

feature such linguistic characteristics as 'hypercorrection'. (9) Alternatively, those in Upper Social Groups constitute the very realization of Legitimate Language; and are therefore sufficiently in control to be able to adopt a more relaxed style. Moreover, added 'symbolic profit' is gained by exhibiting this dominance by 'playing ' with the language, using euphemisms, and vulgar phrases as a mark of 'Distinction'. In the lowest Social Groups 'connaissance' is likely to be severely restricted, and in the case of isolated language groups totally absent. Further more, 'reconnaissance' is not so important as groups tend to be homogeneous (Habitus) and therefore 'practically' unaware. In figure 5, therefore, position on the curve is determined by position within the social group hierarchy. Indeed the steepness of the initial gradient of the curve will reflect the extent to which 'reconnaissance' is actualised as 'connaissance'. Some lower groups may possess high 'reconnaissance' but 'refuse' to use legitimate language. Their very refusal or substitution of illegitimate language instead is an act of protest, and hence a manifestation of 'class' conflict expressed linguistically.

'La Distinction' and the Linguistic Market

The many aspects of linguistic systems therefore constitute a kind of market. Firstly, inherent within it are forces of competition for and between valued (language) products. Moreover, it functions according to rules of supply and demand, with products constantly being devalued and revalued in response to social (objective) forces. Symbolic products that are 'perceived' as such, and therefore appropriated by larger sections of the population, become 'common' and therefore less useful as signalling a mark of 'distinction'. Although, lest

this should be read as simply expressing liberal evolutionism, it should be stressed that much that passes in 'connaissance' and 'reconnaissance' is in fact misrecognised (*méconnaissance*) in the sense of being outside of individual control:

"The schemes of habitus, forms of originating classification owes their effectiveness to the fact that they act on the mind and speech, thus away from examination or voluntary control."

(Bourdieu 1979(d) p.543)

The operational principle of the 'market' is therefore that individuals (and implicitly the groups they represent) act to distinguish themselves from others. Thus in figure 1 stage 5, the consequence of linguistic knowledge shapes and reinforces world views as subjective and objective perceived styles of self and others; although how far this is 'thinkable' by any one individual is limited to degrees of penetration and therefore awareness of the 'unthinkable'. Thus while a social agent may be aware of social class differences in styles of speech, this is unlikely to go beyond the impressionistic; to knowledge of phonetics, discourse strategies, etc. Yet it is precisely these systems of distinction that reinforce and are structurally homologous to Habitus; and therefore acts of perception and appreciation themselves act on linguistic systems of perception and generation of language.

If this theory of language does indeed offer a partial reconciliation of the objective/subjective dichotomy which now appears as a dialectic,

it should also provide better explanations of the social dynamics of linguistic systems. To identify and explain those objectively classable systems of language in its social context.

In order to explore the usefulness of these theories in linguistic research, it was necessary to obtain information on attitudes to language, as well as samples of language discourse. The Orléans Corpus (Blanc and Biggs, 1971) was chosen as fulfilling this criteria; and indeed does so for a range of samples from various socio-economic origins.

Orléans is relatively 'neutral' according to its socio-geographical position: a town in full economic development, and close to national communications. Moreover, its features of speech are free from idiosyncracies, with no marked accents or unusual speech forms.

The corpus therefore represents a cross-section of the French language at a specific period in its socio-historical development. Moreover, it contains explicit discussions on attitudes to language. It is on the basis of this information that the theories surrounding Bourdieu's 'Linguistic Market' were explored. This exploration took two separate directions: firstly, an investigation of the content of the socio-linguistic questionnaire included in the corpus; secondly, a more purely linguistic analysis of specific features of speech. In both cases these were related to social groupings, the implication of which for 'language group' I shall take up in my final discussion and conclusions.

Before proceeding with these analyses, I shall continue with some further comments on the population sample and details of the (corpus) questionnaire.

The Orleans Corpus : 1969

The Population

Of the original sample of 600,147 were finally interviewed (see Blanc and Biggs 1971). This sample can be divided according to age (18 to 30, 31 to 50, and 51+), sex, and socio-professional grouping; although no attempt was made to make all of these equally represented. Initially, socio-professional classification was carried out according to the principal INSEE divisions:-

- 2 Patrons de l'Industrie et du Commerce
- 3 Professions libérales et Cadres Supérieurs
- 4 Cadres moyens
- 5 Employés
- 6 Ouvriers
- 7 Personnel de service

Table 1 INSEE Socio-professional Groups

This scale is not necessarily hierarchial, although within it there are clear levels of occupational status and economic reward. However, for the purposes of linguistic study it is not particularly useful as a basis for language variation. Sankoff (1977) has raised a similar point in claiming little justification for matching linguistic variation with occupation; as this does not take account of those dealing with language in their job. In these cases (eg Secretary),

a vastly different linguistic profile would be expected despite their relatively low Socio-economic status (linguistic Capital +, economic/social Capital -/=).

If Habitus is the crucial determinant for language group other factors of age, sex, education, and network relations, are likely to be significant (if not more) as professional category. No scale existed (nor still exists) to designate social groups according to all these criteria. Although if 'linguistic Capital' is part of 'Cultural Capital', then education is primely important. Bourdieu has indeed argued (Bourdieu 1979 b 1977 b) how 'school' is the apparatus for instilling those cultural attributes that are likely to be profitable as a means of securing social placements. And specifically in linguistic terms this means having the 'right' accent, knowing 'how' to express oneself, defining attitudes to language, etc.

Mullineaux and Blanc(1982) have developed a scale that combines occupation and educational groups. Occupations are assigned on the basis of analogy with the INSEE catergories:-

S (0) C 1	Higher Professionals
S (0) C 2	Lower Professionals
S (0) C 3	Non-Manual Workers
S (0) C 4	Skilled Manual Workers
S (0) C 5	Semi and Unskilled Workers

Table 2 Orléans Social (Occupation) Classes (6)

Education social groups, on the other hand, are determined by age of leaving education, which is mostly synonymous with level of

education and/or qualifications obtained:-

Age at End of Education

S (E) I	21+
S (E) II	18, 19, 20
S (E) III	17
S (E) IV	15, 16
S (E) V	14 or under

Table 3 Orléans Social (Education) Classes

By giving weighting to each of these, Social (Occupation + Education) group can be defined. The S (O+E) C for each of the 147 respondents is given in Table 4. From this it can be seen that having a high occupational status is not enough to secure an equally high position in S (O+E) C. For example, interviewee 020 is in S (O) C.1, as a bank manager, but is placed in S (O+E) C . C on the strength of the fact that he finished his schooling at 14 years. It may be argued that this gives unfair weighting to educational factors that have long since been left behind (sample 020 was 58 in 1969); it does nevertheless attempt to combine constituents of Habitus, which as argued earlier, is more useful in the linguistic study of social groupings.

Table 5 represents percentage calculations of social mobility for the three age groups. It shows that some 20 years after the second world war, a period in which France experienced enormous social and economic expansion, those at the height of their adult activity (aged 30 - 50 during this period, so now (1969) 50+)

had experienced high upwards mobility: some 63% ascended socially, whilst none descended. Those in the 30 - 49 age group in 1969, showed high upwards mobility (49%), but also increased downwards movement (21%). Those in the youngest group were experiencing a much more modest upwards movement at 29% (possibly due to the still relatively early stage of their career), but also a substantial level (37%) of downwards mobility. The profound structural changes going on in French society were therefore having different effects on separate social groupings. It is specifically these objective conditions that will have determinant effects on Habitus. (8)

Tables 6 and 7 show corresponding movements into different occupational groups from originating educational group. (9)

In this, S (E) C.V showed a strong tendency to ascend; which may partly be explained as 'stratified diffusion'. Nevertheless, despite leaving school at 14 or under, some 40% of them had made it into non-manual and professional jobs.

From table 7 we can see that most movement away from S (E) C is restricted to one S (O) C. Moreover, the higher the S (E) C, the more possibility there is of descending in S (O) C. However, almost 70% of the highest educated, to University level or higher, secured a job in the higher professions.

Of those leaving school at 18 to 20, S (E) C.II, with perhaps only the Baccalaureat, 57% descend occupationally away from the professions to manual/non-manual, skilled/unskilled employment. This phenomenon

Social Grouping according to Occupation and Education

(O)	(E)	A G E								S(O+E)C				
		I (50)				II (30-49)					III (under 30)			
		M		F		M		F			M		F	
1	I	058		072		003	018			004		196		A
		097				079	027			121		153		
		155				012	156			125		029		
1	II			127	709	078	083	733				718		A
				716										
2	I							720		069	092	070	144	A
										075	098	017		
1	III							005	088					A
2	II	052				056	724	046	068			085	030	B
3	I											084		B
1	IV							082	133					B
2	III			095	021	002	118	094	703	100				B
3	II					119		123	138	059	141	101	117	B
								734						
2	IV			019	022	057	008	055	007					B
				042		064	066							
						69/2679 *								
3	III					137		701				015	063	C
1	V	020		076				086	713					C
4	II							114	705					C
3	IV			060	124	011	054	065	139	013		028		C
				010	132									
4	III					051	142	712	730	048				C
						150	702	732						
2	V			067		071	089	041	053	062				
								731	70/3701 *					C
5	II							102						C
4	IV	047				148		107		110		151		D
								707	711					
5	III									149				D
3	V	001	024	091		087		049	090	128		115	140	D
		025	043					009	135					
		045	159					722						
5	IV					077	708	704	723	130				D
4	V	023	129	074	080	014	099	108	112	044	116	050		E
		129	161	103	106	70/3600 *			146	726	126			
				136	143			727	735					
				109										
5	V	006	073	061	081	113	721	104	105			016		E
		111	147	131	152			725	145					
		160		096										

TABLE 4 . ORLEANS INFORMANTS: SOCIAL (OCCUPATION+EDUCATION) CLASS
(based on summed ranks)

*recordings not available

(Mullineaux,A.and Blanc,M. 1982.)

Table 5Percentage of Age groups against Social Mobility

Age	Social Mobility	Stayed Same	Went Down	Went Up
- 30		34	37	29
30 -49		29	21	49
50 +		37	0	63

Table 6% Movement Between Occupational Group and Educational Group

Educational Group	Occupational Group	1	2	3	4	5
I		69	22	3	5	0
II		5	38	42	10	5
III		10	31	18	36	5
IV		5	30	30	20	15
V		5	11	24.5	34.5	25

Table 7

Percentage of Educational Group against corresponding Occupational
Group social Mobility

Educational Group	Social Mobility	Stayed Same	Went Down	Went Up
I		69	31	0
II		38	57	5
III		18	41	41
IV		20	15	65
V		25	0	75

is perhaps symptomatic of 'Qualification Inflation' (Bourdieu 1979 (e)) that has been apparent through the post-war socio-economic development. So the same amount of education 'buys' fewer employment opportunities.

The Questionnaires

The interviews were carried out in 1969/70 and consisted of 3 questionnaires.

1 Open-ended Questionnaire (Appendix I)

Designed primarily as an introduction to the interview, this questionnaire allowed the interviewees to express themselves freely on a wide range of general topics relevant to their life and experience in Orléans: opinions of town life, description of work, leisure etc., views on education, etc. By asking identical questions, comparison was facilitated. The language thus used here covers a wide range of tenses, narrative, descriptive, styles as well as the abstract/hypothetical. Interestingly, the interview also often contained a discussion of May 1968, a most recent and momentous event in 1969.

2 Sociolinguistic Questionnaire (Appendix II)

A more detailed description of this will be included in the next section where some of its results are analysed. Its main objective was to establish the precise attitudes and behaviour of the interviewee with regard to language. It was therefore concerned with language competence, and exploring the characteristics of a linguistic 'Norm'.

3 Close-ended Questionnaire (Appendix III)

This questionnaire was a more factual collection of personal details on the interviewee; age, sex, family details, and specific information on the education and leisure activities.

Of the three, only the open and sociolinguistic questionnaire are available on tape, and it is these that were used in the present study. Additional information on personal details were obtained from the catalogue of the recordings (Essex University Archives 1974). Where possible, existing semi-orthographic transcriptions were used, although in each case these were checked against the recordings of the interviews. Where transcriptions were not complete these were carried out to gain access to necessary information.

The Socio-Linguistic Questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed by the Orléans team under the guidance of M. B. Vernier, sociologist and pupil of Bourdieu.

It included a number of questions as set out in Appendix I.

Despite the broad range of these, I shall use the following 'Framing Criteria' as a means of differentiation. Sub-category 1(b) has been added to distinguish between actual language practices, 1(a), and opinions about language that involve themselves rather than others.

- 1) Self - their own language. a) practices
b) attitudes
- 2) Others - the language of others.
- 3) Objects - the 'hardware' of language, eg., pens, books, paper, etc.

Using this criteria it is possible to categorise each of the questionnaire questions under one sub-heading as follows:-

- 1) (a) Self - Questions 3, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21, 27, 28, 29, 32
- 1) (b) Opinions - Questions 4, 5, 17, 18, 19
- 2) Others - Questions 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 26, 33
- 3) Objects - Questions 1, 2, 9, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30

The questionnaire is therefore concerned with exploring what might constitute a linguistic 'norm' for this particular population.

The investigation also includes attempts to establish attitudes to

language and its use. Any definition of a 'norm' therefore implies a triple level of analysis; prescriptive, objective, and subjective. 'Prescriptive' refers to 'knowledge' (Connaissance) of what might be termed 'correct' language; itself a reflection of the 'Legitimate'. 'Subjective' and 'Objective' refer to the extent to which knowledge about language (correct and incorrect) is known (reconnu) as such; how far can it be consciously articulated, and how far it is merely an intuitive reflection or 'feeling'. The linguistic model under review should be able to account for these separate perspectives expressed in terms of 'linguistic capital' and 'legitimate language'. Moreover, we need to situate language within the 'relationships of its production', since

"La langue n'est pas seulement un instrument de communication ou même de connaissance, mais un instrument de pouvoir."

(Bourdieu 1977 (e) quoted by

Gueunier et al 1983 p. 764)

Individuals are therefore not indifferent to or unaware of the production and perception of language but 'understand' it as the very expression of the situational tensions and intentions they find themselves in. And it is this 'understanding' that the sociolinguistic questionnaire explores.

Method

After an initial pilot study the following questions were chosen from the questionnaire as representative of our 'Framing Criteria':-

1(a) Self (practice) : Did your parents correct you?

Do you do crosswords?

What was your best subject at school?

2(b) Self (opinions) : Would you be favourable to a reform of
French spelling?

Is French spoken better or worse these days?

Is the actual French language deteriorating?

What do you think of 'Franglais'?

Is it important to have a good handwriting?

Is it important to have good spelling?

2 Others : Are there differences in speaking according
to social classes?

Of the people you know who speaks best?

3 Objects : Do you have/use a fountain pen?

What type of writing paper do you use?

The results to these questions were obtained from the tape recordings and/or transcripts. Fourteen subjects were chosen to represent a cross-section of Social (O+E) Categories. Within these limits it was not possible to also match them according to other 'habitus' criteria, age, sex, occupational and educational origin, etc., although the implications of these will be brought out in a later discussion.

SUBJECT NO.	OCCUPATION	EDUCATION	OCCUPATION AND EDUCATION	SEX	AGE	PROFESSION	REFORM OF SPELLING	SOCIAL CLASS DIFFERENCES	FRENCH SPOKEN BETTER OR WORSE	FRENCH GETTING BETTER OR worse	PARENTS CORRECTED	CROSS-WORDS	FRANGLAIS	BEST SPEAKER	fountain-pen	WRITING	SPELLING	BEST SUBJECT	TYPE OF PAPER
058	1	1	A	M	63	Prof.	NO	YES/LESS	WORSE	WORSE	YES	NO	AGAINST	TEACHERS	YES	IMPORTANT	V. IMPORT.	science	NEVER SQUARED
012	1	1	A	M	54	Ingenieur	NO	YES/LESS	WORSE	WORSE	YES	YES	AGAINST	LAWYERS	YES	IMPORTANT	USELESS	ALL	NEVER SQUARED
019	2	IV	B	F	72	Comptable	NO	YES/LESS	WORSE		YES	YES	NOT AGAINST		NO	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	SELLING	WHITE NOT LINED
059	3	II	B	M	25	Employé Bureau	NO	YES	BETTER		YES	YES	AGAINST	HE DOES	YES	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	FRENCH	NOT LINED
094	2	III	B	F	40	directrice		YES	WORSE	WORSE	NO	YES	NOT AGAINST	DOCTORS	YES	READABLE	VERY IMPORTANT	MATHS	NEVER LINED
066	2	IV	B	M	30	Restaurateur		YES	WORSE	WORSE	NO		INDIFF.	OLD TEACHER	YES	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	GEOGRAPHY	NEVER LINED
010	3	IV	C	F	59	Couturière	YES	YES	SAME	WORSE	YES	NO	NOT AGAINST	DIRECTOR	NO	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	COMPOSITION	NEVER SQUARED
001	3	V	D	M	57	Boucher		YES	BETTER	BETTER	NO	NO	AGAINST	COLONELS	YES	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	SPELLING	USES
087	3	V	D	M	39	Agent EDF	NO	YES		SAME	YES	NO		CENTRE CHIEF	NO	LITTLE	IMPORTANT	SPELLING	LINED
135	3	V	D	F	39	Employé Bureau	NO	NO	BETTER		NO	NO	NOT AGAINST	DOCTORS	YES	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT		
140	3	V	D	F	19	Vendeuse	YES	YES	SAME		NO	NO	INDIFF.	STUDENTS		NOT IMPORTANT	QUITE IMPORTANT	SPELLING	LINED
006	5	V	E	M	52	Chauffeur	YES	YES	BETTER	WORSE	NO	YES	FOR	LAWYERS	YES	NOT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT		LINED
106	4	V	E	F	60	Sans activité	YES	YES	BETTER		NO	NO	FOR		YES	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT		LINED
014	4	V	E	M	33	Magon-Syndicat-liste	YES	YES	BETTER	WORSE	NO	NO	NOT AGAINST	TEACHERS	YES AGAIN	IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	CALCUL	

Table. 4. Answers to the Socio-linguistic Questionnaire

Results of the Socio-linguistic Questionnaire

The results to the questionnaire are set out in Table 8.

Analysis

The distinction between qualitative and quantitative analyses is a useful one. At the same time this very separation can encourage misleading oversimplifications of the results obtained, and hence the conclusions to be drawn from them. In my own analysis this discrimination will be much less rigidly adhered to. Instead, after an initial 'quantitative' résumé, I shall go on to examine the specific content of the answers. This in an effort to improve our understanding (Verstehen) of all aspects and information from the questionnaire results. I also hope to demonstrate important differences aside from the purely statistical. Finally, I shall return to Bourdieu's concepts to examine particular opinions expressed by the respondents. By doing this, I hope to relate the qualitative to the quantitative, the objective with the subjective, and explore 'group' distinction as suggestive of the linguistic theory previously outlined.

'Quantitative'

By examining Table 8 it is possible to sum-up answers obtained as follows:-

'Upper' Social Groups tend -

- to be against a spelling reform
- to see less social class differences
- to be against 'Franglais'
- to do crosswords
- not to use lined or squared paper
- to think French is spoken less well now than before.

'Lower' Social Groups tend -

- to be for a reform of spelling
- to see greater social class differences
- to be for 'Franglais'
- not to do crosswords
- to use lined paper
- to think French is spoken better now than before.

'Qualitative'

Clearly insufficient respondents have been tabulated to apply satisfactory statistical methods. Also some question responses show no inter-group differences at all. Obviously this may be due to the 'interviewers paradox'; that the intention behind the question is too explicit. Or it may be that particular aspect of language has become 'normalised' so that it is devalued as a mark of distinction. To explore some of these notions I shall now examine particular group representative responses within our 'framing criteria'.

Self

(a) Practices. If we take respondents own language practice/ background it is perhaps unsurprising that in 'Upper' social groups parents tend to correct (or perhaps more importantly are remembered as having corrected) their children; while lower down in the social hierarchy this does not seem to be the case. There is therefore a clear opposition here between 'Upper' and 'Lower' groups.

Similarly, it is clear that the very individual choice of crosswords as a pastime is divided between social groups. A predilection for 'playing' with language reveals a dominance or attempted dominance of language per se. As an exercise therefore it does not irritate or annoy, but can be regarded with sufficient detachment to constitute,

"Un exercise intellectual " (O12, A, 6, 1.) (10)

On the other hand, according to a subjective assessment of best school subjects, many chose those which could be regarded as language based, eg., French, Spelling, Composition etc. Indeed it is mainly in 'Upper' groups that respondents admit to being strongest in Science and Maths. This may well be a mark of subjective linguistic insecurity, that although respondents claim to be best at language based subjects, few of them express this as an active choice for relaxation.

(b) Attitudes. From the quantitative analysis it is clear that 'Upper' social groups tend to be against a reform of spelling in French. Moreover, there is some correlation with views on 'Franglais' (a nascent problem in 1969), where 'Upper' groups tended to be against or indifferent. Lower groups, on the contrary, express a preference for it, matching an eagerness to reform French spelling. Many lower group respondents admitted frustration with French, whilst for 'Upper' groups it is clear that 'language' is regarded as a 'heritage', to be kept and defended if necessary.

Most groups did indeed feel that French was generally getting worse, although paradoxically 'lower' groups believe it is 'spoken' better. In an initial pilot study this trend was even more marked; of 12 respondents, all 6 from S (O+E) C.A and B thought French was spoken worse compared with all 6 C, D, E group respondents who thought it was spoken better. This shows an interesting difference between subjective and objective perceptions of language. So whilst at a objective level 'Language' is seen as deteriorating by lower-middle, and lower groups, actual 'speech' as subjectively experienced is felt to be improving. This may also involve perceived differences between spoken and written forms of language. Many, across all groups (although especially 'upper' groups) project written standards in language onto spoken forms. It is then regretted that pronunciation is incorrect or that modern usages are common. Despite this, most lower group respondents 'feel' that it is spoken better; the explanation for which is often given as education. This in itself seems to reflect a growing 'culturation' or education of the French population.