長野大学紀要　第27巻第4号　17—42頁（261—286頁）2006

言語接触、維持と交代についての一考察

Language Contact, Maintenance and Shift : An Overview of Approaches and Research

Margaret Jean Simmons*

マーガレッツ・シモンズ

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to consider several influential theoretical perspectives concerning the sociolinguistic dynamics of language contact and the associated multilingualism, maintenance or shift of the languages involved. Language contact and bilingualism on both the large scale of society and the micro-scale of interpersonal relations are complex matters that have attracted the attention of academics in not only linguistics and sociolinguistics, but also sociology and social psychology ; Weinreich, Fishman, Tajfel, Homans, Bourdieu, Smolicz, Boissevain, Giles, Bourhis, Scotton, Heller, among others are considered here. The presentation of the selected studies hopes to show developments in the field and also interrelated and overlapping aspects of some of the approaches to researching language contact situations. First the theoretical viewpoints are presented, then selected studies of language contact situations are reviewed. Gal's work with Hungarian and German, Milroy's work with dialects in Belfast, Gorter's and Jaspaert and Kroon's work with Dutch in contact with other languages and also Bourhis' and Lambert's work with French and English are included.

Setting the context of language maintenance and shift

Language contact frequently results in varying degrees of bilingualism on the part of some individuals and varying uses of the languages in the society involved. Though bilingualism is an asset for individuals, over time bilingualism often results in one language being preferred over the other, which in turn may result in the abandonment of the less preferred language unless the speakers of the language make efforts to continue its use. The aim of this article is to summarize some fundamental perspectives about language contact, maintenance and shift and to observe a few concrete language contact situations. Theoretical views on language maintenance and shift will be presented along with some additional works which support and complement understanding the dynamics of languages in contact. Then several studies concerning the contact situation of various languages will be reviewed.

1.0 Theoretical perspectives and viewpoints

1.1 Language contact

One of the most fundamental works providing a base for language maintenance and shift research is *Languages*

*産業社会学部助教授

in Contact by Weinreich (1953) which discusses a wide range of factors influencing language shift on the level of the individual and the level of society. The work addresses factors influencing language interference and the question as to when interference becomes a language shift from the linguistic point of view and also from the point of view of the speaker's subjective experience. The importance of social motivations for language change is clear : "A full account of interference in a language contact situation, including the diffusion, persistence, and evanescence of a particular interference phenomenon, is possible only if the extra-linguistic factors are considered (p.3)." The importance of the individual is stressed ; he says, "When one considers, however, that the bilingual speaker is the ultimate locus of language contact, it is clear that even socio-cultural factors regulate interference through the mediation of individual speakers (p.71)." In later pages he states, "... there are no strictly linguistic motivations in language shifts... (p.107)." However, linguistic as well as social factors are important to consider in interference, and he summarizes these in a table of possible stimuli and resistance factors in structural and non-structural categories (pp.64-65).

Language shift is defined as "the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another (p.68)." He also indicates that although the first language a person learns in life is generally considered to be the person's dominant language, it is possible to become more proficient in a language which is learned later in life. Furthermore it is possible to have two mother-tongues (p.77). He notes that schools and education control language learning and behaviors, they also protect a language from foreign influences (p.88).

Of particular interest is the section entitled Congruence of Linguistic and Socio-Cultural Divisions (Weinreich, pp. 89-97).[1] In this section, Weinreich mentions the possible indigenous vs. immigrant divide and that the "cultural disorientation" that immigrants experience "undermines their inertial resistence to excessive borrowings into their language (p.91)." Weinreich refers to interference but the same principal ought to be applicable to shift.[2] Where there is an age factor associated with linguistic divisions in a society, Weinreich notes that the more obsolete language may cause laughter or even be restricted to rather humorous material in newspapers and he gives examples of Patois columns in French Swiss newspapers or Pennsylvania-German sections in some Pennsylvania journals (p.95).[3]

Language loyalty is presented as being to language what nationalism is to nationality. He says, "In response to an impending language shift, it produces an attempt at preserving the threatened language ; as a reaction to interference, it makes the standardized version of the language a symbol and a cause (p.99)."

At the end of the work, Weinreich notes that it is difficult to compare the work of various researchers because of differences in techniques and orientations from both linguistic and sociological perspectives (p.115). This is still the situation today.

1.2 Language and Ethnicity

While Weinreich addresses the reasons for as well as the linguistic and socio-cultural factors that might stimulate or resist interference and shift, Fishman looks at how shift happens and also at how to construct the reverse process for language revival.[4] The relationship between language and identity is a fundamental one in language revival or maintenance and also in achieving normalization of a language. Identity is also a multifaceted concept as any individual often has multiple roles in life and participates in diverse groups. But often, in considering socio-cultural identity, there is an associated ethnic group and sometimes an associated language as well. In describing what ethnicity is Fishman (1977) says : "Ethnicity is rightly understood as an aspect of a collectivity's self-recognition[5] as well as an aspect of its recognition in the eyes of outsiders. Ethnic recognition differs from other kinds of group-embedded recognition in that is operates basically in terms of paternity rather than in terms of patrimony and exegesis thereupon (p.16)." Later he adds that "..., so ethnicity may be the maximal case of societally-

organized intimacy and kinship experience... (p.18)." Because of common ancestry both individuals and collectives feel connected to their past and thus gain a sense of transcending time and mortality : "Through ethnic collectivities, individuals feel augmented and come to experience immortality as an immediate physical reality (p.19)." Ethnicity is something one has or does not have inherently.[6] Although even first language is acquired, it is often considered as though it were biological so that it is frequently associated with paternity[7] and may be considered one of the ways of fulfilling the obligations of ethnicity (pp.20-21). In principal, many group characteristics or group related "things" could serve as symbols of the group but language often seems to do so best for the following reason : "Language is the recorder of paternity, the expresser of patrimony and the carrier of phenomenology. Any vehicle carrying such precious freight must come to be viewed as equally precious, as part of the freight, indeed, as precious in and of itself. The link between language and ethnicity is thus one of sanctity-by-association (p.25)." Furthermore both ethnicity and language can serve as socio-cultural "boundaries" and language may indicate the ethnicity—or sub-ethnicity—of an individual (p.28). Though not necessarily natural, this association of ethnicity and language is often taken for granted as such and gives some insight into the link of language to individual and social identity through ethnicity.

1.3 Language rescue, revitalization and maintenance

In *Reversing Language Shift* (1991), Fishman thoroughly covers the process of language shift and its possible reversal with a "how it can be done" approach. Reversing language shift (RLS) is a goal for *Xmen* who want to be *Xish* culturally through *Xish* language or *Xmen via Xish* often in a contact situation with *Ymen* and *Yish* culture and language. He clarifies that "... reversing language shift[8] and language maintenance are not about language *per se* ; they are about language-in-culture. Reversing language shift is an attempt to foster, to fashion, to attain and to assist a particular language-in-culture content and pattern (p.17)." The reasons for language shift involve various kinds of dislocations : physical and demographic, social and cultural discolocations (Section 3). The key to a language's future is the continuity of intergenerational language use ; when this link is endangered, the language is threatened. In section 4 of the work, he provides guidelines for determining "how threatened" a language is with his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS). He outlines eight stages, starting with stage 8, the worst situation.

Stage 8 : most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be reassembled from their mouths and memories and taught to demographically unconcentrated adults.

Stage 7 : most users of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age.

Stage 6 : the attainment of intergenerational informal oralcy and its demographic concentration and institutional support.

Stage 5 : Xish literacy in home, school and community, but without taking on extra-communal reinforcement of such literacy.

Stage 4 : Xish in lower education[9] that meets the requirements of compulsory education laws.

Stage 3 : use of Xish in the lower work sphere (outside of the Xish neighborhood/community) involving interaction with Xmen and Ymen.

Stage 2 : Xish in lower governmental services and mass media but not in the higher spheres of either.

Stage 1 : some use of Xish in higher level educational, occupational, governmental and media efforts (but without the additional safety provided by political independence).

Even in stage 1 languages are not necessarily considered safe from possibilities of language shift. Intergenerational mother tongue transmission and language maintenance are not one and the same (p.113). Maintenance takes effort. In the last section (1991)[10], Fishman reviews the kinds of efforts which are needed at each stage of the process. He points out that incentives for the ordinary person to become involved in efforts to reverse language shift are essential and that "RLS must stress the functionality of Xish in terms of satisfying the deeply cherished values and needs of all ordinary, rank-and-file Xmen (1990, pp.27-28)."

1.4 Domains

Fishman has also emphasized the importance of domains in understanding language maintenance and language shift. He views work in the area of language maintenance and shift in terms of three main subdivisions : "a) habitual language use at more than one point in time or space under conditions of intergroup contact ; b) antecedent, concurrent or consequent psychological, social and cultural processes and their relationship to stability of change in habitual language use ; and c) behavior toward language in the contact setting, including directed maintenance or shift efforts (1964, p.33). Related to habitual language use, it is necessary to consider the degree of bilingualism and the location of bilingualism, and location can be viewed in terms of domains. The range of domains used by researchers varies, but often home, school, work, neighborhood, sports club, church and public offices are included. Domains offer a way of understanding the distribution of languages used by bilinguals in intragroup communication and also the connection between micro-and macrosociolinguistics (also see 1972).

1.5 Intergroup relations

Tajfel's (1974) theory of intergroup relations indicates that the intensity of group affiliations may be partly a function of the existence of outgroups (pp.66-67). An individual bases decisions to remain or not remain part of a group based on whether or not the group contributes positively to her/his social identity. So, to maintain its members, a group needs to offer the incentive of a positive social identity. If a group does not contribute positively to the social identity of its members, Tajfel explains that there are at least two options :

"a) to change one's interpretation of the attributes of the group so that its unwelcomed features (e.g. low status) are either justified or made acceptable through a reinterpretation,

b) to accept the situation for what it is and engage in social action which would lead to desirable changes in the situation[11] ... (p.70)."

These concepts run parallel to Fishman's : Xmen engage in social, cultural and linguistic planning to reform Xish culture and language because of the threat of interference from or assimilation into Ymen's society. It is the contact of the groups which stimulates the increased awareness of one's own group. And in order to increase or maintain group membership numbers, the group must offer incentives. RLS efforts recognize the situation for what it is and also involve raising consciousness to be able to positively reinterpret the Xish culture and achieve identity reformation, so that it's positive value offers an incentive to participate.

In order to contribute aspects of social identity which are valued positively by an individual, a group must have positively valued distinctiveness (Tajfel, 1974, p.72). Various characteristics of a group may provide a basis for group distinctiveness compared to other groups, and language is certainly a possibility (p.75)[12] Maintaining group distinctiveness is an on going effort, even for high status groups (p.77).

Groups are composed of individuals who have the possibility to act as group members or to act as individuals. Individuals may also have the ability to move between groups, leaving one and seeking membership in others or to maintain multiple group memberships, i.e., individuals have the possibility of social mobility. In the process of seeking social mobility, they may also need linguistic mobility, which means not only knowledge, but real skill

and fluency whether of a regional or social variety or of a different language. Socially mobile individuals will learn languages which help them enter attractive groups. This is exactly why RLS efforts and language maintenance efforts need to offer incentives of positively valued characteristics that can enhance the individual's social identity.

An individual is often in the situation of weighing the incentives for membership in one group as compared to another. Of course their may be requirements or costs for entering a new group and also possibly for leaving a group (Tajfel, 1974, above also mentions the possibilities of sanctions for leaving a group on p.82), and their maybe positive or negative feedback for using the language varieties involved in attempting to alter one's group associations. Thus individuals must make language choices to indicate association with a particular group at a particular time.

1.6 Exchange, reward, cost and profit

Homans' (1958) theory of social behavior as exchange provides an underlying explanation of individuals' assessments of their groups' positive contribution (or not) to their social identity. He writes that "exchange is one of the oldest theories of social behavior (p.597)" but also rather neglected by social scientists. He describes social behavior as an excange of material or non-material goods which can include approval and prestige (p.606). Homans further states that "an incidental advantage of an exchange theory might bring sociology closer to economics (p.598)," which in fact is what Pierre Bourdieu (1977) has done in his work on "the economics of linguistic exchanges" to be discussed later.

Homans (1958) cites experiments by Festinger, Schrachter and Bach (1950) who looked at behavior in small groups and found that group cohesiveness was considered a value ; also in more cohesive groups more members conform to its norms, and members can influence changes in the behavior of other members more easily. Homans refers to an experiment reported by Gerard (1954) where the persons involved were categorized as "agreement, mild disagreement and strong disagreement" and then organized into two groups : "high attraction" who were told that they would like each other or "low attraction" who were told they would not like each other. Disagreements were prompted and those who did and did not shift their opinions towards those of a paid participant were observed. The results showed that those who changed the least were those of "high attraction/agreement" members. Homans further considers these results in terms of the costs and rewards of disagreeing with the other members in each group. He uses the formula "Price = Reward – Cost (p.603)." These "high attraction/agreement" persons were already in accord with the group and getting high rewards for their agreement behavior, so they gained little by changing their opinions. Some of the other types of members showed more change because their connection with the group did not necessarily give them high rewards and they could afford the cost of changing.

Exchange theory coincides with Tajfel's work and facilitates understanding the decision process of members to change groups or not.[13] Though Homans did not specifically look at language, language is clearly a behavior related to group membership, and non-compliance of use of the group language is easily noticed by other members and may result in disapproval. Persons with close ties to members in a cohesive group may not want to risk disapproval through any kind of non-group behavior, including language, whereas others who are not so involved, like the "low-attraction" people discussed above, may feel they can afford the costs of disapproval and make changes.

The basic concept is that people will do what is profitable, and that reward increases the likelihood of repeating the behavior if there are not excessive costs which would outweigh the reward and eliminate the profit. When profit is not anticipated, behavior is less predictable. In language choice, individuals must weigh the potential benefits and costs involved which means weighing the social value of each of the available languages from which their linguistic repertoire allows them to choose against the others. Value includes the potential reactions of in-

group and outgroup members as well as concrete associations of the languages with the economic status, employment opportunities or other prestige. However, in any case of exchange, it is important to keep in mind Blau's (1964) view that exchanges made under conditions of physical force are not considered legitimate.

1.7 Linguistic markets and linguistic exchanges

Pierre Bourdieu (1977) explains that sociology must address language because language carries not only linguistic but also social meaning, and while language represents reality with symbols, the use of symbols also creates reality in some ways. Furthermore, language is learned as a corporal skill through experiences with language, lexicon, grammar and phonetic structures and with the social values given to these linguistic features. Because of this type of learning, the habits of using language to represent meaning is often less than conscious yet always concerned with communication of social values (pp.660-662).

Bourdieu (1977, 1982, 1991) views language maintenance and shift as exchange of linguistic products which vary in type and value, in a market situation. Thus linguistic varieties are rated according to a hierarchy of social values connected to the people who use them, and linguistic products function in the same way that any product is valued and exchanged in an economy. Persons belong to groups and through their groups they learn who they are and who they aren't and also how they are valued compared to others. This socialization process generally results in reproduction of the status quo. The social value systems are learned and accepted, and one tends to remain in one's social and linguistic place largely through self-censorship.

In Bourdieu's work language is considered an instrument of action and power. He describes linguistic varieties, whether different languages or varieties of accents[14] as categories of symbolic capital or currency because the way one speaks is endowed with high or low symbolic value that can be exchanged, or not, for other kinds of capital such as employment which can in turn result in economic capital. This linguistic capital functions in a system run on economic principles of exchange ; those who have more valuable capital can participate in more exchange activity than those who have little symbolic capital. Basically, there are three kinds of capital : economic (money, property), cultural (education, knowledge, skill) and symbolic (prestige, honor) (see editor's introduction by Thompson in Bourdieu, 1991). Since there is a great variation in linguistic systems, it is possible to assign value to them, often in association with the kinds of capital possessed by the people who speak each variety (1977, p.652). The linguistic variety associated with the most capital often becomes the standard or dominant language. Though such values are arbitrary, overtime, they may come to be considered a natural hierarchy of values ; this, of course, is a *misrecognition* of something arbitrary as something natural. It is this very *misrecognition* that legitimizes the dominant language (1977, p.652 ; 1991, p.214). When, through social interaction and/or educational or legal interventions, the dominant language becomes accepted by all the participants of the market as the standard by which to measure all varieties, the linguistic market is considered to be unified (1977, p.652 ; 1982, pp.34-38).

Through the association between a language variety and the amounts of capital possessed by its speakers, both the value of the language and the qualifications of who can be a legitimate speaker of that language are determined. This view runs parallel to the felicity conditions required to effectively execute performative speech acts by Austin (1962). In order for a performative utterance to be effective : the speaker must be qualified to say the words (such as a priest performing a wedding), the situation must be a real situation (a real wedding), the recipients of the effect should be the designated ones (human beings in this case), and they should believe in the authority of the speaker. (Austin gives an example of a baptism (p.24).) The main point here is that the speaker of the performative utterance must be qualified and authorized to do so, i.e., she/he must be a legitimate speaker of those words, just as those who use the dominant or legitimate language must be qualified to do so. Bourdieu refers to Austin (1991, pp.73-4, 107-115, 125, 129), yet he seems to criticize Austin (p.107) for ignoring that the authority

of a speech act depends on the qualification of the speaker ; this is not justified criticism in my view, but is an aside to the concept of markets and exchange.

That those who use the dominant language must not only be able to speak it, and speak it well, but they must also be qualified and authorized to do so illustrates the double message sent to those who attempt to learn the dominant language. Everyone should try to learn the dominant language even though the possibility to use it effectively and to benefit from using it maybe severely limited. Actually being able to exchange cultural capital, such as knowledge and skill in the dominant language, for employment or other social advancement opportunities may depend on non-linguistic qualifications (see 1991, p.69).[15] In reality, access to learning the dominant language and other associated behaviors is unequally distributed across social groups. Furthermore, members of some groups may exclude themselves from taking advantage of access, when it is available, because it may be socially uncomfortable to do so, i.e., access to social mobility maybe rejected through self-censorship.

Censorship is a key concept in Bourdieu. He discusses hypercorrection in the speech of the petite bourgeoisie and also the use of euphemisms in various situations ; this means that censorship is accomplished in relationship to the market : whether the interlocutors are from the same social group or not and whether the situation is formal or informal, etc. (see 1991, p.84). Related to censorship is the concept of "strategies of condescension" (1991, p.68) whereby a dominant language speaker may decide to use a minority language in certain situations. In such situations, the dominant language speaker does not lose value or face for adapting to the less valuable variety, but rather gains a double profit by maintaining his own eliteness and also endears himself to the speakers of the lower valued variety ; this simply reinforces the differences between and the hierarchy of the values of the groups and their languages. Adapting to the interlocutor's language variety, or accommodation, is often thought to be indicative of a desire to narrow social distances between the two speakers ; however, it may be in fact a strategy of condescension which in effect denies one speaker access to the language of the other speaker.

As one variety of language becomes considered better than others, the other varieties lose value, at least in the large scale market where the dominant variety is preferred, i.e., government, education, formal situations, media and perhaps in business as well. Non-dominant varieties are likely to be or become absent from these domains. As speakers of non-dominant varieties come to accept the low value of their own speech and prefer the speech of the dominant group, they contribute to the disappearance of their linguistic systems.

Two further essential concepts in Bourdieu's work are the *habitus* and bodily *hexis* (1982, pp.81-89 ; 1991, pp.83-95). The habitus consists of an individual's cumulative experience in all of the markets he/she has participated in. Through these interactions involving language learning and use within the value hierarchy of groups and languages in contact, one comes to understand the value of his/her linguistic products and the success he/she may anticipate when using them in various situations. Through this awareness of one's own value, the individual can also predict likely unsuccessful situations and can thus exercise self-censorship through modifying speech or usages or perhaps by not speaking at all. One can recognize the lower or higher value of one's own language (and group) relative to others (especially the dominant), can know what and how something should be said but also know that one may not be qualified (or authorized) to speak in certain situations. On the other hand, positive experiences with one's own group also reinforce that the person is complying with appropriate linguistic behavior in these smaller markets. Here, we can recall Homans' "reward minus cost equals profit" formula. The calculation may result in choosing not to do something (self-censorship) if profit seems unlikely, or in choosing a particular behavior because profit is anticipated. Furthermore, positive reward encourages repetition of a behavior (Homans, 1958 ; also 1974, pp.15-50) which in turn reinforces the *habitus* to be comfortable doing these reward bearing behaviors but to be uncomfortable in unknown situations where reward is not certain and costs are expected.

Linguistic capital is an embodied capital because it is a body technique, and especially phonetic competence is

part of the *bodily hexis* (Bourdieu, 1977, pp.660-662). Different social groups use or carry their bodies differently including the use of language.[16] Language behaviors are interrelated with other physical behaviors and the physical image of the person. Based on this line of thinking, it seems reasonable to consider the *habitus* and the *bodily hexis* to be key elements of one's personal identity which includes awareness of one's social identity.

Considering language maintenance and shift a market dynamics, the dominant market creates pressures on minority markets by attracting minority groups to become more like the mainstream dominant group, i.e., through encouraging attempts at social mobility. This often results in a change in the way of speaking which contributes to the gradual disuse of the minority language and other related behaviors.

The value system and structure of the market tend to reproduce themselves ; however, these can also change if beliefs and groups can be unmade and remade (see Bourdieu, 1977, pp.654, 664 ; 1991, pp.127-136). As discussed above in Tajfel's work, a group may make efforts to redefine and revalue itself. And Fishman's RLS is really a series of interventions that create or recreate the market for the language at first within the L1 group and then in interaction with the dominant group with the goal of gaining some legal status for the language and its use in the bilingual or multilingual social space where *Xmen and Xish* coexist with *Ymen and Yish*. This space where Xish and Yish exist and where Xmen and Ymen interact is the dominant market place, a concept used by Jaspaert and Kroon (1991) to be discussed later.

Fishman's, Tajfel's and Bourdieu's views overlap ; from different approaches and in different words, they have each described the idea of a market where group contact takes place and where interventions may be made to increase the value of a group, and in association its language, to make it more attractive to its members and possibly to outsiders.

1.8 Core Values

Smolicz's (1981, 1988) concept of core values offers another approach to understanding language maintenance and shift. Core values can include elements such as religion, language, family cohesiveness and historicity and "they generally represent the heartland of the ideological system and act as identifying values which are symbolic of the group and its membership (1981, p.75)." These core values may exist in a hierarchy. The link between a group's cultural system and social system are these values. Furthermore, if these core values are lost, the group will likely lose its ability to perpetuate itself across generations (1988, p.394). Smolicz also says "Rejection of core values carries with it the threat of exclusion from the group (1981, p.75)."

Core values of a group often become accentuated when the group feels external pressure to alter its culture ; under such circumstances the group reacts with counter measures that result in clear identification of the values considered by the group to be their cultural core (1988, p.77). Mainstream pressure for minority groups to assimilate could be forceful, such as in the case of the Poles during the 19th century (Smolicz example, 1981, p.76) or as in the case of Spain's experience under the 1939-1975 dictatorship. Depending on social circumstances at various times in history, groups may alternate the priority of their core values according to the types of external pressures experienced.

Scmolicz, Secombe & Hudson's (2001) data comes from Australia. Findings include that the group most successful in maintaining their language is the Greek-Australian group because family, language and the Orthodox religion have reinforced each other as core values. The case histories indicate that many Greek-Australians attended Greek school outside of their usual studies and also usually spoke Greek at home. For Italian-Australian's language was important but family life was more important. The histories for the Italians indicated that they often spoke Italian at home, often in a dialect form or a form mixed with English, but there was not an emphasis on learning standard Italian and the family unit was a higher priority.

Identity is also addressed (Smolicz, 1981) : "In the case of identity what we are really dealing with is a person's attitudes to the core values of a particular social group (p.85)." "The group's core values always refer to the way they are experienced, shared and expressed by members (p.85)." He also uses the concept of *personal cultural system* or values which are personalized (p.86) and says that the personal system is considered to mediate between the group culture and the "private world of the individual." Group experiences are shared but expressed in individual ways.

The situation of minority groups in plural societies varies according to the values and traditions of the mainstream dominant group. If the majority culture has a tradition of multilingualism, it may be relatively easy for language-centered groups to establish themselves and maintain their core value. However, if the dominant culture has a monolingual tradition, it will no doubt be more difficult (1981, p.88). A larger plural society needs to have supra-ethnic values that appeal to and can be shared by all ethnic groups. In Australia these include values of parliamentary democracy, freedom of the individual and the English language (but without excluding other languages). Another factor for cultural maintenance is the attitude of the mainstream toward the coexistence of other cultures ; some may consider multiculturalism to be simply a transitional phase in the process of total assimilation, others may consider it to be *residual* but on the fringes of mainstream, while a third view of *multiculturalism for maintenance*[17] is concerned with preserving the culture of minority groups (1988, pp.403-404).

The concept of core values relates well with Fishman's view of *Xish* and the groups consciousness about the identity and meaning of the X group. Also, in Tajfel's view, when a group seeks to redefine itself positively, core values must come to the forefront of consciousness.

1.9 Social network

Social network[18] analysis looks at the personal network of contacts with whom an individual person interacts. Boissevain (1974), an anthropologist, described immediate contacts with whom one has direct interactions and also second order contacts with whom one does not interact directly on a usual basis but who are potential contacts and potentially helpful or influential persons because they are 'friends of friends' (my inverted commas). The example he uses in his introduction is from a Sicilian town where a professor uses his personal network contacts to avoid efforts being made to block his son's education by an adversary. Both face to face contacts and 'friends of friends' were involved and collaborated because of their relationships and obligations with contacts over time. Boissevain explains that a network is not only about communication but that the "messages are in fact *transactions*(p.25)." He also talks about the value of and reciprocity of transactions and exchange. From this point of view, we can suppose that an individual's behavior in face to face interactions is very much influenced not only by social norms and group values (see p.6), but also by what present or potential value may be drawn from interactions with another person and from the potential contacts of this person. He sees network as an intermediary dimension between relationship and society (p.25).

Boissevain's description of the interaction and structure of networks (pp.24-48) includes a discussion of the kinds of links a person may have. Uniplex links between two people are based on only one role relation whereas multiplex links between two people involve more than one role relation (p.30). Role relations include things like family, neighborhood, sports and religious relationships. The transactional content that is exchanged, the direction of the flow of the exchanged elements, the frequency and duration of relations are also important. The main point is that, overall, multiplex links in a network are likely to be stronger and perhaps more influential than uniplex links. This is also important in considering influence on language behavior ; we often speak similarly to people we interact with frequently whether unconsciously or because we adapt to their speech ; multiplex relations are likely to put people in contact with each other more often than uniplex relations (though of course there are exceptions).

Uniplex relations may also become multiplex overtime, where, for example, work mates become friends, join the same sports team and also socialize on other occasions (my example).

In a multilingual setting, the influence of the underlying values and benefits to be obtained from various people in a network, in face to face interactions may influence the choice of language used by an individual. The influence on social networks on language maintenance and shift was studied in detail by Milroy (1980, discussed below) who found that degree of conformation to group language norms was related to degree of integration into the social network.

1.10 **Accommodation theory**

Giles (1979) indicates that many concepts from social psychology can help explain some of the common issues in sociolinguistics such as : "why are speech variables important in evaluating others, and why do people speak the way they do in different social contexts (p.2)?" He also asserts that experimental and statistical methods used in social psychology can compliment the usual methods in sociolinguistics.

Accomodation theory is based partly in Tajfel's work with intergroup relations as well as in similarity-attraction processes, social exchange and casual attribution processes (Giles & Smith, 1979). This viewpoint investigates whether or not speakers accommodate by converging their language toward or diverging their language from that of their interlocutor in inter-group conversations (see Giles, 1973). Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) hypothesized that a French Canadian bilingual who made efforts to accommodate an English Canadian would be perceived favorably by the English Canadian and that the English Canadian would also respond with efforts to accommodate the French Canadian and that the degree of effort would effect the perception and response. Their hypotheses were confirmed. They also discuss the possible influences of social exchange on language accommodation behaviors. Accommodation is further analyzed for possible optimal levels of convergence in Giles and Smith (1979) ; they consider content, pronunciation and speech rate as separate elements in an experiment concerning British English speakers evaluation of varying degrees of convergence by a North American speaker. The results showed that speakers were rated more favorably when they did not converge on all three elements (p.60), thus confirming that full convergence may not be optimal. They also discuss that divergence, or some degree of divergence, may be expected and that in some situations convergence by an outsider might be viewed as a threat to ingroup distinctiveness (p.62). Bourhis and Giles (1977) found that accent differences were reduced in interactions perceived as inter-individual encounters whereas the differences were accentuated in encounters perceived to be intergroup. Bourhis et al. (1979) found that threats toward the speaker's language tended to increase divergent linguistic behavior on the part of the speaker.

Giles and Johnson (1987) see language divergence as an act of language maintenance at the micro-level, especially so where the outgroup language is the norm and social sanctions might result from such divergence :

> "Indeed, this type of face-to-face strategy may arguably be an instance of language maintenance *par excellence* in the sense that when an outgroup language is the societal norm, ethnolinguistic differentiation can invoke considerable social sanctions as a consequence (p.69)."

This highlights the importance of individual decisions to linguistically accommodate outgroup interlocutors. Convergence and divergence are two important options in code switching which will be elaborated after a look at two other concepts from Giles et al. : ethnolinguistic vitality and ethnolinguistic identity as explanations for and possible predictors of linguistic behavior in interethnic situations.

1.11 Ethnolinguistic vitality

Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) introduce the idea of ethnolinguistic vitality in the context of Tajfel's (1974) theory of intergroup behavior and Gile's (1973) theory of speech accommodation. They see ethnolinguistic vitality as consisting of three main kinds of factors : status factors, demographic factors and institutional support factors. In intergroup situations the behavior of ethnic groups may be influenced by the degree of their ethnolinguistic vitality. They suggest that vitality is the underlying factor in the likelihood that a group would "behave as a distinctive and active collective entity in an intergroup situation (1977, p.308), and vitality may also be a way to classify linguistic minorities (p.310). A Subjective Ethonolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire (Bourhis, Giles & Rosenthal, 1981) was developed to compliment the earlier objective approach, realizing that perceptions of a particular group's vitality maybe different on the part of the group itself as compared to the perspectives of outgroups. They suggest that subjective vitality data might be useful in predicting the survival of a minority group in a larger society (p.147). Husband and Khan (1982) criticized the variables used to determine vitality as too ambiguous. Pittman, Gallois and Willemyns (1991) applied the concepts to compare perceptions of dominant and minority subgroups but found that it was useful to consider perceived potential future change. Labrie and Clément (1986) applied a modified Subjective Ethnolinguistic Vitality Questionnaire in a second language learning situation to consider various hypotheses linking individual processes to the perceived vitality of the first and second language groups (p.272) but found that self-confidence related to contact with members of the other group was an important element. Giles and Johnson (1987) include vitality as an element in their questionnaire in their work with ethnolinguistic identity theory. Harwood et al. (1994) review the course of vitality theory, introduce a non-linear multidimensional model of interacting elements (p.180) and offer several related research propositions including an underlying one with implications for language maintenance and shift :

> "Group members who perceive their ingroup to have high vitality will tend to converge little towards outgroup members, whereas group members who perceive their ingroup to have low vitality will tend to converge toward the outgroup, and especially so if their identification with their own group is low. As identification with the ingroup increases, members of low-vitality groups will become less likely to converge toward the outgroup (Harwood et al., 1994, p.191)."

The above proposition emphasizes the importance of power and status relationships in language choices for communication in interethnic interactions, and also the power relations between groups on the large social scale which may be influenced by institutional support factors such as official status of languages as well as presence in the education situation, etc. These and other factors contribute to the establishment of social norms which often favor a dominant language over a minority language. Nonetheless, as indicated above by Giles and Johnson, individuals sometimes choose the marked language choice of divergence from their interlocutor and the norm.

1.12 Ethnolinguistic Identity

Ethnolinguistic identity theory (Beebe & Giles, 1984 ; Giles & Johnson, 1981, 1987) is an approach to understanding and possibly predicting speech strategies in intergroup relations through identifying common underlying social psychological processes (Giles & Johnson, 1987, p.70). In this approach, ethnicity is viewed as a subjective phenomenon where individuals define themselves as belonging to the same ethnic category (Giles & Johnson, 1981, p.241) and that takes into consideration that many ethnic groups exist in situations where they not only compete with the dominant mainstream social group but also with other minority groups (Giles & Johnson, 1981, p.243). The approach is based in four components, the most central of which is social identity (Tajfel & Turner,

1979). The other components are perceived ethnolinguistic vitality (Giles et al., 1977 ; Bourhis et al., 1981), perceived group boundaries (cf. Weber, 1964) and multiple group memberships (cf. Coser, 1956). Social identity concerns the image of a group and the positive or negative influence the group has on the individual ; where the image is not positive, some individuals may choose social mobility and leave the group, but in other cases the group's members may use strategies of social creativity to redefine the group in various ways (refer to the discussion of Tajfel above). Perceived ethnolinguistic vitality, as discussed above, indicates the perception of the group on the part of ingroup members and also outgroup members considering status, demographic, institutional support as well as subjective factors. The perception of group boundaries is based on discontinuities in interactions between individuals ; language boundaries often coincide with group boundaries, thus language itself is often influential in maintaining boundaries. The extent to which individuals can move between groups depends on the perception of the "hardness-softness" of the boundaries which is linked to the membership characteristics/criteria of a group. Groups which define membership based on ascribed or inherited characteristics are likely to be more closed while groups determining membership based on acquired characteristics are likely to be more permeable ; it is more difficult to leave groups based on ascribed characteristics, but members of groups based on acquired characteristics may also be considered less distinctive which may contribute to emigration from the group and lower ethnolinguistic vitality (Giles & Johnson, 1981, p.235).[19] The fourth concept of multiple group memberships (see a detailed discussion in Giles & Johnson, 1981) acknowledges that individuals may belong to several social groups as well as their ethnic group, individuals may be influenced by some of their groups more than others and some groups may provide more satisfying social identities than others, individuals with multiple group memberships will likely be less influenced by their ethnic group than individuals with few other memberships, and individuals from different ethnic groups may be co-members of other groups. Based on the above concepts, ethnolinguistic identity theory suggests that :

"Individuals are more likely to define themselves in ethnic terms and adopt strategies for positive linguistic differentiation (e.g., divergence and linguistic creativity) to the extent that they (1) identify strongly with their ethnic group, which considers language an important dimension of its identity ; (2) regard their group's relative status as changeable and illegitimate ; (3) perceived their ingroup to have high ethnolinguistic vitality ; (4) perceive their ingroup boundaries to be hard and closed ; (5) identify strongly with few other social categories, each of which provides them with inadequate group identities and low intragroup statuses (Beebe & Giles, p.13 ; also see Giles & Johnson, 1987, p.72)."

Positive linguistic differentiation is maintenance of the ingroup language. Where there is less interethnic consciousness or membership in an ethnic group with an unsatisfying social identity, their maybe more convergence towards the language of an outgroup interlocutor.

As social identity and strategies of social creativity to create a positive group image, based in Tajfel's work, are essential underlying concepts, there is also a coincidence with Fishman's language rescue strategies mentioned above. And the idea of multiple group membership indicates possible participation in different linguistic markets ; the degree of permeability of group boundaries also has some overlap with Bourdieu's concept of being recognized, or not, as a legitimate member (or legitimate speaker of a group's language). Also, the concept of multiple group memberships shares some overlapping aspects with the concept of social network. An individual's network includes all the interlocutors an individual comes into contact with and these interlocutors can be from a variety of social, ethnic and linguistic groups ; these interlocutors are members of the individual's network and the individual is in turn a member of each of the other interlocutors' networks. Though being a network member is not necessar-

ily the same as being a group member, the ideal of multiple "group" membership is present in both cases. More integrated group members will likely have more multiplex ties with the ingroup and fewer memberships in other groups while less integrated members will likely have looser uniplex ties, just as the network ties of some individuals will be more multiplex in some cases and more uniplex in others.

1.13 Code switching

Code switching may involve a change of register in the same language, a change of dialect features or a change of a language. Code switching by bilingual individuals happens for many reasons and in response to many factors (see Gumperz 1982 ; Fasold,1984 ; Myers-Scotton, 1993 for overviews). An individual's proficiency in each language may require borrowing from the language of higher proficiency. Proficient bilinguals adapt and carry out conversations in the language of monolingual or low proficiency interlocutors in order to assure communication ; however, when both persons are proficient bilinguals, codes choices still occur but not necessarily for the sake of communication.

In some multilingual societies, code switching may be diglossic and associated with a change of domain such as speaking one language at home but another at work (see Ferguson, 1959). Gumperz (1982) refers to this as situational code switching where only one code is used in a particular situation as opposed to conversational code switching where speakers may change codes to communicate various kinds of information to each other. In their study of standard and dialect use in Hemnesberget in Norway, Blom and Gumperz (1971) distinguished between situational and metaphorical code switching, where metaphorical code switching related to different topics or to different roles between the speakers without necessarily changing the situation. They also found that the use of the dialect was associated with local values and preferred by locals who "tolerated" the standard language in various contexts, such as conveying meaning of officiality and politeness toward strangers. Speakers often change their style of speaking for politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1978), to accomplish certain objectives (see Fasold, 1990) or to indicate differences in power and respect (Brown and Gillman, 1960 ; see Fasold 1990 for elaboration).

Codes switching may be used to adjust social distance as an index of social negotiations (Myers-Scotton, 1988, 1993). The choice of languages by a bilingual speaker may be used in creating or in neutralizing conflict (Heller, 1988 ; Scotton, 1976). Myers-Scotton (1993) discusses code switching as marked language choices and the possible costs and rewards to individual speakers when they make marked choices. Genesee and Bourhis (1988) found convergent language accommodation to be a possible strategy to promote ethnic harmony between interlocutors. Gorter (1987) observed four patterns of language choice in the use of Frisian and Dutch in conversations in a bilingual context in a bureaucratic setting : convergence, neutrality, switching and asymmetry.

The willingness of individuals to code switch to another language may also be affected by the official status and governmental support of a language. Bourhis (1983) shows the influence of governmental language legislation to promote French on speakers' attitudes towards French and English The research includes self-reports of French and English usage in Quebec ; findings indicate both L1 francophones and L1 anglophones felt more comfortable speaking French with the new legislation.

Another perspective considers whether the person is acting in terms of her/himself, possibly for social mobility or other benefit, or in terms of her/his group, possibly for social change on a larger scale. As discussed above, Bourhis and Giles (1977) found that bilingual individuals were more likely to diverge their speech when communication was perceived to be interethnic but not so in communications perceived to be interpersonal. Yet Bourdieu writes :

"What happens between two persons – [here he gives various examples of possible interlocutors] – derives its

particular form from the objective relation between the two languages or usages, that is, between the groups who speak those languages (Bourdieu 1991, p.67)."

From this point of view, one must wonder if interpersonal communication is really possible at all since every language and person is associated with a group.

1.14 Intergenerational transmission

It is possible to consider the decision to transmit the language to children as a code choice, at the intergenerational level. Intergenerational transmission of language is essential for maintenance, yet it is clear that many immigrants, for example to the US or to Australia, have chosen to speak English rather than their own native language with their children. Fishman's work highlights the importance of intergenerational transmission, and Smolicz's work indicates that some people find that relying on family only is not enough (see 2001, pp.159-160). Nancy Dorian's (1981) longitudinal study of Sutherland Gaelic in Scotland shows in detail the process of language morbidity and the phenomenon of the "semi-speaker" who have only partial acquisition of the language. Intergenerational transmission is the essential language survival factor.

1.15 Maintenance of marginalization

There are some minority language varieties which seem to persist in spite of their lower valuation compared to other groups in the social system (see Ryan 1979). Some varieties may persist partly due to solidarity among group members or possibly related to extreme marginalization and lack of social mobility prospects. In some cases, covert prestige may provide a an incentive to maintain the variety or particular language features, such as associating non-standard forms with masculinity (see Bourdieu, 1991, p.88). As mentioned above, Blom and Gumperz (1972) found that the local dialect was preferred to the standard by the local residents of Hemnesberget.

Over time political conditions may change or group characteristics may change and a language variety may gain status, even official status as in the case of Italian and French which became the standard languages rather than Latin (Ryan, 1979). As another example, the status of Catalan was politically marginalized and then was transformed into an elite official language when the political regime changed in the 1970 s.

1.16 Language and identity

Language and identity seem to be inseparable from some perspectives because speaking is both an intellectual and physical behavior that is acquired by people usually as young children. It is an incorporated behavior which is difficult to change (see Bourdieu, 1991). Yet, the language varieties that one speaks are acquired, not genetically inherited, and can be changed even though it is difficult to erase all traces of influence from the first language in the pronunciation of additional languages. Another question is whether or not second or third languages can have the same connection to personal identity as the first language. This remains an issue in modern society where many traditional identity references are changing and borders are disappearing.

Certainly language can be used to express group membership such as in the case of those who used the centralized pronunciation of /ay/ and /aw/ in Labov's (1972) study of sound patterns on the island of Martha's Vineyard to express their identity as islanders as compared to those who expressed less connection to the island and also less centralization in their pronunciation of these dipthongs. The studies by Bourhis et al. (1979) and Bourhis and Giles (1977) mentioned earlier also show the use of divergent language behavior through ingroup language maintenance in interethnic conversations. Language is often highlighted in relationship to ethnic and national identity. Furthermore language is often manipulated politically in the process of nation building or national identity build-

ing (see Safran, 1999 ; also Fenton, 1999).

Heller (1995) discusses the uses of code switching in Quebec as ways of controlling or calling into play various kinds of knowledge to accomplish conversational objectives. She applies Bourdieu's (1977, 1982) concepts of linguistic markets and linguistic products and also domination through control of these unequally distributed (linguistic and other) resources by powerful groups who then are able to control the marketplace. She does not limit her analysis to Bourdieu's concepts but also refers to views by Gumperz (1982) and social networks (Milroy, 1980) and others. The case of Franco-Ontarian women married to Anglophone men is considered. After Bill 101 was passed in 1977, previously stigmatized French gained new status and value. This opened new opportunities but also questions.

> "The new opportunities that opened up for them in this way also raised a number of difficult questions, including how to cope with linguistic insecurity constructed through years of subordination and language transfer and how to re-define marital and parental relations in which ethnolinguistic relations of domination no longer so completely overlap gender relations of inequality (1995, p.162)."

Other cases of bilingualism and access to various economic opportunities are discussed. Code switching is seen as a way of taking action, reacting to experience and also creating experience

In a more recent article, Heller (2003) writes about the commodification of language and identity in the global and information society. In relationship to tourism, ethnic identity may become a kind of commodity for creating an interesting attraction for tourists. On the other hand, language may become a valuable resource for customer services and outsourcing. Language and ethnic identity may be commodified separately or together ; thus, the existence of a link between language and identity cannot necessarily be assumed.

1.17 Comment

Language maintenance and shift has been approached in various ways by different researchers in linguistics, anthropology, sociology and social psychology. The concepts of exchange and markets is a useful context, but may be too limited in itself to address all the dynamics of language contact, maintenance, shift and revival. The idea of social network is useful in understanding how individuals are integrated to various degrees into one or multiple social groups and the extent to which they participate in various sectors of the larger society through their social contacts. Domains and markets and also networks have some overlap in defining various arenas where a particular language may be more appropriate than another. Core values and intergroup relations offer insight into the values on which groups choose to base their collective identity and how these values may change in importance under different conditions and/or how they may be redefined. Observation of code switching patterns in a bilingual or multilingual society indicate the social norms for language choice in various situations. Code switching may also be used consciously by an individual to break usual norms to assert changes in social relationships, and by doing so, norms may gradually change.

2.0 Overview of studies related to language maintenance and shift

In this section several studies of language contact will be reviewed to compliment the theoretical viewpoints and perspectives mentioned so far.

2.1 German and Hungarian in Austria

Gal's work views language shift as a redistribution of linguistic variables within the overall framework of the

way speakers expressively and symbolically use linguistic variation (1979, pp.4-5). She spent a year in Oberwart interviewing, observing and sometimes recording language. She worked most closely with five families and a total of sixty-eight bilingual speakers of both Hungarian and German aged three to eighty.

Oberwart is located in an area on the Austrian-Hungarian border called Burgenland. Originally a Hungarian settlement founded to guard the Hungarian western border, the town has always been surrounded by German speaking towns. These Hungarian border guarding communities were granted a written charter in 1327 stating that noble privileges were given to each village as a corporate group. Fortresses were also built as a part of the defense system and large amounts of land were included ; German speaking peasants came to work on these estates. Though the villages were able to maintain independence because of their nobility, they became a speech island surrounded by German and Croatian speaking villages by the end of the 16th Century. The Reformation also affected the area resulting in the population of Oberwart becoming mainly Calvinist and remained so by resisting the Counter-Reformation, receiving official permission to build a Calvinist church and school in 1681. However, surrounding villages were Lutheran or Catholic and there was persecution of the Oberwart Calvinists during the Counter-Reformation. Consequently, Oberwart became a Hungarian speech island, a Calvinist religious island as well as a closed corporate community surrounded by manor estates (pp.34-37).[20]

More significant changes in social diversity within the town occurred in the 19th Century due to immigration of German-speaking Lutherans, Catholics and Jews. Oberwart also became a commercial center and a county seat ; factories, shops, banks and a railway station developed and so did a new economic stratification of the population. Though the Calvinist Hungarian speaking peasant population remained fairly stable in the town, Lutheran immigrants arrived as merchants and artisans, Jews as trades people and professionals in medicine and law, and Catholics were involved in crafts, professions and government work. In the peasant community, there was variation in the economic status of families, but these differences were minimal compared to the differences between the agricultural community and the other sectors of society. Religion, language, ethnic background, type of work and economic status reinforced group identities (pp.37-40). However, while under Hungarian rule, Hungarian was the language associated with opportunity and upward mobility, and for a time it was a prerequisite for higher education, and it was the language of administrators as well as professionals. German also had prestige and was taught but was not backed by the state. The territory of Burgenland was transferred to Austria in 1921 ; a portion of the intellectuals and administrators fled to Hungary, but the peasant population remained ; Hungarian continued to be used by the Calvinist church, but the county government and courts began to use German with the change to an Austrian administration. The upper classes spoke German and the peasant population was bilingual (pp.37-43).

Sociopolitical transitions continued. Some of the native Oberwart peasants' children obtained higher education and returned to work in the local government. Perhaps because of their location, people in Oberwart had ties with both countries and a rather flexible perspective concerning some aspects of identity. However, WWII, for the most part severed Oberwart's ties with Hungary, and the teaching of Hungarian was prohibited by the Third Reich. But later, Oberwart was occupied by Soviet troops until 1955. It gradually became difficult to maintain ties with contacts and traditions in Hungary, and there was little economic desire to do so. After 1955, economic expansion occurred, there were more jobs and more consumerism ; traditional agriculture was more difficult to maintain and was less appealing compared to the benefits of commercial and industrial livelihoods. German became important for education that would lead to jobs in both administration and industry (pp.43-55).

Although peasants in other areas of Burgenland maintained their land and socio-economic status, largely through marriages between landowners, because of Oberwart's urbanizing character, and the relative lower socio-economic class of the peasants in Oberwart, peasants there began to depend on the town's industries for wages to supplement their agricultural activities (p.58). The lifestyle of workers, symbolized by German, gradually became

more attractive, and the peasant life symbolized by Hungarian became less attractive to the point that peasant men had difficulty finding marriage partners (pp.55-63).

With social changes and commercial development, four main neighborhoods developed in Oberwart (p.28), and these neighborhoods coincided with the ethnic, religious, socioeconomic and linguistic divisions of the population.

Switching between German and Hungarian was more salient than style switching, but there was a wide range of variation among speakers as to when and why they seemed to choose one language or the other. Two factors, the speaker and the listener, seemed to be good predictors of the language that would be used in an interaction. Gal developed a matrix ranking speakers on the verticle axis and interlocutor types on the horizontal axis. Interlocutor types were also ordered according to their degree of urbaness or Austrianess as compared with peasantness. Speakers and interlocutors were ranked so that the results fell into an implicational or Guttman scale. The results showed that Hungarian was used more frequently with interlocutors on the peasant end of the horizontal axis. Older speakers tended to use more Hungarian and younger speakers more German (p.119), but there was still variation among speakers.

In seeking additional social variables related to speakers' linguistic choices, a peasant status rating for the speaker and a peasantness rating of the speaker's social network were developed (pp.136-137, 140). Although for some speakers, the individual rating was more closely related to the speakers language choice, overall, the social network rating was more closely related to language choice than the individual rating (pp.139, 183-184). The close relationship between social network and language choice confirms that language choice is at least partly a function of group norms and expectations. This also highlights the importance of the speaker's relationship with interlocutors and their shared expectations of appropriate linguistic behavior.

Concerning the effects of social networks on individuals, Gal interviewed German monolingual women who married bilinguals in Oberwart and found that those who married peasants and lived with their parents-in-law learned Hungarian and those who established their own households with working husbands did not (pp.144-145). A speaker's social network also influenced the effect of particular interlocutors in that relatives could not exercise the same sanctions against the worker wife as against the peasant wife (p.144).

There was often a usual language between any two interlocutors who knew each other (see pp.108, 177). The symbolic meaning of language between the interlocutors was also important. She explains a situation in which she was speaking Hungarian with a bilingual man whose son was also present ; the son entered the conversation by offering some information in German and the father switched languages to answer his son in German even though both of them knew and spoke Hungarian with others. In this case, Hungarian was considered to be the language of older people and old fashion things, so that even though both father and son were capable bilinguals, they felt it more appropriate to use German with each other because using Hungarian might have implied that one thought the other was old fashioned or valued peasant life (pp.123-124).

Though German clearly gained prestige, Hungarian was considered a symbol of trust and solidarity among many who still spoke it (p.150).

Shift to German on the part of many people in Oberwart can be related to speakers' reinterpretation of the symbolic meaning of German and Hungarian and subsequent increased choice of German and redistribution of German to more and more aspects of daily life over time. Gal further elaborates the process of the shift to German in Oberwart in the last chapter, including the increased use of German by younger speakers and maintenance of Hungarian mainly by older speakers. She also notes that young women use more German than men and relates this to the influence of choice of marriage partner on women's lives (Gal, 1979. p.167).

2.2 Marginalized language varieties in Belfast

Milroy (1980) considers that various kinds of social significance underlies variability in the way that people use language. She also considers that there are social units, which are smaller and less abstract than the category of social class, to which people feel that they belong and which are important for their identity (p.14). She refers to Hymes' (1974, p.51) notion of community : "... a local unit, characterized for its members by common locality and primary interaction." These units or social networks may be closed or open and an individual's connection to the group may be through uniplex or multiplex ties. A uniplex network is one in which an individual has diverse relationships with many other persons in different situations ; a multiplex network implies that individuals may have multiple relationships with each other such as being members of the same family, working together, being neighbors and participating in other activities together. These close knit groups with more multiple role relationships can exercise more control over members and members' linguistic (as well as other) behavior (pp.15-22). In further describing social networks, she observes the characteristic of density, clusters and multiplexity, factors which increase the ability of the group to function as a norm-enforcement mechanism. "Relationships in tribal societies, villages and traditional working-class communities are typically multiplex and dense, whereas those in geographically and socially mobile industrial societies tend to uniplexity and spareness (see chapter 3, especially pp.49-52, also p.61)."

Milroy collected and recorded a variety of speech styles from numerous speakers in three inner city working class neighborhoods with high unemployment and poverty. The three neighborhoods were Ballymacarett, the Hammer and Clonard. The population in all three areas was marginalized in that their employment possibilities and lifestyles were rather outside mainstream industrial society with little possibility for upward mobility. In such communities there is often a high value placed on social solidarity. "The ethic of social solidarity is highly developed in marginal communities and is clearly associated with extreme poverty ; individuals who become less poor tend to sever network ties with other marginals, reconstructing less dense, less multiplex sets of ties elsewhere (p.74)." In all three areas, women seemed to have more employment possibilities than men. Women also tended to be less restricted territorially as they often found work outside the community area (p.80).

Milroy investigates the use of eight vowels as sociolinguistic variables (pp.116-120) in relationship to the social variables of social class, sex, age, regional origin and group identity of the speakers. When the results of variable use were displayed in regard to age, sex and area, there are differences noticed, especially in use by men as compared to women ; this is especially true in Ballymacarett. Further, there is a wide range of differences in usage by individual speakers.

A social network score was determined for individual speakers according to density and multiplexity of the speaker's relationships (pp.141-142). Network scores for men and women were fairly close except in Ballymacarrett where men's network scores were much higher than women's scores. Of all the subgroups, Ballymacarrett women had the lowest network scores and Clonard women had the highest network scores (p.146). Some of these differences were related to different conditions existing in the three areas : Ballymacarrett had employment within the area and most of the men were thus employed locally (also see p.79 regarding traditional sex roles and vernacular maintenance) ; the Hammer area had experienced more geographical mobility of residents.

The network scores go along with scores for linguistic variable use as well : men's higher linguistic score and women's lower linguistic score in Ballymacarrett, less difference between men's and women's scores in the Hammer area and higher linguistic scores for women in the Clonard area. Not all variables follow the association with network scores, however ; the (th) variable, for example, was associated more clearly with sex than with network in all three neighborhoods (pp.148-149).

In both Gal's and Milroy's work, language as a symbol of solidarity is considered to be a factor related to maintenance of the less dominant language in both studies. Non-linguistic behaviors which symbolize solidarity are also present in both cases : the reason for solidarity among the poor is explained as a kind of buffer and source of assistance if needed for protection from outsiders or in time of need (Milroy, p.73). In the case of Oberwart, the traditional peasant lifestyle included relying on neighbors for help for activities, such as building a house or other labor exchanges for various agricultural tasks that would have otherwise required machinery (Gal, pp.31, 148-150).

Just as a language system or a linguistic variable can symbolize solidarity, the very same system or element can also be interpreted as symbolizing social mobility and status. The way a speaker interprets what the linguistic system or element is symbolizing evidently depends largely on the individual's social network and degree to which the individual is integrated into that network. Those speakers who are integrated into their networks through density and multiplex ties probably share group viewpoints as well as behaviors. And conversely, less dense networks and more uniplex ties are more characteristic of groups with social mobility. However, the question can still be asked : do people leave networks because they become socially mobile individuals or do they become socially mobile because their networks become less dense?

"Frankenberg further suggests that when networks become less dense and multiplex, people are, as result, more anxious to achieve a high social status ; 'the less the personal respect received in small group relationships, the greater is the striving for the kind of impersonal respect embodied in a status judgment (Frankenberg, 1969, p.232, cited in Milroy, p.82).'"

If there are less incentives to comply with the norms of the social network, speakers may consider alternative relationships ; this follows along the lines of Tajfel's view that group members assess the degree to which their group contributes to their positive social identity. Perhaps the more stable community of Ballymarcarrett more clearly offered its members the benefits of solidarity where as in the Clonard and Hammer areas, physical relocation of members outside the community territory decreased the density and multiplexity of the group and speakers also had somewhat looser ties and lower social network scores.[21] In Oberwart, various aspects of peasant life were being changed through the industrial and commercial changes in the town while at the same time the alternative worker lifestyle clearly offered incentives which were easily accessible geographically. Perhaps the solidarity associated with Hungarian did not seem strong enough compared to the benefits of the alternative lifestyle associated with the German speakers. Also, in Oberwart, individuals could participate in many aspects of both lifestyles and did not have to completely break ties in their more traditional social spheres. The situation in Oberwart presents a clear example of what Bourdieu refers to as linguistic markets.

2.3 Frisian and Dutch in Friesland, The Netherlands

The contact situation between Frisian and Dutch, especially in the official domain of government, was investigated by Gorter (1987). The Frisian area had been over 95% Frisian speaking until about 1950 after which the area became more heterogeneous and Dutch gradually became more prevalent.[22] Gorter's study involved four months of intensive observation of the behaviors of government clerks through observation, tape recordings, interviews and questionnaires.

The main interaction situations included the following combinations of interlocutors : 1) both clerk and customer being monolingual Dutch speakers, 2) both participants being bilingual, 3) a bilingual clerk with a monolingual Dutch client or 4) a monolingual Dutch clerk and a bilingual client (p.127). He also mentions that although monolingual Dutch speakers report not speaking Frisian, 95% of the people surveyed reported that they understood Frisian (p.128).[23] The accepted norm was to accommodate and the clerks stated that they would speak the lan-

guage that the client spoke.

After analyzing the data, apart from interactions between two Dutch monolinguals speaking Dutch, four main behaviors were noted : convergence as expected, another kind of convergence called '*language neutral* behavior', code switching and asymmetry (pp.128-129). When a client entered the service area, a clerk usually had to initiate the conversation by offering service. Clerks seemed to use strategies of choosing expressions that were the same in Frisian and Dutch to leave the choice open for the customer. Sometimes the customer replied with minimal expressions that also could not be determined as either Frisian or Dutch, and some clients did not respond verbally at all but simple passed their applications to the clerk. Code switching behavior seemed to be related to on going negotiation of language choice rather than to the situational or metaphorical reasons described by Blom and Gumperz (1972). In the case of asymmetry, a bilingual speaker spoke Frisian to a monolingual Dutch speaker ; this option was possible because of the high report of understanding Frisian in spite of not speaking it.[24]

2.4 Italian and Dutch in The Netherlands and Flanders

Jaspaert and Kroon (1991) investigated language shift and loss in three groups of Italian immigrants in the Netherlands. They used data from a large scale sociolinguistic project and then developed path-analytical models with the effects of primary social factors on language choice directly and with intermediary concepts.

They begin by considering a principal from Gal concerning the definition of language shift as "a socially motivated redistribution of synchronic variants to different speakers and different social environments (Gal, 1979, p.19)." They see this happening in two stages. In the first stage the redistribution is rather forced by being involved with a new group of people with whom one needs to communicate, and such communication can only happen by learning their language. The second stage of redistribution of variants to new speakers and environments occurs when immigrants begin to use the new language among themselves ; when this happens, the immigrants are making a true choice of language, and these choices within the immigrant group are what impact on language maintenance or shift (Jaspaert and Kroon, 1991, p.78).

They are concerned with the fact that any particular social factor may in some cases promote shift and in others prevent shift. Their proposed solution to this problem is to examine "the way in which these factors interact in constituting mechanisms of influence (p.78)." They chose as their starting point three principals from Bourdieu (1982) which they refer to as "intermediary concepts" in their model. The three intermediary concepts are as follows : 1) The structure of LM1 (the first linguistic market) which is where immigrants interact with members of the host culture. They indicate that LM1 is not necessarily the same as the official linguistic market where the host culture members interact among themselves. 2) The relative importance of LM2 (the second linguistic market) where immigrants interact among themselves and where language shift does or does not take place. 3) The immigrant individual's anticipation of being able to produce linguistic products which will be acceptable in the market. They also discuss another concept from Bourdieu which is the unification of the linguistic market ; as the ethnic group becomes more integrated into the society, the immigrant language market and the dominant language (Dutch in this case) market would become unified and immigrants would use Dutch with other immigrant community members ; norms from LM1 would be imported to LM2 (see pp.79-81).

They gathered data thought to indicate a measure of language choice in 1) situations with various interlocutors and 2) an overall approximate average use of Dutch. They tried to consider both frequency of language use and use in domains. At the time of writing the article they had only been able to incorporate the second and third intermediary concepts. Community and generation were found to be important factors with the effect of community passing through the importance of LM2 and the factor of generation was found to hold a central position and to characterize different levels of anticipation.

Apart from the path-analytical models, they also report a few other results concerning language choice. In terms of family member interlocutors, speaking Dutch with the father was the least reported and speaking Dutch with a sister the most reported. In terms of domain locations, Church had the lowest report of Dutch use and work the highest. The most important reason for an occasional use of Dutch in the above cases was the presence of a non–Italian speaking person.

2.5 French and English in Quebec

In 1977, Bourhis (1983) collected data from university students in Quebec regarding their attitudes towards language and their self-report concerning use of French and English in various situations. His data was collected two and a half months after Bill 101, which made French the only official language of Quebec, was passed by the Quebec National Assembly. The participants were Quebec Francophones from one university and Quebec Anglophones from another university. He reports on a sample consisting of sixty-five persons in each category. The method was by a questionnaire which included biographical information, sociolinguistic attitudes and self-reported language use items. While the Francophone group largely agreed with Bill 101 and also the importance of speaking French in Quebec, the Anglophone group disagreed with the bill but still felt it was equally important to speak French as well as English in Quebec. Respondents were asked about their usage of the ingroup and the outgroup language at the time of the data collection and also what they thought had been their usage three or four years earlier. Francophones reported more maintenance of French in various situations while Anglophones reported increased use of French at the time of data collection compared to three or four years earlier. Anglophones even reported some convergence to French with bilingual clerks in shopping situations. Bourhis considered that these results may have been related to the establishment of French as the official language in Quebec (p.174).[25] Although self-report is an inexact measure of real language behavior, people's perceptions of what they do and what they did offer some insight into changes that occur.

Also concerning the French-English contact situation in Quebec, Lambert et al. (1960) and Lambert (1967) conducted matched-guise tests with secondary students. The matched-guise procedure involves a number of bilingual speakers reading/speaking a passage in French and also in English ; recordings of the passages are presented one by one to the participants, without indicating who the speakers are ; after hearing each passage, the participants rate the speaker according to a list of personality and other traits. It is hypothesized that there will be a preference for the participants to rate speakers who use the participant's language more highly than speakers who use the other language.

These researchers found that the English speakers rated the speakers more highly when they spoke in their English guises than when they spoke in their French guises. This result was expected. However, unexpectedly, they found that the French speaking participants also rated the speakers using their English guises more highly than when they used their French guises. They considered the results to be consistent with a widely held stereotype of French Canadians as "relatively second-rate people (167, p.91)." Similar results were observed in an experiment by Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner and Fillenbaum (1960).

2.6 Summary

The perspectives and studies reviewed here show a variety of approaches to language maintenance and shift. Individuals' linguistic choices to maintain their language or shift to that of another interlocutor may be motivated by various factors, such as to be able to communicate more easily, to assert their own identity or to be viewed more favorably by others. Underlying such choices, the process of exchange seems to be at work, and thus linguistic exchanges can be seen as occurring in a market environment with various conditions determined by social, cultural

and political factors. Individuals, though members of large societies, are also members of the networks involving the concrete people with which they come in contact in everyday life, and these smaller and more concrete networks influence individual's behaviors more directly. Networks may give individuals access to other groups or, depending on the kind of network, may limit an individual's access to the larger society ; the reactions of the people in a close-knit network towards one's linguistic behavior can be very influential – either encouraging or discouraging uses of outgroup linguistic varieties.

Though the process of language maintenance or shift can be influenced drastically by political policies and economics, efforts by minority groups can sometimes be successful in revitalizing their language and culture through grassroots efforts and positive redefinition of themselves. On the other hand individuals may seek to change their group affiliations if their original group does not have prestige or other incentives to remain associated with it.

The process of language shift and abandonment may be seen on a large scale as generational process. However, in interpersonal interactions, the choice of language on the part of bilinguals can also be seen as an act of maintenance or shift. Furthermore the actions of individuals contribute to the reinforcement or creation of new norms of language use, and in turn these norms are very influential in determining the presence of a language in daily life.

Notes :

[1]The coexistence of linguistic and socio-cultural divides will also be evident in the Hungarian and German contact situation of Gal's (1979) study in Oberwart, Austria where religion, ethnic origin, profession and geographical neighborhood as well as linguistic divisions existed between speakers of the two languages. Gal's study will be summarized in the coming pages.

[2]A rather similar interpretation is made by Woolard (1989) where she associates proficient Catalan language learning and use by certain L1 Spanish speakers with their immigration to Catalunya, after the age of about 8 years old, and to the related disruption of their social networks and need to make new relationships.

[3]Though not an age related phenomenon, Woolard (1988) illustrates how code switching between Catalan and Spanish is used for humor.

[4]Fishman's work on the symbolic functions of language and language maintenance and shift is vast ; here, only a few works will be mentioned.

[5]Fishman includes a rather lengthy note explaining the use of the term self-recognition. "Specificially, self-recognition is used here to avoid the implication of the heightened state of awareness which the terms "identity" or "consciousness" imply (p.46).

[6]However, Fishman mentions on p.17 that there may be "escape hatches" which allow the acquisition, or loss, of ethnicity. This concept may be important in the case of assimilation of immigrants who wish to integrate themselves and make efforts to do so.

[7]Though he clearly states that language is "importantly patrimonial".

[8]Reversing language shift is indicated as *RLS* in the original.

[9]Fishman designates "type a and b".

[10]This section also appeared as a separate article in 1990.

[11]He continues here indicating that there are also possible combinations of a) and b).

[12]Tajfel cites : Fishman, J.A. 1968. "Nationality-nationalism and nation-nationalism", in : J.A. Fishman ; C.A. Ferguson ; J.D. Gupta (eds.). *Language problems of developing countires*. New York, Wiley.

[13]Later, similarities with social network membership will be seen where members who are more integrated in the network will conform more regarding use of the group's language.

[14]Bourdieu mainly describes the differences between the standard and non-standard varieties of French.

[15]"Linguistic capacity is not a simple technical capacity but a statutory capacity with which the technical capacity is generally paired, if only because it imposes the acquisition of the latter through the effect of statutory attribution (*noblesse oblige*), as op-

posed to the commonly held belief that regards technical capacity as the basis for statutory capacity."

[16]Bourdieu gives an example from Labov, 1972, *Language in the Inner City*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

[17]Italics in the original : *transitional, residual, multiculturalism for maintenance*.

[18]Barnes (1954), in his study of Bremnes in Norway, used the term network for the social field consisting of the direct contacts of an individual and also the secondary contacts. He also used the concept to look at social class as a "network of relations between pairs of people who accord each other approximately equal status (p.45)." He also found that while pairs of people regarding themselves as approximate equals (in Norways society based on equality), not everyone regarded all members of the network to be their equals. The network facilitated social activities and mutual help and also finding jobs.

[19]It seems, though, that more permeable groups should also have the possibility to recruit new members more easily and increase their vitality, especially if they employ positive social creativity as well. Also, some kinds of characteristics may be difficult to acquire which would still allow for a high degree of distinction such as wealth, post-graduate education, fame or extremely high degrees of artistic or physical skill.

[20]Some of the historical citations in Gal : Breu 1970, Burghardt 1962, Kovács 1942, Gyenge 1973.

[21]Though in Milroy's study it is not clear as to whether or not any of the members were becoming socially mobile.

[22]There was some interest in language policy to give equal value to Frisian and Dutch in the government but their were diverging views and various degrees of use of the language.

[23]It seems then that in reality, these monolinguals were actually passive bilinguals, at least in terms of listening comprehension.

[24]Also see Gorter, 1987b, where he discusses two large scale sociolinguistic surveys done in 1967 and 1980. He reviews the questionnaire methods used in terms of Lieberson's (1980) view on questionnaires

[25]The Catalan and Spanish contact situation is another example that involves changes in legislation that increase the power of the local language of the geographical territory.

References :

Austin, J. L.1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press.

Barnes, J.A.1954. Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish. Human Relations, vol.7, no.1, pp.39-58.

Blau, Peter.1964. *Exchange and power in social life*, pp.88-97. New York : Wiley.

Blom, Jan-Petter and John J. Gumperz. 1972. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp.407-434). New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Boissevain, Jeremy. 1974. *Friends of Friends*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16 (6), 645-668.

——1982. *Ce que parler veut dire*. Fayard.

——1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge : Polity Press.

——1984. *Distinction : A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge : Harvard University Press. (Translated by Richard Nice, originally published in 1979, *La Distinction : Critique social du jugement*. Paris : Les Éditions de Minuit.)

Bourhis, Richard. 1983. Language attitudes and self-report of French-English language usage in Quebec. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.4. No.2, pp.163-179.

——and Howard Giles. 1977. The language of intergroup distinctiveness. In Howard Giles, (Ed.) *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp.119-135). London : Academic Press.

——, Howard Giles, Jacques P. Leyens and Henri Tajfel. 1979. Psycholinguistic distinctiveness : Language divergence in Belgium. In Howard Giles and Robert N.St. Clair, (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp.158-185). Oxford : Blackwell.

——Howard Giles & Doreen Rosenthal. 1981. Notes on the construction of a 'subjective vitality questionnaire' for ethnolinguistic groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol.2, no.2, pp.145-155.

Brown, Penelope. and Stephen L. Levinson. 1978. Universals in language use : politeness phenomena. In Esther Goody (Ed.),

Questions and politeness. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Roger W. and Albert Gilman,. 1960. The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in Language* (pp.253-76). MIT Press. (Reprinted in Pier Paolo Giglioli (Ed.), 1972, *Language and social context* (pp.252-282). Middlesex : Penguin.)

Dorian, Nancy. 1981. Language death : The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fasold, Ralph. 1984. *The sociolingustics of society*. Oxford : Blackwell.

——1999. *The sociolinguistics of language*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. Word, Vol.15, pp.325-340. (Reprinted in Pier Paolo Giglioli (Ed.), 1972, *Language and social context* (pp.232-251). Middlesex : Penguin.)

Festinger, L., S. Schracter and K. Bach, 1950, Social Pressures in Informal Groups (pp.72-100), New York : Harper & Bros. (Cited in Homans, 1958, p.600.)

Fishman, Joshua. 1964. Language maintenance and shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics*, Vol.9, pp.32-70.

——1972. Domains and the relationship between micro-and macrosociolinguistics. In John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp.435-453). New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

——1977. Language and Ethnicity. In Giles, Howard (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp.15-57). London : Academic Press.

——1990. What is reversing language shift (RLS) and now can it succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.11, Nos.1 & 2, pp.5-36.

——1991. *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.

Frankenberg, R.1969. *Communities in Britain*. Harmondsworth : Penguin. (Cited in Milroy, 1980, p.82).

Gal, Susan. 1979. *Language shift : Social determinants of language change in bilingual Austria*. New York : Academic Press.

Gerard, H.B., 1954, The anchorage of opinions in face-to-face groups, Human Relations, VII, pp.313-325. (Cited in Homans, 1958.)

Giglioli, Pier Paolo. 1972. *Language and social context*. Middlesex : Penguin.

Giles, Howard. 1973. Accent mobility : Amodel and some data. *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol.15, No.2, pp.87-105.

——, Donald M. Taylor & Richard Bourhis. 1983. Towards a theory of interpersonal accommodation through language : some canadian data. *Language in society*, 2, pp.177-192.

——1979. Sociolinguistics and social psychology : An introductory essay. In Howard Giles and Robert N. St. Clair, (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp.1-20). Oxford : Blackwell.

——, Richard Y. Bourhis & D.M. Taylor. 1977. Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In Howard Giles, (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp.307-346). London : Academic Press.

——and Philip Smith. 1979. Accommodation theory : Optimal levels of convergence. In Howard Giles and Robert N. St. Clair, (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp.45-65). Oxford : Blackwell.

——and Patricia Johnson. 1987. Ethnolinguistic identity theory : a social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, pp.69-99.

Giles, Howard (Ed.). 1977. *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*, London : Academic Press.

——and Robert N. St. Clair. 1979. *Language and social psychology*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Gorter, Durk. 1987 a. Aspects of language choice in the Frisian-Dutch bilingual contex : Neutrality and asymmetry. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.8, Nos.1 & 2, pp.121-132.

——1987 b. Surveys of the Frisian language situation : Some considerations of research methods on language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 68, pp.41-56.

Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

——and Dell Hymes. 1972. *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Harwood, Jake, Howard Giles & Richard Y. Bourhis. 1994. The genesis of vitality theory : Historical patterns and discoursal dimensions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 108, pp.167-206.

Heller, Monica, (Ed.). 1988a. *Codeswitching : Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Amsterdam : Mouton de Gruyter.

——1988b. Strategic ambiguity : Code-switching in the management of conflict. In Monica Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching : Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp.77-96). Amsterdam : Mouton de Gruyter.

——1995. Code switching and the politics of language. In Lesley Milroy and Pieter Muysken, *One speaker, two languages* (pp.158-174). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

——2003. Globalization, the new economy, and the commodification of language and identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7/4, pp.473-492.

Homans, George. 1958. Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 62, pp.597-606.

——1974, *Elementary forms of social behavior* (2nd Ed.), New York : Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich., pp.15-50.

Husband, Charles and Verity Saifullah Khan. 1982. The viability of ethnolinguistic vitality some creative doubts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.3, No.3, pp.193-205.

Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in sociolinguistics : An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press. (Cited in Milroy, 1980.)

Jaspaert, Koen and Sjaak Kroon. 1991. Social determinants of language shift by Italians in the Netherlands and Flanders, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 90, pp.77-96.

Labov, William. 1972. The social motivation of a sound change. In William Labov, *Sociolinguistic patterns* (pp.1-42). Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press. (First published in Word, 19, pp.273-309 (1963).

Labrie, Normand and Richard Clément. 1986. Ethnolinguistic vitality, self-confidence and second language proficiency : An investigation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.7, No.4, pp.269-282.

Lambert, Wallace E. 1967. A social psychology of bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 23, No.2, pp.91-109.

——, R.C. Hodgson, R.C. Gardner & S. Fillenbaum. 1960. Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, Vol.60, No.1, pp.44-51.

Milroy, Lesley. 1980. *Language and social networks*. Oxford : Blackwell.

——1982. Language and group identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.3, No.3, pp.207-216.

Myers-Scotton. 1993. *Social motivations for code switching : Evidence from Africa*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Pittam, Jeffery, Cynthis Gallois & Michael Willemyns. 1991. Perceived change in ethnolinguistic vitality by dominant and minority subgroups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol.12, No.6, pp.449-457.

Ryan, Ellen Bouchard. 1979. Why do low prestige language varieties persist? In Howard Giles and Robert N. St. Clair, (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp.145-157). Oxford : Blackwell.

Scotton, Carol Myers. 1976. Strategies of Neutrality : Language choice in uncertain situations. *Language*, 52 (1), pp.919-941.

Scotton, Carol Myers. 1988. Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In Monica Heller, (Ed.) Codeswitching : Anthropolical and sociolinguistic perspectives (pp.151-186). Amsterdam : Mouton de Gruyter.

Smolicz, Jerzy J. 1981. Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol.4, no.1,pp.75-90.

——1988. Tradition, core values and intercultural development in plural societies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol.11, no.4, pp.387-410.

——and Margaret J. Secombe & Dorothy M. Hudson. 2001. Family Collectivism and Minority languages as core values of culture among ethnic groups in Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, vol.22, no.2, pp.152-172.

Tajfel, Henri. 1974. Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), pp.65-93.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact*, New York : Columbia University Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. 1988. Codeswitching and Comedy in Catalonia. In Monica Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching : Anthropological and sociological perspectives* (pp.53-76). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.

——1989. Double talk. Stanford : Stanford University Press.

——1993. *Identitat i contacte de llengües a Barcelona*. La Magrana, Barcelona.

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Tae-Joong Gahng. 1990. Changing language policies and attitudes In autonomous Catalonia. Language in Society, 19, pp.311-330.