

## Notes

- 1 Note that Guarani is not an official language (i.e., recognized and utilized for purposes of government, formal education, the courts, etc.) in Paraguay. It is not uncommon for the H variety alone to have such recognition in diglossic settings without this fact threatening the acceptance or the stability of the L variety within the speech community. However, the existence of a single "official" language should not divert the investigator from recognizing the fact of widespread and stable bilingualism at the levels of societal and interpersonal functioning.
- 2 This development differs significantly from the traditional Eastern European Jewish pattern in which males whose occupational activities brought them into regular contact with various strata of the non-Jewish coterritorial population utilized one or more coterritorial languages (usually involving H and L varieties of their own, such as Russian, German or Polish on the one hand, and Ukrainian, Byelorussian or "Baltic" varieties (e.g. Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian), on the other), but did so for *intergroup* purposes almost exclusively.
- 3 The compartmentalization of roles (and of domains and situations as well) requires the redefinition of roles, domains and situations in any encounter in which a seemingly inappropriate topic must be discussed between individuals who normally stand in a given role relationship to each other. Under such circumstances one or other factor is altered (the roles are redefined, the topic is redefined) so as to preserve the cultural norms for appropriateness (grammaticality) of behavior between interlocutors.
- 4 A theory which tends to minimize the distinction between languages and varieties is desirable for several reasons. It implies that *social* consensus (rather than inherently linguistic desiderata) differentiates between the two and that separate varieties can become (and have become) separate languages given certain social encouragement to do so, just as purportedly separate languages have been fused into one, on the ground that they were merely different varieties of the same language.
- 5 Switzerland as a whole is not a case in point since it is not an example of discontinuous and hierarchically stratified speech communities under a common political regime. Switzerland consists of geographically stratified speech communities under a common regime. Except for the Swiss-German case there is hardly any societally patterned bilingualism in Switzerland. Only the Jura region, the Romansch area and a very few other small areas have (had) a recent history of diglossia without bilingualism.
- 6 At an individual level this need not be the case since translation bilingualism can be maintained for intragroup communication purposes and for individual vocational purposes without the formation of natural bilingual speech communities.

Source: Fishman, J.A. (1967) Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2): 29-38, by permission of Blackwell Publishers.

## Who speaks what language to whom and when?

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN

### The analysis of multilingual settings

Multilingual settings differ from each other in so many ways that every student of multilingualism must grapple with the problem of how best to systematize or organize the manifold differences that are readily recognizable. This chapter is primarily limited to a formal consideration of several descriptive and analytic variables which may contribute to an understanding of *who* speaks *what* language *to whom* and *when* in those settings that are characterized by widespread and relatively stable multilingualism. It deals primarily with "within-group (or intragroup) multilingualism" rather than with "between-group (or intergroup) multilingualism," that is with those multilingual settings in which a single population makes use of two (or more) separate codes for internal communicative purposes. As a result of this limitation, general knowledge of mother tongue and other tongue may be ruled out as an operative variable since most individuals *could* communicate with each other quite easily in *either* of the available languages. It seems clear, however, that habitual language choice is far from being a random matter of momentary inclination, even under those circumstances when it could very well function as such from a purely probabilistic point of view. "Proper" usage, or common usage, or both, dictate that only *one* of the theoretically co-available languages *will* be chosen by particular classes of *interlocutors* on particular *occasions*.

How can these choice-patterns be described? Our basic conceptual problem in this connection is to provide for the variety of patterns that exist in stable within-group multi-lingual settings throughout the world in such a way as to attain factual accuracy, theoretical parsimony and stimulation of future research. Once we have mastered the problem of how to describe language choice on the

level of individual face-to-face encounters, we can then approach the problem of the broader, underlying choice determinants on the level of larger group or cultural settings (Fishman, 1964). Once we have mastered the problem of how to describe language choice in stable within-group bilingual settings (where the limits of language mastery do not intrude), we can then approach the problem of choice determinants in less stable settings such as those characterizing immigrant–host relationships and between-group multilingual settings more generally.

### Group, situation, topic

(a) One of the first controlling factors in language choice is *group membership*. This factor must be viewed not only in a purportedly objective sense, i.e., in terms of physiological, sociological criteria (e.g., age, sex, race, religion, etc.), but also, and primarily, in the subjective socio-psychological sense of *reference group membership*. A government functionary in Brussels arrives home after stopping off at his club for a drink. He generally speaks standard French in his office, standard Dutch at his club and a distinctly local variant of Flemish at home.<sup>1</sup> In each instance he identifies himself with a different group to which he belongs, wants to belong, and from which he seeks acceptance. Nevertheless, it is not difficult to find occasions at the office in which he speaks or is spoken to in one or another variety of Flemish. There are also occasions at the club when he speaks or is addressed in French; finally, there are occasions at home when he communicates in standard Dutch or even French. It would be too much to claim that a shift in reference group occurs on *each* of these supposedly atypical occasions. In addition, the very existence of certain reference groups (e.g., club member) seems to depend largely on location, setting or other environmental factors (which, we will see, may deserve recognition in their own right rather than need to remain hidden under a vague “group” rubric), rather than on group-consciousness or group-experience as such. Finally, even were this not to be the case, it seems unnecessarily difficult to analyze language choice within large, complex, literate societies in terms of the enormous repertoire of shifting reference groups which these provide. Thus, while we may admit that the concept of reference group membership enables us to recognize *some* invariables of habitual language choice in stable multilingual settings (e.g., that our hypothetical functionary *is* Flemish and would probably know no Dutch Flemish at all were this not the case), it does so only at a considerable risk, while leaving many exceptional cases in the dark. Obviously, additional clarificatory concepts are needed.

(b) A further regulating factor is recognized via the concept of *situation*.<sup>2</sup> This term has been used to designate a large (and, at times, confusing) variety of considerations. Indeed, it has been used to designate various *separate* considerations as well as their *co-occurrence*. Thus, Ervin (1964) observes that various

situations (settings) may be restricted with respect to the *participants* who may be present, the *physical setting*, the *topics* and *functions* of discourse and the *style* employed (my italics). Each of these aspects of “situation” may shed light on certain regularities in language choice on particular social occasions. However, the possible *co-occurrence* of so many variables must also make it exceedingly difficult to use the concept “situation,” when so characterized, for analytic purposes. Let us, therefore, limit our use of this term to considerations of “style” alone, and attempt to cope with the other itemized features in other ways and in their own right. Situational styles, following Joos (1962), Labov (1963), Gumperz and Naim (1960) and others, pertain to considerations of intimacy–distance, formality–informality, solidarity–non-solidarity, status (or power) equality–inequality, etc. Thus, certain styles within every language (and, in multilingual settings, certain languages in contrast to others) are considered by particular interlocutors to be indicators of greater intimacy, informality, equality, etc. Not only do multilinguals frequently consider one of their languages more dialectal, more regional, more sub-standard, more vernacular-like, more argot-like than the others, but, in addition, they more frequently associate one of their languages with informality, equality, solidarity than the other. As a result, one is more likely to be reserved for certain situations than the other. Our hypothetical government functionary is most likely to give and get Flemish at the office when he bumps into another functionary who hails from the very same Flemish-speaking town. The two of them grew up together and went to school together. Their respective sets of parents strike them as being similarly “kind-but-old-fashioned.” In short, they share many common experiences and points of view (or think they do, or pretend they do) and therefore they tend to speak to each other in the language which represents for them the intimacy that they share. The two do not cease being government functionaries when they speak Flemish to each other; they simply prefer to treat each other as intimates rather than as functionaries. However, the careful observer will also note that the two do not speak Flemish to each other invariably. When they speak about work affairs, or the worlds of art and literature, not to mention the world of government, they tend to switch into French (or to reveal far greater interference in their Flemish), even though (for the sake of our didactic argument) the mood of intimacy and familiarity remains clearly evident throughout. Thus, neither reference group membership nor situational style, alone or in concert, fully explain(s) the variations that can be noted in habitual language choice in multilingual settings. It must also be observed that situational styles, however carefully delineated, may still not provide us with much substantive or procedural insight into the socio-cultural organization of any particular multilingual setting.

(c) The fact that two individuals who obviously prefer to speak to each other in X nevertheless switch to Y (or vacillate more noticeably between X and Y) when discussing certain topics leads us to consider topic per se as a regulator of language

use in multilingual settings. It is obviously possible to talk about the national economy (topic) in a thoroughly informal way (situational style) while relating oneself to one's family (reference group). Under such circumstances – even when reference group and situation agree in requiring a particular language – it is not uncommon to find that topic succeeds in bringing another language to the fore.<sup>3</sup>

The implication of topical regulation of language choice is that certain topics are somehow handled better in one language than in another in particular multilingual contexts. This situation may be brought about by several different but mutually reinforcing factors. Thus, some multilingual speakers may “acquire the habit” of speaking about topic *x* in language X partially because that is the language in which they were *trained* to deal with this topic (e.g., they received their university training in economics in French), partially because *they (and their interlocutors) may lack the specialized terms* for a satisfying discussion of *x* in language Y, partially because *language Y itself may currently lack as exact or as many terms for handling topic x* as those currently possessed by language X, and partially because *it is considered strange* or inappropriate to discuss *x* in language Y. The very multiplicity of sources of topical regulation suggests that *topic* may not in itself be a convenient analytic variable when language choice is considered from the point of view of the social structure and the cultural norms of a multilingual setting. It tells us little about either the process or the structure of social behavior. However, topics usually exhibit patterns which follow those of the major spheres of activity in the society under consideration. We may be able to discover the latter if we enquire why a significant number of people in a particular multilingual setting at a particular time have received certain kinds of training in one language rather than in another; or *what it reveals* about a particular multilingual setting if language X is actually less capable of coping with topic *x* than is language Y. Does it not reveal more than merely a topic–language relationship at the level of face-to-face encounters? Does it not reveal that certain socio-culturally *recognized spheres of activity* are, at least temporarily, under the sway of one language (and, therefore, perhaps of one sub-population) rather than another? Thus, while topic is doubtlessly a crucial consideration in understanding language choice variance in our two hypothetical government functionaries, we must seek a means of examining and relating their individual, momentary choices to relatively stable patterns of choice that exist in their multilingual setting as a whole.

### Domains of language behavior

(a) The concept of domains of language behavior seems to have received its first partial elaboration from students of language maintenance and language shift among *Auslands-deutsche* in pre-Second World War multilingual settings.<sup>4</sup> German settlers were in contact with many different non-German speaking populations in various types of contact settings and were exposed to various kinds of socio-

cultural change processes. In attempting to chart and compare the fortunes of the German language under such varying circumstances Schmidt-Rohr (1963) seems to have been the first to suggest that *dominance configurations* (to be discussed below) needed to be established to reveal the overall status of language choice in various domains of behavior. The domains recommended by Schmidt-Rohr were the following nine: the family, the playground and street, the school (subdivided into language of instruction, subject of instruction, and language of recess and entertainment), the church, literature, the press, the military, the courts, and the governmental administration. Subsequently, other investigators either added additional domains (e.g., Mak, 1935, who nevertheless followed Schmidt-Rohr in overlooking the work-sphere as a domain), or found that fewer domains were sufficient in particular multilingual settings (e.g., Frey, 1945, who required only home, school and church in his analysis of Amish “triple talk”). However, what is more interesting is that Schmidt-Rohr's domains bear a striking similarity to those “generally termed” spheres of activity which have more recently been independently advanced by some anthropologists (Dohrenwend and Smith, 1962), sociologists (Kloss, 1929), social psychologists (Jones and Lambert, 1959) and linguists (Mackey, 1962) for the study of acculturation, intergroup relations, and bilingualism. The latter are defined, regardless of their number,<sup>5</sup> in terms of *institutional contexts* or *socio-ecological co-occurrences*. They attempt to designate the *major clusters of interaction situations that occur in particular multilingual settings*. Domains such as these help us understand that *language choice* and *topic*, appropriate though they may be for analyses of individual behavior at the level of face-to-face verbal encounters, are, as we suggested above, related to widespread socio-cultural norms and expectations. Language choices, cumulated over many individuals and many choice instances, become transformed into the processes of *language maintenance* or *language shift*. Furthermore, if many individuals (or sub-groups) tend to handle topic *x* in language X, this may well be because this topic pertains to a *domain* in which that language is “dominant” for their society or for their sub-group as a whole. Certainly it is a far different social interaction when topic *x* is discussed in language Y *although it pertains to a domain in which language X is dominant*, than when the same topic is discussed by the same interlocutors in the language most commonly employed in that domain. By recognizing the existence of domains it becomes possible to contrast the language of topics for individuals or particular sub-populations with the language of domains for larger parts, if not the whole, of the population.

(b) The appropriate designation and definition of domains of language behavior obviously calls for considerable insight into the socio-cultural dynamics of particular multilingual settings at particular periods in their history. Schmidt-Rohr's domains reflect not only multilingual settings in which a large number of spheres of activity, even those that pertain to governmental functions, are theoretically

open to both or all of the languages present, but also those multilingual settings in which such permissiveness is at least sought by a sizable number of interested parties. Quite different domains might be appropriate if one were to study habitual language use among children in these very same settings. Certainly, immigrant-host contexts, in which only the language of the host society is recognized for governmental functions, would require other and perhaps fewer domains, particularly if younger generations constantly leave the immigrant society and enter the host society. Finally, the domains of language behavior may differ from setting to setting not only in terms of number and designation but also in terms of level. Thus, in studying acculturating populations in Arizona, Barker (who studied bilingual Spanish Americans; 1947) and Barber (who studied trilingual Yaqui Indians; 1952) formulated *domains at the level of socio-psychological analysis*: intimate, informal, formal and intergroup. Interestingly enough, the domains defined in this fashion were then identified with domains at the *societal-institutional level* mentioned above. The "formal" domain, e.g., was found to coincide with religious-ceremonial activities; the "inter-group" domain consisted of economic and recreational activities as well as of interactions with governmental-legal authority, etc. The inter-relationship between domains of language behavior defined at a societal-institutional level and domains defined at a socio-psychological level (the latter being somewhat similar to situational analyses discussed earlier) may enable us to study language choice in multilingual settings in newer and more fruitful ways. We will present one approach to the study of just such inter-relationships in our discussion of the *dominance configuration*, below.

(c) The "governmental administration" domain is a social nexus which brings people together *primarily* for a certain *cluster of purposes*. Furthermore, it brings them together *primarily* for a certain set of role-relations (discussed below) and in a delimited environment. Although it is possible for them to communicate about many things, given these purposes and contexts, the topical variety is actually quite small in certain media (e.g., written communication) and in certain situations (e.g., formal communication), and is noticeably skewed in the direction of *domain purpose* in most domains. Thus, domain is 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 culture, in such a way that *individual behavior and social patterns can be distinguished from each other and yet related to each other*.<sup>6</sup> The domain is a higher order of abstraction or summarization which is arrived at from a consideration of the socio-cultural patterning which surrounds language choices. Of the many factors contributing to and subsumed under the domain concept some are more important and more accessible to careful measurement than others. One of these, topic, has already been discussed. Another, role-relations, remains to be discussed. Role-relations may be of value to us in accounting for the fact that our

two hypothetical governmental functionaries, who usually speak an informal variant of Flemish to each other at the office, except when they talk about technical, professional or sophisticated "cultural" matters, are themselves not entirely alike in this respect. One of the two tends to slip into French more frequently than the other, even when reference group, situational style, topic and several other aspects of communication are controlled. It would not be surprising to discover that his role is different, that he is the supervisor of the other for example.

## Domains and role-relations

In many studies of multilingual behavior the family domain has proved to be a very crucial one. Multilingualism often begins in the family and depends upon it for encouragement if not for protection. In other cases, multilingualism withdraws into the family domain after it has been displaced from other domains in which it was previously encountered. Little wonder then that many investigators, beginning with Braunschauen (1928), have differentiated *within* the family domain in terms of "speakers." However, two different approaches have been followed in connection with such differentiation. Braunschauen (and also Mackey, 1962) have merely specified family "members": father, mother, child, domestic, governess and tutor, etc. Gross (1951), on the other hand, has specified *dyads* within the family: grandfather to grandmother, grandmother to grandfather, grandfather to father, grandmother to father, grandfather to mother, grandmother to mother, grandfather to child, grandmother to child, father to mother, mother to father, etc. The difference between these two approaches is quite considerable. Not only does the second approach recognize that interacting members of a family (as well as the participants in most other domains of language behavior) are *hearers* as well as *speakers* (i.e., that there may be a distinction between multilingual *comprehension* and multilingual *production*), but it also recognizes that their language behavior may be more than merely a matter of individual preference or facility but also a matter of *role-relations*. In certain societies particular behaviors (including language behaviors) are *expected* (if not required) of *particular individuals vis-à-vis each other*. Whether role-relations are fully reducible to situational styles for the purpose of describing habitual language choice in particular multilingual settings is a matter for future empirical research.

The family domain is hardly unique with respect to its differentiability into role-relations. Each domain can be differentiated into role-relations that are specifically crucial or typical of it in particular societies at particular times. The religious domain (in those societies where religion can be differentiated from folkways more generally) may reveal such role relations as cleric-cleric, cleric-parishioner, parishioner-cleric, and parishioner-parishioner. Similarly, pupil-teacher, buyer-seller, employer-employee, judge-petitioner, all refer to specific role-relations in other domains. It would certainly seem desirable to describe and

analyze language use or language choice in a particular multilingual setting in terms of the crucial role-relations within the specific domains considered to be most revealing for that setting. The distinction between one-group-interlocutor and other-group-interlocutor may also be provided for in this way.<sup>7</sup>

### Domains and other sources of variance in language behavior

Our discussion thus far has probably succeeded in making at least one thing clear, namely that any simultaneous attempt to cope with *all of the theoretically possible* sources of variance in language behavior in multilingual settings is likely to be exceedingly complex. It is even more complex than indicated thus far, for we have not yet attended to the questions of what *kind of language data to recognize* in a study of multilingualism or of language maintenance and language shift. Should we follow the linguist's dominant tradition of testing for phonetic, lexical and grammatical interference (not to mention semantic interference) in the several interacting languages? Should we follow the psychologist in testing for relative speed or automaticity of translation or response? Should we follow the educator in testing for relative global proficiency? Certainly, each of these traditional approaches is legitimate and important. However, each of them has been set aside in the discussion below, in favor of the sociologist's grosser concern with *relative frequency of use*, a perspective on multilingualism which seems to be particularly appropriate for the study of language maintenance or language shift (Fishman, 1964). However, even when we limit ourselves in this fashion we can barely begin to approximate data collection and analysis in accord with all possible interactions between the many sources of variance and domains of language use mentioned thus far. Any study of multilingualism can select only an appropriate sub-cluster of variables for simultaneous study. Hopefully, all other variables can remain, temporarily, at the level of unexplained error variance until they too can be subjected to study.

For the purpose of illuminating patterns of language choice in multilingual settings, it would seem appropriate to distinguish at least between the following sources of variance:

- 1 *Media variance: writing, reading and speaking:* Degree of mother tongue maintenance or displacement may be quite different in each of these very different media.<sup>8</sup> Where literacy has been attained *prior* to interaction with an "other tongue" reading and writing use of the mother tongue may resist displacement longer than speaking usage. Where literacy is attained subsequent to (or as a result of) such interaction the reverse more frequently obtains (Fishman, 1964).
- 2 *Role<sup>9</sup> variance:* Degree of maintenance or shift may be quite different in conjunction with *inner speech* (the language of thought, of talking to one's

self, the language of dreams, in short, all of those cases in which ego is both source and target), *comprehension* (decoding, in which ego is the target), and *production* (encoding, in which ego is the source). There is some evidence from individual as well as from group data that where language shift is resisted by multilinguals, inner speech remains most resistant to interference, switching and disuse of the mother tongue. Where language shift is desired the reverse frequently obtains (Fishman, 1964).

- 3 *Situational variance:* Degree of maintenance or shift may be quite different in conjunction with *more formal, less formal* and *intimate* communication (Fishman, 1965a). Where language shift is resisted more intimate situations seem to be most resistant to interference, switching or disuse of the mother tongue. The reverse obtains where language shift is desired.
- 4 *Domain variance:* Degree of maintenance or shift may be quite different in each of several distinguishable domains of language behavior. Such differences may reflect differences between interacting populations and their socio-cultural systems with respect to autonomy, power, influence, domain centrality, etc. Domains require sub-analysis in terms of the role-relations that are crucial to them, as well as sub-analysis in terms of topical variance.

A description and analysis of the *simultaneous, cumulative effect* of all of the above-mentioned sources of variance in language choice provides a dominance configuration (Weinrich, 1953). Dominance configurations summarize data on the language choice behavior of many individuals who constitute a defined sub-population. Repeated dominance configurations for the same population, studied over time, may be used to represent the evolution of language maintenance and language shift in a particular multilingual setting. Contrasted dominance configurations may be used to study the relative impact of *various* socio-cultural processes (urbanization, secularization, revitalization, etc.) on the *same* mother tongue group in different contact settings, or the relative impact of a *single* socio-cultural process on *different* mother tongue groups in similar contact settings (Fishman, 1964).

### The dominance configuration

Table 1 is primarily intended as a summary derived from an attempt to estimate the relationships obtaining between *domains* of language behavior and the particular *sources of variance* in language behavior specified earlier. The resulting dominance configuration reveals several general characteristics of this mode of analysis:

- 1 A complete cross-tabulation of all theoretically possible sources and domains of variance in language behavior does not actually obtain. Certain co-occurrences appear to be logically impossible. Other co-occurrences, while

Table 4.1 Yiddish-English maintenance and shift in the United States: 1940-60

Sources of variance			Domains of language behavior					
Media	Role	Situational	Family	Friends	Acquaintances	Mass media	Jewish organizations	Occupations
Speaking	Inner*	Formal	X	X	X	X	X	X
		Informal	Y, E	Y, E	Y, E	E, E	Y, E	E, E
		Intimate	Y, E	Y, E	Y, E	E, E	Y, E	E, E
	Comp.	Formal	X	X	E, E	E, E	Y, E	E, E
		Informal	E, E	E, E	E, E	E, E	Y, E	E, E
		Intimate	Y, E	Y, E	X	X	X	X
	Prod.	Formal	X	X	E, E	X	Y, E	E, E
		Informal	E, E	E, E	E, E	X	Y, E	E, E
		Intimate	Y, E	Y, E	E, E	X	X	X

Reading	Comp.	Formal	Y, E	X	X	X	Y, E	X
		Informal	Y, E	X	X	X	Y, E	X
		Intimate	E, E	X	X	X	X	X
	Prod.**	Formal	Y, E	X	X	Y, E	Y, E	X
		Informal	Y, E	X	X	Y, E	Y, E	X
		Intimate	E, E	X	X	E, E	X	X
Writing	Prod.	Formal	X	X	X	X	Y, E	X
		Informal	E, E	E, E	X	X	Y, E	X
		Intimate	E, E	E, E	X	X	X	X

Notes: Comparisons for immigrant generation "secularists" arriving prior to the First World War (first language shown is most frequently used; second language shown is increasing in use; X indicates no data for this particular population or not applicable).

\* For "speaking-inner" combinations the domains imply topics as well as contexts. In all other instances they imply contexts alone.

\*\* For "reading-production" combinations the distinction between "family" and "mass media" domains is also a distinction between reading to others and reading to oneself.

Source: Fishman, 1965a

- logically possible, are either necessarily rare or so rare for the particular population under study that it may not be necessary to provide for them in the dominance configuration.
- 2 Each cell in the dominance configuration summarizes detailed process data pertaining to the particular role-relations most pertinent to it and the topical range encountered.
  - 3 The domains of language behavior that figure in a particular dominance configuration are selected for their demonstrated utility (or for their theoretical promise) in analyzing language choice in a particular multilingual setting at a particular time.
  - 4 An exhaustive analysis of the data of dominance configurations may well require sophisticated pattern analyses or other mathematical techniques which do not necessarily assume equal weight and simple additivity for each entry in each cell.<sup>10</sup>
  - 5 The integrative summary-nature of the dominance configuration should enable investigators to avoid the reporting of atomized findings although the configuration as such must be based upon refined details. In addition, the dominance configuration does not preclude the combining of domains or other sources of variance in language choice whenever simpler patterns are recognizable (e.g., public vs. private spheres or formal vs. informal encounters). In general, the dominance configuration may best be limited to those aspects of *degree of bilingualism* and *location of bilingualism* which empirical analysis will ultimately reveal to be of greatest *independent importance*.
  - 6 A much more refined presentation of language maintenance or language shift becomes possible than that which is provided by means of traditional mother tongue census statistics (Fishman, 1965c).

Although the dominance configuration still requires much further refinement, it seems to merit the time and effort that such refinement might necessitate.

### Some empirical and conceptual contributions of domain analysis

The domain concept has facilitated a number of worthwhile contributions to the understanding of bilingualism and language choice. It has helped organize and clarify the previously unstructured awareness that language maintenance and language shift proceed quite unevenly across the several sources and domains of variance in habitual language choice. Certain domains appear to be more resistant to displacement than others (e.g., the family domain in comparison to the occupational domain) across all multilingual settings characterized by urbanization and economic development, regardless of whether between-group or within-group

comparisons are involved (Fishman, 1964). Under the impact of these same socio-cultural processes other domains (e.g., religion) seem to be very strongly maintenance oriented during earlier stages of interaction and strongly shift oriented once a decision is reached that their organizational base can be better secured via shift (Fishman, 1965c). The simultaneous, concomitant effect of certain domains and other sources of variance seems to be protective of recessive languages, even when language shift has advanced so far that a given domain as such has been engulfed.<sup>11</sup> On the other hand if a strict domain separation becomes institutionalized, such that each language is associated with a number of important but distinct domains, bilingualism can become both universal and stabilized even though an entire population consists of bilinguals interacting with other bilinguals (Rubin, 1963). The domain concept has also helped refine the distinction between coordinate bilingualism and compound bilingualism (Ervin and Osgood, 1954) by stressing that not only does a continuum (rather than a dichotomy) obtain, but by indicating how one stage along this continuum may shade into another. Thus, as indicated by Figure 4.1, most late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century immigrants to America from eastern and southern Europe began as compound bilinguals with each language assigned to separate and minimally overlapping domains. With the passage of time (involving increased interaction with English-speaking Americans, social mobility, and acculturation with respect to other-than-language behaviors as well) their bilingualism became characterized, first, by far greater domain overlap (and by far greater interference) and then by progressively greater coordinate functioning. Finally, language displacement advanced so far that the mother tongue remained only in a few restricted and non-overlapping domains. Indeed, in some cases, compound bilingualism once more became the rule, except that the ethnic mother tongue came to be utilized via English (rather than vice-versa as was the case in the early immigrant days). Thus, the domain concept may help place the compound-coordinate distinction in greater socio-cultural perspective, in much the same way as it may serve the entire area of language choice. More generally, we are helped to realize that the initial pattern of acquisition of bilingualism and subsequent patterns of bilingual functioning need not be in agreement (Figure 4.2). Indeed, a bilingual may vary with respect to the compound vs. coordinate nature of his functioning in each of the sources and domains of variance in language choice that we have discussed. If this is the case then several different models of interference may be needed to correspond to various stages of bilingualism and to various co-occurrences of influence on language choice.

Bilingual functioning type	Domain overlap type	
	Overlapping domains	Non-overlapping domains
Compound (interdependent or fused)	2. <i>Second Stage</i> : More immigrants know more English and therefore can speak to each other either in mother tongue or in English (still mediated by the mother tongue) in several domains of behavior. Increased interference.	1. <i>Initial Stage</i> : The immigrant learns English via his mother tongue. English is used only in those few domains (work sphere, governmental sphere) in which mother tongue cannot be used. Minimal interference. Only a few immigrants knew a little English.
Coordinate (independent or discrete)	3. <i>Third Stage</i> : The languages function independently of each other. The number of bilinguals is at its maximum. Domain overlap is at its maximum. The second generation during childhood. Stabilized interference.	4. <i>Final Stage</i> : English has displaced the mother tongue from all but the most private or restricted domains. Interference declines. In most cases both languages function independently; in others the mother tongue is mediated by English (reversal of Stage 1, but same type).

Figure 4.1 Type of bilingual functioning and domain overlap during successive stages of immigrant acculturation

### Some remaining problems and challenges for domain analysis

Nevertheless, as is the case with most new integrative concepts, the major problems and the major promises of domain analysis still lie ahead. There are several methodological problems of data collection and data analysis, which cannot be enumerated here, but which do not seem to be in any way unprecedented. The substantive challenges pertaining to domain analysis are more varied, for they will depend on the interests of particular investigators. Domain analysis and the dominance configuration merely seek to provide a systematic approach to descriptive

Bilingual acquisition type	Domain overlap type	
	Overlapping domains	Non-overlapping domains
Compound (interdependent or fused)	Transitional bilingualism: the older second generation. The "high school French" tourist who remains abroad somewhat longer than he expected.	"Cultural bilingualism": the bilingualism of the "indirect method" classroom, whereby one language is learned through another but retained in separate domains.
Coordinate (independent or discrete)	Widespread bilingualism without social cleavage: the purported goal of "responsible" French-Canadians. The "direct method" classroom.	"One-sided bilingualism" or bilingualism with marked and stable social distinctions, such that only one group in a contact situation is bilingual or such that only particular domains are open or appropriate to particular languages.

Figure 4.2 Initial type of bilingual acquisition and subsequent domain overlap type

Source: Fishman, 1964

parameters. Some will wish to utilize these parameters in connection with *other formal features of communication than code-variety*. Thus, the study of "sociolinguistic variants" (i.e., of those linguistic alternations regarded as "free" or "optional" variants *within* a code) may gain somewhat from the greater socio-cultural context provided by domain analysis. Other investigators may seek to establish cross-cultural and diachronic language and culture files in order to investigate the relationship between changes in language behavior (including changes in language choice) and other processes of socio-cultural change. In this connection, domain analysis may facilitate language use comparisons between settings (or between historical periods) of roughly similar domain structure. Still other investigators, more centrally concerned with multilingualism and with language maintenance or language shift, may well become interested in refining the typologies and stages that are currently on record: e.g., Vildomec's (1963) "local" vs. "cultural" multilingualism,<sup>12</sup> Kloss's (1929) much earlier five-fold classification of patterns of



stabilized multilingualism, Carman's (1962) recent ten-stage analysis of language shift among immigrants settling in Kansas, and many others. Domain analysis (within the context of a dominance configuration) may enable us to see unexpected relationships *between* these several formulations and to improve upon them both on theoretical and empirical grounds.

## Conclusions

The concept of "domains of language choice" represents an attempt to provide socio-cultural organization and socio-cultural context for considerations of variance in language choice in multilingual settings. When systematically interrelated with other sources of variance in language behavior (media variance, role variance, situational variance) and when based upon underlying analyses of the role-relations and topics most crucial to them, domains of language behavior may contribute importantly to the establishment of dominance configuration summaries. Domain analysis may be a promising conceptual and methodological tool for future studies of language behavior in multilingual settings and for socio-linguistic studies more generally. Ultimately, a relatively uniform but flexible analytic scheme such as that described here may enable us to arrive at valid generalizations concerning (1) the kinds of multilingual settings in which one or another configuration of variance in language choice obtains and (2) the language maintenance or language shift consequences of particular configurations of dominance or variance.

## Notes

- 1 This example may be replaced by any one of a number of others: Standard German, Schwytzertüsch and Romansch (in parts of Switzerland); Hebrew, English and Yiddish in Israel; Riksmal, Landsmaal and more local dialectal variants of the latter in Norway; Standard German, Plattdeutsch and Danish in Schleswig, etc.
- 2 *Situation* and *setting* are frequently used interchangeably in the socio-linguistic literature. In this paper *setting* is intended to be the broader and more multifaceted concept. (Thus, a complete consideration of "the multilingual setting" requires attention to language choice data, socio-cultural process data, historical perspective on the particular intergroup context, data on attitudinal, emotional, cognitive and overt behaviors toward language (Fishman, 1964), etc.) *Situation* is reserved for use in characterizing certain circumstances of communication at the time of communication.
- 3 This effect has been noted even in normally monolingual settings, such as those obtaining among American intellectuals, many of whom feel obliged to use French or German words in conjunction with particular professional topics. The frequency of lexical interference in the language of immigrants in the United States has also

often been explained on topical grounds. The importance of topical determinants is discussed by Haugen, 1953; 1956; Weinreich, 1953; Gumperz, 1962; and Ervin, 1964. It is implied as a "pressure" exerted upon "contacts" in Mackey's (1962) description of bilingualism.

- 4 The study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with the relationship between change or stability in habitual language use, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social or cultural processes of change and stability, on the other hand, in multilingual settings (Fishman, 1964).
- 5 We can safely reject the implication encountered in certain discussions of domains that there must be an invariant set of domains applicable to all multilingual settings. If language behavior is related to socio-cultural organization, as is now widely accepted, then different kinds of multilingual settings should benefit from analyses in terms of different domains of language use, whether defined intuitively, theoretically, or empirically.
- 6 For a discussion of the differences and similarities between "functions of language behavior" and "domains of language behavior" see Fishman, 1964. "Functions" stand closer to socio-psychological analysis, for they abstract their constituents in terms of individual motivation rather than in terms of group purpose.
- 7 These remarks are not intended to imply that *all* role-relation differences are necessarily related to language-choice differences. This almost certainly is *not* the case. Just which role-relation differences *are* related to language-choice differences (and under what circumstances) is a matter for empirical determination within each multilingual setting as well as at different points in time within the same setting.
- 8 Writing and reading are differentiated as separate media not only because they may be pursued in different languages but because each is capable of independent productive and receptive use. In general, the formal dimensions presented here make use of more distinctions than may be necessary in all multilingual settings. Both empirical and theoretical considerations must ultimately be involved in selecting the dimensions appropriate for the analysis of particular settings.
- 9 Unfortunately, the term *role* is currently employed in several somewhat different ways, e.g., "role in society" (*mayor, untouchable, bank president*), "role relation" vis-à-vis particular others (*husband-wife, father-child, teacher-pupil*), "occasional role" (*chairman, host, spokesman*), and "momentary role" (*initiator of a communication, respondent, listener*). It is in this last sense that the term "role" will be used in connection with "role variance" above, while it is in the sense of "role-relation" that the term "role" has been used previously in our discussion of differentiations within the domains of language behavior.
- 10 Disregarding this stricture an inspection of Table 4.1 reveals:
  - 1 there is no cell in which the use of Yiddish is currently increasing in the studied population;
  - 2 reading is the most retentive area of media variance;
  - 3 inner speech is the most retentive area of role variance;
  - 4 formal usage is the most retentive area of situational variance;

- 5 the organizational context is the most retentive area of domain variance whereas the occupational context is the least retentive.
- All in all, this dominance configuration leaves one with the impression of greatest retention of Yiddish in those circumstances that are either most private and subject to personal control or most structured and generationally restricted (Fishman, 1965a).
- 11 Note, for example, the mass media interaction with either reading-production-formality or with reading-production-informality in Table 4.1.
- 12 This seems to be the latest in a long tradition of attempts to reduce multilingualism to a dichotomy. For many earlier attempts along such lines see Weinreich, 1953: 9–10, 35, 81–2; Fishman, 1964.

Source: Fishman, J. A. (1965) Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique* 2:67–88, by permission of the author.

## Notes for students and instructors

### Study questions

- 1 Give two examples from the language contact situations that you know of which may be described in terms of Fishman's model of the four relationships between diglossia and bilingualism.
- 2 Central to the concept of domain is the notion of congruence on two levels: (a) congruence among domain components (e.g. participant, topic and setting); (b) congruence of domain with specific language or language variety. Give an example from the community you are familiar with and demonstrate how language choice varies across domains.

### Study activities

- 1 Carry out a 'domain analysis' of the language choice patterns of a bilingual family or a small group of bilingual speakers, using a questionnaire or through interview. Summarise your findings in a table or graphical formats.
- 2 Find a three-generation family from an ethnic minority background (if you live in a multilingual area, find a three-generation multilingual family) and ask one person from each generation about his/her language preference and language use in key domains. Ask them to list ten of their most important and regular contacts who are not members of the family, including the age, sex, occupation and language background of each of the contacts. Can you see any relationship between the three speakers' language preference and language choice patterns and the social characteristics of their key contacts?

### Further reading

General introductions to the study of bilingual language choice can be found in Chapter 4 of R. Wardhaugh, 1998, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (3rd edn), Blackwell, and Chapter 7 of R. Fasold, 1984, *The Sociolinguistics of Society*, Blackwell.

On the notion of 'diglossia', see R.A. Hudson, 1992, Diglossia: A bibliographic review, *Language in Society*, 21: 611–74, and M. Fernandez, 1994, *Diglossia: A comprehensive bibliography 1960–1990 and supplements*, John Benjamins.

For Fishman's contributions, see *Language in Sociocultural Change: Essays by J.A. Fishman*, selected by A.S. Dil, 1972, Stanford University Press; *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity*, 1985, Mouton; and *Reversing Language Shift*, 1991, Multilingual Matters.

For classic examples of earlier studies of bilingualism and language contact, see *Languages in Contact: Findings and problems*, 1953, U. Weinreich, Linguistic Circle of New York, and *The Norwegian Language in America*, 1953, by E. Haugen, Pennsylvania University Press.

Examples of community-based studies of language choice include: S. Gal, 1979, *Language Shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*, Academic Press; N. Dorian, 1981, *Language Death, The life cycle of a Scottish Gaelic dialect*, Pennsylvania University Press; V. Edwards, 1986, *Language in a Black Community*, Multilingual Matters; and Li Wei, 1994, *Three Generations Two Languages One Family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*, Multilingual Matters.

For an anthropological perspective on language choice, see J.H. Hill and K.C. Hill, 1986, *Speaking Mexicano: Dynamics of syncretic language in Central Mexico*, University of Arizona Press, and D. Kulick, 1992, *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialisation, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinean village*, Cambridge University Press.

On language choice as a political strategy, see K.A. Woolard, 1989, *Double Talk: Bilingualism and the politics of ethnicity in Catalonia*, Stanford University Press; M. Heller, 1994, *Crosswords: Language, education and ethnicity in French Ontario*, Mouton; and M. Heller, 1999, *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*, Longman.

## Bilingual interaction