DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 559 FL 015 246

AUTHOR Sridhar, Kamal K.
TITLE Sociolinguistic Issues in Non-Native Varieties of English.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Dialect Studies; *English (Second Language); *Language Classification; Language Research; *Language Usage; *Language Variation; Linguistic Theory; Pidgins; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics

ABSTRACT

A careful study of second language varieties (SLVs) of English, which have not yet entered the mainstream of sociolinguistic research because of neglect and misunderstanding, shows that they are qualitatively different from the categories recognized in current sociolinguistic typology. SLVs provide some of the clearest evidence of sociocultural determination of language variation, on both micro- and macro-levels. An adequate account of these varieties calls for the descriptive techniques and explanatory power of the variationist, interactionist, and sociology of language paradigms within sociolinguistic theory. The circumstances of their acquisition and their viability as modes of communication argue for a reevaluation of some of the traditional assumptions about second language acquisition and teaching. (Author/MSE)

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ISSUES IN NON-NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

Kamal K. Sridhar
Queens College, City University of New York

Abbreviated title: Sociolinguistics of Non-native Englishes

1985

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ISSUES IN NON-NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

Abstract

A careful study of second language varieties of English shows that they are qualitatively different from the categories recognized in current sociolinguistic typology. They also provide some of the clearest evidence of socio-cultural determination of language variation, both on the micro- and macro- levels. An adequate account of these varieties calls for the descriptive techniques and explanatory power of the variationist, interactionist, and sociology of language paradigms within sociolinguistic theory. The circumstances of their acquisition and their viability as modes of communication argue for a reevaluation of some of the traditional assumptions about second language acquisition and teaching.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC ISSUES IN NON-NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts to explore the implications for sociolinguistic theory of "one of the most significant linguistic phenomena of our time, the incredible spread of English as a global language" (Ferguson 1982: vii). From a speech community consisting of about 7 million speakers on a little island at the time of Shakespeare (Quirk 1985), English has spread to every corner of the world, and is used today by over 700 million speakers, out of which nearly or more than half may be non-native users (Strevens 1982). Generations, in some cases centuries, of use in alien socio-cultural contexts has led to the emergence of several non-native varieties of English, including second language varieties such as Indian English, and foreign language varieties, such as Japanese English.

Although variation has been a central theme in sociolinguistic research of the last three decades, it is only recently that variation in the use of language by non-native speakers has come to be taken seriously in mainstream research. However, among the different types of non-native varieties, only the study of pidgins has received much attention (Hymes 1971). Other types, for example, second and foreign language varieties of languages such as English, have not played a role in the development and testing of sociolinguistic theories (see, for example, the textbooks by Trudgill (1974), Dittmar (1976), Hudson (1980), among others).

By ignoring non-native variation except pidgins the standard textbooks imply that either it does not properly fall in the domain of mainstream sociolinguistic research or that the current models are quite adequate to account for this phenomenon. Both these assumptions need to be reexamined in the light of recent work (see Smith 1981, 1983, Kachru 1982a, and Pride 1982) on non-native varieties of English. In this paper I will attempt to show that non-native varieties, especially the established 'institutionalized' second language varieties such as Indian English, Singapore English, Filipino English, and Nigerian English, pose in a particularly focused form many of the problems with which sociolinguistic theory is concerned. I will argue that a theoretically oriented study of such varieties contributes to a better understanding of concepts such as sociolinguistic typology, macro- and micro- sociolinguistic determinants of variation, the role of functional distribution and the establishment of indigenous norms, the role of socio-cultural factors in language acquisition, and the dynamics of language standardization and language planning, among others.

The reasons why non-native varieties (NNVs hereafter) have not entered the mainstream of sociolinguistic research parallel the reasons for a similar neglect, until recently, of pidgins, Black English, and other "non-standard" varieties. First, dialectologists considered them marginal to the main focus of their studies, namely native varieties. Second, they were denied systematicity, being regarded essentially as a collection of idiosyncratic "errors" or "localisms" caused by indolence or

ignorance (Prator 1968, Newmark 1966). Third, even when systematicity was implicitly conceded by discussing the phenomena under such titles as "Indian English: An examination of the errors of idioms made by Indians in writing English" (Whitworth 1907) the approach was prescriptive and corrective rather than descriptive or scientific. Fourth, the negative pedagogical stereotypes were adopted by the speakers of these varieties themselves, who did not think their "corrupt" or "degenerate" renditions were worthy of serious description or codification.

These reasons are interesting from the point of view of the history and sociology of science. The relegation of the NNVs to a marginal status follows from a sacred cow in linguistics namely, the

> special place [given] to the native speaker as the only truly valid and reliable source of language data whether those data are the elicited texts of the descriptivists or the intuitions the theorist works with (Ferguson 1982:vii)

The second reason, denial of the systematicity of the NNVs, is not unlike other manifestations of prejudice which are then used to justify unequal treatment. The pedagogical attitude which insists on conformity with the prescriptive norms, even from the earliest stage of language learning, derives from a long-held axiom in langauge teaching which has only recently come to be challenged. Finally, the self-annulling attitude of non-native speakers is of course typical of low prestige langauges all over the world.

In addition to these axiomatic and attitudinal barriers there has been a serious, practical obstacle which has come in the way of the desired integration. This is the paucity of

detailed, rigorous descriptions of the varieties which either explicitly address or contain data of the sort that can be used to address current issues in sociolinguistic theory. Most of the descriptions are either impressionistic or fragmentary. They present a wealth of individual features attributed to the varieties but are often lacking in crucial background information on the sources of the data, the conditions of elicitation, or the regularity of its occurrence. There is virtually no empirical or experimental evidence as to the relationship between the occurrence of a given feature and the socio-economic, educational, substratum characteristics of the speakers (some exceptions to be discussed later are Kachru 1976, Smith and Rafiqzad 1979, Platt and Weber 1980 Parasher 1980, Shaw 1981, Sridhar 1982). Because most of the studies of NNVs contain observations which, eminently plausible though they may be, are stated in such broad or vague terms as to need considerable specification before being subjected to empirical validation, the study of NNVs may be said to be still in a pre-theoretical stage. One of the aims of this paper, therefore, is to make explicit the relationship between some aspects of the descriptive data and current theoretical issues in sociolinguistics. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with socio-linguistic typology: here I will present arguments for treating three types of NNVs--pidgins, second language varieties (SLVs), and foreign language varieties (FLVs)--as separate sociolinguistic categories defined in terms of explicitly stated criteria. The rest of the paper will focus on SLVs. Section 3

deals with methodological issues in describing the formal properties of SLVs. Section 4 explores situational features contributing to the distinctiveness of SLVs; section 5 is concerned with selected applied sociolinguistic issues raised by SLVs. The final section 6 brings the discussion together.

2. SOCIOLINGUISTIC TYPOLOGY

The second language and foreign language varieties have, in a sense, fallen between two stools in sociolinguistic research. At one extreme, they are regarded as "nothing but" pidgins and at another extreme they seem to be 'varieties' like other native varieties. In order to motivate a separate categorical status in sociolingusitc theory for these varieties, it is necessary to differentiate them from pidgins at one end and native varieties at the other and, of course, from each other. I will attempt to do this in this section with reference to a set of explicit criteria based on formal features, functional range, and evaluations of status. I will not compare these varieties to creoles, since they are not native languages of the respective communities.

Although linguists are not in agreement as to the necessary and sufficient features of a pidgin, its generally conceded that pidgins involve the following characteristics: a drastically reduced vocabulary (as few as 700 to 1,000 words in the case of Sango, see Samarin 1971:119), elimination of several types of grammatical features, and an extremely limited functional range. Attitudinally, they carry very little prestige (Hymes 1971). The other two major types of NNVs are sharply differentiated from pidgins with respect to all these criteria. Taking as our basis

the educated varieties of these speech forms (I will return to the question of how these are defined in Section 3), the following observations can be made about second and foreign language varieties: they show no such "impoverishment" of vocabulary as the pidgins. On the contary, SLVs exhibit expansion in the area of the lexicon. This expansion is effected through several processes including heavy borrowing from the native languages; calques; hybrid words and compounds; novel collocations not attested in native varieties; and neologisms created by the application of regular word-formation rules of the reference language (Kachru 1975, Bokamba 1982). This feature of creativity has been cited by some linguists as a ground for classifying SLVs as 'dialects' of the reference languages on par with native dialects (Halverson 1966). This feature also distinguishes SLVs from the foreign langauge varieties--the latter tend to be conservative. In the area of grammar, even the middle level subvarieties of SLVs are marked by regular differences from the reference language patterns, for example, in embedded questions, invariable tag in tag questions, use of present perfect for simple past, ommission of articles, use of mass nouns as count nouns, use of the progressive aspect with verbs of perception, among others (cf. Tay and Gupta 1983, Bokamba 1982, Kachru 1969). While some of these features may be viewed as examples of "simplification" characteristic of pidgins, it is clear that the grammar of SLVs is both quantitatively, and more important, qualitatively different from that of pidgins. SLVs do not show elimination of grammatical categories such as

number, gender, etc., and elimination of redundant features as in pidgins. Their sentence structure is marked by a degree of complexity (measured in terms of the range of embeddings, and types of subordinating and coordinating devices employed) comparable to that found in native varieties. The paucity of available research on FLVs makes it difficult to say whether they are different from SLVs in this respect. Observational evidence indicates that they are also marked by grammatical differences from the reference language norms but these differences do not amount to 'reduction' either (cf. Stanlaw 1982) . However, the question of the nature and degree of formal differences between SLVs and FLVs is an important topic of research that has yet to be addressed adequately.

The three types of NNVs are sharply differentiated in terms of <u>functional range</u> also. Traditionally, the functional range of a language has been discussed in the framework of Fishman's (1965) concept of <u>domains</u> or institutional contexts, defined in terms of factors such as location, topic, and participants. Typical domains investigated in the literature include family, neighborhood, school, work, religion, transactions such as shopping, and others. Of course, a finer analysis involving different combinations of topic, participants and style is employed to arrive at a detailed profile of the functional range of a lanbguage or variety.

Most pidgins are employed in a severely restricted range of domains, eg. trading, plantations, tourism. (Some pidgins, eg. Tok Pisin, are now used in an extended range of domains including school and administration, but these are arguably varieties on

their way to becoming second languages.) FLVs, on the other hand, are used in a wider range of contexts such as international trade, international scientific and cultural exchange (eg. conferences), and tourism. It may be noted that all these domains involve contact with speakers of the reference language, whether native or non-native, as in the case of a Korean businessman or scientist interacting with her Norwegian or Colombian counterpart. FLVs are rarely used in intranational domains such as in local government offices or among friends discussing everyday topics. (A possible exception may be technical discussions among scientists or engineers.) In contrast, SLVs have a broad functional range. They are typically used in all or most of the following domains: administration, education (as subject language and as medium of instruction) especially at the higher levels, inter-regional communication (involving business people, scientists, engineers and other professionals, as well as in travel and correspondence), in the national and regional media, in general conversations and transactions among the educated people, and in creative writing. This range of intranational use is undoubtedly the single most important factor determining the form and status of SLVs. Convincing empirical support for the typological differences between SLVs and FLVs posited here may be found in Shaw (1981) discussed in detail later on in this paper.

As important as the range is the evaluation of functions performed by the three types of non-native varieties. The functions of pidgins are typically not highly valued while those

of SLVs are analogous to those of the 'High' variety in a diglossic situation (but see section 4 for qualifications). FLVs also perform high functions relative to pidgins but they are not as highly valued across a range of domains. The importance of the evaluation of functions rather than simply the functional range is illustrated by the fact that in India, English is the lingua franca of the educated elites in high domains while Hindi functions as a low level lingua franca (Sridhar 1982).

Second and foreign language varieties are also unlike pidgins in some other respects. SLVs have time depth. Indian English, for example, has a history of over two centuries, and there is evidence that this variety is actually increasing its uses. FLVs are also relatively more 'stable' than pidgins. A pidgins is not mutually intelligible with the reference language. SLVs and FLVs in their more educated or 'standard' forms are intelligible (Bansal 1969, Nelson 1982, Smith and Rafiqzad 1979). Pidgins are primarily learnt by informal contact. The primary agency for the learning of SLVs and FLVs is through formal instruction. There is, of course, a greater degree of environmental support and hence opportunity for informal learning in SLVs something that is markedly lacking in the learning of FLVs.

The arguments presented in this section are, I believe, sufficient to motivate the setting up of second and foreign language varieties as separate sociolinguistic types analogous to categories such geographical and social varieties, pidgins, creoles, doglossia, etc. I will now examine to what extent the theoretical concepts and methods used in current sociolinguistic

models may be applied to the description of these varieties. The discussion will be based primarily on data from Indian English but I will occassionally refer to other SLVs as well.

3. PROBLEMS IN THE DESCRIPTION OF SECOND LANGUAGE VARIETIES

Descriptions of second language varieties such as Indian English so far have adopted what may be termed a deviationist approach, contrasing the non-native formal patterns with those of British or American English. This approach suffers form two drawbacks. First, the term 'deviation' used by linguists such as Kachru (1969) has been interpreted as a potentially judgemental characteristic (Mehrotra 1982), although it was intended only in a descriptive sense. Secondly, the contrastive approach has resulted in the listing of a heterogeneous set of departures from the native norms, collectively labelled 'Indian English' 'Filipino English', etc. An examination of the long lists of features claimed to mark any of the second language varieties reveals that they have been culled from speakers with different levels of proficiency, different mother tongue backgrounds, and different styles of usage. The contrastive approach, therefore, is useful only as an initial stage of analysis to identify the variables. It needs to be supplemented by (i) a <u>systemic</u> approach that seeks to explain how the putative features pattern into an autonomous system; and (ii) a <u>sociolinguistic</u> approach that seeks to predict the social and/or linguistic circumstances in which a given formal feature is likely to occur.

I will briefly explain this point with selcted examples of Indian English. Consider the observation that Indian English

speakers tend to use the non-past perfective form where a native speaker would use the simple past (eg. 'I have gone there yesterday'). This observation is correct (at least of certain mother tongue varieties, eg. Telugu) but inadequate, unless a complete analysis of the set of aspectual contrasts in Indian English is given in sui generis terms. Similar analyses are needed to illuminate the use of articles, count/mass distinction in noun phrases, etc. There are other examples. It has been claimed that lack of inversion of subject and auxiliary in yes-no questions, and the use of the invariant tag "isn't it" or "no?" are in tag questions two (of the many) important features of Indian English. However, there is quite a bit of variation in the frequency of occurrence of these features, with education being almost certainly the major determinant. Similarly, simplification of consonant clusters and insertion of glides before vowel-initial words have also been cited as typical markers. But the strategy employed in the simplification (anaptyxis or epenthesis) depends on the speaker's mother tongue. Glide insertion is restricted to Dravidian language speakers. And whether these features occur at all and their frequency of use depends on the speaker's education/occupational status.

The preceeding discussion demonstrates the dangers of a purely linguistic (i.e., formal) analysis of a second language variety. Even more so than in the case of native varieties, second language varieties demand sociolinguistics as a congruent "level" of analysis.

Among the factors determining the occurrence of different

non-native variants, the following seem to be intuitively the more important ones: (i) education and/or occupation; (ii) mother tongue; (iii) style, formal/informal; and (iv) medium, spoken/written. While some of these factors are standard in sociolinguistic theory, the mother tongue as a determinant is, of course, applicable only in the analysis of a non-native variety. It is also possible that the relative weightage given to education/occupation may be different from that given in the analysis of native language variation, because the "lower" levels of the educational spectrum exhibit differences in grammar from other levels to a degree unimaginable in native varieties. The significance of medium as a determinant of variation also seems to be different in second language contexts, where the spoken medium is marked by a limted register differentiation and, perhaps, greater density of occurrence of non-native features. Since there has been very little systematic study of the role of these factors in non-native variation, it is hard to be more explicit at present. I will now turn to a detailed examination of the first two of the above listed determinants.

3.1 Variation based on education/occupation

It is widely recognized that terms such as Indian English, Nigerian English, Singapore English are abstractions. In actual fact one encounters a continuum of language types, somewhat like the post-creole continuum described by DeCamp (1971). This range has been referred to as the cline of bilingualism (Kachru 1969), speech continuum, lectal range (Platt 1975), etc. At one end of the continuum are various types of local pidgins (used by porters, waiters, street vendors, taxi drivers, office

attendants, tourist guides). Preliminary descriptions of these pidgins are found in Schucharat (1891 [1980]), Hosali (1982), and Mehrotra (1982). These pidgins are primarily products of informal acquisition and exhibit structural features typical of pidgins described in the literature. Resulting from formal instruction in English are two types of proficiency in the language that may be called, following Platt's terminology, mesolects and acrolects. Mesolects are used by speakers with limited education (upto the first college degree) who are employed in various types of middle level occupations for example as school teachers, office clerks and receptionists, insurance agents, contractors, etc.). They are marked by a heavy regional accent and various types of grammatical differences from the native standard. The third type or acrolect, is used by speakers with considerable educational qualifications who are employed as professionals, i.e., doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, professors, high level government officers, business executives, journalists, etc. This variety is widely understood throughout the country and abroad and shows a wider style range though it is still noticeably distinct from the rererence language norms at every level of linguistic organization. In addition, a very small number of speakers use a variety that is not easily distinguishable from native varieties. However, this is generally regarded as a sign of affectation.

3.2 Mother tongue based variation

By vitrue of their use in multilingual societies, SLVs exhibit various degrees of 'interference' from the mother tongue.

Since this type of interference is highly patterned and regular (see Weinreich 1953, Selinker and Gass 1983), this results in recognizably distinct sub-varieties. Kachru (1976) reports that speakers of Indian English claim to be able to identify several different mother tongue-based subvarieties, such as Panjabi English, Tamil English, Bengali English, Hindi English, etc. Bangbose (1971) has pointed out that this is true of Nigerian English as well, where Hausa, Yoruba, and Igbo speakers can be identified by their English (see also Akere 1978). The accuracy and reliability of such identifications, however, has yet to be researched.

While transfer of structural features from the mother tongue adds to the diversity of non-native varieties used in multilingual communities, it also has a unifying effect when the mother tongues in question share typological or sprachbund features. This is true of South Asia, where due to millennia of language contact, most of the languages of the area have come to share a number of formal properties (Emeneau 1956) such as retroflex stops, the dative subject construction, etc. The English spoken in this area is influenced by these areal features, contributing to the structural conesiveness of South Asian English (Kachru 1969).

3.3 The notion of a second language speech community

This range of variation, baffling as it is at first glance, is perhaps not much more elaborate than that found in native varieties (cf. Cockney and Received Pronunciation in British English, and Black English and Network Standard in American English). The relevant question is whether this variation is

patterned, and can be related to the customary social and linguistic parameters. Variation per se does not negate the validity of the concept of a speech community as is evident from the following observation by Labov:

> The speech community is not defined by any marked agreement in the use of language elements, so much as by participation in a set of shared norms; these norms may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and by the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation which are invariant in respect to particular levels of usage... (1972:120).

There is indirect evidence that speakers of Indian English participate in a set of shared norms. For example, Willard Shaw (1981) in a survey of 825 students in Singapore, India, and Thailand, asked them to label the variety of spoken by them. The results show that the Singaporeans were divided equally between describing their English as British English (40.5%) or a variety uniquely their own (42.3%). Half of the Indians (50.6%) indicated that a form of Indian English was prevalent, while more than a quarter (27.4%) identified British English as the norm. The Thais (speakers of a foreign language variety) were divided in their opinion of the variety they spoke, 28.1% identified with American English, 40.3% with their own variety, and 25.1% chose the option, "others". A similar pattern was found in a survey of Indian graduate students by Kachru (1976). One of the more urgent desiderata of research on SLVs is the study of the acceptability of educated vs. native utterances to a range of speakers from different backgrounds.

There is also evidence of "uniformity of abstract patterns of variation" in SLVs, though empirical evidence is as yet

limited. Platt and Weber (1980) have shown that a number of variables (eg. the copula in various syntactic positions, past tense marking, plural marking, consonant clusters, etc.) are sensitive to the educational/occupational status of the speakers in Singapore English. They also show that 'lect switching' is conditioned by such factors as the formality of the situation, relationship with the interlocutor, etc. In other words, SLVs seem to exhibit the same patterns of socially conditioned variation as native varieties. The second piece of evidence consists of the fact that speakers of SLVs can identify different sub-varieties based on the mother tongue of the speaker although the accuracy and relia-bility of such identification has not been empirically studied Third, SLVs themselves are sufficiently unified and distinct from one another so that speakers of other varieties are able to "place" a Nigerian or an Indian or a Filipino speaker on the basis of his or her English alone. Again, this claim is based on observation and needs to be empirically supported.

4. SITUATIONAL FACTORS

In this section I will examine the significance, from the viewpoint of sociolinguistic theory, of the patterns of use of English in second language varieties. I stress that the aim is not to give a complete account of the topic but to draw attention to those aspects of the situation which help to explain why second language varieties have the formal characteristics that they have. Let us first examine the domains in which English is used as a lingua franca in India. It is generally assumed that English performs this function mainly in the formal domains such

as academic discussions, high level administration, law, and commerce. However, the few empirical studies available show that English is used as a contact language in other domains as well. Parasher (1980) in a survey of 350 educated bilinguals employed in several all-India level institutions and organizations in Hyderabad-Secunderabad (in South India) found that English played an important role in such informal domains as the family, friendship, neighborhood, and transactions. Although the mother tongue was far more important than English in the family domain, English was nevertheless used with about 25% frequency in conversing with various members of the family. In the friendship and transactions domains it actually outranked the mother tongue by an almost two to one margin. English was the preferred choice of language in corresponding with children, siblings, and friends. In a study of 299 students and 88 employees of government and private enterprises in Bangalore, South India, Sridhar (1982) found that English was used extensively (though not as much as the mother tongue) in several informal domains. These included interactions with friends (students 42%, employees 33%), with friends and relatives during weddings etc., (students 24%), and with customers who speak the respondents' mother tongue (employees 38%). In certain other informal domains, English actually outpaced the mother tongue and Hindi: with strangers on the bus (students 47%), and while visiting another state in India (students 64%). These findings indicate that in the urban areas at least, the role of English is not simply <u>complementary</u> with the mother tongue but is <u>overlapping</u> in certain domains. This

overlap is manifested in actual usage in the form of code-switching and code-mixing and provides the condition for extensive mother tongue influence on the variety of English used.

The second situational factor is interlocutors. The majority of speech situations in which SLVs are employed involve exchanges between speakers of the respective SLVs themselves and only marginally native speakers of English. This observation is supported by the findings of the questionnaire survey of 865 students from Singapore, India, and Thailand by Willard Shaw referred to earlier. In response to the question "It is important for me to speak English so that I can talk to ...," Singaporeans and Indians identified (a) "my fellow countrymen in specific social or business situations"; (b) "fellow countrymen who do not know my first language"; (c) "native English speakers"; and (d) "non-native speakers from other countries" in that order, while Thai students placed native English speakers first and their fellow countrymen last (Shaw 1981:115). This finding like all the others in Shaw's excellent study demonstrates the empirical validity of the dichotomy between second language and foreign language varieties. Furthermore, it shows that second language varieties are used in contexts of shared linguistic and socio-cultural norms and that their reference groups are intra-varietal rather than extra-varietal. This fact in turn has implications for determining the criteria of intelligibility and the instructional model in second language contexts (see section 5).

The third situational factor is the ideational content expressed by English in second language contexts. Although English is foreign to these contexts, it is used primarily to

express an indigenous socio-cultural reality. Indian English, as Kachru has emphasized in several papers (Kachru 1983), is used to express typically Indian socio-cultural meanings. This function is responsible for not only the occurrence of non-native lexical items but also for certain semantic and pragmatic features that have been less well-noticed. Take the semantic domain of kinship, for instance: Indian English uses the term co-brother for "wife's sister's husband" to fill a lexical gap in native English. Similarly, Nigerian English has extended the semantic range of the word family to include one father, several mothers, half brothers and half sisters, in addition to the concept of nuclear family usually denoted by the word (Akere 1978). In India, where vegetarianism is the norm, a meat-eater is designated by the marked term non-vegetarian. In the area of pragmatics, the modes of greeting, introducing, inviting, cursing, apologising, expressing hospitality and gratitude, etc., incorporate semantic formulae characteristic of the corresponding speech acts in Indian languages, which are often quite different from those of the native varieties of English. These are clear cases of how the indigenous nature of the ideational content and the socio-cultural norms governing verbal interactions affect the form of a second language variety.

The last situational factor that I wish to discuss here relates to the role of English within the overall verbal repertoire of the community of second language speakers. As we have already noted, in India at least, English is a predominantly urban language and is restricted (except for the pidginized

varieties) to the educated segment of the population. Its use in higher education, in the influential professions, higher government functions, big time commerce, and influential news media makes it a high prestige language and a coveted asset for upward mobility (for a detailed profile of the extent of use of English in the various domains, see Sridhar 1977, 1979, 1982). The functional distribution of English relative to the mother tongue (and Hindi) is highly reminiscent of diglossic situations described by Ferguson (1959). However, the Indian situation is much more complex even in relation to the model of 'diglossia with bilingualism' discussed in Fishman (1967). While it is true that English is (a) highly codified normative language with a respected literary tradition, (b) a formally acquired language, and (c) used in the High domains (three of the major criteria cited by Ferguson), there are several other characteristics that distinguish the contexts in which second language varieties are used from a typical diglossic situation. First, the codes that would be analogous to the low variety in diglossia are not really low in prestige but only relatively so in certain domains. The major languages of India such as Hindi, Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, and Marathi are the official languages in their respective states and have established literary traditions. In some cases they are themselves diglossic (e.g., Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam). Second, several other codes or languages also figure in the community's repertoire. These may include, depending on the circumstances, Hindi--the official language of the federal government, the tribal or ethnic minority languages of the region (eg. Gondi in Andhra, Tulu in Karnataka), and classical languages (Sanskrit and

Arabic). Thus the Indian situations are closer to the 'polyglossia' in Singapore described by Platt (1977) than to either Ferguson's diglossia or Fishman's diglossia with bilingualism. The multiple codes in the English speaker's repertoire participate in a complex hierarchy of relative prestige. Thus, Hindi is less prestigious than the regional languages (state official languages) in South India (cf. Srinar 1982), but ranks higher than the ethnic or tribal languages. Sanskrit is prestigious in the religious domain and in traditional learning. The mother tongues outrank the ethnic or tribal languages. English, however, ranks highest in prestige in all but a few domains.

This pattern of distribution of functions and their evaluation in SLVs explains the absence of pidgin-like characteristics such as limited vocabulary and reduction of grammatical categories--features characteristic of NNVs used in the limited or low functions.

There are two other situational factors that play a role in determining the form of English used in SLVs. These have to do with the mode and models of acquisition. First, English is learnt predominantly through formal instruction in second language contexts. While this does not come as a revelation, the implications of this fact have only recently come to be appreciated. It has been suggested in the literature on second language acquisition that formal learning (as opposed to informal acquisition) is more conducive to mother tongue transfer (Krashen 1978). Also, the fact English is learnt in the overwhelming

majority of cases from teachers who are themselves non-native speakers of English guarantees that the variety of English used in India will increasingly diverge from the native standards.

The discussion in this and the previous section makes it clear that both micro-and macro-sociolinguistic factors should be taken into account in explaining the formal properties of SLVs.

5. APPLIED SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONCERNS

Like all other non-standard varieties, second language varieties raise a number of applied sociolinguistic issues. They have to do primarily with the theory and practice of teaching English in an international context.

Although the last two decades have been the most active period in the study of second language acquisition, there has been little attention paid to the process of acquisition of second language varieties. Most of the research has dealt with acquisition of a target language in contexts where it is spoken natively (eg. English in the U.S.A. and U.K.,) and secondarily in foreign language contexts (eg. English in Germany or Switzerland). The occassional references to the second language contexts have implied that varieties such as Indian English are fossilized stages in the acquisition of native speaker norms (Selinker 1972). They also suggest that mother tongue influence is a characteristic of early stages in the acquisition process that is eventually overcome by the ideal learner (Taylor 1975, Krashen 1982). These assumptions result from an inadequate appreciation of the sociolinguistic context in which SLVs are acquired. As we have seen, the transference of patterns (lexical, pragmatic) from the mother tongue serves the important

function of adapting an alien code to the socio-cultural context of use (cf. Richards 1974). Secondly, as several scholars have pointed out that a speaker who uses native-like pronunciation (as well as other features such as hyper-correct grammar) is viewed with suspicion and derision in second language contexts (cf. Bamgbose 1971, Eersel 1971, Tongue 1974, Tay and Gupta 1983, among others). Also, since the native models are not available to the learner and since native speakers are not the intended addressees in interactions in which these varieties are used, treating them as inadequate approximations of native norms imposes a sociolinguistically unrealistic and irrelevant standard.

Another widely held pedagogical assumption that needs to be refined in the light of data from SLVs has to do with the type of motivation considered appropriate for success in foreign language learning. In the words of Gardner and Lambert (1972),

> This theory, in brief, maintains that the successful learner of a second language must be psychologically prepared to adopt various aspects of behavior which characterise members of another linguistic-cultural group. The learner's ethnocentric tendencies and his attitudes toward the members of the other group are believed to determine how successful he will be, relatively, in learning the new language. His motivation to learn is thought to be determined by his attitudes toward the other group in particular and toward foreign people in general and by his orientation toward the learning task itself. The orientation is said to be <u>instrumental</u> in form if the purposes of language study reflect the more utilitarian value of linguistic achievement, such as getting ahead in one's occupation. In contrast, the orientation is <u>integrative</u> if the student wishes to learn more about the other cultural community because he is interested in it in an open-minded way, to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that other group.

Empirical studies of language attitudes in second language

contexts show that the primary motivation for learning English is "instrumental" in the sense defined above. For example, in Willard Shaw's survey referred to earlier, 95% of Singaporeans and 94% of Indians ranked "I studied English because I will need it for my work" at the top of the list of 25 possible reasons for studying English (Shaw 1981:110). Similar results have been reported for the Phillippines by Gardner and Lambert (1972) and Bombay, India by (Lukmani 1972). These results have to be interpreted with reference to the common observation that countries like Singapore and India "maintain a generally high standard in the learning of English" (Shaw 1981:112; see also Bansal 1969, Smith and Rafiqzad 1979). These studies have two important implications for sociolinguistic theory. One is that instrumental motivation can contribute to successful language learning. The second is that integrative motivation need not neccessarily involve identification with the native speakers of the target language and a desire to be accepted as a member of that group. Lukmani has observed that her subjects viewed themselves as "based in their own country but reaching out to modern ideas and life styles" (1972:272). The reference group may well be a community of non-native users of the language being learnt. Viewed in this perspective, the integrative and instrumental motivations need not be opposed to each other. Sociolinguistics and pedagogical theory have to recognize the fact that the extended use of a language beyond its native habitat may entail the dissociation of that language from its original cultural accoutrements.

The third applied topic is the choice of instructional

models in second language contexts, the basic issue being the acceptability of localized forms of English (Strevens 1982) in place of the traditional native speaker standards. Since this topic has been discussed extensively in the literature (Prator 1968, Kachru 1976, 1982, Wong 1982, among others), I will not repeat the arguments here. Suffice it to say that a strong case has been made for recognizing standard forms of national second language varieties as instructional models on the following grounds: (a) these varieties function chiefly in intra-national domains, (b) the use of native varieties is considered affected and inappropriate in second language contexts, (c) there is empirical evidence supporting the intra-regional and international intelligibility of the standard non-native varieties, (d) externally imposed models have not succeeded in the past in impeding the natural forces of language evolution, and (e) the logistics of implementing native speaker standards in second language contexts are prohibitively complex and expensive. Notwithstanding these arguments, the advisability of encouraging second language models has been questioned recently by no less a respected authority than Randolph Quirk (1985, 1985). Quirk questions the currently 'fashionable' skepticism regarding the value of the standard of the second language among sociolinguists such as Trudgill (1975). Citing Bollinger's (1980:181) "law of communicative responsibility" he says,

> he (Bolinger) and others have also pointed out that it is perhaps disingenuous if not actually irresponsible for linguists and educationists, secure in their own acrolectal language command, to encourage the belief that other forms of language can provide the user with equal security (1983:14-15).

He adds,

> It is at least arguable that ESL countries as different as Nigeria and Singapore need a basically monovarietal "exoglossic", international form of English as much as Germany, Japan and Russia do (1985: 14-15).

Quirk's position is predicated on the following assumptions: (1) that there is "a relatively narrow range of purposes for which the non-native needs to use English (even in ESL countries)" (1985:6); (2) that the indigenous languages, rather than English, are the (primary) vehicle for self-expression as well as for the sustaining of traditional cultural values in second language contexts; and (3) that the arguments for not imposing the standard variety on speakers of non-standard varieties, even if they may be right for the native English speaking community, are not necessarily "exportable" to second language situations like Nigeria or Singapore.

It is instructive to examine Quirk's assumptions in some detail. His first assumption is contradicted by the overwhelming evidence for the extensive range of functions that English performs in second language contexts (see sections 2 and 3 above). His second assumption is also questionable. While it is true that the indigenous languages are the primary vehicles for the maintenance of traditional culture and values, an examination of the content of books and articles produced by users of second language varieties leaves no doubt that English plays an extremely significant role in the discussion and dissemination of indigenous social, cultural, economic, political, and even religious issues. English is also being used increasingly as a

medium of creative expression as witnessed by the vibrancy of literatures in English written in these varieties (S.N. Sridhar 1982, Thumboo 1985) and the status of English as one of the languages recognized by the Indian Literary Academy. The justification for Quirk's third assumption regarding the non-exportability of sociolinguistic theories is not clear. If the argument is that developing countries need an internationally intelligible form of English for purposes of technology transfer etc., it is not a strong one. There is empirical evidence (Bansal 1969, Smith and Rafiqzad 1979, Nelson 1982, among others) that the standards forms of SLVs are internationally intelligible; in fact, preliminary findings suggest that certain types of standard non-native varieties may be more intelligible than native varieties because of their phonological characteristics such as vowel reductions, elisions, etc. On the other hand, if the argument is that a global standard of English is a goal to which the development of national/regional languages should be sensitive, then it is an argument that affects the independent evolution of languages such as French and Japanese as much as second language varieties of English.

6. CONCLUSION

A careful study of second language varieties of English shows that they are qualitatively different from the categories recognized in current sociolinguistic typology. SLVs also provide some of the clearest evidence of socio-cultural determination of language variation, both on the micro- and macro- levels. An adequate account of these varieties calls for the descriptive techniques and explanatory power of the variationist,

interactionist, and sociology of language paradigms within sociolinguistic theory. The circumstances of their acquisition and their viability as modes of communication argue for a reevaluation of some of the traditional assumptions about second language acquisition and teaching.

REFERENCES

Akere, F. 1978. Sociocultural constraints and the emergence of a standard Nigerian English. Anthropological Linguistics 20.9, 407-421.

Bamgbose, A. 1971. The English Language in Nigeria. In: J. Spencer (ed.), The English Language in West Africa, 35-48. London: Longman.

Bansal, R.K. 1969. The intelligibility of Indian English. Hyderabad: Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.

Bokamba, E.G. 1982. The Africanization of English. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.), The Other Tongue. 77-98. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bolinger, D. 1980. Language: the loaded weapon. London: Longman.

DeCamp, D. 1971. Toward a generative analysis of post-creole continuum. In: D. Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and Creolization of languages. 349-370. London: Cambridge University Press.

Dittmar, N. 1976. A Critical Survey of Sociolinguistics. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Eersel, C. 1971. Prestige in choice of language and linguistic form. In: D. Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and creolization of languages. 317-322. London: Cambridge University Press.

Emeneau, M.B. 1956. India as a linguistic area. Language 29, 339-353.

Ferguson, C. 1982. Foreword. In: B.B. Kachru (ed), The Other Tongue. vii-xi. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Ferguson, C. 1959. Diglossia. Word 15, 325-340.

Fishman, J.A. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. Journal of social issues 32, 29-38.

_____ 1965. Who speaks what English to whom and when. Linguistics 2, 67-68.

Fishamn, J.A., R.L. Cooper, and A.W. Conrad (eds.) 1977. The spread of English: the sociology of English as an additional language. Mass.: Newbury House.

Gardner, R.C. and W.E. Lambert 1972. Attitudes and motivations in second language learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Gass, S. and L. Selinker (eds.) 1983. Language transfer in language learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Halverson, J. 1966. Prolgomena to the study of Ceylon English. University of Ceylon Review 24.1 and 2, 61-75.

Hosali, P. 1982. Butler English: form and function. Ph.D. diss. Hyderabad: Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages.

Hudson, R.A. 1980. Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (ed.) 1971. Pidginization and creolization of languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B.B. 1983. The Indianization of English: the English language in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1982. Meaning in Deviation: toward understanding non-native English texts. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.), The other tongue. 325-350. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

_____ 1976. Models of English for the Third World: white man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics? TESOL Quarterly 10.2, 221-239.

_____ 1975. Lexical innovations in South Asian English. International journal of the sociology of language 4, 55-74.

_____ 1969. English in South Asia. In: T.A. Sebeok (ed.), Current trends in linguistics. 7, 627-78.

Krasnen, S.D. 1978. Individual variation in the use of the Monitor. In: W.C. Ritchie (ed.), Second language acquisition research. 175-183. New York: Academic Press.

Labov, W. 1972. Language in the inner city: studies in the Black English vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

_____ 1969. Contraction, deletion and inherent variability of the English copula. Language 45, 715-762.

Lukmani, Y. 1972. Motivation to learn and language proficiency. Language learning 22, 261-273.

Mehrotra, R.R. 1982. Indian English: a sociolinguistic profile. In: J.B. Pride (ed.), New Englishes. 150-173. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Nelson, C. 1982. Intelligibility and non-native varieties of English. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.), The other tongue. 51-57. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Newmark, W. 1976. How not to interfere with language learning. International Journal of American Linguistics 40.

Noss, R.B. (ed.), 1983. Varieties of English in South East Asia. Anthology Series 11. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Parasher, S.V. 1980. Mother-tongue-English diglossia: a case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use. Anthropological Linguistics 22.4, 151-68.

Platt, J. 1975. The Singaporean English speech continuum. Anthropological Linguistics 17.7, 363-374.

_____ 1977. A model for polyglossia and multilingualism (with special reference to Singapore and Malaysia). Language in Society 6.3, 361-378.

Platt, J. and H. Weber 1980. English in Singapore and Malaysia: status, features, functions. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Prator, C.H. 1968. The British heresy in TESOL. In: J.A. Fishman et al (eds.), Language problems in developing nations. 459-476. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Pride, J.B. (ed.) 1982. New Englishes. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Quirk, R. and H.G. Widdowson (eds.) 1985. English in the world. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ 1983. Language variety: nature and art. In: R.B. Noss (ed.), Varieties of English in Southeast Asia. 3-19. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik. 1972. A grammar of contemporary English. London: Longman.

Richards, J.C. 1974. Social factors, interlanguage and language learning. In: J.C. Richards (ed.), Error analysis. 64-91. London: Longman.

Samarin, W.J. 1971. Salient and substantive pidginization. In: D. Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and creolization of languages. 117-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schuchardt, H. 1891. [1980] Indo English. In: G.G. Gilbert (ed., and transl.), 1980. Pidgin and creole languages: selected essays by Hugo Schuchardt. London: Cambridge University Press.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics. 10.3, 209-231.

Shaw, W.D. 1981. Asian student attitudes towards English. In: L. Smith (ed.) English for cross-cultural communication. 108-122. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, L. (ed.) 1981. English across cultures. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, L. and K. Rafiqzad 1979. English for cross-cultural communication: the question of intelligibility. TESOL Quarterly. 13.3, 371-380.

Sridhar, K.K. 1982. English in South Indian urban context. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.). The Other Tongue. 141-153. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

_____ 1979. English in the sociocultural context of India. Studies in Language Learning. 2.1, 63-79.

_____ 1977. The development of English as an elite language in the multilingual context of India: its educational implications. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.

Sridhar, S.N. 1982. Non-native English literatures: context and relevance. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.), The other tongue. 291-306. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Stanlaw, J. 1982. English in Japanese communicative strategies. In: B.B. Kachru (ed.), The other tongue. 168-197. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Strevens, P. 1980. Teaching English as an international language. London: Oxford University Press.

Tay, M.W.J. and A.F. Gupta. 1983. Towards a description of standard Singaporean English. In: K.B. Noss (ed.), Varieties of English in Southeast Asia. 173-189. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Taylor, B. 1975. The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students in ESL. Language Learning 25, 73-109.

Thumboo, E. 1985. English literature in a global context. In: R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds.), English in the world. 52-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tongue, R.K. 1974. The English of Singapore and Malaysia. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.

Trudgill, P. 1975. Accent, dialect, and the school. London: Arnold.

_____ 1974. Sociolinguistics: an introduction. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Weinreich, U. 1953. Languages in contact: findings and problems. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

Whitworth, G.C. 1907. Indian English: an examination of the errors of idioms made by Indians in writing English. Letchworth, Herts: Garden City Press.

Wong, I. 1982. Native speaker English for the third world today? In: J.B. Pride (ed.), New Englishes. 259-286. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.