

On the other hand, 'Upper' groups are less sure, recognising a clear standard or 'norm' that is being violated. Ironically the major cause of this is again education. Gueunier (op. cit.) found that 67% of group A/B types distrusted education when it came to matters of language.

Others. A discussion of perceptions of others language will be deferred to the next section where it will be developed in line with previously stated linguistic concepts.

Objects. If we turn to what might be termed the 'hardware' of language, we again see marked differences between social groups. To this extent mere pen and paper embodies specific 'symbolic capital'. So whilst most upper and middle groups 'recognise' that lined or squared paper is not 'correct', this is much less true of the 'lower' groups. Interestingly, the general practice for 'middle' groups seems to be to insert lines under blank paper to simulate supposed sufficient structural control over layout. Moreover, although most subjects possess a fountain pen (a relic of first communion! ?), few actually use it. Nevertheless, one S (O+E) C, A respondent (not included in table 8) expressed difficulty with giving it up, "on m'a dit non: tu peux le faire au crayon bille j'avoue que ça m'a choqué parce qu'on s'adresse quand même à un supérieur - c'est vrai pour moi c'est un marque de politesse d'écrire à la plume" (098, A, 106, 14).

Whilst respondent 014, a Maçon-boiseur (E), but also a syndicaliste and thus in contact with the 'patron' and 'directeurs', admits to trying to take it up again,

"j'essaie de reprendre là écrire à l'encre ça écrit plus fin" (014, E, 81, 18).

Whilst biro is therefore 'acceptable', writing in ink still holds its symbolic content, especially for specific contexts.

This semi-quantitative analysis of the socio-linguistic questionnaire does indeed reveal some opposition between upper and lower groups. This is, however, only a partial objectification of language and language attitudes by respondents. In order to examine the more subjective implications of such attitudes for actual language use, I shall now turn to a consideration of 'self and others'. In other words, how aware are respondents of the 'linguistic market'?

Discussion: Self and Others.

In the original model proposed on the basis of Bourdieu's 'Linguistic Market', the basic discourse was presented in the form of a dyad. I further suggested that this was enclosed within the actuality of the relationship of language production, designated as 'le Champ'. It was the defining principle of this (structured) space that gave value to 'linguistic capital'. A consequence of this is that differences are articulated through the structured linguistic systems of the self/other distinction. This can be partly demonstrated through a qualitative analysis of the content of the socio-linguistic questionnaire results.

The major mediating concept between 'objective' and 'subjective' conditions was habitus; defined as a source of 'practice provoking systems'. Many within the corpus are aware of social background as having a determinant effect on language, although this is usually expressed through the relative intimacy of the family. Thus respondent 012, an 'ingénieur' very much representing the 'ideal type' of his group, defines it thus,

"alors je pense que c'est une tradition de famille que de s'exprimer à peu près correctement et ne pas faire de fautes d'orthographe et d'écrire convenablement" (012, A, 22, 3)

Or S (O+E) C. B, respondent 094, la Directrice, when talking about the family as a major influence on children in language matters,

"je crois que les enfants dans un milieu comme ça automatiquement parlent très bien" (094, B, 10, 100)

This understanding of socialization extends well into the middle groups, eg. 'la Couturière' S (O+E) C. C.,

"la maison c'est primordial ce que les enfants entendent, ce que les enfants voient ils y viennent automatiquement ... c'est une ambiance familiale" (010, C, 79, 8)

and then admits,

"dans ma famille on a des tics" (010, C, 97, 22)

Yet the trend in lower social groups is to see education as the major determinant.

As previously discussed, our own social groups combine educational and occupational criteria which are analytically distinct from 'objective' social 'classes'. Nevertheless, when asked about social class differences in the way people talk, practically all respondents recognise them. We might therefore conclude that there is no inter-group distinction on this question. However, analysis of the content of answers reveals wide differences in the degree of social class distinction. Some respondents 'see' these linguistic traits as "big and important" (066); perhaps, in this case, reflecting his modest education (S (E) C.IV) compared with his present occupational (S (O) C.II) status. Others obscure or tend to deny them. Interestingly this phenomenon of 'occultation' of social class differences is most apparent in 'Upper' social categories. The denial of superiority is again 'the' very mark of dominance. Bourdieu would call this a "strategy of euphemisation" which would depend on, "the possibility of material and symbolic profit that different forms of speech can secure for different producers as a function of the position they occupy in the 'champ'"

(Bourdieu 1982 p.168)

Such a process allows the Ingénieur (012, A), when asked, to interpret social class differences as different regional accents, the disappearance of which he regrets. Moreover, when confronted with the 'ouvrier/bourgeois' opposition he claims,

"tout le monde parle de la même façon malheureusement d'ailleurs, parce que les accents étaient savoureux" (012,A,8,10).

This amounts to a strange idealization of a linguistic 'heritage', the diversity of which he sees as a mark of richness rather than differentiation.

Yet implicit in this 'awareness' of social differences in language must be a recognised 'Legitimate' norm. How is this expressed by the respondents?

When asked who is the best speaker amongst their acquaintances, it is clear that those professions with the highest language status are best represented. Thus Teachers, Lawyers, Doctors, etc.; the very agents of control over the 'norm'. But how is this legitimate/illegitimate language perceived? 010 (C) defines it much in terms of the attitude as content of the language,

"ils sont très courtois ils parlent très bien ... pas fiers" (010, C, 7)

"des bourgeois ont des idées préconuës l'ouvrier a peut-être des idées plus larges" (010, C, 71, 10)

And when asked whether there are features of her husbands speech that annoys her, reflects that

"mon mari est très impulsif" (010, C, 97, 23),

suggesting that for her at least, superior language traits are mixed up with a whole set of values concerning manners and socially acceptable behaviour.

Elsewhere, the Agent EDF (087, D) describes the feelings of alienation he experiences from his best speaker who is "glacial" (087, D, 27, 11) and complains,

"ces gens vous comprennent mieux que vous les comprenez"
(087, D, 27, 150.)

Again we need to recall the tension and insecurity such attitudes must provoke within discourse where individuals are confronted with language they feel no empathy for. It is in this sense that power relations are expressed through language. Interestingly, from the questionnaire 'middle' social group tend to personalise the question, choosing a specific individual rather than a professional group; possibly a sign of overt sensitivity to language of self and others. One respondent (094, B), after singling out her daughters teacher as the best speaker admits,

"elle m'intimide" (094, B, 8, 21)

something that must have a devastating effect on their discourse.

Within the area of social class therefore, there is a high degree of 'reconnaissance' of differences, albeit idealized in matters of speech. I shall now turn to written presentation of language. Again it would appear self-evident that writing and spelling are considered important by respondents. This is mostly true from answers obtained, although there are some interesting differences in explanations given for their relative importance, or lack of it.

Thus our 'ideal type' 'Ingénieur' (012, A) agrees that it is important to have a good handwriting, but only,

"Simplement parce qu'on peut la lire" (012, A, 14, 5)

thus implicitly denying the 'symbolic value' of presentation as a mark of ones status; again a 'euphemism'. More interestingly, when asked about spelling, he is confident enough to claim,

"l'orthographe, c'est inutile elle ne sert à rien et c'est en cela que c'est précieux de la même façon qu'un bijou" (012, A, 14, 16)

He therefore has all that is 'nécessaire' to take it for granted. In this case 'le superflu', 'l'inutile' has value.

This compares interestingly with another 'ideal type' from S (O+E) C.E; respondent 006, the 'Chauffeur', who on writing states,

"pour moi ça n'a aucune importance" (006, E, 50, 5),

and then on spelling,

"il faut mieux avoir une bonne orthographe que l'écriture" (006, E, 50, 10)

Which seems to amount to diametrically opposed subjective attitudes to presentation of language. Yet language is still recognised as being important. When quizzed on his possession of dictionaries and encyclopedias, 006 enthusiastically claims,

"oui, oui, quatre, cinq, je sais pas combien les grands les gros" (006, E, 29, 13); an emphatic assertion of the symbolic value of cultural products. And many agree with him; thus 010 'Courturière (d)' when asked the same question immediately responds,

"oui les gros" (010, D, 57, 25)

Or again the 'syndicaliste' (014), referring to "les gros bouquins" (014, E, 44, 10)

All of which emphasises the 'exhibition' of language, but this time much less as a 'heritage' than a 'trésor', something of value to be treasured. Again the 'Chauffeur',

"ça remplaçait la Bible" (006, E, 34, 11)

Although when asked on why it is used, this rarely seems to go beyond crosswords, for the 'Chauffeur' at least. Elsewhere, it seems mainly to be used for spelling.

Compare this with, again, the Ingénieur who has Larousse (en dix volumes!), which he uses everyday. Although this time, his spelling being "very good", it is used for

"le sens exact des mots (et) l'étymologie" (012, A, 3, 10)

It is in these important differences that 'la distinction' is most apparent. And it is these practices, these dispositions, these attitudes (indeed prejudices) that individuals bring into the 'champ' of discourse. It is therefore within the discourse

dyad (at its simplest level) that tensions are manifest and linguistic values 'negociated'. As social-psycholinguists have suggested, convergent and/or divergent speech patterns are likely to be symptomatic of these forces, depending on individual positions in the structure hierarchy of the 'field'; more explicitly expressed as levels of superiority and inferiority in the linguistic exchange. It is this procedure that will specifically determine, shape, eventually limit the freedom of linguistic choice individuals possess; and in so doing, implicitly recognise the legitimacy of their position within the field, and hence the power relations expressed there.

Thus the Maçon-boiseur (014), the linguistically aware S (O+E) C.E respondent in describing his everyday use of language as a 'syndicaliste', "c'est moi qui change ... j'essaie de parler comme la personne qui est en face" (014, E, 57, 11).

So when he talks to the 'patrons',

"c'est moi qui fais un effort pour changer j'essaie de réfléchir à des phrases je dirais des phrases nettes mais j'en parlerais moins que si je parlerais (sic) avec un ouvrier"

(014, E, 58, 19)

Now compared with his speech to 'un ouvrier',

"je change directement toute la phrase carrément je dis la même chose mais pour le dire plus en français" (014, E, 60, 4)

An evident account of 'la distinction' in operation at this linguistic or discourse level.

Conclusions I

A major objective in producing the socio-linguistic questionnaire was to gain knowledge on the linguistic 'norm'. From the results obtained it would appear that there are indeed predominant standards in language practices, and that these do vary to a greater or lesser extent according to social groupings.

'Middle' social groups share with 'Upper' groups a sense of correctness. This is often expressed as concern with maintaining standards, or protecting the linguistic heritage from 'degrading' influences. Middle groups also seem ready to conform to these standards, possibly as a 'misrecognised' (*méconnu*) instrument of social ascension. Yet this aspiration is the very cause of affective insecurity in linguistic practices; itself symptomatic of lack of 'control' over 'knowledge' (*connaissance*) of language. This sense of effort is absent in the 'Upper' most groups. Control over, and knowledge of 'legitimate language' enables them to engage in a wide range of 'strategies of euphemism'; interpreting the 'norm' at a distance. Language is still seen as being 'valued' (precious), but not necessarily useful (for social dominance). This attitude enables them to redefine standards by constantly recreating newer structures. This licence to act on language is the prerogative of the dominant classes, a sure sign of their 'distinction' and legitimacy in occupying this position.

Within the present sample, recognition (reconnaissance) of the 'norm' penetrates well into the lower social groups; a possible reflection of the socio-economic complexion in Orléans at this time. This penetration, however, is always limited; resulting in some 'misconceptions' about language. So whilst many 'lower' group respondents may agree that writing and spelling is important, (an objectified 'fact'), explanations of why this is so vary considerably. Moreover, although all groups recognise social class differences, this is often interpreted in vastly different ways. On less clearly objectified standards, for example, attitudes to spelling reforms, Franglais, etc., the implications for the 'norm' are 'misrecognised' and articulated differently from dominant groups. Attitudes on these topics therefore make them unavailable to these group members as a sign of 'distinction'. Language might therefore be regarded as important (un trésor), but is not practically useful in establishing social prestige. 'Lower' group members are less likely to act upon the language 'norm' than 'be'acted upon.

Aside from this, it is also clear from the results that replies are highly individualised. Configurations of penetrations into 'norm' standards therefore match configurations of 'habitus' constituents. 'Habitus', as a source of structured dispositions has made certain standards (attitudes) more available to some than others. Non-typical class attitudes need therefore to be explained in terms of linguistic environment (habitus), and not as merely idiosyncratic.

Footnotes

1 'Grammaticalness' is inadequate as a concept as it is too 'ideal' and static. 'Acceptability' on the other hand takes account of the conditions in which discourse is produced. These conditions are always specific to the 'situation' and exist in a field of determinant social forces; defining what is possible within the limits of the field. Linguistic choices are then made on the basis of what is acceptable, credible, admissable, efficacious, etc.

2 'Legitimate' is a sociological term used to express a dominant act, usage, or institution. Of course, for Bourdieu it is not necessarily recognised (*reconnu*) as such. Indeed its strength is partly derived from it being misrecognised (*méconnu*), and therefore only tacitly '*reconnu*'.

3 Because Bourdieu sees individuals as bringing mental dispositions into the 'field' that are created through world experience; and this latter is akin to 'knowledge' of the active recreation of social classes through social action, discourse cannot simply be utilitarian communication. Rather it embodies social tensions as an expression of power relations. As discourse is imposed upon (acted upon) by these power relations, language function and form are symptomatic of them. The extent of this 'power' can be termed its 'value'.

4 Bourdieu's work is full of economic metaphors, although he criticises 'economism' as such. 'Capital' is used in the sense of 'exchange', implying an exchange value. As such it is prone to constant revaluation and devaluation according to objective socio-economic and situational conditions. It can also be 'accumulated' and therefore analysed qualitatively and quantitatively.

It is 'symbolic' as an ideational concept. Although it is crucial for social exchange, it has no inherent 'value' apart from its usefulness for securing (symbolic) profit; and thus gaining dominance in the social field.

5 Labov (1972 ch. 5) has shown how lower-middle-class speakers go beyond the highest-status groups in their tendency to use phonological forms considered correct and appropriate for formal styles. 'Hypercorrection' more usually refers to misapplication of an imperfectly learned rule. For Bourdieu it is more specifically a reflection of 'linguistic insecurity'; although this term has a much wider use than simply "contrasting own language use with correctness" (Labov *ibid* p. 132). Rather it pertains to an affective lack of confidence in 'knowledge' (Connaissance) to use the 'norm'.

6 This is in fact by analogy with the English Registrar General's classification. The categories are applicable as the two societies have much in common - modern, post industrial, west european, capitalist, etc.

7 $\chi^2 = 22.099$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$

Jonckheeres Test of Trend: Kendalls $S = 2713$ corresponding to a Z score of 2.99, significant at $p < .005$

8 Interestingly this accords with Boudon (1973). He concludes that education is 'the ' major instrument in the perpetuation of social inequalities. Even when inequalities of educational opportunity are reduced, inequalities of social opportunity are unlikely to decrease; for such reasons as devaluation of qualifications as more gain them, and misconceptions of meritocratic society, etc. Increase educational opportunity since 1945 has not therefore resulted in a correlative increase in social and economic equality.

9 $\chi^2 = 86.689$, $df = 8$, $p < .001$

Jonckheeres Test of Trend : Kendalls $S = 5254$ corresponding to a Z score of 7.61, significant at $p < .001$

10 In the quotations I shall give information in the following sequence: Corpus Number, S (O+E) C, Page Number, Line Number. Unless otherwise stated the page number refers to the transcription of the socio-linguistic questionnaire or the transcription of the entire interview when available.

So far, analysis of the corpus has operated on a mainly qualitative level; albeit that some 'quantitative oppositions' have been noted within the social hierarchy. The subjective attitudes of respondents were examined in the belief that these were crucial in shaping actual language 'praxis'. The other important level of analysis concerns the more 'objective' or purely linguistic (11). And it is to this that I now propose to turn; although here too it will be necessary to move outside of the limits of empiric observation in order to give an adequate account of the results obtained.

Linguistic Analysis

On a purely impressionistic level, when listening to a tape or reading a transcript from the corpus, it is not possible to avoid the evocation of a whole range of reflections, attitudes, and feelings. Giles and Powesland (1975) have demonstrated that in communication the non-content (eg. vocal qualities) features of language are some $4\frac{1}{2}$ times more effective than content in determining subjective reactions. We need to know what these vocal qualities are, and more importantly the 'value' they contain (12). Of course linguistic analysis can take place on any of the constituent levels of phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. In each case, the theory of linguistic markets ('connaissance' and 'reconnaissance') should still be applicable. I will later argue that within the linguistic content of speech various constituent configurations will be set up as a consequence of 'habitus'. I shall now examine some of these features of speech.

For the purpose of linguistic analysis the 'Open-ended' questionnaire (Appendix I) was used. This is because the language in it is more fluent, less mechanical in responding to specific questions.

Discourse obviously varies considerably from interview to interview, although it is generally more freely expressive. In each case a range of utterance lengths/topics were included in the analyses.

Phonetics and Phonology

It is in the area of phonetics and phonology that sociolinguists have been most active. Labov in particular has developed a number of analyses of phonetic variation within the social hierarchies of America. One important conclusion from his work (Labov 1972 p.132) has been that some speakers perceive their own phonetic intentions differently from the actual sound that is produced. Gueunier et al (op. cit.) have applied such a perspective to the French spoken in Tours. They are specifically concerned with the phonological pair /e/ and /ɛ/ in words like 'ticket'. /ɛ/ is the 'norm' or 'correct' pronunciation; [tikɛ] rather than [tike]. Here again perception and production differed as a mark of 'linguistic insecurity'. Interestingly, the actual context (situation, 'champ') had a determining effect; so whilst /ɛ/ was pronounced 'correctly' 13.8% of the time as part of a reading text, this rose to 53.3% for pronouncing separate words. In both cases there was a correlative increase in 'correct' pronunciation as social groups were ascended.

On the Orléans corpus, no specific phonetic analysis was undertaken for the practical difficulties this entailed in a non-standardised

test situation. Nevertheless, there was a clear range of accents according to social category or geographical origin. For example, one respondent from Lorraine (008. S (O+E) C.B, S (O) C.2, S (E) C.IV) had a marked accent of the area; in this case /a/ was sometimes pronounced [æ], but more usually [ɛ] was used. Another, (024. S (O+E) C.E, S (O) C.3, S (E) C.V) rolled the 'r'; here /r/ was pronounced [ʀ] rather than [ʁ]. The most usual comment made by interviewers (13) was concerning the opposition between 'français populaire' and 'français correct'. From my own counts, unsurprisingly 77% of those referred to as 'populaire' came from S (O+E) C. D and E, although this rose to 92% if S (E) C.IV and V only were taken. Of those speaking 'correct', 86% came from S (O+E) C. A or B.

Phonology

Methodology

The specific phonological investigation carried out on the corpus was an analysis of elision and liaison. By elision we mean the suppression of specific phonemes in speech:-

/plus d' femmes /

/ je s' suppose /

Liaison refers to the running together of two phonemes:-

/ mes_enfants /

/ est_important /

The number of liaisons and elisions per 1000 words was counted at various sample points (each constituting 200 words) throughout the interview.

Results

The counts are set out in Table. 9. together with Elision/Liaison ratio. The number of liaisons is also plotted against the number of elisions in Graph. 1.

Analysis

From Table. 9. and Graph. 1. we can see that elisions tend to increase with lower social groupings; the opposite being the case for higher groups. Similarly liaisons increase with higher social categories and vice versa for lower grouping. I have shown this on the graph as two opposing 'forces' of 'légitime' and 'populaire'. So on the graph, 'légitime' will 'pull' respondents to the right and down; 'populaire', up and to the left. This does seem to be true for the 14 respondents studied. Moreover, there is an 'area of legitimacy' representing a S (O+E) C. A and B cluster.

A dividing line has been drawn to 'standardise' positions. It is then interesting to examine those finding themselves each side of the line.

Thus, those in the area of 'populaire' on the graph, but to the right of the line should show relatively more 'légitime' usage; in the feature of liaison at least. Q14 (E) is the Maçon - boisseur/syndicaliste who showed himself to be linguistically sensitive in the socio-linguistic questionnaire. In his case a higher number of elisions may be a reflection of his modest education, S (E) C. V. Nevertheless, he is clearly applying liaison more

Graph.1. Graph of No. of Elision
and Liaison/1000 words

No. of Elision/
1000 words

.087.D.

Key

'Populaire' ↖ Up and Left
'Légitime' ↘ Down and Right

140

130

120

110

100

90

80

70

60

50

40

30

20

.140.D.

.014.E.

.006.E.

.066.B.

.106.E.

.001.D.

.019.B.

.059.B.

.135.D.

.058.A.

.012.A.

.094.B.

.010.C.

10

20

30

40

50

60

70

No. of Liaison/1000 words