Course Structure

1. Language Contact
   - language change

2. Individual Bilingualism
   - code-switching & code-mixing

3. Societal Bilingualism
   - diglossia, language maintenance, language shift & language death (obsolescence)

4. Language Policy and Language Planning
   - national languages, the EU and multilingualism, language revitalisation & bilingual education

Definition: Bilingual

Having an effectively equal control of two native languages. Thus a minority of people in Wales are bilingual in Welsh and English; many in England are bilingual in English and e.g. Punjabi. A bilingual community, as in Welsh-speaking parts of Wales, is one in which bilingualism is normal.

Loosely or more generally, in some accounts, of people or communities that have two or more different languages, whether or not control is effectively equal and whether or not more than one is native. Bilinguals in the ordinary sense are then variously called ‘ambilingual’ or ‘equilingual’, or are qualified as ‘full’, ‘true’, ‘ideal’, or ‘balanced’ bilinguals.

**Criteria for determining bilingualism 1**
(Skutnabb-Kangas 1981)

1. Origin
2. Competence
3. Function
4. Attitudes

---

**Criteria for determining bilingualism 2**
(Skutnabb-Kangas 1981)

1. **Origin**

Anyone who has learnt two languages in a family of native speakers from the very beginning
(from 0 years old = mother tongue)

---

**Criteria for determining bilingualism 3**
(Skutnabb-Kangas 1981)

2. **Competence**

Anyone who:

a) has a complete command of two languages
b) has a native-like command of two languages
c) masters two languages equally well
d) can "get by" in two languages
e) can produce meaningful utterances in two languages

---

**Criteria for determining bilingualism 4**
(Skutnabb-Kangas 1981)

3. **Function**

Anyone who uses (or is able to use) two languages (in the majority of situations) according to their own wishes and societal demands
Criteria for determining bilingualism 5

(Skutnabb-Kangas 1981)

4 Attitudes

Anyone who:

a) identifies themselves as bilingual/knowing two languages and/or two cultures (to some extent)

b) is identified by others as bilingual or as a native speaker of two languages

Expertise/allegiance vs. competence/native speaker

Rampton (1990, 1995) proposes expertise-affiliation-and-inheritance as

“a simple and workable set of terms that try to recognise rather than obscure the dynamic social and institutional processes through which sociolinguistic identities are defined.” (1995: 344)

expertise

allegiance

affiliation

inheritance

Three myths about bilingualism

- Bilinguals are like two monolinguals rolled into one.
- Bilinguals have two equally developed languages
- Bilinguals who master two languages do not usually code-switch

Code-switching 1

“the ‘alternating use of two or more “codes” within one conversational episode’” (Auer 1998: 1)

Early view of code-switching:

“(N)o one has been able to show that such rapid alternation is governed by any systematic rules or constraints and we must therefore describe it as the irregular mixture of two distinct systems.”

(Labov, 1971: 457)

Labov thus laid down a challenge to other linguists.
John Gumperz (a linguistic anthropologist) was the first to draw attention to ways in which code-switching is used as a meaning-making resource.

In conversation “speakers associate one alternative expression with the casualness or intimacy of home or peer-group relations (we-code) and the other with the formality of public or out-group relations (they-code).” (Gumperz 1982: 84)

Thus bilingual communities ascribe different sets of symbolic values to each code. By switching they can claim distinct identities.

Problems:
- Ethnic group boundaries are fluid (i.e. constantly being negotiated)
- “Not all instances of codeswitching within the same situation have an identifiable metaphorical [symbolic] value.” (Martin-Jones, 2001)
- Auer calls this a ‘semantic’ view of code-switching, since the direction of the shift determines the meaning of any code switch.

Gumperz also highlighted that code-switching functions as a **contextualisation cue** used to signal “what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows” (Gumperz, 1982: 131).

Gumperz (1982) also proposed a **preliminary typology of discourse functions:**
- (i) quotations (direct or reported speech)
- (ii) addressee specification
- (iii) interjections
- (iv) reiterations (for emphasis or clarification)
- (v) message qualification
- (vi) personalization vs. objectivization
Sociolinguistic perspectives on code-switching can be grouped into two broad categories:

- **the organisational approach**: focussing on the management and sequential organisation of conversation, i.e. viewing code-switching as a contextualisation cue
- **the identity-oriented approach**: emphasising the metaphorical link between language and the social identity of speakers, along with the rights and obligations associated with each language

“...group of researchers [...] who practice conversation analysis (CA) question the primacy of macrostructural or societal contributions to the social meanings of code-switching, that particular languages stand as metaphors for, and see the meanings of code-switching as emerging out of the sequential and negotiated development of conversational interaction. The meaning of any particular code-switch can only legitimately be ascertained in the context of conversational interaction, as the variety of social meanings of code-switching that interactants produce are generated *in situ*, and are ‘genuine’ meanings only in as far as participants attend to them structurally in their orderly co-construction of sense.” (Stroud 1998: 322)

“But the ‘partial autonomy’ of the conversational level does not imply that ‘macro’ dimensions are irrelevant for the interpretation of code-switching.” (Auer 1998: 4)

Indeed, “there is no doubt that, in the construction of meanings, language alternation interacts with other aspects of the wider non-linguistic social structures. However, the interaction between language choice and the wider non-linguistic social structures is much more complex than the ‘language-reflects-society’ framework implies.” (Gafaranga 2005: 297)

A revised taxonomy of code-alternation based on Gafaranga & Torras’ taxonomy (2002: 19)
**Code vs medium**

**Code** – from the analyst’s perspective, which “pure” language varieties are we dealing with?

**Medium** – from a members’ (interactants’) perspective, do they orient towards a switch in codes?

- **Next-turn proof procedure**: observing how “speakers display in their sequentially ‘next’ turns an understanding of what the ‘prior’ turn was about.” (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 15)

**Mixed medium**

- “bilingual medium” (e.g. Welsh and English) as a default option
- unmarked choice (i.e. no additional local meaning) (Myers-Scotton 1993)
- code-mixing (e.g. Auer 1999)
- there may be an identifiable pattern of “insertional” or “alternational” mixing (Auer 1999: 315)
- yet it may (or may not) signal group identity (Auer 1999: 318)

**A revised taxonomy of code-alternation based on Gafaranga & Torras’ taxonomy (2002: 19)**

```
code-alternation
  unmarked (code-mixing)
  marked (code-switching)
  mixed medium
    medium repair
    medium switching
    medium suspension
```

```
A revised taxonomy of code-alternation based on Gafaranga & Torras’ taxonomy (2002: 19)

```
```
Occurrences of code-switching, distributed between the three categories (Musk 2006: 315)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code-switching</th>
<th>Overall total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium switching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium repairs</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium suspension</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Medium suspension

- Code-switching proper
- marked medium choice (cues “interactional otherness”)
- may be accompanied by “prosodic cues (extra emphasis, preceding pause) and verbal markers (metalinguistic comments, hesitation)” (Auer 1999: 314)
- “sequential implicativeness of [medium] choice”: returns to previous medium within the interactional sequence

A revised taxonomy of code-alternation based on Gafaranga & Torras’ taxonomy (2002: 19)

- code-alternation
  - unmarked (code-mixing)
  - marked (code-switching)
    - mixed medium
      - medium repair
      - medium switching
      - medium suspension
Medium switching

- code-switching proper
- marked medium choice (cues “interactional otherness”)
- “sequential implicativeness of [medium] choice” (Auer 1984: 5):
  results in a new medium within the interactional sequence
- attends to medium preferences (personal or situational)
- “[medium] negotiation sequence” (Auer 1998: 8)

A revised taxonomy of code-alternation based on Gafaranga & Torras’ taxonomy (2002: 19)

- code-alternation
  - unmarked (code-mixing)
  - mixed medium
  - marked (code-switching)

- medium repair
- medium switching
- medium suspension

Medium repair

- code-switching proper
- ‘corrected’ medium choice
- thus the repaired medium is/emerges as a marked choice
- (self/other-initiated) self-repair or (self/other-initiated) other-repair

Double monolingualism norm vs. integrated bilingualism norm

- Jørgensen & Holmen (1997) criticise the prevailing double monolingualism norm, whereby bilinguals should keep their languages apart
- Instead they advocate an integrated bilingualism norm, whereby:
  “persons who command two languages will employ their full linguistic competence at any given time adjusted to the needs and the possibilities of the conversation, including the linguistic skills of the interlocutor.” (1997: 13)
**Language crossing (Rampton 1995)**

**Definition:** “the use of language varieties associated with social or ethnic groups that the speaker does not normally ‘belong’ to” (14)

Rampton’s work investigates “the pragmatic and symbolic meanings of Creole, Panjabi and Indian English, particularly when these are used by people who neither have linguistic ‘ownership rights’, nor normally speak these languages.” (15)

He claims that language crossing “plays an important role in the negotiation of social identity, and serves as a rich point of entry for analysis of the connections between language, ethnic relations, youth culture and the experience of social change.” (4)

---

**Strategies to develop more than one first language (Håkansson 2003: 151-4)**

- one parent – one language
- one language at home – another away from home
- language time, language space
- mixing languages

*Which strategy works best?*

*What is the long-term outcome?*

---

**Parent’s reaction when child uses the “wrong” language (Huss 1991)**

- pretend not to understand (or do not understand)
- translate what the child has said
- continue the conversation as if nothing has happened (with or without medium switching)
“Got Bob” 1 (Benjamin 2;8)

1. Nigel: are you gonna put the lights on
2. the (little) lights on the pictures
3. you do that?
4. Benjamin: ((walks over to lights)) as: ((puts lights on))
5. DÄ:::R [yeah THERE]
6. Nigel: there you go GOOD
7. what about the light in the cabinet
8. Benjamin: ((walks over to cabinet)) as: där [yeah there]
9. Nigel: you put it on then
10. put both of them on
11. ((B. puts on lights)) that’s good
12. that’s better
13. it’s a bit brighter in here now ;isn’t it.
14. Benjamin: (d)e lite STARK::: [(it)’s a bit BRIGHT]

“Got Bob” 2

15. Nigel: yeah that’s a very bright light isn’t it that one
16. what’s that
17. Benjamin: kt [-t]
18. Nigel: what’s richard done over here then
19. let’s have a look
20. Benjamin: ehe ehi
21. Nigel: what’s he put on laa laa
22. Benjamin: he put the e benamin ehe en [Benamin uhu a]
23. Nigel: what’s he done
24. Benjamin: benamin DEN he [Benamin that heh]
25. Nigel: what’s panda got
26. see panda got the truck
27. and what’s winnie the pooh got
28. Benjamin: ehe eh eh

“Got Bob” 3

29. Nigel: what’s he got there
30. Benjamin: hehe heh got -t BOB
31. Nigel: he’s got bob the builder the tr-
32. the bottom of uh scoop isn’t it from bob the builder
33. Benjamin: eh he ehhhh eh bob a BUILDER gone
34. Nigel: yeah where’s bob the builder gone
35. Benjamin: bob a builder a g- ((gets two bricks from box))
36. bub bub mih ehe gör så eehäh es ah [do like this]
37. ((puts bricks on base)) gch o- ehe d- (ockse) hehe [and a- uhu th- (too)]
38. Nigel: we haven’t put your slippers on yet have we let’s go
39. and find your slippers benjamin
40. shall we go and find your slippers
41. Benjamin: hehe
42. Nigel: we haven’t put your slippers on yet have we let’s go
43. and find your slippers benjamin
44. shall we go and find your slippers
45. Benjamin: hehe
46. Nigel: what’s Richard done over here then
47. what’s that
48. what’s richard done over here then
49. let’s have a look
50. Benjamin: ehe ehi
51. Nigel: what’s he put on laa laa
52. Benjamin: he put the e benamin ehe en [Benamin uhu a]
53. Nigel: what’s he done
54. Benjamin: benamin DEN he [Benamin that heh]
55. Nigel: what’s panda got
56. see panda got the truck
57. and what’s winnie the pooh got
58. Benjamin: ehe eh eh
Bilingualism in practice

- highly situated social practices
- expertise/affiliation vs. competence/native speaker
- varying linguistic expertise
- dynamic rather than static over time
- code-switching common – integrated bilingualism norm vs. monolingualism norm
- influenced by beliefs, attitudes and opportunities
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