Further Implications

Social Identity/Linguistic Identity

The starting point to this project was a critique of existing 'subjective' and 'objective' approaches to the study of social variation in language. The major concern in what has followed has been to restore the 'dynamic' to language as 'linguistic praxis'; and to do this by examining language variables within the framework of a particular social theory. For Bourdieu then, language is the expression of practical relationships maintained by individuals. If the sum total of these relationships constitutes 'social reality', this latter is itself constrained by what is internalised by the individual:-

"Through bodily and linguistic discipline, objective structures are incorporated into the body and the 'choices' constituting a certain relation to the world are internalised in the form of durable patternings not accessible to consciousness nor even in part amenable to the will"

(Bourdieu 1977 (e) p. 662)

These 'objective structures' include externalised internality(25). It is within such a social dialectic that the internalisation can be seen as a expression of all the fundamental oppostions and principles of the social world - material, spiritual, physical, affective, division of sexes, etc. This is not so much 'known' though, as 'experienced and expressed' in and as practical social behaviour.

The embodiment of this social praxis is called 'hexis corporelle' by Bourdieu (26). The principal objective of the present study was to explore the linguistic aspects of this:-

"Language is a body technique and specifically linguistic, especially phonetic competence, is a dimension of the body hexis in which ones whole relation to the social world is expressed"

<div align="right">(Bourdieu 1977 (e) p. 661)</div>

Language Norm.

One issue raised from the study has been the degree of possible objectification for any individual linguistic component. In both the socio - linguistic questionnaire and the linguistic analysis of the Orléans corpus, objectification of subjective and objective linguistic behaviour has varied within the social hierarchy as well as our interpretation of it. This was earlier expressed in terms of qualitative and quantitative measures of 'connaissance' and 'reconnaissance'. As then suggested, there appear to be two opposing linguistic 'forces' of 'légitime' and 'populaire'; although the extremes of these are rarely realised. The symbolic value of language ultimately depends on their relative use; in this sense there is an 'interlanguage' (27) between the two. Moreover, it is not simply a question of the 'norm' having an inherent value in itself, it must rather be constantly recreated anew. Knowledge of it can be expressed anywhere and on any linguistic level — although ultimately use depends not only on what is spoken but by whom and where.

We have also seen that besides expressions of 'légitime' and 'populaire' manipulation of these can give rise to all sorts of linguistic strategies such as hyper - and hypo - correction. These were explained as attempts at gaining social 'distinction', and reflecting linguistic security/insecurity. For Bourdieu they are one of many 'reconversion strategies' (28) used by groups to maintain social dominance. The ultimate source of such strategies is therefore the underlying trends for social change and the configurations of capital (29) available in the socialstructure.

Language Group

At various points throughout the study I have raised the concept of 'language group' , and attempted to broaden its definition. It has been suggested that 'Habitus' offers a better explanatory framework for the study of linguistic variables, as theorectically at least it includesand synthesises constituent configurations of age, sex, education, occupation, etc., and weights them according to their linguistic influence. One future research objective must surely be to refine this as a tool of analysis; for example, perhaps by keeping one variable constant, and examining variation in terms of the other elements. The aims of this should be to attribute positive and negative values to the linguistic effects of separate elements of habitus.

For social psychologists (30) language groups are expressed in terms of minority and majority grouping. However, for them these are predominantly defined in terms of ethnicity.

Linguistic relations between in - and out - groups is indeed a fruitful area of research. Nevertheless, it is now clear that other groups may be self-conscious and share key linguistic values without being linked by ethnicity. We might therefore ask how and why dominance/subordination is gained; which surely needs to be explained in broader political and economic terms, with their subsequent effects on social status.

Finally, for sociolinguists and psychologists, 'language group' as 'habitus' dependent needs to be expressed more explicitly in terms of network of relations; as a part of the sum total of possible social contacts. This perhaps more than any other element is crucial in determining language practices.

Language Group, Class, and Social Change.

Tajfel (31) refers to the 'freedom' of social identity of individuals. To an extent this may be true, although we should add that phenomenologically, identity is closely related to the 'experiences and expressions' referred to earlier in linking social identity with linguistic identity. Likewise, therefore, there is too a 'freedom of choice' in language use. However, we have again seen how this 'choice' is always preconstrained by what is intrinsically possible - homo linguisticus - and the limits expressed within the discourse as defined and evaluated by the 'champ'. As the principle of the logic behind the 'champ' is social differentiation, linguistic difference will be expressed there. And it is this differentiation that has been apparent within the Orléans corpus. It has been suggested that it is by the dynamic of this phenomenon that linguistic change occurs:-

"In such a way that the contribution that the effort (eg hypocorrection) of assimilation (to the upper classes) at the same time as dissimulation (in relation to lower classes) brings to linguistic change is only more visible than the strategies of dissimulation that it gives rise to in return from the owners of a rarer competence."

(Bourdieu 1982 (a) p. 54).

The motor source of this change is therefore the hierarchical structure of class society. We have seen that aspects of speech, views on language are slanted by class characteristics, and that within the processes of change, the linguistic praxis of middle social groupings is crucial. Thus according to Labov, hypercorrection and linguistic change has a lower - middle class source. Certainly, from our own analyses it is clearly between middle and higher social groups that 'negociation' of values for the linguistic 'norm' takes place.

Lower groups are left out of this process; indeed may even constitute 'anormative' linguistic behaviour. Again though, this can only exist in terms of its relationship to the 'norm'. Even so this appropriation of linguistic behaviour counter to the expressed 'norm' itself links up with a whole set of affective notions used in defining social identity. 'Labov has explained that resistance of the New York male working class speakers to the pressure of the legitimate language by the fact that they associate the concept of manliness with their speech.'(32) In this case the 'legitime' would be seen as effeminate. However, for middle groups linguistic

conformism and therefore docility is considered as the vehicle
for social mobility.

Linguistic alternatives therefore form part of the cognitive
alternatives produced by the processes of the social superstructure.
Tajfel (1982, p.229), believes that these alternatives depend on
the 'perception' of 'visible cracks' in the social hierarchy.
Groups might therefore 'act' as groups representing a alternative
counter-culture. For Bourdieu this would represent a 'hetero doxa'
to the dominant 'doxa' (33). Sociolinguists and social-psychologists
might agree that the language a minority group used(or is 'permitted'
to use) depends upon the 'needs' of the majority,not the 'wishes'
of the minority. This presupposes some prior 'symbolic system'.
As such, language deviance itself works to maintain the subordinate
position of linguistic minorities or the lower social groupings.

Research

The research implications of this study are both theoretical and
practical. The practical 'rapprochement' between the objective
and subjective is of course finally incomplete. Bourdieu's social
theory does, however, at least make it possible. The challenge
must surely now be to realise this in practical terms. Indeed the
verbal questionnaires collected in the Orléans corpus are limited.
From the perspective of the theory itself the interview situation
entails some definition of linguistic and symbolic values as
represented within this particular 'champ':-

"Those wanting to avoid linguistic abstraction by trying to
establish statistically social factors of linguistic competence
(measured by some or other phonological, lexical, or syntactical
index) are only going half way: they are in effect forgetting
different factors measured in a situation of a particular market;
that those who create the investigation, might in a different
situation, receive very different relative values; and that it is
a question therefore of determining how the explanatory value of
different determining factors vary when one systematically varies
the situations of the market."

(Bourdieu 1982 (a) p.67)

To move outside of the limitations of the interview, therefore, a
much more explicit experimentation plan will be required. Otherwise
we cannot be certain that the language variation is not the result
of that particular situation. Such a plan would have to include
'real-life' situations rather than simulated contexts.

Much more attention should be given to discourse. Even within L_2
acquisition, interest in discourse strategies has come comparitively
late; research tools are consequently still rudimentary. Yet
our theory suggests that we need to know how individuals identify
and understand linguistic situations. This may involve attempts
to establish order and control. These attempts will themselves
be liable to interpretation. We do not yet have sufficient knowledge
of the framework in which this accounting is realised and analysed.
Moreover, how it depends on context and linguistic environment.

Nevertheless, this interpretation process is accessed by individuals and comprehended in terms of how different language will be understood and evaluated. We therefore need some account of the various linguistic choices made, and how those 'automatic' aspects of language are evaluated. This study has shown that practical features of language are meaningful, and has offered some theoretical explanation on the nature of this intelligibilty (34). Much more is now needed on the 'praxis' of this latter.

Besides conventional measures of linguistic variation then, more qualitative analysis will be required of actual discourse. This may well entail an individual rather than a group based approach. The practical difficulties of such an undertaking should not obscure its desirability.

Conclusion

I earlier referred to the economic metaphors in Bourdieu's work. The concept of 'linguistic market' was subsequently used as a frame of reference for the analysis of language. The two major preoccupations of this study have therefore been to present the social theory underlying this concept, and to explore its usefulness in accounting for linguisitc variation. In the course of doing this a number of other theoretical concepts have been raised and their relevance related to the theory as a whole. Indeed, it may be finally felt that ultimately Bordieu's achievement is theoretical rather than practical; having reconciled disparate traditions in the social-anthropological field, and answered some of more overt objections to structuralism. Nevertheless, it should be noted

that his published work is rooted in empiric observation. In
fact of all leading French writers, he is probably the most empirical.
However, this has not yet extended to the field of linguistics.
The analysis of the Orléans corpus was in part response to this omission.

Of course, it is always hazardous to talk of 'values' and 'symbols'
in the social sciences, preoccupied as we often are with appearing
'scientific'. I have though argued that at some stage the 'qualitative'
needs to be restored in order to fully realise the possibilities of
our 'quantitative' discoveries. This may mean moving outside of
the mainstream of linguistics or even breaking some of its cardinal
rules. Indeed adequate explanations may depend on such a move.
A satisfactory theory of language does therefore need to go beyond
the chomskyan notion of ideal speaker - listener described in my
introduction. Such a theory will have to take account of linguistic
variation and variability. This is not possible within the confines
of synchronic description.

It is not necessary or desirable to become the slaves of a theory,
to make everything fit a predetermined mould. Nevertheless, any
theoretical perspective will only be valid if it can adequately
explain all observed differences. Not that this is necessary for
purely 'voyeuristic' reasons. It is not sufficient either simply
to describe or explain the dynamics and features of language as
an end in itself. Rather, in a theory, we are looking to it to
provide us with a better understanding of the macro - and micro
origins of linguistic processes. Language is after all fundamentally

a social interaction. From what has been said it seems that within it our most intimate social experiences are expressed. Such knowledge is no less applicable to the principal issues of language acquisition than the more substantive goals of education.

Footnotes

25 Bourdieu on occasion refers to 'the externalization of internality and the internalization of externality'; a 'dialectic' previously developed by Berger and Luckmann (1966).

26 "Dimension fondamentale du sens de l'orientation sociale, l'hexis corporelle est une manière pratique d'eprouver et d'exprimer le sens que l'on a , comme on dit, de sa propre valeur sociale: le rapport que l'on entretient avec le monde social et la place que l'on s'y attribue ne se déclare jamais aussi bien qu'à travers l'espace et le temps que l'on se sent en droit de prendre aux autres, et, plus précisement, la place que l'on occupe avec son corps dans l'espace physique, par un maintien et des gestes assurés ou réservés, amples ou étriqués (on dit très bien de quelqu'un qui fait l'important qu'il fait du volume) et avec sa parole dans le temps, par la part du temps d'interaction que l'on s'approprie et par la manière, assurée ou agressive, désinvolte ou inconsciente, de se l'approprier."

(Bourdieu 1979 (d) p. 552)

27 Of course 'interlanguage' is more usually used in L_2 acquisition research. The main tenet of this theory is that the learner consructs for himself a series of hypotheses about the target language and consciously and unconciously tests these out in formal and informal contexts. An investigation of the analogy with the 'linguistic market' may be an interesting one.

28 "these strategies depend on the volume and structure of
capital to reproduce (economic, social, and cultural capital)
and their relative value in the total social structure"

(Bourdieu 1979 (d) p. 145)

29 Refer to Figure 3.

30 Here I am specifically thinking about the work of Henri Tajfel,
and Howard Giles and his co-authors.

31 Tajfel (1982 p. 226)

32 Bourdieu 1977 (e) p.660
The best account of this association between language and
attitudes to class and sex is given in Willis (1978)

33 Bourdieu 1977 (a) p. 164

34 Here I am thinking about the work of Garfinkel (1968),
the challenge of which does not yet seem to have been taken up.

Appendix I

The Open-ended Questionnaire

A Preliminary Questions.

    1 How long have you been living in Orleans?
    2 What brought you here?
    3 Are you happy here? Why?
    4 Do you intend staying in Orleans? Why?

B Work.

    1 What is your work?
    2 Could you describe to me a typical days work?
       What is the most important aspect of your work?
       Are you happy with it or not?
    3 If you were not a .... what would you liked to have been?
    4 More and more women work these days. Are you personally
       for or against this? Why?

C Leisure.

    1 What do you do with your free time? evening? Saturday
       and Sunday?
    2 How did you spend last Sunday?
    3 What are you doing for your summer holidays?
    4 If you had two hours extra free time each day what would you
       do with it?

D Education.

    1 In your opinion, what should children be taught at school?
       Why?
    2 What do you think of Latin at school?
       Which subjects would you like your children to be strong in?
    3 How is it children succeed or not at school?
    4 Until what age should children continue their studies? Why?
       Is it the same for girls as boys?

E Orleans, Social Classes, May 1968.

    1 Is enough done for those living in Orleans?
    2 Who has the most influence in Orleans?
    3 Can you explain the events of May 1968 to me?

Appendix II

The Sociolinguistic Questionnaire

1   Do you have a dictionary/encyclopedia? How often do you use it and why? Where did you get it?
2   Do you have a book on 'l'art de parler/d'ecrire'?
3   Do you do cross-words?
4   Do you think that children should learn Latin at school?
5   What do you think of 'Franglais'?
6   Are there differences in speaking according to social classes?
7   Do people speak better or worse these days?
8   Of the people you know, who speaks best?
9   Is there an organisation in France that decides if a word is correct or not?
10 Is it a idea to make journalists on T.V., Radio, etc., speak good French?
11 Is French taught better or worse these days?
12 In which subject were you strongest at school?
13 Do you normally have something to write with?
14 Do you have a fountain-pen?
15 When did you last write?
16 Do you have to write for your job?
17 Do you think that it is important to have a good 'script'?
18 Is it important to spell properly?
19 Would you be favourable to a reform of French spelling?
20 Do you or your wife/husband normally do the writing at home?
21 When you write to friends do you make a rough copy first? Do you re-read the letter, and are careful about making spelling mistakes?
22 With what do you write?
23 What type of paper do you use?
24 Do you change any of this when you write to your childs teacher?
25 And for an official letter?
26 Are there things about your wifes/husbands language that annoys you?
27 Who usually fills in official letters at home?
28 Who writes/speaks best, you or your wife/husband?
29 About how many letters do you write each month?
30 Do you keep personal letters that are sent to you?
31 Could you describe how to make an omlette!
32 Did your parents correct you in matters of speech when you were a child?
33 Is the French language getting worse?

Appendix III

The Close-ended Questionnaire

1 Date of Birth
2 Sex
3 Married/Single/Divorced
4 Number of children
5 Date of arrival in Orleans
6 Profession
7 Original Nationality
8 Information on Family (including grandparents, parents, brothers, sisters) plus education
9 Education of children
10 Is there someone in the family that is studying a) Latin b) Greek?
11 Level of Education
12 Private Education in Family
13 Years of study
14 Did you study Latin/Greek?
15 Type and conditions of Education
16 Do you listen to the radio? Number of hours – favourite programmes?
17 Do you watch T.V.? Number of hours – favourite station/programmes?
18 Do you go to the cinema? How often? Films preferred?
19 Is the cinema, T.V., or Radio an instrument of culture?
20 Do you do photography? Frequency?
21 Do you paint? Visit art galleries? Favourite Painters?
22 Do you like music? Favourite Composers?
23 Do you go to the theatre? Preferred authors? Frequency?
24 What newspapers, magazines, revues do you read regularly?
25 How many books do you read each year?
26 Is there a political party that represents your opinions?

Bibliography

Ashby, W. J. (1982). The drift of French syntax. Lingua, 57, 29-46.

Ball, R. V. (1983). Noun, pronoun and discourse structure in French. Modern Languages, 4, 229 - 239.

Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. (1971). The social construction of reality. Harmondsworth, Middx. : Penguin.

Blanc, M. and Biggs, P. (1971). L'enquête socio-linguistique sur le francais parlé à Orléans. Le Français dans le Monde, 85, 16 - 25.

Blanc, M. (1984). In Prujiner, A. et al (eds) Variation du comportement langagier lorsque deux langues sont en contact. Quebec: CIRB Publication G - 5.

Boudon, R. (1973). Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P.

In English

Books

- (1977 a). Outline of a Theory of Practice, trans. Richard Nice, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. (Original edition, Esquisse d'une Théorie de la Pratique. Genève : Droz 1972).

- (1977 b). (Wtih Passeron, J-C.) Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, trans. Richard Nice. London: Sage Publications.

(Original edition, La Reproduction . Eléments pour une théorie de l'Enseignement. Paris : Editions de Minuit. 1970)

- (1979 b). (with Passeron, J-C.) The Inheritors, French Students and their Relation to Culture, with a new epilogue, trans. Richard Nice. Chicago : University of Chicago Press. (Original edition, Les Héritiers. Paris : Editions de Minuit. 1964)

Articles

- (1968 b). Structuralism and theory of sociological knowledge. Social Research, XXXV, 4, Winter, 681 - 706.

- (1971 a). The thinkable and the unthinkable. Times Literary Supplement, 15 Oct, 1255 - 1256.

- (1973 a). The three forms of theoretical knowledge. Social Science Information, XII, I, 53 - 80.

- (1977 e). The economics of linguistic exchanges. Social Science Information, XVI, Dec, 645 - 668.

In French

Books

- (1979 a). La Distinction. Paris : Editions de Minuit.

- (1980 b). Le Sens Pratique. Paris : Editions Minuit.

- (1980 d). Questions de Sociologie. Paris : Editions de Minuit.

-(1982a). Ce que parler veut dire. Paris : Fayard.

- (1982 b). Leçon sur La Leçon. Paris : Editions de Minuit

Articles

- (1975 c). La critique du discours lettré. Actes de la Recherche en Science Social, 5 - 6 Nov.

- (1975 e). (with L. Boltanski) Le fétichisme de la langue. Actes de la Recherche en Science Sociale, 4.

- (1977 e). L'économie des échanges linguistiques. Langue Française, 34, mai.

- (1979 e). Les trois états du capital culturel. Actes de la Recherche en Science Sociale, 30.

Essex University Archives. (1974). Etude Sociolinguistic sur Orléans.

Francois, D. (1974). Français Parlé. Paris : S. E. L. A. F.

Garfinkel, H. (1963). Studies in Ethnomethodology. London: Polity Press.

Giles, H. and Powesland, P. F. (1975). Speech Style and Social Evaluation. London : Academic Press.

Gueunier, N., Genouvrier, E., and Khomsi, A. (1983). Les Français

devant la norme. In Bédard, R., and Maurais, J. (eds), La Norme Linguistique. Paris/Quebec :Le Robert.

Judge, A. (1976). Cohesion in spoken French. Ph.D., Birkbeck College, University of London.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Oxford : Blackwell.

Labov, W. (1977). Language in the Inner City. Oxford : Blackwell.

Mullineaux, A. and Blanc, M. (1982). The problems of classifying the population sample in the socio-linguistic survey of Orléans (1969) in terms of socio-economic, social and educational categories. Review of Applied Linguistics, 55, 3 - 37.

Rouvière, D. (m.s.). Linguistic behaviour according to the social context : the nominal phrase in spoken French. Birkbeck College: University of London.

Sankoff, D. and Laberge, S. (1978). The linguistic market and statistical explanation of variability. In Sankoff, D. (ed.), Linguistic Variation - Models and Methods. New York : Academic Press.

Schatzman, L. and Strauss, A. (1955). Social class and modes of communication. The American Journal of Sociology, LX, 4, 329 -338.

Tajfel, H. (1982). The social psychology of minorities. In
Husband, C. (ed), "Race" in Britain . Continuity and Change.
Hutchinson U. L.

Thibault, P. (1980). Le Français Parlé. Edmonton : Linguistic
Research, Inc..

Thibault, P. (1983). Equivalence et grammaticalisation. Ph. D.,
Université de Montréal.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to Labour. Farnborough : Gower.