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, on the other hand, when populations differing in language are in contact with each other. That languages (or language variants) SOMETIMES replace each other, among some speakers, particularly in certain types or domains of language behavior, under some conditions of intergroup contact, has long aroused curiosity and comment (46). However, it is only in quite recent years that this topic has been recognized as a field of systematic inquiry among professional students of language behavior.

1 Fellow, 1963-64, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California. I wish to express my sincere thanks to the following friends and colleagues for their many helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper: John J. Gomperz, Einar Haugen, John E. Hofman, Wallace E. Lambert, Vladimir C. Nahirny, Leonard Savitz, Thomas A. Sebeok, M. Brewster Smith, and Uriel Weinreich.

2 E.g. “Everything is Greek, when it is more shameful to be ignorant of Latin” (Juvenal Satires, Sat. VI, 1.187) and “…Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon and of Moab; And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews’ language, but according to the language of each people” (Nehemiah, 13:23-24) to mention only two classical Western references.

3 Anthropologists, historians, linguists, sociologists and psychologists have recognized and studied many phenomena related to language maintenance and language shift in their pursuit of other topics such as culture change and acculturation, nationalism, language interference, intergroup relations, second language learning and bilingualism. However, only rarely and recently has such interest led to a definition and formulation of this field of study in its own right. Among earlier partial efforts to do so one must mention those to be found in the huge “auslandsdeutsche Volksforschung” and “sprachwissenschaftliche Minderheitenforschung” literatures which continued from the latter part of the 19th century into World War II days (see e.g. 27, 53, 57, 63, 65, 75, 81), the 1953 Conference of Anthropologists and Linguists, and the work of Uriel Weinreich (87, 88) and Einar Haugen (36, 38). My indebtedness to the last two investigators is quite evident. Some of the earlier terms proposed for the phenomena here referred to have been Spracherhaltung (53), language persistence (72), language replacement (62), language shift (62), language retention (36), and language displacement (38). The terminology here prsed (language maintenance and language shift)
It is suggested here that the three major topical subdivisions of this field are: (a) habitual language use at more than one point in time or space under conditions of intergroup contact; (b) antecedent, concurrent or consequent psychological, social and cultural processes and their relationship to stability or change in habitual language use; and (c) behavior toward language in the contact setting, including directed maintenance or shift efforts. It is the purpose of this paper to discuss each of these three topical subdivisions briefly, to indicate their current stage of development, and to offer suggestions for their further development.

1.0 HABITUAL LANGUAGE USE AT MORE THAN ONE POINT IN TIME OR SPACE UNDER CONDITIONS OF INTERGROUP CONTACT

The basic datum of the study of language maintenance and language shift is that two linguistically distinguishable populations are in contact and that there are demonstrable consequences of this contact with respect to habitual language use. The consequences that are of PRIMARY concern to the student of language maintenance and language shift are NOT interference phenomena per se but, rather, degrees of maintenance or displacement in conjunction with several sources and domains of variance in language behavior. Thus, the very first requirement of inquiry in this field is a conceptualization of variance in language behavior whereby language maintenance and language displacement can be accurately

is derived from my recently completed study of the non-English language resources of American immigrant groups (18). Although somewhat more cumbersome than previously proposed terms, "language maintenance and language shift" may have the advantage of more clearly indicating that a continuum of processes and outcomes exists.

Linguistic distinctions may be recognized at any level, e.g. between different languages (English and German in the American Midwest, or French and Flemish in Belgium), between different regional variants of a single language ("southern" and "non-southern" in Washington, D.C.), between different social-class variants of a single regional variant (middle class and lower class in New York City), etc. Only the first level, above, is of direct concern in this paper, although most of the topics considered may well be applicable to the other levels as well. Thus, the study of language maintenance and language shift may be of some interest to students of social dialectology.

Weinreich makes this point very strongly: "Whereas interference, even in its sociocultural setting, is a problem in which considerations of linguistic structure enter, the matter of language shifts is entirely extra-structural." (88, pp. 106-107) My own position is represented by the word PRIMARY above, and is discussed briefly in sections 1.1 and 3.4, below. It does seem to me that certain interference phenomena may well be of concern to us in connection with several aspects of the study of language maintenance and language shift.
and appropriately ascertained. In the course of their labors linguists, psychologists, anthropologists, and other specialists have developed a large number of quantitative and qualitative characterizations of variance in language behavior. By choosing from among them and adding to them judiciously, it may be possible to arrive at provocative insights into more sociolinguistic concerns as well. Whether those aspects of variance in language behavior that are currently conceived of as qualitative can be rendered ultimately commensurable with those that are currently conceived of as quantitative is a difficult problem which cannot now be answered definitely. As a result, these aspects may well be treated separately here.

1.1 Degree of Bilingualism

For the student of language maintenance and language shift the quantification of habitual language use is related to the much older question of ascertaining degree of bilingualism. This question, in turn, has been tackled by a great number of investigators from different disciplines, each being concerned with a somewhat different nuance. Linguists have been most concerned with the analysis of bilingualism from the point of view of switching or interference. The measures that they have proposed from their disciplinary point of departure distinguish between phonetic, lexical and grammatical proficiency and intactness.

At the other extreme stand educators who are concerned with bilingualism in terms of total performance contrasts in very complex contexts (the school, even the society). Psychologists have usually studied degrees of bilingualism in terms of speed, automaticity, or habit strength. Sociologists have relied upon relative frequencies of use in different settings. Thus, since a great number of different bilingualism

---

6 Thus, Haugen suggests, “distinct tests … on each of the levels of phonemics, grammar, and basic lexicon” (38, p. 76), with several further differentiations within these levels, some of which are indicated below. Mackey goes even further and suggests that separate measures are also required at the semantic and stylistic levels (66).

7 Among the most recent measures are those of Herschel T. Manuel which seek to enable “educators to compare the achievement of a student in one language with his achievement in another.” (68) It is typical of educational concerns to be more interested in determining the overall extent of bilingualism than in describing it in terms of quantified componential analysis.

8 A convenient review of modern psychological approaches to the measurement of bilingualism is contained in (61), in which Wallace Lambert discusses his own studies as well as those of others.

9 See, e.g. Hayden (39), John E. Hofman (43, 44), and Nahirny and Fishman (71). Perhaps the most influential examples of this approach are found in the work of Moses N. H. Hoffman (42) and Seth Arsenian (2).
scores or quotients are already available, the student of language main-
tenance and language shift must decide which, if any, are appropriate to
his own concerns. If particular sensitivities to language behavior or
if particular organized approaches to the data of habitual language
use characterize the field of language maintenance and language shift,
these must be brought into play in evaluating the methods suggested by
scholars from other disciplines who have approached the quantification
of bilingualism with other sensitivities or points of view.

1.11 The need for a combination of interrelated measures. It would
seem that the linguist's concern with interference and switching is a
necessary ingredient of the study of language maintenance and language
shift, if only to answer the question "which language is being used".
This question may be easier to answer in some cases than in others (e.g.,
it may be easier to answer in connection with encoding than in connection
with inner speech; it may be easier to answer in connection with writing
than in connection with speaking; it may be easier to answer in connection
with formal and technical communication than in connection with inte-
mate communication) for the "density" of interference and switching
varies for the same individual from occasion to occasion and from situa-
tion to situation. Although interference and switching are lawful be-
haviors, there are advanced cases of language shift in which even linguists
will be hard pressed to determine the answer to "which language is being
used", particularly if a single supra-level answer is required.

Similarly, concern with relative proficiency, relative ease or automati-
city, and relative frequency of language use in a contact setting are
also necessarily of concern to the student of language maintenance and
language shift, for these too are indications of whether or to what degree
conservation or change are operative. However, these factors also vary
from occasion to occasion and from situation to situation. Thus, in
conclusion, the contribution that the student of language maintenance
and language shift can make to the measurement of bilingualism, is
precisely his awareness (a) that various measures are needed if the social
realities of multilingual settings are to be reflected and (b) that these
measures can be organized in terms of relatively general variance
considerations. Of the many approaches to variance in language use
that are possible the following have greatest appeal to the present
writer:

a. Media variance: written, read and spoken language. Degree
of maintenance and shift may be quite different in these very different
Where literacy has been attained prior to interaction with an "other tongue", reading or writing in the mother tongue may resist shift longer than speaking. Where literacy is attained subsequent to (or as a result of) such interaction the reserve may hold true (23).

b. **ROLE VARIANCE**: Degree of maintenance and shift may be quite different in connection with **INNER SPEECH** (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). Where language shift is unconscious or resisted, inner speech may be most resistant to interference, switching and disuse of the mother tongue. Where language shift is conscious and desired, other roles may be more resistant (24).

c. **SITUATIONAL VARIANCE**: **FORMAL**, **SEMI-FORMAL**, **INFORMAL**, **INTIMATE**, etc., whether in accord with the stylistic distinctions recognized by Joos (52), Labov (58), who have recognized the greater redundancy and predictability of certain situations in comparison with others, or others. Where language shift is unconscious or resisted more intimate situations may be most resistive of mother tongue, interference, switching or disuse. The reverse may be true where language shift is conscious and desired (24).10

d. **DOMAIN VARIANCE**, which will be discussed separately in section 1.2.

* Writing and reading are here differentiated as separate media primarily because each is capable of independent productive and receptive maintenance or shift. In general, the formal dimensions presented here make use of more distinctions than may be necessary in any one multilingual setting.

** "Situation" and "setting" are frequently used interchangeably in sociolinguistic literature. In this paper "setting" is intended to be the broader and more multifaceted concept. An exhaustive consideration of a multilingual "setting" would require attention to language choice data, socio-cultural process data, data on attitudinal, emotional, cognitive, and overt behaviors toward language, etc. "Situation" is reserved for use in characterizing the formality of communication at the time of communication.

10 I am indebted to the work of many others for this tripartite division into media role and situational sources of variance. Floyd Lounsbury suggested this particular Nomenclature when I presented him with my dissatisfaction at referring to these distinctions in terms of "levels", "aspects", "modes", or other commonly used and insufficiently denotative designations. The distinctions themselves have a long history. They are obviously related to the distinctions between "receiving and sending bilinguals", "oral and visual bilinguals", and "close and distant bilinguals" suggested by Mary Haas (62, p. 42); to the distinctions between "mode of use" (speaking vs. writing and reading) suggested by Weinreich (88, p. 75); to the discussion of comprehension, production, frequency distortions and levels of style provided by Haugen (38, p. 85), and to the distinction between "internal functions" and "external functions" made by Mackey (66, pp. 55 and 63). Similar or related distinctions have certainly also been made by others.
1.2 Location of bilingualism: The domains of language behavior

The qualitative aspects of bilingualism are most easily illustrated in connection with the location of language maintenance and language shift in terms of domains of language behavior.\footnote{Haugen, Weinreich, and Mackey all refer to "functions" of language rather than to "domains". However, in recent years, Jakobson, Hymes, Sebeok, Weir, and other linguists and anthropologists have popularized the term "functions" in quite a different connection (see section 1.22 below). As a result, it seems preferable to revert to the term "domain" (probably first advanced by Schmidt-Rohr, 81, p. 179) in an attempt to avoid confusion.} What is of concern to us here is the most parsimonious and fruitful designation of the occasions in which one language (variant, dialect, style, etc.) is habitually employed rather than (or in addition to) another. Thus far this topic has been of systematic concern only to a very few linguists, anthropologists and sociologists. Their interest has not yet led to the construction of measuring or recording instruments of wide applicability in contact settings that appear to be very different one from another. One of the major difficulties in this connection is that there is little consensus concerning the definition and classification of the domains of language behavior in bilingual communities.\footnote{The most extended recent discussions of the location of bilingualism pertinent to the study of language maintenance and language shift are those of Weinrich, Haugen, and Mackey. Weinreich concludes that "a general survey of language functions in the bilingual communities of the world is not yet available" (88, p. 87). Haugen concludes that it is "necessary to devise subtler measures ... to draw a full profile of the speaker's activities and assign measures of language function and skill for both languages" (38, p. 95). Mackey's theoretical cross-classification of external "functions" according to a set of "contacts" and "variables" (66) is referred to at various points throughout this section.}

More than thirty years ago Schmidt-Rohr differentiated nine domains of language (81), namely: the family, the playground and the 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 bureaucracy ("Verwaltung").\footnote{Within a year of his original publication, Schmidt-Rohr felt it necessary to release a revised second edition. The major differences between the two are recognizable in the intense nazification and racialization of terms and interpretations as well as in the panegyric to National Socialism in the introduction and appendix to the second edition. A revised and somewhat improved statement of his domains appeared a few years later, together with a self-report questionnaire for use by Auslandsdeutsche (82).} Schmidt-Rohr also deserves recognition in connection with his claim that each domain had to be studied separately and a total inter-domain configuration presented if various "types" of bilingualism were to be differentiated and understood. Some subsequent students
of language maintenance and language shift have required a more differentiated set of domains (17). Others have been satisfied with a much more abbreviated set. Still others have required greater differentiation within particular domains. Thus Nicolas Braunshausen differentiated within the family domain between the language of mother, the language of father, the language of governesses and tutors, the language of children, and the language of domestics (6), and has been followed in this respect by various investigators such as Gross (31) and Mackey (66). Refinements such as these pertain to role-relations rather than to sub-domains. They sensitize us to two facts: (a) that a central domain such as the family may well require further differentiation, and (b) that domains can best be studied, for the purpose of inquiry into language maintenance and language shifts, via their most pivotal role relations. Thus, in studying the relationship between religion and language maintenance among American immigrant groups, it may be necessary not only to distinguish between services, sermons, confession, announcements, and church-related activities (43, 44), but also to distinguish between the language of clerics with clerics, clerics with laymen, and laymen with laymen, etc. Husband–wife, parent–child, employer–employee, pupil–teacher are all examples of role-relations, in other domains. Role-relations, in turn, may themselves be further analyzed in terms of social occasions and encounters.

Although the entire economic domain is absent from Schmidt-Rohr’s

14 Mackey has recommended only five domains (66): home, community, school, mass media, and correspondence, thus combining a media aspect with four domains mentioned above. At this time there is no empirical evidence concerning the adequacy of these domains. Both Barker (5) and Carroll Barber (3), in their studies of acculturating populations (Spanish American or Yaqui Indian) in Arizona, restricted themselves to four domains: familial (intimate), informal, formal and intergroup. In Barber’s analysis the formal domain is limited to religious-ceremonial activities, while the intergroup domain is limited to economic, legal, and recreational activities. A similar consolidation or restriction in domains and activities is evident in J. Wm. Frey’s analysis (26) of Amish “triple tak” where three domains – home, school, and church – suffice. It is quite obvious that Barker and Barber have formulated their domains at a more psychological level, whereas Frey’s, like Schmidt-Rohr’s, are along more ecological-institutional lines. The relationship between different domain levels such as these may enable us to investigate bilingualism and language maintenance or shift in newer and more stimulating ways (25).

15 Unfortunately, the term “role” has several different current meanings, e.g., “role in society” (mayor, bank president, untouchable), “role-relations” vis-à-vis particular others (husband, father, employer), “occasional role” (chairman, host, lecturer), and “momentary role” (speaker, hearer). In the discussion of role-variance, above, the latter use of the term “role” was involved. However, as a means of detailing domain variance the term “role” is now used in the sense of “role-relations”. A less confusing systemization of terms would be quite helpful.
list, and although a list is by no means the same as an instrument for the measurement or recording of bilingualism in each domain, there is much to be said for his categories even as they now stand. They bear a very marked resemblance to the “sets of ordered, interdependent, structural activities” or “spheres of activity” recently proposed for the study of acculturation (14, 51) and of minority-majority relations more generally (80).\textsuperscript{16} On the other hand they doubtlessly require alteration, combination and/or differentiation from the point of view of language maintenance and language shift phenomena in settings much different from those of immediate interest to Schmidt-Rohr (in which language groups either have, or aspire to, control over a governmental-military apparatus). It may even be necessary to consider the domains of language behavior somewhat differently for the purpose of studying children primarily than for the purpose of studying adults primarily.

The above considerations are sufficient to indicate that the student of language maintenance and language shift obviously requires a highly complex sort of evidence on habitual language use. Indeed, we can barely begin to approximate data collection and analysis in accord with all possible interactions between the several components and levels of language use mentioned thus far. However, only when our data will correspond more closely to complex models of language use will it become possible for students of language maintenance and language shift to derive valid and refined dominance configurations capable of representing the direction or drift of changes in bilingualism over time.

1.21 The domains of language behavior and the compound-coordinate distinction. If the concept of domains of language behavior proves to be a fruitful and manageable one (given future empirical attempts to render it more rigorously useful)\textsuperscript{17} it may also yield beneficial results in connection with other areas of research on bilingualism, e.g. in connection with the distinction between coordinate and compound bilingualism (16, p. 140). The latter distinction arose out of an awareness (mentioned by several

\textsuperscript{16} Dohrenwend and Smith suggest the following domains for the study of acculturation: political, economic, military, kinship, religious, educational, medical, social-recreational (14). Schermerhorn proposes the study of the relations between dominant and minority groups across these same sets or orders of activity (80). Jones and Lambert utilize the following “spheres of activity” in their study of attitudes toward immigrants: work, neighborhood, social-recreational, commercial, family, religious, educational (51).

\textsuperscript{17} A more detailed discussion of the domains of language behavior and of their relationship to topical and interlocutor variations may be found in (25).
investigators over the years) that there are "at least two major types of bilingual functioning",\textsuperscript{18} one (the compound type) being "characteristic of bilingualism acquired by a child who grows up in a home where two languages are spoken more or less interchangeably by the same people and in the same situations" and the other (the coordinate) being "typical of the ‘true’ bilingual, who has learned to speak one language with his parents, for example, and the other language in school and at work. The total situations, both external and emotional, and the total behaviors occurring when one language is being used will differ from those occurring with the other."\textsuperscript{19} From our previous discussion of domains of language behavior it is clear that these two types of bilingual functioning have been distinguished\textsuperscript{20} on the bases of some awareness, however rudimentary, that BILINGUALS VARY WITH RESPECT TO THE NUMBER AND OVERLAP OF DOMAINS IN WHICH THEY HABITUALLY EMPLOY EACH OF THEIR LANGUAGES. However, this is true not only initially, in the acquisition of bilingualism (with which the compound-coordinate distinction is primarily concerned) but also subsequently, THROUGHOUT life. Initially coordinate bilinguals may become exposed to widespread bilingualism in which both languages are used rather freely over a larger set of overlapping domains (Fig. 1). Similarly, compound bilinguals may become exposed to a more restrictive or dichotomized environment in which each language is assigned to very specific and non-overlapping domains (Fig. 2). Thus, we have the makings of a typical "turnover" or panel-study design in which some individuals are exposed to different forms of bilingualism whereas others are reinforced in their original pattern. This enables us to raise such questions as: (a) whether it is harder (or otherwise different) to change from a compound to a coordinate bilingual than to change in the opposite

\textsuperscript{18} See Weinreich (88, pp. 9-10, 35 and 81-82) for several early examples of the "two types of bilingualism" school of thought, many of which are quite similar to the coordinate-compound distinction. Still other early examples are found in the work of Schmidt-Rohr (81), Swadesh (86), and, most recently, in that of Vildomec (86a).

\textsuperscript{19} There continues to be a culture-bound suspicion that the latter type of bilingualism is not only "truer" but also inherently "healthier". See, e.g., Jakobson (62, p. 44) and Hymes (47, p. 43) to the effect that if the contexts of language use are not kept distinct "there may be personality difficulties" (47) and "even pathological results" (62). Schmidt-Rohr, Geissler and others working under much greater political-ethnocentric influence considered compound bilingualism to be the cause of racial degeneration and to lead to loss of depth, clarity and uniqueness in the individual (27, 33, 64, 81).

\textsuperscript{20} It is generally recognized that the labels coordinate and compound identify the extremes of a continuum of neurological organization and psychological functioning, although for the sake of simplicity they are usually treated as if they pertained to a dichotomy.
way, and (b) whether change or stability in this respect is in any way related to the fortunes of language maintenance and language shift.

1.22 The domains and functions of language behavior. It may be helpful at this point to devote a few words to distinguishing between the above mentioned domains of language behavior and the functions of language or speech which have recently again excited the interest of many linguists, anthropologists, and others. Although the list of such functions varies from author to author all of the lists have in common “an interpretation of the factors of the speech event in terms of motive or purpose (47, p. 30)” or, to put it differently, a motivational-purposive interpretation of verbal communication. The proposed functions are intended

---

### Table: Initial Type of Bilingual Acquisition and Subsequent Domain Overlap Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILINGUAL ACQUISITION TYPE</th>
<th>DOMAIN OVERLAP TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compound</strong> (&quot;Interdependent&quot; or fused)</td>
<td>Overlapping Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinate</strong> (&quot;Independent&quot;)</td>
<td>Non-Overlapping Domains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnote:

21 E.g., Karl Buhler (9): Auslösung, Kundgabe, Darstellung; Roman Jakobson (48), referential, emotive, conative, poetic, phatic, metalingual; Dell Hymes (47): expressive, directive, poetic, contact, metalingual, referential, contextual; Edward Sapir (70): communication, socialization, cultural transmittal and accumulation, individualization; George Barker (4): group-defining functions (coordinating group activity, symbolizing group membership, transmitting patterns of thought and behavior), group-relating functions (relating the individual to the group, relating one group to another). Other lists of functions have been proposed by Kenneth Burke, J. R. Firth, C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, Bruno Snell, and a host of others interested in language, literature or life. A mere enumeration cannot pretend to do justice to the historical relationships between the several systems of functions listed here.
to help answer somewhat different questions than the proposed domains. The functions are concerned with "why did he speak and say it the way he did when he did?" The proposed domains are concerned with specifying the larger institutional-role contexts within which habitual language use occurs in multilingual settings. It may be that the domains are actually much cruder categories (relative to their purpose) than are the functions. It may also be that the domains and functions are ultimately commensurable via reference to common categories of "speech events". All that can be said at the moment is that it does not seem to this writer that the functions are immediately as useful in understanding language maintenance or language shift as the domains seem to be.22

22 The advice of Hymes in conjunction with functions ("while some general classes of functions are undoubtedly universal, one should seek to establish the particulars of the given case and should be prepared to discover that a function, identifiable in one group, is absent in another": 47, p. 31) should also help prepare us to face the likelihood that there is no single invariant set of best or necessary "basic" domains for the study of language maintenance and language shift.

---

**Fig. 2. Type of Bilingual Functioning and Domain Overlap During Successive Stages of Immigrant Acculturation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BILINGUAL FUNCTIONING TYPE</th>
<th>DOMAIN OVERLAP TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compound</strong> (&quot;Interdependent&quot; or fused)</td>
<td>2. Second Stage: 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordinate</strong> (&quot;Independent&quot;)</td>
<td>3. Third Stage: 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 The dominance configuration

Sections 1.1 and 1.2, above, clearly indicate the need for basic tools of a complex and sophisticated sort. Precise measurement of degree of maintenance or displacement will be possible only when more diversified measures of degree of bilingualism (including attention to media, role, and situational variance) are at hand. Precise measurement of domains of maintenance or displacement will be possible only after concerted attention is given to the construction of instruments that are based upon a careful consideration of the various domains of language behavior (and the role-relations, social occasions, etc., subsumed under each of them) mentioned in a scattered international literature. The availability of such instruments will also facilitate work in several related fields of study, such as the success of intensive second-language learning programs, accurate current language facility censuses, applied "language reinforcement" effects, etc. Given such instruments, the inter-correlations between the several components of variance in degree of bilingualism will become amenable to study, as will the variation of such inter-correlations with age or with varying degrees of language ability, opportunity and motivation. The relationship between maintenance or displacement in the various domains of language will also become subject to scrutiny. Speculation concerning the relationship between shifts in degree and direction of bilingualism and shifts in the domains of bilingualism will finally become subject to investigation. Finally, out of all of the foregoing, it will become possible to speak much more meaningfully about the dominance configurations of bilinguals and of

---

28 Students of acculturation have asked whether there are "orders of structured activities which are 'pillars' of a culture in the sense that effects on contact in these orders ramify widely into other orders of the culture. (If so) ... are they the same orders in different cultures or do they vary from culture to culture? Are there 'carrier' activities in the contact situation which though relatively unaffected by contact themselves, nevertheless set up indirect effects on other sets of structured activities?" (Dohrenwend and Smith, 14, p. 37). These questions have very precise parallels in the study of language maintenance or language shift. Our ability to answer them will depend on our ability to specify the domains of language appropriately and to intercorrelate degrees of shift in the several domains.

24 For a recent study conducted essentially along these lines see that of Joan Rubin (77). The growth of bilingualism in Paraguay seems to be due to a clearcut domain difference such that each language controls several crucial domains. As a result monolinguals find it more and more necessary to learn the "other tongue", whether it be Spanish or Guarani. Rubin considers Paraguay to have "the highest degree of bilingualism in the world" due to the mutually exclusive domain pattern which has developed there.
changes in these configurations in language maintenance-language shift contexts.\footnote{The question of dominance (or direction) of bilingualism arises less frequently today in the United States (or in other acculturated immigrant setting) where English (or another officially established language) may be assumed to be dominant and uniformly “available” in various bilingual contexts so that degree and location considerations do not apply to it nearly as much as they do to the immigrant languages. This situation must not be assumed to be universally the case in multilingual contact settings.}

1.31 Weinreich reintroduced the concept of dominance configuration as a result of his well founded dissatisfaction with the current practice of “tagging two languages in contact as respectively ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ at any cost” (88, p. 98). He correctly observes that “the difficulty of ranking two mother-tongue groups in hierarchical order is aggravated by the need to rank functions of the languages as well”, but adds, in conclusion, that “it is therefore expedient, perhaps, to restrict the term dominant to languages in contact situations where the difference in mother-tongues is coupled with a significant difference in social status” (88, p. 98). For the purposes of studying language maintenance or language shift, this last recommendation would seem to be questionable on two counts. On the one hand it jumps from the individual to the group or societal level of analysis, whereas both the study of bilingualism and of language maintenance or language shift frequently require a determination of language dominance in the individual per se. On the other hand, it jumps from language to non-language criteria, whereas both of the aforementioned fields of inquiry usually require a determination of language dominance (or of change in dominance) based on language use alone.\footnote{If one mixes language and non-language criteria the relations between them cannot be examined. As for individual and societal assessments of dominance, although both are clearly possible, it is likely that they would not correspond. Thus, a societal assessment of dominance would probably concentrate upon language use in institutional-organizational settings. These may actually account for a smaller percentage of interaction situations and, therefore, may be less important than non-institutionalized settings.}

For our purposes the dominance configuration constitutes an attempt to represent the direction or status of language maintenance or language shift in such a way as to recognize a multiplicity of considerations that are presumably incommensurable. “The dominance of a language for a bilingual individual can only be interpreted as a specific configuration or syndrome of characteristics on which the language is rated” (88, p. 79). Weinreich proposes seven characteristics on the basis of which dominance configurations may be constituted (in conjunction with the study of lan-
guage interference): (a) relative proficiency, (b) mode of use,\(^\text{27}\) (c) order of learning, (d) emotional involvement, (e) usefulness in communication, (f) function in social advance, and (g) literary-cultural value.* From the point of view of coordinated investigation into language maintenance or language shift several of these characteristics would seem to be of uncertain value. Thus, item (a) above would seem to be further analyzable into several components, as has already been suggested in sections 1.1 and 1.2. Characteristic (b) certainly appears to be important and has already been referred to in section 1.1. Item (c) as well as items (e) through (g) appear to be antecedents, concurrents or consequences of language contact situations rather than aspects of degree or direction of bilingualism per se. As such they deserve to be considered in the second and third topical subdivisions of the study of language maintenance or language shift (see sections 2 and 3, below) rather than entered into the dominance configuration per se. Characteristic (d) is also of this latter variety and may properly be conceived of as the resultant of many experiences and values including those pertaining to characteristics (e) through (g) above. Thus, although global determinations of "the linguistic dominance of bilinguals", such as Lambert's (59), may well be both premature and insufficiently revealing from the point of view of the study of language maintenance and language shift, the particular configurational pattern suggested by Weinreich also would seem to require substantial revision.

1.32 Table I is primarily intended as an impressionistic summary of one possible approach to determining a dominance configuration based upon several DOMAINS and SOURCES OF VARIANCE in language behavior mentioned earlier in this discussion. The types of language use data favored by linguists, psychologists and educators have been set aside temporarily in favor of grosser "frequency of use" data. However, of primary interest at this time are the suggested parameters rather than the rough data presented. An inspection of this Table reveals several general characteristics of the dominance configurations: (a) the dominance configuration summarizes multilingual language use data for a particular population studied at two points in time or space; (b) a complete cross-tabulation of all theoretically possible sources and domains of variance

\(^{27}\) Weinreich uses this term to refer to visual (writing, reading) exposure as contrasted with aural-vocal exposure. This is equivalent to my term "media variance" in section 1.1, above.

* In an earlier discussion (87) Weinreich presented a much different approach to the dominance configuration, more similar in many respects to that of Schmidt-Rohr, but with certain quantitative (rather than entirely qualitative) features.
TABLE I

Yiddish-English Maintenance and Shift in the United States: 1940-1960. Comparisons for Immigrant Generation "Secularists" Arriving Prior to World War I. (First language shown is most frequently used; Second language shown is increasing in use.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Situational</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Domains of Language Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Inner(1)</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (3)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>Y, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>Y, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>Y, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>Y, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Comp.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prod.(2)</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Prod.</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>E, E</td>
<td>E, E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For "speaking-inner" combinations the domains imply topics as well as contexts In all other instances they imply contexts alone.
(2) For "reading-production" combinations the distinction between "family" and "mass media" domains is also a distinction between reading to others and reading to one's self.
(3) X = not applicable or no entry.
in language behavior does not actually obtain. In some instances, logical difficulties arise. In others, occurrences are logically possible but either necessarily rare or rare for the particular populations under study; (c) each cell in the dominance configuration summarizes detailed process data pertaining to the particular role-relations (parent–child, teacher–pupil, etc.) pertinent to it and the social occasion, encounter, and topical range encountered; (d) some of the domains utilized do not correspond to those listed in section 1.2, above, nor are all of the domains previously listed utilized here. This should sensitize us further to the probability that no invariant set of domains can prove to be maximally revealing, notwithstanding the efforts expended in pursuit of such a set (14, 51, 66, 80). If, as is most commonly believed, language use is related to socio-cultural structure, then different social and cultural structures should benefit from analysis by means of different domains of language use; (e) an exhaustive analysis of the data of dominance configurations may well require sophisticated pattern analysis or other mathematical techniques which do not necessarily assume equal weight and simple addativity for each entry in each cell; (f) a much more refined presentation of language maintenance or language shift becomes possible than that which is provided by means of mother tongue census statistics (54, 72).28 On the other hand, the ultimate “summary” nature of the dominance configuration and the further possibilities of collapsing domains according to higher order psychological or sociological similarities (e.g. “public” vs. “private” language use) obviates the proliferation of atomized findings.29

1.33 All in all, the dominance configuration represents a great and difficult challenge to students of bilingualism and of language maintenance or language shift. It is possible that once this challenge is recognized, serious problems of configurational analysis will also arise, as they have in other areas in which syndromes of incommensurables are encountered.30 However, it is unnecessary to prejudge this matter. It

28 For a comparison of census data, dominance configuration data, and detailed role-process data dealing with related phenomena, see (24), in which the relationship between these several approaches is examined.

29 The patterns yielded by the dominance configuration should enable us to either conform or significantly revise Kloss’s intuitive five fold classification of patterns of language use in multilingual settings (54): (i) only the given language is used for all communication purposes; (ii) the given language is used alongside another for all purposes; (iii) the given language is used only in correspondence and reading – alone or alongside another language also used for these same purposes; (iv) the given language is used only for business purposes, particularly with foreigners; (v) the given language is used only for advanced educational or scientific pursuits.

30 Other problems of a technical measurement or recording nature can be antici-
does seem fitting to conclude that the dominance configuration – if it is to have maximal analytic value – might best be limited to those aspects of DEGREE OF BILINGUALISM and of LOCATION OF BILINGUALISM which further inquiry may reveal to be of greatest relative IMPORTANCE and INDEPENDENCE.

2.0 PSYCHOLOGICAL, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROCESSES RELATED TO STABILITY OR CHANGE IN HABITUAL LANGUAGE USE UNDER CONDITIONS OF INTERGROUP CONTACT

The second major topical subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift deals with the psychological, social and cultural processes associated with habitual language use under conditions of intergroup contact. Under certain conditions of interaction the relative incidence and configuration of bilingualism stabilizes and remains fairly constant over time within each interacting group. However, under other circumstances an “other tongue” may continue to gain speakers to the end that bilingualism initially increases and then decreases as the erstwhile “other tongue” becomes the predominant language of the old and the mother tongue of the young. The second subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift seeks to determine the processes that distinguish between such obviously different conditions of interaction as well as the processes whereby the one condition is transformed into the other. The processes pertaining to this topical subdivision may be conceived of either as antecedent, concurrent (contextual), or consequent variables, depending on the design of particular studies.

pated, although no attempt will be made to discuss them at this time: the independence or independent importance of all of the measures provided for by the dominance configuration; individual vs. group forms; the need to disguise or insulate questions on language use (“One can gain the confidence of a bilingual by getting him to talk about the things he is interested in much more easily than by asking him searching questions about his language”: 37, p. 21); provision for multi-lingual contact situations in language use data. (Psychology and Sociology have a long tradition of self-report data such as Ruth Johnston’s, 49, 50), as contrasted with observed or demonstrated language use data. (Psychology and Sociology have a long tradition of self-report data [e.g. in the measurement of attitudes or preferences], although self-reports sometimes show little correlation with observed or demonstrated behavior. Nevertheless self-report data continue to be considered important in these disciplines, at least as a level of behavior noteworthy in itself. The relationship between self-reports of habitual language use in given domains or sources of variance and the observations of field workers or the productions of Ss themselves have yet to be studied.) Finally, it may be anticipated that the larger the populations, and the more complex the societies involved, the more difficult will be data collection with respect to dominance configurations.
Their major common characteristic is that they are primarily outside of language per se.

Although it is currently impossible to specify in advance an invariant list of psychological, social and cultural processes or variables that might be of universal importance for an understanding of language maintenance or language shift, it may nevertheless be instructive to note those that have been mentioned by scholars who have devoted greatest attention to this topic thus far. Weinreich discusses the following ten "socio-cultural divisions" in some detail: geographic obstacles or facilitations,31 indigenousness, cultural or ethnic group membership, religion, race, sex, age, social status, occupation, and rural vs. urban residence (88, pp. 89-97). Haugen also lists many of these same categories and, in addition, family, neighborhood, political affiliation (including nationality and citizenship) and education (38, p. 91). Mackey's list of external functions specifies several "variables" that may presumably modify language use: duration of contact, frequency of contact and "pressures" of contact derived from "economic, administrative, cultural, political, military, historical, religious or demographic" sources (66, p. 61-63).

Underlying (or overlying) psychological, social and cultural processes are less fully listed or discussed by any of the above scholars than are demographic groupings or institutional categories per se. The result of such reliance on disjointed categories has been that no broadly applicable or dynamic theories, concepts or findings have been derived from most earlier studies. Indeed, the study of language maintenance and language shift currently lacks either a close relationship to theories of sociocultural change more generally or to theories of intergroup relations more specifically. Just as an understanding of social-behavior-through-language must depend upon a general theory of society so the understanding of language maintenance or language shift must depend on a theory of socio-culture contact and socio-cultural change.

2.1 The paucity of cross-cultural and diachronic regularities

It would seem that since we are concerned with the possibility of stability or change in language behavior on the one hand, we must be equally concerned with all of the forces contributing to stability or to change

31 Weinreich points out that geographic obstacles (mountains, deserts, etc.) or facilitations (rivers, trade routes, etc.) in the path of group contact have frequently influenced group interaction and, therefore, language contact, including language maintenance or language shift.
in human behavior more generally, on the other. Thus the selection of psychological, social and cultural variables for the study of language maintenance and language shift may well be guided not only by impressions of what seem to be the most relevant processes in a particular contact situation but also by more general theories of personal, social, and cultural change. This is not to imply that all forces leading to change in other-than-language behaviors necessarily also lead to language shift. Indeed, whether or not this is the case (or, put more precisely, a determination of the circumstances under which language and non-language behaviors change concurrently, consecutively or independently) constitutes one of the major intellectual challenges currently facing this field of inquiry. If this challenge is to be met, it will be necessary for the study of language maintenance and language shift to be conducted within the context of studies of intergroup contacts that attend to important other-than-language processes as well: urbanization (ruralization), industrialization (or its abandonment), nationalism (or de-ethnization), nativism (or cosmopolitanization), religious revitalization (or secularization), etc.

Our current state of generalizable knowledge in the area of language maintenance and language shift is insufficient for the positing of relationships of cross-cultural or diachronic validity. Indeed, many of the most popularly cited factors purportedly influencing maintenance and shift have actually been found to “cut both ways” in different contexts or to have no general significance when viewed in broader perspective. Thus, Kloss illustrates that no uniform consequences for language maintenance or language shift are derivable from (a) absence or presence of higher education in the mother tongue,32 (b) larger or smaller numbers of speakers, (c) greater or lesser between-group similarity, and (d) positive or hostile attitudes of the majority toward the minority (55, pp. 9-13). The presence of so many ambivalent factors is a clear indication that complex interactions between partially contributory factors (rather than a single overpowering factor) must frequently be involved and that a typology of contact situations (as well as a theory of socio-cultural change) may be required before greater regularity among such factors can be recognized.

32 The realization that higher education (even when it is in the mother tongue) can be a two-edged sword represents a recent partial change in Kloss’s thinking relative to his own earlier position (53) and that of von Pritzvald (75), Kühn (57), and many others impressed with auslandsdeutsche phenomena in Slavic or other “underdeveloped” areas. On the other hand, Kloss continues to list “affiliation with denominations, fostering parochial school”, among the six factors favorable to language maintenance for “normal, non-insulated” minority groups in the United States (55, pp. 6-7). Perhaps this should be taken as a separation rather than as an education variable.
Although debunking represents a rather primitive level of scientific development it may be a necessary stage on the path to greater maturity. Although we CANNOT currently formulate universally applicable regularities in our area of inquiry we CAN indicate that several earlier attempts along these lines fall somewhat short of their mark:

2.11 *A few questionable generalizations*

a. **Language maintenance is a function of intactness of group membership or group loyalty, particularly of such ideologized expressions of group loyalty as nationalism.** Among the evidence pointing to the need for refining or justifying this view is that which reveals that the Guayqueries of Venezuela preserved their groupness by preserving their property relations while giving up their language and religion (45), that lower caste groups in India pursue Sanskritization (emulation) rather than solidarity as a means of group mobility (73), that "the Raetoromans, like the Italian Swiss, cultivate the fullest possible loyalty to their language without aspiring to such nationalistic goals as political independence" (88, p. 100), that the "Yiddishist" movement in Eastern Europe before and after World War I similarly concentrated on a language program rather than on political organization (88, p. 100); that second and third generation Americans frequently maintain "cultural (refinement) bilingualism" after ethnic group loyalty disappears at any functional level and, vice versa, that vestiges of behavioral ethnicity often remain generations after language facility has been lost (20); that many auslandsdeutsche maintained their self identification as Germans in the midst of Polish or Ukrainian majorities, long after completely giving up their German mother tongue (57); that language loyalty is low in many newly developing and highly nationalistic African states (8, 85); that the aristocracy in Czarist Russia (and elites in several other

---

88 The nationalism of modern developing countries seems to be much more characterized by NATIONISM than by the nationalistic elaboration of ethnicity per se. It is much more concerned with the political and economic conditions of NATIONHOOD than with the internal, substantive content of PEOPLEHOOD. The political and administrative limits of the new nations are now usually defined in advance of their formation rather than in the process of their formation. The new nations are less frequently formed as the result of the "painful but glorious" unification of hitherto particularistics who have groped to define the language, the history, the customs, and the missions that unite them and set them apart from others. They are formed along supraethic lines that normally follow colonial demarcations which depended on the fortunes of conquest and the skills of treaty-making. Political and economic self-determination are much more prominent considerations in the new nations than is cultural self-determination of the pre- and post-World War I variety. Political leadership is much more evident than cultural leadership. The Western experience has typically been that industrialization preceded urbanization and (particularly in Eastern Europe) that nationalism
countries at various other times) preferred a language other than the vernacular without changing their national identity or loyalty, etc. Thus, it would seem, on the one hand, that language maintenance has continued under various and highly different forms of group membership, some of which have involved significant changes in traditional social relationships and in pre-established role-relations. On the other hand, it appears that group loyalty can be similarly (if not more) ubiquitous, continuing both with and without language maintenance. The American readiness to use language as an index of acculturation may, in itself, be quite culture bound (78). Hymes' observation that "some languages do not enjoy the status of a symbol crucial to group identity" (47, p. 30) and Weinreich's observation that "the connection (between language maintenance and group maintenance) is thus at least flexible and cannot be taken entirely for granted" (88, p. 100) really represent important intellectual challenges to the study of language maintenance and language shift. We very much need a more refined understanding of the circumstances under which behaviors toward language and behaviors toward the group are related to each other in particular ways. We can recognize today that the pre-World War II views of many German students of language maintenance and language shift (as to whether language and language consciousness create - or are derived from - race, peoplehood and consciousness of kind) where too simplified and too colored by then current political considerations. However, the fact remains that the relationship between language-saliency and group-saliency is almost as speculative today as it was at that time, although it seems clear that a language undergoing massive displacement may be retained most fully by increasingly atypical and self-consciously mobilized populations as displacement progresses.

b. Urban dwellers are more inclined to shift; rural dwellers (more conservative and more isolated) are less inclined to shift. This is one of the most reasonable and best documented generalizations in the study of language maintenance and language shift. Nevertheless, preceded nationism and that the first set of phenomena preceded the second. In the new nations, the reverse sequences seem to be more common, and these may be among the major socio-cultural determinants de-emphasizing language issues in connection with local or regional languages, on the one hand, and which favor the continued use of supra-regional and colonial language, on the other. Indeed, it may be that language concerns are most noticeable today only where we find socio-cultural conflicts in which the likelihood of complete political separatism is highly problematic (Canada, Belgium, India, e.g.).

34 See, e.g., the reports of The American Council of Learned Societies (1), Carman
it runs counter to the first mentioned generalization, above, in that consciousness of ethnicity and the espousal of nationalism have been primarily urban phenomena. Language revival movements, language loyalty movements, and organized language maintenance efforts have commonly originated and had their greatest impact in the cities. Intelligentsia and middle class elements, both of which are almost exclusively urban, have frequently been the prime movers of language maintenance in those societies which possess both rural and urban populations. Indeed, urban groups have been "prime movers", organizers or mobilizers more generally, that is in connection with other than language matters as well as in connection with language behavior and behavior toward language. Thus, whereas small rural groups may have been more successful in establishing relatively self-contained communities which reveal language maintenance through the preservation of traditional interaction patterns and social structures, urban groups, exposed to interaction in more fragmented and specialized networks, may reveal more conscious, organized and novel attempts to preserve or revive or change their traditional language. The urban environment does facilitate change. However, the direction of such change has not always favored language shift at the expense of language maintenance. When it has favored the one and when the other (and when urban-inspired language shift has actually signified a return to a languishing ancestral language), represents a further challenge to this field of study.35

C. THE MORE PRESTIGEFUL LANGUAGE DISPLACES THE LESS PRESTIGEFUL LANGUAGE. Our earlier discussions of sources of variance and do-
MAINS OF LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR may have prepared us for the realization that language prestige is not a unit trait or tag that can be associated with a given language under all circumstances. Indeed, our earlier discussions were necessary precisely because the prestige of languages can vary noticeably from one context to another and from one point of view to another. It is for this very reason that Weinreich recommends that "as a technical term ... 'prestige' had better be restricted to a language's value in social advance, or dispensed with altogether as too imprecise" (88, p. 79). However, even this limitation does not solve all of our problems since social advance itself is relative to various reference groups. Advance in family and neighborhood standing may require a different language than advance in occupational or governmental standing. The fact that an overall hierarchy of reference groups may exist does not mean that the top-most reference group will be dominant in each face-to-face situation.  

It may be precisely because "prestige" obscures so many different considerations and has been used with so many different connotations that the relationship between prestige data and language maintenance or language shift data has been rather more uneven than might otherwise be expected. Thus, whereas Hall claims that "It is hard to think of any modern instance in which an entire speech community is under pressure to learn a sub-standard variety of a second language" (34, p. 19), it is really not very hard to do so: A Low German dialect displaced Lithuanian in East Prussia before World War I, although many Lithuanians there were highly conversant with Standard German (28, p. 61). Unstandardized Schwyzertütsch is replacing Romansh, although several generations of Raetoromans have known Standard German as well (87, pp. 284-286). Standard German completely displaced Danish in a trilingual area of Schleswig, but it was itself then increasingly displaced by the local Low German dialect (83). Obviously, Schwyzertütsch maintains itself quite successfully in competition with Standard German, Landsmaal achieved considerable success (into the 1930's, at the very least) in competition with Dano-Norwegian; Yiddish won speakers and adherants among Russified,  

---

86 Herman makes this quite clear in his discussion of (a) conditions under which "background factors" will or will not dominate over "immediate situation factors" with respect to language choice, and of (b) conditions in which "immediate situation factors" will or will not dominate over "personal factors" (41). His paper is definitely among the more stimulating attempts to provide social-psychological theory for this area of study.

87 E.g., usefulness in communication, literary-cultural merit, emotional significance, overall respect, overall popularity, etc.
Polonized and Germanized Jewish elites in Eastern Europe before and after World War I; Castilian speaking workers settling in more industrialized Catalonia tend to shift to Catalan, etc. Indeed, the entire process whereby a few classical languages were displaced by "lowly" vernaculars and whereby some of the latter, in turn, were later displaced by still other and even "less prestigious" vernaculars (13; the latter are still referred to as "dialects", e.g. Yiddish, Ukrainian, Byelo-Russian, Flemish, Afrikaans, Macedonian, to mention only European derivatives) indicates that the prestige notion is easily discredited unless serious qualifications and contextual redefinitions are attempted. This too may be an appropriate task for the study of language maintenance and language shift. 38

All in all we would be hard put to find a single conclusion in this field of study that would not be subject to question in the light of cross-cultural and diachronic study. This is not due to the fact that earlier conclusions are necessarily erroneous. It is simply due to the fact that they pertain to a limited set of parameters and circumstances and that neither the original investigators nor their subsequent critics have been in a good position to state just what these were or are. A partial rectification of this state of affairs might obtain if the world wide literature on language maintenance and language shift could be subjected to secondary analysis on the basis of an advanced and uniform theoretical model. Under such circumstances, indeed, parameter estimation rather than merely hypotheses testing alone might finally become possible in this field of study.

2.2 Toward more general theory and a more inclusive comparative approach

a. When two groups are in contact they (and, therefore, the language that "represent" them to each other) are differentially involved in the crucial socio-cultural processes that characterize their interaction. These processes serve to increase or decrease interaction between the popula-

38 In general, the phenomenological validity of the "prestige" concept is so general (i.e. speakers so commonly regard their language as appropriately prestigeful for their purposes) and the objective determination of the concept so difficult that the former level may be a better one to investigate than the latter. The fact that Hasidim in Williamsburg regard Yiddish as more appropriate for most of their purposes than either English, Hebrew or Hungarian, needs to be examined from the point of view of their values, goals and social organization rather than from any "more objective" point of view.
tions or sub-populations in question, to either detach them from or to confirm them in their accustomed sources of authority, to either lead them to influence others or to be particularly receptive to influence from others, to either emphasize or minimize their own groupness and its various manifestations, to either rise or fall in relative power or control over their own and each other’s welfare, to either view with positiveness or negativeness the drift of the interaction between them and to react toward this drift on the basis of such views. We must look to these engulfing socio-cultural processes and, particularly, to indices of individual and group involvement in them, in our efforts to explain the direction or rate of language maintenance and language shift.

b. However, after having appropriately selected and specified one or more variables from among the endless subtleties that make up the “process” of socio-cultural change, it may still be found that their cross-cultural and diachronic study reveals inconsistent results. The “same” process (e.g. “urbanization”, as measured by constant indices such as those selected and cross-culturally applied by Reissman, 76) may result in language shift away from hitherto traditional language in some cases, in language shift back to traditional languages in other cases, while revealing significantly unaltered maintenance of the status quo in still others. Under such circumstances a typology of contact situations might serve to control or regularize a number of group or contextual characteristics, in the manner of moderator variables, and, by so doing, reveal greater order in the data.

We all have an intuitive impression that the “American immigrant case” (24) is different from the “Brazilian immigrant case” (90); that the “Spanish conquest case” (7, 15) is different from the “Anglo-American conquest case” (12, 32); that the “immigrant case”, in general, is different from the “conquest case”, in general; that the “Yiddish speaking immigrant to America case” (23) is different from “German speaking immigrant to America case” (55), etc. The question remains how best to systematize these intuitive impressions, i.e., what variables or attributes to utilize in order that contact situations might be classified in accord with the differences between them that we sense to exist. In the terms of R.A. Schermerhorn’s recently formulated typology (80) the “American immigrant case” immediately prior to World War I would be characterized as revealing (i) sharply unequal power configurations between non-English speaking immigrants and English-speaking “old-Americans”; (ii) incorporation (rather than extrusion or colonization) as the type of control exercised by American core society over the immi-
grants; (iii) marked plurality and recent immigration (rather than duality, intermediate plurality without recent immigration, or any other of a continuum of patterns) as the PLURALITY PATTERN; (iv) intermediate stratification and substantial mobility within the STRATIFICATION PATTERN; (v) widespread mutual legitimization of acculturation and de-ethnization as the INTERPRETATION OF CONTACT in philosophical or group image terms; and (vi) growing industrialization, mass culture and social participation as MAJOR SOCIAL FORCES.39

Given the above typological framework it has proved possible to summarize the current status of language maintenance and language shift among pre-World War I immigrants in terms of a very few PRE-CONTACT FACTORS, HOST FACTORS, and PRODUCT FACTORS (24). Unfortunately, Schermerhorn's typology for intergroup contacts is so recent that is has not yet been widely tested on either practical or theoretical grounds, whether in conjunction with language maintenance-language shift or in conjunction with other topics in the area of intergroup relations. However, it may be expected that any typology based upon six parameters, each with several subdivisions, is likely to be somewhat unwieldy and require simplification.

At the opposite extreme of complexity from Schermerhorn's typology is one which is derivable from an intensive review of the extensive literature on auslandsdeutschum.* One of the major differentiations among the German settlers seems to have been the ORIGINAL LEGITIMIZATION AND CONCENTRATION OF THEIR SETTLEMENTS. A three way break is recognizable here: STAMMSIEDLUNGEN (settlements founded as a result of official invitation and assistance from non-German governments), TOCHTERSIEDLUNGEN (settlements founded by those who left the earlier Stammiedlungen and who settled elsewhere as GROUPS, but without governmental invitation or assistance), and EINSIEDLUNGEN (the in-migration of German individuals or of small occupationally homogeneous groups into non-German communities). Another related distinction is that between the relative "cultural development" of the settlers and their hosts. During

39 The inclusion of "major social forces" in Schermerhorn's typology carries one step beyond my own convictions that socio-cultural processes should be treated as variables rather than as classificatory attributes. Nevertheless Schermerhorn's approach does not preclude the study of degrees of any particular major social force, taken as an independent variable, in conjunction with his overall typological approach.

* Kühn (57a) seems to have developed the typology of German Sprachinseln further than did any of his contemporaries. He provides typologies according to (i) origin and colonization type, (ii) surroundings, and (iii) period of settlement and age. In all, he discusses 15 characteristics of German Sprachinseln, most of which are applicable to all types.
the decade before the second world war the two most frequently recognized co-occurrences were (a) EINSIEDLUNGEN of "culturally more mature" Germans living in the midst of a "culturally less developed" population, as opposed to (b) STAMM- and TOCHTERSIEDLUNGEN of "culturally younger" Germans surrounded by a "more mature, nation-oriented" population. Thus, although only two diagonal cells of a theoretically complete two-by-two typology are extensively discussed it is possible to find examples of the remaining cells as well. Even when limited to the two co-occurrences mentioned above very interesting and consistent differences appear both in rate and in stages of language shift and acculturation. The implications of this rough typology and of the regularities that it has suggested deserve consideration in connection with quite different intergroup contact settings.

c. Although the study of language maintenance or language shift need not be completely limited to the comparison of separate cases it is nevertheless undeniably true that the comparative method is quite central to inquiry within this topic area. Certainly the comparative method is indispensable in our pursuit of cross-cultural and diachronic regularities. Assuming that a relatively uniform set of appropriate socio-cultural process-measures could be selected and applied and assuming that a recognizably superior typology of contact situations were available it would then become possible to study:

(i) The same language group in two separate interaction contexts that are judged to be highly similar (with respect to primary socio-cultural process(es) and contact type), e.g., two separate German STAMMSIEDLUNGEN in rural Poland.

(ii) The same language group in two separate interaction contexts judged to be quite dissimilar (with respect to major socio-cultural process(es) and contact type), e.g., one German-Swiss community in contact

40 In the case of EINSIEDLUNGEN of "culturally more mature" Germans the following progression of rough stages appears: (i) "other tongue" for communication with non-Germans, (ii) "other tongue" for communication with other German immigrants, (iii) "other tongue" for family communication, (iv) "other tongue" for internal speech, (v) national de-identification, (vi) ethnic-religious de-identification, (vii) intermarriage. In the case of STAMM- and TOCHTERSIEDLUNGEN of "culturally younger" Germans the following stages are most frequently differentiated: (i) national de-identification, (ii) ethnic de-identification, (iii) "other tongue" for communication with non-Germans and for internal speech, (iv) "other tongue" for communication and intermarriage. An overarching Protestant-Catholic difference (Catholics being more likely to experience rapid umvolkung) is also repeatedly stressed (30, 57, 65).

41 Yet another typology of contact settings may be derived from Weinreich's paper on bilingualism in India (89) in which exposure to contact, group size, functional importance of languages, and linguistic diversity are the major classificatory topics.
with Swiss Raetoromans and another German-Swiss community in Cincinnati, Ohio.

(iii) Different language groups in two separate interaction contexts judged to be highly similar (with respect to major socio-cultural process(es) and contact type), e.g., a Polish speaking and a Slovak speaking community, both of rural origin, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

(iv) Different language groups in two separate interaction contexts judged to be quite dissimilar (with respect to major socio-cultural process(es) and contact type), e.g., a German STAMMSIEDLUNG in rural Poland and a Slovak community in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Thus, by judiciously contrasting groups, socio-cultural processes and types of contact situations (not necessarily taken two at a time, if higher level interaction designs prove to be feasible) it should become possible to more meaningfully apportion the variance in language maintenance or language shift outcomes. Furthermore, the greater our insight with respect to socio-cultural processes and the more appropriate our typology of intergroup contact situations, the more possible it becomes to meaningfully assemble and analyze language maintenance and language shift files. Such files would permit both cross-cultural and diachronic analysis, of primary as well as of secondary data, based upon comparable data, collected and organized in accord with uniform sets of socio-cultural processes and contact categories. This state of affairs is still far off but it is the goal toward which we might attempt to move within this second topical subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift, once more basic methodological and conceptual questions reach a somewhat more advanced level of clarification.

3.0 BEHAVIOR TOWARD LANGUAGE IN THE CONTACT SETTING

The third (and final) major topical subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift is concerned with BEHAVIOR TOWARD LANGUAGE (rather than with language behavior or behavior through language), particularly, with more focused and conscious behaviors on behalf of either maintenance or shift per se. Strictly speaking this subdivision may be properly considered a subtopic under 2.0, above. However, it is of such central significance to this entire field of inquiry that it may appropriately receive separate recognition. Three major categories of behaviors toward language are discernible within this topical subdivision:
3.1 Attitudinal-affective behaviors

We know all too little about language oriented attitudes and emotions (running the gamut from language loyalty – of which language nationalism is only one expression – to language antipathy – of which language betrayal is only one expression) as distinguished from attitudes and emotions toward the “typical” speakers of particular language variants. The features of language that are considered attractive or unattractive, proper or improper, distinctive or common-place, have largely remained unstudied. However, in multilingual settings, particularly in those in which a variety of “social types” are associated with each language that is in fairly widespread use, languages per se (rather than merely the customs, values and cultural contributions of their modal speakers) are reacted to as “beautiful” or “ugly”, “musical” or “harsh”, “rich” or “poor”, etc. Generally speaking, these are language stereotypes (17). However, the absence or presence of a “kernel of truth” (or of verifiability itself) is entirely unrelated to the mobilizing power of such views.

The manifold possible relationships between language attitudes and language use also remain largely unstudied at the present time. Although Lambert reports a positive relationship between success in school-based second language learning and favorable attitudes toward the second language and its speakers (60), this finding need not be paralleled in all natural multilingual contact settings. Thus, Ruth Johnston reports a very low correlation between subjective and objective (external) assimilation in the language area (50). Many older Polish immigrants in Australia identified strongly with English, although they hardly spoke or understood it several years after their resettlement. On the other hand, many young immigrants spoke English faultlessly and yet identified strongly with Polish, although they spoke it very poorly (49). Similarly, in summarizing my findings concerning current language maintenance among pre-World War I arrivals in the United States coming from rural Eastern and Southern European backgrounds, I reported a long-term distinction between attitudes and use, namely, an increased esteem for non-English mother tongues concomitant with the increased relegation of these languages to fewer and narrower domains of language use (24). Thus, the particular non-English mother tongues in question were now found to be viewed positively and nostalgically by older first and second generation individuals who had formerly characterized these tongues as ugly, corrupted and grammarless in pre-World War II days. Younger second and third generation individuals were found to view these mother tongues (almost always via translations) with less emotion but with even
more respect. Instead of a "third generation return" (35) there seemed to be an "attitudinal halo-ization" within large segments of all generations, albeit unaccompanied by increased usage. This development (a negative relationship over time between use rates and attitudinal positive-ness) was not predictable from most earlier studies of language maintenance or language shift in immigrant or non-immigrant settings. We are far from knowing whether its explanation in American contextual terms (i.e., in terms of the greater acceptability of marginal rather either primordial or ideologized ethnicity) would also apply to other settings in which similar developments might obtain.

3.2 Overt behavioral implementation of attitudes, feelings and beliefs

Both language reinforcement ("language movements") and language planning may be subsumed under this heading. Language reinforcement may proceed along voluntary as well as along official routes and encompasses organizational protection, statutory protection, agitation and creative production. As for language planning, it has not always been recognized that much (if not most) of its activity (standardization, regularization, simplification, purification, amplification, hybridization, etc.) occurs in the context of language maintenance or language shift (21).

The possible relationships between language reinforcement (or language planning), on the one hand, and the waxing or waning of actual language use (or of other socio-cultural processes) are largely unknown at this time. Data from the American immigrant case imply that a number of unexpected relationships may obtain in that novel reinforcements may be introduced as actual language use diminishes. Thus, as even some of the more "exotic" mother tongues (i.e. mother tongues not usually considered to be among the major carriers of European civilization and, therefore, hitherto usually associated only with foreign ethnicity in the minds of "average Americans" (40)) have ceased to be primarily associated with immigrant disadvantages or with full blown religio-ethnic distinctiveness among their own sometime- and erstwhile-speakers, they have been increasingly introduced as languages of study at the university, college and public high school levels (21).* At the same time, massive displacement seems to have had greater inhibitory impact on language planning efforts in the American immigrant case than it has had on language reinforcement efforts. The latter are essentially conservative

* Similar phenomena also occurred some fifty or more years ago in connection with the de-ethnization of the mother tongues of German and Scandinavian immigrants to the United States (36, 55).
and seem to require less in the way of highly specialized leadership. The former are frequently innovative and dependent upon expert personnel working in concert with compliance producing or persuasive authority. To what extent this differential impact also holds true in other types of language shift settings is currently unknown but worthy of study.

3.3  **Cognitive aspects of language response**

Constantly flitting between the above two categories and overlapping partially with the one, with the other, or with both are such matters as: CONSCIOUSNESS of mother tongue (or “other tongue”) as an entity separate from folkways more generally; KNOWLEDGE of synchronic variants, language history and literature; and PERCEPTIONS OF LANGUAGE AS A COMPONENT OF “GROUPNESS”. We have little systematic information concerning the circumstances under which language consciousness, language knowledge and language-related groupness-perceptions do or do not enter into reference group behavior in contact situations. As a result, it is difficult to say at this time whether or when language maintenance and language shift are ideologically mediated as distinguished from their more obvious situational and instrumental determinants discussed thus far. We recognize very gross long-term contrasts in this connection, namely, that there were periods and regions when language “was in no way regarded as a political or cultural factor, still less as an object of political or cultural struggle” (56, p. 6); that there were other periods and regions marked by a sharp increase in such regard, so that language became a principle “in the name of which people... (rallied) themselves and their fellow speakers consciously and explicitly to resist changes in either the functions of their language (as a result of a language shift) or in the structure or vocabulary (as a consequence of interference)” (88, p. 99), and that there currently seems to be less of this than previously, particularly if we compare African with European nationbuilding. However, gross differentiations such as these are patently insufficient to enable us to clarify the conditions under which language becomes a prominent component in PERCEPTIONS of “own-groupness” and “other groupness”. This topic (language-related groupness-perception) is, of course, closely related to one previously mentioned, namely, the role of language in group membership and in group functioning (see section 2.11a, above).

42 The implication of this quotation is that language loyalty is necessarily or primarily defensive in nature; however, perceived threat (or advantage) may be reacted to aggressively as well. Thus, language loyalty may seek to expand the permissible or required domains of one’s language, i.e. to INSIST ON CHANGES rather than merely to resist them.
In the American immigrant case we have seen a growing dissociation between self-perceived ethnic identification and language maintenance. Far from being viewed as necessary components of groupness (whether in the sense of resultants or contributors) non-English mother tongues appear to be viewed increasingly in terms of non-ethnic CULTURAL or non-ethnic PRACTICAL considerations (24, 71). At the same time, some form of ethnic self-identification is frequently still reported by many of those who no longer claim any facility at all in their ethnic mother tongues, implying that in the American immigrant case some kind of ethnicity usually appears to be a much more stable phenomenon than language maintenance (29). Most immigrants became bilingual much before they embarked on de-ethnization or seriously contemplated the possibility of bi-culturism. However, there were obviously exceptions to this process, both in the United States and in other contact settings. We certainly do not seem to be in a position to indicate the underlying regularities in this subtle area of inquiry at the present time.

3.4 Interference and Switching.

Within the topical subdivision of behavior toward language we once again meet the topic of interference and switching, first introduced in section 1.1, above. The absence or presence of interference and switching can have cognitive, affective and overt implementational implications for language maintenance and language shift. Certainly, both interference and switching are related to type and location of bilingualism, on the one hand, and to socio-cultural processes and type of interaction, on the other hand. Moreover, within this topical subdivision it is appropriate to stress that where attitudes and awarenesses concerning purism obtain, interference is sometimes viewed as AN IMPERFECTION – not in the speaker or in his productions but IN THE LANGUAGE ITSELF. At the opposite pole, there are multilingual contact situations in which conscious, purposive interference obtains. In these instances speakers attempt to incorporate

43 Negative attitudes toward mother tongues viewed by their speakers as suffering from excessive interference are revealed by such designations as gemixste pickles and die schönste lengvitch (in referring to American-German); Yankee-Dutch (Netherlandish); Yankee-Yiddish and Yinglish (Yiddish); Minnesota Norwegian (Norwegian); Finglish (Finnish); etc., to mention instances only from the American immigrant scene. A common international designation is “jargon,” this term (or an equivalent) sometimes being accepted as the official name of vernaculars (rather than being restricted to makeshift languages alone). It may very well be that languages or styles revealing considerable stable interference are particularly likely to develop when more substantial language shift is inhibited although group interaction is very substantial.
into their language usage as many elements or features as possible from another language including (in very advanced cases) interference in stress patterns, intonation, and Denkformen. In either case (i.e., when interference occurs although it is considered undesirable, or when interference occurs and is considered desirable) interference is not always considered to be all of one piece. Certain occurrences are considered to be more acceptable, excusable, permissible, necessary than others. In either case it can become a factor in hastening language shift, particularly since bilinguals tend to interpret interference in each of the languages known to them quite differently. Finally, at a point when language shift is appreciably advanced, certain sounds and forms of the language undergoing displacement may become so difficult for the average speaker (while errors in connection with them may become so stigmatized among purists) that this in itself may accelerate further shift. All in all, recognition of interference, attitudes toward interference, and the behavioral consequences of interference represent interesting and important topics within the field of language maintenance and language shift.

4.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Various language maintenance and language shift phenomena have long been of interest to scholars and to laymen. Several sub-topics within this area have undisputed relevance to the daily concerns and joys of millions. Others, of more theoretical interest, are closely related to topics of recognized concern to linguists, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, educators, etc. Culture contact and language contact will always be with us, and out of these contacts will come modifications in habitual behavior as well as attempts to restrain or channel such modifications. Whether (or when) language habits change more or less quickly than others, whether (or when) language loyalties are more or less powerful than others, indeed, whether (or when) men can live in a supraethnic tomorrow without strong links (linguistic and non-linguistic) to their ethnic yesterday and today – these are questions to which there are currently no definitive answers. However, interest in social-psychological aspects of language behavior is currently growing (whether under that name or under the name of socio-

44 There have been many proposed "language reforms" along such lines; see, e.g., the proposal of Elias Molee (70) in connection with American English.
linguistics, anthro-po-linguistics, ethno-linguistics, the ethnography of speaking, the ethnography of communication, the sociology of language, or some other designation). In most instances, there is some recognition of behavior toward language as a crucial topic within the field of social behavior through language. This growing interest will undoubtedly contribute answers to many of the currently unanswerable questions within the field of language maintenance and language shift.

Three major subdivisions of the study of language maintenance and language shift have been suggested. The first deals with the precise establishment of habitual language use in a contact situation. This requires instruments, not yet available, for the measurement of degree of bilingualism and of location of bilingualism along sociologically relevant dimensions. Degree of bilingualism, hitherto recognizable in terms of automaticity, proficiency, and code-intactness at the phonetic, lexical and grammatical levels, must also be investigated with respect to situational variance, role variance and media variance. Location of bilingualism requires investigation with respect to functional variance in appropriately designated domains of language, each domain being abstracted from patterned role-relations, social occasions, encounters, topics and/or other lower order phenomena. The complex relationships between the several components of degree of bilingualism and location of bilingualism may be represented by a dominance configuration which, in turn, may or may not be reducible to a single index of direction of bilingualism. The drift of language maintenance or language shift may be established by diachronic measures pertaining to some or all of the above factors.

The second major topical subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift deals with psychological, social and cultural processes that are associated with ascertained changes in habitual language use. No conceptual systematization of these processes is currently available although several preliminary typologies of “contact situations” exist and require further refinement in cross-cultural perspective.

The third (and final) major subdivision of the study of language maintenance and language shift pertains to behavior toward language, including (but not limited to) more focused and conscious behaviors on behalf of maintenance or shift. Three major sub-topics within this topic are recognizable: attitudinal-affective behaviors (loyalty, antipathy, etc.), overt behavioral implementation (control or regulation of habitual language use via reinforcement, planning, prohibition, etc.), and (overlapping partially with each of the two foregoing sub-topics) cognitive
behaviors (language consciousness, language knowledge, language-related
group-perceptions, etc.).

The exhaustive study of language maintenance and language shift ul-
timately involves the diachronic and synchronic interrelation of the
above three topical subdivisions along conceptual lines. In terms of
systematic inquiry the field as such is still in its infancy. Since the basic
instruments required for the establishment of degree and direction of
anguage maintenance or language shift are still lacking, that would seem
lo be a most important area for concentrated technical attention in the
near future. In addition, it would seem to be most important to establish
a language maintenance and language shift file, with a serious attempt
to attain both world-wide as well as historical completeness. If the data
in such a file were obtained and analyzed via a uniform theoretical or
topical system many of the currently unanswered questions in the study
of language maintenance and language shift might well become somewhat
more tractable. The current writer hopes to engage in both of these
undertakings in the years ahead.

Yeshiva University
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