Problems of bilingualism. Edited and with an introduction by John Macnamara. (The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, The Journal of Social Issues, vol. XXIII, No. 2) New York, April 1967. Pp. 1, 135.

Reviewed by EMY M. PASCASIO
Ateneo de Manila University

This particular issue of the Journal of Social Issues brings together for the first time nine highly interesting papers by anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and linguists on the problems of bilingualism. There is no attempt to cover exhaustively the whole area of research on bilingualism but it appears at a time when researches, conferences, and international seminars on bilingualism are more numerous than ever before.

In his introduction, Macnamara mentions that widespread and diversified bilingualism not only occurs in Europe but it is much more so in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. However, it is not enough merely to list bilingual situations or to classify them according to their origins. It is more important to ask what functions are served by each of the languages in a bilingual situation, and what settings and functions are considered appropriate to each by their speakers. Such questions have been a major concern of particularly the sociolinguists.

Charles A. Ferguson (1956) coined the term *diglossia* to describe this particular type of bilingual situation. He defines *diglossia* as "a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) super-imposed veriety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or of another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation." An example of diglossia is seen in Switzerland where the adult German-speaking population knows both Standard German and Swiss German, but employs them for distinct functions. The term *diglossia* has been generalized to all situations in which a *high* or *standard* variety is employed for the purposes of more formal communication, and a *low* or relatively uncultivated variety is employed for the purposes of more intimate communication. Joshua A. Fishman, in his "Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia: Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism", presents the relationships between diglossia and bilingualism. There are speech communities in which both diglossia and bilingualism occur. These are societies that utilize two or more languages for their own, carefully compartmentalized, intragroup

purposes and, at the same time, provide for easy role access and code access. Such access is singularly lacking in societies marked by diglossia without bilingualism. These represent instances of imposed political or religious unity, with underlying socio-cultural disunity. Widespread individual monolingualism under such circumstances is often due to emphasis on ascribed status coupled with the polarization of rigidly compartmentalized roles. Bilingualism without diglossia is typical of settings in which populations have undergone large scale and rapid social change (industrialization, urbanization, immigration, etc.) to the end that social norms for intragroup language regularities have crumbled or never been established. Both bilingualism and diglossia are absent in small, undifferentiated and isolated societies but even these develop some speech repertoire differences if only metaphorical or stylistic purposes.

Dell Hyme's "Model of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting," points to the need of a general theory and body of knowledge within which code-switching and diversity of code repertoire could find a natural place, and within which salient bilingualism could be properly assessed. One recognizes that every community is characterized by a variety of codes and by rules for choosing and switching among them. The study of such variety and such rules is in turn part of the general study of sociolinguistic systems. Such systems, understood as the rules governing speaking in a community, differ significantly cross-culturally in ways that affect the role of language in thought and in social life as a whole. There is need for a taxonomy of such systems and a model, or theory, for their description. Hymes proposes here a taxonomy and a descriptive model linked to investigation of cross-cultural differences in the acquisition of speaking by children. Among the notions found essential are notions for social units of analysis, such as speech community, speech area, speech field, speech network, speech event, and speech act; and notions for the components of speech events that enter into the statement of rules of speaking. Some of the problems and limitations of the formal statement of rules for speaking are suggested.

John J. Gumperz suggests in his "On the Linguistic Markers of Bilingual Communication" that any attempt to describe the verbal skills involved in the bilingual's concurrent use of his two languages must face the fact that the speaker's view of what constitutes distinct languages is not always directly related to linguistic reality. Ethnographic field studies of verbal behavior in a number of societies using measures of language distance adapted from machine translation analysis and which are independent of speaker's attitudes, reveal instances where distinct genetically unrelated languages have almost identical grammars. In such cases of near grammatical identity it maybe no more difficult for speakers to switch from one language to another, than to change from formal to informal styles of the same language.

The relationship between bilingualism and nationalism is discussed by Heinz Kloss in his, "Bilingualism and Nationalism." However, he does not attempt to describe the real complexity of either. First, he outlines the impact of na-

tionalism on the role of link languages. Nationalism may give rise to an urge to expand a language (e.g. French) as a second language in foreign countries. Or it may motivate a nation to reject one foreign language in favor of another (e.g. German in favor of English in the Netherlands), or, finally, it may cause newly-developing nations to adopt some imported language as a symbol of their nationhood (French and English in Sub-Saharah Africa). In multinational states a distinction is made between: (a) countries in which two or three languages enjoy full equality of status (e.g. Switzerland), (b) those which because of the multiplicity of the languages involved are compelled to select one language for national purposes but otherwise treat all languages as equal (India), (c) those which in theory make all languages equal but in practice discriminate among them (Soviet Union). On the other hand, there are nations that have a single official language which is the mother tongue of the great mapor
ity of the inhabitants. or of that ethnic group which feels and claims that it possesses some special title to rule and represent the nation as a whole—Examples of this type are Denmark, Brazil, and Tunisia. Where two or more official languages are spoken there are two types namely: those where the nondominant ethnic groups are usually subjugated by the minority which is the ruling group (e.g. Ethopia, Bolivia), and those where one of the minority languages has acquired its status as an official national language with the consensus of all the major speech communities in the nation (Bahasa-Indonesia, Tagalog-Pilipino). I would disagree with the classification of Tagalog-Pilipino as a minority language. Tagalog-Pilipino is one of the major languages spoken as it is by 44.7% of Filipinos according to the 1960 census. Where the dominant language and the minority tongue are closely related the dominant group often tries not to blot out, but to dialectize the minority tongue. This may aim at diglossia bilingualism instead of replacive bilingualism.

The other themes in this issue relate more specifically to the psychological and educational aspects of bilingualism. Susan Ervin-Tripp and Wallace Lambert discuss the effects of attitudes toward race and language on the individual bilingual. Ervin-Tripp's paper, "A Nissei Learns English," deals with the effects of such attitudes, and those of other factors, on the acquisition of English by Japanese women who married English-speaking Americans and came to live in the United States. This study is of particular interest in that it is one of the very few which combines the theoretical frameworks and techniques of both psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Lambert in his, "A Social Psychology of Bilingualism", attempts to integrate psychological and social-anthropological approaches to bilingualism. An outline of a social psychology of bilingualism is presented here wherein attention is directed to the distinctive behavior of the individual bilingual, to the social influences that affect his behavior, and to the social consequences that follow from his behavior. The outline is illustrated through studies of the changes in reactions of social audiences when bilinguals switch languages or dialects. It is argued that such switches call out dramatically different sets of stereotypes and that these affect the role relationships of a

bilingual and his co-actors in various social settings. Likewise, the person progressing toward full bilingual skill is affected by the attitudinal reactions of his co-actors so that his progress toward becoming bilingual is conditioned by his attitudes and orientations toward the two ethno-linguistic groups involved. Although the bilingual consequently encounters social and cultural tugs and pulls, it is argued that he can overcome these annoyances and may be particularly instrumental in creating a totally new, non-ethnocentric form of social inter-action. Taken together these two papers treat of language learning and of norms and attitudes which the learner acquires often quite unconsciously together with language. Thus these studies complement the work of sociolinguistics who study language usage from the point of view of society by adding the dimension of the individual within society.

The two other papers in this issue that study problems relating to the educa-tion of bilinguals with special reference to the use of the "weaker" language as medium of instruction are those by Gaarder and Macnamara. John Macnamara in his paper, "The Effects of Instructions in a Weaker Language", reviewed studies which investigate teaching subjects such as mathematics, history and geography (i.e. subjects other than languages) in a student's weaker language. The effects of such instruction on a student's attainment in those subjects is discussed and also its effects on his two languages. Special attention is paid to the student's attempts to learn and understand material in a weaker language even when he knows all the vocabulary and syntactic structures employed. Macnamara also presents for the first time in this particular paper some new data of his own on the student's ability to read and understand a weaker lan-guage. A. Bruce Gaarder's article, "Organization of the Bilingual School", is directed toward sociologists and school administrators interested in bilingual edu-cation. It distinguishes carefully between adding the mother tongue and adding a second language, tries to show why more than ordinary teacher training is needed for second language work, and takes the position that the effectiveness of bilingual schooling can neither be assessed nor assured without full considera-tion of school organization and classroom practices. It describes an American bilingual public school, and gives some information about its pupils' achievement.

Since 1950, there has been increased awareness of the complexity of the bilingual's use of both languages. John Macnamara in his article, "The Bilin-gual's Linguistic Performance —A Psychological Overview," reviewed studies that have been aimed at explaining bilingual functioning itself rather than the effects of bilingualism on children's scholastic attainment and intellectual func-tioning. The topics receiving particular attention here are: The meaning and measurement of bilingualism, the amount of overlap in the linguistic systems of bilinguals, success and failure in keeping linguistic systems from getting mixed up, the ability to switch from one system to the other and the ability to translate. The theoretical implications of the studies which are reviewed are assessed and suggestions made about the possibilities of future research.