1 What is Multilingualism?

The term “multilingualism” can refer to either the language use or the competence of an individual or to the language situation in an entire nation or society. However, at the individual level it is generally subsumed under “bilingualism.” This may be because, while there are probably more bilinguals in the world than monolinguals, there are not perceived to be so many people who use more than two languages habitually. There are, of course, many rich multilingual situations in the world (see, e.g., Khubchandani, 1988, on India and Søndergaard, 1991, on the Dano–German border, to cite only two researched areas). For individuals, “normative” definitions (Van Overbeke, 1972) requiring those termed bi– or multilinguals to have equal competence in the languages, to have acquired them simultaneously, or to use them in the same contexts have proved unrealistic (cf. Haugen, 1973). Thus definitions now tend to be general (“methodological” in Van Overbeke’s sense). A common definition of “multilingualism” would then be “the use of more than one language” or “competence in more than one language.” This allows for further refinement in the actual description to cover different levels of command or use of the various languages.

At the societal or national level, we have to distinguish between “official” and “de facto” multilingualism. For instance, Switzerland is an officially multilingual nation in that it has been declared such, but there, multilingualism is based on a territorial principle. While public documents for the entire nation are in French, German, and Italian, most people grow up monolingually in a canton which typically has one official language. Canada is officially a bilingual nation because English and French are enshrined in the Canadian Constitution as the official languages, but most Canadians still have regular (nonschool) contact with only one of these. Moreover, there are many other languages used in Canada today—over a hundred heritage languages brought to Canada by immigrant groups, some of them maintained for several generations and concentrated in particular areas, as well as the indigenous languages of the Indians and the Inuit (Eskimos). So Canada, while officially a bilingual nation, is a de facto multilingual one.

Societal multilingualism is created by contextual factors such as international migration (as in Argentina or the US), colonialism (e.g., in Wales or Kenya), international borders (e.g., the border between Austria and Slovenia), Sprachinseln (ethnolinguistic enclaves, e.g., Hungarian enclaves in Slovakia, Sorbian ones in Germany), and the spread of international languages.

In multilingual societies, in which the same languages are generally used by the same people, the various languages have differing functions. This situation is known, depending on the number of languages involved, as diglossia, triglossia, or polyglossia (see chapter 12). Almost the entire population of Paraguay employs Guarani as the vernacular (L language) and Spanish as the language of the more formal or official domains (H language). The Luxem–bourgers have Letzebuergesch as their first language and the language of everyday interaction but they employ French and German
more or less in complementary distributions as H languages with language functions, domains (contextualized spheres of communication, see section 5) and social class determining the choice. However, since 1984, Letzebuergesch has shared official status with French and German. It is therefore possible to use it in similar situations (Newton et al., forthcoming; Clyne, forthcoming). In Singapore, Standard English, Mandarin, Standard Malay, and Tamil are used as H languages in official domains, nonstandard English as the M(edium) language, and Hokkien, Cantonese, nonstandard Malay, or an Indian language other than Tamil as an L language for everyday purposes (Platt and Weber, 1980: 12).

The choice of language among multilinguals is determined according to social variables which will be discussed below (section 5). These social variables are also instrumental in code-switching between languages within the same stretch of discourse. Multilingualism, especially in more open settlement, has been characterized by dynamics which have been the focus of much research (see section 5).

2 Research Paradigms

As will be gathered from the above, the study of multilingualism embraces the study of the language systems in contact, the functions of the languages in society, the groups or communities in contact, and the speech of individuals using more than one language. These facets should not be seen in isolation from one another. They are part of a puzzle which can be disentangled only by seeing them as part of a whole. Thus the research methods for studies of multilingualism will be drawn from a range of disciplines and subdisciplines, including structural linguistics, sociolinguistics, sociology, psycholinguistics, social psychology, and demography. Accordingly, a number of distinct paradigms have been introduced into this field (cf. Clyne, 1991a: 159–60).

The language contact paradigm has focused on “language as a system” and has been extended to take account of sociolinguistic and psycholinguistic factors, embracing the processes of language contact and interactional patterns (e.g., Weinreich, 1953; Haugen, 1956; Gumperz, 1976; Giles et al., 1977; Neustupný, 1985).

The language shift paradigm is concerned with language use, the domains of use, and explanations of shifts from the use of one language to that of the other in certain situations or in general (e.g., Fishman, 1966, 1985, 1991; Veltman, 1983).

The language death paradigm overlaps with that of language shift but the object of the study is usually languages which are not represented elsewhere (e.g., Breton, American Indian, or Australian Aboriginal languages). Unlike language shift studies, language death research generally includes a consideration of the changing grammars of languages in the last stage of existence (e.g., Dorian, 1977, 1981; Dressler and Wodak-Leodolter, 1977).

The language attrition paradigm is concerned with measuring the loss of language skills in the individual’s first language. This is frequently studied, however, by finding out about limitations in the retention of these languages (see, e.g., Weltens et al., 1986). As language attrition studies rarely have the benefit of longitudinal data, they have to rely on surrogate methods, such as comparing parents’ and children’s speech or immigrants’ speech with that of people who remained in their native environment. Retention might be a more appropriate way than attrition of conceptualizing the problem. Among the issues challenging researchers are studies in all areas centering on the effects of using more than two languages, as well as on the activation of languages employed receptively and the reactivation of languages no longer used by the individual or the respective community.

3 Social Consequences of Multilingualism

Apart from particular national or regional tendencies, there is a constant tension between the forces of monolingualism and of multilingualism. This may be observed in the history of the US and Australia, both of which gradually replaced policies accepting multilingualism which were in existence for much of the nineteenth century, first by tolerant but restrictive ones (in the late nineteenth century) and then by ones rejecting multilingualism or any kind of cultural pluralism by the time of World War I. A shift to more accepting policies started in the 1960s in the US and in the early 1970s in Australia (see, e.g., Kloss, 1977; Fishman, 1985; Clyne, 1991a: chapter 1). Globally, there are
corresponding waves of more positive and more negative policies towards multilingualism, with the period immediately before World War I and between the wars essentially negative, reflecting xenophobia and monoculturalism, and the 1960s and 1970s positive, reflecting a quest for social equity, human rights, and a change from inhibiting structures. The tension between mono- and multilingualism may be observed in Europe today, where massification within the development of European integration is being counterbalanced by national revivals, especially in Eastern and Central European countries which have regained their political autonomy in recent years, and regional resurgence in Western Europe, e.g., in Italy and Germany. However, the inevitable economic and political interdependence may promote multilingualism and cultural autonomy at the regional as well as the wider international level. Population flow all over the world is another important factor promoting multilingualism. Attitudes towards immigrant languages, for instance, are determined to a large extent by immigration policy or an absence thereof. Western European countries who believe that the immigrants and their children are foreign “guest workers” and deny that theirs is a multicultural society will marginalize their “minority languages.” They might make provision for “foreign” children, most of whom will have been born there, to learn their parents’ language, but that language would not be offered to “majority” children. The Charter on Regional and Minority Languages, passed by the European Parliament in 1993, gives minorities rights to the use of their language in education, the media, public administration, care of the aged, and cross-border communication. However, this does not apply to immigrants.

4 Language Planning and Multilingualism

Language policies (see chapter 27) and/or community attitudes may enforce, support, accept, tolerate, or reject multilingualism or give special status to one or more than one language. Where language policies have been formulated to promote multilingualism, the motivation may be:

Social – in the interests of equity for all groups;

Cultural – to facilitate cultural maintenance;

Political – to ensure the participation of all groups and/or gain their electoral support;

Economic – to be able to harness language assets to the advantage of the country’s balance of payments.

A few examples may be drawn from Namibia, Singapore, Australia, Canada, and Switzerland.

The language policy of the new Namibia gives official status to English only, although English is the native language of not more than 3 percent of the population and only 53 percent of the population have any competence in it. The adoption of English as the sole official language is due to the identification of the other two prior official languages, Afrikaans and German, with colonialism and/or oppression, and it was considered that there were too many African ethnic languages spoken for one of them to become an official language (Pütz, 1992). In contrast, Singapore has four official languages. Three of the languages - Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil - may be seen to represent the three major ethnic groups, the Chinese, Malays, and Indians. The other official language is English, the language of interethnic and international communication. Clearly the choice is on the basis of status. The majority of Singapore Chinese use a variety other than Mandarin at home while a significant number of Singapore Indians are not native speakers of Tamil. By choosing English as an official language, Singapore has a vehicle of trade communication with the rest of the world. Mandarin opens doors to both Taiwan and the People’s Republic of China. These language resources are also being developed by neighboring Malaysia, for example. The former Soviet Union had Russian as its overall official language but with each republic also being allowed a second official language for its own purposes (Lewis, 1972: 209). The disappearance of the overarching “imperial” language as an official language from the republics other than the Russian Federation, while giving full status to the language of the majority group, has diminished the position of many ethnic minorities (including the formerly privileged Russian minorities) in the newly independent republics.

Australia, while not declaring an official language, uses English as its national (i.e., de facto official) language. Both the National Policy on Languages (Lo Bianco, 1987) and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (Dawkins, 1991) have followed the guiding principles:
Competence in English for all;

Maintenance and development of languages other than English;

Provision of services in languages other than English;

Opportunities to acquire second languages.

Most of the efforts have concentrated on education, with primary and secondary schools teaching children from all backgrounds a range of languages, including some of those of the immigrant groups, and about 38 languages examined in the end-of-secondary school examination. In addition, many public notices are published in a variety of languages of – especially – newly arrived immigrant groups, there are government and publically subsidized radio stations broadcasting in a total of over 60 languages, a state–run television service transmits films in community languages with English subtitles, local public libraries hold books, magazines, cassettes, and videos in the languages of the local community, and there is a telephone interpreter service available in about 90 languages (Clyne, 1991a). While the 1987 Lo Bianco Report was motivated by a combination of social, cultural and economic factors, more recent policies represented a change of emphasis to an economic rationale (Clyne, 1991b).

The declaration of an “official language,” sometimes under the guise of “protecting a threatened” majority language or guaranteeing continuity of national cohesion, neither of which is usually under threat, will usually have the effect of undermining other languages. This is apparently behind the movement (Marshall, 1985) to make English the official language of the US. Such a declaration has already been promulgated with respect to over a quarter of the states of the US. The scapegoat is the largest minority language of the US, Spanish, and the casualties are bilingual ballots and many bilingual education programs.

In Canada, “official bilingualism” is intended to protect the “balance” between English and French, which had been tipped in the direction of English for most of Canada's history, for economic and political reasons. Following the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Royal Commission, 1965–70) and the declaration of the Official Languages Act (1969), while Canada had become increasingly bilingual as a whole, Quebec had become increasingly monolingual. In 1974 French was declared the sole official language of Quebec, though still conforming to constitutional prescriptions regarding parliamentary, legislative, and judiciary bilingualism (Fortier, 1994). Bill 101, the Charter of the French Language (1977), made French the language of work, business, and everyday life in Quebec, except for the education of children whose parents had received English-medium schooling in Canada, The revised Official Languages Act of 1988 represented an adaptation to the consequences of the Charter of the French Language. While Canada has declared itself a “multicultural” country, it is in fact also a multilingual one like Australia. There is the anomaly that, in the provinces of Alberta, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan, there are far fewer speakers of French than of a number of languages other than English which do not have any official status. Despite the sizable group of Franco-Ontarians, the same state of affairs exists in Toronto. The English component of the “imagined bilingual nation” of Canada is therefore giving a large proportion of its resources to French, especially in education (immersion and core programs) while disregarding some of its other assets. (However, facilities are being made available for the teaching of “heritage languages” after school hours.)

One can differentiate between symmetrical multilingualism, where all the languages have equal status, and asymmetrical multilingualism, where one at least of the languages has more status than the others.

In Switzerland, each of the national languages – French, German, and Italian – is equal despite substantial differences in the number of users – 73.5 percent of Swiss citizens have German as their first language, 20.1 percent have French, 4.5 per cent Italian, and 0.9 percent the regional official language, Rhoeto-Romansh (Albrecht and Mathis, 1990). The languages are distributed on a territorial principle, i.e., almost all cantons are German–language or French–language or Italian–language cantons rather than, say, bilingual. The same equality of status does not apply to Singapore. Malay is the national language but its special functions are limited to the national anthem and the national motto. Mandarin has been propagated in the majority Chinese community, and Tamil is the official
language undergoing the greatest language shift, but in most respects the four languages – English, Mandarin, Malay, and Tamil – are officially equal. In fact, the originally "exotic" language, English, which is both the lingua franca between the ethnic groups and the medium of the link with most of the rest of the world, is often employed on its own (cf., e.g., Gupta, 1994). One is hard pressed to find a single notice in any other language at Changi International Airport in Singapore. In Australia and the US, it is clear that English is the dominant language, regardless of what other languages may at times be used in addition for particular purposes. Within the European Union, all official or national languages of member nations are equal, but the French version (and to a lesser extent, the English) is used as the basis of translations of documents into the other languages, which are not made available till later (Volz, 1993).

In his book, *Imagined Communities*, Anderson (1983) demonstrates the role of print languages (standard languages) when hitherto nonexistent nations were “invented.” Print languages became the basis for national consciousness, especially in nineteenth–twentieth century Europe. The nineteenth–twentieth century German philosophers Herder and Humboldt saw language as the basis of a nation and a culture. Humboldt developed the twin theories of linguistic determinism and linguistic relativism (language plays a significant role in determining culture, and each language has a different way of “looking at the world”). Most of the nation–states of the nineteenth century were based on an entity comprising people of a single language background. (Belgium, with its French– and Dutch–speaking groups, was a notable exception.) There then existed side by side nations such as France, Germany, and Italy, which were conceived this way, and Austria–Hungary (and Russia) which were multilingual and multicultural entities. Since that time, there has been a myth that “national cohesion” is possible only through a single common language (see, e.g., Kedourie, 1961; Isajiw, 1980). This view is widespread in both Western and Eastern Europe, but it is challenged, for instance, by the Australian policy of unity within diversity. Of course English provides the communicative link, but Australia's multiculturalism has become part of its national identity and so multilingualism (English plus at least one other language) is contributing to national cohesion.

5 Functional Specialization of Languages in Multilinguals and in a Multilingual Society

Multilinguals are people who either belong to more than one language group or function within more than one language group. Fishman (1977) has made the point that the use of two or more languages in the long term depends on the need for these two languages (see also Bratt Paulston, 1994). The most clearcut examples are whole societies observing a functional distribution between two languages or distinct language varieties ("diglossia" whether in the sense of Ferguson, 1959, or of Fishman, 1967).

Multilinguals' choice of languages is determined according to:

**Interlocutor** Different people will be identified as, say, X, Y, or Z speakers. Such an identification will be made even by many who are themselves multilingual. Such people will be addressed in the appropriate language (Sankoff, 1971). Interlocutors who are monolingual will usually cause a code-switch even if they are passive participants in a conversation. The age of an interlocutor may influence the choice of the language. In both immigrant countries such as the US and Australia, and in stable bilingual situations such as parts of Burgenland (Gal, 1979), the minority language is frequently associated with the older generation and the majority language with the younger generation.

The interlocutor is the basis of one method of bringing up children bi– or multilingually, where both parents or different relatives consistently use their language to the child. It is difficult to break the nexus between interlocutor and language once a relationship has been established.

**Role relationship** Where the same interlocutors have multiple relationships (e.g., a family friend in a Hispanic context and a public–school teacher in an Anglo–American context), the language choice may be governed by the role relationship (Clyne, 1991a).

**Domain** The contextualized sphere of communication, e.g., home, work, school, religion, transactional, leisure or friendship, community group (Cooper, 1967). The home domain is often the last that survives in a minority language, but sometimes it is religion and/or a community group. Where there are several languages, their use may also be domain-bound, e.g., among some Mauritian...
immigrants in Australia, Mauritian Creole (the French Creole of Mauritius) for home, Standard French for religion, English for the work and transactional domains.

A limitation of the use of a language to one domain can mean an impoverishment of the language; not using it in the home domain detracts from its liveliness and endangers its transmission into future generations, while using it solely in the home domain limits its ultimate usefulness, since speakers will be unable to cope with the interpenetration of domains such as talking about work or school at home.

**Topic** This overlaps slightly with the domain. Different types of experience associated with the two languages (e.g., in the homeland and the country of migration, or in the spheres associated with each language) will cause some people to switch languages to talk about their jobs, their present leisure activities, school, new technological developments, or particular forms of sport, to give a few examples (Haugen, 1953).

**Venue** Certain buildings or other venues (e.g., street, garden, home) are identified with a more public or a more private domain and therefore generate code-switching to the other language.

**Channel of communication** Some people who use one language for face-to-face communication will employ another for telephone communication. Some will speak one language to each other but write another (Clyne, 1991a).

**Type of interaction** Formal business communication tends to be in the language of the public domain (except in some cases when it is restricted to an ethnic group) while more informal interaction, including the telling of jokes and anecdotes, takes place in the language of the private domain (Clyne, 1991a).

**Phatic function** The use of a particular language can signal an attempt to create a specific effect, e.g., dramatic (Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez, 1975; Appel and Muysken, 1987:119; Heller, 1988).

The most important use of a “minority language” is boundary marking. The speakers of this language who may be perceived as an out-group by the dominant group are able, through their bilingualism, to exclude the latter. They become the in-group (Schermeserhorn, 1970). The first generation of an immigrant group, for instance, may require their first language to communicate (especially with their families and friends) because of their limited competence in the national language. The second generation usually does not have this need. Where they use the “minority language” for anything but a language of communication with the older generation – especially if they employ it with their children – it is for reasons of symbolic identification or else because they are convinced by the value of bi- or multilingualism.

### 6 Language Maintenance or Shift

A number of attempts have been made to develop explanatory and predictive models relating to the dynamics of language maintenance (keeping up the use of a specific language entirely or in one or more domains) and language shift (shifting partly or wholly to the use of another language) (see chapter 20). Kloss (1966) argues that there are social variables, such as ethnolinguistic enclaves and religious insulsion, that clearly promote language maintenance and others which, depending on their combination, may lead to either language maintenance or shift, e.g., the number of speakers and their educational attainment. Kloss suggests that a large community of speakers can afford more language maintenance institutions (e.g., ethnic schools, newspapers) but can also be “lost” easily in the mass of minority speakers. People with a high educational attainment can learn the majority language more easily and do not need the first language so much for communicative purposes but, because they do not have to devote so much time to acquiring the dominant language and culture, they have more opportunity to maintain the first language. Nevertheless, the relative size of a community of speakers (e.g., Spanish speakers in America, to cite one example) does appear to correlate significantly with language maintenance. The status and economic value of the language, also tends to support language maintenance, while exogamy is usually a clear-cut factor promoting language shift.

A more controversial variable is the position of language as a core cultural value, which is the basis of
a powerful explanatory model (Smolicz, 1980). Smolicz's argument is that each group has specific cultural values that are basic to their continued existence as a group, and language is such a value to some groups but not to others. Language attitudes do not always lead to language maintenance (cf. Fishman, 1985). There is evidence that the most successful language maintenance occurs in groups for whom language is intertwined as a core value with other core values, such as religion and historical consciousness or family cohesion, rather than those for whom language stands in isolation as an identity maker. This might explain the success of Greek but also why Hassidic Jews, who have no ideological commitment to Yiddish, maintain it much better in the US than do Yiddishist ideologues, because the former have specific domains in which they have to use it, owing to religious considerations (cf. Fishman, 1991:195). While the Dutch practice multilingualism in the interests of communication, they attach relatively little importance to the Dutch language as a distinctive symbol of ethnicity; nor do they see the maintenance of other languages as an important issue for their own linguistic minorities (Extra and Verhoeven, 1993: 23). In addition, Dutch people are inclined to lose their language due to identity change in a predominantly Anglo–Celtic society such as the US, English–speaking Canada, or Australia. Some problems with the "core value" theory include defining the "group," for different sections of a large community may have different relationships to their language for political, social, or religious reasons, which sometimes motivate migration. Also, the same languages are maintained at different rates even in contact with similar languages and/or cultures. This applies, for instance, to Finnish and (American) English in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway (Boyd et al., 1992). The position of language within the cultural value system may alter in a dynamic situation between groups.

Another relevant model, that of Giles and others (1977), is intended to explain the role of language in intergroup relations. Their notion of ethnolinguistic vitality is based on the components: economic status, self-perceived social status, sociohistorical factors (e.g., experience of coping with minority status; cf. Kloss, 1966, and see above), and demographic ones (e.g., numbers, group distribution, and institutional support). Tajfel's model concerns the redefining of group attributes in relation to the majority group, while speech accommodation involves converging or diverging speech in relation to the majority. Aspects of the "core value" theory could be accommodated within the "ethnolinguistic vitality" framework. For instance, part of the ethnolinguistic vitality of Greek in immigrant situations is determined by a belief in the uniqueness of Greek culture and the authenticity of the language as the language of the New Testament, linking language, religion, historical consciousness, and identity.

Fishman (1985) proposes sets of measures for predicting relative survival rates of minority languages, while expressing caution as to their applicability. They are based on the number of speakers, adjusted for average age, institutional resources for language maintenance, and religious and racial distance from the "mainstream." (For a critique of this model, see Clyne, 1991a: 106–9.) The significance of insulation from the "mainstream" is stressed in Fishman's (1991) comprehensive study evaluating the success of attempts by groups in different parts of the world to reverse language shift (e.g., Maoris in New Zealand, some outback Aborigines in Australia).

7 Linguistic Consequences of Multilingualism

So far we have focused on the social and sociopolitical consequences of multilingualism. Perhaps the best developed field of study in this area is the effect of one language on the other. These effects are manifested at all levels of language – grammar, phonology, lexicon, pragmatics (the use of language in communication), and discourse (the level beyond the sentence).

7.1 Lexical transfers and their integration

Early research centered around the lexicon (vocabulary). What words were "borrowed" from one language to the other? The outcome was frequently "washing lists" of words which were sometimes rather repetitive. However, grammar and phonology were also dealt with and played a prominent part in the overall models proposed by Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1956). In accordance with the normative definition of bilingualism current until fairly recently, bilinguals were expected to be "double monolinguals," which meant that they should not "mix their systems" and they should only switch between the languages deliberately. On the one hand, those areas of vocabulary where lexical transference took place were described; it occurred mainly where the L2 context of situation differed
from that in which the LI had been used. On the other, attempts were made to differentiate between those "borrowings" that were essential and therefore permissible, and those that were unnecessary and therefore unacceptable. However, it could be argued that lexical items are only transferred because they are needed by a speaker – because no exact equivalent is available to them or to create a particular stylistic effect. Far more significant than the actual lexical transfer itself is the type and degree of integration into the semantic, grammatical, phonological, and graphemic (writing or spelling) system of the recipient language. Phonological Integration involves replacing some sounds (phonemes and phoneme realizations) and sound sequences that are nonexistent in or peripheral to the recipient language by more usual ones. There is a good deal of variation in phonological integration, depending on the speaker’s command of the sounds of the recipient language, the desire to keep the two systems apart, and how much the item is accepted as a central part of the vocabulary of the recipient language. Where the recipient language has gender-marked articles and/or adjectival and noun inflections, transferred nouns are assigned a gender according to one or more of the following criteria – natural gender (il teacher or la teacher, Italian in Australia), gender of semantic equivalent in the recipient language (le job < le travail; la fence < la haie, la palissade, French in Australia), bilingual homophone (der roof < der Ruf, “reputation,” despite das Dach, German in Australia), suffix (das Department, i ruler (feminine, cf. roula, Greek in Australia). Noun plurals and past tenses of verbs are formed according to particular rules, often indicating how much the transfer is felt by the speaker or community to be part of the recipient language. (For instance, the past participle geschrunkt is more recognizable as “possibly foreign” than geschrunken (for “shrunk”) in German in Australia.) In writing lexical transfers, the spelling system or script of the recipient language may be employed, e.g., Mifi (Miss, German), or MADZET (budget, Greek). When a transfer is integrated semantically, the lexical field in the recipient language changes. In Australia, fattoria (Standard Italian, “small farm”) has widely assumed the meaning of “factory” and English “farm” has been integrated as farma to denote a “farm” in the Australian sense. Fattoria is here a semantic transfer (where a meaning has been transferred from a word in the other language). Semantic transfers are due to interlingual identification where there is morphemic, phonological, or partial semantic correspondence and could be seen to constitute a very high degree of integration. They are used by people deliberately avoiding “Language mixture” and are particularly prevalent in closed networks of speakers.

7.2 Grammatical transference and grammatical change

In contact situations, especially where the “minority language” is not maintained very well, and there is considerable isolation from the “heartland” of the language, grammatical change will occur quite rapidly. This may include a gradual typological change, say, from Subject–Object–Verb or a mixture of Verb–second and Subject–Object–Verb to Subject–Verb–Object (the general typology of the dominant language). There are tendencies in that direction as early as the first generation in Dutch–English bilinguals and in the second in German–English bilinguals in Australia – the more advanced change in Dutch being attributable to both typological factors (drift towards a Dutch syntax determined by a fixed order of sentence elements due to the loss of case markings as in English) and sociolinguistic ones (greater language shift). Grammatical change may include the use of the masculine singular adjective as an unmarked adjective instead of an inflection (some second-generation Italian speakers in Australia and the US), or the overgeneralization of one gender and/or of one plural marker, and even the loss of verb inflections (in some second-generation bilinguals in Australia) (Clyne, 1991a: 176–86; Gonzo and Saltarelli, 1983; Bettoni, 1985).

7.3 Code-switching

Code-switching (see chapter 13) involves production in more than one language, within one sentence or between sentences within a stretch of discourse. It often occurs within structural constraints which may be language–specific or even universal (see Myers–Scotton, 1993b). It is often motivated by the social variables of code–choice (see section 5) and/or by a symbolic (us – them) function in conversation (see, e.g., Gumperz, 1982; Auer, 1984; Myers–Scotton, 1993a). Code-switching is frequently facilitated by grammatical convergence between the languages on the part of the speaker or community and by trigger-words of ambiguous affiliation (Clyne, 1991a: 193–6), for example,

Sie war in New Guinea when the Japanese came there and dann haben's/ mußten
sie’raus von New Guinea at the time of the war.

(Clyne, 1991a: 195)

(She was in … and then she had to leave New Guinea …) (To the speaker, who uses New Guinea in her German, it is part of both language systems.)

Ja sprasivaju vas (Russian) my dear friend wos zol ig tun mit (Yiddish) my daughter?

(Röt, 1985: 203)

(I tell you … what should I do with …)

(Trigger-words facilitate code-switching between three languages.)

8 Intercultural Communication in Multilingual Communities and Regions

Intercultural communication constitutes communication between people of different cultures, including the effects of different sets of communication patterns on one another. In regions of close cultural contact, such as the Balkans or South Asia, groups of unrelated or only distantly related languages will form groups of languages known as Sprachbiinde, which will influence one another in structure as well as in the lexicon (Becker, 1948). The influence will extend to the communication patterns of the language (Sprechbiinde; Neustupny, 1978). In immigrant societies, the dominant language will tend to affect such patterns. For instance, the second and later generations in such countries as the US and Australia will tend to give up distinctions in pronouns or other forms of address, often overgeneralizing the informal (T) pronoun and first names.

While, in a multicultural society, there will be convergence towards the communication patterns of the dominant language, there will be people of vastly different cultural backgrounds communicating in that language as a lingua franca. Their discourse structures – length of turns in conversation, ways of maintaining and appropriating turns, tendencies towards overlapping speech, choice of complex interaction sequences (such as directive, apology and complaint sequences, all of which include other speech acts) – are all strongly influenced by their cultural value systems.

1 I thank Florian Coulmas and Mark Newbrook for helpful comments on an earlier draft.
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