

White-Thunder, a man around forty, speaks less English than Menomini, and that is a strong indictment, for his Menomini is atrocious. His vocabulary is small; his inflections are often barbarous; he constructs sentences of a few threadbare models. He may be said to speak no language tolerably. His case is not unknown among younger men, even when they speak but little English. (1927:437)

We are thus concerned with the obsolescence and loss of ways of speaking as well as with their development and maintenance. Of central interest will be the community's attitudes towards these phenomena, and ultimately the potential applications of our findings in furtherance of its goals.

3

Varieties of Language

Within each community there is a variety of language codes and ways of speaking available to its members, which is its *communicative repertoire*. This includes 'all varieties, dialects or styles used in a particular socially-defined population, and the constraints which govern the choice among them' (Gumperz 1977). Any one speaker also has a variety of codes and styles from which to choose, but it is very unlikely any individual is able to produce the full range; different subgroups of the community may understand and use different subsets of its available codes.

The means of communication used in a community thus include different languages, different regional and social dialects of one or more of the languages, different registers (generally varying on a formal-informal dimension which cross-cuts dialect dimensions), and different channels of communication (e.g. oral, written, manual). The nature and extent of this diversity is related to the social organization of the group, which is likely to include differences in age, sex, and social status, as well as differences in the relationship between speakers, their goals of interaction, and the settings in which communication takes place. The communicative repertoire may also include different occupational codes, specialized religious language, secret codes of various kinds, imitative speech, whistle or drum language, and varieties used for talking to foreigners, young children, and pets.

Identification of the varieties which occur in any community requires observation and description of actual differences in pronunciation, grammar, lexicon, styles of speaking, and other communicative behaviors which are potentially available

for differentiation, but it must ultimately depend on the discovery of which differences are recognized by members of the group as conveying social meaning of some kind. In addition, the communicative repertoire of a group includes the variety of possible interaction strategies available to it. These are most commonly used to establish, maintain, or manipulate role-relationships. Speakers' choices of interaction strategies provide a dynamic connection between the language code, speakers' goals, and the participant structure in specific situations.

LANGUAGE CHOICE

Given the multiple varieties of language available within the communicative repertoire of a community, and the subset of varieties available to its subgroups and individuals, speakers must select the code and interaction strategy to be used in any specific context. Knowing the alternatives and the rules for appropriate choice from among them are part of speakers' communicative competence. Accounting for the rules or system for such decision-making is part of the task of describing communication within any group, and of explaining communication more generally.

The concept of *domain* developed by Fishman (1964; 1966; 1971; 1972) is useful for both description and explanation of the distribution of means of communication. He defines it as:

a socio-cultural construct abstracted from topics of communication, relationships between communicators, and locales of communication, in accord with the institutions of a society and the spheres of activity of a speech community. (1971:587)

Factors determining domains may thus include the general subject area under discussion (e.g. religion, family, work), the role-relationships between the participants (e.g. priest-parishioner, mother-daughter, boss-secretary), and the setting of the interaction (e.g. church, home, office).

No fixed set of domains can be posited a priori for all speech communities, since the set of activities which will constitute a cluster of purpose, role-relations, and setting will be culture-specific. Different levels of *focus* have also proved to be salient in different communities: e.g. societal-institutional (family, school, church, government) versus social-psychological (intimate, informal, formal, intergroup). These levels tend to coincide (family with intimate, for instance, and church with formal), but provide an interesting additional dimension for investigation (Fishman 1971).

Topic is often a primary determinant of language choice in multilingual contexts; bilinguals have often learned about some topics through the medium of one language and other topics through the medium of the second, and thus only know the vocabulary to discuss a topic in one of their languages, or feel it is more 'natural' to use one language for a particular topic.

Linguists from non-English speaking countries who were trained in an English-medium university provide a good example: they sometimes continue to discuss, lecture, and publish about linguistics in English, often even when their students are not fluent in that language. This may be because they do not know the necessary terminology in their national language, or because they have come to believe it is more appropriate to use English to talk about such subjects as grammatical analysis, and even to use English examples rather than their own Chinese, Arabic, or Japanese.

In bilingual education programs in the United States, native speakers of other languages find it easier to teach in English if they themselves are products of English-only education. For this reason, university training programs are recognizing the need to teach methods and content area courses in the language the teachers will be teaching the subject in. Some teachers have asserted it is impossible to teach a subject like American History in languages other than English because 'only English can be used to express American concepts'. A similar belief is held even more strongly by many Navajo teachers, that Navajo history and culture cannot be taught adequately in English. In this case, the Navajo language is

believed to be so integrally related to the culture that religious beliefs must be understood in order to know how to use the language correctly, and the beliefs can be fully expressed only in Navajo.

In addition to topic, appropriate language choice may depend on *setting* (including locale and time of day) and *participants* (including their age, sex, and social status). A bilingual child may regularly use English at school with a grandmother if she has come to observe the class, and English at home with the teacher if he or she has come to visit.

Choice of varieties within a single language is governed by the same factors. Speakers may select from among regional varieties in their repertoire depending on which geographic area and subgroup of the population they wish to express identity with, or as they travel from one area to another. On a paralinguistic dimension, whispering is likely to be chosen for conversation in a church, or when the topic is one that should not be overheard by others, while shouting may be chosen for greeting out of doors, and from a distance. Shouting may be an appropriate choice even in this setting only for males under a certain age, and only when greeting other males of the same or lower age and status, or with other restrictions (including perhaps time of day). Choice of channel may depend on environmental conditions: drums may be used in jungle regions, signal fires where there are barren bluffs, and whistle languages or horns where there is low humidity. Choosing oral or written channels is usually dependent on distance, or the need for a permanent record.

Choice of register depends on the topic and setting, and also on the social distance between speakers. The possible complexity of levels of formality may be illustrated by different forms which would be chosen in a single speech event, a Japanese woman offering tea. According to Harumi Williams, the act of offering a cup of tea in upper- and middle-class homes demonstrates how Japanese place each other in society, and so requires careful choice of language forms and manner of speaking. The hierarchy of forms used with addressees of lower to higher status is usually as follows:

- 1 *Ocha?* (to own children) [tea]
- 2 *Ocha dō?* (to own children, friends who are younger than self, own younger brothers and sisters) [tea how-about]
- 3 *Ocha ikaga?* (to friends who are the same age, own older brothers and sisters) [tea how-about (polite)]
- 4 *Ocha ikaga desu ka?* (to husband, own parents, own aunts and uncles, husband's younger brothers and sisters) [tea how-about (polite) is Q]
- 5 *Ocha wa ikaga desu ka?* (to own grandparents) [tea topic how-about (polite) is Q]
- 6 *Ocha ikaga deshō ka?* (to husband's elder brothers and sisters) [tea how-about (polite) is (polite) Q]
- 7 *Ocha wa ikaga deshō ka?* (to teachers, husband's parents, husband's boss, husband's grandparents) [tea topic how-about (polite) is (polite) Q]

Williams reports that ranking varies with such factors as how often she sees the people, and the level of respect form used for her husband would be different if the marriage were *miai* 'arranged marriage' rather than *renai* 'love marriage'.

Nonverbal alternatives are also important in this event: when tea is offered in a Japanese *tatami* room it should not be offered standing, but standing is appropriate if the room is Western style. If there is a picture on the tea cup, the picture side should face the receiver; the cup should be held with the right hand on the body of the cup and the left supporting the base. When offering tea to people ranking higher than her own husband, a woman should bow slightly. Vocally, increased formality not only involves choice of higher level respect forms, but a higher pitched voice. In general, the longer the sentence, the more polite; but the most honorific expression is silence, which would be the appropriate choice when offering tea to a guest of a very high position in the society.

The choice of appropriate language forms is not only dependent on static categories, but on what precedes and follows in the communicative sequence, and on information

which emerges within the event which may alter the relationship of participants.

Rules for language choice are usually not consciously formulated by native speakers, as they are in the Japanese example above, and must be inferred by the ethnographer from a variety of observation and interview techniques (which will be discussed in Chapter 4). Essentially, the questions of language choice we are seeking answers to are: who uses what (variety of) language; with whom; about what; in what setting; for what purpose; and in what relationship to other communicative acts and events. Relating patterns of language choice within a speech community to these dimensions of context is discovering and describing rules of communication.

DIGLOSSIA AND DINOMIA

The clearest example of language choice according to domain is *diglossia*, or a situation in which two or more languages (or varieties of the same language) in a speech community are allocated to different social functions and contexts. When Latin was the language of education and religious services in England, for example, English and Latin were in a diglossic relationship.

The term was coined by Charles Ferguson (1959), who used it initially to refer only to the use of two or more varieties of the same language by speakers under different conditions. He exemplified it in the use of classical and colloquial varieties of Arabic, Katharevousa and Demotike varieties of Greek, Haitian Standard French and Creole, and Standard German and Swiss German. In each case, there is a high (H) and low (L) variety of a language used in the same society, and they have the following relationship:

- 1 There is a specialization of function for H and L.
- 2 H has a higher level of prestige than L, and is considered superior.
- 3 There is a literary heritage in H, but not in L.
- 4 There are different circumstances of acquisition; children learn L at home, and H in school.

- 5 The H variety is standardized, with a tradition of grammatical study and established norms and orthography.
- 6 The grammar of the H variety is more complex, more highly inflected.
- 7 H and L varieties share the bulk of their vocabularies, but there is some complementary distribution of terms.
- 8 The phonology of H and L is a single complex system.

Diglossia was extended by Fishman (1972) to include the use of more than one language, such as the situation in Paraguay where Spanish is the H language of school and government, and Guaraní is the L language of home (cf. Rubin 1968). Since the term diglossia refers to language distribution in the whole society and not in the usage of individuals, the fact that only a relatively small percentage of the population of Paraguay speaks both H and L does not affect the designation; only those who speak Spanish have traditionally participated in education and government, although this situation may be changing with the advent of bilingual education. To distinguish societal and individual language distribution, Fishman suggests a four-way designation; both bilingualism and diglossia, diglossia without bilingualism, bilingualism without diglossia, and neither bilingualism nor diglossia.

Regional distribution is not a determining factor in identifying a diglossic society. French and Flemish are in complementary regional distribution in Belgium, but each is used for a full range of functions in each part of the country; this is characterized as bilingualism without diglossia. The situation in Paraguay is characterized as diglossia without bilingualism.

Most (but not all) of the features by which Ferguson characterized monolingual diglossia are also true of multilingual situations. There is a comparable specialization of function for H and L languages; the H language generally has more prestige; and L is learned at home and H at school. Also, although the L language in a multilingual society may well have a literary heritage, tradition of grammatical study and established norms and orthography, these often are not known to its speakers in a diglossic situation. The only clear

differences between monolingual and multilingual diglossia are those that relate to the structures of the codes themselves: i.e. the relationship of their grammars, vocabularies, and phonological systems.

Because our interest in communicative behavior includes not only language structures, but also the social and cultural systems which govern how they are used, I have added the concept of *dinomia* (Saville-Troike 1978), which translates roughly from Greek as 'two systems of laws'. There are clear analogies between language domains and choice, and cultural domains and choice, and obvious parallels with language in the appropriate use of cultural rules, and in switching between alternative cultural systems. The minority culture first learned by many Spanish speakers in the United States, for instance, is comparable to the L variety of a language in a diglossic situation, and the dominant US 'mainstream' culture to the H variety of a national language. Just as with L and H language varieties, the L culture is generally learned by children at home, and H at school; the H culture has more prestige in the society than the L; and there is a specialization of function for H and L. *Dinomia* may thus be defined as *the coexistence and complementary use within the same society of two cultural systems*, one of which is the dominant culture of the larger society and the other a subordinate and less prestigious subculture from within that same society. (See figure 3.1.)

Dinomia, like diglossia, is a societal state of affairs; biculturalism, like bilingualism, refers to individual distribution. A society in which an entirely different set of cultural norms governs behavior in home and school, for example, is considered *dinomic*. This is the case in many African and Asian communities where Western educational systems (often

	LANGUAGE CODE	CULTURE
Society	diglossia	dinomia
Individual	bilingualism	biculturalism

Figure 3.1

116

including Western teaching and administrative personnel, as well as curriculum and instructional material) have been incorporated without adaptation into the indigenous cultures. This is also the case in the Navajo community, where the dominant US culture governs behaviors in most educational contexts, but a different culture governs behaviors at home (even though one language – either English or Navajo – may be used in both domains). Individual Navajos who are both bilingual and bicultural, and travel off the reservation, may change ways of speaking as well as language codes, including greeting forms, nonverbal behavior, and timing between questions and responses. A complete switch of rules for appropriate communicative behavior involves more than language; otherwise, the switch is only a partial one which identifies speakers as bilingual, but not bicultural.

Nonverbal aspects of communication are likely to prove more closely associated with *dinomia* and biculturalism than with bilingualism, since most individuals who can switch language codes with ease still use the gestures and proxemics of their native language, as well as its interactional strategies.

Part of my intent in coining the term '*dinomia*' is to separate language code from patterns of use of the language code (and other means of communication) at the societal level; it is quite possible for language codes and rules of communicative behavior (as part of culture) to be distributed differently in the society. Fishman (1980) has accepted the analogy of *diglossia/bilingualism:dinomia/biculturalism* given here, but suggests a narrower concept would be more useful, which he terms *di-ethnia*. However, a concept relating to ethnicity is not coordinate with the *language:culture* distinction envisioned here. To adapt his suggestion in turn, one may find cases of biculturalism with or without *dinomia*, as well as *dinomia* with and without either bilingualism or diglossia.

CODE-SWITCHING AND STYLE-SHIFTING

Because of the proliferation of terms and inconsistent usage in the field, it is necessary to begin any discussion of this topic

with definitions. I have been intentionally vague in using *varieties* to indicate any patterned or systematic differences in language forms and use which are recognized by native speakers as being distinct linguistic entities, or 'different' from one another in some significant way. More precise distinctions must be made about types of varieties within any one speech community, but their nature cannot be presumed for all languages prior to investigation. *Variety-changing* would perhaps be a useful term to adopt in order to remain at this level of generality, but that is one term that has not yet been suggested by others, and I do not wish to add yet another to the catalogue.

We first require a definition of *codes*, by which I will mean different languages, or quite different varieties of the same language (comparable to classical versus colloquial Arabic, or Katharevousa versus Demotike Greek). *Code-alternation* (Gumperz 1976) refers to change in language according to domain, or at other major communicative boundaries, and *code-switching* to change in languages within a single speech event. *Style-shifting* will refer to change in language varieties which involves changing only the *code-markers*; these are variable features which are associated with such social and cultural dimensions as age, sex, social class, and relationship between speakers (discussed in the next section).

The distinction among these three types of code-variation is illustrated in the following sequence of speech acts (reported by Silverio-Borges) at the Cuban interest section office in an embassy in Washington, DC prior to official political recognition of the Castro government and full embassy status. To begin with, the receptionist is talking to a visitor in Spanish when the telephone rings. This *summons* marks a major boundary point, a change in events, and the receptionist changes to English (an example of *code-alternation*). The conversation begins:

- 1 Receptionist (R): *Cuban Interest Section.*
- 2 Caller (C): *¿Es la embajada de Cuba? (Is this the Cuban embassy?)*
- 3 R: *Sí. Dígame. (Yes, may I help you?)*

This is an example of the receptionist *code-switching* (→) from English to Spanish, changing languages within the same speech event, because she had identified the caller as a Spanish speaker.

- 4 C: *Es Rosa. (This is Rosa.)*
- ↓5 R: *¡Ah, Rosa! ¿Cómo anda eso? (Oh, Rosa! How is it going?)*

This is downward *style-shifting* (↓) from formal to informal Spanish as the receptionist identifies the caller as a friend, still in the same event. There is a shift to more marked intonation and faster speed, as well as use of the informal *¿Cómo anda eso?* rather than formal *¿Cómo le va?* or *¿Cómo está usted?* There is also a change to louder voice volume because the call is recognized as long distance, which may also be considered a kind of style-shifting. [I am introducing here an 'arrow convention' to distinguish between code-switching (→) and style-shifting (↑) or (↓), indicating shifts to higher or lower level, respectively.]

On another dimension, we may distinguish between *situational code-switching* and *metaphorical code-switching* (Blom and Gumperz 1972), a distinction which applies to style-shifting as well.

Situational code-switching occurs when the language change accompanies a change of topics or participants, or any time the communicative situation is redefined. Within a single conversation, Navajo teachers usually speak English to one another when discussing matters related to school, for instance, but may switch to Navajo to discuss their families, or rodeos and other community activities. They may also situationally switch into English if non-Navajo speakers join the conversation, so the new arrivals will not be excluded.

Style may also shift situationally within a conversation, perhaps as the addressee shifts from female to male, or adult to child, or with a shift in topic from personal to work-related: e.g. D. H. Lawrence employs style-shifting as a literary device to redefine situations in *Lady Chatterley's*

Lover as Mellors shifts from standard English to a 'broad Derbyshire dialect' with changes in topic and addressee (Shuy 1975a).

Metaphorical code-switching occurs within a single situation, but adds meaning to such components as the role-relationships which are being expressed. Since speaking different languages is an obvious marker of differential group membership, by switching languages bilinguals often have the option of choosing which group to identify with in a particular situation, and thus can convey the metaphorical meaning which goes along with such choice as well as whatever denotative meaning is conveyed by the code itself.

An example of such metaphorical switching was reported by Tuladhar, who described an event which occurred at a border checkpoint between India and Nepal. A woman was stopped by the guard, accused of carrying too much tea, and threatened with a heavy fine. The woman first used Nepali (the official language) to make an appeal to the law, and to argue on legal grounds that she was within her limits of legitimate allowances. From the guard's accent in Nepali she inferred he was also a native speaker of Newari and switched into that language to make an entreaty on the grounds of common ethnic identity, an appeal to solidarity. She finally switched into English 'for formulation of thought above the system', which was both an implicit attack on the corruption of the system, and an assertion that she belonged to an educated class in society which had no intent or need of 'smuggling' across a few packages of tea. She consciously used code-switching as a verbal strategy in this instance, and was successful.

Even young children make use of the choices in their linguistic repertoire for a variety of communicative purposes. They commonly use intrasentential code-switching (i.e., code-switching within a sentence), for instance, to give additional force to part of an utterance, such as highlighting the object of a claim or the thrust of an insult. The following insults were uttered by two four-year-old boys, the first Korean and the second Chinese, each in talking to his younger brother:

- 1 *He is a* → *baba*.
[idiot]
(He is an idiot.) [Referring to a third Korean child they were playing with]
- 2 *Ni shi* → *rug*.
[you are]
(You are a rug.)

In both of these cases, the child also knew the switched lexical item in the other language.

This strategy is in contrast to the intersentential code-switching (i.e., code-switching between sentences) that children often use to speak disparagingly about speakers of other languages who are within hearing when they do not wish them to understand. For example, a four-year-old Chinese girl spoke disrespectfully of two nearby nursery school teachers, knowing they did not understand Chinese:

- 3 *Tamen hao taoyan ei. Taoyande laoshi*.
(They are very disgusting. Disgusting teachers.)

A final example of this strategy involved a twelve-year-old Korean boy who was speaking to his brother disapprovingly about an Icelandic girl who was trying to talk to him:

- 4 *Zigo mueonde?*
(Who is she [to tell me]?)

Code-switching may be quite unconscious, and the fact of switching itself may be as meaningful in expressing a closer or more informal relationship as the referential content or specific language forms used. Blom and Gumperz (1972) report that speakers in Norway could not accurately recall their own changes between Ranamal, the local dialect, and Bokmal, the standard, and census takers in India have found segments of the population who are not even aware of being bilingual although they can converse in more than one language, depending on the addressee (Kachru 1977).

Metaphorical style-shifting occurs in such situations as

faculty meetings, where professors may address each other formally by title when making motions and conducting other official business, but shift to a first name level when trying to win the support of a colleague for their point of view. In some universities a ritual shift occurs at the end of a successful dissertation defense, when professors address the (former) student as *Doctor* and invite first names in return.

Metaphorical shifting may accomplish distancing as well as solidarity, of course, as when a German girl shifts from *du* to *Sie* with a boy to indicate the relationship has cooled, or when a wife calls her husband *Mr (Smith)* to indicate her displeasure.

Mohammed Abdulaziz (personal communication) reports policemen in Kenya switch from Swahili to Pidgin English to establish authority in a confrontation situation, and professors may switch into English if someone comes into their office at an inconvenient time. They may say in English, 'Oh, did we have an appointment at this time?', but different rules would be in operation if they used Swahili, and a referentially comparable expression would be considered rude. (If the visitor dropped by their house instead of their office, the professors would be constrained from switching into English, and would have no choice but to take time to visit.)

Yet another dimension to be distinguished is the scope of switching, or the nature of the juncture at which language change takes place (as illustrated in examples above). The basic distinction in scope is usually between *intersentential switching*, or change which occurs between sentences or speech acts, and *intrasentential switching*, or change which occurs within a single sentence. Some sociolinguists refer to the latter type as 'code-mixing', but I reject that term because of the pejorative connotation it carries that intrasentential switching involves a random or unprincipled combination of languages.

In conversations between Spanish and English bilinguals, Poplack (1979) reports half of the switching is of each type. The most common intrasentential switching involves the insertion of a single noun from the other language, and next in frequency is switching for such major constituents as full

noun or verb phrases, independent clauses, or tag questions. Factors which influence the scope of switching in these data are sex (women favor intrasentential switching), age of acquiring the second language (those bilingual from early childhood used the highest percentage of intrasentential switching, those from adolescence or adulthood much less), and attitudes toward ethnic identity (positive feelings yield more intrasentential switching).

I have found intrasentential switching for nouns or noun phrases the most common form for Navajo-English and Chinese-English bilinguals. The following utterances were made by Navajo children (Saville-Troike 1980):

- 1 *The boy* → *lééchaa'í bilanné.*
[dog with-him-playing]
(The dog is playing with the boy.)
- 2 *Table* → *yaa sidá.*
[under-it seated]
((He) is seated under the table.)
- 3 *Table* → *t'ááhi* → *dollie* → *dóó* → *drum* →
[under] [and]
siniit.
[are (in position)]
(The doll and drum are under the table.)

Switches at other constituent boundaries occur, but with much less frequency, e.g.

- 4 *Boy is* → *lééchaa'í yílaané.*
[dog with-it-playing]
(The boy is playing with the dog.)

Similarly, Chinese children typically switch to English for nouns and noun phrases or for unanalyzed chunks or routines, as in the following examples:

- 5 *Neige* → *fox* → *yao chi ta.*
[that] [want eat him]
(That fox wants to eat him.) [Telling a story]

- 6 *Ta yong yi ge* → *picture of a fox*.
[he use a]
(He used a picture of a fox.) [Another child telling
the same story]
- 7 *Clean up time* → *le*.
[aspect marker]
(It's already clean up time.)

Gunarwan recorded informal conversation among Bahasa Indonesian (I), Dutch (D), and English (E) trilinguals, including the following sentences:

- 1 (I) *Akan ada rapat* → (D)*van avond*.
[will be meeting this evening]
(There will be a meeting this evening.)
- 2 (D) *Samengaan*, → (I)*yok?*
[go-together let's]
(Shall we go together?)
- 3 (I) *Berapa panjangnya* → (E)*this side?*
[how-many length-the]
(How long is this side?)
- 4 (I) *Jam berapa* → (E)*New Year's Eve's party* → (I)*-nya?*
[clock how-many] [the]
(What time is the New Year's Eve party?)

The greatest number of his examples are also of switching for a noun phrase, but some are at other constituent boundaries (e.g. the tag in 2), and some even within words (e.g. the article in 4, which is a suffix). Gunarwan reports some utterances in which all three languages were used by the same speakers within a single turn:

- 5 (I) *Ini, ini*. → (D)*Tien* → (E)*centimeter*.
[this this ten]
(This, this. Ten centimeters.)

- 6 (I) *Ee*, → (D)*Tante, je hebt verkeerd*
[hey aunt you have mistake
gedaan. → (I)*Kan harus begini*. → (E)*You see?*
made ? must like-this]
(Hey, Aunt, you have made a mistake. It should be
like this. You see?)

When the two languages used in intrasentential switching do not share the same word order, an additional distinction is needed between *guest* and *host* languages in an utterance (Sridhar and Sridhar 1980; Nishimura 1986). The host language is the one to which the basic grammatical structure is assigned; elements of the guest language are switched into it following placement rules of the host language. In the following sentence, for instance, a child inserted an English noun while maintaining Korean Subject-Object-Verb word order (Korean-English examples from Oh 1988):

Na → *toy* → *chueyo*.
[me] [give]
(Give me a toy.)

Korean is also considered the host language in the following example, where a Korean inflection (s.m. = subject marker) is attached to an English noun:

Bird → *-ga wasseyo*.
[s.m. came]
(The bird came.)

The guest language component maintains its own integrity of word order, as in the following sentence (in this case, Korean is guest and English is host):

I'm → *ppalli wa* → *-ing*.
[quick come]
(I'm coming quickly.)

The integrity of guest language structures is further illustrated in the following utterance by an adult Arabic speaker from Jordan, who was receiving technical training in electronics in the US (Al-Rusan):

Es → *circuit* → *lat tandhīm*, → *but you can bypass it*
 [the] [this regulator]
 → *bidūn mushkileh idha kān el* → *voltage* → *9adi*.
 [without problem if was the] [normal]
 (This is a regulator circuit, but you can bypass it without
 any problem if the voltage is normal.)

There is need to distinguish further between code-switching and *borrowing*, in which lexical items from one language are adapted phonologically to the sound system of the other, and are frequently subject to is morphological inflections. If someone says *I'm going to Los Angeles* (pronounced as Anglicized [las ænjɪləs]), the place name is a borrowing from Spanish. If someone says *I'm going to* → [*los ánheles*], using Spanish pronunciation, they are code-switching. Similarly, *He's going to work on one of the kibbutzes next year* includes a lexical borrowing from Hebrew because the term *Kibbutz* has been used with an English plural inflection. *He's going to work on one of the* → *kibbutzim* → *next year* is code-switching for some, because the Hebrew plural inflection is used along with the lexical item.

This is not an absolute distinction, because there are lexical borrowings in English such as *datum*, *data*, *alumnus*, and *alumni* where these have included the morphological inflection and they have been incorporated as exceptions in English grammar; this does not mean they involve code-switching into Latin. *Kibbutzim* is a borrowing in English for those who are not consciously using a Hebrew inflection. Speakers' attitudes about how 'native' a word is must be taken into account, as well as formal criteria. It is possible that a word which is a borrowing for the person speaking may be perceived as code-switching by the listener, or vice versa, depending on

subgroup membership within the speech community. A New Yorker may use Yiddish words like *schlemiel* and *schlok* quite natively, but the initial consonant sequence is considered non-English in most other parts of the country, and thus code-switching.

Intrasentential style-shifting occurs when the variety of language being used changes within a sentence, as in *Hi*, ↑ *Mr President*, where an informal greeting is followed by a formal term of address. A more extreme example is *Hey*, ↑ *Professor Smith*, ↓ *ain't ya'* ↑ *promulgating* ↓ *a gob of* ↑ *unwarranted presuppositions?*, which involves not only a shift in level of formality between greeting and term of address, but also in grammar and lexicon.

Unless it is being intentionally used for humorous purposes, such shifting is likely to be viewed negatively as 'style-slipping' by school teachers, particularly if it occurs in a written mode. In other languages, however, such intrasentential style-shifting may be quite appropriate. In Javanese (prior to World War II), for instance, there were at least three levels of 'status styles' encoded in both grammar and lexicon: *Krama*, the most formal and polite (H); *Madya*, intermediate (M); and *Ngoko*, informal (L). Since the choice of levels to be used depended not only on the relationship and relative status of speaker and hearer, but also on that of persons being referred to, a single sentence often contained words from different levels. If a speaker were using an H style to speak to a person of superior rank and said:

Dalem bade ↓ *kesah* ↑ *dateng* ↓ *gryanipun katja* ↑ *dalem*
 H H M H M M H
 (I am going to my friend's house.)

the forms referring to 'I go' and 'friend's house' would be shifted down to M. If he were using M style speaking to a friend and said:

Kula adjeng kesah teng ↑ *daleme pak guru.*

M M M M H H H

(I am going to my teacher's house.)

he would shift the forms referring to 'teacher's house' up to H (examples from Retmono 1967).

Some languages, such as Japanese, mark foreign words as such visually in their written form (using katakana rather than the usual hiragana symbols for Western borrowings, and kanji for Sino-Japanese), which adds another dimension to code-switching. Studies of code-switching have been limited almost entirely to the spoken channel of communication, but consideration should be given to written and nonverbal channels as well.

A number of linguists have suggested universal constraints on where within a sentence switching may occur (e.g. Berk-Seligson 1986; DiSciullo, Muysken, and Singh 1986; Sankoff and Poplack 1981; Woolford 1983). The fact that exceptions have been reported for almost all constraints yet posited (including examples of switching within a word, such as I have reported above) suggests that researchers who have focused exclusively on grammar may have been sociolinguistically naive in not taking the *contexts* of switching into account (cf. Lavandera 1980). Our emphasis here is on the variety of functions code-switching and style-shifting may have within a speech community: group identification, solidarity, distancing, and redefinition of a situation have already been mentioned. Additionally, switching languages may serve either to soften or strengthen a request or command, and saying something twice in different languages may serve either to intensify or to eliminate ambiguity. Jong A. Kiem reports that a superlative seems more powerful in Sranan than Dutch, for instance, and that a bilingual reduplication is used if something is really 'out of this world'. Morray provides the following examples for degrees of intensification in Sranan: *pikin* 'small'; *pikin-pikin* 'very small'; *pikin-tjoti* 'very, very small' ('small' in Sranan + 'small' in Hindi).

Switching may also be used for a humorous effect, or to indicate that a referentially derogatory comment is not to be taken seriously. It is also used for direct quotations, which

may range from stereotypical imitative speech in joking to learned citations in Latin or Greek.

Switching may be used to make an ideological statement, as in the case of Mexican Americans referring to New Mexico as *Nuevo Mexico* [méhiko], or Texas as [téhas], in an otherwise English sentence. Not infrequently, such switching is employed by monolingual speakers of English or English-dominant bilinguals who wish to assert their Hispanic ancestry. A contrasting function was observed in Barcelona during a period of considerable tension between speakers of Castilian and Catalan (Woolard 1987). Code-switching by a popular entertainer there helped to ease group boundaries, serving for boundary-leveling rather than maintenance.

Switching may occur because of real lexical need, either if the speaker knows the desired expression only in one language, or if formulaic expressions in one language cannot be satisfactorily translated into the second. For this reason, native speakers of English who have learned some French, German, or Arabic continue to use such expressions as *savoir faire*, *macht's nichts*, and *inshallah*, respectively, in otherwise English sentences, and speakers of many other languages insert English *OK*.

One of the potentially useful functions of code-switching is to exclude other people within hearing if a comment is intended for only a limited audience, such as some of the children's insults I reported earlier. This may be considered rude, but it is not necessarily so. A Tanzanian professor residing in the United States, for instance, says that in the presence of guests in their home a husband and wife would employ code-switching for discussion concerning the comfort and needs of their guests. The exclusionary function was used by President and Mrs Herbert Hoover around the White House; they reportedly switched into Chinese when they did not wish to be understood by others. In such situations, the other language functions as a 'secret' language.

Code-switching is also used as an avoidance strategy, either if certain forms are incompletely learned in one of the languages, or if one language requires (usually because of pronominal selection) a social status distinction one does not

wish to make. For this latter reason, many native speakers of Javanese find Bahasa Indonesian a useful post-independence, democratic alternative. For this reason, too, a speaker of a status-marking language such as Korean or Thai may switch to English with another speaker of that language when he or she prefers not to be deferential.

In some cases code-switching functions as a repair strategy, when the speakers realize they have been using an inappropriate code. This was a relatively frequent occurrence in Greece, during the period when liberal politicians trained in a rhetorical tradition which ranked Katharevousa over Demotike for formal speaking realized they were (ironically) using Katharevousa to advocate democratization of the national language. Shifting for repair is necessary when speakers realize they have begun an event, such as a telephone conversation, at an inappropriate stylistic level. The unitary nature of the telephone calling/answering routine is evident in the fact that such repair usually requires backing up to start over with a different greeting form, rather than switching or shifting in the middle of the routine.

Community attitudes toward switching and shifting are of interest for ethnographic description. These appear to be changing rapidly among English-speaking bilinguals in the United States, with the ability to code-switch becoming widely accepted as a symbol of ethnic viability and integrity. In the American Southwest poetry is being written, songs sung, plays performed, and formal speeches delivered in a Spanish-English mode. There are still diverse attitudes about the phenomenon, however, based on both age and political sentiment.

Whatever specific functions are served by code-switching within a community, it adds to the verbal strategies that speakers have at their command, and is to be recognized as a dimension of communicative competence.

CODE-MARKERS

The concept of code-markers is based on the distinction between *marked* and *unmarked* language forms first developed

within the Prague School of linguistics. This distinction may be applied to all aspects of communicative behavior, and indeed has been adopted by ethnographers for more general descriptive and explanatory purposes. The basic assumption is that behavior can be distinguished as marked or unmarked according to certain component features, and that the unmarked is more neutral, more normal, or more expected.

In explaining the recognition and interpretation of different varieties of language within a speech community, it is necessary to assume that speakers have a concept of naturalness both for their language in general and in any specific context. Markedness on the more general level identifies language forms as belonging to a particular variety, such as regional dialect, register, or social category. Markedness in a specific context refers to usage which calls attention to itself, like an Australian variety of English being spoken in Canada, a formal register used in an intimate relationship, feminine gestures and interaction strategies used by a male, or adult language structures used by a young child.

Language forms must be perceptibly different in some systematic way to be recognized as distinct varieties. Variability in any aspect of a language may potentially serve a marking function, including vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, paralinguistic elements, and visual appearance (in the case of written and manual forms). Variation in interactional strategies may also pattern along these dimensions. Different variables will be considered significant in each speech community, so no single set may be posited, and different aspects of language may mark different kinds of varieties within a single community. In American English, for instance, regional varieties are most marked by vocabulary and pronunciation features, but seldom by grammar; social class is most marked by grammatical features; ethnicity, sex, age, and personality most by pronunciation, paralinguistic features, and discourse strategies; and register most by vocabulary, grammatical complexity, and rhetorical organization.

It is possible that some kinds of linguistic features are inherently more suitable for signalling particular kinds of social meaning, but it remains a topic for empirical investiga-

tion. The lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical features marking register in English are more likely to be under conscious control than the phonological and paralinguistic features marking ethnicity, sex, age, and personality, and thus more likely to be available for manipulation. Since relative level of consciousness is related to both circumstances of acquisition and neurological factors, it is a possible universal.

Although some neurological factors are also involved in determining how much of a difference in language productions will be perceived by humans, no single degree of variability can be established as significant in all languages; very small differences in an absolute sense may carry a heavy load of social information, while major absolute differences may be socially meaningless. The difference between [s] and [ʃ] is the shibboleth of Biblical days (Judges 12:4-6), which served a password function with mortal consequences, yet the same variation in Tonkawa (once indigenous to Texas) apparently carried no social weight, and may not have even been noticed, e.g. as in [maslak] versus [maʃlak] 'white'.

The term *code-marker* as I am using it includes all variable features which are available to members of a speech community for distinguishing among the varieties in their communicative repertoire. It includes social markers (which mark such characteristics as social and educational status, occupation, and regional affiliation), physical markers (which mark such characteristics as age, sex, and physical condition), and psychological markers (which mark personality characteristics and affective states) (cf. Laver and Trudgill 1979).

In identifying and defining what a linguistic variable is, Labov (1972) distinguishes among three levels of these features, which he calls 'indicator', 'marker' (with a different meaning than that used here), and 'stereotype'. An 'indicator' is a variable which is not perceived at a highly conscious level in the speech community, although it does serve to mark varieties of language. The pronunciation of *caught* with the vowel [a] or [ɔ] for instance, is one regional marker in American English, but it does not carry much social significance. A 'marker' for Labov is a variable which has taken on social valuation, and is perceived at a conscious

level. Voicing of the medial consonant in *greasy* is also a regional distinction in English, but one that has more social significance: the voiced variant generally carries a pejorative connotation toward the object being described for users of the [s]; the pronunciation is quite consciously perceived, and regional identity of the speaker inferred. The New York [r]-less variable described by Labov (1966) is also at this level, as is calling the evening meal *dinner* versus *supper*. Because this 'marker' level is conscious, such variables may be used for intentional metaphorical switching, while 'indicators' may not.

A 'stereotype' for Labov is the highest level of code-marking. It is likely to be commented on, and is used in characterizing groups when joking about them, but it need not conform to actual usage. Someone from Brooklyn (NY) may be characterized as saying *Toidy Toid (33rd) Street*, but that pronunciation is disappearing from actual use because of being heavily stigmatized. Similarly, French speakers when speaking English are stereotyped as saying *I sink (think)*, Texans as greeting everyone with *Howdy, pardner*, and Britishers as calling all men *chap*. Others in the speech community will recognize the group being referred to by such marking since this, too, is part of communicative competence, but it does not necessarily conform to linguistic reality.

Some code-markers are absolute, or *categorical* in their distribution, occurring only and always in a particular variety of language, but most are *gradient phenomena* which occur more or less in one variety than in another. It is not clear exactly how and to what extent native speakers interpret relative frequencies of market occurrence, but perception is undoubtedly conditioned by the relative importance of the social information its use conveys.

Determining the social meaning of code-markers is an important contribution of qualitative ethnographic research to variation theory, since 'Quantitative techniques can only sensibly be applied after a prior examination of the dependencies that a linguistic variable's significance has on other aspects of interaction structure and process' (Brown and Levinson 1979:333). An illustration of the contrastive meaning

which may be conveyed by alternating variables is found in Huspek's (1986) analysis of *-ing* versus *-in'* in workers' speech. Huspek found that *He went jogging* conveyed an attitude of either respect or resentment toward the individual being referred to, while *He went joggin'* conveyed lower social status, but also ingroup identification. On the other hand, the same linguistic variable may have different social meaning depending on other features in the interaction situation, and on other code-markers which may be present. The same intonational variables which mark 'baby talk' signal warmth and affection toward a young child, but may be interpreted as mocking and demeaning if used with an older child or adult, for instance, and the [r]-less variant which has negative valuation when used by a working-class native of New York is a marker of social prestige when it (along with the different variants in vowel quality and lexicon) indicates the speaker is an upper-class native of Boston.

Statistical analysis of frequencies and correlations may help to verify or define certain tentatively identified relationships, but in general the identification of hypotheses to be tested regarding possible relationships should precede the application of statistical techniques. Occasionally, however, quantitative analysis will reveal previously unrecognized associations, or will demonstrate regular patterns in data which seemed amorphous.

The following sections of this chapter illustrate a number of the social and cultural dimensions with which varieties of language might be associated in a speech community, and the range of communicative phenomena which might be marked.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH SETTING

Varieties of language which are more closely associated with the setting or scene in which they are used than with the people who are using them are usually included in the concept of *register*, and distinguished from one another primarily on the dimension of relative formality.

The physical setting of an event may call for the use of a

different variety of language even when the same general purpose is being served, and when the same participants are involved. English greeting forms may differ inside a building versus outside, for instance, or inside an office versus inside a church, as well as between participants at differing distances from one another. In this case, primary markers are voice level and nonverbal behaviors, but often also involve a choice of lexical and grammatical structures along a polite-casual, impersonal-personal, sacred-secular, or public-private dimension; all of these may be generally subsumed under formal-informal (Brown and Fraser 1979).

In question-and-answer exchanges between professor and students, appropriate language use is determined in large part by the setting, including the size of the room and the seating arrangement (e.g. chairs in fixed rows, in a circle, or around a conference table). In this case, different levels of formality are signalled primarily by whether or not students are expected to raise their hands and be formally recognized before speaking, and by whether or not strict turn-taking applies. Relative level of formality as determined by the setting will also affect how questions and answers are phrased, and what topics may be queried.

A formal greeting in a locker room would be considered a highly marked communicative event (especially if the participants were not fully clothed), as would informal questions and interruptions by students in a large lecture hall. In these cases where level of formality in language use does not coincide with level of formality in the setting, language may serve to increase or decrease the distance between speakers. When physical distance cannot be maintained for some reason, such as in a crowded Japanese household where all four grandparents sometimes live with children and grandchildren, very polite language (the highest form of *Keigo*) may be used to maintain social distance, even though a less formal variety of Japanese would normally be appropriate.

In some communities a particular setting is required for an event to take place: e.g. there may be a particular place in which it is appropriate to pray, or teach, or to tell stories, and these events are often concomitant with choice of different

language varieties. Language restrictions or taboos are also often related to setting, such as constraints against talking about certain topics at the dining table, whistling in the house, or cursing in a place of worship.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH PURPOSE

Choice of language or variety of language according to purpose is included in the concept of diglossic speech communities as one aspect of the domain which determines appropriate selection but the marking of language according to the purpose for which it is being used is a much more inclusive phenomenon. Along a societal-institutional dimension, for instance, different varieties of language and patterns of language use serve religious, educational, and governmental purposes, as well as different occupations.

Language codes used primarily for religious purposes include Geez by Christians in Ethiopia, Latin by Catholics, Classical Arabic by Muslims, and Pali by Buddhists.

When a Japanese Buddhist priest in a California Buddhist church recites a *sutra* in Pali with his English-speaking congregation, this is a fine example of the spread of a particular language variety over enormous distances in space and time. When accounts of the Buddha and his sayings were collected and came to be accepted as the canon of Buddhist scripture, they were in a Middle Indo-Aryan language, Pali, whose exact provenience is not clear. When the Pali scriptures were used in worship in India and Ceylon, the language functioned as a special religious register in many speech communities where related Indo-Aryan languages were the worshippers' mother tongues. When Buddhism spread to areas such as Burma, Thailand, China, and Japan, the sacred scripture went along. Buddhist missionaries and scholars translated Pali and Sanskrit texts into other languages, but just about everywhere at least some uses of Pali were kept. In these new areas, the

Pali language, still functioning as a religious register, was no longer related at all to the language of the worshippers, but retained its aura of sacredness. (Ferguson 1978:3)

Brown and Levinson (1979) report that within the Arab world, distinctive dialects are used by different sects, e.g. Sunni and Shi'i followers in Bahrain speak different varieties of Arabic; and Hindus and Christians generally speak different dialects of Konkani in Western India (Ferguson 1978).

The use of glossolalia, or 'speaking in tongues', by certain charismatic Christian groups, also exemplifies language choice for religious purposes, although much of its meaning is conveyed through features other than verbal code (Goodman 1969). Certain language forms themselves are believed in some communities to be prescribed by a supernatural being and the only ones mortals may use for communication with that force, or they may be considered the medium through which the supernatural may speak to humans. In other cases the language forms themselves are considered imbued with power, and they may be used to control the forces of nature.

When the same language is used in a community for both secular and religious purposes, the religious variety is often marked by more conservative forms: e.g. second person *thou*, *thee*, and *thy* in English. Other common markers are lexical (such as the use of different terms of address, or words used with unique meanings), morphological (often involving more deferential forms), paralinguistic (intoned speech, or different patterns of pitch, stress, and rhythm), and kinesic (head, hand, and body position and movement). Different channels of communication are often utilized, including bones, shells, horns, and drums, and receptive senses may be heightened or otherwise altered by drugs and trance states. Organization of discourse in religious events is frequently marked, including prescribed ritual openings and closings and the genre-specific 'one-many dialog, in which a speaker addresses the whole group and receives a unison response' (Ferguson 1986:209).

Some opponents of modernization of the English Bible believe that modernization ignores speakers' feelings that

sacred beliefs are more appropriately expressed in a 'special' code rather than an everyday one, and that modernization thus reduces the capacity of English to serve aesthetic and religious purposes. Those who disagree often support Biblical language modernization on the grounds that religion should be accessible to each person without need for interpretation by others, and thus that its concepts are more appropriately expressed in the vernacular. Because the religious functions of language are not the same in all speech communities, any resolution of this controversy cannot necessarily be generalized to other societies.

A comparable issue in dispute is whether language used for such specialized purposes as curing, legal briefs, or contracts should be a 'special' variety, or 'plain' language. Specialized forms are required in many communities for curing rituals, including among the Rosebud Sioux, where a formal style of Lakota is used for such purposes.

Labels for herbs, medicines and powers as well as prayers are uttered in the formal style because proper ritual prescriptions must be observed if the spirits are to respond as desired. Prayer is almost always spoken in formal speech, as supplication must be in the ritually prescribed form to be received. (Grobsmith 1979:357-8)

Sociolinguists studying doctor-patient communication in English (e.g. Pliskin 1987; Skopek 1975; Shuy 1974) document the misunderstanding which can result when technical medical terms are used, but many patients do not have faith in a doctor who 'doesn't talk like one'.

Specialized varieties of language are often used when the purpose is to be secretive, or to deceive. Argots have been created by criminals for secret communication among themselves since the days of the Roman underworld (Maurer 1940), and adolescents in many societies use a secret code comparable to Pig Latin in English, which involves permutation and addition of phonological segments. Most phonological changes intended to obscure various languages are quite simple. Of the secret varieties of Welsh which have been

described, for instance, two involved merely inserting a vowel plus consonant in each syllable (Awbery 1984). These appear to have been quite widely used, while the distribution of one with a more complex structure seems to have been much more limited.

In a bar district of Addis Ababa, an Amharic argot which was created by school boys has reportedly been adopted by unattached young women for such purposes as 'concealing conversations and planning tricks at the customers' expense' (Demissee and Bender 1983:340). The pattern also primarily involves phonological substitution and duplication, but in this case there is in addition grammatical change, with occurrence of compound verbs in a form that does not occur in 'normal' Amharic.

Franklin (1977) describes three types of secret speech among the Kewa of New Guinea. *Ramula agaa* 'pandanus language' is used to protect people who travel in swamp forest areas where ghosts and wild dogs are present. People are instructed by their ancestors not to speak their 'normal' language, and to use a secret variety marked by special vocabulary. *Mumu ne agaa* 'whispering talk' is used whenever others within hearing of speech produced at normal volume are not supposed to know what is going on, as when the topic is trading, bespelling, or stealing something. *Kudiri ne agaa* refers to 'secret talk', or talk limited to insiders, such as cult initiates.

The first of these types is for external secrecy, known by all in the speech community and directed toward outsiders; the latter two are for internal secrecy, or inhibition of information flow within the community. Brandt (1977) describes these phenomena in Pueblo societies, where internal secrecy assures that no single member possesses all necessary information for the performance of rituals, and preserves the interdependence of subgroups in the social organization. Pueblo strategies for secrecy include: barring outsiders from performance of ceremonies in ritual spaces, such as kivas; constructing false and misleading information; evasion of questions; purging the language of Spanish and English loanwords in the presence of those who might understand them (sometimes requiring elaborate circumlocutions); use of

special ritual varieties which contain archaic words, borrowings from other languages, and different semantic systems (i.e. different referents); and special styles of speaking, such as 'talking backwards'.

Secretive purposes may overlap with exclusionary ones for identification, as with teenage slang and 'CB (Citizens' Band radio) lingo'. The latter has been widely used by truck drivers in the United States for solidarity purposes, sharing information on road conditions, asking and giving directions, summoning help in case of emergency, and for trying to evade the common antagonist, the highway patrolman (called *Smokey the Bear*, and often seen driving a *plain blue wrapper*). Many drivers expressed considerable resentment during the mid-1970s when CB radio use became popular with thousands of 'outsiders', although they seem to have enjoyed the participation of the President's wife, Betty Ford, whose code name was *First Mama*.

Specialized language for governmental or academic purposes in most Western societies includes the extensive use of acronyms (often deliberately chosen for pronounceability) to designate administrative units: e.g. US *OBEMLA* 'Office of Bilingual Educational and Minority Language Affairs', British *CILT* 'Centre for Information on Language Teaching', Belgian *AIMAV* 'Association Internationale pour la Recherche et la Diffusion des Méthodes Audio-visuelles et Structuro Globales', Mexican *INI* 'Instituto Nacional Indigenista', Peruvian *CILA* 'Centro de Investigación en Lingüística Aplicada'. This pattern is generally tied to an alphabetic writing system: Chinese, in contrast, regularly selects elements for combination that are no smaller than what is represented by a single character, as in *Běi Dà* for *Běijīng Dàxué* 'Peking University'. In part, however, patterns are also related to political orientation. Since the communist revolution, the Russian pattern has been to use the first syllable of words rather than the initial letters; this pattern was used metaphorically by Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* for designating administrative units. The association of this linguistic pattern with a particular kind of political system is further illustrated by Cuba's change from an acronym to *Min Ed* 'Ministerio de

Educación' with the rise of Castro to power. Further study of comparable patterns in other speech communities would be of interest, especially as they are related both to typological features of language structures and orthographic systems, and to sociocultural features of the society.

Specialized vocabulary and phrases must also be mastered in order to communicate about governmental functions and processes, as in US 'federalese': *zero-based budgeting*, *inhouse capabilities*, *RFP* (request for proposal), and *regs* (regulations). In one of the few quantitative studies on this topic, Chiu (1972) compared the frequency of words occurring in over 1,000 pieces of Canadian governmental correspondence with a number of word lists and found almost no overlap: e.g. the most common verbs in government writing were *make*, *attach*, *enclose*, *receive*, *require*, *appreciate* and *provide*, as opposed to Lorge's magazine count with *go*, *ask*, *say*, *come*, *make*, *know*, *get*, and *see*. All but one most common in government use are French/Latinate; Lorge's verbs are all Germanic. Grammatically, Chiu found administrative writing contains a much higher percentage of passives and modals than formal spoken English, and a much lower percentage of verbs in the simple present or progressive forms.

Lexical requirements are also quite specific to many occupational areas (including linguistics), which is one reason why training received through the medium of one language cannot be easily discussed in others. It is probably safe to estimate that no more than 3 per cent of the English lexicon can be considered immediately relevant to all of its speakers. Recognition of this has given strong impetus to development of programs and materials in ESP (English for Special Purposes) and Vocational English for non-English speaking adults who need to function immediately within a single occupational domain. These focus on developing competence in the narrow range of communicative activities which are most likely to be required (cf. Munby 1977; 1978; Widdowson 1973; Wilkins 1976; Bhatia 1987 (law); Maher 1986 (medicine)). Even within a single work place, however, there may be patterned lexical variation, as shown by Tway's (1975) study of language use within a pottery-making factory.

Different terms are likely to develop for the same object whenever there are spatial or social boundaries between types of work associated with it.

To paraphrase a point made earlier, while all languages may be inherently capable of serving all purposes which humans may ask of them, specific languages evolve differentially through processes of variation, adaptation, and selection. Speakers in different communities will have different purposes for using language, and a different hierarchy of purposes, and the way in which means of communication will be marked to serve these differential purposes is language specific. Study and description of one specialized use of language in a community must be related to the total means of communication if there is to be understanding of the patterning and interrelationship.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH REGION

Regional varieties of language develop as different norms arise in the usage of groups who are separated by some kind of geographic boundary. This is commonly in vocabulary, as when English speakers in New England carry water in a *pail* and those in Texas in a *bucket*, and in pronunciation, as when Navajo speakers call 'snow' *yas* versus *zas* on different sides of the Lukachukai mountain range. Grammatical markers associated with region are less common, but they do develop: e.g. English speakers in the south and south-eastern regions of the United States use such double modal constructions as *might could* and *might will*, which are rare or nonexistent elsewhere in the country.

As geographic boundaries increase in strength, so generally do the degrees of difference between speakers of the 'same' language. The very rugged terrain of the state of Oaxaca, Mexico, for instance, and the resultant difficulty in traveling from one village to another, is in large part responsible for the maintenance of 25 distinct languages in an area no larger than the US state of Indiana (c. 36,000 square miles). The major distinction in the colloquial Arabic spoken in Algeria is

between sedentary and nomadic dialects, which although not a strict regional division, similarly reflects ecological influences in limiting interaction between subgroups.

Regional phonological and lexical markers have been studied in many languages as the result of research on dialect geography, but little attention has been paid to regional patterning in the other aspects of communication. One notable difference which has been studied in the United States is in naming practices, with southerners using double names (e.g. *Billy Joe*, *Billy Gene*, *Larry Leroy*, *Mary Fred*) and nicknames or diminutives, even in formal contexts (e.g. former First Lady *Lady Bird Johnson*, *Dr Billy Graham*, *President Jimmy Carter*); also *Bobby*, *Johnny*, and *Jimmy* are bisexual only in southern usage (Pyles 1959). Another regional difference is in terms of address: e.g. a southern man may call his wife or a female friend *ma'am* with no negative connotation intended, while a northern interpretation would be one of distancing, or implications that the woman is of a more advanced age.

Nonverbal behavior may also differ regionally, including facial expressions and the scope of body movements, but these patterns have received little attention as markers associated with regional varieties. Some nonverbal behaviors pattern regionally even across unrelated languages. The emblem for 'no' is a vertical head movement in Greece, Turkey, the Arabian Peninsula, and most of North Africa, for instance; Israel seems to be the one regional exception, using the horizontal head movement of the Northern European area. Other gestures which exhibit areal over genetic influence are those of greeting and farewell.

Although the development of mass communication and rapid transportation has done much to retard the forces of regional differentiation, local forces remain most powerful during the early years of language acquisition and hence are unlikely to be entirely offset. Furthermore, since these markers themselves serve a boundary function between a local group and 'outsiders', or provide a means of identifying people from 'home' when in another area, the differences may be accentuated (cf. Labov's 1963 report of linguistic

change in Martha's Vineyard, which illustrates this process). The importance of this function differs from community to community, and is related to the value placed on being different or unique.

When several members of a group migrate to another area where the group is identified with higher or lower than average status, markers associated with their regional variety may become associated with social class. The stigmatized [r]-less variety of English used by lower-class Blacks in New York City as reported by Labov (1966), for instance, represents a subgroup immigration from the south, where that is a nonstigmatized regional pronunciation.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH ETHNICITY

A multiethnic speech community may pattern in several different ways with respect to language use: (1) subgroups in the community may use only their minority ethnic language(s); (2) minority group members may be bilingual in their ethnic language(s) and the dominant language; or (3) minority group members may be monolingual in the dominant language. In conditions (2) and (3), members of minority groups who identify themselves as such often speak a distinctive variety of the dominant language. These 'accents' are usually interpreted simply as arising from the influence of the ethnic language(s), and features indeed may be attributed to substratum varieties or to the mother tongue, but they may be maintained and cultivated (consciously or unconsciously) as linguistic markers of ethnic identity (Giles 1979).

In English, ethnicity markers are most likely to be at the levels of phonology, vocabulary, and overall style, since grammatical markers are more likely to be associated with social class and educational level on a standard-nonstandard dimension. One notable exception is the 'invariant *be*' of Black English, which is generally recognized as an ethnic marker (except by teachers in the schools, who misinterpret it as 'ungrammatical'); the use of a 'double negative' in English, on the other hand, is not considered a marker of Hispanic or

French ethnicity (although it is a grammatical feature in both mother tongues), but rather as nonstandard and uneducated usage.

Black English in the United States has been the best described ethnically marked speech, although linguists' attention has generally been limited to nonstandard varieties, and has failed to recognize the range of social levels within identifiably Black usage (Wright 1975; a notable exception is Baugh 1983). Black standard varieties differ from White varieties primarily in intonational features, and in the marked pronunciation of a few lexical items (including *particularly*, in which the penultimate syllable has secondary stress and an unreduced vowel). Other descriptions of ethnically marked speech include Indian English (Kachru 1976; 1983; Gumperz 1977), Gästarbeiterdeutsch (Dittmar 1977), Puerto Rican English (Wolfram 1973), and Chicano English (Ornstein-Galicia 1984). Ethnic markers also occur in American Sign Language, where Black signers in the south have developed some characteristics which are different from the signs used by Whites in the same region (Woodward 1976). Differences in signs are both lexical and phonological: Black signing has not shared with White signing the same changes with respect to centralization, symmetry, and morphological preservation.

Markers associated with ethnicity may include nonverbal features as well, including the side-to-side head movement of some speakers of Indian English, and the different eye contact patterns of American Whites and Blacks (cf. Harper, Wiens, and Matarazzo 1978).

Tannen (1981) discusses ethnic markers in conversational style, including differences in the use of questions, methods for getting and keeping the floor, topic cohesion, and the use of irony and humor. Dimensions of difference between New York Jewish and Los Angeles non-Jewish style in her study include relevant personal focus of topic; paralinguistic features of pitch, loudness, voice quality, and tone; pacing and timing with respect to other utterances; rate of speech; and choice of lexical items and syntactic forms. Analysis of narratives collected from different groups (e.g. Tannen 1980), provides additional interesting information on ethnic markers in patterns of language use.

Ethnic differences in style may be modified in accordance with the situation, of course, as may other variables. Baugh reports the perceptions of one of his Black constituents about an event which required consistent style-shifting when he addressed different participants:

I'm in the middle cause I know them both. They are both my friends. . . . I have to talk to them [the whites] one way and then I have to turn back around and talk to them [the black girls] another way . . . and try to keep him [the white man] from feeling left out of this conversation, and the girls from feeling left out in the other conversation . . . so . . . it's kind of hard to sit in the middle of a situation like that. (1983:28)

Unlike using a foreign language, using an ethnically marked variety of language generally requires being born into group membership, unless the intent is to ridicule or joke (which indeed is often the case). One of the best sources of data on which ethnic markers are stigmatized and stereotyped is the imitative language markers used in telling ethnic jokes.

On the other hand, individual speakers born into the ethnic group – or the entire group membership – can generally succeed in eliminating all ethnic markers in their speech if they desire to fully assimilate to the dominant group, or they can develop both marked and unmarked varieties and shift between them depending on desired group identification in specific situations.

Changes which are occurring in Black varieties of both speech and sign provide good evidence for the types of social factors that are involved in ethnic marking. The speech of young Blacks appears to be diverging further from white speech than does the speech of Black adults. Bailey and Maynor (1987) attribute this increasing divergence to such social developments as migration to inner cities, economic stagnation, and residential segregation. Black youth are cultivating linguistic divergence as a vehicle for identification and solidarity. The sign language of young Blacks in the South, on the other hand, is converging with white forms.

Maxwell and Smith-Todd (1986) attribute this to the integration which has taken place in schools for the deaf; most deaf children learn sign language at school, rather than in home or community.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH SOCIAL CLASS, STATUS, AND ROLE

When describing patterns of language use in a speech community, determining what subgroups are accorded differential status and prestige, and understanding what criteria are used within the community for defining subgroup membership, must precede discovery of how the means of communication within the total linguistic repertoire may be differentially allocated according to social class, status, and role.

Social class may be defined primarily by wealth, or by circumstances of birth, or by occupation, or by other criteria specific to the group under investigation. If wealth is a criterion, this may be calculated in terms of money, or in terms of how many pigs, sheep, or blankets an individual or family possesses, or how much land they claim. Status is often largely determined by social class membership, but age or education may be more salient, or whether a person is married and has children. Role refers to the position(s) an individual holds which entails particular expectations rights, and responsibilities vis-à-vis others in the society: e.g. chief, minister of education, head of family, friend.

In rigidly stratified communities social class membership is clearly defined, roles strictly compartmentalized, and associated varieties of language clearly differentiated. In such communities members of the lower strata have little opportunity to acquire 'higher' language forms. In more democratic communities individuals have a wider range of roles potentially open to them, and generally command a wider range of socially marked speech. Studies in the United States and Canada have shown that those who are upwardly mobile tend to adopt the variety of language spoken by the group just above them, often to the point of hypercorrection, although a

social revolution may include the overthrow of prestige language forms as well as people who speak them.

The wider range of language available to higher social classes is exemplified by speakers of the East Godavari (India) dialect of Telugu (Sjoberg 1962). In this group only members of the upper class can use both formal and informal varieties, which are marked by two distinctive phonemic systems. This range relates directly to patterns of education, since the formal variety is learned only by those who attend school. For the same reason, written means of communication in many societies are available only to the upper class.

Most research on social class markers in language have focused on phonology and grammar, but other aspects of language may also be involved. There appears to be a social stratification in the use of color terms for women's fashion in English, for instance, with advertisements of clothes targeted for lower income groups using a limited set of color terms such as *blue, red, green, yellow, and purple*, perhaps together with the modifiers *light* and *dark*. Expensive clothes are advertised using a much greater variety of basic color terms: e.g. an advertisement from Saks Fifth Avenue included *rust, russet, camel, plum, wine, fuchsia, teal, sapphire, turquoise, emerald, seafoam, bone, and taupe*. A similar observation has been reported to me by native speakers of German, Spanish, and Arabic, although there is some disagreement over whether the diversity of color terms carries connotations of higher prestige or merely reflects the greater range of hues available in more expensive fabrics.

Individuals being trained to fill particular roles in a society may learn varieties that others do not: e.g. a Samoan 'talking chief' learns to use rhetorical forms limited to speakers in that role, and a boy who is expected to assume his father's role as curer, chief, or judge often learns the appropriate language forms in the process of informal observation, an opportunity which is not open to other children.

Roles are often marked by different pronouns or terms of address, and may require different levels of formality corresponding to different levels of prestige or deference which they are assigned. English-speaking rulers may refer to

themselves with the 'imperial' *we*, for instance, and a French businessman was fined for addressing a policeman as *tu*. This was judged to be a 'rude' form of address to someone in that role (Eliason 1980). Such linguistic marking of a particular social role is to be distinguished from markers of the dyadic role-relationship of speakers, which will be discussed below.

Another linguistic characteristic of the rights and responsibilities inherent in some roles is the type of performative that can be uttered, and how others must respond. For example, *You're out* is felicitous only if spoken by someone in the role of baseball umpire, and *I hereby sentence you to . . .* only if spoken by someone in the role of judge (cf. Searle 1969).

Other markers of status and role include differential naming patterns for married versus unmarried women in many societies, and the Iranian practice of shaking hands with an unveiled woman, but not with one wearing a *chadour*. The function of clothing in signalling role or status is illustrated by all uniforms, whether nurse, police, or soldier (with auxiliary markings indicating exact rank). Complaints about nuns and priests abandoning religious garb generally reflect the uncertainty caused by the loss of signals of identity, which in turn help to structure appropriate interaction with them.

Change in status may be signalled linguistically, as with the change in name at marriage, or the change in the official term of reference for a person after he assumes high office and again after he steps down. Soon after Haile Selassie was deposed as emperor of Ethiopia, for instance, official references changed from 'king of kings' to merely 'king' (still used to distinguish him from other people with the same name). The choice of ways to refer to him constituted a conscious political statement at that time, as conservatives continued to refer to him with a respectful pronoun and the imperial title *janhoi*, radicals used an informal pronoun, and extremists used his former name *Teferi*.

The use of 'role-playing' techniques often allows a researcher to elicit informants' perceptions of the speech of people who are in the particular roles they pretend to assume. Children playing 'school' or 'house' often adopt the language markers they consider typical of teacher or parent roles, while adults

asked to take the role of children use high voices and their perception of 'baby talk'.

A number of questions have been raised about the accuracy of judgements on social class and role which are based on linguistic markers alone, but several studies suggest they may in fact be quite reliable. Ellis (1967) for English found a correlation of 0.80 between the actual social class of speakers and the estimation of judges merely hearing them count from one to ten, and Shuy, Baratz, and Wolfram (1969) found considerable accuracy in social class identification of their Detroit sample based only on 30-second speech samples. Reviews of these and similar studies are available in Brown, Strong, and Rencher (1975) and in Robinson (1979); cross-cultural research is quite limited. Of interest is not only what markers are being perceived, but about beliefs people have in different speech communities about the relationship of language markers and social class and how these may affect both social organization and patterns of language use.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH ROLE-RELATIONSHIPS

While many aspects of language use consistently mark a particular role, the roles which individual speakers assume and the status they are accorded is generally dependent on their relationship to other participants in the communicative event. While the French court declared it 'rude' to call a man *tu* while he was in the role of policeman, for instance, it would be equally inappropriate for the same man to be addressed as *vous* if he were in the role of husband or friend. The relativity is clearly illustrated in Japanese, Javanese, Korean, Thai, and other languages which make extensive use of status-marking honorifics; the same speakers use different forms when speaking to someone in a superior versus someone in an inferior social position, even within the same conversation. These forms are not static markers of social class, but markers of the relative status of speakers in dyadic role-relationships.

In addition to choice of pronouns and use of honorific particles, which are well described in the literature (e.g. Brown and Gilman 1960; Tsujimura 1977), the relative status of speakers and their role-relationship may be marked in a variety of ways. Tyler's (1972) description of kinship terminology used by Koya speakers in India illustrates how choice of terms relates in a systematic way to both expectations and differences in contextual features; Nahuatl (Aztec) speakers in central Mexico use reflexive prefixes with causatives to imply respect for the person addressed or spoken of: e.g. 'he sleeps' is more politely expressed as 'he causes himself to sleep' (Sapir 1915); and Tzeltal speakers in Chiapas, Mexico use a sustained falsetto to express deference to the addressee (Brown and Levinson 1978).

Role-relationships may also be marked by the order in which participants speak, eye contact or avoidance, and body position. In a cyclic or interaction event with several people in sequence, such as greetings, introductions, or thanks, the order of address may mark relative deference or closeness. The cycle of Iranian families exchanging traditional New Year Greeting visits always begins with an early call of the youngest on the eldest relative, for instance, then the closest relative or friend, and then acquaintances, with the ordering considered an important sign of relative love and respect for each. The eldest in the family does not pay return visits until the third day or later in the celebration (Jafarpur).

Among the Sierra Popoluca (Mexico), women whisper to their husbands as a mark of deference, and children are expected to whisper when they are first learning to talk. This is an example of the 'powerless speech style' which women may adopt with men, children with adults, or ethnic minorities with majorities, and it marks a power relationship rather than the social categories of sex, age, or ethnicity (Giles, Scherer, and Taylor 1979). In conversation, subordinates more often pursue topics raised by those with superior status than the other way around, and superiors interrupt and touch more frequently (Zimmerman and West 1975). An example of similar status marking is reported by Goffman (1967), who notes that doctors touch other (lower) ranks as a

means of showing support and comfort, but others consider it presumptuous to even return (let alone initiate) such contact with a doctor. The strategic selection of different linguistic forms for such functions as requesting or directing also indicates the nature of the role-relationship between speaker and addressee: i.e. pragmatic strategies are potential markers of social relationships (Brown and Levinson 1979).

In some speech communities particular role-relationships require that clearly distinct varieties of language be used, often involving avoidance or taboo in some respect. An aboriginal Guugu Yimidhirr man in Australia must use only a specialized vocabulary with his brother-in-law (Haviland 1979), for instance, and a Navajo man traditionally cannot speak directly to his mother-in-law, or even be in her presence. Furthermore, he cannot refer to her with the usual third person pronoun form, but employs a more remote fourth person to indicate deference and respect. Avoidance of personal names in some role-relationships is also found in several languages, for direct address and/or in reference. Subrahmanian (1978) reports this taboo is still observed in Indian villages, where women cannot mention their husband's name; this must be circumvented in census taking by asking neighbors.

Relative status in particular role-relationships often involves complex consideration of several factors and the relative importance of such characteristics as age, sex, occupation, kinship, and social class in the determination differs in different speech communities. Their relative salience is interesting not only for discovering patterns of language use in interaction, but as potential indicators of the communities' social organization and cultural values.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH SEX

A differential distribution of language resources by sex in a community is often associated with differential patterns of education and distribution of labor, including trade versus childrearing responsibilities. Males are more likely to be

educated, and thus to control the formal and written varieties of a language. They are also more likely to be bilingual, both because of educational level, and because of mobility and contact in military encounters and trade. In Algeria, for instance, the only remaining monolingual speakers of Berber are women. Exceptions to this pattern occur in societies where women have equal opportunities for education, and possibilities for mobility without dependence on indigenous social structures (e.g. where there are no preferred cross-cousin marriages, or other family-arranged alliances), or in communities where women assume a primary marketing role (e.g. in Guatemala, where women take products to market and are most likely to be bilingual in Spanish and their native Mayan language).

In some communities, participation in certain kinds of events is restricted to a single sex, as where it is considered appropriate only for men to tell stories or preach; in others a particular mode of communication is restricted, as where only men whistle, or only women wail. The 'tuneful weeping' mode of northern India is used only by women, for instance (Tiwary 1975). Educated, urban women in that area are now refusing to accept this communicative role as one aspect of change in their social role in the community. A comparable shift among women in eastern Austria from German-Hungarian bilingualism to German-only is reported by Gal (1979) as a correlate of social change, including women's rejection of peasant life (and peasant husbands).

Some type of sexual differentiation in patterns of speech is likely, perhaps universal, whenever there is social differentiation between male and female roles. Linguistic markers associated with sex often include phonology: e.g. English-speaking women tend to use more socially prestigious speech forms than men (Labov 1966; Trudgill 1975), as well as higher pitch and more variable intonation patterns (Smith 1979); Boas (1911) found that female speakers of some Eskimo dialects used voiced nasals [n, n̄, ng, nḡ] in final position, which corresponded to male stops [p, t, k, q]; and Sapir (1915) found Yana women unvoicing final vowels.

Morphological markers include different first person inflec-

tions used by men and women in the North American language Koasati (Haas 1944; cf. Saville-Troike 1988), reduplication for emphasis of a verb by Thai women versus the addition of *mak* by Thai men, and the sentence-final particle *ne* in Japanese used almost exclusively by female speakers (Smith 1979). Morphology may also be marked for the sex of the listener, as with the second person inflections of Hebrew, or the different terms for 'they' in the North American language Tunica depending on whether a man or woman is being addressed (Haas 1941). Based on data collected for the Linguistic Atlases of the Upper Midwest and the North Central States, Van Riper (1979) reports women at all levels of education use significantly more of the past tense forms prescribed as 'correct' in English usage handbooks than do men, although there is less difference between male and female speakers who have more formal education. Grammatical markers associated with sex in Japanese include affirmative and nonaffirmative usage of the copula, and differential use of interjections at the beginning and end of utterances; syntactically, women are more likely to use subject inversion and topic-comment constructions.

Lexical markers may also be associated with the sex of either speaker or listener: e.g. a Hopi woman would use a different term if expressing the concept 'That's a beautiful area' to a man than she would to a woman, and swear words in many languages differ not only with the sex of the speaker, but also with whether a member of the opposite sex is within hearing. Some English words, such as *adorable* and *lovely*, are associated more with women speakers, and *beautiful* and *handsome* more appropriately used in reference to females and males respectively.

Topics considered appropriate for discussion may also differ for men and women, as may form or content of insults or other speech acts. In a study of the topics of teachers' conversations in a US faculty room, for instance, Kipers (1987) found females most likely to talk about social issues such as child abuse and women's rights, and males about recreational and work-related activities. At the University of Illinois, in one department female graduate students lodged a

formal protest that they were excluded from the opportunity for interaction with male faculty equal to that accorded male graduate students, because the principal topic of conversation was usually sports, with which they were less familiar than the males. Tiwary (1975) reports males in Northern India may insult each other by threatening the chastity of mother, sister, or daughter, while women assert the other's sexual activities with father, brother, or son, and curse each other with barrenness or widowhood. In English, a man is traditionally congratulated on the occasion of engagement or marriage, while a woman is offered 'best wishes'.

Nonverbal marking associated with sex includes traditional male hat-doffing and handshaking in English, with handshaking between women or between men and women still generally interpreted as a statement of 'women's liberation', providing another example of sex differentiation in communicative patterns declining with the lessening of division in social roles. In Mali, where role distinctions are more strictly maintained. Bambara men also shake hands in greeting, but women never do; a female may kneel down when greeting a man, which is never done by males, and she may use only limited eye contact. Clothing markers associated with sex may be relevant to interpreting patterns of communication, including whether or not one or more participants are veiled. (Although this is usually associated with women, men are also veiled in the nomadic Atobak tribe of southern Algeria, and can show their faces to no one except their wives.) Whether women wear dresses or trousers may also be significant, as may whether members of a non-Western society wear traditional or Western garb.

The maintenance of clearly distinct male-female roles is also illustrated by the rules of speech such as those followed by Tamil couples, at least in rural areas of central Tamil Nadu: the husband can address his wife by her name, but the wife is expected to use a non-specific respect term; the husband uses a familiar verb inflection with his wife, while the wife uses the more respectful second person plural ending in return; and the wife is expected to give the 'right of way' to her husband in conversation with other adults (Britto).

Either men or women are often considered to be more polite or indirect than the other in their style of speech. For example, Keenan (1975) reports only men in Malagasy possess the valued skills of using metaphor and proverb, with women perceived as informal and direct, and Strathern (1975) finds Melpa women excluded from taking part in public verbal display because they cannot use 'veiled talk' and are always direct; on the other hand Laver and Trudgill (1979) report men use a higher percentage of direct imperative constructions in English when 'giving suggestions', while women use a higher percentage of more indirect interrogatives and tag questions. Some of the stylistic differences attributed to men versus women have not been corroborated in observational studies of actual usage, or yield contradictory evidence (cf. Smith 1979 for a review of studies on English), although the attitudes and expectations revealed even by unsupported stereotypes within a community are of considerable ethnographic interest, as are their social implications.

Also of interest are perceptions and attitudes regarding apparent violations, such as female markers used by males and vice versa. A Japanese female who uses less polite forms is considered 'rough', for instance, while a Japanese male who is too polite is 'effeminate', as is a Tunisian male who speaks a Parisian variety of French. Male speech considered imitative of women's is called 'sweet-talking' by Black Americans, on the other hand, and is quite appropriate for use in a courting situation without threatening male identity (Abrahams 1973).

Switching to a style of speech in which stereotyped features considered characteristic of the opposite sex are exaggerated may function as a marker of homosexual identity, or may be used in teasing or mocking the addressee by suggesting sexual deviance. The mocking signs used to refer to deaf homosexuals are touching the middle finger to the nose and flinging it back with a limp wrist, for instance, or by touching it to the tongue and then flattening the eyebrow (Rudner and Butowsky 1980). A general characteristic of American Sign Language which may also be interpreted as reflecting sex stereotypes is that signs associated with males are made on the forehead (as are those referring to intellect and decision-making), while

those associated with females are made near the mouth (as are those for words of emotion and feeling, or for personal appearance).

Sex differences in language forms and patterns of interaction cannot be understood apart from situation and social factors. In all speech communities they are interrelated with setting, age, social class, education, occupation, and (perhaps most importantly) with the role-relationship of participants in the communicative event. Some aspects of the potential complexity are illustrated in the rules observed by a Mixe-Zoque family walking to market in Oaxaca, Mexico, as reported by O'Neill:

Women will walk three steps behind their husbands, or an elderly relative, as a sign of respect. If the head of the household is the eldest son (occasionally the child will be only six or eight years old), the mother will still walk about two steps behind the son. Grandmothers and elderly aunts are an exception to this rule. They are permitted to walk in front of the male head of a daughter's/niece's household. This deference is based on her age status, but the same grandmother must still walk the required number of steps behind her own husband.

A woman walking beside her daughter indicates her position has been elevated from childhood to adulthood. Usually, this occurs at the age of ten to twelve years.

The smallest male child will walk beside the grandfather in order to hear stories about the town and its people. The grandfather will also use this time to instruct the youngest child how to judge different character types - 'who is an honest man'.

The younger children frequently imitate the adults by arranging themselves in line so that the young male children will be in front of their sisters. The older sisters will usually push the smaller brothers back in line, and inform them that they should lead because they are older.

In this case it is proxemics, or social space, which serves to mark categories of sex, age, role, and status.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH AGE

In most speech communities, age is a major dimension for social categorization. Three kinds of markers associated with age should be distinguished: those which yield information about the speaker, those which yield information about the receiver, and those which yield information about the relationships between the two which are influenced by their relative age. Markers associated with young children as speakers, for instance, generally relate to developmental stages and processes in language acquisition. 'Baby talk' is associated with young children as receivers; it is characterized by the linguistic modifications which adults make when addressing young children, rather than direct imitation of child language forms. The use of baby talk is often associated with a caretaker role-relationship, and marks this relationship even if participants are not adult and young child: e.g. a young child (who does not speak baby talk with adults or peers) may use baby talk with a doll or infant sibling, or an adult may use baby talk with a small pet. Use of baby talk between adults may mark an affectionate relationship or be interpreted as insulting, depending on the context.

Baby talk is not part of the linguistic repertoire in all speech communities, but where it is, similar modification of adult language forms are to be found. In his characterization of baby talk in fifteen languages, Ferguson (1964) lists these shared features: processes of reduction (especially in phonology), substitution, assimilation, and generalization; repetition of words, phrases, and sentences; exaggerated intonational contours and deliberate articulations; diminutive affixes; and high pitch. A few alternative modifications have been reported for other languages, including using a relatively fixed word order and whispering in Quiché, a Mayan language of Guatemala (Pye 1986).

The actual effect of such modifications on child language

development is not clear, although there is some evidence children may attend better to baby talk (Snow 1972), and that its prosodic features may facilitate the acquisition of segmentation (Garnica 1977).

Beliefs about the appropriateness of baby talk and its relation to child language acquisition are of considerable interest. Among English speakers, baby talk is generally considered appropriate for females to use with children from birth to age three or four. The use of baby talk with a child approaching school age is considered potentially damaging to his or her emotional and linguistic development, both by parents and teachers. Children who use baby talk when they enroll in kindergarten or first grade are the subject of peer ridicule, and they almost immediately switch to more mature linguistic forms. Some English-speaking males use baby talk with young children, but father's language does not usually indicate the same caretaking relationship as does 'motherese' (cf. Gleason 1975; Gleason *et al.* 1977; Gleason and Weintraub 1978). This difference may diminish with the middle-class trend to share childrearing responsibilities; Gleason (1976), for instance, does not find significant differences in the speech of male and female day care attendants, although she reports that English-speaking children taking the role of father when playing with dolls typically do not use baby talk, but use a 'gruffer' voice quality and a greater percentage of threats and imperatives than when they play 'mother'.

In addition to linguistic forms, communicative phenomena associated with young children include beliefs about the appropriateness of children listening to or participating in conversations among adults, beliefs about what topics should be discussed by them or in front of them, different terms of address used by them and for them, and expectations regarding their nonverbal behavior.

The elderly in a society may be accorded higher status and greater deference, or they may be considered less competent. General ways in which deference for age may be marked are listed by Silverman and Maxwell (1978): spatial (special seats), victual (given choice foods), linguistic (addressed in

honorifics), presentational (special posture assumed in their presence), service (housekeeping performed for them), presentative (given gifts, or having the right to sing certain songs), and celebrative (ceremonies held in their honor).

The view that they are less competent may be conveyed by others talking to old people in a loud voice and at a very slow rate, assuming they are hard of hearing and losing mental faculties (Helfrich 1979), or the elderly may be recipients of demeaning caretaker behavior similar to that used with children: e.g. a son or daughter may order meals for them in a restaurant, or speak about them in the third person when they are present.

Some of the speech markers associated with age relate to physiological change, but many more are stylistic in nature, or reflect the different status or roles of speakers which relate to age. Some markers may also be the result of language and culture change, but we cannot assume that age-grade differences in a speech community indicate diachronic processes until their relation to the life cycle has been explored. An American's age may be marked by saying *ice box* rather than *refrigerator*, for instance, or *Negro* rather than *Black*, reflecting actual shifts in usage. However, in some languages it may be the case that a different term is appropriate for an older person to use, and that the young person who uses one term today will change to the other at age fifty or so.

One very interesting age marker has been reported by Gardner, who says the Paliyans of south India 'communicate very little at all times and become almost silent by the age of 40' (1966:398). There has been speculation that elderly speakers of English employ different strategies for topic switching than younger speakers, and that they pause longer in narratives or conversations without giving up the floor. Helfrich (1979) reports age differences in a speaker's preference for action-oriented style (verbs dominating) or qualitative style (adjectives and nouns dominating), but few studies have yet been done which identify markers associated with speaker age other than those dealing with child language development.

VARIETIES ASSOCIATED WITH PERSONALITY STATES AND 'ABNORMAL' SPEECH

Markers associated with personality states include some that are physiological in nature, as well as some that are socially determined. Even among the former, however, there may be culture-specific constraints and interpretations that are of interest for the ethnography of communication.

The most extreme examples are probably markers associated with psychotic states, such as schizophrenia. Language is considered by some psychologists to be such a reliable indicator of this disease that purely verbal measures have been said to prove valid in diagnosis and judgements of severity (Gottschalk and Gleser 1969). The content of a doctor-patient interview is analyzed in terms of (1) theme (unfriendly, hostile, avoidance), (2) inaudible or unintelligible remarks or words, (3) illogical or bizarre statements, (4) repetition of phrases or clauses, and (5) questions directed to the interviewer. Linguistic analysis can also be used to distinguish false and genuine suicide notes. Gottschalk and Gleser report that in genuine notes, the percentage of references to others is less than 14 per cent, and the percentage of references to inanimate objects is greater than 1 per cent. This procedure predicts 94 per cent of the genuine notes and misidentifies only 15 per cent of the false ones, as judged by whether the writer of the note actually attempts suicide. Other themes are also related to personality disorders. We consider depressed people laconic; they talk about self-deprecatory and morose topics. Manic people are verbose, and talk about achievements and frequent superficial contacts with people.

Although comparable features may be found in other languages, the resulting diagnosis/interpretation cannot be generalized. Mental illness is culturally defined, and behavior a person may be institutionalized for in one society may be considered 'normal' in a second, and valued as supernaturally determined in a third.

Children may be characterized as 'good' or 'bad' at least

partly in terms of their language use, not only in terms of the employment of politeness rules and 'proper' vocabulary, but even in features of pronunciation: e.g. English-speaking children who pronounce *coming* as [kəmɪn] are judged less well behaved or intelligent than those who say [kəmɪŋ] (Fischer 1958). Frender, Brown, and Lambert (1970) elicited judgements based on the language use of French-Canadian third grade boys of the same nonverbal IQ and social class, but with different grade averages; the boys with higher grades had greater variance in intonation, and were judged to sound more 'appropriate', more confident, and to have higher pitch. Brown, Strong, and Rencher (1975) speculate lower pitch at this age could reflect strong identification with tough, masculine models and less with the values of the educational system.

Several studies show that the same features of speech are interpreted as markers of different personality characteristics in males and females within the same speech community, but few have compared perceptions and interpretations in different cultures. Scherer (1979) reports correlations between certainty-uncertainty markers in American speech with self-rating of aggressiveness and dominance, and with ratings by American judges, but not by German-speaking judges. Scherer also suggests there are subcultural differences, such as loudness of voice indicating friendliness and sociability for lower class people, and boorishness and aggressiveness for upper class.

Speakers of English have stereotypic perceptions of personality differences between Americans, British, and Australians, and it would be interesting to know what specific differences are serving as markers for the groups, and how and why the personality attributions are derived. Similar studies might be conducted across languages to determine what markers are associated with personality traits considered 'typical' of particular ethnic groups, and the extent to which similar markers are used by members of one speech community to type all 'others'. Such verbal behavior as repeated interruptions and dominating a conversation may be characteristic of a particular personality type, but these may also be strategies which have been learned in a particular

speech community as conversational rules for asserting power or solidarity, and thus may be markers of role-relationship more than of personality.

Finally, speech may be intentionally marked to indicate personality traits or emotions in someone else. Sapir (1915) reported that in Nootka, 'Cowards may be satirized by "making one's voice small" in referring to or addressing them, in other words by speaking in a thin piping voice that suggests timidity.' Hymes (1979a) analyzes [s] and [ɪ] prefixes inserted in the speech of bear and coyote in Takelma folklore as having a similar metaphorical function: the [s] conveys 'diminutive meanings that have to do with condescension, sympathy, even affection on the part of an audience, and closeness between actors', while the [ɪ] conveys greater emotional distance, 'depreciation, disdain for coarseness and stupidity, and . . . distance between actors.'

Speech markers may also be used to imply physical characteristics. In Nootka this speech-mockery was done by suffixed participles and by inserting or altering consonants:

The physical classes indicated by these methods are children, unusually fat or heavy people, unusually short adults, those suffering from some defect of the eye, hunchbacks, those that are lame, left-handed persons, and circumcised males. (Sapir 1915:180-1)

Sapir reported that speech-mockery in Nootka was also used in reference or address with people who have speech defects. Those recognized in the community are: (1) involuntary nasalization of all vowels and continuants (a 'nasal twang'), (2) 'hole in palate' (cleft palate?), (3) palatalization of all [s] and [ts] to [š] (speakers are thought to be keeping their teeth open), (4) 'to talk as one with missing teeth' (lisp), and (5) stuttering. Speech-mockery takes the form of imitation of the defect.

Like mental illness, what is considered pathological speech is culturally determined. Discovering what is considered 'abnormal' provides an enlightening dimension in revealing the perceptions and attitudes of a group, and in defining

'normal'; it deserves more attention than it has thus far been accorded in sociolinguistics.

NON-NATIVE VARIETIES

Three very different types of language varieties are included in this category: (1) the marked forms and patterns used by speakers in a foreign or second language; (2) the lingua francas or international language codes; and (3) the languages which have developed with official or auxiliary but 'transplanted' status in societies where there are not indigenous speakers.

Within the first category there is a major distinction to be made between foreign and second languages in terms of function and the relationship of their speakers to a speech community. The former are generally used for learning about another culture or for intercultural communication, and may enable speakers to participate more or less successfully in that speech community without becoming members of it; sometimes they are used for one-way knowledge transfer, and many are content to acquire only reading skills, and do not become 'speakers'. Second languages are used within a speech community for many of the same functions they serve for native speakers, and their speakers must usually be considered members of the community in its sociological/anthropological sense even when the linguistic forms and rules are as yet quite imperfectly acquired. Both kinds of varieties are most commonly marked by an 'accent' which identifies speakers' native language identity, intralingual developmental phenomena, and ways of speaking and writing which are inappropriately translated into the target language.

English has replaced French as the most common international language, and the variety generally used for international communication is characterized by minimal use of metaphorical and idiomatic expressions, and neutralization of regional differences. Suprpto calls this 'Standard English for Foreigners', and reports from her observations:

Even the native speakers of English strive to minimize their type of English in pronunciation and syntax. Thus, for example, an Englishman would try not to sound too British, nor an American too American.

This variety functions as a lingua franca at the World Bank and many other international agencies, and at meetings and conferences where there is a forum for the exchange of information in various academic or political domains. It is an elaborated code which makes minimal assumptions about shared cultural experiences among its speakers, other than that they all have a high level of formal education.

The essential difference in the nature and functions of non-native official/auxiliary languages from those of the other varieties has been argued most extensively with respect to 'Indian English' by Kachru (e.g. 1976; 1980; 1983), who extends the distinctions to the Englishes of the Philippines, the Caribbean, and West Africa as well. He is primarily concerned with a situation

in which *Indian* English is used as a language of interaction, for maintaining *Indian* patterns of administration, education, and legal system, and also for creating a pan-Indian (Indian English) literature which forms part of the world writing in English. (1976:223; emphasis his)

In other words, 'The medium is non-native, but the message is not' (Kachru 1986:12).

It is interesting that this role for English has developed while efforts to promote a more artificial international language, such as Esperanto, Novial, Occidental, Interlingua, and Volapük have had only limited success. This may be because of language attitudes, or because a natural language is more adequate as a medium for communication.

The range of varieties used for auxiliary national purposes even within a single country, such as India, runs from pidginized English on the one extreme, through regionally marked varieties (e.g. Punjabi English, Kashmiri English), to

'educated Indian English', and finally to varieties which very closely approximate British or American norms.

Such varieties are part of the communicative repertoire in India, West Africa, South Asia, and the West Indies, with important functions in each of the national contexts. Kachru (1983) lists these as: (1) instrumental, especially for education; (2) regulative, in legal systems and administration; (3) interpersonal, as a 'link language' between speakers of different languages and a symbol of prestige and modernity; and (4) imaginative/innovative. The use of a non-native language in creative contexts, as a medium for literature and drama, indicates that it is being more deeply embedded in the culture of its speakers and undergoing nativization. Subvarieties developed as part of this process, as variables in the transplanted language begin to serve as markers in the society.

The development and creative use of non-native varieties of language provides further evidence for the point made earlier that there is no intrinsic reason that the structures and vocabulary of one language cannot be used in many domains of communication within other speech communities to express the cultures of those communities, and in ways in keeping with their rules of appropriate behavior.

4

The Analysis of Communicative Events

In undertaking an ethnography of communication in a particular locale, the first task is to define at least tentatively the speech community to be studied, attempt to gain some understanding of its social organization and other salient aspects of the culture, and formulate possible hypotheses concerning the diverse ways these sociocultural phenomena might relate to patterns of communication (as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3). It is crucial that the ethnographic description of other groups be approached not in terms of preconceived categories and processes, but with openness to discovery of the way native speakers perceive and structure their communicative experiences; in the case of ethnographers working in their own speech communities, the development of objectivity and relativity is essential, and at the same time difficult.

Some early steps in description and analysis of patterns of communication include identifying recurrent events, recognizing their salient components, and discovering the relationship among components and between the event and other aspects of society. The ethnographer is also interested in attitudes toward the event (Chapter 5), and how both relevant communicative skills and attitudes are acquired (Chapter 6). The ultimate criterion for descriptive adequacy is whether someone not acquainted with the speech community might understand how to communicate appropriately in a particular situation; beyond that, we wish to know why those behaviors are more appropriate than alternative possibilities.

Observed behavior is now recognized as a manifestation of a deeper set of codes and rules, and the task of ethnography