understanding the complexity of language use in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and multi-socioeconomic situation which seem to be quite common now in this fast-shrinking world.

Bilingualism/Multilingualism

It is not easy to start any discussion on bilingualism because as a concept it has open-ended semantics. Definitions are numerous and if we turn to just a few, their inadequacies immediately become apparent.
"In ... cases where ... perfect foreign-language learning is not accompanied by loss of the native language, it results in bilingualism, native-like control of two languages. After early childhood few people have enough muscular and nervous freedom or enough opportunity and leisure to reach perfection in a foreign language. Yet bilingualism of this kind is commoner than one might suppose, both in cases like those of our immigrants and as a result of travel, foreign study, or similar association. Of course one cannot define a degree of perfection at which a good foreign speaker becomes a bilingual: the distinction is relative."

(BLOOMFIELD, 1935: 55-56)

In this quotation there is a clear contradiction between what is said in the first sentence with reference to native-like control of two languages and the final sentence which mentions relative degree of ability.

Two of the major specialists in this branch of linguistics have attempted definitions which are probably deliberately vague and which consequently raise as many questions as those they attempt to avoid. MACKEY, for example, states:

"It seems obvious that if we are to study the phenomenon of bilingualism we are forced to consider it as something entirely relative. We must moreover include the use not only of two languages but of any number of languages. We shall therefore consider bilingualism as the alternate use of two or more languages by the same individual."

(MACKEY, 1957: 51)

This statement is very similar to that by WEINRICH who says:

"The practice of alternatively using two languages will be called here BILINGUALISM, and the persons involved BILINGUAL. Unless otherwise specified, all remarks about bilingualism apply as well to multilingualism, the practice of using alternately three or more languages."

(WEINRICH, 1953: 5)
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The extreme caution which such generalisations as the above reveal give little information on how well two or more languages need to be known or whether there are any gradations in bilingual usage depending on things like speaking, writing, reading or listening abilities.

The following totally different type of definition provides a startling contrast with the above but is not unique:

"Bilingualism is the condition in which two living languages exist side by side in a country, each spoken by one national group, representing a fairly large proportion of the people."

Here the definition could well be considered as referring to contiguous communities and have very little to do with bilingual speakers.

The above illustrations show the potential confusion that definitions can provoke. Nevertheless, the notion of bilingualism well-established in the minds of both the specialist and the layman is the origin of passion and polemics, and the source of widespread comment and enquiry. To some extent the notion of bilingualism finds itself in the same category as the elusive yet so familiar concept of the word; everyone knows what a word is yet no one can give a satisfactory definition. Many linguists have tried to do away with attempts to work on the basis of the word, building up their understanding and explanation of language on foundations more amenable to definable analysis and in a way this is a situation similar to the problems of handling bilingualism. Just as in our bones we know what a word is, inadequately definable though it may be, so most of us have an opinion as to what bilingualism is, even though individual interpretations may vary considerably.

Much pragmatic investigation in the natural sciences is beset with similar difficulties of precision in definition yet this has in no way prevented man from building up theories, conducting research and discussing certain as yet elusive phenomena; it is perfectly feasible to treat the notion of bilingualism in a similar fashion, bearing in mind that the field of investigation is evident but not as precise as one might wish.

One explanation for the difficulties in circumscribing the field of bilingualism in the multidisciplinary nature of the aspects involved. The various disciplines involved in analysing the phenomenon, be they linguistics,
psychology, sociology or pedagogy, approach it from their own particular
vantage point, leading at times to an appearance of confusion, though in fact
this is not necessarily the case. Nevertheless, the term bilingualism covers a

Perhaps the greatest area of difficulty lies within the field of linguistics,
accountable for maybe, by the general state of flux in which linguistic theory
finds itself. Most widely accepted linguistic theories to date are grappling
with the problems of understanding the functioning of a single language in the
mind of the speaker, taking structure as a primary end in itself, and
minimising the significance of language use (IfYMES. 1972: 272), though
there are of course theoreticians with wider ranging ambitions. Bilingualism,
on the other hand, must be able to account for the presence of at least two
languages within one and the same speaker, remembering that ability in these
two languages may or may not be equal, and that the way the two or more
languages are used plays a highly significant role. Consequently a theoretical
approach to bilingualism must of necessity have a broader and more all-
embracing vision of speech behaviour than one that concentrates specifically
and solely on structure. Much of the very reputable work conducted by
linguists into the purely structural aspects of bilingual speech has resulted in a
greater awareness of the phenomena of bilingualism, or of specific features in
a bilingual’s performance, but this has not necessarily led to any clear
awareness of the fundamental difference between bilingualism and
unilingualism—if it exists. This question will be investigated during the course
of our class meeting

As we have already seen from the definitions provided earlier it should
be made clear from the outset that the term bilingualism does not necessarily
restrict itself to situations where only two languages are involved but is often
used as a shorthand form to embrace cases of multi- or plurilingualism. There
is no evidence to suggest that the fundamental principles affecting language
usage are any different whether two, three or more languages are being used
by one and the same speaker, and the major question is whether they differ
significantly from cases where only one language is being used.

One of the most important distinctions to be made as the basis of any
discussion in this field is that between societal and individual bilingualism.
Societal bilingualism, an area extensively studied by FISHMAN (1966) and
his disciples, is strictly speaking, more involved with the sociology of
language than with sociolinguistics or pure linguistics as developed over the
past two decades but there are points of convergence which make the findings
of the sociological investigation of societal bilingualism relevant to the more linguistic issues implied in socio- and theoretical linguistics. In societal bilingualism the investigator is placing the accent primarily on understanding what linguistic forces are present in a community, their inter-relationships, the degree of connection between political, economic, social, educative and cultural forces and language. The scope of such investigation can be very wide and can lead to implications for language policy makers and language planners, educational strategists, social engineers and media or communications specialists. Basic to the study of societal bilingualism is the assumption that in complex, stratified societies many social differences are language-linked and that,

"... language plays an important role in the differential social distribution of positive and negative social values of both a material and symbolic nature." (JOLSETH, 1978: 801)

For the student of bilingualism the societal aspects often form the background canvas which determines the relevance of his enquiry by clarifying the historical and social processes which lead to the existence of bilingual individuals. Even the microlinguistic case study of one bilingual speaker must normally be prefaced by a contextualisation of the elements which brought about the presence of two or more languages in one speaker, often in the form of a simple case history, but sometimes leading to a complex description of both the background and the ways the two languages form part of the person's everyday life.

The point where societal or group bilingual studies diverge most from the investigation of individual bilingualism is in the cases where one is examining multilingual federations, nations or societies whose major component elements consist of unilingual individuals living in close proximity. Such multilingual states as Belgium and Switzerland are clear illustrations of societal bilingualism based on the principle of territorial unilingualism (MACKAY, 1976: 83) where the majority of the inhabitants are monoglots, though less obvious examples are those situations where isolated pockets of individuals do not speak the language of the majority of the inhabitants in their environment, as is often the case with immigrants. Even in multilingual societies of this nature, however, there are usually large numbers of individual bilinguals who function as linguistic mediators between the different groups present. It is these mediators who represent the link between societal and individual bilingualism.
One of the more comprehensive typologies of bilingualism that covers both major distinctions is that produced by POHL (1965), though some of the labels he uses have not gained the widespread recognition they deserve. Among the more interesting types he lists are the following.

*Horizontal bilingualism* occurs in situations where two distinct languages have an equivalent status in the official, cultural and family life of a group of speakers and is most frequently found, according to POHL, amongst upper-level speakers such as the educated Fleming in Brussels (using Dutch and French), the Catalans (using Catalan and Spanish), and certain Quebecois (using French and English). Although such speakers might functionally differentiate their language usage there could also be considerable overlapping where either language might be used in very similar circumstances. For POHL *vertical bilingualism* obtains when a standard language together with a distinct but related dialect, coexists within the same speaker though the more generally accepted term for this situation is *diglossia* which we will discuss later. This pattern can be found in many parts of the world including Walloon Belgium (Walloon and French), Germanic Switzerland (Schwyzer德utsch and German) and Bali (Balinese and Indonesian). *Diagonal bilingualism* occurs with speakers who use a dialect or non-standard language together with a genetically unrelated standard language, as can be found in Malaysia (Tamil dialects and Bahasa Melayu), Louisiana in the United States (Louisiana French and English), German Belgium (Low German and French) and amongst Maori communities in New Zealand (Maori and English).

The link between societal bilingualism on the one hand and individual bilingualism on the other can be sought in the question discussed by FISHMAN (1965): who speaks what language to whom and when? In cases where more than one language is being used by one and the same speaker we must find out what circumstances make him change over from the one to the other. The individual momentary choices must then be related to the larger stable patterns of choice that exist in the bi- or multilingual setting as a whole. This is done by examining the domain of language behaviour (e.g., the school, the family, the press, the administration), the topic of conversation within this domain, the role relationships between the interlocutors (e.g., superior to inferior, equal to equal, buyer to seller), the locale or setting of the interaction, and perhaps other factors (FISHMAN, 1972). If we now add to the multiple question of Fishman's put earlier that of how the bilingual operates in reality, we move more clearly into the field of sociolinguistics as developed by people like LABOV (1972) where grammatical structure is examined as forming a totality of sociologically and psychologically determined
interaction variables. The social psychological dimension of the whole question has been principally worked upon by social psychologists like LAMBERT (1971a) so that by putting these different approaches together we can begin to get a composite picture of bilingualism as viewed from various disciplines.

One of the most difficult problems the student of bilingualism encounters is that of pinpointing just how bilingual a speaker must be in order to be considered a bilingual. HAUGEN (1953: 7) has suggested that;

"bilingualism is understood... to begin at the point where the speaker of one language can produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language."

Although this statement may be intellectually adequate it does not seem to stand up to the test of common-sense reality. It is true that many people can make a "complete meaningful utterance" or two in a foreign language without in any way being able to function--be it ever so minimally, other than in their primary language. A taxi driver in Malaysia plying from the International airport to the city may not be able to count up to ten in Japanese but he can say "ohio guzaimas", "arigato", and "sayonara" which are complete meaningful utterances. Many Malaysian teenagers can also reel off the words of a popular song in a foreign language yet could hardly hold an elementary conversation in the same foreign language. Theoretically, of course, it is true that the bilingual process has begun with these manifestations of other-language usage, though it is unlikely that native-speakers of that other language would consider this as sufficient proof of the beginnings of bilingualism.

The above arguments should indicate that one of the most important factors to be borne in mind in discussing bilingualism of any type is that a notion of relativism must be introduced whereby the degree of bilingualism under analysis can be ascertained (ARSENIAN, 1937: 19). Now degree of bilingualism is not an easy thing to measure, though of course all language proficiency tests do this to some extent. However, such tests are usually geared to monoglot norms of a target language and often measure no more than discrete points of linguistic competence without really revealing to what extent the individual's functioning is adequate as a bilingual. The nature of the difficulties involved in this task can be gauged from the voluminous report by KELLY (1969) devoted to the description and measurement of bilingualism from which no clear-cut definitive guidelines can be traced though it is full of many useful insights.
HAUGEN's statement might be considered as providing a minimalist definition of bilingualism at the opposite pole to the maximalist viewpoint as put forward by HALLIDAY, McKINTOSH & STREVENS (1970). These authors talk of ambilingualism to describe the person who is capable of functioning equally well in either of his languages in all domains of activity and without any traces of the one language in his use of the other. For some people this type of person is the only "true" bilingual (THIERY, 1976) but in that case there may be very few "true" bilinguals around. As the discussion about ambilingualism is careful to point out, the complete ambilingual is a rare if not non-existent species since the implication is that the speaker in question has lived a double life in which all of his activities in one language have been or could be reduplicated in the other. Since language functioning, be it only on the lexical level, is closely tied to the activities and experiences one goes through in life it is highly unlikely that a person who has concentrated his time on a particular set of activities in one language has had equal opportunity to do the same in another. Thus a highly competent speaker of two languages, such as a professional interpreter, may well be able to pass off as a native-speaker in two languages with no traces of interference in either, but lexical availability is likely to be greater in one of the two in specific semantic areas. For even the ambilingual may find that when he is talking about a subject in a different language from that normally used to discuss it he may hesitate, perhaps only for a fraction of a second before finding the precise term needed to develop the subject in the less-used language. Although such a speaker may well have two sets of lexical items available in his memory store, functional specialisation of language usage will make those tied to one particular language more readily available than those from the other. Professional interpreters are trained to overcome this kind of difficulty but even these people are often found to work more easily from one of their languages into another according to the domain of activity, even if outside specific domains they are capable of functioning equally well in both directions.

The extent to which functional specialisation is connected to linguistic conditioning can be illustrated by looking at the example of the so-called natural bilingual who has not undergone any specific training and who is often not in a position to translate or interpret with facility between his two languages. By natural bilingual, also known as primary bilingual (HOUSTON, 1972) we understand someone who has picked up two languages by force of circumstances, either in the home as a child or by moving to a community where the speaker is obliged to work with more
than one language, but where no systematic instruction in two languages has been provided. The latter case is sometimes known as secondary bilingualism, i.e., where a second language has been added to a first language via instruction. The author Julien Green is a case in point. Although he comes very near to being an ambilingual in that he can read, write, understand and speak equally well in French and English his attempts to translate one of his own books led to failure. Thus although Julien Green represents a case of fluent and highly competent bilingualism this does not necessarily imply equal ease at handling all activities in all domains with the same facility. Functional specialisation of language usage can even lead to momentary mental blockages where this is least expected as when the perfectly competent bilingual who normally conducts a particular activity in one language is suddenly obliged to do so in another and cannot find the appropriate terms. The equation between a particular language and a specific activity may bring about a conditioning which impedes the ready availability of a term which in other circumstances may be on hand without hesitation. The sudden loss of ability to find a perfectly current term can even lead to situations where it is not only unavailable at the requisite moment in the "other" language but that its equivalent in the "primary" language (for that activity) also suddenly becomes inaccessible. The speaker may then be left with a precise image which he cannot render in either language except by some circumlocution. And yet to all intents and purposes this same speaker might well be a highly competent bilingual. What happens more frequently in such circumstances is that the expedient of borrowing from the language in which the activity dominates is resorted to, though this normally happens only if the interlocutor can interpret the borrowing. To illustrate this point is the example of a group of English-dominant bilinguals who worked in a French educational environment and referred to "ponderating" (Fr. ponderer) examination results in discussions in English, rather than using the term "weighting" with reference to marks. In theory this group of speakers' dominance configuration should have made the English term more readily available though in practice it was the contextual environment which made the French term intrude. We will look into this process when we come to the section on interference and code-switching but is used here to show up some of the difficulties connected with ambilingualism.

Ambilingualism should not be confused with equilingualism, though there may be points of similarity. Equilingualism, alternatively called balanced bilingualism, occurs when a speaker's master of two languages is roughly equivalent and where this ability may match that of monoalot speakers of the respective languages if looked at in broad terms of reference. On the
other hand, an equilingual may have a fairly balanced knowledge of two languages but is clearly discernible from two monoglot speakers, respectively, through possible traces of interference in both. In this case knowledge of the two languages is roughly equal but by monoglot norms of reference both may show signs of deviation. However, it might be that monoglot terms of reference are irrelevant in the examination of the bilingual ability of an individual who functions equally well in two languages in a given society.

Although we have queried whether monoglot norms of reference are relevant in decisions on whether a speaker is bilingual or not since they may well represent an exceptional, if not unattainable goal for the vast majority of users of two languages, yet they still tend to represent the beginning and end point of all discussions on the question for many people. If they represent an idealised and often exceptional measure of ability as is the case with the ambilingual, we might wonder how significant such types of bilingual proficiency are for investigation purposes. From the purely linguistic standpoint the ambilingual is not a particularly interesting case since there is nothing in the speech of such a person worth commenting on. In the hypothetical case of the ambilingual with a “perfect” mastery of two languages in all fields of activities with no traces of interference there will be no phonological, morphological or syntactic features peculiar to either language that will be distinguishable from the speech produced by separate monoglots. From the psychological or sociological point of view such cases are interesting, of course, since we would want to know how such a speaker achieves this feat and how this successful functioning in two languages affects his life, but from a purely linguistic standpoint there is little worthy of comment. The second point that makes the study of the ambilingual less relevant is that he is not representative of a very large class of bilingual speakers; the vast majority of people who by force of circumstances or by choice manipulate more than one language do reveal significant differences in the quality of speech produced, sometimes in both the languages involved but more often manifesting greater ease and ability in one than the other. In fact, it has been stated that the vast majority of cases are those of the non-fluent bilingual (SEGALOWITZ & GATBONTON, 1977) where clear divergences from monoglot speech are detectable in at least one of the languages used. Thus the non-fluent bilingual represents a more useful case for investigation in both sociological and linguistic terms.

The obsession with monoglot norms of reference has led to the notion of semilingualism, a variant of double semi-lingualism (HAugen, 1977), which has been particularly discussed by SKUTNABB-KANGAS & TOUKOMAA
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Semilingualism should not be confused with what HOCKETT (1958) labels as *semilingualism* and which he understands as receptive bilingualism accompanying productive monolingualism.

The idea of semilingualism has been based on comparisons of performance of Finnish immigrant children living in Sweden in their Finnish and Swedish with monoglot children living respectively in Finland and Sweden and noting that their ability in both languages shows signs of considerable retardation. The studies go further to indicate that this retardation on the part of the bilingual immigrant children, when compared with their monoglot peers, can become a permanent feature among the immigrants leading to social stigmatisation which may represent a life-long handicap to the psychological, social and moral development of the bilingual. The case of semilingualism is a problematic one on several counts, and may be attributable to the peculiar social circumstances of the Finnish immigrant in Sweden (and indeed other immigrant groups elsewhere) where ghetto-like conditions isolate the speaker from the rich linguistic environment of the host community, driving him back into the more restricted world of the home group. This home group, cut off as it is from the varied range of linguistic input that would have been available in the country of origin, could well be the origin of a certain atrophied language development in the child.

On the other hand, the imbalance in linguistic input from the two potential sources, Finnish and Swedish, makes it unlikely that one should expect equal and balanced mastery of the two languages in a way that is comparable to that of the respective monoglot peers. Moreover, studies of bilingual education in other parts of the world, although not specifically dealing with immigrants, contradict the evidence put forward to support the notion of semilingualism, notably the case of immersion programmes in Canada (SWAIN & BARIK, 1978). In immersion programmes of whatever type they may be (SWAIN, 1980) English-speaking children from middle-class backgrounds receive all their instruction, or else part of it, in French in the first few years of schooling yet do not become semilingual; although their knowledge of French is not comparable to that of their monoglot French-speaking peers they show no retardation in their development of English once the time factor is taken into consideration. When the level of competence in English is correlated with age and amount of input received it is found that any initial retardation is made up over a period of time. Children in immersion programmes end up by having an equivalent mastery of English to that of their peers and a better knowledge of French than children who had gone through a standard French-as-a-foreign language programme so that instead of being
The findings of SKUTNABB-KANGAS and others which have led to the idea of semilingualism have caused a certain amount of polemic amongst those involved in bilingual education. It would seem that the notion of semilingualism has been influenced by the deficit hypothesis put forward by BERNSTEIN (1971) in which the social class-determined notions of restricted and elaborated code account for different linguistic behaviour. However, the increasing criticism of the BERNSTEIN hypothesis (DITTMAR, 1976; AMMON & SIMON, 1975; LABO, 1970) and the sociolinguist's appraisal of the integrated nature of bilingual behaviour make it difficult to accept the notion of semilingualism in its crudest form without certain restrictions. For although many bilinguals' performance in two languages may well differ distinctively from that of two separate monoglots in terms of the totality of the range of abilities, the bilingual may well achieve a similar, if different repertoire. This aspect will be dealt with in greater detail later in this course. Although it may well be that the bilingual does not possess a complete repertoire of each separate language he uses, owing perhaps to functional specialisation determined by the circumstances of his life experience, his total range across both languages is likely to be similar to that of a monoglot. As long as the tools with which one measures bilingualism are those used for measuring the one speaker/one language behaviour patterns one is bound to come across some difference, lag, deviation, or whatever, in at least one of the languages involved.

Nevertheless the concept is perhaps a useful one if restricted to deal with those cases where, through social deprivation, a speaker is unable to acquire sufficient mastery of a second language in order to function adequately in that language and at the same time fails to develop, or loses control, of his first language through isolation or insufficient linguistic stimulus. In Wales situations like these are sometimes known as having "two second languages" instead of one first and one second. Cases like this may arise with young immigrant children as illustrated by SKUTNABB-KANGAS and TOUKOMAA, or with adult immigrants who are socially isolated in the host community and who fail to master the second language while they gradually
lose facility in their language of origin under the effects of time. With the latter cases it is often true, however, that renewed contacts with the environment of the language of origin, e.g. a prolonged holiday in the country of emigration, re-awaken dormant abilities after an initial period of re-adaptation.

The idea of semilingualism lies perhaps at the opposite pole from that of ambilingualism and should no more represent a yardstick for average bilingual ability than the perfectly balanced case. If only one of the speaker's two languages is inadequate by monoglot norms there is no case of semilingualism. If both of the languages are marked as different from monoglot norms there is still not necessarily a case for semilingualism since such norms might be irrelevant in a society where everyone shares the bilingually-marked speech patterns. The real argument for semilingualism is when the speaker cannot function adequately in either of his languages and such cases are usually determined by social or psychological factors which are reflected linguistically but not determined by language.

The emphasis that has been placed upon what the speaker has to do with his languages in the society in which he lives leads to the idea of functional bilingualism. This term can be interpreted in two ways, a minimalist and a maximalist interpretation. Under the minimalist interpretation a person can be called functionally bilingual if he is able to accomplish a restricted set of activities in a second language with perhaps only a small variety of grammatical rules at his disposal and a limited lexis appropriate to the task in hand. In this respect the idea is close to that of languages for special purposes, as, for example, when certain jobs require a minimal working knowledge of another language, e.g. airline pilot English as used at international control towers, the French of 'haute cuisine' for people in the catering industry. This type of linguistic knowledge is fairly easy to acquire, does not involve the intensive investment in time and tuition that a more pronounced and wide-ranging set of abilities involves and can be taught in specially designed courses that concentrate solely on the limited objectives of producing a speaker who can function primarily in his first language and over a restricted range in his second. The cost-effectiveness of achieving these limited goals has led to an increasing interest in the promotion of languages for special purposes and the creation of specialised working groups and journals to investigate this particular field (GOROSCH, 1978). Many people would not accept this minimalist interpretation, however, as representing a form of bilingualism.
The maximalist interpretation of functional bilingualism comes much nearer to widely held views on what is involved in being bilingual since it covers a wide range of activities and capacities in two languages. In this case the speaker is able to conduct all of his activities in a given dual linguistic environment satisfactorily. Note that there is no reference to norms in this explanation, since such a speaker may well use patterns that are completely alien to the monoglot reference group and show heavy signs of interference in phonology, morphology, lexis and syntax. However, to the extent that these do not impede communication between speaker and listener they do not get in the way of functional bilingualism. It may well be true that the majority of adult bilinguals who have learned their second language late in life fall into this category. Although they may not possess sufficient command of nuanced expression in the second language to operate in the same way that a monoglot would, they nevertheless succeed in understanding almost everything they read and hear, and speak and write sufficiently coherently for their interlocutors to appreciate their message.

The narrowing down of the range of ability implied in the preceding paragraphs leads to the notion of receptive bilingualism, which in itself could be considered as one form of functional bilingualism. This particular description fits the person who understands a second language, in either its spoken or written form, or both, but does not necessarily speak or write it. An alternative term for this case is passive bilingualism, though this is not favoured by specialists involved in language learning because it is felt that any language decoding activity implies active neurological processes where the mind is filtering and organizing the stimuli it receives into meaningful patterns. Receptive bilingualism is relatively easy to acquire, particularly for the older learner, and is a less time-consuming learning task in that it does not involve the laborious acquisition patterns that must be at ready command for fruitful conversation or written communication with a speaker of another language. Moreover, its long-term effects tend to be greater in that the ability to understand a foreign language can linger on far longer than the ability to speak or write. Indeed there are many cases of schoolday learners or university graduates in a foreign language who have lost the ability to communicate their ideas in the learnt second language but who have little difficulty in reading or understanding it.

Even native speakers of a language who emigrate to a foreign country and have little opportunity to keep their first language actively in use may, after a considerable period of absence from their home country, find that they are no longer readily able to communicate with ease in their first language.
They often have less difficulty in reading newspapers and letters from their home country or in understanding their original compatriots. This situation can arise even when the emigrant learns the second language after adulthood. Although some might consider this to be a further case of semilingualism it is rare for adult emigrants in this situation to have completely lost the faculty to produce utterances in their first language. What is often the case is that after a period of acclimatisation in the community of origin the language that has lain dormant for a considerable period of time is reactivated. This is a different case from that semilingualism of the type described earlier and it is a moot point whether one should, for example, consider the Estonian immigrant to the United States who may not have used his first language for thirty years or more in a productive fashion as a receptive bilingual in Estonian and a productive speaker of English. Under the correct environmental stimulus such as a holiday in the country of origin such speakers usually become productive again in their first language.

The case of the young child who is transferred to another linguistic environment at a very early age, say five years, is not quite the same. It is well known that young children removed to a community where there is no further stimulus in the first language can completely and rapidly lose the ability to manipulate that language or even understand it. It is not clear whether reactivation of the first language is easier in such cases than if the child had never had any knowledge of it.

The promotion of receptive bilingualism in teaching programmes is slowly gaining ground because of its manifest advantages merit in time investment. In many universities across the world courses in reading ability in foreign languages form an essential component of many studies. In certain circumstances receptive abilities in reading and comprehension are even used to foster cross-lingual communication among people who speak and write only in their first language. For this policy to be a viable proposition in cross-cultural communication it implies that two linguistic communities liable to have frequent contacts advocate the same policy of mutual receptive bilingualism and indeed this situation can be found in Belgium and Canada. In these countries public oratory is often conducted by members of parliament in their respective first languages but the services of the interpreter are often dispensed with for listening purposes. In this way two speakers may conduct a dialogue in two different languages yet both understand each other perfectly adequately. The advantages of this type of situation are that they allow each speaker to express his ideas with the precision of his national language ability and to conduct business efficiently.
A receptive ability particularly of the comprehension type, however, often accompanies a more limited productive ability and in circumstances where language loyalty is not involved or where great precision is less important there often arises a tendency on the part of one of the interlocutors conducting a dialogue involving speaking in a different language from the partner to switch to the partner’s language. This can be explained by the fact that for most people cross-language communication based on receptive bilingualism is an unrealistic situation in which it feels abnormal to conduct a dialogue in a different language from that used by the partner. The factors that determine the move away from communication based on this receptive pattern towards the use of one language for both speakers are multiple and include the degree of intimacy in the interaction (the more intimate the setting or relationship the greater the tendency to use the same language); the relative productive knowledge of each speaker involved (the one with the better command tending to switch more readily); the prestige of each language (the more prestigious tending to take over); attitudinal patterns towards each language (one community often expecting the other to be more or less bilingual than itself); the size of the group interacting (where the majority of speakers of one language might influence the minority present from the other language to switch to coalesced unilingual usage, though this is not always the case); and individual personality traits. A concrete illustration can be taken from the situation which might arise in Dutch-French interaction in bilingual Brussels. In the informal setting of, say, a cocktail party, speakers from the different language groups might well start off by using their own individual languages in communicating with each other. Very quickly this pattern may be broken with the likelihood that the Dutch speaker is likely to know French since it is tacitly assumed by both groups that the Dutch speaker is likely to know French better than his counterpart knows Dutch and because French may for a variety of subtle reasons be considered as prestige-laden. These factors may well combine to override the numerical strength of representatives of each language group present so that the presence of perhaps only one French speaker in the group could lead the Dutch speakers to switch. The above example should not be over-generalised but serves to illustrate the inter-relationship between societal and individual bilingualism in determining particular bilingual communication patterns.

The counterpart to receptive bilingualism is the situation where speakers not only understand but also speak and possibly write in two or more languages, i.e. productive bilingualism. Most foreign language teaching programmes are designed potentially to lead to productive bilingualism though
whether they do so or not depends to a large extent on the point at which one considers a person can handle the second language with enough facility to be classified as a bilingual. What is apparent from observation is that the development of receptive bilingualism outpaces that of productive bilingualism in the same way that its long-term effects seem to be greater. Productive bilingualism does not necessarily imply that the individual is capable of both writing and speaking two languages to the same level of proficiency. Such equivalent ability is largely determined by the learning circumstances. Some people are able to speak and understand two languages with almost equal facility without necessarily being able to write either of them adequately while others can write only one with any degree of accuracy though they may speak two. Certain productive bilinguals may be able to write relatively easily in two languages but not speak with equal fluency in two, though often the ability to use the written form productively implies relative ease in oral abilities. However, one need only think of scholars of classical languages to realise that it is perfectly possible to write in a language one does not speak. On the other hand, in the same way that receptive bilingualism may be restricted to oral/aural skills productive bilingualism need not imply biliteracy and indeed in many parts of the world where bilingualism is prevalent the speakers may not be able to read or write in either language. The classification of an individual as a productive bilingual makes no statement about his degree of competence in two languages since this is not a qualitative term. The user might speak and write his two languages in a manner that clearly reveals that he is not a monoglot user of either of them, or else he might speak and write only one of the two with traces of measurable distinctiveness. Since many biliterzite bilinguals who regularly use their two languages do so in clearly differentiated circumstances, it is perfectly feasible to envisage the productive bilingual who speaks language A better than he writes it and writes language B better than he speaks it. By “better” here we mean, of course, with greater ease or with less disparity from the monoglot norms of reference. Situations like this are prevalent in countries where formal education is conducted in a language different from that of everyday life, particularly if the home language has no written form.

The typologies discussed up to this point lead to the following possible combinatory patterns for bilingual ability across the four language skills.
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**Table 1. Patterns of Individual Bilingualism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Skills</th>
<th>Productive Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Production:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Production:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Skills</th>
<th>Receptive Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comprehension:</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Production:</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Production:</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POHL's (1965, 347) list of bilingual types includes symmetrical bilingualism which coincides with the notion of productive bilingualism discussed earlier with the difference that it implies equal competence in both languages (i.e. balanced). His description of asymmetrical bilingualism coincides with the different types of receptive bilingualism I have presented. It might be useful, however, to retain this label to describe the situation which at first sight may seem exceptional but in fact is not so rare. This is the case of the student of a foreign language who has probably learnt via a standardised model and can make himself understood (in spite of a trace of accent and certain structural or lexical inadequacies) but who has difficulty in understanding what is said to him by native speakers. The French student of English, for example, who lives in the north of England for the first time may have immense difficulties in understanding the inhabitants of, say, Newcastle, whereas the latter will have little difficulty in understanding their visitor. Although we are dealing with a form of productive ability on the part of our French student it differs from the standard situation where productive ability subsumes receptive ability; here there is obviously a receptive ability as far as standard English is concerned but this is not adequate for the Newcastle situation so that the idea of asymmetrical bilingualism neatly defines the circumstances. (Alternatively this could be described as one particular instance of bilingualism without diglossia, cf. p. 34). Usually this situation is only a temporary one to which rapid adjustment can be made. It might also be useful to consider as a form of asymmetrical bilingualism the situation in which one of the languages involved is no longer spoken, as with ancient Egyptian, so
that it is impossible to go beyond the receptive reading and the productive writing skills.

The different types of bilingualism examined so far show the relative nature of the concept quite clearly but say nothing about how well a person needs to master one of the four skills in order to be considered as bilingual. We have also seen that the minimalist definition of the onset of bilingualism is of little practical help in solving this question. A useful way of describing the pre-bilingual state is to talk of incipient bilingualism (DIEBOLD, 1961), which we would like to use as follows. Since it is generally accepted that receptive bilingualism precedes productive ability in the basic language skills there is some stage in the acquisition of a second language when the person is beginning to unravel the patterns of that language either at the decoding or the encoding level. This early or pre-bilingual stage can potentially lead to successful receptive or productive skills, the extent to which it does so depending on learning opportunity, amount of exposure to the second language and motivation to progress in its acquisition. It is possible that the majority of school learners of foreign languages can be considered as incipient bilinguals in that they are potential users of a second language but may never be in a position to want to use it or feel confident enough to do so in a real-life situation. Although still a somewhat imprecise notion it can be a useful way of describing people who have some knowledge of a second language which is not considered adequate for them to be ranged under the category of either receptive or productive bilinguals.

As one progresses through the different types and levels of ability, from the incipient, through the receptive to the symmetrical or asymmetrical productive stages one can see a pattern of increasing complexity of skills developing. The speaker whose ability to function in a second language increases with its use is in a position of ascendant bilingualism while if he no longer uses one of his two languages for a period of time and begins to feel some difficulty in either understanding or expressing himself with ease he is in a position of recessive bilingualism. The most typical example of the latter is the school learner of a foreign language who may have attained considerable skill but who in later life no longer has any contact with that language and gradually loses whatever ability might have been acquired. Such situations can even arise with people who have specialised in foreign languages, such as university graduates, or who have lived in a foreign country for a period of their lives but who later lose all contact with and use of a particular language. The older generation of Indonesians who under colonial
rule had a regular use for Dutch but who since independence have had less and less need for the language illustrate this situation particularly well.

It is useful to distinguish the two categories described above from similar designations which do not quite cover the same circumstances the same circumstances. The first is that of additive bilingualism as defined by LAMBERT (1974) in which the second language brings to the speaker a set of cognitive and social abilities which do not negatively affect those that have been acquired in the first language but where the two linguistic and cultural entities involved in being bilingual combine in a complementary and enriching fashion. Such a situation is brought about when the society in which the individual evolves attributes positive values to both languages and considers the acquisition of a second language as an extra tool for thought and communication. This form of enrichment language learning has been typical of the educated elite right down the ages (LEWIS 1976) from the time when the ancient Romans considered knowledge of Greek and Latin as an essential feature of the civilized citizen, through the Franco-Russian bilingualism described by Tolstoy under the Tsars to contemporary Singapore where Mandarin and English are given complementary positive status. Whatever the reality of the teaching situation may be it is also the principle of additive bilingualism which serves as the intellectual justification for much of the mass foreign language instruction conducted in the majority of monoglot schools today.

The opposite situation arises with subtractive bilingualism, where the second language is acquired at the expense of the aptitudes already acquired in the first language and where, instead of producing complementarity between two linguistic and cultural systems, there is competition. This situation is prevalent in societies where the socio-cultural attributes of one of the languages are denigrated at the expense of those of the other which has a more prestigious socio-economically determined status. This situation is often found where ethnolinguistic minorities are present and is most easily brought about when schooling, coupled with upward social mobility, is conducted in a language different from that spoken in the home environment. In its extreme form this can lead to the type of semilingualism alluded to earlier or else may have disturbing effects on the development of the personality. Subtractive bilingualism can also be the origin of socio-political tensions in communities where linguistic identification and language loyalty play a significant role, and it accounts for the present dwindling in numbers of Welsh speakers in the United Kingdom, the decline of Irish in Eire and even the domination of world languages like English and French in former colonial territories.
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Section Two

At this stage it should be pointed out that bilingualism need not necessarily be coupled with biculturalism, though most successful bilingual educative programmes strive to make the two coincide. It is perfectly feasible to learn a foreign language without acquiring any of the cultural attributes implicit in that language though the learner's resultant behaviour may appear somewhat strange to a native speaker of that language. Much of the friction across different linguistic communities can arise out of situations where speakers of two languages have acquired two sets of linguistic patterns but then proceed to use the second set with the cultural values of the first. At the least this can give rise to bewilderment on the part of the interlocutor who is likely to interpret linguistic cues as coinciding with the cultural implications which are familiar to him; at the worst it can lead to interpretations of ignorance, rudeness or arrogance. Moreover, the further one progresses in bilingual ability the more important the bicultural element becomes, since higher proficiency increases the expectancy rate of sensitivity towards the cultural implications of language use.

One frequent example of lack of concordance between bilingual ability and cultural awareness is in the misuse of taboo terms in the second language because their equivalents in the first language may be fairly anodine in connotation or because the speaker is not sensitive to the implications of the taboo terms in the second language. A more subtle illustration of the intertwining of language and culture is to be found in the difficulties encountered by speakers of German or Dutch with the correct use of "Please" and "Thank you" in English, to which they often attribute the functions of the German "Bite", "Danke schon", or the Dutch "Alstublieft", "Dank U". In German and Dutch the equivalent of "Please" is often used when handing something over and speakers of these languages often feel at a loss in English if this pattern cannot be carried over in the same type of situation. When they do so by using "Please", however, the speaker's reaction is likely to be one of interpreting the linguistic cue as an initiation to a request or to a requirement of further information, leading the listener to query this Germanc cultural feature by "Please what?". The uses to which "Thank you" are put also differ widely between English and other languages; for example, in turning down an offer in French "Merci" is sufficient to indicate that something is not required and can be interpreted as "Non, merci" whereas in English its equivalent "Thank you" is more likely to be interpreted as "Yes, thank you", implying acceptance. Thus it can be seen that without bicultural awareness the speaker can quite unwittingly achieve the opposite of the desired goal and may not communicate effectively in two languages. VAN OVERBEKE (1976: 115)
all this phenomenon "interference which affects sociolinguistic behaviour". Awareness of the cultural facet in language learning has led to the development of the theory of communicative competence (cf. pp. 38, 108) and serious programmes of bilingual education contain this bicultural element. Moreover, in many circumstances where mixed ethnic groups are in contact it is essential to actively foster biculturalism beyond that which might be inherent in the language component itself of a two-language curriculum in order to minimise the effects of subtractive bilingualism.

The illustration just given of the relationship between language and meaning leads to discussion of the preoccupation of psycholinguists with the semantics of bilingual speech and their account of some of the differences in usage between different types of bilingual speaker. Analysis of the relationship between signs and meaning was triggered off by WEINRICH (1953: 9-11) who distinguished between three types of bilingualism. In type A the signs of each language separately combine one unit of expression with one unit of content, e.g.

```
"book"
\[/buk/\]
```

```
"livre"
\[/livr/\]
```

In type B the signs combine one single unit of content with two units of expression, one for each language, e.g.

```
"book"
\[/buk/\]
```

```
"livre"
\[/livr/\]
```

In type C the meaning unit is that of the first language with its corresponding unit of expression and is the same for the equivalent unit of expression in the second language, e.g.

```
"book"
\[/buk/\]
```

```
"livre"
\[/livr/\]
```
Type C would be a manifestation of subordinate bilingualism and would describe the case of the bilingual who exhibits interference in his language usage by reducing the patterns of the second language to those of the first (PARADIS, 1977b: 238). Later research on WEINREICH's original analysis collapsed type B and C into one category with ERVIN & OSGOOD (1954) formulating a hypothesis whereby the original type A situation was called **co-ordinate bilingualism** and the types B and C together were called **compound bilingualism**. The new dichotomy has gained some anchorage in discussions about bilingual functioning but has led to increasing controversy and confusion with the passage of time so that it requires some attention in the drawing up of our typologies. ERVIN & OSGOOD's hypothesis was based on the environmental or acquisition context in which the languages had been learned. For a compound bilingual, where two sets of language signs were associated with the same set of representational mediation processes this came about as a result of having learned a foreign language in the traditional school situation (and via the intermediary of the first language) or else through the individual growing up in an environment where two languages were spoken more or less interchangeably by the same people in the same situations. For the co-ordinate bilingual, where the two languages correspond to two independent meaning systems, this came about by learning two languages in totally differentiated circumstances, e.g. one in the home and the other outside, or where the second language was learnt in a totally different cultural environment from the first.

It was the work of LAMBERT et al. (1958) and JAKOBOVITS (1968) which extended the dimensionality of the distinction so as to embrace not only aspects of the semantic functioning of bilinguals but also the lexical, syntactic, phonological, cultural and attitudinal aspects. However, in a critical appraisal of experiments designed to test the hypothesis MACNAMARA (1967) found both contradictory results and an inadequate explanation for the way in which the compound bilingual managed to keep his two languages apart. Attempts to accommodate these findings were made by concluding that the compound-co-ordinate opposition was a relative one more readily reflecting a continuum in which the same individual possibly behaves in a co-ordinate fashion during some activities or at certain periods of his life and in a compound fashion at other times (LAMBERT, 1969b). PARADIS (1977a) relativises further between compound, coordinate and subordinate to explain different types of bilingual behaviour. For JAKOBOVITS (1968: 31) the extreme example of a coordinate bilingual would represent linguistic schizophrenia where there is complete functional independence in all aspects of the speaker's two language
systems, while with the pure compound the two language systems are so fused that

"the second language represents a mere alternative channel for the overt manifestation of the same underlying system represented by the 1st language."

(JAKOBOVITS, 1968: 31)

In other words, the extreme example of a compound bilingual would be a translation machine!

Earlier experimental evidence, alluded to by Macnamara, had already raised doubts as to the adequacy of the hypothesis in predicting the separated (i.e. interference-free) use of languages by either compounds or co-ordinates as well as the difficulty in classifying people in either category. According to PARADIS (1977b: 244) compounding is mostly predominant in phonology in the speech of normal bilinguals, where the person uses one and the same phoneme in both languages as a blend of the actual phonemes of each separate language. An English-French bilingual, for instance, will produce an /i/ which is neither the English /I/ nor the French /i/ but a mixture of the two, and this in both languages. Consequently, to the extent that a subject possesses a compound system he does not speak either language quite like a native monoglot; this type of situation is encountered mainly amongst communities where two languages are in permanent contact and it might lead to a recognizable contact dialect of each language.

In spite of the attempt to clarify the distinction (e.g. by the reintroduction of the subordinate case by PARADIS) it would seem that the hypothesis does not allow for the reconciliation of conflicting cases of bilingual development. ERVIN & OSGOOD had indicated that the compound bilingual was one who had acquired the two languages in childhood in a context where both were used almost interchangeably by the same persons. Such cases do exist but fail to account for other speakers in the environment who might well use one language exclusively and who presumably also influence language development.

Awareness of the contradictory evidence surrounding the distinction led LAMBERT (1969b) to modify his original conception of compound-coordinate bilingualism so that
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"compound bilinguals were defined as those brought up in a thoroughly bilingual home environment from infancy on, while coordinates were those who had learned the second language at some time after infancy, usually after ten years of age, and usually in a setting other than the family." (LAMBERT, 1972a: 308)

Based on this assumption and on differences noted in ability between early as opposed to late bilinguals, BAETENS BEARDSMORE (1974a) suggested that the compound language system represented that which reflects the acquisition of 2 X L1 during the vital formative years of the child's linguistic development. This falls in with the ideas on the language acquisition device, or LAD, as put forward by CHOMSKY (1965: 56 and 206) and LENNEBERG (1967: 142-187) which indicate that there is a critical age of ± 11 years for the development of language in the monoglot. Language learning beyond this age appears to involve some different processes so that the coordinate language system would be that which reflects an acquired L1 during the formative years, to which has been added a learned L2 at some stage beyond the critical age of ± 11 years. The above differentiation between the two systems would perhaps explain how in the co-ordinate case the two languages might correspond to two independent meaning (and other) systems. It might also account for the interference-free behaviour of the compound bilingual who has not necessarily acquired only one set of representational mediation processes, but two, whose nature would still be different from the two sets (one acquired, one learned) of the co-ordinate.

The confusion around the whole issue of compound-co-ordinate-subordinate bilingualism has led some researchers to question the validity of the entire hypothesis. DILLER (1970), in a review of the literature, has noted that at least three contradictory definitions have been used and that experimental evidence does not confirm any distinction. He concludes that the notion of compound and co-ordinate bilingualism is a conceptual artifact, while SHAFFER (1976) further suggests that research into bilingualism should proceed without assuming that the distinction has been established. It would be wise to take these warnings into account, particularly since the careful investigation into bilingual neurological processes by ALBERT & OBLER (1978), although not discarding the notions, does not convincingly establish their significance.

The preceding discussion on different types of mental processes which may affect bilingual behaviour highlighted a significant difference between
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Section Two

early and late bilingualism. By early bilingualism is meant the acquisition of more than one language in the pre-adolescent phase of life, what HAUGEN (1956, 72) calls infant bilingualism, SWAIN (1972) describes “bilingualism as a first language”, and ADLER (1977) terms ascribed bilingualism. Late bilingualism occurs when the first language is acquired before the age of more or less 11 and further languages are learned at some age beyond this period (what ADLER (1977) calls achieved bilingualism). An alternative way for distinguishing between the time-determined types is to talk of consecutive bilingualism for the early cases and successive bilingualism for the late cases.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted into the acquisition of more than one language by very young children, succinctly overviewed in McLAUGHLIN (1978: 87). The pioneer in this field was RONJAT (1913) who described the bilingual development of a child up to the age of 4 years and 10 months in a situation where a clear distinction was made between language and interlocutor on the principle of one person = one language. Ronjat's son, Louis, learnt German from his mother and French from his father and went through the following developmental stages. Initially Louis' pronunciation seemed to be based on a unified phonological system in that his pronunciation was the same in both languages. In both languages there was a parallel development in phonetics, morphology and syntax and the child soon became aware of his bilingualism and translated messages from one language into the other. At a later stage in his life the child's usage reflected functional specialisation brought about in part by schooling, with Louis preferring French for technical expression and German for personal literary expression. His development was not accompanied by retardation in general linguistic progress and loans from one language into the other were isolated cases.

The most important analysis of early bilingualism is that conducted by LEOPOLD (1939-49) in which the author's daughter, Hildegard, was systematically observed in the first two years of her life and less systematically up to the age of 15 years 7 months. Hildegard was brought up in the United States in English and German (her father's language) and became dominant in English because of the richer environmental stimulus provided in this language. Although she showed considerable signs of interference in both languages in different phases of her development from the age of 2 onwards she too began quite early to use only one of her two languages according to the language of her interlocutor. Interference from English into German was particularly noticeable in the lexis and syntax but less evident in pronunciation, morphology and word formation. Again no negative effects
were found in the general linguistic and mental development of the child which could be attributable to the simultaneous acquisition of two languages.

A third significant investigation of early bilingualism is that conducted by RUKE-DRAVINA (1967) into her two children brought up in Latvian and Swedish. In this case the children were confronted with Swedish after their first language had been established in the home environment, but at a very young age, and Swedish represented the language of the outside world, friends, play groups, etc. As with the cases cited earlier these children began to distinguish between the two languages in their lives very early in life, towards the end of the third year. They kept both distinct in function, depending on their interlocutors. It appeared that the first language acquired, Latvian, maintained strong emotional ties, even when Swedish became more developed so as to dominate in lexical and structural complexity.

Two rather different studies of early bilingual development describe cases in which the second language gradually displaces the first (subtractive bilingualism), as frequently happens when young children are removed to a new linguistic environment and have decreasing contacts with their first language. KENYERES & KENYERES (1938) describe the case of their daughter, Eva, who spoke Hungarian (the family language) and a little German up to the age of 6 years and 10 months when she moved to Geneva and began school in French. After 10 months she spoke French as well as a native speaker except for a few deviant verb forms and French gradually began to take the place of Hungarian, continuing to develop in step with the child's intellectual progress. Interesting results from this study show how Eva manifested similarities with monoglot linguistic development as well as significant differences. It was noted that there was no transitional step by step build up of language abilities in the second language as occurs when children learn one language only, that there was more reflection on language structure, and that the first language often served as a support in the learning of the second. Unlike late bilinguals, such as adult learners of a foreign language, there was less reliance on the articulatory habits of the first language in acquiring the pronunciation of the second.

The second case of early (successive) bilingualism is that described by TITS (1948) of a Spanish refugee girl who was taken in by a Belgian family and who spoke only Spanish on arrival but was sent to a French school at the age of 6 years and 4 months. She rapidly adapted to her new linguistic environment, showed no signs of retardation in intellectual development or in her articulation of French and after 93 days declared to her guardians that she
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had forgotten her Spanish. The latter had tried to keep Spanish up in the home environment but with a relative lack of success.

The two examples just discussed reveal an interesting area of investigation for students in this field, namely that of language loss. It is known that this can occur swiftly and perhaps definitively with young children who sever all connections with their original language environment. What is not clear is whether relearning the original language at some later stage in life occurs with any greater ease than is the case with people learning a second language for the first time. A study of this type of situation has been conducted on a very young child (3-4 years) by Berman (1979) but more information is required on older people in similar circumstances. Nor is it clear how quickly the process of language loss occurs, what the critical age for avoidance of language loss may be or, in the case of adults who lose contact with their language of origin and become "rusty", how long it takes to re-activate the dormant abilities. Ancillary to all these questions is the study of language loss among late learners of a second language, i.e. the school learner of a foreign language.

It is generally accepted that early bilingualism has many advantages over late bilingualism from the viewpoint of linguistic competence in the two languages, though documented cases of the negative consequences of such cases do exist (Lebrun & Hasquin, 1971; Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa, 1976). However, it would seem that in most cases where the consequences are less positive they can usually be attributed to social and psychological factors coupled with educational strategies that have not sufficiently taken into account the many variables involved in achieving successful bilingualism. A critical appraisal of experiments, and their defects, which purport to reveal the negative aspects of bilingualism, particularly in education, can be found in Balkan (1970).

Many specialist studies have demonstrated the positive aspects of early bilingualism, both for the ease with which it can be achieved and the superior level of attainment when compared with late bilingualism, particularly with respect to the acquisition of a flawless, native-like accent and intonation patterns in more than one language. Lenneberg's (1967) analysis of the biological foundations of language, although devoted to monoglot circumstances, provides many arguments applicable to the early acquisition of two or more languages and reveals the great plasticity of the nervous centres relevant to speech in the pre-adolescent child. It also accounts for the gradual loss of language-learning ability with ageing, which perhaps explains the
apparent greater difficulty noted with late bilinguals in achieving a competence in the second language which completely masks influences from the first. Other neurolinguists (PENFIELD & ROBERTS, 1959; GLEES, 1961) have tended to confirm the relationship between the development of cerebral mechanisms and verbal behaviour which stress the fact that young children have a capacity for acquiring new linguistic mechanisms which older people do not have. According to TITONE (1972), although two languages can be acquired from the very onset of language development, the optimum age for the introduction of early bilingualism would appear to be between 4 and 5 years, particularly when the parents themselves are not in a position to provide the necessary input. At this age the imitative capacities of the child are at their highest development and receptivity to socialisation via verbal communication is at its greatest. TITONE (1972: 93-138) summarises the arguments in favour of early bilingualism as follows: motivation to communicate is very great with young children who also enjoy playing with language and are less inhibited than older learners in the manipulation of sounds, words, structures, etc.; young children have an extremely sensitive perception of highly nuanced differences in sounds, which coupled with their imitative capacities, lead to the ready assimilation of distinctive differences between languages which might escape the attention of the older learner. There is little evidence based on reliable experimentation that early bilingualism in itself can have negative effects on the development of the personality, though many observers have erroneously attributed to bilingualism personality problems which have become apparent or been exacerbated by bilingualism but which in fact may be due to sociocultural factors. There is also little evidence to show that early bilingualism need have negative cultural effects on the child, provided that different cultures are not presented as conflicting but are allowed to integrate harmoniously. This may be difficult to achieve in certain social conditions but should not be automatically considered as a bilingual problem. On the linguistic side early bilingualism may in the initial stages lead to a lower level of vocabulary development per language than in monoglots. This is only revealed, however, if one looks at the two languages involved separately. When both languages are examined the total lexis representing the total conceptual vocabulary of the bilingual child may even be greater than that of the monolingual (DOYLE et al., 1977: 28).

Many of the advantages listed above are more difficult to realise with the late bilingual, but not necessarily absent. Awareness of the differences between the two categories of speaker should lead to a more careful appraisal of how one sets about describing, measuring and promoting the same or
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similar goals. Strong evidence as to the difference between early and late bilingualism has been given by GENESEE et al. (1978), where in a small-scale but refined experiment the authors have shown how early bilinguals are less inclined to keep their two linguistic systems functionally distinct or segregated than is the case with late bilinguals. The experiment suggested that the phonetic, syntactic and semantic components of the adolescent bilingual’s language processing may be more differentiated neurophysiologically than those of the infant and childhood bilingual; with early bilinguals meaning appeared to play a pre-eminent role in the interpretation of lexical stimuli whereas late bilinguals appeared more able to circumvent semantic forms of processing.

The debate on the overall desirability of introducing bilingualism early or late in the child’s educative process has been refined to some extent by experimental evidence which revealed that in certain linguistic and cognitive skills the older learner was at an advantage. SWAIN (1981b) analysed test results for anglophone children learning French and showed how in some aspects of learning a second language the older pupil who had begun schooling in the foreign language at age 13 compared favourably with the younger pupil who had begun at age 5. The older learner was found to be superior in reading comprehension tests while the younger pupil was better in listening comprehension tasks; measurements using cloze procedures for testing grammatical competence revealed the two types of pupil to be almost equal. Interpretations of these findings were that the older learner is more cognitively mature, more able to abstract, classify and generalise in formulating and applying L2 rules; the older learner has already acquired the skills of reading and writing and needs only to learn the different surface realisations of these skills in L2. The older learner also has a greater “world knowledge” which he can transfer to L2.

In a further study designed to try and explain this difference (SWAIN, 1981b; CUMMINS, 1979; CUMMINS, 1980) distinguish between “basic interpersonal communicative skills” or BICS and “cognitive and academic aspects of language proficiency” or CALP, which are significant for understanding differentiated progress rates for early and late bilinguals. CALP refers to the demands inherent in the educational system, such as literacy skills, whereas BICS refers more to language use which reflects manifestations such as oral fluency, accent and certain aspects of sociological competence. SWAIN also argues that CALP is cross-lingual and that once its features have been learned they are applicable to any language context. In this way the older learner can more easily transfer the abilities required for handling
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decontextualised language as implicit in literacy activities, once they have been acquired in L1.

It should be noted that in the presentation of the different types of bilingualism so far great care has been taken to avoid mention of the "mother tongue". This has been deliberate since in many cases it is irrelevant to talk of a mother tongue in the widely accepted layman's understanding of the idea. To many, mother tongue often means the language best known which is assumed to be that first learnt. If one looks at the early infant bilingual there may have been more than one language from the outset so that neither is best known, while in other cases the language first learnt may, through force of circumstances not be the one best known in later life. Given that competence in the different languages may vary across time and also be determined by functional specialisation it is wiser to talk of a bilingual's dominant language in enquiring after the one representing greatest fluency. This may or may not coincide with the first language learnt, and in cases where two languages are continually used in a wide variety of circumstances may even be difficult to pin down. DODSON (1981) uses the concept preferred language as a substitute for the notion of dominant language, mother tongue or L1 since it brings out clearly the varying nature of bilingual proficiency. For DODSON the preferred language is determined by factors which change the significance of a given language across time, according to the subject's case history, and in line with subjective self-assessment of relative fluency.

Very little attention has been given to the other widely-used non-specialist ideas of "perfect bilingualism" since these tend to imply value judgements of linguistic ability which are often difficult to circumscribe. POHL (1965: 347) claims that it is absurd to talk about a perfect bilingual just as it is to talk about a perfect unilingual. In circumstances where it is felt necessary to make a distinction between the language first spoken or that in which the speaker feels greater ability it is wiser to indicate this in terms of dominance or preference, or if L1, L2, etc., are used, to show that the numbers refer to order of acquisition in consecutive bilingualism.

What has been discussed so far covers the range of possibilities from the minimalist starting point indicated by HAUGEN to the maximalist case put forward by HALLIDAY, McKINTOSH & STREVENS, as well as different levels of bilingual competence at any stage in between. It makes no restrictions about the nature, purity or equivalence in linguistic knowledge in either language, except the indication that communication must be efficient. It does not even imply that one has to speak a second language since the person
who speaks one but understands two can possibly communicate efficiently by means of two linguistic systems - in this case there is at least one-way communication from the speaker of language A to the listener who speaks language B but also understands language A.

The usefulness of this definition is that it allows one to view bilingualism as a cline with no clear-cut limits other than those of the pure monoglot at one end and the perfect ambilingual at the other. Its weakness is that one still has to place the type of bilingualism under discussion once the definition has been given. In this way the student of the question has to fix his own limits along the cline and accommodate his explanations within the framework he has set himself. On the other hand the definition can be extended to allow for the interpretation of bilingualism along lines that fit in with the investigation of what are generally considered monoglot speech communities.

The homogeneity of the monoglot speech community is never as clear-cut as superficial observation might lead one to assume, as has been shown by Labov (1972) in his investigation of New York English. Not only are there frequently considerable dialect differences within one speech community, but within each dialect group there are also significant varieties in language form according to the functions to which the language is being put. These functional differences, sometimes called registers, are the varieties of a given dialect that are conventionally distinguished by the subject matter or use to which the language is being put. The register of the law, or of the church, significantly differs in English from that of a letter or an informal chat and the differences may be of substance as well as of form. High Church Anglicanism, for example, is characterised by differences in grammar, lexis and pronunciation from any other form of English use, as for example in pronoun forms (Thee, Thou), verb morphology (The hour cometh and now is ... ), lexis (the handmaiden of the Lord, verily I say unto you), as well as the particular intonation often associated with corporate prayer. It might be argued that these differences are not significant when compared with bilingual behaviour across two languages, since many educated speakers of English can call on any of these relatively infrequent elements at will so that they form part of his global mental grammar of English. That he does not do so unless called upon by profession or proclivity is merely a question of availability, not of substance. Nevertheless, a vast number of native speakers of English are conceivably never in a position to place any of these elements in their speech with any more ease than certain types of bilingual who are expected to switch to another language according to function.
When one moves to differences in dialects within one language, one is confronted with a similar situation of formal and functional separation. It is well known that linguistic borders are quite often arbitrary, as are the groupings of dialect families under one national language umbrella. The inhabitants of the Dutch-German border area are respectively classified as speakers of Dutch or of German depending on which side of the national frontier they may find themselves. Yet internal evidence from analysis of the dialects in question often reveals that they are more closely related to each other than to the respective national languages under which they are classified. In other words it may well be that the Dutch dialect speaker on the western side of the common frontier has more features in common with his German neighbour than he has with a Dutch inhabitant of Amsterdam. It may also imply that the Amsterdamer has just as much difficulty in communicating with his compatriot on the Dutch border as he has with the German national on the other side. This situation has consequences for the notion of language distance by which bilingualism is sometimes measured.

Diglossia

As one moves through different dialect varieties of a language one moves along a scale of differentiation which may lead to the point of mutually unintelligible dialects. Once mutual unintelligibility has been reached one is faced with the same conditions as pertain to bilingualism. In many nations a situation exists where speakers of a dialect which differs considerably from the national standard are obliged to learn this national standard for purposes of education and wider communication beyond the region. Such is the situation in German Switzerland where a regional form of German, Schwyzertutsch, is spoken but where standard German is used in print, the media and education. Such cases of bi-dialectalism tend to be a one-way process in that the speaker of a standard variety of a national language rarely feels the need to learn the non-standard variety whereas the opposite is more frequent. Bilingual societies are similar in that usually only one of the groups in contact feels the need to learn the language of the other. It is rare to have stable two-way bilingualism in equal proportions across two language groups (MACKEY, 1976, 30). The bi-dialectal situation, more prevalent than is often imagined, has led to the notion of diglossia as put forward by FERGUSON (1959: 336).
"Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which in addition to the primary dialect of the language, which may include a standard or regional standard, there is a very divergent, highly codified, often grammatically more complex, super-posed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of literature, heir of an earlier period or another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal purposes, but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation."

Diglossic situations can be found all over the world, as in the Arabic-speaking countries where a High form of Arabic is used for education, religion and formal communication, and a Low form for informal contacts and local usage. This Low form differs from region to region and may vary so considerably from the High form as to be almost unintelligible to a speaker of a different Low form from another part of the Arab world. In Greece the demotic form of Greek is reserved for High situations and the katharevusa for Low situations, though the dichotomy is gradually being eroded. In Belgium it may be a Flemish or Walloon dialect that serves in Low situations with standard Dutch or French in High situations. The same holds true for Malaysia where the standard or High variety called Bahasa Melayu Baku is used interchangably with other Low varieties such as Kelantan Malay, Kedah Malay, Negeri Sembilan Malay, and so on. Some of these Low varieties are quite unintelligible and they deviate considerably in terms of phonetics, lexis, and syntax from the High variety.

The relationship between diglossia and bilingualism becomes apparent when one thinks of the rel - nip between dialects of one language and bilingualism in terms of the cline described earlier. If two dialects of an umbrella language are mutually unintelligible and differ considerably from the standard, one is clearly in a state of diglossia and theoretically at least in a potential state of bilingualism. FISHMAN (1967, 34) has stated that

"Bilingualism is essentially a characteristic of individual linguistic behaviour whereas diglossia is a characterization of linguistic organization at the sociocultural level"

and has drawn up a theoretical framework for analysing situations where either or both may co-occur in a particular sociocultural context. Thus one can have situations of bilingualism with and without diglossia and diglossia with and
without bilingualism as illustrated on the next page in Fishman's schematic representation:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diglossia</th>
<th>Bilingualism without diglossia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both diglossia &amp; bilingualism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingualism</td>
<td>Diglossia without bilingualism</td>
<td>No diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No bilingualism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diglossic component of this table, implying a subdivision into High and Low forms, fits into the bilingual component depending on whether the High language is genetically related to the Low or not.

To illustrate the possibilities represented in Table 2 we can look at the case of a complex urban setting such as Brussels where two standard languages are present, French and Dutch, together with dialect variants of each, some indigenous to the city and some brought in by Walloon and Flemish immigrants (BAETENS BEARDSMORE, 1979c). The linguistic forces present in the city can be broken down as in Table 3.

Table 3. Linguistic forces in Brussels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Speaker</th>
<th>Diglossia</th>
<th>Bilingualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indigenous upper-level French monoglot</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indigenous lower-level French monoglot</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indigenous bilingual</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indigenous Dutch monoglot</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Flemish immigrant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Walloon immigrant</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction to Sociolinguistics

The indigenous monoglots, be they upper-level French-speakers (category 1) or Dutch speakers (category 4 - these belonging to lower-level social groups since the upper-level indigenous Dutch monoglouts is a relatively rare occurrence in Brussels), share the features of no diglossia and no bilingualism. However, the French monoglouts will mainly use a High, prestige form, while the Dutch monoglouts, an ageing and diminishing sub-group, will probably use a Low, dialectal form of Dutch in most of their activities. Category 2, the indigenous lower-level French monoglout, may be diglossic (hence the brackets) if he uses a form of French marked by contact and interference features from Dutch in the more intimate aspects of his daily life, reserving the High form of French for official transactions; on the other hand, he may well only master the Low, regional form of French productively and only handle standard, High French receptively. His nearest counterpart is the Walloon immigrant to the city (Category 6) who may or may not be a Walloon dialect speaker in Low circumstances, using High French elsewhere. The indigenous bilingual (Category 3) generally speaks a Low form of a Dutch dialect in more intimate communication and some variety of French in High circumstances characterised by a certain degree of formality. Finally, the Flemish immigrant (Category 5) usually masters a dialect and a standard form of Dutch making him diglossic in the Dutch component of his social behaviour but he may also use French in High circumstances since this is the numerically dominant language in the city.

Although this overview is somewhat simplistic, it illustrates the complex intertwining of both diglossia and bilingualism in a small geographic area.

In a re-appraisal of the relationship between bilingualism and diglossia, FISHMAN (1980) added two further dimensions to the general debate. What intrigued him were the ethnocultural implications of the presence of two languages in diglossic functioning, bearing in mind that just as bilingualism is primarily concerned with individuals, so biculturalism is an individual asset or debit. Culture, for Fishman, refers to norms pertaining to all of human behaviour, belief and valuation. On the societal level of diglossic functioning, determined by institutional forces, there is a potentiality for di-ethnia, where ethnicity is to be understood as the more restricted set of behaviours, values and beliefs related to membership in a particular people. It would seem that di-ethnia is a rare phenomenon since it is difficult to reconcile ethnic values of say, black African society and white western society, though Fishman quotes the example of certain sectors of the Moslem world where traditional
behaviour, dress, diet and values dominate most of life but where modern economic and technical roles require different dress, diet and languages. Biculturalism, on the other hand, may or may not accompany bilingualism, as we have read earlier.

The complex picture that emerges from any discussion of bilingualism, where individual language use is closely inter-related with social forces, brings into focus the point made at the outset of my discussion on this topic that bilingualism is a relative concept with no clear cut-off points. If we accept that bilingualism is situated somewhere along a cline which ranges from non-diglossic monolingualism, through bi-dialectalism to the use of two distinct languages at varying levels of ability, then it is clear that some of the phenomena that have traditionally been considered as exclusive to bilingual behaviour may well manifest themselves amongst categories of speakers other than manipulators of two distinct languages.

SUMMARY

In an attempt to circumscribe the field of investigation covered by bilingual studies a typological frame of reference has been presented which clarifies some of the ambiguities inherent in over-generalised definitions of bilingualism. Particular emphasis has been placed on the fundamental distinction between societal and individual bilingualism, with the accent on the latter, though without neglecting the interlocking nature of the sociological and linguistic aspects of using two or more languages. Starting from a minimalist standpoint which defines the onset of bilingualism, different degrees and types of bilingual ability have been reviewed until the maximalist position is reached whereby bilingualism is equated with equal native-like mastery of two or more languages. For the individual speaker, examples have been given ranging from the initial stages of incipient bilingualism, through such types as receptive and productive bilingualism, ascendant, to indicate a progressive development, recessive, to indicate diminishing ability, additive and subtractive bilingualism dependent on the effect on the primary language, as well as equilingualism and ambilingualism which indicate different types of advanced ability. The relativistic status of bilingual ability has been underlined, highlighting distinctions between early and late bilingualism, and varying types of language dominance in the manipulation of the four basic linguistic skills. Attention has been carefully drawn to several polemical
questions in connection with definitions and typologies, particularly the arguments around semilingualism, compound and coordinate bilingualism. Within the larger framework of societal bilingualism individual cises have been described in terms of symmetrical, asymmetrical, vertical and horizontal bilingualism, leading into the discussion of the relationship between bilingualism and diglossia. In this field the linguistic aspects of dual language usage cannot be dissociated from sociological questions so that biculturalism and di-ethnia have also been taken into account as factors determining both degree of bilingualism and the nature of bilingual usage.
Interference and Code-switching

The preceding typology and analysis of factors intervening in the scientific discussion of bilingualism allow you to decide what specific type of bilingual behavior you intend to investigate - i.e. if there is any intention of doing any kind of investigation at all, and to narrow down the scope of enquiry to manageable proportions. In this section we shall pay attention to the purely linguistic elements relevant to such investigation. These must of necessity be those features which distinguish the speech of a bilingual from that of a monoglot. It could be argued that the speech of an ambilingual with perfect mastery of two languages which makes him indistinguishable from two separate monoglots is of no interest to you as a student of bilingualism since such a person will manifest no linguistic characteristics that can be investigated. Although this achievement may be of interest to the psycholinguist, particularly in the quest for an understanding of how this feat is achieved, or to the sociolinguist for an understanding of how such ambilinguals operate their two codes successfully, there is no significant evidence of deviance from the monolingual norm in either language. Your field of investigation lies with the more prevalent type of bilingual, the one who betrays his bilinguality in either or both of his languages. Here a choice will have to be made based on criteria discussed in the previous chapter as to what type of non-fluent bilingual one is going to investigate at a particular stage of development in the range of bilingual competence. It is clear that an examination of the speech characteristics of the incipient bilingual will differ significantly from that of the balanced bilingual, though there may well be points of convergence. At this stage, however, our task is to concentrate on identifying the specificity of bilingual speech in order to intensify our awareness of what it is we are looking at. Much of what will be said in this sub-Section One will be based on the pioneering work of Uriel WEINREICH's Languages in Contact (1953) and Einar HAUGEN's Bilingualism in the Americas (1956) both of which represent milestones in the development of the linguistic study of bilingualism to which we will add examples of more recent thinking. Although much of the work cited in this particular sub-Section had been carried out in the early 1950's, the findings and discussions generated are still relevant to us today, and I hope that in the spirit of wanting to know and how to improve our understanding of the positive and/or
negative aspects of bilingualism then dates will not pose any problem in our pursuit of knowledge.

Now coming back to our discussion on bilingualism and language interference, our major concern here will be with the observable features of bilingual speech. For if one examines the observable features, one is of course commenting on performance rather than on competence, to use the transformational-generative dichotomy. Such an approach might be called into question by the pure theoretician but it would seem that there is little choice open to the student of bilingualism since, as the previous discussion has shown, it is difficult to define the ideal bilingual speaker-hearer and his competence. Moreover, there are communities in many parts of the world where it is impossible to talk about an ideal speaker-hearer either in one or two languages who functions in a homogeneous group in the way posited by theoreticians of monoglot behaviour. There are tribes in the north-east Amazon where the normal scope of linguistic competence covers a control of at least four languages, a similar situation pertaining in South-East Asia where the ideally fluent speaker is often multilingual, though with restricted specialization of function in each language. It is cases like these that have led many students of bilingualism to reject the straightforward notion of linguistic competence as the quest of their investigations in favour of that of communicative competence as developed by HYMES (1972). For the field we are looking at this notion is of particular significance since it covers not only the knowledge possessed by the user of the formal code of a particular language or languages but also the social implications of choice within and across the languages involved. Both elements are important in examining bilingual behaviour since they allow for the examination of structure, together with use, and more specifically the way one speaker may use more than one language.

Therefore, in bilingual studies one is interested not only in grammaticality with respect to linguistic competence, but also in acceptability with respect to performance, which can be judged by providing answers to the following four basic questions,

a) whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible;
b) whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation available;
c) whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate (adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated;
In examining a bilingual's use of English using the criteria outlined above one would first have to find out whether other speakers of English do the same or similar things with the language in the same or similar circumstances or not. If the bilingual is in a monoglot native-speaker English environment the answers to the four criteria test may well be different from those that would apply in an English-other language bilingual community of the type found, say, in Singapore or Malaysia. The theory of communicative competence takes into account the interaction of grammatical systems (what is formally possible), psycholinguistic systems (what is feasible in terms of human information processing), sociocultural systems (what is the social meaning or value of a given utterance), and probabilistic systems (what actually occurs). CANALE & SWAIN (1980: 20) illustrate these points by showing how a given utterance may be ungrammatical with respect to a particular grammar (e.g. *the was cheese green* with respect to standard English), unacceptable or awkward in terms of a particular perceptual strategy (e.g. the *cheese the rat the cat the dog saw chased ate was green* with reference to a perceptual constraint on processing multiple centre-embedded clauses), inappropriate in a particular social context (e.g. saying good-bye in greeting someone), or rare in a particular community or situation (e.g. *saying may God be with you* instead of *good-bye, bye-bye, and so forth in ending a routine telephone conversation*). Now it could well be that in a bilingual community where English is one of the components of the majority of speakers' linguistic profiles different criteria of possibility, feasibility, appropriateness and actual performance apply and these could be accounted for in the same way that the examples quoted can be analysed for the monoglot English-speaking community, thereby allowing for a more comprehensive approach to bilingual behaviour than one based purely on linguistic competence. In so doing one can more readily integrate the observable features of bilingual speech into a theoretical frame of reference than is the case which relies on intuitive assumptions about the idealised grammar of a difficult to define ideal bilingual.

One claim is that the difference between integration and interference can be recognised by the phonological and morphological shape of the term under examination. If the term has been assimilated to the patterns of the host or recipient language it can be considered as integrated; for example, the original French word "liqueur" ['likoer] is often pronounced [lik'jue] in English. If on the other hand the term has not been completely integrated into the regular
patterns of the host language it can be considered as an element of interference. But this yardstick is not completely satisfactory. In bilingual communities made up of a large number of speakers who share the same linguistic background norms of pronunciation and word formation may not be the same as those of the respective monoglot standards since all speakers follow some bilingually determined patterns. Terms borrowed from one of the languages may in such circumstances follow standard monoglot norms, be realigned on patterns determined by the borrowing language or fall somewhere in between the two according to some community-based bilingual norm. The sociolinguist might argue that decisions on interference or integration depend on both the formal aspects and the frequency and nature of usage in a particular community. Take the case of certain borrowings in the French-Dutch contact situation of Brussels. Many highly educated, monoglot French speakers in Brussels use the Dutch term "sterput" to indicate "a draining well, cesspool" instead of the standard French "puisard". Depending on their degree of sensitivity to pronunciation features they may render this as [ster'pyt] or [sterfpyt], the first being more "French" in form than the second. Now by monoglot norms of reference "sterput" can only be considered as an interference element replacing "puisard", yet the fact that "puisard" is either not known or not used in French in the Brussels context implies that "sterput" must be considered as an example of integration since the alternative form from standard French is absent in the community. Thus by sociolinguistic criteria the shape of the word does not influence its categorisation as an integrated form since that form nearer to the original Dutch pronunciation, ['sterfp tj], is also used by some. (Perhaps you can also start thinking about some of the words that we use in our everyday communication here in Malaysia: are they "interference" or "integration"?).

From the above it can be seen that integration is a question of degree, the more a particular term of foreign origin is used in a bilingual’s speech (and also in that of the monoglot too) the more integrated it must be. MACKEY (1976) suggests that the range of integration can be measured on a usage scale going from 0 to 100%, with the lower end of the scale tending to reflect interference and the upper end integration.

This illustration of the distinction between integration and interference has been taken from the lexis but it is useful to enquire whether the same distinction does not hold good for other levels of linguistic analysis. The whole question will depend on the type of bilingualism under investigation and the methodology being applied. If one is studying the speech of an ascendant bilingual during some transitional phase there are likely to be
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phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical features in the second language which clearly owe their existence to patterns in the first language. In terms of interference and integration the second language which is undergoing the borrowing is known as the recipient language while the first is known as the source or donor language. Thus a foreign accent in the second language may be considered as reflecting interference from the first or donor language if one is using monoglot norms of reference. The examination of speech of representatives of stable bilingual communities in which accent or any other feature is often marked as revealing bilingual characteristics may be a different case. Here the community norms prevalent in the bilingual society may be more significant than monolingual reference points, in which case the marked distinctive features possibly reflect integration rather than interference. If large masses of speakers in the bilingual community share the same distinctive speech characteristics they have probably been stabilised and integrated into regional speech patterns.

Question:

Consider the situation in Malaysia, does any of the languages spoken here bear the mark of “recipient,” or “donor,” or both?

The interference/integration dichotomy becomes more important when one turns to what might be called residual bilingual communities, as in a society where large masses of speakers have shifted from using one language to the exclusive use of another via an intermediary bilingual phase. Mass language shift of this type can occur as swiftly as in three generations with the first generation using language A exclusively, the second being bilingual in languages A and B, and the third being unilingual in language B (VAN LOEY, 1958). Immigrant communities often undergo this process, brought about by subtractive bilingualism operating in the middle generation, though it also accounts for the anglicisation of large parts of Wales and the shift from Dutch to French predominance in Brussels. If one examines the type of French spoken today in Brussels it will be readily distinguishable from that used by a Frenchman whether his Belgian counterpart is a bilingual or not. This distinctiveness noticeable even among the majority of monoglots in Brussels cannot directly be attributed to interference since they know little or no Dutch, though historically speaking what distinguishes Brussels French from that spoken in France is attributable to Dutch influence. Thus, what was originally a question of interference must now be considered as one of integration.
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For certain purposes of investigation it is useful, however, to examine data initially on the assumption that specific features noticeable in bilingual speech represent interference, even if at some later stage the investigator might wish to reconsider his data as representing integration. This is particularly true if the aim is to highlight the specificity of bilingual speech as opposed to that produced by monoglots. In the lexical field it appears that interference can take on different forms and will affect different lexical categories in varying ways. Most studies of lexical interference have revealed that nouns are most easily transferred from one language to another while structure or function words are less easily transferred (HAUGEN, 1956: 59). Between languages that have similar syntactic patterns it appears that after nouns it is verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and interjections which are transferred in decreasing scale in the order listed, with pronouns and articles showing the greatest resistance to transfer (HAUGEN, 1972, 177). When transfer does occur it may take different forms. Nouns may retain their source language shape, be partially assimilated to the recipient language or be complete loan translations, whereas verbs, adjectives and adverbs are less likely to keep their original form in the process of transfer.

A fairly well established classification of the different types of transfer, a term preferred to that of the more widespread borrowing in that it is neutral in connotation (HAUGEN, 1958: 534), has been provided by HAUGEN (1956: 59-60). This classification is based on the degree or manner of integration of a particular element. On the phonemic level there is a division into unassimilated loans (where there is no adaption to the phonology of the recipient language), partially assimilated and wholly assimilated loans. Coupled with this phonemic division is a morphemic distinction between loans that show no morphemic substitution, those that show partial substitution and those with total substitution. An item that shows no morphemic substitution is known as a loanword. An illustration of this is the name given to the game of darts in Brussels French as a replacement for the standard French "fléchettes". Many Brussels bilinguals use the Dutch-origin word "vogelpik" in their local variety of French. Whether the term is phonologically assimilated to French, giving the pronunciation [vogelpik], or pronounced on the local Dutch dialect pattern [vougalpik], will depend on the individual speaker's social origins, linguistic background and general sensitivity to French phonological patterns. In cases where only part of the phonemic shape of the transfer is imported these are known as hybrid loanwords or alternatively, loanblends, illustrated by the English "plum pie" adopted in Pennsylvania German as [blaumepai], where the English morpheme [pai] has been imported but the local German [blaume] has been substituted for "plum" (HAUGEN, 1972: 165).
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Section Two

The third classification for a transferred lexical item is that of loanshift in which morphemic substitution occurs without any importation from the donor language. Loanshifts are alternatively known as loan translations or calques. The English "skyscraper" has been imported into Dutch as "wolkenkrabber", into German as "Wolkenkratzer", into French as "gratte-ciel", into Spanish as "rascacielos", into Bahasa Melayu Baku as "pencakar langit", all of which are illustrations of loanshifts. The term loanshift has also been used to describe the semantic displacement that occurs when a native term is applied to a novel cultural phenomenon that has been imported and is referred to by an existing term in the recipient language that acquires new semantic features. Thus American Portuguese uses "pêso", originally meaning "weight" in Portuguese, with the significance of "dollar". It is perhaps wise to distinguish between a loanshift of this kind and the case where semantic confusion arises between words of similar form in both source and recipient languages, so as to be near homonyms, but with clearly distinct semantics.

Many French speakers of English, even with an advanced knowledge of English, frequently use the English "library" with the meanings of the French "librairie" = "bookshop", leading to semantic ambiguity. Many similar examples among second language learners could be found, and although such cases are evidence of loanshifts it would perhaps be clearer to refer to them as loan translations which reveal influences of what VAN OVERBEKE (1976: 120) calls both inter- and intralinguistic interference; by interlinguistic interference is meant the obvious connection between French and English in the above example, while by intralinguistic is meant the analogical semantic process that is in operation within one of the languages involved, in this case English, and where the semantics of library is re-aligned under the influence of the relationship to books. Interference of this subtle type increases in proportion to the degree of similarity of features between the two languages. In other words, the greater the difference between the two languages the easier it is to keep lexical items apart and interference-free.
Question:
Do we also have loanblends or hybrid loadwords, and calques in any of the languages used in this country? Examples?

Continuing on the assumption that lexical transfer, whatever form it may take, is to be measured in terms of the donor and recipient languages seen as idealised norms, we may note with interest what areas of human activity lend themselves most readily to transfer. What indicators can we observe that allow for the transfer of words?

The relative prestige of the two languages involved, it would seem, will determine their permeability to transfers and also the nature of transfer. It is generally felt that the more prestigious language transfers more readily to the less prestigious in terms of quantity, though other elements discussed later may affect this general principle. Factors determining the relative prestige of two languages are sociological in nature and often shared by the whole community. It is the relative high prestige held by English in Uganda which accounts for the Luganda borrowing from English of "doctor" in the form "ddokita", even though the indigenous term "omusawo" could cover the same semantic functions adequately (MOSHA, 1971: 293).

A further illustration of the transfer of elements from a less prestigious to a more prestigious language (in the eyes of the speakers of the latter, of course) can be seen from the fact that the French used in Switzerland readily borrows terms of German origin to disparagingly designate women, thereby increasing the pejorative association connected with the use of the transfer. Cases of the type discussed have been called "loans of convenience" (VALKHOFF, 1931: 9) since they are determined by affective associations connected with the transfer rather than any lexical inadequacy in the recipient language. A "loan of necessity" (VALKHOFF, 1931: 9), on the other hand, is a transfer used when no precise equivalent exists in the recipient language. Generally, such transfers designate culture-tied phenomena and may move in either direction between greater and less prestigious languages. A technically and economically more advanced language community tends to export more
culture-tied terms than a less advanced community, primarily because newly developed concepts and objects are accompanied by their designation—loosely stated, word follows the thing”. It is this phenomenon that explains the historical enrichment of a language via transfers, as when Welsh imported words of Latin origin when Roman influence on the British Isles brought with it such novel institutions as the church (Latin “ecclesia”> Welsh “eglwys”) or technical improvements like the bridge (Latin “pons”> Welsh “bont”). More recent equivalents are such French transfers from English as, “le marketing, le briefing”, or the Luganda borrowing from English of a term designate baptism, “bbatismu”, an activity not indigenous to Luganda to society (MOSHA, 1981: 292).

In cases where borrowing from another language leads to enrichment and reinforcement of the recipient language's lexical stock one might talk of positive transfer (as with the examples “eglwys, bont, bbatismu”) whereas cases of borrowing which affect the norms of the recipient language might be examples of negative transfer. The value judgement implicit in these designations should be handled with care, however, if one is trying to establish what bilingual community norms may be independent of monoglot terms of reference.

Perhaps more important for the nature of bilingual speech than prestige, convenience and necessity in the explanation of lexical transfer or interference is the question of the amount of contact, or, pressure from one linguistic group upon another. Many of the above examples can be found in what are traditionally considered as monoglot speech communities though at some stage bilingual speakers must have acted as mediators to allow for the penetration of the term of foreign origin into general speech. It is of interest to capture this mediating phase by looking at the circumstances which determine the bilingual's use of transfers where the monoglot would not normally do so. This happens when there is frequent contact between two linguistic communities. Loans can potentially occur in any field of human activity but seem to be determined by the following criteria:-

a) The nature of the activity indulged in by the bilingual; if a subject which is normally and regularly handled in one language infrequently gets discussed in the other the speaker might find lexical availability in the other language impaired. Thus a scientist who normally conducts his research in English may readily use English terms in discussing the same subject in another language. (This might be one explanation why so many
b) The frequency of contact between two language communities; the bilingual may well have terms readily available which are indigenous to either of his languages but more frequent contact with an area of activity in one language may lead to an automatic use of language A's terminology in language B settings. Thus although the Dutch term "zegel" is familiar and widespread in the Brussels bilingual setting one will often hear the French term "timbre" [tember] used in the local spoken Dutch.

c) The frequency with which the individual bilingual uses his two languages can also affect transfer; the language used less frequently is more likely to reveal elements of interference or borrowing than that used more frequently as when long-term emigrants have temporary difficulty in re-adjusting their lexis when they are using their pre-emigration language. This may even lead to one or two startling examples of transfer, as noted in the case of a Dutch-English bilingual who spoke only Dutch for the first thirty years of her life and predominantly English for the subsequent thirty years; during the first few days of return to her community of origin she regularly introduced the conjunctions "and" and "but" into otherwise Dutch sentences.

It should be noted that these three criteria are closely inter-related but not quite the same. It would appear that social circumstances of the above type determine the quantity of transfer though it is likely that structural forces within the two languages in question determine the nature and form of the transfer. To date there is little empirical evidence to bear out this assumption (HAUGEN, 1972: 179).

The different criteria alluded to may to a large extent determine whether a transferred element will take the form of a loanword, a loanblend or a loanshift, but this will also be tempered by individual characteristics of the speaker. Such things as degree of sensitivity to language in general and awareness of the norms in the two languages being manipulated come into play, as do level of education, literacy; and personality factors such as adjustment to the interlocutor's mode of speech.

Investigation into the semantic effects of interference is more difficult than the simple observation of lexical interference in cases where no formal
features can be seized upon in the flow of utterances. It may often be only in the course of time that a listener may become aware of the fact that, as the dialogue proceeds, the semantics of the terms being used may differ from those monoglots would ascribe to the same terms. It is even possible that such differences may not be noticed at all, apart from some general feeling of misunderstanding or lack of communication between two speakers, in spite of apparent lexical clarity. This is particularly true if the divergences exist not on the denotative level but on the connotative level of meaning, leading to connotative interference.

The classical example of the way bilingualism can affect the semantics of a term is taken from an examination of the colour spectrum. It is a well-established fact that different languages identify the range of colours in the spectrum in different manners so that there is no necessary overlap in the cut-off points between one colour and the next when a given pair of languages are compared. Welsh, for example, has two terms for distinguishing shades of green which do not coincide with their English counterpart; **gwyrrd** = 'green', and **glas** = 1) 'blue', 2) 'green', for natural objects like 'grass, leaves, etc.', which is used with a transferred meaning of 'young' in **glastan** = literally 'green lad, youngster'. A Welsh-speaker is likely to use two different terms to cover hues of green where his English-speaking neighbour will not distinguish between certain shades. The bilingual Welsh-English speaker, on the other hand, may use the English terms blue and green when using that language to coincide with the semantics of the equivalent Welsh terms. Differences of this nature have been illustrated in an experiment on semantic shift in bilingual speech (ERVIN, 1961a) in which Navaho Indian bilinguals were tested to see to what extent their naming of colours differed from that of Navaho and English monoglots respectively. Interesting results showed that choices among the bilinguals were determined by their dominant language. Navaho-dominant speakers using English, designated hues nearer to the Navaho range of classification while English-dominant speakers did so nearer to the English range. In cases where one language divided a range into two categories (e.g. blue and purple) and the other into three (e.g. violet, lavender, purple) it was found that bilingual speakers, in comparison with monoglots, tended to reduce the range of the middle category when speaking the language in which this was present. (We will be looking at this again when we go to Section Four: under Language, Thought, and Culture).

Bilinguals who are sensitive to language norms in their two languages and who are aware of potential problems with terms which have a formal similarity may also use strategies for minimising interference which are not
always successful. It requires a relatively high degree of cultural sophistication in both languages for a speaker to afford the structural luxury of maintaining separate subphonemic habits in each.

Although there may be superficial similarities between interference and code-switching, particularly with respect to the lexis in general it would seem that interference is determined by internal linguistic factors whereas code-switching is determined by extra-linguistic factors. Bilingual speakers with more than one language at their disposal may choose to use the whole repertoire of linguistic elements available where the monoglot might interpret the inclusion of elements extraneous to one of the languages as manifestations of interference. Whatever interpretation is given will depend on the norm one is using as a reference points, FISHMAN (1965a: 67) stresses the fact that the habitual language choice in multilingual speech communities or networks is far from being a random matter of momentary inclination or "inadequacy" (i.e. interference) and that "proper" usage in such communities indicates that only one of the theoretically co-available languages or varieties will be chosen by particular classes of interlocutors on particular kinds of occasions to discuss particular kinds of topics. Thus in bilingual communities certain elements extraneous to a particular language may be inserted by choice rather than unwittingly.

In a study of Malay-English bilinguals (ABDULLAH, 1979) it was noted that the following factors were decisive in determining whether "foreign" elements appeared in one of the languages available: whether the personal repertoires of the interlocutors were equal or not; whether certain personal characteristics were shared which led to the forming of a homogeneous group; the degree of intimacy or friendship; the setting or the locale, since formal situations tend to encourage linguistic purism; the topic which determined whether certain subjects were better handled in one language rather than the other. ABDULLAH noted that in specific circumstances greetings, introductions, farewells and invitations tended to prevail in Malay while discussion concerning studies led to exchanges in English. In conversation in Malay, English was often used to refer to concepts that are specifically Western and the insertion of English elements in a Malay conversation demonstrated a certain degree of intimacy, on the basis of shared knowledge, between the participants. The following example from ABDULLAH shows this process in operation, where the English elements are not really questions of interference but of code-switching determined by extra-linguistic phenomena:
"I already know the size of my clothes; I know it by heart...."

Similarly, in a Malay context the word to indicate "wife" may be the English term replacing the Malay possibilities of "isteri", which has very formal connotations, or "bini" which may have crude connotations, to circumvent potential offending signals. One of the more interesting cases of transfer in the Malay-English bilingual context is the use of the English personal pronouns "I" and "You" in discourse between Malaysians bilinguals in a conversation conducted primarily in Malay. It has been noted earlier that pronouns tend to be highly resistant to interference effects and in this context the choice of a foreign pronoun is deliberate not accidental, thereby not reflecting interference. Consider the following italicised pronoun usage:

"You ambil dua setengah gula"

"I suruh dia buat Masters, jadi dia buat Masters"

In the second quotation the English pronoun "I" is used alongside the Malay third person pronoun "dia" = he/she. Now the latter Malay pronoun is seldom replaced by its English equivalents so that the explanation for this complex case of mixed language usage has to be sought in terms of codeswitching rather than interference. The Malay pronoun system is involved and is determined by rank or status; in face-to-face interaction a superior or senior may use personal pronouns when addressing an inferior or junior but the reverse is considered unacceptable. By inserting English pronouns for first and second person reference neutral implications are involved with respect to power, seniority or respect, something already present in the third person Malay pronoun "dia". This is an outstanding and popular feature of codeswitching among Malay bilinguals.

The above examples show code-switching operating as a fairly conscious device and this is even more so when it is done for rhetorical purposes. RAYFIELD (1970: 54) feels that this stylistic function is one of its most important traits. Literature has made ample use of this technique with such noteworthy examples as the insertion of French in Shakespeare's Henry V and Tostoy's War and Peace (for a detailed account of code-switching in the latter, see TIMM, 1978). In contemporary spoken language it has been noted as a device for emphasis through repetition in another language,
"Going so soon! Cepatnya!"
for emphasis by contrast,

"I know it by heart, tapi buat tak tahu"
or to make a parenthetic statement,

"I bought a rubber estate on credit.
Really? Pandai orang tua ni"

(The last three Malay-English examples are taken from ABDULLAH, 1979).

The above illustrations clearly contradict the statement made by
WEINREICH (1953: 73) that:

"the ideal bilingual switches from one language to the other
according to appropriate changes in the speech situation
(interlocutors, topics, etc.), but not in an unchanged speech
situation, and certainly not within a single sentence. If he does
include expressions from another language, he may mark them
off explicitly as 'quotations' by quotation marks in writing and
by special voice modifications (slight pause, changes in tempo,
and the like) in speech".

Before turning definitively away from the question of interference we
should stop to look at situations in which more than two languages may
interact. Interference between the different codes available in these
circumstances, although "...swing the general principles already outlined in
this discussion, are not necessarily determined by the primary or dominant
language. In complex multilingual societies as prevalent in South-East Asia or
Africa the relative dominance of the different languages in a speaker's
repertoire may not coincide with any chronological order of learning. The first
language learnt may be restricted to intimate family life and be accompanied
by a regionally more important second language at the onset of schooling.
The effects of peer-group interaction and schooling may combine to outweigh
the significance of the primary vernacular in the direction of interference and
code-switching. If at the onset of secondary schooling a third language is
introduced producing a triglossic situation of the type described by TSOU
(1981) it may well be that the chronologically learnt second language is the
source of interference in the third. This may even be the case when the
chronological second language is less dominant than the primary language.
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As CHUMBOW (1978) has pointed out with illustrations from Nigeria and the Cameroon, although the determinants of transfer are the same irrespective of the number of languages involved an interweaving of linguistic and extra-linguistic variables decides which of the languages serves as the source of transfer.

When only two languages are involved the most significant criterion specific to multilingual interference of the type under discussion is the degree of structural and phonological interrelatedness between the languages under manipulation. West African students from Nigeria, who on top of their primary vernacular, Yoruba, learn Hausa, English and French at school, often show greater interference from English in their French than from Yoruba. The speaker's perception of cultural or ethnic relations between his different languages may be an extra factor in determining the direction of interference. CHUMBOW shows that the two genetically related African languages, Yoruba and Hausa lead to greater interference from Yoruba in Hausa than from Yoruba in French, even though the medium for instruction of Hausa is English and not Yoruba. In Brussels, where French-dominant students had to learn Dutch via intensive methods, i.e. four hours per day, subsequently followed by intensive English instruction, sources of interference in English were often from Dutch as well as from French. When the order of foreign language learning was reversed amongst a similar French-dominant population, i.e. intensive English followed by intensive Dutch, the English origin interference phenomena were equally significant. Here then, we have a case of classroom ascendancy of one language over another, together with genetic inter-relatedness, leading to a strong source of interference equal to that of the primary language.

Question:
Can you think of similar situations in Malaysia? Which two/three languages are you referring to?
To conclude it must be noted that bilingually marked speech patterns are
determined by a complex set of factors, some of which are purely linguistic,
others not, some of which lead to clear cases of interference, others leading to
manifestations of code-switching, and that there may be apparent overlap in
the formal properties of interference and codeswitching.

Answer the following questions. Your response should be typed, double-space
using Times New Roman font size 12 (or nearest equivalent in other fonts) and
kept in a folder.

This folder will not be passed up to the instructor but will be used to place all
your written responses to questions following specific sections or chapters
read for this course. Please keep your folder up to date.

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS

Question 1:
Give 4 examples each of a loanblend, loanword, and a loanshift in any
language spoken in Malaysia.

Question 2:
Why do people code-switch? Give 3 examples and state reason why the switch
is made. Which age group switch more often. Why?

Question 3:
The sentence “Could you send me home, please?” is definitely an example of
Malaysian English. Monoglots would say “Could you take me home, please?”
Is this a case of linguistic interference or integration? Explain.
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The nature of language

Since sociolinguistics deals with language and the society that uses that language, we are therefore bound by the fact that we need to know more about language, what it is, and how it affects the society that uses it.

Models of language

There seems to be fairly general agreement among linguists that language is a system which relates meaning to sound, whether in the action of speaker or hearer. Presumably the speaker has some meaning which he wishes to convey. He utters certain appropriate sounds. The other person hears these sounds and tries to derive the meaning expressed by the speaker. How this actually occurs is the object of study in the field of neuro- and psycholinguistics. Linguistic is, in the simplest terms, trying to find out what happens when people speak and when they listen.

The principal focus of linguistic research has been on the grammar. Within grammar, the emphasis may be on one of its three main areas or levels: phonology, the system of speech sounds; syntax, the means by which words and other grammatical units are combined to form sentences (nowadays usually taken to include morphology, the study of patterns of word formation); and semantics, the meaning system. In practice, it is not only impossible but also undesirable to keep these levels separate. Every language (and every speaker) also has a lexicon, or dictionary (in an abstract not physical sense) which contains the words, grammatical forms, idioms, etc., and the rules for their use. This question, and the way in which the grammar does relate sound and meaning, are matters of great theoretical importance in linguistics, and a wide variety of positions have been taken. The most productive ones, however, can be grouped under the general heading of generative-transformational grammar, an approach publicly launched by Chomsky’s Syntactic Structures (1957).
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One of the most important assertions of generative-transformational grammar is the recognition of universal grammar, i.e., that certain features are present in all human languages, presumably as a consequence of pan-human structures of cognition. Besides its insistence on making all grammatical explanations complete and explicit, transformational grammar generally assumes the existence of a more abstract level of representation ("deep" or "underlying" structure) below that of actually uttered forms ("surface" structure), and more closely tied into the meaning of the sentence. Consider these simple examples of different surface structure (but which presumably have the same underlying structure) from three different areas of the grammar.

Syntax
1. David gave Manuel a fish.
2. David gave a fish to Manuel.
3. Manuel was given a fish by David.

Phonology
4. What did you eat?
5. Wha' did ya eat?
6. Whadya eat?
7. Whajeat?

Semantics
8. eye doctor
9. ophthalmologist

We are, however, not going into the nature of the underlying abstract syntactic, phonological, and semantic representations in these examples, except to point out that the surface forms 1, 4, and 8 are probably the surface structures in each case which are closest in form to the more abstract underlying representations.

Transformational grammar, therefore, is particularly interested in the processes by which various types of sentences are derived through a series of transformations from basic underlying declarative sentences. Thus, speaking about linguistic behavior, we cannot talk about "language" in vague, generalized terms but must focus on specific phonological, syntactic, or semantic
phenomena. Because our frame of reference is generally a "scientific" one, we will describe how people speak without praise or condemnation. Our approach, in other words, is descriptive rather than prescriptive.

At the same time, we also know that sentences are often spoken within specific contexts, and the meaning of these sentences, therefore, must relate to the relevant features of the "real world". This is where the study of pragmatics, discourse analysis and conversational analysis becomes a necessary adjunct to sentence grammar. Conversation is a type of speech event - a category which also includes speeches, joke telling, therapeutic interviews, etc. Speech events are considered to consist of smaller units referred to as speech acts, such as statements, questions, promises, insults, etc. How speakers do all these things in different societies is the subject of a most fertile and promising field of research in sociolinguistics.

However interesting and relevant these different areas are, we might not be able to go into any great length in all of them. But it is necessary to remember them and to be always aware that we governed by them whenever or wherever we speak in our everyday conversation.

**Universals**

The concept of universals is relatively new in both sociology and linguistics, that is, the idea that certain characteristics are found in all human societies or in all human languages. The assumption in the latter case is that fundamentally all languages are at base the same because the human brain is everywhere the same. All humans, therefore, live in the same world, and experience is directly translatable from one culture to another and from one language to another. What then are some of the features all human languages share?
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1. All languages use both consonants and vowels. The order of sounds is meaningful, that is, for example, pin and nip do not mean the same thing. The order of words and other sentence elements also convey meaning. A limited set of consonants and vowels in any language can be combined to produce an infinite number of different sentences.

2. As a result of the development of generative transformational grammar, much of the search for universals has concentrated on syntax. One position is that every grammar requires such categories as noun, predicate, and sentence but that other grammatical categories and features may be differently arranged in different languages.

3. All languages have some sets of two or more words which mean the same or almost the same thing, such as English skunk and pole cat. Likewise, every language has at least some words each of which means more than one thing, such as English bank or fair. All languages have means of negating statements and asking questions.

4. A number of language universals seem particularly relevant to social factors and may reflect sociocultural universals. For example, all languages have lexical items that shift their meaning depending on elementary features of the speech situation. That is, every language personal or demonstrative pronouns or words like "here" or "there." Every language has an element that denotes the speaker and one that denotes the addressee, that is, the first and second person singular pronouns, and so on. Furthermore, every human language has proper names (Hockett 1966:21).

5. At the same time, with increasing attention paid to what many feminist critics are calling our "sexist language," it is interesting to consider the nature of grammatical gender which is alleged as one source of sexism. Gender (masculine and feminine) is a matter not only of grammatical relationships but also of social convention, as contrasted with sex (male and female) which is a biological distinction. It is universally true that if a language has gender categories in the noun, it will have gender categories in the pronoun. Furthermore, if a language makes distinctions of gender in
the first person, it will always have gender distinctions in the second and/or third person. Also, when we find gender distinctions in the plural of the pronoun, we will find gender distinctions in the singular (Greenberg 1966:96). The search for universals is one of the most active areas of current linguistic research.

Animal and human communication

A major theoretical issue in the human sciences is whether the differences between animal and human communication systems are discrete or form a continuum, or whether they represent two different orders of phenomena. Chomsky (1972:70 notes that although the two types of systems share some properties, the human language is based on entirely different principles.

1. Humans are not simply more intelligent but possess a specific type of mental organization. Human language is not the type of communication utilized by other animals.
2. One of the most important characteristics of animal communication systems is that they ordinarily consist of a limited number of signals, each of which has its own behavioral or emotional referent. Even the most elemental stages of human speech seem to be quite beyond any non-human species.
3. Animals not only do not have language in the human sense but also have been singularly unsuccessful in learning human language when given an opportunity to do so. The problem is not so much the inability to reproduce human sounds or to learn to associate words with their referents. The latter they learn with relative ease, at least with a limited number of concepts. The major difficulty seems to be their inability to deal with human syntax. Their ability to combine signs is very limited.
Many attempts to teach gestures to animals have been more successful than attempts to teach vocalization, as shown by the work of the Gardners with a chimpanzee they have raised as a human infant. They taught their chimpanzee, Washoe, to "speak" by means of deaf-mute sign language. Washoe had a vocabulary of some 30 words at 25 months of age, a figure which compares favorably to the number of words human children use at that chronological age. Three years later she had two or three times as many. Washoe is addressed in and responds in sentences but with a difference; Washoe combines words without restriction - something human children do not do. There are no constraints on the way she combines signs. Thus, the concept of a sentence must be an innate human possession and not the product of learning (McNeill 1971:533; Gardner and Gardner 1969; Kess 1976).

Rumbaugh (1977) and his colleagues who worked on the Lana Project devised a computer-based training system for teaching a chimpanzee to "read" and "write" using ideographs, and to perform simple arithmetic computations. Messages were in the form of strings of ideographs which could be typed on a keyboard and read from a visual display. Lana's conceptual system appears to be prelinguistic; that is, rather than thinking in words, she uses language as a means of creating a symbolic map of those ideas which are already in her mind. The same conclusion is suggested by Premack's (1976) study of another chimpanzee, Sarah, who learned to "read" and "write" using a system of plastic symbols stuck to a board.

However, an important point must not be lost sight of. While subhumans may be taught to use true language, no such animals have, in fact, devised their own. Assuming that the higher primates have the intellectual capacity for language, then the question arises as to why they did not develop it while the hominids did. We may reasonably speculate that the more complex society of hominids required a true linguistic system for communication purposes. Whatever the cause-and-effect
relationship may have been, it is certain that the complexity of human society and the complexity of human language evolved hand in hand.

So, what is a human language and how different is it from animal language? Hoijer (1969) has identified four characteristics of human language, unique to human communication systems, which he calls **productivity**, **displacement**, **duality of patterning**, and **traditional transmission**.

1. The **productivity** of language refers to the fact that it is an open system capable of producing an almost infinite number of utterances. Man’s language enables him both to utter and to understand sentences that are completely novel; that no one has ever spoken or heard before. As a matter of fact, almost every sentence is uttered for the first time. The productivity of human language is perhaps the fact most-often repeated in contemporary linguistics.

2. **Displacement** refers to the fact that humans can talk about things and events that are remote in time or space or, in fact, may never have existed.

3. **Duality of patterning** refers to the fact that, with a very limited set of consonants and vowels, seldom more than fifty, many thousands of words can be formed, whereas in animal call systems, each call differs from the rest, both in sound and in meaning.

4. **Traditional transmission** refers to the fact that language is not biologically transmitted by genes, as are animal call systems, but is socially taught and learned. Duality of patterning appears to be the key to the origin of language. In fact Swadesh (1972) using the comparative method, has tried to prove that all languages are descended from a single original human language.
Paralanguage and kinesics

People also communicate in forms other than using language alone. Nonlinguistic communication is a normal part of the communication process and is integrated with linguistic communication. Under the name "body language," it has become of considerable popular interest in recent years. The terms "kinesics" and "paralanguage" are used among social scientists.

Paralanguage is defined by Key (1975) as "some kind of articulation of the vocal apparatus or significant lack of it, i.e., hesitation between segments of vocal articulation." This can include all sorts of noises such as hissing, shushing, and whistling, as well as speed, quality, and pitch of voice. On the other hand, kinesics includes all body movement which communicates meaning such as physical or physiological action, automatic reflexes, posture, facial expression, and gesture (Key 1975b:10).

"Body language" is not to be confused with nonverbal communication which is a much broader concept. Thus, one can communicate by the composition or placement of objects, as well as by pictures and graphs, pictorial signs, etc. (Ruesch and Kees 1961). Body language, however, is used in interpersonal interaction either as a substitute for or as an accompaniment of verbal communication (most often vocal but also signed or written).

It would seem that "paralanguage" is different from "kinesics" in the sense that "Paralanguage is

whereas kinesics" is
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In order to fully understand what is really happening in human interaction as far as the communication process is concerned, one has to examine kinesics and paralanguage, as well as verbal signs. Paralanguage, kinesics, and verbal communication together form a definable system.

Nonverbal behavior is structured, as is other linguistic and nonlinguistic behavior. Because of its complexity and magnitude, no one can systematically describe the structure of his own nonverbal behavioral pattern without concerted analytical effort. Nonverbal competence is for the most part below the level of consciousness and culturally patterned. As an instance of the cultural patterning of nonverbal communication, the case of Mayor Fiorello La Guardia of New York City may be cited. He was trilingual, tricultural, and trikinesic. This famous politician spoke English, Italian, and Yiddish, and with each shift of language, he also shifted his kinesic and paralinguistic behavior (Efron 1972:196).

Have you ever met or seen such a person? What was the most striking feature that you noticed about him/her?

In a wide range of informally reported studies, Goffman (e.g., 1959, 1967, 1971, 1978) has called our attention to the ways in which people manage the impressions they give to the people with whom they interact in various kinds of encounters. Paralinguistic and kinesic movements play a great part in such interpersonal interaction, as in the use of different vocalizations, glances, gestures, and positionings.

Birdwhistell (1970) analyzes the communication process as one in which interacting parties contribute messages along one or more channels, such as language, movement, or smell. These
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elements are viewed as culturally patterned. He has produced
many detailed analyses of motions, especially those of
Americans, using special transcription systems for recording
body movement. Birdwhistell utilizes a motion picture camera
and a slow-motion projector. He is convinced that body motion
is a learned form of communication which can be broken down
into an ordered system of isolatable elements. He was very
sensitive to the cultural setting in his study and so far his
detailed kinesic analyses provide ample verification of his
viewpoint.

Hall (1959) has emphasized the ways in which people in
different cultures use time and space to communicate. These
different ways of utilizing time and space frequently cause
problems in cross-cultural communication. Persons unaware of
these differences may be offended or feel threatened. For
example, being twenty minutes late for a business appointment
carries quite different meaning in Malaysia as contrasted with
the United States. In the latter, there appears to be a scale of
lateness in which different lengths or periods of lateness have
different social implications and behavior patterns associated
with them. Hall identifies the shortest periods as "mumble
something" periods and slight apology periods, followed by
mildly insulting periods requiring full apology, then rude
periods and finally downright insulting periods.

We would expect evaluation of the period of lateness also to be
related to the relative social statuses of the two individuals. In
some cases, status may be validated by the amount of lateness,
as at a party in Malaysia, where generally higher status people
arrive later and leave earlier. Hall (1969:159-160) also points
out that much difficulty in interpersonal communication may
arise from the different uses of space by people from different
cultures; for example, the different position of the bodies of
people in conversation. The close proximity of speakers in a
friendly conversation of Middle Eastern people, for example,
could be ascribed as hostility or sexual interest by a Malaysian
due to a position so close that each person can feel the other’s breath on his or her face.

Is there a difference in the use of space among the Malays, Chinese, and Indians in Malaysia. If there is, where (in what setting) does the difference occur, and how noticable is this difference?

Speech as social interaction

Notably all the items with DEICTIC meanings, referring to the speaker (I, we), the addressee (you), the time of speaking (present/past tense, today, etc.) and the place of speaking (here, etc). Moreover, we also know that many items are often restricted in their use to certain social circumstances (e.g. get versus obtain), and took for granted that such information was part of our language. Consequently, it would be natural to make the same assumption about the information that the French word tu 'you' is to be used only to intimates (and small children and animals). And having made that decision, it is only a small step to including in 'language' similar information about whole classes of items, such as the class of first names in English, which are also to be used only to intimates (in contrast with names like Mr Brown).

It is easy to see how 'language' and 'social constraints on speech' merge, and that social constraints on speech can apply not just to speech but to social behaviour in general. The accepted term for aspects of behaviour through which people influence and react to each other is SOCIAL INTERACTION, and speech is only one aspect of such behaviour, closely meshed with other aspects. One of the leading investigators in this field, Michael Argyle (a social psychologist), has described the field as follows (Argyle 1973: 9):
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One achievement of recent research has been to establish the basic elements of which social interaction consists; current research is concerned with finding out precisely how these elements function. It is now agreed that the list consists of various signals: verbal and non-verbal, tactile, visible and audible - variotis kinds of bodily contact, proximity, orientation, bodily posture, physical appearance, facial expression, movement of head and hands, direction of gaze, timing of speech, emotional tone of speech, speech errors, type of utterance and linguistic structure of utterance. Each of these elements can be further analysed and divided into categories or dimensions; each plays a distinctive role in social interaction, though they are closely interconnected.

Below we shall look in more detail at some of the non-verbal aspects of social interaction and see how they relate to speech.

The study of speech as part of social interaction has involved many different disciplines, including social psychology, sociology, anthropology, ethology (the study of behaviour in animals), philosophy, artificial intelligence (the study of human intelligence via computer simulation), sociolinguistics and linguistics. Each discipline brings a different range of questions and methods to bear on the study, and all can learn a lot from the others. The main methods used in the study are introspection and participant observation, with a certain amount of experimentation (by social psychologists and ethologists) and computer simulation (by artificial intelligence workers). One of the most important contributions has been made by anthropologists who engage in what is called THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF SPEAKING or THE ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNICATION, a field dominated by the work of Dell Hymes (1964, 1974, and the following anthologies by Bauman and Sherzer (1974), Gumperz and Hymes (1964,1972). The importance of their work has been to feed into the discussion data on societies other than the advanced western ones in which most linguists live, and to make it clear how much variety there is in the social constraints on speech.
The functions of speech

What part does speech play in social interaction? There is no simple answer, nor even a single complicated one, as speech plays many different roles on different occasions. The anthropologist Bronislawsky Malinowski claimed that ‘in its primitive uses, language functions as a link in concerted human activity, as a piece of human behaviour. It is a mode of action and not an instrument of reflection’ (Malinowski 1923). An example of this would be the kind of speech one hears from people shifting furniture: To you ... now up a bit ... and so on, where the speech acts as a control on people's physical activity, in contrast to its function in a lecture where it is intended to influence the thoughts rather than the actions of the listeners. Another use of speech is simply to establish or reinforce social relations—what, or what Malinowski called phatic communion, the kind of chit-chat that people engage in simply in order to show that they recognise each other's presence. We might add many other uses of speech to this list—speech to obtain information (e.g. Where's the tea-pot cover?).

How does the classification of speech-acts fit into that of speech functions, discussed at the start of this section in terms of 'phatic communion', 'speech for obtaining information', etc.? One possible answer is that the two sets of concepts are appropriate for classifying bits of speech of different lengths, with speech-acts as the smallest bits, classified by illocutionary and perlocutionary force, and longer stretches classified as 'phatic communion' and so on. This answer presupposes the existence of some kind of hierarchical organization to speech, a possibility which we can consider but cannot take for granted. An alternative is to think of speakers as having a variety of intentions at any given moment in speech, varying in scope from relatively long-term intentions like maintaining good relations with the addressee, through shorter-term intentions such as pleasing the addressee, to other types of intentions such as producing a promise. This view differs from the hierarchical model in that it allows for changes in the speaker's intentions.
However, the functional analysis of any given bits of speech cannot be satisfactorily made in terms of a single set of mutually exclusive categories, since different purposes can coexist. Once again we find the speaker locating his speech in a multidimensional space, just as he did with reference to other people and other kinds of situation.

**Speech as skilled work**

We have just seen that speech is sufficiently important to clear for it to be given special treatment in the culture - in any culture, we may assume - as an object to be classified and talked about. This still does not in itself show that speech is social, in de Saussure's sense, since it is likely that the socially recognised categories reflect rather than determine the ways in which speech is used in the community. In other words, if someone wanted to say something which would not fit into any recognised category, this would presumably not deter him from saying it (though this is of course debatable).

We now move to a somewhat more constraining aspect of which we may call 'skilled work'. It is work, since it requires the "know-how" type of knowledge, which applied more or less successfully according to how much practice one has had (and according to other factors such as intelligence) will bring about successful communication. Putting these two characteristics together, we can predict that speech may be more successful at some times than at others, and some people may be better at it than others. There is no doubt that this is the case: we all know that sometimes we get 'tongue-tied', and that some people are more likely than others to be stuck for 'the right thing to say'.

If the same is true of other aspects of social interaction - face-to-face communication (or 'focused interaction'), it is fruitful to look upon the behavior of people engaged in focused interaction as an organized, skilled performance, analogous to skills such as car driving' (Argyle & Kendon 1967). Just as some people are better drivers than others (to the extent that some pass the
driving test and others fail), so some people are better at social interaction than others.

However, there are two major caveats. Firstly success in speech varies considerably according to its function and to other aspects of the situation. Thus, some people are good at intellectual debate and poor at phatic communion, and vice versa; and we shall see that children who are highly skilled in verbal games may flounder in the classroom or in a formal interview. Or, if a chatterbox (C), is with a person (S) who habitually stays silent while others do the talking, C may think S is very unsuccessful at speaking, because he does not do his fair share towards filling any awkward gaps. However, S may feel that his own speech is totally successful (since he has nothing of special importance to say), and that C is an unimpressive empty chatter. The same two caveats apply equally, of course, to other aspects of social interaction.

We can now see in what respect each social using it are for the most part learned from other people, in just the same way that linguistic items are learned. For example, one learns how to get a ticket from a bus-conductor by watching and listening to other people doing it, just as one learns how to arrange nouns and verbs into sentences by hearing it done by others.

There is another social aspect to speech, however, which has to do with 'work' rather than 'skill', namely that the effort one puts into speaking depends on motivation, which in turn derives in part from one's relations to the other people involved. Social psychology offers a number of theories to explain why people are willing to put effort into social interaction (and are also willing to be bound by the kinds of social constraint discussed above. The main recurrent theme in these theories, however, is that people accept the demands of others because they want their approval and liking.
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One particular theory, developed by the sociologists, is of particular interest in a discussion speech and is concerned with what Goffman (1955) has called the way in which a person maintains his 'face' (in the expression to lose face). This is done by presenting a consistent image to other people, but one can gain or lose face by improving or spoiling this image. The better one's image, the more others will approve, but it is dangerous to aim too high, because of the increased risk of losing face by a mistake. Accordingly, there is a strong tendency to aim at the average of one's group, rather than above it, and for everyone in a group to apply the same criteria in judging people, since each member knows that these are the criteria by which they are themselves being judged. For example, it would be difficult to belong to a group where everyone thought it important to keep the house tidy, or to be good at roller-skating, or to do well at examinations, without coming to accept the same criteria as important oneself.

Speech is one of the most important ways in which one presents a personal image for others to evaluate, both through what one says and the why one says it. Moreover, most people want to present to the world an image of considerateness, because this is most likely to make them popular, and this turns speech into a highly cooperative task where everyone tries hard to help everybody else maintain their personal images. We usually try to avoid exposing other people's weaknesses, or raising heated controversy, unless we are sure that it will not affect the attitude of others towards us or we are indifferent to their opinion. As hearers, we try hard to make sense of what other people say, even when this means reading far more between the lines than is in them. But as speakers we try to anticipate problems which the addressee may have in making sense of what we say, by saying only what we may reasonably expect him to understand. Of course, people differ in their capacity either to anticipate how the addressee will take what they say, or to avoid possible misunderstandings, but the theory of face-work maintains that all adults at least are aware of the need for speakers to make concessions to those whom they address.
Competence and performance

All that we have discussed relate to another important aspect involved in language and language use, and that is language and speech or langue and parole (de Saussure) or competence and performance (Chomsky). Basically both refer to the difference between the idealized or abstracted patterns of the and the way people actually speak. The former is, of course, not directly observable but is inferred from the latter. The former is what it is that the native speaker knows how to do with his language. De Saussure (1962:321) sees the social aspect of language, langue, as so general that it is in the possession of every speaker so that one can investigate langue by asking anyone about it, even oneself. However, the details of the individual's use of parole can be ascertained only through a survey of the population – that is, how it is used in a society.

Chomsky, being very much to linguistics, rejects, or at least postpones, the study of performance. Therefore, in a real sense his theory is a theory of grammar rather than a theory of human language. Chomsky (1965:3) has expressed his goals in a statement that has become classic:

"Linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and efforts (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance."

We cannot follow this viewpoint as it contradicts the central concern of sociolinguistics - namely the inherent variability found within any given language and its attention to the social contexts within which real live people, not abstractions, are actually speaking. Thus, we go back to the definition of what
sociolinguistics is - that it is a study of language in relation to
the society that uses it.

Prescriptive grammar

The role of prescriptive grammar in sociolinguistics may not be
direct but indirect. The type of grammar which is most familiar
to you as a speaker is undoubtedly the prescriptive type, that is,
one which tells you what you should say if you want to speak
and write your own language or some foreign language
correctly. Do's and don'ts are given, with examples of bad, good
and better usage. As such we can find many books that will
teach those who wish to "improve" their speech. And these
books tend to emphasize two things, that is, good style (clear
and/or elegant speech) and the avoidance of bad grammar (that
is, the way speakers of lesser educational and/or socioeconomic
status speak). Such grammars contain a great deal of descriptive
material, for example, paradigms such as declensions or
conjugations. Unfortunately, much traditional grammar in the
past was based on the framework of Latin grammar, quite
different from that of, say, English, rather than on a strictly
independent analysis of the language itself. Hence, even the
descriptive parts were faulty and unrealistic. Thus, for example,
it fostered the "logical" notion that two negatives make a
positive, and "I don't have no money" really means I have
money. This deviation from "standard" usage is a dialect
difference and is found throughout the English-speaking world.
Such usage is often looked down upon by educated people but is
nonetheless "logical," for double or multiple negatives with
negative meaning are the rule in standard Russian and Spanish
and many other languages. Take, say, the following sentence in
standard Serbo-Croatian:

Nisam nikada nikome rekao o tome ni rijeći. "I haven't
ever said a single word about that to anybody."
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The literal translation is "I haven't never to no one said about that not even a word." (Partridge 1972:121).

Thus, such judgments of "incorrectness" are judgments based upon social considerations, not logic. Yet people are more likely to be convinced by an argument which purports to be based on logic rather than one which is patently derived from social prejudice.

As students of sociolinguistics, one must be careful not to succumb to the dictation of the prescriptive grammarians; one does not necessarily accept their judgments as to how a particular language actually works. This is important so that we do not ourselves become prescriptive about the language of the society that we might want to study. In this respect, Hall (1960) has again been one of the most vigorous polemicsists attacking prescriptive notions of language. As a structural linguist, he insists on the notion that if a certain form of expression comes naturally to a given individual, it is all right to say it. Among the most important of Hall's arguments is that there is no such thing as good and bad (or correct and incorrect, grammatical and ungrammatical, right and wrong) in language. "Correct" can only mean "socially acceptable." He believes that there is no such thing as "written language." He regards speech as basic in human life and writing as a reflection of speech. To change the writing is not to change the language. The way a person speaks is more an authority for his own speech than any dictionary or grammar. Hall maintains that words do not have any "real" meaning as opposed to other "false" meanings. The meaning which people give to a word is its real meaning in that particular situation. No language or dialect has more merit than any other, and language change is not "decay" or "corruption," so that a later stage of a language is not necessarily worth either more or less than an earlier stage. According to Hall, "good" language is language which gets the desired effect with the least friction and difficulty for its user, whereas "good" style is simply that style of speaking or writing which is most effective under any given set of circumstances.
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Do you agree with Hall?

Is it possible that Hall's position is an extreme one? As a matter of fact in the light of generative theory, it does occur that a person can make "mistakes," that is, produce sentences that are not generated according to the rules of an identifiable dialect - even his own personal idiolect. A person might say, for example, by mistake, *I didn't wrote that letter yesterday,* or a non-native speaker might say for *three years now I am speaking English every day.* These two sentences are unacceptable to native speakers of English. That is, there is such a thing as an ungrammatical or unacceptable sentence. It is necessary, however to distinguish between the concepts of grammatically incorrect and socially inappropriate. Formal language is inappropriate in an informal situation, and informal language is inappropriate in a formal situation.

To find out how a language "actually" works, one must attempt to describe the language without any preconceptions as to correctness or incorrectness from a logical or any other standpoint. Although modern linguistics has emphasized this point, it goes back at least as far as Noah Webster who wrote that "Grammar is built solely on the structure of language. That which is not found in the practice of speaking a language can have no place in a grammar of that language.... Grammars are made to show the student of language what a language is - not how it ought to be" (quoted by Haugen 1966a:12).

The study of language

The preferred point of departure of most linguists for the study of language is linguistic theory. When the linguist attempts to write a grammar of a language, or of some specific part of it, what he is trying to do is to devise a theory of the language, that
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is, to generalize about how the language works (or how language in general works if he is dealing with universal grammar or linguistic universals). As a theory, a grammar attempts to predict what people will or will not say. The ability of a grammar to do this explicitly, fully, accurately, and parsimoniously is the measure of its validity.

At the same time, we must also realize that grammars are ordinarily stated in the form of rules, that is, generalizations regarding certain forms or categories of forms. A rule specifies to what forms the rule applies and then says what happens to these forms. In this regard Labov has distinguished three rules.

1. **categorical rules**, rules which must be followed in all circumstances (for example, the "reflexive" transformation, so that you must say "I wash myself," not "I wash me");

2. **optional rules**, where the grammar permits a choice (for example, the "dative movement" transformation which gives "I gave Sam the lizard," as well as "I gave the lizard to Sam"); and

3. **variable rules**, such as the phonological variation between "fishing" and "fishin." These are rules which respond systematically to such phenomena as dialect, speaking style, social setting, age, sex, etc.

The competence of the native speaker presumably includes a knowledge of which rules are categorical, which are optional, which variable, and under which conditions they are used. Frequently foreigners reveal their non-native status by turning a variable rule into an obligatory one. Thus, for example, no matter how often a native speaker of English says *dese*, *dem* and *dose*, he does not use these forms exclusively. He always uses enough standard *these, them* and *those* to show that he can produce th- words. He does not confuse *dose* "those" with doze "to sleep," (Labov 1971a:50).
Although no strong case has been made for the psychological reality or unreality of rules, it must certainly be the case that they have social reality in that they are frequently the object of evaluation. While rules are the form which grammars take, the latter are not the entire substance of language. The language itself consists both of lexicon (words, affixes, idioms, etc.) and rules for their use, as well as grammar, the latter consisting in turn of phonology, syntax, and semantics.

**Semantics**

Sociolinguists have long been concerned, directly or indirectly, with questions of meaning. We are particularly interested in meaning as it is expressed in language in actual social situations. So, for each speech event to be examined in the study of sociolinguistics, there is an immediate social context to be considered, as well as the social conditions - the broader society which affect the specific situation. In any case, it is always necessary for us to keep in mind pragmatic considerations of the "real world" as related to the linguistic facts of the case. What semantic systems do is to relate linguistic to nonlinguistic phenomena, so that when we give the meaning of some linguistic event we are stating rules for its use in terms of nonlinguistic events. Let us elaborate on this a bit.

The ways in which people use language are meaningful in themselves. By exercising the options (grammatical, referential, situational, and personal) within domains of his competence, the speaker expresses his meaning. Perhaps most fundamental of all is *referential meaning*: the speaker wishes to talk about something. In other words, he refers to things, persons, concepts, and makes comments about them (the subject-predicate phenomenon). He utilizes the syntactical and phonological resources of the language to express his meaning, exercising his options in the choice of specific pronunciations, vocabulary items and grammatical constructions. It is not quite the same thing socially to say *kindly refrain from attempting to deceive*
me with your false words as to say Don't give me none of that jive, Please don't lie to me, or Cut out the B.S., although referentially the meanings are very similar. Choice of variants will, of course, be affected not only by the situation, as perceived by the speaker, but they will also reflect personal characteristics of the speaker - his own linguistic style, as well as his emotional and psychological state at the moment. It is his selection of a synonymous variant from among those available which conveys social meaning.

We might also look at an aspect called Linguistic creativity. Take, for example, this nonsense verse which the author recalls as being popular in her childhood:

One bright day in the middle of the night
Two dead boys got up to fight.
Back to back they faced each other,
Drew their swords and shot each other.
A deaf policeman downstairs heard the noise,
Came up and killed the two dead boys.

it is both from a knowledge of the language and from a knowledge of the real world that a person is able to identify sense and nonsense, contradiction and plausibility.

Languages can be classified:

1. genetically, that is, in terms of common origin;
2. typologically, that is, in terms of type of structure; and
3. area, that is, by particular geographical areas where languages, because of long-term mutual influence, share
significant common features – for example, the Balkan Peninsula or India.

With reference to the genetic relationships of languages, those known or thought to be derived from some common ancestral tongue form what are known as language families. Presumably the later languages were all once dialects of some earlier language. Thus, for example, most of the languages of Europe belong to the Indo-European family, which besides English and other Germanic languages (German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, etc.) includes Latin (and its daughters French, Spanish, Italian, Romanian, etc.), Greek Slavic (Russian, Polish, Czech, SerboCroatian, etc.), languages of India such as Hindi-Urdu, Bengali, Marathi etc. and many others from northwest Europe to southern Asia, whose speakers encompass a broad spectrum of cultural and racial types.

Another important language family is the Semitic, including Babylonian (Akkadian), Hebrew, Phoenician, Arabic, Aramaic, and Amharic, the national language of Ethiopia. Speakers of Arabic range from central Asia to Central Africa and likewise include speakers of many different racial and cultural backgrounds. The Indo-European family has sometimes been referred to as Aryan, that is, "Iranian," as the ancient Indo-European speaking invaders of India presumably originated in Iran. Thus, it is, of course, nonsensical to speak of an "Aryan" race or of a "Semitic" race. There are only speakers of Aryan languages or Semitic languages. But one might ask, don't those who speak related languages have something in common besides linguistic structure? Some of the people speaking related languages obviously share a common (not necessarily unmixed) ancestry; the ancestors of the others certainly must have had some historical connection in the past. A language cannot be shared in a vacuum. Such sharing must be mediated by social relationships. We can only speculate about the nature of these relationships in the past in the absence, that is, of any archaeological or historical evidence. But what we can be sure
of is that these relationships were basically of the same nature as those we observe today where languages are being adopted or mixed through military conquest (which is often followed by subjugation, colonization, and acculturation); trade relations; religious and cultural conversion; border and neighboring tribal relations; and the "prestige" or practical advantages to be gained by adopting the language of a society which is thought to be "superior" militarily, politically, economically, or culturally. Thus, for example, in the case of persons of African ancestry in the Americas presently speaking English, Spanish, French, or Portuguese, we have historical evidence of the institution of slavery to account for this wholesale case of linguistic dislocation and acculturation. Similarly, in the Ottoman Empire, young boys from Balkan families were transported to Anatolia where they learned Turkish and became fiercely loyal Janissary soldiers or officials in the administration, in effect ceasing to be Serbs, Greeks, etc., and becoming Turks. Similar institutions undoubtedly have had a long, if inglorious, history in other times and places. On the other hand, linguistic affiliation may become the basis of nationalistic political movements, as in the case of the nineteenth century pan-German, pan-Slavic, and pan-Turkic movements. Similar historic event happened to immigrants who came to the Malayan peninsula some three hundred years ago and who decided to settle permanently in that country.
UNIT 4

PLEASE READ:


Chapter 7
"Language and gender"

Chapter 11
"The ethnography of communication"
Unit 4: Language, Thought, and Culture

Language, speech and thought

Among nineteenth and some early twentieth century scholars, there was a tendency to equate a child's language with a so-called primitive language, and both with early language—all of them being considered simple and inaccurate modes of expression used for practical purposes, especially magical ones. Such characterizations were based on an ethnocentric view of culture and language that failed to take into account the complex nature of all language.

The point that there is no necessary correlation among race, language, and culture was perhaps made most forcefully by Franz Boas (1911); that is, people speaking related languages do not necessarily have similar cultures, and persons sharing the same or similar culture do not necessarily speak languages with similar structures. Furthermore, "advanced" nations do not necessarily have "advanced" linguistic structures. While technology may be a criterion of "advanced" culture, there are no criteria for "advanced" linguistic structures, although technologically advanced societies generally have much more extensive lexicons. As Sapir (1921:234) so aptly put it, "When it comes to linguistic structure, Plato walks with the Macedonian swineherd, Confucius with the headhunting savage of Assam." It was once thought that the so-called language types, namely isolating, agglutinative, and flexional, could be put on a scale from lower to higher forms. An "isolating" language was one like Chinese, in which words do not take any kind of grammatical prefixes or suffixes but are invariable. Words, generally one syllable, cannot be analyzed into separable meaningful components or morphemes. An "agglutinative" language was one like Turkish in which a whole series of morphemes were "glued" together, without any of them undergoing modification; each morpheme clearly retains its own
meaning and shape. The equivalent of a whole English phrase, clause, or sentence may be expressed in a single word, e.g., *sokaktakiler* from *sokak* "street," *ta* "in," *ki* "which" and *ler* "plural," that is, "The people in the street." A "flexional" language was characterized as one in which the grammatical suffixes were often fused and lost their separate character. For example, in Latin amo "I love," *am-* is the root meaning "love," while the suffix -o conveys the meaning of both "I" and "present indicative active." Compare the Turkish equivalent *severim,* where *sev-* is the root meaning "love," *-er* is "present" and *-im* is "I."

Some nineteenth century scholars like Müller and Whitney even went so far as to correlate the three types of language structure with three stages of social organization. They thought that the isolating languages were associated with a family stage of social development, the agglutinative languages with nomadic society, and the flexional with Western European type societies (Firth 1970:78).

While we may smile at the naïveté of these precultural relativity linguistic scholars of the nineteenth century, some correlation between language type and level of technological or sociocultural development must not be rejected out of hand. The differences, however, lie more in the areas of lexicon and style than in morphology. Hymes (1972b) has forcefully claimed that evolutionary advance can be clearly seen with reference not to linguistic form but to linguistic function. Certain types of syntactic development make certain kinds of arguments and analysis available for scientific discourse, as does an expanded lexicon for naming everything in the world. Languages such as English and Japanese, for example, have developed in this fashion. But all languages are probably equal for other functions, such as interpersonal relations, aesthetic play, poetry,
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This brings us to the question of linguistic determinism— that is, to what extent, and in what ways, does language determine thought? This question is normally answered with reference to the SAPIR-WHORF HYPOTHESIS, according to which language determines thought to a very great extent and in many ways. However, there are several other points of contact between language or speech and thought.

The first connection to be established is between language and other aspects of culture to the extent that linguistic items are learned from other people. They are one part of the culture as a whole and as such are likely to be closely associated with other aspects of the culture that are learned from the same people. We might therefore expect that if a particular person learns two different linguistic items from different groups of people, each might be associated with a different set of cultural belief and values. Furthermore, it would not be surprising if each item activates a different set of such beliefs and values as it is used, and to what extent we could say that language (in this case, the choice of one linguistic variety rather than another) was determining thought.

There is some evidence that this can indeed happen, as was shown by the behaviour of a number of women born in Japan who moved to the United States as wives of American ex-servicemen and learned English there. These women took part in an experiment organised by Ervin-Tripp, a pioneer in the psychological and sociological study of language (Ervin-Tripp 1964). Each woman was interviewed once in English and once in Japanese and asked to perform various tasks that involved the creative use of language. One was to complete, in the language appropriate to the interview, a number of sentence-fragments, e.g. I like to read ... (or its Japanese translation). In a typical Japanese interview, this might be completed by ... about sociology, reflecting a Japanese set of values, whereas in her English interview the same woman might produce I like to read
comics once in a while because they sort of relax my mind, reflecting, presumably, the values which she had learned in America. Similar differences emerged from another of the tasks in which the women were asked to say what was happening in a picture showing a farm, with a farmer ploughing. In the background, a woman was leaning against a tree, and a girl in the foreground was carrying books in her arms. In the Japanese interview, a typical description was as follows:

A student feels in conflict about being sent to college. Her mother is sick and the father works hard without much financial reward. Nevertheless, he continues to work diligently, without saying anything, praying for the daughter's success. Also he is a husband who never complains to his wife.

When the interview was in English, on the other hand, the same woman might give the following description:

A sociology student observing farmers at work is struck by the difficulty of farm life.

It would be unwise to base too many conclusions on this rather small and in some ways unsatisfactory piece of research. For instance, it is not clear how many of the women involved showed such considerable changes in attitude from one language to another, or how many tasks produced such changes; and in any case it is always dangerous to generalize from what people do in formal experimental interview situations. However, the findings are at least compatible with what we predicted on the basis of the connections between language and the rest of culture, and so it is quite plausible to suggest that we make use of different value and belief systems according to which linguistic varieties we happen to be using at the time and which aspects of the socialization process are most emphasized.
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Turning to the most obvious subjects of socialization of young children, there is some evidence that parents - specifically, mothers - make different uses of speech in socializing their children. This evidence comes mainly from the work of the sociologists Basil Bernstein, of London, and Robert Hess, of Chicago. The hypothesis under investigation was that mothers from different social classes used speech differently in socialization. If true, this hypothesis was expected to offer a partial explanation for differences between children from different social classes in the ways in which they in turn used speech.

Most of the evidence comes from interviews in which mothers were asked about hypothetical situations - for instance, "How much harder would it be for parents to do X with young children if parents could not speak?" (where X might be 'playing games with them' or 'showing them what is right and wrong', or a variety of other specially selected types of activity, covering different aspects of socialization), or "What would you say if your child brought home some object picked up on a building site?" There are obvious problems in interpreting the answers to questions like the latter if one is primarily interested in what the mothers actually do say in real-life situations rather than in what they say they would say. In particular, there is a danger that some mothers would idealize their behavior. However, there was such consistency among the answers, and they accorded so well with the results of a few experiments which tested mothers' actual behavior (in an experimental situation), that we can take them as reflecting more or less directly what the mothers really would do and say.

The conclusion of this research is that there are indeed differences between 'average' mothers from the middle class and the lower working class (the two classes compared in Bernstein's work). 'Average' middle class mothers use speech more than 'average' lower-working-class mothers in personal
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matters involving emotions, whereas the latter are more likely than the former to use speech for teaching skills. Middle-class mothers are also more likely than lower-working-class mothers to use speech in explanation of commands ('You mustn't do that because . . .'), and to give factual information about things and people, with the consequence (presumably) that they are more likely to stimulate and satisfy curiosity in the children.

If these findings are correct, it is clear that they have far-reaching implications, both theoretical and practical. Unfortunately, the evidence for differences in 'maternal style' is part of a general theory which also contained, at one time, a sub-theory about specifically linguistic differences between middle-class and working-class children which is now largely discredited and has distracted critics from taking the question of maternal style seriously.

As we might expect, gross differences can be found in the role that speech is allowed to play in socialization between cultures. For example, the Gonja of West Africa regard questioning as a way of asserting authority over another person, so it is considered inappropriate for a student to ask his teacher questions. Consequently apprentice weavers, for instance, are expected to pick up the art of weaving without ever asking direct questions about it (Goody, 1978). Examples like this show how the demands of one aspect of socialization (not using questions to one's superiors) may conflict with those of other aspects (learning to weave), and the same may be said too of the social class differences in maternal styles mentioned above.

Language and socialization

Speech is an important factor in socialization, not only through the information that it is used to impart, but also through the
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concepts which it requires the child to identify as meanings for the linguistic items he learns from other people's speech. In other words, the language which a child learns is closely related to the concepts he learns as part of his socialization. The question is whether language can be said to influence these concepts, or whether it simply reflects concepts which would be there in any case. The answer according to sociolinguists seems to be 'a bit of each'.

However, we can be sure that some concepts are independent of language, including those we learned as babies before the acquisition of language towards the end of the first year of life. Others are formed later, but without recourse to language since we have no words for them in our adult vocabulary. For instance, we have a concept for the kinds of things we buy at a bookstore (or a fruit-stall), but no name for any of these concepts, in contrast with concepts for things bought in other kinds of shop, e.g. groceries. Whether or not there is a name for these concepts seems to have little to do with our ability to learn them. Similarly, we can see the similarities among nails, screws, rivets, and nuts and bolts - they have similar functions and we might expect people to store them together - but there is no name for this concept. Examples like this are easy to multiply, and warn us against the danger of assuming that concepts only exist when there is specific linguistic evidence for them. Interestingly, it seems that such 'lexical gaps' tend to occur at the levels above the 'basic' one.

On the other hand, we can be equally sure that there are other concepts which we could not have if it were not for language. The most obvious cases are those which relate to language as a phenomenon - the concepts 'language', 'meaning', 'word' and so on. However, there are other concepts which we learn after we have learned their names, and for which the name is our main evidence. For instance, a mother may say to her 5-year-old child, "We have to keep the screen door closed, honey, so the flies
won't come in. Flies bring germs into the house with them.” When the child was asked afterwards what germs were, the answer was “Something the flies play with!” This example illustrates nicely the way in which a new word may act as evidence that an unknown concept exists, leaving the learner with the problem of somehow working out what that concept is, making use of any evidence that may be available. Many students of linguistics must find themselves doing just this on occasions, when they come across terms like *a priori* or even *empirical*.

Moreover, we learn many concepts by being told about them, especially during our formal education, so we do in fact learn them through language, whether or not we could have learned them without it. If it were not for language we should probably not have concepts to which we could attach words like *Perinsular, feudal, metabolism, classical or factor*. One of the main functions of education is to teach concepts, and technical terminology is the teacher's most important teaching aid in this task. (It should be noted, however, that there is a tendency for teachers to confuse knowledge of the concept with knowledge of the correct technical term for it.)

In conclusion, we can say that language is more important in learning some concepts than others, and the general principle may be that language becomes more important as the concepts concerned get further from one's immediate sensory experience - in other words, more abstract.

![The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis](image)

Finally we come to the celebrated 'Sapir-Whorf hypothesis', so named after the American linguists Edward Sapir and Benjamin
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Lee Whorf. Both Sapir and Whorf worked extensively on American Indian languages and made important contributions to our knowledge of those languages and also to linguistic theory (to say nothing of Sapir's contributions to anthropology and psychology). The work most clearly relevant to the hypothesis was done in the 1930s, towards the end of their respective careers, so their ideas represent the results of two distinguished lifetimes devoted to the serious study of language and culture, and cannot be dismissed lightly. On the other hand, it is not at all clear exactly what formulation of the hypothesis Sapir and Whorf would themselves have accepted, since neither tried to define any such hypothesis, and both changed their views radically on relevant matters from time to time.

What the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis has to say about language and thought.

The romantic idealism of the late 18th century, as encountered in the views of Johann Herder (1744-1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1762-1835), placed great value on the diversity of the world's languages and cultures. The tradition was taken up by the American linguist and anthropologist Edward Sapir (1884-1939) and his pupil Benjamin Lee Whorf (1897-1941), and resulted in a view about the relation between language and thought which was widely influential in the middle decades of this century.

The 'Sapir-Whorf hypothesis', as it came to be called, combines two principles. The first is known as linguistic determinism: it states that language determines the way we think. The second follows from this, and is known as linguistic relativity: it states that the distinctions encoded in one language are not found in
any other language. In a much-quoted paragraph, Whorf propounds the view as follows:

We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native languages. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face; on the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds -and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way - an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, but its terms are absolutely obligatory; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees.

Whorf illustrated his view by taking examples from several languages, and in particular from Hopi, an Amerindian language. In Hopi, there is one word (masa’ytaka) for everything that flies except birds - which would include insects, aeroplanes and pilots. This seems alien to someone used to thinking in English, but, Whorf argues, it is no stranger than English-speakers having one word for many kinds of snow, in contrast to Eskimo, where there are different words for falling snow, snow on the ground, snow packed hard like ice, slushy snow (cf. English slush), and so on. In Aztec, a single word (with different endings) covers an even greater range of English notions - snow, cold and ice. When more abstract notions are considered (such as time, duration, velocity), the differences become yet more complex: Hopi, for instance, lacks a concept of time seen as a dimension; there are no forms corresponding to English tenses, but there are a series of forms which make it possible to talk about various durations, from the speaker's point of view. It would be very difficult, Whorf argues, for a Hopi and an English physicist to understand each other's thinking, given the major differences between the languages.
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There is nothing in everyday English to correspond to the many Arabic words for *horse* or *camel*, the Eskimo words for *snow*, or the Australian languages' words for *hole* or *sand*. Speakers of English have to resort to circumlocutions if they want to draw the distinctions which these languages convey by separate words - such as the size, breed, function, and condition of a camel. On the other hand, several languages cannot match the many words English has available to identify different sizes, types, and uses of vehicles - *car*, *lorry*, *bus*, *tractor*, *taxi*, *moped*, *truck*, and so on - and might have just one word for all of these.

Examples such as these made the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis very plausible; but in its strongest form it is unlikely to have any adherents now. The fact that successful translations between languages can be made is a major argument against it, as is the fact that the conceptual uniqueness of a language such as Hopi can nonetheless be explained using English. That there are some conceptual differences between cultures due to language is undeniable, but this is not to say that the differences are so great that mutual comprehension is impossible. One language may take many words to say what another language says in a single word, but in the end the circumlocution can make the point.

Similarly, it does not follow that, because a language lacks a word, its speakers therefore cannot grasp the concept. Several languages have few words for numerals: Australian aboriginal languages, for example, are often restricted to a few general words (such as 'all', 'many', 'few'), 'one' and 'two'. In such cases, it is sometimes said that the people lack the concept of number - that aborigines 'haven't the intelligence to count', as it was once put. But this is not so, as is shown when these speakers learn English as a second language: their ability to count and calculate is quite comparable to that of English native speakers.
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However, a weaker version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is generally accepted. Language may not determine the way we think, but it does influence the way we perceive and remember, and it affects the ease with which we perform mental tasks. Several experiments have shown that people recall things more easily if the things correspond to readily available words or phrases. And people certainly find it easier to make a conceptual distinction if it neatly corresponds to words available in their language. Some salvation for the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis can therefore be found in these studies, which are carried out within the developing field of psycholinguistics.

Language and thought

It seems evident that there is the closest of relationships between language and thought: everyday experience suggests that much of our thinking is facilitated by language (p. 13). But is there identity between the two? Is it possible to think without language? Or does our language dictate the ways in which we are able to think? A simple answer is certainly 'not possible', but at least we can be clear about the main factors which give rise to the complications.

Kinds of thinking

Many kinds of behavior have been referred to as 'thinking', but not all of them require us to posit a relationship with language. Most obviously, there is no suggestion that language is involved in our emotional response to some object or event, such as when we react to a beautiful painting or an unpleasant incident: we may use language to explain our reaction to others, but the emotion itself is 'beyond words'. Nor do people engaged in the
creative arts find it essential to think using language: composers, for example, often report that they 'hear' the music they wish to write. Also, our everyday fantasies, day-dreams, and other free associations can all proceed without language.

The thinking which seems to involve language is of a different kind: this is the reasoned thinking which takes place as we work out problems, tell stories, plan strategies, and so on. It has been called rational, 'directed', 'logical', or 'propositional' thinking. It involves elements that are both deductive (when we solve problems by using a given set of rules, as in an arithmetical task) and inductive (when we solve problems on the basis of data placed before us, as in working out a travel route). Language seems to be very important for this kind of thinking. The formal properties of language, such as word order and sentence sequencing, constitute the medium in which our connected thoughts can be presented and organized.

**Independence or identity?**

But how close is this relationship between language and thought? It is usual to see this question in terms of two extremes. First, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are totally separate entities, with one being dependent on the other. At the opposite extreme, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are identical - that it is not possible to engage in any rational thinking without using language. The truth seems to lie somewhere between these two positions.

Within the first position, there are plainly two possibilities: language might be dependent upon thought, or thought might be dependent upon language. The traditional view, which is widely held at a popular level, adopts the first of these: people have thoughts, and then they put these thoughts into words. It is
summarized in such metaphorical views of language as the 'dress' or 'tool' of thought.

The view is well represented in the field of child language acquisition where children are seen to develop a range of cognitive abilities which precede the learning of language. The second possibility has also been widely held: the way people use language dictates the lines along which they can think. This view is also represented in the language acquisition field, in the argument that the child's earliest encounters with language are the main influence on the way concepts are learned.

A third possibility, which is also widely held these days, is that language and thought are interdependent - but this is not to say that they are identical. The identity view (for example, that thought is no more than an internalized vocalization) is no longer common. There are too many exceptions for such a strong position to be maintained: we need think only of the various kinds of mental operations which we can perform without language, such as recalling a sequence of movements in a game or sport, or visualizing the route from home to work. It is also widely recognized that pictorial images and physical models are helpful in problem-solving, and may at times be more efficient than purely verbal representations of a problem.

On the other hand, these cases are far outnumbered by those where language does seem to be the main means whereby successful thinking can proceed. To see language and thought as interdependent, then, is to recognize that language is a regular part of the process of thinking, at the same time recognizing that we have to think in order to understand language. It is not a question of one notion taking precedence over the other, but of both notions being essential, if we are to explain behavior. Once again, people have searched for metaphors to express their views. Language has been likened to the arch of a tunnel;
thought, to the tunnel itself. But the complex structure and function of language defies such simple analogies.

Our extreme version of the hypothesis is a combination of extreme relativism with extreme determinism. It claims that there are no restrictions on the amount and type of variation to be expected between languages, including their semantic structures, and that the determining effect of language on thought is total - there is no thought without language. If we put these two claims together, we arrive at the conclusion that there are no constraints on the variation to be found between people in the way they think, especially in the concepts they form. It also follows that if one can find a way to control the language that people learn, one would thereby be able to control their thoughts.

It is clear that the extreme hypothesis is wrong. We have cited reasons for rejecting both of its constituents in the last two sections so we need not repeat the arguments, but at the same time there is some truth in both relativism and determinism, so we may expect language to be responsible for some differences in people's concepts. An extract from Whorf (1940) can be quoted, which gives one of the most extreme formulations of his and Sapir's theory, in order to see how it compares with our extreme hypothesis:

...the background linguistic system (in other words the grammar) of each language is not merely a reproducing instrument for voicing ideas but rather is itself the shaper of ideas, the program and guide for the individual's mental activity, for his analysis of impressions, for his synthesis of his mental stock in trade. Formulation of ideas is not an independent process, strictly rational in the old sense, but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from slightly to greatly, between different grammars. We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language. The categories and types that we isolate from the world of phenomena we do not find there because they stare every observer in the face. On the contrary, the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be
organized by our minds - and this means *largely* by the linguistic systems in our minds. We cut nature up and organize it into concepts, and ascribe significance as we do, *largely* because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way - an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course an implicit and unstated one, BUT ITS TERMS ARE ABSOLUTELY OBLIGATORY; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees... We are thus introduced to a new principle of relativity, which holds that all observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe, unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated.

In this quotation we see something of the problem of interpreting Whorf and Sapir. Some passages represent extreme relativity and extreme determinism - e.g. 'We dissect nature along lines laid down by our native language' - yet others are qualified by the word *largely* (italicized by the writer, not Whorf), which leaves open the possibility of some thought independent of language. So can this passage really be said to represent the extreme version of the hypothesis?

It should be clear however, that virtually everything that this passage says, so eloquently, runs counter to the points we have seen in this Unit. It is ideas that shape language, rather than vice versa, except in relatively abstract areas of thought. Formulation of ideas is on the whole an independent process, relative to language. We dissect the universe along lines laid down by nature and by our communicative and cognitive needs, rather than by our language. The meanings of linguistic items *can* be adjusted by the individual to fit his needs, by metaphorical extensions; to the extent that meanings are learned from others there is no need for a 'speech community' as a whole to agree on them since there are many specialist sub-communities with their own semantic systems. On the other hand, the fact that two linguists as outstandingly competent and experienced as Sapir and Whorf could believe otherwise offers sobering food for
thought, suggesting that any claims about language and thought (including those discussed here) should not be accepted lightly.

Language, thought, and women

Much of meaning we learn is learned from others. As children grow to adulthood, the community around them constantly feeds them with ideas and meanings of words. Some of the meaning imposed on certain words is sexist in nature. This brings us to the issue of women and the forms of speech they use. As many studies have indicated, women seem to adhere to the standard form of language use more than men. Various reasons have been proposed and the following are some of them.

Explanations of women's linguistic behavior

'Why can't a woman be more like a man?' (My Fair Lady)

Many social dialectologists asked: "Why do men use more standard forms than women?" In answer to this question, at least four different (though not mutually exclusive) explanations were suggested. The first appeals to social class and its related status for an explanation, the second refers to women's role in society, the third to women's status as a subordinate group, and the fourth to the function of speech in expressing masculinity.
1. The social status explanation

Some linguists have suggested that women use more standard speech forms than men because they are more status-conscious than men. The claim is that women are more aware of the fact that the way they speak signals their social class background or social status in the community. Standard speech forms are generally associated with high social status, and so, according to this explanation, women use more standard speech forms as a way of claiming such status. It is suggested that this is especially true for women who do not have paid employment, since they cannot use their occupations as a basis for signaling social status. This is verified by the fact that women who were interviewed in New York and in Norwich reported that they used more standard forms than they actually did. Women generally lack status in the society, and so, it is suggested, some try to acquire it by using standard speech forms, and by reporting that they use even more of these forms than they actually do.

Though it sounds superficially plausible, there is at least some indirect evidence which throws doubt on this explanation. It is suggested that women who are not in paid employment are most likely to claim high social status by using more standard forms. This implies that women in the paid workforce should use fewer standard forms than women working in the home. But the little evidence that we have, in fact suggests that just the opposite may be true. An American study compared the speech of women in service occupations, working in garages and hotels, for instance, with the speech of women working in the home. Those in paid employment used more standard forms than those working in the home. In the course of their jobs, the first group of women were interacting with people who used more standard forms, and this interaction had its effect on their own usage. By contrast, the women who stayed home interacted mainly with each other, and this reinforced their preference for vernacular forms.
2. Woman's role as guardian of society's values

An anecdote:

Mrs Godley, an early New Zealand settler, believed in the civilizing influence of women. When two young men she knew were about to take up a sheep station in Canterbury in 1852, she warned them that they would become 'semi-barbarous'. She begged them to have a 'lady figure of a lady, carefully draped, set up in their usual sitting-room, and always behave before it as if it was their mother'.

A second explanation for the fact that women use more standard forms than men points to the way society tends to expect 'better' behavior from women than from men. Little boys are generally allowed more freedom than little girls. Misbehavior from boys is tolerated where girls are more quickly corrected. Similarly, rule-breaking of any kind by women is frowned on more severely than rule-breaking by men. Women are designated the role of modeling correct behavior in the community. Predictably then, following this argument, society expects women to speak more correctly than men, especially when they are serving as models for children's speech.

This explanation of why women use more standard forms than men may be relevant in some social groups, but it is certainly not true for all. Interactions between a mother and her child are likely to be very relaxed and informal and it is in relaxed informal contexts, that vernacular forms occur most often in everyone's speech. Standard forms are typically associated with more formal and less personal interactions. It seems odd to explain women's greater use of more standard speech forms (collected in formal tape-recorded interviews) by referring to a woman's role as a speech model in her very intimate and mainly unobserved interactions with her child.
3. Subordinate groups must be polite

A story

‘You are an intolerable bore Mr. Brown. Why don’t you simply shut up and let someone speak who has more interesting ideas to contribute’, said Lord Huntly in the well-educated and cultured accents of the over-privileged.

A third explanation which has been proposed for women’s use of more standard forms is that people who are subordinate must be polite. Children are expected to be polite to adults. Women as a subordinate group, it is argued, must avoid offending men and so they must speak carefully and politely.

It is not immediately apparent why polite speech should be equated with standard speech. It is not possible to express oneself politely using a Malay, Chinese, or Indian English accent, and it is not equally possible to be very insulting using standard English? A more sophisticated version of this explanation, however, which links it to the social status explanation, suggests that by using more standard speech forms women are looking after their own need to be valued by the society. By using standard forms a woman is protecting her ‘face’ (a technical term used by sociolinguists with approximately the same meaning as in the phrase to lose face). She is also avoiding offence to others.

2. Vernacular forms express machismo

An example:

Roy: Comin’ down the club Jim?
Jim: Not friggin’ likely. It’s rubbish that club.
Roy: It ain’t that bad. Music’s cool. I seen a couple of sharp judies there too. If we plays our cards right......Anyways you was keen enough las’ week.
One answer which has been suggested to the question ‘why don’t men use more standard forms?’ is that men prefer vernacular forms because they carry macho connotations of masculinity and toughness. If this is true it would also explain why women might not want to use such forms. There is some evidence to support the suggestion. The speakers on a tape who were identified as most likely to win in a street fight were those who used most vernacular forms. The fact that Norwich men tended to claim that they used more vernacular forms than they actually did, while the women didn’t, supports this explanation too. The men apparently wanted to sound less standard than they actually were. This suggests that men regard vernacular forms positively and value them highly, even if they do not always openly admit to doing so. It has been suggested, then, that these forms have ‘covert prestige’ by contrast to the overt prestige of the standard forms which are cited as models of correctness.

The converse of this claim is that standard forms tend to be associated with female values and femininity. Some linguists have pointed to the association of standard forms with female teachers and the norms they impose in the classroom, with the suggestion that boys may reject this female domination, and the speech forms associated with it than girls.

This discussion and examples given above have focussed on the widespread evidence that men use more vernacular forms than women. But there are exceptions to this pattern. Women from the lower social groups in Norwich used almost as many vernacular forms as the men. And there are some communities, such as Pont-rhyd-y-fen, a small Welsh mining community, and Brazlandia, a satellite city of Brasilia, where the women use more vernacular forms than the men. A high frequency of vernacular forms may have a much wider range of associations than the explanation which identifies them with masculinity and
toughness suggests. To give just two contrasting examples, vernacular forms may express conservative non-urban values (where the standard is the urban norm), or alternatively vernacular forms may reflect anti-establishment attitudes (where the standard is the middle-class adult norm).

One of the most obvious speech differences between women and men is in the pitch of their voices. Most people believe this difference develops at puberty. It is thought to be as difficult to guess the sex of a 5 year-old on the phone as it is to identify the sex of a swaddled infant from its wails and coos. It is certainly true that young boys' voices often 'break' at puberty and become noticeably lower in pitch. Their voice quality reflects their physical growth. Boy’s vocal cords generally grow faster and bigger than girl's at puberty. Men's heads and lungs are also larger than women’s, just as older people’s are bigger than children's. As a result male voices generally sound lower in pitch than women's, just as adult voices sound deeper than children's. Differences are relative, however, and the pitch ranges of women and men overlap to a considerable extent. In any community there will always be some women whose natural speaking pitch is deeper than that of some men.

This physical explanation is only part of the reason for sex differences in voice pitch, however. Social and cultural factors contribute too. Young boys' voices often become lower in pitch than girls' voices well before there is any physical basis for the change. It is more masculine to speak with a lower-pitched voice, and so young boys often develop this masculine feature, along with other more obviously sociolinguistic features of male speech such as the greater use of vernacular forms described above.

Influence in public domains has been a male prerogative until relatively recently. The fact that some women politicians have deeper voices than average may reflect the public's preference
for voices with masculine associations in politics; or perhaps women politicians are using male models in order to gain acceptance in spheres previously dominated by males. These norms are culturally relative too. There are cultures where the average pitch of men's voices is considerably higher than that of the average American male, for instance, and the upper reaches of some Japanese women's pitch range are out of sight compared to those of English speaking women. Only a young child could compete.

Sex, politeness and stereotypes

In this section we will look at the issue of 'women's language'. Is women's language a distinct style or register of a language? Are women more polite than men? Are there any differences in the way women and men interact? How is language used to refer to women and men? What message does the language used about women convey about their status in the community? These are the questions we will address in this section of the Unit. We will review some of the evidence that women's speech differs from men's. We will also examine further evidence that women and men use language differently, and look at what language reveals about the way society categorizes women.

Women's language and confidence

Sad but ...(true?)

'...a girl is damned if she does, damned if she doesn't. If she refuses to talk like a lady, she is ridiculed and subjected to criticism as unfeminine; if she does learn, she is ridiculed as unable to think clearly, unable to take part in a serious discussion: in some sense, as less than fully human. These two choices which a woman has - to be less than a woman or less than a person - are highly painful.'

(Taken from Holmes, 1995:313)
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While some social dialectologists suggested that women were status conscious, and that this was reflected in their use of standard speech forms (see above), Robin Lakoff, an American linguist, suggested almost the opposite. She argued that women were using language which reinforced their subordinate status; they were ‘colluding in their own subordination’ by the way they spoke.

Lakoff suggested that women’s speech was characterized by linguistic features such as the following:

(a) Lexical hedges or fillers, e.g. you know, sort of, well, you see.
(b) Tag questions, e.g. she’s very nice, isn’t she?
(c) Rising intonation on declaratives, e.g. it’s really good.
(d) ‘Empty’ adjectives, e.g. divine, charming, cute.
(e) Precise color terms, e.g. magenta, aquamarine.
(f) Intensifiers such as just and so, e.g. I like him so much.
(g) ‘Hypercorrect’ grammar, e.g. consistent use of standard verb forms.
(h) ‘Superpolite’ forms, e.g. indirect requests, euphemisms.
(i) Avoidance of strong swear words, e.g. fudge; my goodness.
(j) Emphatic stress, e.g. it was a BRILLIANT performance.

Many of these features are illustrated in the list of sentences that she provides elsewhere. Lakoff’s claims were based on her own intuitions and observations, but they sparked off a spate of research because they appeared to be so specific and easy to investigate.

However, much of this initial research was methodologically unsatisfactory. Speech was recorded in laboratory conditions with assigned topics, and sometimes rather artificial constraints (such as a screen between the speakers). Most of the subjects were university students. Consequently, it was difficult to generalize from the result to the natural informal speech in the community as a whole. In addition the linguistic analysis of the data was often rather unsophisticated.
The positive role of women’s speech

Example 1:

Margaret is holding a small party to introduce a new neighbor, Frank, to other people in the street. She introduces Frank to an old friend, Andrew.

Margaret: Andrew this is our new neighbor, Frank. Andrew has just changed jobs, haven’t you?
Andrew: Yes I am now a well-paid computer programmer instead of a poorly paid administrative assistant.

Teachers, interviewers, hosts at parties and, in general, those in leadership roles who are responsible for the success of an interaction tend to use tags in this facilitative way. The host provides the guests with a topic of conversation. In the next example, a teacher makes it easy for the child to participate.

Example 2:

Mrs. Lim is a primary school teacher working with a group of 5-year-olds. They are preparing for a nature walk by looking at pictures of bird, flowers, and leaves that they hope to see on their walk.

Mrs Lim: Here’s a pretty one. What’s this one called Rahim?
Rahim: Mm, erm [pause]
Mrs Lim: See its tail, look at its tail. It’s a fantail, isn’t it?
Rahim: Mm, a fantail. I have seen one of them.

A tag may also soften a directive or a criticism as in the following example.
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Example 3:

Zoe and her mother Claire have just come home from the supermarket.
Zoe, empties the shopping basket all over the kitchen floor.
Claire: That was a bit of a daft thing to do, wasn't it?

The tag functions not to express uncertainty, but rather to soften the negative comment. Tags may also be used as confrontational and coercive devices. In the next example a tag is used to force feedback from an uncooperative addressee.

Example 4:

A police superintendent is interviewing a detective constable and is criticizing the constable’s performance.
A: You'll probably find yourself before the Chief Constable, okay?
B: Yes, Sir, yes, understood.
A: Now you er..fully understand that, don't you?
B: Yes, Sir, indeed, yeah.

The tag in this exchange functions not to hedge but rather to strengthen the negative force of the utterance in which it occurs. So here we have a tag which could be classified as a boosting device. Therefore, treating all tags as signals of uncertainty is clearly misleading.
Table I: The distribution of tag questions by function and sex of speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of tag</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressing uncertainty</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softening</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Holmes, 1984: 54)

Table I above summarizes the patterns found in a sixty-thousand word corpus containing equal amount of female and male speech collected in a range of matched contexts. It is clear that the women used more tags than the men, as Lakoff predicted. But they did not use them for the same purposes as men. Women put more emphasis than men on the polite or affective functions of tags, using them as facilitative positive politeness devices. Men, on the other hand, used more tags for the expression of uncertainty.

How the English language colludes in the subordination of women
Sexist language

In 1980 an American linguist published a book called *Language: the Loaded Weapon*. In it he explored the wide variety of ways in which the English language provides categories and ways of encoding experience which could be regarded as 'loaded' - in other words carrying an implicit value judgement or manipulating responses. Alongside discussions of the language used in advertising and politics, he also considered the area of sex' language. Sexist language is one example of the way a culture or society conveys its values from one group to another and from one generation to the next.

Language conveys attitudes. Sexist attitudes stereotype a person according to gender rather than judging on individual merits. Sexist language encodes stereotyped attitudes to women and men. In principle, then, the study of sexist language is concerned with the way language expresses both negative and positive stereotypes of both women and men. In practice, research in this area has concentrated on the ways in which language conveys negative attitudes to women.

Can a language be sexist?

Feminists have claimed that English is a sexist language. At first sight it may seem odd to suggest that a language rather than its speakers are sexist. Sexism - involves behavior which maintains social inequalities between women and men. Can a language contribute to the maintenance of social inequalities between the sexes?
There are a number of ways in which it has been suggested that the English language discriminates against women. Most obviously, perhaps, in the semantic area the English metaphor is able to describe women as it includes an extraordinarily high number of derogatory images compared to those used to describe men.

**Example 5:**
This is a story of a ‘girl’s life in the chicken metaphor.

In her youth she is a *chick*, then she marries and begins feeling *cooped up*, so she goes to *hen parties* where she *cackles* with her friends. Then she has her *brood* and begins to *hen-peck* her husband. Finally she turns into an *old biddy*.

Animal imagery is one example where the images of women seem considerably less positive than those for men. Consider the negativity of *bitch, old biddy, and cow*, compared to *stud* and *stallion*. Animal imagery which refers to men often has at least some positive component (such as wiliness or sexual prowess). *Birds* are widely regarded as featherbrained and flighty! Even the more positive *chick and kitten* are sweet but helpless pets.

Women may also be described or referred to in terms of food imagery, which is equally insulting. Saccharine terms, such as *sugar, sweetie, honey*, are mainly, though not exclusively, used for addressing women. Less complimentary terms such as *crumpet* and *fart*, however, are restricted to female referents. They illustrate a common evolutionary pattern in the meaning of words referring to women. Terms which were originally neutral or affectionate eventually acquire negative connotations as they increasingly refer only to women, and as their meanings focus on women as sexual objects. By contrast there appears to be little food imagery which is appropriate for referring only to men, though there are insulting terms such as *veg and cabbage*, and, according to my 11 year-old, *parsnip*, which may be used to abuse either sex!
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If you are familiar with a language other than English (Bahasa Melayu, any Chinese dialect, any Indian dialect) see if you can discover whether there is evidence of sexism expressed through the vocabulary and imagery of that language.

Many words reflect a view of women as a deviant, abnormal or subordinate group. For example, English morphology - its word-structure - generally takes the male form as the base form and adds a suffix to signal 'female': e.g. lion/lioness, count/countess, actor/actress; usher/usherette; hero/heroin; aviator/aviatrix. This is true for a number of other European languages, such as French and German, too. The male form is the unmarked form, and therefore, it is argued, implicitly the norm. The use of an additional suffix to signal 'femaleness' is seen as conveying the message that women are deviant, abnormal, and not important.

It has also been suggested that suffixes like -ess and -ette trivialize and diminish women, and when they refer to occupations such as authoress and poetess, carry connotations of lack of seriousness. This attitude doubtless derives from the meaning of the associated diminutive suffixes in terms such as launderette ('a little laundry') and maisonette.

Generic structures provide further evidence to support the claim that the English language marginalizes women and treats them as abnormal. In fact, words like 'generic' he and man can be said to render women invisible.
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Example 6:

Mountain and ecosystems are fragile, and particularly vulnerable to the influence of man and his introduced animals... Life in the mountains is harsh. Storms are common, and temperatures are low... Into this scene comes man, with his great boots, ready to love the mountains to death. Man loves to hunt. He sees it as a tradition and a right. He believes that deer herds should be managed so he and his son after him can hunt them. He cannot understand his brother's claim that deer diminish the range of plants. After all his brother couldn't name a single plant that deer had made extinct.

The basis for claims that English renders women invisible is the use of forms such as he and man - as generic forms, as illustrated in example 6. Since these forms are also used with the specific meanings of 'third person singular male subject pronoun' and 'male human being', the satisfactoriness of their use to convey the meanings 'third person human subject pronoun', and simply 'human being' or 'humanity' has increasingly been challenged. One can see why. Reading example 6, with its references to man, his great boots, his son and his brother, it is difficult to believe that the writer had ever conceived of the possibility that women too might venture into the mountains.

The use of man as a generic form has - a long history. But its generic use is no longer acceptable to many English speakers because this meaning has become overshadowed by its masculine meaning. Others avoid it as clumsy or misleading for the same reason - man has become increasingly ambiguous between the generic and the masculine meaning. In a sentence such as Man loves to hunt, for instance, readers may be genuinely unsure whether women are meant to be included or not.

It is also clear that the word man is associated with male images, even when it is used generically. The best known experiment asked college students to select pictures to illustrate the chapters
of a sociology textbook. Chapter titles such as *Social Man*, *Industrial Man* and *Political Man* evoked male images to a much greater extent than headings like *Society*, *Industrial Life* and *Political Behavior*. Those who claim man can still be used generically are ignoring the fact that for many readers the term man is firmly established as meaning 'male'.

Generic *he* raises exactly the same issues, with even more challenging problems when writers want to avoid it. Attempts to solve the problem by introducing a new epicene (sex-neutral) pronoun can be traced back to the eighteenth century when grammarians were concerned not with the invisibility of women caused by generic *he*, but by the grammatical inefficiencies and confusions of gender and number it caused. More than eighty bisexal pronouns have been proposed since the eighteenth century, including *tey, thon, et, ip, ou, co, per, ne and hiser*.

There is some evidence that newspapers, journals and books -ire becoming aware of attitudes to the use of generic *he* and *man*, and writers are using a variety of strategies to avoid these terms. The *New Zealand Women's Weekly*, for example, used four times fewer generic forms in 1984 than it did in 1964. An American study of a wide range of magazines and newspapers found a dramatic drop in the use of generic forms from twelve to four per 5000 words between 1971 and 1979.

Some writers adopt the strategy of using *he and she* in alternate chapters or even in alternate paragraphs. Others use *she* consistently as a generic 'to even things up'. But singular *they* is by far the most widespread solution, and it has been used by well-established authors including Shakespeare, Chesterfield, and George Bernard Shaw. It was opposed virulently by some nineteenth-century grammarians who were delighted when an *Act of Parliament* in 1850 legislated that in all acts 'the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females'. Nevertheless, *they* is nowadays the most frequently heard
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generic pronoun in informal speech, and it is spreading to more formal contexts too. Its use is not always problem-free, however, but a start has already been made and it is now up to the society to continue being sensitive to the problem of language being sexist and demeaning to women.

Your Notes

Is there a relationship between language and culture? Is it culturally true that some languages are more sexist than others? Is your own language sexist? Give evidence.
UNIT 5

PLEASE READ:


Chapter 4  
“Language planning and policy”

Chapter 13  
“Literacy and literacies”

Chapter 14  
“Language and education”
National And Official Languages

In sociolinguistics the distinction between a national language and an official language is generally made along the affective-referential dimension, or more precisely in this context, the ideological-instrumental dimension. A national language is the language of a political, cultural and social unit. It is generally developed and used as a symbol national unity. Its functions are to identify the nation and unite the people of the nation. An official language, by contrast, simply a language which may be used for government business. Its function is primarily utilitarian rather than symbolic. It is possible, of course, for one language to serve both functions.

Not surprisingly, governments do not always recognize the distinctions made by sociolinguists. They use the terms 'official' and 'national' to suit their political ends, as had happened in many countries. For example, in Paraguay the government declared both Guarani and Spanish to be national languages, while Spanish was also identified as an official language. In other countries, such as Tanzania, just the reverse is found. There is one national language, Swahili, but two official languages, Swahili and English. Many countries make no distinction between a national language and an official language. In countries which regard themselves as monolingual nations, the same language serves both purposes. In multilingual communities, however, all kinds of permutations have been used in order to satisfy both political and social goals on the one hand, and more practical and utilitarian needs on the other.

In multilingual countries, the government often declares a particular language to be national language for political reasons. The declaration may be a step in the process of asserting the nationhood of a newly independent or established nation, for instance, as in the case of Swahili in Tanzania, Hebrew in Israel, Bahasa Melayu in Malaysia, and Bahasa Indonesia in Indonesia. Where this national language cannot serve all the internal and
external functions of government business, however, it has then been necessary to identify one or more official languages as well. So French is an official language in many countries, such as Zaire, the Ivory Coast and Chad, where France was previously a colonial power, and Arabic is an official language in Israel alongside Hebrew.

The identification of official languages may also be necessary when the choice of national language is problematic. In multilingual India, for example, attempts to give Hindi sole status as the national language have not succeeded. Fourteen regional Indian languages are recognized as official languages alongside English and Hindi for the country as a whole, and in addition different states each have their own official languages. Telugu, for instance, is the official language of the state of Andhra Pradesh. Like Paraguay, other countries have nominated more than one national language. Zaire, for instance has four African languages as national languages, Lingala, Swahili, Tshiluba, and Kikongo, but only one official language, French. In Haiti, the 1983 constitution declared Haitian Creole a national language alongside French, but there too French serves as the only official language.

In Indonesia by contrast, the government did not select the language of the political and social elite, the Javanese, as the national language. Instead they developed and standardized a variety of Malay which was widely used in Indonesia as a trade language. Since Javanese has a complex linguistically marked politeness system based on assessments of relative, this was an eminently sensible decision. Indeed the successful spread of Indonesian owes a great deal to the fact that it is a very useful neutral choice in many situations.

- Can you fill in the following table
- Why do you think some countries have more than one language with official status?
A short story on language

Abdullah Hassan is a highly educated Malaysian who lives in Kuala Lumpur, the capital city. He has spent many years fighting to develop and encourage pride in Bahasa Melayu, the indigenous language, among Malays from all social backgrounds. Upper class Malays have always regarded English as the language of culture, education and civilization, and in the past they tended to belittle Bahasa Melayu as the language of the uneducated. Abdullah has pointed to the linguistic richness of Bahasa Melayu with its extensive vocabulary in areas such as culture, administration, and agriculture. He has also emphasized its importance as the only language which can adequately express the Malaysian national identity. As a result of his efforts and those of others, Bahasa Melayu is now a language most Malaysians are proud of. Bahasa Melayu – also known as Malay, has the fifth largest number of speakers in the world although this fact is never really mentioned in most books produced here or in the West. It is spoken by a total of over 50 million people in Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Brunei, and the Philippines; and in Malaysia it has co-existed for the past 300 years with English, Mandarin, Tamil, and Arabic. Malaysia provides a clear case of a stable broad diglossia, with Bahasa Melayu and English as the H languages (used in formal contexts, for administration, in education and legal business), and other Malay, Chinese, and Indian dialects as the L language of solidarity, the language of love, humor and poetry. Malaysians are generally happy to recognize English as a useful language for academic and official purposes and as the language for international communication.

1 Answers: Australia – English; Belgium – Flemish Dutch, French, (German); Brazil – Portuguese; Canada – English, French; Colombia – Spanish; Finland – Finnish, Swedish; France – French.
What is involved in developing a code or variety (whether dialect or language) so that it is suitable for official use? Addressing this challenge involves issues relating to the form of the variety to be used, the functions it serves, and the attitude people hold towards it.

There are generally four interrelated steps:

1. **Selection**: choosing the variety or code to be developed.

2. **Codification**: standardizing its structural or linguistic features. This kind of ‘linguistic processing’ is sometimes called corpus planning.

3. **Elaboration**: extending its functions for use in new domains. This involves developing the necessary linguistic resources for handling new concepts and contexts.

4. **Securing its acceptance**: The status of the new variety is important, and so people's attitudes to the variety being developed must be considered. Steps may be needed to enhance its prestige, for instance, and to encourage people to develop pride in the language or loyalty towards it.

Selecting the code to be developed is often an entirely political decision, though linguists may point out the different linguistic problems presented by selecting one variety rather than another. Acceptance by the people will generally require endorsement by politicians and socially prestigious groups. So selection and acceptance are steps which involve social and political factors. Codification and elaborating the code to handle a wider range of functions are, by contrast, essentially linguistic processes. Producing a dictionary and ensuring there are words available for teaching mathematics, science, and technology in the variety, for instance, are problems for linguists. In practice, however, all these steps are closely interrelated, as the examples below will demonstrate.
1. SELECTING A CODE

The case of Tanzania

Tanzania faced the dilemma of which language to choose as its official national language. Choosing one language from over a hundred indigenous languages, each associated with a particular tribe, would have simply provoked discontent, if not inter-tribal warfare. Choosing English for a newly independent nation seemed inappropriate (though many other nations have had little choice but to use the language of the colonizers as their only official language). The first President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, chose Swahili, a language of the Bantu language family, which was widely used throughout the country as a lingua franca in many contexts. There were some obvious reasons for his choice. Some were pragmatic. Swahili was already the medium of primary education, for instance, and so all Tanzanians learned the language at school. Other obvious reasons were more ideological. Ninety-six per cent of Tanzania's languages are Bantu languages, like Swahili, so it could be clearly identified as an African language. Moreover, Swahili had served the lingua franca of the anti-colonial political movement for dependence. In this role it had acted as a kind of social cement between very disparate groups. It could hardly have had other credentials from a political and social point of view.

A SUCCESS STORY OF LANGUAGE REVIVAL

The case of Israel

The Academy of the Hebrew Language in Israel was faced with the opposite task from that facing language planners in Tanzania, namely to revive an ancient written language to serve
Unit 5: Language Policy, Planning and Implementation

the daily colloquial needs of a modern people. Considering each of the four steps outlined above (code selection, codification, elaboration and acceptance), what problems do you think they faced?²

Thus, in selecting a national language, the following criteria have been identified as important.

1. Unifying - it must unify the nation, and offer advantages to speakers over their dialects and vernaculars.

2. Separatist - it must set the nation off from surrounding nations. It should be an appropriate symbol of separate national identity.

3. Prestige: it should be recognized as a proper or ‘real’ language with higher status than local dialects and vernacular languages.

4. Frame-of-reference function: the standard variety must serve as a yardstick for correctness. Other varieties will be regarded as non-standard in some respect.

Are all these functions served for the Tanzanian nation by Swahili?

¹Answer
Selecting a code: The chosen language had to act as a Jewish symbol and therefore had to be a Jewish language. Hence the only real choices for the people of Israel were Yiddish or Hebrew. The selection of Hebrew was basically a political decision. It was considered the only possible choice for the great majority of Israeli Jews. Not all Jews spoke Yiddish and it had little prestige. For many the associations of Yiddish especially the variety closely related to German linguistically - were simply unacceptable.
2. CODIFICATION

Codification: Like Latin, Hebrew is a highly codified variety. Grammars and dictionaries already existed. Spelling and pronunciation rules based on classical texts existed too. Codification of the modern variety of Hebrew which has now emerged is still in progress.

3. ELABORATION

Elaboration: This is where most work needed to be done. The selection of forms for use in everyday conversation involved drawing on a variety of literary dialects of Hebrew, as well as the various mainly European vernaculars spoken by immigrants to Israel.

4. ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance: Hebrew had great prestige. People respected it and revered it as the language of religion and literature. An extensive literary revival of Hebrew in the eighteenth and nineteenth century meant that it was used for new and broader functions by writers. This prepared the ground for its being seen as the obvious candidate for national language. It was adopted as a vernacular in the 1880s by enthusiasts who persuaded people to teach it to their children as a first language, though some felt it was too sacred for everyday use. Its advantages as a lingua franca between immigrants who spoke many different languages generally added to its attractions. So its prestige, its unifying function and its usefulness all contributed to its acceptance.

Once a language has gone through the various processes described above, the country will then teach that variety to its population. The process of disseminating it is usually through its educational system where students will be taught how to write and read in the new code.
1. Describe the case in Malaysia and state where Bahasa Melayu is within the processes mentioned above?

2. Relate what you have read in this unit to Chapter 4 in your textbook on "Language Planning and Policy" and state whether it is the neoclassical or historical-structural approach that should be used by teachers and language planners in determining the path they should take.

3. Relate this Unit to your reading of McKay's article on "Literacy and Literacies" (pp421-445) in your textbook.