4

Languages in Contact: Multilingual Societies and Multilingual Discourse

Key Concepts

The pervasiveness of multilingualism

Domains of language use

The influence of language ideologies and language attitudes on language use

Multilingual discourse shapes interactions, relationships, and social identities

This chapter will address what happens when languages, or more accurately the speakers of multiple languages, come into contact. Multilingualism is common in societies across the world, despite the perception by many monolinguals that speaking only one language is the norm (see Fuller 2012, 2013 for discussion of what she calls 'the ideology of normative monolingualism'). In many cases, groups of people who speak different languages live near each other; sometimes there are political boundaries that divide them and sometimes they identify as being part of the same nation or state, but in all such cases they have contact and must communicate. (An example of the former situation is the neighboring nations of France and Germany; of the latter, the German and French-speaking regions of Switzerland.) In other cases, there is movement of speakers of one language into an area where another

An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, Seventh Edition. Ronald Wardhaugh and Janet M. Fuller.

language is spoken – this is the case for immigration, colonialization, and various scenarios of conquest.

In these latter scenarios, there is likely to be one language which has social dominance, and in this situation **language shift** may occur, that is, speakers shift to speaking the dominant language. In situations of immigration, commonly within three generations, members of the minority group shift to the dominant language. In some scenarios, we have what is called **language maintenance**, that is, both languages continue to be spoken. Giles et al. (1977) proposed a framework within which to assess a language's **ethnolinguistic vitality**, that is, how likely it is to be maintained. They say that we must consider three things about any threatened language: (1) its status: economic, social, and historical; (2) its territorial distribution and concentration together with its population demographics, for example, absolute numbers, birth rates, marriage patterns, and migrations in and out; and (3) its institutional support or lack thereof, both formally, as in the media, education, and government services, and less formally, as in the workplace and in religious, social, and cultural activities.

In the rest of this chapter, we will discuss language use in situations in which there is maintenance, that is, in multilingual communities. We will use the term **multilingual** to refer generally to situations in which there are speakers of more than one language.

Multilingualism as a Societal Phenomenon

In many parts of the world it is just a normal requirement of daily living that people speak several languages: perhaps one or more at home, another in the village, still another for purposes of trade, and yet another for contact with the outside world of wider social or political organization. These various languages are often acquired through simple exposure to the language, although one language or more in a speaker's repertoire may be learned through schooling or in an instructional setting.

One example of a varied multilingual society is present-day India. Mohanty, an Indian sociolinguist, writes of his own linguistic repertoire:

> I use Oriya in my home, English in my work place, Hindi for television viewing, Bengali to communicate with my domestic helper, a variety of Hindi-Punjabi-Urdu in market places in Delhi, Sanskrit for my prayer and religious activities, and some conversational Kui with the Konds for my research in their community. These languages fit in a mutually complementary and non-competing relationship in my life. (Mohanty 2006, 263)

It is unusual in urban Indian society for someone not to use a variety of codes in different contexts and with different interlocutors, and children learn at a young age not only to master several languages but also to master the art of knowing the appropriate language for each social context. Maintaining multiple languages over

generations is less common in some other societies and often much less valued. Multilingualism has nonetheless become an expected and increasingly prestigious part of urban cultures across the world. Fuller (2012), in her work in a German-English bilingual classroom in the urban center of Berlin, Germany, notes that many of the children speak two languages at home, sometimes German and English but in some cases English and Spanish, or German and Russian, Hindi, or Setswana. They consider it advantageous to master more languages, often claiming competence in languages to which they have had limited exposure. They also provide positive reinforcement to their classmates as speakers of Serbian, Romanian, or Farsi. This is, of course, not the case everywhere. Fuller notes that the Mexican-American children in her research in rural southern Illinois, USA, who also spoke indigenous languages from Mexico were often hesitant to admit this, and were sometimes teased for their association with these languages. The status of these languages in Mexico was low and there was not a general sense of the value of linguistic diversity in the rural US community in which they lived. Thus while multilingualism can be found almost anywhere, it does not always have positive associations.

Competencies and convergence in multilingual societies

Most people who are multilingual do not necessarily have exactly the same abilities in all the languages (or varieties) they speak; in fact, that kind of parity may be exceptional. As Sridhar (1996, 50) says,

> Multilingualism involving balanced, native-like command of all the languages in the repertoire is rather uncommon. Typically, multilinguals have varying degrees of command of the different repertoires. The differences in competence in the various languages might range from command of a few lexical items, formulaic expressions such as greetings, and rudimentary conversational skills all the way to excellent command of the grammar and vocabulary and specialized register and styles.

Sridhar further specifies that the level of competence in a code is, of course, developed based on the need of the speaker to use a language in a particular domain or for a particular activity. The models for multilingual discourse we will discuss below recognize such factors as topic, speakers, and setting on language choice. They also recognize that context does not *determine* language choice, but merely *influences* it. Speakers draw on the social norms and meanings that are shared in a community, but are not controlled by them.

In such situations, that is, when speakers master multiple languages and use them all in conversation, there may be linguistic consequences. One possibility is the development of what we call **contact languages**, which will be discussed in the next chapter. In other cases, the consequence is diffusion of certain features from one language to the other(s) as a result of the contact situation, particularly certain kinds

of syntactic features. This phenomenon has been observed in such areas as the Balkans, the south of India, and Sri Lanka. An early landmark study which reported this is Gumperz and Wilson (1971). They reported that in Kupwar, a small village of about 3,000 inhabitants in Maharashtra, India, there was convergence among the four languages spoken: Marathi and Urdu (both of which are Indo-European), Kannada (a non-Indo-European language), and Telugu (also a non-Indo-European language spoken by only a few people in the village). The languages were distributed mainly by caste. The highest caste, the Jains, spoke Kannada, and the lowest caste, the untouchables, spoke Marathi. People in different castes also needed to speak to one another and to the Telugu-speaking rope-makers. The Urdu-speaking Muslims also needed to be fitted in. Bilingualism or even trilingualism was normal, particularly among the men, but it was Marathi which dominated inter-group communication. One linguistic consequence, however, was that there was some convergence of the languages spoken in the village so far as syntax is concerned, but vocabulary differences were maintained (McMahon 1994, 214–16). It is vocabulary rather than syntax which serves to distinguish the groups, and the variety of multilingualism that has resulted is a special local variety which has developed in response to local needs.

Language ideologies surrounding multilingualism

As we have said, multilingualism is common in many parts of the world and people in those parts would view any other situation as strange and limiting. Nonetheless, there is a long history in certain Western societies of people actually 'looking down' on those who are multilingual. In many of these societies, prestige is attached to only a certain few classical languages (e.g., Classical Greek and Latin) or modern languages of high culture (e.g., English, French, Italian, and German). You generally get little credit for speaking Swahili and, until recently at least, not much more for speaking Russian, Japanese, Arabic, or Chinese. Multilingualism in such societies is often associated with immigrant status, and thus with groups who tend to occupy rather low positions in society. Thus, multilingualism becomes associated with 'inferiority.' One unfortunate consequence of this is that some Western societies go to great lengths to downgrade, even eradicate, the languages that immigrants bring with them while at the same time trying to teach foreign languages in schools. What is more, they have had much more success in doing the former than the latter. We will return to this issue in chapter 14 on language planning and policy, specifically in connection with certain recent developments in the United States.

It is important to note that ideologies about multilingualism are also part of the development of contact linguistics as a field of study, and this influences the terms we use to refer to various contact phenomena. In chapter 2 we used the term variety as a neutral term in referring to ways of speaking, and here we will also use another term, **code**, that, like variety, seeks to avoid the language versus dialect issue. Much of the research on discourse in multilingual contexts uses the term **code-switching**

(sometimes written without a hyphen) to avoid the issue of whether people are speaking multiple language or dialects. Many of the theoretical approaches we will discuss can also be applied to data regardless of how we define the status of the relationship, that is, whether it is switching between two distinct languages or between two dialects of one language. However, there is also a growing discussion of the fluidity of codes, and such codes are perhaps better described from an ideological perspective than from a linguistic one (Bailey 2007, Creese and Blackledge 2010). Thus, we will use the term **multilingual discourse** instead of code-switching or code-mixing, as these latter terms imply a normative monolingual ideology which is at odds with current research trends in language contact. Other terms which have been used for this type of discourse are languaging (Jørgensen 2008), translanguaging (Garcia 2009), and metrolingual practices (Otsuji and Pennycook 2011, 2012, Jaworski 2014).

Linguistic landscapes

A recently emerged area of study in the sociolinguistics of multilingual societies is the topic of **linguistic landscapes**, that is, the display of languages in public spaces, including signs, billboards, advertisements, and graffiti. A linguistic landscape is not a straightforward reflection of the official statuses of the languages used, the linguistic diversity present in the city, nor the relationship between languages. Rather, how languages appear in public space provides evidence about underlying ideologies concerning particular codes and their speakers (Hélot et al. 2012). The ways in which languages are used both reflects and impacts their perceived values (Stroud and Mpendukana 2009).

In Berlin, Germany, although German is, of course, the dominant language seen in the linguistic landscape, both English and Turkish (among other languages) are also present, and how they are used provides a perspective on the statuses of these languages. English is frequently used as a lingua franca for speakers of various linguistic backgrounds, for example, in signs in the subways instructing passengers what to do in case of emergency (these are provided in German, English, and French) or in translations of information in tourist attractions (usually only in German and English). However, what is more interesting is the use of English in the names of businesses which are aimed at a primarily native German-speaking audience. A German airline is called *German Wings*, a café has the name *Café Happy Day* (see Figure 4.1), an auto rental agency is named *My Car*, a hairdresser's shop advertises with the slogan *Pimp My Hair* and a club advertises evening entertainment aimed at a female audience with the wording *Zugang zum Mainfloor for ladies only* 'access to the main floor for ladies only.' In most of these cases, the use of English is linked to its status as a prestigious global language which plays an important role in popular culture.

Turkish is used quite differently. In some cases, it appears in contexts in which a Turkish-speaking, as well as a German-speaking, audience is targeted, for example,

Figure 4.1 Linguistic landscapes in Berlin, Germany: Café Happy Day

Figure 4.2 Linguistic landscapes in Berlin, Germany: Your multicultural fresh market

the use of signs with 'welcome' in both German and Turkish (*Willkommen – Hoşgeldinez*) or 'evening dresses 50% off' (*Abendkleider 50% Reduziert – Abiyeler 50% Indirim*). These uses are found exclusively in neighborhoods with high concentrations of Turkish-background residents, unlike the English signs, which can be seen in all districts. Further, Turkish words are often used to sell things that are considered part of Turkish culture, food in particular. In Figure 4.2, we can see

how a Turkish grocery store advertises with the words *Helâl et Pazari*; *helâl*, (literally, 'lawful') is readily understood by non-Turkish speakers as meaning food prepared in accordance with Islamic rules. Despite the fact that *pazari* ('market') may not have this same transparency of meaning, this business is clearly using Turkish strategically to attract a varied Berlin clientele. The sign includes a drawing of the Brandenburg Gate – a famous Berlin landmark – and the German description *Ihr multikultereller Frischemarkt* 'Your multicultural fresh market.' Thus the use of Turkish here is not solely, or even primarily, a means of appealing to Turkish-speaking customers, but instead advertising the Turkish nature of the products sold. Thus Turkish is aimed at a particular audience and/or references a specific culture and cuisine. In contrast, English is mostly used without intent to make an association with a specific English-speaking culture; instead, it creates a modern, globalized image for the business.

Such aspects of the linguistic landscape of Berlin bring us to the next topic we wish to explore with regard to multilingualism – the attitudes about particular languages and their speakers. As we will see, the choice of a code is often associated with particular characteristics for the speaker (see also our earlier discussion of this in chapter 3 in our section on ideologies and social groups).

Language attitudes in multilingual settings

Before turning to models which address how speakers use multiple languages in discourse, we must address the issue of attitudes about particular codes. Speakers' choices of code also reflect how they want others to view them. This is apparent from various **matched-guise** experiments that certain social psychologists have conducted. If person A is fluently bilingual in languages X and Y, how is he or she judged as a person when speaking X? How do the same judges evaluate A when A is speaking Y? In matched-guise experiments the judges are unaware that they are judging the same person speaking different language (that is, in different 'guises'). Their judgments are therefore seen as a reflection of their feelings about speakers of X and Y, feelings about such matters as their competence, integrity, and attractiveness.

Lambert, a Canadian social psychologist, developed this technique in order to explore how listeners react to various characteristics in speech. Listeners were asked to judge particular speech samples recorded by bilingual or bidialectal speakers using one language or dialect (one guise) on one occasion and the other language or dialect (the other guise) in identical circumstances. The judgments sought are of such qualities as intelligence, kindness, dependability, ambition, leadership, sincerity, and sense of humor. Since the only factor that is varied is the language or dialect used, the responses provide group evaluations of speakers of these languages and dialects and therefore tap social stereotypes. In one such study, Lambert (1967) reported the reactions of Canadian men and women, referred to as English Canadian and French Canadian according to their dominant language, to subjects who

spoke English on one occasion and French on another. Both English Canadian and French Canadian listeners reacted more positively to English guises than French guises. Among eighty English Canadian (EC) and ninety-two French Canadian (FC) first-year college-age students from Montreal, he found (1967, 95–7) that:

- The EC judges rated the female speakers more favorable in their French guises; in particular, they were rated as more intelligent, ambitious, self-confident, dependable, courageous, and sincere than when speaking English.
- Male speakers were rated more favorable in their English guises by EC speakers: they were rated as taller, kinder, more dependable, and more entertaining by the EC male judges, and as taller, more likeable, affectionate, sincere, and conscientious, and as possessing more character and a greater sense of humor by the female EC judges.
- In contrast, FC male speakers were rated lower in integrity and social attractiveness.

The judges were also given the opportunity to compare Continental French (CF) speakers with FC speakers, and Lambert (1967, 7) reports that 'EC judges appear to be less concerned about European French people in general than they are about the local French people; the European French are neither down-graded nor taken as potential social models to any great extent …'

What was most surprising, however, was that the FC judges showed a greater distinction between FC and CF speakers, rating the CF speakers more favorably than the EC speakers, who were rated more favorably than in their FC guises. In other words, they rated members of their own group less favorably on the whole, apparently viewing their own linguistic and cultural group as somewhat inferior to both the English Canadian and the Continental French groups, with this preference apparently stronger in French Canadian males than females. (This study is now nearly fifty years old; it would be surprising if a replication done today would show the same results, in view of the many changes that have occurred in Quebec in recent decades.) This finding can be tied into our discussion in chapter 2 on hegemony; part of this concept is that the dominant group is accepted as rightfully dominant even by members of the groups it dominates.

Other investigators have used the matched-guise technique and report results which clearly indicate that listeners are affected by code choices when they judge what speakers say to them. Certain codes are deemed more appropriate for certain messages than other codes. Code and message are inseparable. The choices we make about the codes we speak influence how we are evaluated. Giles and Coupland (1991, 58) conclude their summary of the work done up to 1990 on the matched-guise technique with the observation that, 'Listeners can very quickly stereotype others' personal and social attributes on the basis of language cues and in ways that appear to have crucial effects on important social decisions made about them.'

Not only are particular languages stereotyped, but the mixture of two or more languages is often, even usually, stigmatized. Many people have a **monoglossic**

ideology, that is, they believe that languages should be kept strictly separate, and this is true of monolingual and multilinguals alike. They may even use derogatory terms to describe what they hear, for example, *Franglais* (French and English in Quebec), *Fragnol* (French and Spanish in Argentina), and *Spanglish* or *Tex-Mex* (Spanish and English in the USA). Such dismissal of the phenomenon demonstrates serious misunderstanding. What we have here is not just a haphazard mixing of two languages brought about by laziness or ignorance or some combination of these. What we have are speakers with a sophisticated knowledge of both languages who are also acutely aware of community norms. These norms require that both languages be used in this way so that speakers can show their familiarity or solidarity. The ability to mix codes in this way is often a source of pride; note, for instance, a number of popular books on *Spanglish* which present it as a desirable way of speaking (Cruz and Teck 1998, Morales 2002, Santiago 2008). These writings show a **pluralist ideology**, in which multiple ways of speaking and being are valued.

Exploration 4.1: Everyday Multilingualism

What varieties of language do you hear in your everyday life? Do all of these varieties have names? What values are assigned to these different ways of speaking, by yourself and others? How do these ideologies and attitudes influence your language use?

Diglossia

Diglossia is the term used to describe a situation in which there are two distinct codes with clear functional separation; that is, one code is employed in one set of circumstances and the other in an entirely different set. Ferguson (1959, 336) has defined diglossia as follows:

> DIGLOSSIA is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation.

In the same article he identifies four language situations which show the major characteristics of the diglossic phenomenon; in each situation there is a 'high' variety

(H) of language and a 'low' variety (L). Each variety has its own specialized functions, and each is viewed differently by those who are aware of both.

The first situation is in Arabic-speaking countries, in which the two varieties are Classical Arabic (H) and the various regional colloquial varieties (L). The second example is Standard German (H) and Swiss German (L) in Switzerland. Third, Ferguson cites the language situation in Haiti, where the varieties are Standard French (H) and Haitian Creole (L). The fourth is found in Greece with Katharévousa (H) and Dhimotiki or Demotic (L) varieties of Greek. In each case the two varieties coexisted for a long period, sometimes, as with Arabic and Greek, for many centuries. Consequently, the phenomenon of diglossia is not ephemeral in nature; in fact, the opposite is true: it appears to be a persistent social and linguistic phenomenon.

Diglossia has been widely attested across space (e.g., varieties of Tamil in the south of India) and time (e.g., Latin in Europe in the Middle Ages). According to Ferguson (1959, 338), it is likely to come into being when (1) 'there is a sizable body of literature in a language closely related to (or even identical with) the natural language of the community … [and when (2)] literacy in the community is limited to a small elite, [and] … a suitable period of time, of the order of several centuries, passes from the establishment of (1) and (2).'

Domains

A key defining characteristic of diglossia is that the two varieties are kept quite separate in their functions. One is used in one set of circumstances and the other in an entirely different set; these circumstances are called **domains**. For example, the H varieties may be used for delivering sermons and formal lectures, especially in a parliament or legislative body, for giving political speeches, for broadcasting the news on radio and television, and for writing poetry, fine literature, and editorials in newspapers. In contrast, the L varieties may be used in giving instructions to workers in low-prestige occupations or to household servants, in conversation with familiars, in 'soap operas' and popular programs on the radio, in captions on political cartoons in newspapers, and in 'folk literature.' On occasion, a person may lecture in an H variety but answer questions about its contents or explain parts of it in an L variety so as to ensure understanding.

Speakers are unlikely to use an H variety in circumstances calling for an L variety, for example, for addressing a servant; nor do they usually use an L variety when an H is called for, for example, for writing a 'serious' work of literature. If you do the latter, it may be a risky endeavor; it is the kind of thing that Chaucer did for the English of his day, and it requires a certain willingness, on the part of both the writer and the readers, to break away from a diglossic situation by extending the L variety into functions normally associated only with the H. For about three centuries after the Norman Conquest of 1066, English and Norman French coexisted in England

in a diglossic situation with Norman French the H variety and English the L. However, gradually the L variety assumed more and more functions associated with the H so that by Chaucer's time it had become possible to use the L variety for a major literary work.

The L variety often shows a tendency to borrow learned words from the H variety, particularly when speakers try to use the L variety in more formal ways. The result is a certain admixture of H vocabulary into the L. On other occasions, however, there may be distinctly different pairs of words, that is, doublets, in the H and L varieties to refer to very common objects and concepts. Since the domains of use of the two varieties do not intersect, there will be an L word for use in L situations and an H word for use in H situations with no possibility of transferring the one to the other. So far as the pronunciation of the two varieties is concerned, the L system will often appear to be the more 'basic.' However, actual circumstances can vary. Whereas the two varieties of Greek have very similar sound systems, there is a considerable difference between Classical Arabic and the colloquial varieties, and a still greater difference between High German and Swiss German.

Language attitudes and ideologies

The H variety is the prestigious, powerful variety; the L variety lacks prestige and power. In fact, there may be so little prestige attached to the L variety that people may even deny that they know it although they may be observed to use it far more frequently than the H variety. Associated with this prestige valuation for the H variety, there is likely to be a strong feeling that the prestige is deserved because the H variety is more 'beautiful,' 'logical,' and 'expressive' than the L variety. That is why it is deemed appropriate for literary use, for religious purposes, and so on. There may also be considerable and widespread resistance to translating certain books into the L variety, for example, the Qur'an into one or other colloquial varieties of Arabic or the Bible into Haitian Creole or Demotic Greek. (We should note that even today many speakers of English resist the Bible in any form other than the King James version.)

This last feeling concerning the natural superiority of the H variety is likely to be reinforced by the fact that a considerable body of literature will be found to exist in that variety and almost none in the other. That literature may also be regarded as reflecting essential values about the culture and, when parts of it are classical literature, deemed worthy of recalling by allusion and quotations on occasions suitable for the employment of H. Speakers of Arabic, for example, gain prestige from being able to allude to classical sources. The folk literature associated with the L variety will have none of the same prestige; it may interest folklorists and it may be transmuted into an H variety by writers skilled in H, but it is unlikely to be the stuff of which literary histories and traditions are made in its 'raw' form.

Language learning

Another important difference between the H and L varieties is that all children learn the L variety; it is also generally the home language. Some may concurrently learn the H variety, but many do not learn the H variety at all; for example, most Haitians have no knowledge at all of Standard French but all can speak some variety of Haitian Creole, although some, as we have said, may deny that they have this ability. The H variety is also likely to be learned in some kind of formal setting, for example, in classrooms or as part of a religious or cultural indoctrination. To that extent, the H variety is 'taught,' whereas the L variety is 'learned.' Teaching requires the availability of grammars, dictionaries, standardized texts, and some widely accepted view about the nature of what is being taught and how it is most effectively to be taught. There are usually no comparable grammars, dictionaries, or standardized texts for the L variety, and any view of that variety is likely to be highly pejorative in nature. When such grammars and other aids do exist, they have in many cases been written by outsiders, for example, 'foreign' linguists. They are also likely to be neither well known to the people whose linguistic usage they describe nor well received by those people, since such works are unlikely to support some of the myths that accompany diglossia, particularly the myth that the L variety lacks any kind of 'grammar.'

The statuses of the H and L varieties

A diglossic situation has by definition prescribed statuses for the H and L varieties. Unlike other types of societal bilingualism, such as situations in which there is a Standard variety and regional dialects, with diglossia no one learns the H variety as their first language in the home. However, in non-diglossic situations, many people learn what is considered the Standard variety as their first language. Further, in diglossia the varieties do not overlap in their functions because of their status differences. In other types of bilingualism, it is possible that either language, or both languages, can be used in a particular domain.

A diglossic pattern of language use can contribute to societal problems if there is a growth of literacy, or when there is a desire to decrease regional and/or social barriers, or when a need is seen for a unified 'national' language. One situation in which we see some of the social issues associated with diglossia is in Haiti. Haitian Creole was eventually recognized as a national language in 1983, with prestigious French, of course, the other. Both languages were made official in 1987. There has been an ongoing debate about the most appropriate orthography (spelling system) for Haitian Creole: about the use of certain letters and accents, and about whether the differences between French and Haitian Creole should be minimized in the orthography for Haitian Creole or whether that orthography should be as transparent as possible in relating letters to sounds, particularly the sounds of the most widespread variety of Haitian Creole. French, though not widely used, has such

prestige that, according to Schieffelin and Doucet (1998, 306), virtually any proposal for an orthography for kreyòl has created 'resistance both to the adoption of the orthography and to the use of kreyòl as a medium of instruction in school. The double resistance comes from both the masses and the educated elite minority. The masses see the officialization of written and spoken kreyòl in school as limiting their access to French and, consequently, their social and economic mobility. The elites, who already know kreyòl, do not see the point of teaching it, in any form, in school.'

The linguistic situation in Haiti is intimately tied to power relationships among social groups; this is typical of diglossic situations. Traditionally, the H variety has been associated with an elite and the L variety with everyone else. Diglossia reinforces social distinctions. It is used to assert social position and to keep people in their place, particularly those at the lower end of the social hierarchy. Any move to extend the L variety, even, in the case of Haiti, to make the population literate in any variety, is likely to be perceived to be a direct threat to those who want to maintain traditional relationships and the existing power structure.

The Arabic situation is somewhat different. Many Arabic speakers acknowledge the highly restricted uses of the H variety, but also revere it for certain characteristics that they ascribe to it: its beauty, logic, and richness. Classical Arabic is also the language of the Qur'an. Ferguson has pointed out that choosing one colloquial variety of Arabic to elevate above all others poses a number of problems, so communication between speakers of different varieties of colloquial Arabic requires some mutually intelligible variety. What is commonly referred to as Modern Standard Arabic has emerged, and this variety is described as fairly uniform across countries (Abdelali 2004, Ryding 2005). In some ways, Modern Standard Arabic has taken over the role as the H variety. It is similar to Classical Arabic in structure but differs in style and vocabulary, although both varieties are referred to in Arabic as *al-lugha al-fuSHâ* 'the most eloquent language' (Ryding 2005, 4).

Extended diglossia and language maintenance

What Ferguson describes are 'narrow' or 'classic' diglossic situations. They require the use of very divergent varieties of the same language and there are few good examples. Fishman has broadened or extended the term to include a wider variety of language situations. For Fishman (1980, 3) diglossia is 'an enduring societal arrangement,' extending at least beyond a three-generation period, such that two varieties each have their secure, phenomenologically legitimate, and widely implemented functions. Without diglossia, according to Fishman, language shift within three generations will occur as the languages compete for dominance in various domains. Fishman includes Ferguson's examples, in which the H and L varieties are seen as dialects of the same language, but stipulates that in such cases, the varieties must be 'sufficiently different from one another that, without schooling, the elevated variety cannot be understood by speakers of the vernacular' (1980, 4). Fishman's proposal extends the concept of diglossia to include multilingual situations in which

the different languages have quite different functions. For example, one language is used in one set of circumstances and the other in an entirely different set, and such difference is felt to be normal and proper. Fishman gives examples such as Biblical Hebrew and Yiddish for many Jews, Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay, and even Standard English and Caribbean Creoles.

Rubin (1968) provided a detailed description of the bilingual situation of Paraguay in the middle of the last century. Spanish and Guaraní existed in a relationship that Fishman (1980) calls 'extended diglossic' in which Spanish was the H variety and Guaraní the L variety. Spanish was the language used on formal occasions; it was always used in government business, in conversations with well-dressed strangers, with foreigners, and in most business transactions. People used Guaraní, however, with friends, servants, and poorly-dressed strangers, in the confessional, when they told jokes or made love, and on most casual occasions. Spanish was the preferred language of the cities, but Guaraní was preferred in the countryside, and the lower classes almost always used it for just about every purpose in rural areas. Rubin presents a decision tree to depict the factors involved in language choice in this society, identifying a variety of factors: location (city or country), formality, gender, status, intimacy, seriousness, and type of activity.

Choi (2005) presents data from a questionnaire similar to that used by Rubin and administered to seventy-one residents of the same city in which Rubin did her study, Luque. While Choi's work shows that many of the same factors are at play today in the choices to speak Spanish and Guaraní, some changes can be seen. Overall, more bilingual discourse is reported, and Spanish is used much more in all contexts. The only exception to the latter point is in talking to teachers; more people reported using Guaraní to speak with their teachers in Choi's survey than in Rubin's. This change is undoubtedly due to the increase in the use of Guaraní in education as part of language maintenance efforts. On a national level, it appears that Guaraní is becoming more firmly part of rural life and Spanish more dominant in urban areas. Thus, the language situation in Paraguay appears to become less and less diglossic.

Questioning diglossia

Although the concept of diglossia has been important in the study of multilingualism in a diverse range of societies, the validity of it as a language practice has also been questioned. The relative statuses of the languages may not be exactly as Ferguson depicts; for example, Stępkowska (2012) notes that in Switzerland, Swiss German has long had high prestige and this fact would contradict the usual assumptions about the L code in a diglossic situation. The situation there is further complicated because Swiss German is now the language of instruction in elementary schools.

Another issue is the strict compartmentalization of languages which diglossia requires. Several recent studies have shown the use of colloquial varieties of Arabic mixed with Standard Modern or Classical Arabic (Albirini 2011, Boussofara-Omar

2003, Soliman 2009). Managan (2003) also reports that although the relationship between French and French-based creoles in the Caribbean is often assumed to be diglossic, in Guadeloupe, there is frequent code-switching and nothing resembling diglossia in terms of functional distribution of languages. She also reports that this is a situation of stable bilingualism, which is another challenge to the tenets of the diglossia paradigm, as the claim is that such stable bilingualism can be found only with diglossia.

Even if we embrace the idea of diglossia, it is a concept which fits only a narrow range of social situations. There are many more examples of bilingualism which are clearly not diglossic and we will look at some of these in the pages that follow.

Exploration 4.2: A Diglossic Situation?

Use the concept of 'diglossia' as a theoretical construct to consider classroom situations in which children who come to school speaking only a regional or social variety of the dominant language, which is well removed from the standard variety, are taught exclusively in that standard variety. Assume that they are taught various uses of the standard, particularly its use in writing, and are constantly informed that the variety they bring with them is 'corrupt,' 'bad,' 'unacceptable,' and so on. (See also chapter 14.) Consider issues of 'power,' 'solidarity,' and 'identity' in doing so. How do factors such as ethnicity, social class, and possibly even gender come into play? What changes might you recommend in language practices in the schools?

Multilingual Discourse

In most multilingual settings, there are no strict or explicit guidelines for what language to speak. People must select a particular code whenever they choose to speak, and they may also decide to switch from that code to another or to mix codes even within sometimes very short utterances. Take, for instance, the following example of English-German multilingual discourse between two pre-teen girls:

1. I: **Iii**, you **knabber** on your finger.
   'Ick, you chew on your finger[nail].'
2. K: No, I don't, this one is broke off.
3. I: **Ekelig**.
   'Gross.'

Until recently, the most common term used in sociolinguistics to refer to this phenomenon was code-switching. However, this term is losing currency, and we

choose the term multilingual discourse as a cover term for a number of different linguistic patterns. We will, however, continue to use the term code-switching in the context of the discussion of particular studies that use that term. Our main focus in this section will be models for language choice which focus on the social aspects of multilingual discourse. Researchers on this topic look at a variety of factors, from social and political norms and the linguistic marketplace to social identity and emotions. The subsequent pages will address some major theoretical models which have been suggested that address the underlying principles, often unconscious, that guide speakers in making their linguistic choices.

Although we will not provide an overview of research on **code-switching constraints**, that is, the structural features of multilingual discourse, a brief mention of this topic is warranted here. There has been a great deal of research in this vein and it is not always completely separate from the discussion of social factors. Research on code-switching constraints focuses on switches within a single sentence (called intra-sentential code-switching), such as in the following examples with English and Spanish. These examples show sentences primarily in one language which contain nouns and verbs from another language; these are some of the most common patterns in multilingual discourse.

(While setting up a chess board):
D: Me faltan mi **king** y mi **queen**.
'I am missing my king and my queen.'

(As an explanation for his argument with another student)
S: es que **kick**ó, maestra.
'what happened is that he kicked me, teacher.'

Various researchers have proposed models and made predictions about how two languages can be combined. Some of the more popular of these at this time include the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002) and work within the Minimalist Program (MacSwan 2014). Most of this research seeks to find universal constraints that apply to all language pairs, but approaches differ. For example, the MLF model is based on the assumption that one of the languages is dominant and provides the grammatical frame, and that only certain types of morphemes can be switched. Work within the Minimalist Program is based on generative syntactic theory and concerns issues such as the union of the two lexicons (MacSwan 2014, 5). Our focus in the rest of this chapter will be the social meanings of such grammatical phenomena.

Metaphorical and situational code-switching

An early seminal work on multilingual discourse is Blom and Gumperz (1972), in which the concepts of situational and metaphorical code-switching are introduced.

Although this distinction is no longer used as a framework for analyses of multilingual discourse, the underlying ideas about the meanings of language choices provide the basis for subsequent theories, and are thus introduced here.

Situational code-switching occurs when the languages used change according to the situations in which the speakers find themselves: they speak one language in one situation and another in a different one. What we observe is that one variety is used in a certain set of situations and another in an entirely different set. This kind of code-switching differs from diglossia. In diglossic communities the situation also dictates the choice of variety but the choice is much more rigidly defined by the particular activity and by the relationship between the participants. Diglossia reinforces differences, whereas code-switching tends to reduce them.

As the term itself suggests, **metaphorical code-switching** has an affective dimension to it: the choice of code carries symbolic meaning, that is, the language fits the message. This is illustrated in a quote attributed to Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, which indicates attitudes about certain languages being holy, the language of love or male solidarity, or crude or bestial: 'I speak Spanish to God, Italian to women, French to men, and German to my horse.'

Blom and Gumperz' early work set the stage for continued research addressing the question of why speakers switched between languages when and how they did. While many studies have created taxonomies of functions of code-switching (e.g., emphasis, elaboration, and so on), we will focus instead on broader frameworks which seek to provide principles underlying the use of multiple codes in conversation.

Accommodation and audience design

Another framework which has informed current ideas about language choice is Speech Accommodation Theory, later called Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles et al. 1987, 1991, 2007). Speakers sometimes try to accommodate to the expectations that others have of them when they speak, and they may do this consciously and deliberately or be quite unaware of what they are doing. **Accommodation** is one way of explaining how individuals and groups may be seen to relate to each other. One individual can try to induce another to judge him or her more favorably by reducing differences between the two. An individual may even be prepared to sacrifice something to gain social approval of some kind, for example, shift in behavior to become more like the other. This is **convergence** behavior. Alternatively, if you desire to distance yourself from other interlocutors, the shift in behavior will be away from the behavior of another or others. This is **divergence** behavior. Examples would be 'putting on airs and graces' in order to deliberately dissociate yourself from peers, or conversely using slang and nonstandard speech with someone who is speaking a formal, high-status variety.

Giles and Coupland (1991, 60–1) explain speech accommodation as 'a multiply-organized and contextually complex set of alternatives, regularly available to

communicators in face-to-face talk. It can function to index and achieve solidarity with or dissociation from a conversational partner, reciprocally and dynamically.' Le Page (1997, 28) extends this definition to put even more emphasis on the speaker's creation of his or her identity: 'we do not necessarily adapt to the style of the interlocutor, but rather to the image we have of ourselves in relation to our interlocutor.' Speaking is not merely a social act that involves others; it is also a personal act in that it helps create the identity one wishes to be seen as having in a particular set of circumstances.

Exploration 4.3: Accommodation or Mockery?

The concept of accommodation can be used for all levels of language variation, that is, for convergence/divergence in not just distinct languages but also dialects or styles. Think about your own language use; are there instances in which you alter the way you speak to sound more or less like the person to whom you are talking? If you shift your way of speaking to sound more like someone else, where the line between convergence to show solidarity and mocking?

One type of convergent behavior is said to be motivated by how speakers often attempt to deal with listeners through **audience design**, that is, by orienting their speech toward others through code choices. Bell goes so far as to declare that 'Speakers design their style primarily for and in response to their audience' (2001, 143) or occasionally by reference to a third party (referee design) as when the speech of an absent reference group influences language choices. He says that audience design applies to all codes and all speakers, who have what he calls 'a fine-grained ability' to do this (2001, 146). 'Individual speakers use style – and other aspects of their language repertoire – to represent their identity or to lay claim to other identities' (2001, 163). We will take up this perspective below in the section on multilingual identities. We have the ability to present ourselves in different ways. We have control over what is sometimes called speaker design: the use of language 'as a resource in the actual creation, presentation, and re-creation of speaker identity' (Schilling-Estes 2002, 388). Everything we say to others recognizes those others; an individual's speech is not a series of monologs for it is shaped toward and tailored by what others say and do.

Johnson-Weiner (1998) uses accommodation theory to explain differences in language choice between some Old Order Amish and Old Order Mennonite communities in the northeastern United States (mainly New York and Pennsylvania) and Ontario and other New Order communities. The main difference is that the

Old Order communities adhere strictly to use of different varieties of German – Low Pennsylvania German, High Pennsylvania German, and 'Bible German' – and English according to circumstances. They use the varieties of German exclusively within the communities and use English as a contact language with the outside world. Within the New Order communities such as the Beachy Amish and Horning Mennonites there has been a complete shift to English. However, all groups follow strict rules – although not always the same ones – about dress and use (or non-use) of automobiles, electricity, and telephones. Johnson-Weiner says that for the Old Order communities the maintenance of German shows a desire for deliberate divergence from the outside world to the point of rejection. Its use of English accommodates to a necessity to keep that world at bay; it is a way of dealing with that world so as to preserve each community's isolation from it. For communities such as the Beachy Amish and Horning Mennonites, the use of English paradoxically provides both inclusion (convergence) and exclusion (divergence) in that it enables both communication with the outside world and a clear expression to that world of the values of each community, particularly its strong religious beliefs. Burridge (2002) discusses the Ontario group and says that their use of 'Pennsylvania German has always provided an important barrier to the outside world, allowing not only for insider identification, but most importantly for outsider separation. It is one of their main means of remaining detached and isolated from worldly influences. Its loss would also mean the loss of this separate status and, for this group, would be the equivalent of losing their faith' (Burridge 2002, 213).

Accommodation is also a concept used in work done in the Alsace in France. In a study of language use in Strasbourg, Gardner-Chloros (1991) shows among other things how switching between codes, in this case Standard French and Alsatian German, can be an effective neutral compromise for some locals. Speakers can employ code-switching when use of French alone might appear to be too snobbish and Alsatian alone to be too rustic. It is also often necessary when several generations of a family are present and allows for accommodation across the generations. Another investigation (Gardner-Chloros 1997) focused on the use of the two languages in three department stores in Strasbourg: Printemps, a branch of the famous chic Paris store, Magmod, old-fashioned and less luxurious, and Jung, quite provincial in comparison to either of the others. In other words, there is a kind of prestige hierarchy with Printemps at the top, Magmod in the middle, and Jung at the bottom. One would assume that in Printemps French would be the language most likely to be used by shoppers and shop assistants alike, and that Jung would attract most use of Alsatian; Magmod would be somewhere in the middle. Gardner-Chloros found that young French-speaking shoppers in Jung and older Alsatian-speaking shoppers in Printemps code-switched to the other language. There was least code-switching in Magmod. Code-switching goes in both directions: 'up' in Printemps and 'down' in Jung. As she says (1997, 374), it 'is clear … that the … assumption that switching reveals a desire to converge to the prestige norm is inadequate. The group which switches more than any other appears to do so in order to fit in with its surroundings, since it is made up of people who are more at ease in the prestige norm, French,

than in Alsatian. Accommodation would therefore appear to be as relevant a motive as prestige.'

The Markedness Model

Another theory in the study of language choice is the Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton 1983, 1993, 1998). The main idea of this model is that, for a given interaction, there is an **unmarked choice**, that is, a code which is expected in the specific context. The relative markedness of a code varies by situation. It is an unmarked choice for a citizen to address an inquiry to an official in Bokmål in Hemnesberget, for a teacher to speak Standard German to a visitor in a school in the Gail Valley, Austria, and for a police officer to speak English to someone in a good car in Nigeria. Corresponding marked choices for initial encounters between people who do not know each other in each of the above encounters would be Ranamål, Slovenian, and one of the indigenous Nigerian languages. However, the unmarked choices are these latter languages when locals converse socially in each of these places. Quite often, in fact, local solidarity requires the use of a non-prestige language or variety; or it may require a mixing of two languages. These last observations are important: the unmarked–marked distinction is quite independent of any High–Low, standard–nonstandard, language–dialect, or pure–mixed distinctions. It is entirely dependent on situation.

The Markedness Model does not predict that speakers always use the unmarked code, but rather employs the concept of markedness as a means to analyze code-switching. For example, in a Spanish-English bilingual classroom, the unmarked code for English instruction is clearly and often explicitly English. Using this unmarked code reinforces the status quo relationship between the teacher and the students. If a student switches to Spanish, this marked choice could indicate the student's lack of cooperation in the lesson, or her Spanish utterance could be directed at a peer and thus indicate that this turn is seen as outside of the frame of the lesson, where Spanish is the unmarked choice. The essential point is that all language choices, marked and unmarked, contribute to the relationship between the speakers.

This model is exemplified in a study of a Malawian family living in the United States and the switches between English and Chichewa (Myers-Scotton 2002). Everyone in the family (father, mother, and two sons, ages ten and seven – there is also a baby in the family, but he was too young to speak at the time of this recording) speaks both languages fluently. They have lived in the United States for three years. Although English is one of the official languages of their home country, the parents in this family are also invested in having their children learn and maintain Chichewa. A quantitative analysis shows that the parents use Chichewa as their unmarked code choice, while the children use English. The analysis shows how the children use English to show opposition to their parents (e.g., when one of the sons is objecting to changing the baby) and Chichewa to show deference and garner support from

their parents. For example, there is a stark contrast between one boy's use of Chicheŵa to address the parents and his switch to English to argue with his younger brother. Similarly, the parents use English to step out of their parental roles, as shown in the following example in which the mother is leaving for work in the English-speaking public sphere, and her language switch parallels her switch in roles.

(Context: Mother is leaving for work; M is Mother, P(eter) is the oldest son; English is in all caps and Chicheŵa is in regular script)
M [to Peter] OK, *ukangoyang'ana ma*-DRINK *amene ali mu*-FRIDGE-*mo*.
'Ok, just go and look at [the] drinks that are in [the] fridge.'
P WHAT COLOR?
M *Upange kaye* CHECK DRINK *usanathile* …
'You should first check [the] drink before you pour [it].'
M … [now on her way out]
Ukachape uyu, AND THEN I'M OUT OF HERE.
'Go and wash this one, and then I'm out of here.'
(Myers-Scotton 2002, 217)

The Markedness Model was originally designed to explain the social motivations of alternation between two distinct languages in spoken conversation, but has also been applied to switching between different varieties of the same language (see the collection of articles in Myers-Scotton 1998) and also literary code-switching (Gross 2000), advertising (Wei-Yu Chen 2006, Micu and Coulter 2010), poetry (Barnes 2011), and film (Barnes 2012).

Exploration 4.4: The Unmarked Code in the Classroom

When you come into a classroom at your university, what linguistic variety do you expect to hear? (Is this different in foreign language classrooms?) What does it mean if the professor or students speak a different language, a nonstandard dialect, or either more or less formally than you consider 'unmarked'? Compare your expectations with those of your classmates.

Multilingual identities

While the Markedness Model concerns itself with indexing particular role relationships for speakers, there is another approach which regards language choice as a

means to construct social identities; we introduced this **social constructionist** (also called social constructivist) approach in the previous chapter. An important aspect of this approach is that identities are not seen as fixed but as fluid, multiple, and culturally constructed. Identities might align with pre-existent categories such as gender, occupation, ethnicity, and so on, but should be thought of as being brought into being through the interaction with others. Furthermore, and of particular importance when looking at multilingual discourse, there is no one-to-one correspondence between language choice and social identity, that is, speaking Spanish in the USA does not necessarily construct the speaker as Latino; in some contexts this may well be the aspect of identity that is constructed, but in others speaking Spanish might serve to construct any number of other things. These other aspects of identity may be related to macrosocial categories, such as age, gender, or social class; or they may be other levels of identity, for example, that of a father, someone with a good sense of humor, or a humble person. Yet another level of identity involves the relationship between speakers, so a language choice may be part of the construction of a close friendship, a boss-employee relationship, or a flirtation.

As within Communication Accommodation Theory, within the social constructionist framework, speakers are said to use language to position themselves vis-à-vis their interlocutors in various ways, including such matters as social values and ideologies about language, speakers, and social norms. Such research on what is called **stancetaking** will be discussed further in chapters 7 and 11.

Bailey (2001, 2005) reports on research done within this framework on Dominican Americans and their use of different varieties of Spanish and English. He describes how Dominican American high-school students in Providence, Rhode Island, negotiate their way among other students of different language backgrounds, mainly other Hispanics and African Americans. They share a language with the former and racial categorization and social-class characteristics with the latter. However, they seek to assert their own separate identity. Consequently, they have developed a code that 'includes distinctive alternation of forms indexing a Dominican American identity. Most salient of these, perhaps, is the alternation between English and Spanish in code-switching' (2005, 259). The Dominican American students do use some speech characteristics of the African American students but such use does not make them 'Black' since their ability to use Spanish, that is, their Spanish ethnolinguistic identity, triumphs over any common identity derived from African descent (2005, 263). While they continue to speak their varieties of Spanish and English, they maintain, at least for now, their separate identity. However, Bailey adds (2005, 270–1) that if succeeding generations of students fail to continue to do so, this could have serious consequences for maintaining a separate Dominican American identity.

Reyes (2005) reports another study in a very different setting, but one also conducted among children of immigrant backgrounds. She provides a somewhat similar example of another code deliberately fashioned to achieve a distinctive identity but which at the same time creates a link with another group of similar status in the community. Reyes worked over a period of four years with small groups of Asian

American teens near Philadelphia's Chinatown. They were mainly American-born children of recent Cambodian, Laotian, and Vietnamese immigrants. These teens identified closely with African American teens from similar low-income backgrounds and participated in many of the styles and activities associated with them, for example, certain types of clothing, accessories, and hair styles, and hip hop culture. They also adopted some of their speech characteristics and created their own hybrid language variety, a mixture of African American English, mainstream English, and contributions from their various Asian languages. They used this variety as 'a resource to fashion their own identities as the Other Asian … (and) to signal urban youth cultural participation by constructing divisions of identity between youth and adults and between each other' (2005, 527).

Another study of immigrant-background youth, Kallmeyer and Keim (2003), shows how a multiethnic groups of girls in Mannheim use their home languages (mostly contact varieties of Turkish and Italian) along with several varieties of German – local and standard dialects as well as *Gastarbeiterdeutsch* 'guest worker German' – to construct their own identities and also to create caricatures of others. They use these multiple codes to position themselves as different from their parents' generation in order to challenge the ghettoization imposed upon them as youths of migrant background.

Mahootian (2005, 2012), in her work on the use of code-switching in written texts, also addressed how language choice can challenge essentialist ideas about social identity. She analyzes a variety of US sources (e.g., scripted performances, a lifestyles magazine, a short story, and a novel) to address the question of why, given the hegemonic ideology of normative monolingualism, a choice has been made to use multilingual discourse in these contexts. She claims that the use of more than one language in published written language is an intentional strategy to construct not just the identity of the writer as a bilingual but also social categories which challenge those associated with monolingualism.

Another important issue in the study of multilingual discourse and identity has to do with the acceptance by other interlocutors of the identities speakers construct for themselves. Lo (1999) addresses this issue in her analysis of an interaction between a Chinese American (Chazz) and a Korean American man (Ken), in which Chazz uses some utterances in Korean to express both his affiliation with Koreans and his disdain for Vietnamese women. However, perhaps in part because Chazz uses a very derogatory Korean term to refer to Vietnamese women, Ken resists alignment in this exchange, in part by continuing to speak English and not following Chazz's lead and switching to Korean. This pattern of language use constructs a distance between the speaker and the interlocutor while at the same time signaling his lack of participation in using discourses involving ethnic slurs directed at Vietnamese women.

We certainly do use language to construct our social selves, as we can also see in the body of literature on a phenomenon called **crossing** (or sometimes 'styling'; see Rampton 1995, 2001), a concept introduced in chapter 3. In this work, we see how

analysis of multilingual discourse is governed by the same principles as work on the use of different dialects of a language. Rampton's work gives examples of London youths who use different varieties of English, including Jamaican Creole English and Asian English, as well as bits of Panjabi, in their interactions within their multiethnic peer groups. Rampton argues that these choices served to denaturalize racial boundaries and the connection of racialized groups with particular ways of speaking, and '… cultivated a spectacular, dynamic, heteroglossic marginality' (Rampton 1995: 507).

Such studies also provide evidence for 'race' as a cultural construct rather than a simple biological reality, as racial group membership is sometimes fluid, contested, or challenged. In another study addressing the social construction of race, Sweetland (2002) describes how a young White woman in the United States uses linguistic features generally associated with African American Vernacular English (AAVE) in order to achieve membership in a group of Blacks, helped in this case by her growing up in an overwhelmingly Black neighborhood. Bucholtz (1999) describes a similar case of a White male student in a California high school where 'an ideologically defined black–white dichotomy … structures students' social worlds. Yet many European American students symbolically cross this divide through linguistic and other social practices that index their affiliation with African American youth culture, and especially hip hop' (1999, 445). This student drew on features of AAVE – what Bucholtz calls **CRAAVE**, Cross-Race African American Vernacular English – to claim some kind of honorary membership in Black social circles. Bucholtz illustrates how the use of CRAAVE aligns the European American speaker with some African American friends, while at the same time reinforcing stereotypes that associate Black masculinity with physical strength and violence.

Chapter Summary

Chapter 4 explores what happens when languages – or more aptly, speakers of languages – come into contact. There are many different paths to multilingualism, and many different ways of using multiple languages. One pattern of language use we explore is diglossia, in which the two languages differ in terms of their status in society; one is considered more prestigious and is used in more formal contexts, the other is reserved for more casual events and interactions. In many multilingual societies, however, code choice is not so clear, and there is multilingual discourse. Often, the attitudes people have about multilingualism, or about particular languages, influence how the languages are used. We look at three main theoretical approaches to the study of multilingual discourse – Communication Accommodation Theory, the Markedness Model, and the study of language choice as part of the social construction of identity. In this final section, we see how the study of multilingualism and the study of the uses of different dialects of the same language revolve around the same principles.

Exercises

1. The trend in academia has gone from viewing bilingualism as a disadvantage to learning and linguistic ability to viewing it as an advantage in cognitive development (see the websites listed in the links in the online material for this chapter for some background information on this with a focus on bilingualism and cognition.) But what about social advantages and disadvantages? Talk to someone who grew up with two languages and see what they have to say about whether they consider it an advantage or a disadvantage. Here is a preliminary list of questions you might want to ask:
   - Are you glad to be multilingual?
   - Do you continue to use all/both of the languages you know? Describe how and when you use them. Are they used in separate domains or do you use multilingual discourse?
   - Have you ever been ashamed of speaking more than one language, or of being a speaker of a particular language?
   - Do you have different emotional attachments to your different languages?
   - Are there situations when it is very good to be multilingual, and others where it is less good? What are these situations, and what influences how you feel about your language background?
   - If you had children, would you raise them multilingually? Why or why not?
2. Look at the transcript below for a conversation between two young speakers in Berlin, Germany. First read the background information about these speakers, and then, if you would like to hear the conversation, go to the website and click on the link to play the sound file and follow along as you listen. Write a short analysis of the language use by the speakers, using one of the approaches outlined in the chapter.

Sarah and Hans: New Glasses

Sarah and Hans are a heterosexual couple in their early to mid-twenties. They have been together for about two years; they are currently living together temporarily while Sarah looks for a new apartment. Sarah has a German mother but grew up in the United States; she spoke some German growing up but her dominant language is English. She has lived in Germany for about three years. Hans has always lived in Germany and German is his dominant language; he speaks English as a foreign language, having learned it in school. Up until recently, Sarah and Hans almost always spoke German together, but at the time of this recording, Hans was going to be leaving soon for a semester as an exchange student in the United States, and Sarah had been speaking English to him because, as she told the researcher who collected these data, she felt he needed to work on his English.

This segment of the conversation is about halfway through an hour-long recording, during which they have been preparing their evening meal, chatting, and eating.

German words are in **bold**, English in plain font.

1 S: Oh, you know what I had, what I did, I got my eyes checked –
2 H: Oh, where?
3 S: – and my eyes are worse, now, in the last few years, they've gotten worse, especially the right eye. So my right eye has gotten much worse. And um, I need a new, new **Gläser**. Right?
'lenses'
4 H: M-hmm.
5 S: And it's the same man that I know from 1990, 1989.
6 H: **Wo warst Du, Du warst bei der –**
'Where were you, you were at the –'
7 S: **Brillenwerkstatt, wo ich meine Brille, wo ich die habe, eigentlich. And um, ja, er sagte, ja, das kostet 300 Mark mit Krankenversicherung. Und ich muss 300 Mark bezahlen.**
'The Brillenwerkstatt [name of the optician], where I [got] my glasses, where I got these, actually. And um, yeah, he said, yeah, that costs 300 marks with health insurance. And I have to pay 300 marks.'
8 H**: Was kostet mit Krankenversicherung 300 Mark.**
'What costs 300 marks?'
9 S: **Die neue Gläser für diese Brille.**
'The new lenses for my glasses.'
10 H: **Echt? Hat er gesagt?**
'Really? He said that?'
11 S: **Ja ja, wir haben alles aufgerechnet. Alle, ich war da mindesten anderthalb Stunden, er hat alles geprüft, meine Augen, mit die alle verschienden Machinen, die Stigmatismus, die … alle Sachen.**
'Yeah, yeah, we calculated it all. Everything, I was there at least one and a half hours, he checked everything, my eyes, with all the different machines, my stigmatism, the … everything.'
12 H: **Du musst, du musst trotzdem zum Augenarzt gehen, oder? Weil er dass verschreiben muss, wenn Du was von der Krankenkasse haben willst?**
'You have to, you have to go to the eye doctor anyway, don't you? So he can prescribe it, if you want to get something from the health insurance?'
13 S: **Um-umm.** {meaning no}
14 H: **Geht nicht Du lasst nur der Optiker machen.**
'That can't be, that just the optician does it.'
15 S: **Doch. Das is so, auch so wie ich meine Brille gekriegt habe. Ist genau so.**
'Yes it is. That's how, the way I got my glasses too. Just like that.'

16 H: **Du warst nicht beim Augenarzt.**
'You didn't go to an eye doctor.'
17 S: **Nee, nie. Nie, Du musst nie da. Er prüft alles da, die haben alles da. Es ist ganz super, der Laden, echt. Ich war da schon ein Paar mal.**
'No, never. You never have to go there. He checks everything, they have everything there. It's really great, the shop, really. I've been there a couple of times.'
18 H: **Brillenladen in Kreuzberg.**
'Glasses shop in Kreuzberg [a nearby district of their city].'
19 S: **Ich kenne die auch. Ich kenne den Typ.**
'I know them too. I knew this guy.'
20 H: **Ich werde irgendwie skeptisch, also.**
'I'd be skeptical, though.'
21 S: No.
22 **H: Weil der Augenarzt der hat eine Medizinische Ausbildung.**
'Because a doctor has medical training.'
23 S: **Ich war bei Augenarzt, ich kenne das auch, und die, die machen nichts anders. Die machen die selben Tests und so.**
'I've been to an eye doctor, and I know that too, and they, they don't do anything different. They do the same tests and so on.'
24 H: Uh-huh.
25 S: **Aber das Problem ist, ich brauche 300 Mark nächtsten Montag. Kannst Du mir das ausleihen?**
'But the problem is, I need 300 Marks next Monday. Can you lend it to me?'
26 H: **Du kriegst eine neue Brille jetzt, oder was?**
'You're getting a new pair of glasses, or what?'
27 S: **Ja.**
28 H: **Uh-huh.**
29 S: **Ich habe die bestellt.**
'I ordered them.'
30 H: **Tatsaechlich?**
'Really?'
31 S: **Ja, Hans, meine Augen sind schlecter, was soll ich tun, ich renne blind durch die Gegend**!
'Yeah, Hans, my eyes have gotten worse, what should I do, I'm running around blind!'
32 H: **Aber du siehst, du sagst du siehst immer so viel mit der Brille.**
'But you see, you saw you see so much with those glasses.'
33 S: No, can you loan me 300 Marks. Do you have it?
34 H: **Natürlich, klar.**
'Of course, certainly.'
35 S: Do you have that? I thought you had nothing in, on your **Konto.**
'account'

36 H: **Ja, ich nehme das von meinem Sparkonto.**
'Yeah, I'll take it from my savings account.'
37 S: **Geht das? Ist das kein Problem?**
'Will that work? Is that a problem?'
38 H: **Kein Problem.**
'No problem.'
39 S: Okay. That's what I wanna know. All your other comments are unnecessary.
40 H: Blah-blah-blah.
41 S: So anyway, it's a good thing to go, because I've been having headaches a lot lately. And I knew that there was something wrong so I went to my xxx
42 H: **Ja, Dein rechtes Auge seiht immer ein bisschen anders aus.**
'Yeah, your right eye looks a little different.'
43 S: Shut up! It does not.
44 H: **Doch**
'yes it does.'
45 S: **Nicht wie bei dir.**
'Not like yours.'
46 H: **Hängt schon fast heraus.**
'It's almost hanging out.'
47 S: No way. Shut up (laughs)
48 H: (laughs) **Irgendwie dachte ich der fehlt irgendwas an deinem Augen.**
'Somehow I thought there was something wrong with your eye.'
49 S: **Arschloch!**
'Asshole!'
50 H: **Na na na.**

3. Code-switching and borrowing are said to be different phenomena. Try to distinguish between the two, using examples from two languages you know. What criteria do the various scholars who have discussed this issue rely on most? What disagreements do you find? Is there possibly a continuum here, that is, no clear division between the two? You might begin your search for answers by consulting Myers-Scotton (2005, 253ff).

Further Reading

Mahootian, Shahrzad (2006). Code Switching and Mixing. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 511–27. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, vol. 2. 2nd edn. Elsevier: Oxford, 511–27.
An overview of research on code-switching, incorporating different models and approaches to the study of social and structural aspects of the use of multiples codes.

Ogay, Tania and Howard Giles (2007). Communication Accommodation Theory: A Look Back and a Look Ahead. In Bryan B. Whaley and Wendy Samter (eds.), *Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars*. Malwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 121–48.
A recent recap of work on Communication Accommodation Theory; does not focus solely on multilingual discourse but looks at accommodation more broadly.

Sebba, Mark, Shahrzad Mahootian, and Carla Jonsson (2011). *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse. Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
This collection of articles presents multilingual data from a wide range of written contexts, including traditional literature and contemporary media relying on computer and cell phone technology. Different methodological approaches to the analysis of these data are addressed.

Snow, D. (2013). Revisiting Ferguson's Defining Cases of Diglossia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 34(1): 61–76.
A re-examination of the earlier work on diglossia and the proposal of the refinement of the theory to include three different types of diglossia.

Soukup, Barbara (2012). Current Issues in the Social Psychological Study of 'Language Attitudes': Constructionism, Context, and the Attitude–Behavior Link. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6(4): 212–24.
This review of the literature provides a perspective on how matched-guise research, and attitudinal research more broadly, fits with social constructionist perspectives.

For further resources for this chapter visit the companion website at

www.wiley.com/go/wardhaugh/sociolinguistics

References

Abdelali, A. (2004). Localization in Modern Standard Arabic. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and technology* 55(1): 23–8.

Albirini, A. (2011). The Sociolinguistic Functions of Codeswitching between Standard Arabic and Dialectal Arabic. *Language in Society* 40(5): 537–62.

Bailey, B. (2001). Dominican-American Ethnic/Racial Identities and United States Social Categories. *International Migration Review* 35(3): 677–708.

Bailey, B. (2005). The Language of Multiple Identities among Dominican Americans. In S. F. Kiesling and C. B. Paulston (eds.), *Intercultural Discourse and Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bailey, B. (2007). Heteroglossia and Boundaries. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Bilingualism: Social and Political Approaches*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 257–74.

Barnes, L. (2011). The Function and Significance of Bilingual Code-Switching in English Poetry with a Special Focus on the Work of Eliot and Pound. *English Academy Review* 28(1): 23–38.

Barnes, L. (2012). The Role of Code-Switching in the Creation of an Outsider Identity in the Bilingual Film. *Communication* 8(3): 247–60.

Bell, A. (2001). Back in Style: Reworking Audience Design. In P. Eckert and J. R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Blom, J. and John J. Gumperz (1972). Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code-Switching in Norway. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 407–34.

Boussofara-Omar, N. (2003). Revisiting Arabic Diglossic Switching in Light of the MLF Model and its Sub-models: The 4-M Model and the Abstract Level Model. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 6(1): 33–46.

Burridge, K. (2002). Changes with Pennsylvania German Grammar as Enactments of Anabaptist World View. In N. J. Enfield (ed.), *Ethnosyntax: Explorations in Grammar and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (1999). You Da Man: Narrating the Racial Other in the Production of White Masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 443–60.

Choi, Jinny K. (2005). Bilingualism in Paraguay: Forty Years after Rubin's Study. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26(3): 233–48.

Creese, A. and A. Blackledge (2010). Translanguaging in the Bilingual Classroom: A Pedagogy for Learning and Teaching? *The Modern Language Journal* 94(1): 103–15.

Cruz, B. and B. Teck (1998). *The Official Spanglish Dictionary: Un User's Guia to More Than 300 Words and Phrases That Aren't Exactly Español or Inglés*. New York: Fireside.

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. *Word* 15: 325–40. In P. P. Giglioli (ed.), *Language and Social Context: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Fishman, J. A. (1980). Bilingualism and Biculturism as Individual and as Societal Phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development* 1(1): 3–15.

Fuller, Janet M. (2012). *Bilingual Pre-teens: Competing Ideologies and Multiple Identities in the U.S. and Germany*. New York: Routledge.

Fuller, Janet M. (2013). *Spanish Speakers in the USA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Garcia, O. (2009). Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty and M. Panda (eds.), *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1991). *Language Selection and Switching in Strasbourg*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (1997). Code-Switching: Language Selection in Three Strasbourg Department Stores. In N. Coupland and A. Jaworski (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Giles, H., R. Bourhis, and D. M. Taylor (1977). Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*. London: Academic Press.

Giles, H. and N. Coupland (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Giles, H., A. Mulac, J. J. Braodac, and P Johnson (1987). Speech Accommodation Theory: The First Decade and Beyond. In Margaret McLaughlin (ed.), *Communication Yearbook 10*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 13–48.

Giles, H., N. Coupland, and J. Coupland (1991). Accommodation Theory: Communication, Context, and Consequences. In H. Giles, N. Coupland, and J. Coupland (eds.), *Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in Applied Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–68.

Giles, H., and T. Ogay (2007). Communication Accommodation Theory. In B. B. Whaley and W. Samter (eds), *Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 325–44).

Gross, S. (2000). Intentionality and the Markedness Model in Literary Codeswitching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32(9): 1283–303.

Gumperz, J. J. and R. Wilson (1971). Convergence and Creolization: A Case from the Indo-Aryan/Dravidian Border in India. In D. H. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hélot, Christine, Monic Barni, Rudi Jannssens, and Carla Bagna (eds.) (2012). *Linguistic Landscapes, Multilingualism and Social Change*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Jaworski, Adam (2014). Metrolingual Art: Multilingualism and Heteroglossia. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 18: 134–58.

Johnson-Weiner, K. M. (1998). Community Identity and Language Change in North American Anabaptist Communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2(3): 375–94.

Jørgensen, J. N. (2008). Polylingual Languaging around and among Children and Adolescents. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5(3): 161–76.

Kallmeyer, W. and I. Keim (2003). Linguistic Variation and the Construction of Social Identity in a German-Turkish Setting. In J. K Androutsopoulos and A. Georgakopoulou (eds.), *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 29–46.

Lambert, W. E. (1967). A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23: 91–109. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.) (1972), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Le Page, R. B. (1997). The Evolution of a Sociolinguistic Theory of Language. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lo, A. (1999). Codeswitching, Speech Community Membership, and the Construction of Ethnic Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 461–79.

Mahootian, Shahrzad (2005). Linguistic Change and Social Meaning: Codeswitching in the Media. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 9(3–4): 361–75.

Mahootian, Shahrzad (2012). Resources and Repertoires. In M. Sebba, S. Mahootian, and C. Jonsson (eds.), *Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Managan, K. (2003). Diglossia Reconsidered: Language Choice and Code-Switching in Guadeloupean Voluntary Organizations. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 47: 251–61.

MacSwan, J. (2014). *A Minimalist Approach to Intrasentential Code Switching*. New York: Routledge.

McMahon, A. M. S. (1994). *Understanding Language Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Micu, C. C. and R. A. Coulter (2010). Advertising in English in Nonnative English-Speaking Markets: The Effect of Language and Self-Referencing in Advertising in Romania on Ad Attitudes. *Journal of East-West Business* 16(1): 67–84.

Mohanty, A. K. (2006). Multilingualism of the Unequals and Predicaments of Education in India: Mother Tongue or Other Tongue? In O. García, T. Skutnabb-Kangas, and M. E. Torres-Guzmán (eds.), *Imagining Multilingual Schools*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Morales, E. (2002). *Living in Spanglish: The Search for Latino Identity in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The Negotiation of Identities in Conversation: A Theory of Markedness and Code Choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 44: 115–36.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social Motivation for Code-Switching*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Myers-Scotton, C. (ed.) (1998). *Codes and Consequences: Choosing Linguistic Varieties*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). Frequency and Intentionality in (Un)Marked Choices in Codeswitching: 'This Is a 24-hour Country.' *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6(2): 205–19.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Otsuji, E. and A. Pennycook (2011). Social Inclusion and Metrolingual Practices. *Journal of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* 14: 413–26.

Otsuji, E. and A. Pennycook (2012) Unremarkable Hybridities and Metrolingual Practices. In Rani Rubdy and Lubna Alsagoff (eds.), *The Global-Local Interface and Hybridity: Exploring Language and Identity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 83–99.

Rampton, B. (1995). *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, B. (2001). Crossing. In A. Duranti (ed.), *Key Terms in Language and Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Reyes, A. (2005). Appropriation of African American Slang by Asian American Youth. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 9(4): 509–32.

Rubin, J. (1968). *National Bilingualism in Paraguay*. The Hague: Mouton. Excerpted in J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.) (1972), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Ryding, K. C. (2005). *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge University Press.

Santiago, B. (2008) *Pardon my Spanglish*. Philadelphia: Quirk Books.

Schieffelin, B. B. and R. C. Doucet (1998). The 'Real' Haitian Creole. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schilling-Estes, Natalie (2002). Investigating Stylistic Variation. In Jack K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Soliman, A. (2009). The Changing Role of Arabic in Religious Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Study of Egyptian Arabic. PhD dissertation.

Sridhar, K. K. (1996). Societal Multilingualism. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stępkowska, A. (2012). Diglossia: A Critical Overview of the Swiss Example. *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 129: 199–209.

Stroud, Christopher and Sibonile Mpendukana (2009). Towards a Material Ethnography of Linguistic Landscape: Multilingualism, Mobility and Space in a South African Township. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 13(3): 363–86.

Sweetland, J. (2002). Unexpected but Authentic Use of an Ethnically-marked Dialect. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6(4): 514–36.

Wei-Yu Chen, Cheryl (2006). The Mixing of English in Magazine Advertisements in Taiwan. *World Englishes* 25(3–4): 467–78.