3 Language Variation

Key Terms: *language varieties; observer's paradox; intraspeaker variation; interspeaker variation; social capital; language change; diachronic change; synchronic change; language contact; intensity of contact; pidgin; creole; Lingua Franca; diglossia; code-switching; ethnolect*

3.1 Language variation

This chapter provides an overview of language variation and its relation to a wide range of sociolinguistic issues. We begin the chapter by looking at early variationists' work and examine their analyses of sociolinguistic patterns that led to new understandings of how language varied, not only by dialect, but also by variables such as age, gender, and social class, to name a few. We also include a look at how these early sociolinguists collected and analyzed their data. We then move to a discussion of variation and examine the notions of standard and non-standard language within a wide range of linguistic contexts. We provide an analysis of how variation is related to language change. In looking at change, we examine language contact and the linguistic and social results of that contact.

3.1.1 Labov and the early variationists

Language variation began as soon as groups of people moved far enough away from one another, socially, or geographically, for their young generations of speakers to develop their languages independently from the young people in the other groups. The groups might begin to pronounce their words slightly differently, create different sets of new words, even eventually develop different sentence patterns. With enough time and distance, of course, the groups' languages might become distinct enough to be unintelligible to other groups. Now we may label these as separate languages. According to *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, there are 6,909 living languages in the world (Anderson, 2004). Most languages also have a number of different varieties. Consider English, for example. There are differences between the Englishes of Great Britain, Canada, the United States, and any number of other major varieties of the language in other English speaking countries. Even within a given country, there are different varieties of English. These different Englishes and varieties, however, are not held in equal social standing due to centuries of history, and in some cases, the effects of colonialism. People are very aware that the way people use language varies from place to place and from social group to social group, and this awareness is part of our understanding of identity. People hold personal preferences for some varieties over others, although from a linguistic perspective, they are equally well formed. In fact, as we will discuss in this chapter, an intrinsic aspect of studying language use is analyzing the attitudes individuals and groups hold toward particular language varieties.

The study of sociolinguistics began as a pursuit to understand language variation and its relationship with the social life of the language users. In the United States, the work of William Labov is typically considered the beginning of sociolinguistics in its classic, narrow definition. His work, however, was not the first work to look at variation in languages. Dialectologists such as André Martinet, Sever Pop, and Uriel Weinreich, among many others, studied sociolinguistic patterns of language use in a variety of sociolinguistic domains (Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2008; Koerner, 2002).

Labov's (1963) early sociolinguistic work was conducted on Martha's Vineyard, an island community off the coast of Massachusetts in the United States. Labov went to Martha's Vineyard to study the unique language variety that occurred there. He found a distinctive sound pattern that occurred on the island. Many people there tended to say words like *fight*, *hide*, and *sky* in a way that was different from the way many English speakers say these words. The difference was in the way that many people on Martha's Vineyard pronounced the *diphthong*. A diphthong is a vowel sound that is pronounced by quickly moving from one vowel position to another. If you say the word, *I*, in a way that begins with a very short "ah"-like sound and ends up with the "ee" sound of *see*, then you use the diphthong /ay/. This is the diphthong that many people use when they say words like *fight*, *hide*, and *sky*. If you, like those

studied by Labov in Martha's Vineyard, however, say this diphthong starting in a more central position that sounds more like the "u" in "cut," and still end on the "ee" sound of see, then you use the diphthong, /əy/. In this case, the "ə," called a *schwa*, represents the "u" in "cut" sound.

Since the /a/ sound is pronounced low in the back of the mouth and the /ə/ is pronounced more toward the center of the mouth, linguists say that the /əy/ diphthong of Martha's Vineyard speakers is more *centralized* than the /ay/ of other speakers.

For many people in Martha's Vineyard, this centralization means that a word like "fight" was pronounced with the diphthong beginning with /ə/ sound and ending with /y/. This would sound something like "fuеet," if you say the diphthong quickly. Labov also found that many people on Martha's Vineyard also centralized the diphthong /aw/ that you can hear in "pout" and "found" pronouncing it more like /əw/.

Labov, however, was curious to know why many people on Martha's Vineyard had this pronunciation. When he looked more carefully, he found that the centralized vowels occurred only in particular linguistic contexts. In other words, they only occurred in combination with particular consonants. For example, if the diphthong was followed by the consonant sounds /t/, /s/, /p/, or /f/, it was more likely to be centralized. In "fight" and "pout," then, the diphthongs were likely to be centralized. If, however, the vowel was followed by the consonant sounds /l/, /r/, /n/, or /m/, it was less likely to be centralized. In "pine" or "crown," then, the diphthongs were less likely to be centralized.

The story, however, does not end there. Labov considered variables such as where the individuals lived, what they did for a living, whether they lived on the island full time or part time, and, of course, their ages. What he found was that the people with centralized diphthongs were typical of people who lived in rural areas of the island full time, who typically fished as their profession, and who were in their 30s and 40s. In other words, these were people who lived and worked on the island and took pride in being from the island community. Their way of talking made them stand out as individuals who sounded uniquely like people from Martha's Vineyard. Although Labov did not discuss these language sounds as markers of identity, we can see that individuals who used these sounds constructed themselves as valid members of the island community. Their language constructed their identities as people who came from the island.

It is also interesting that Martha's Vineyard has been the site of studies of bilingualism as well. In this case, due to the high numbers of individuals who were born deaf due to hereditary patterns, (Groce, 1985) a large number of people in Martha's Vineyard, particularly in the more rural areas, were bilingual in English and in the local sign language. Sign language, like any other language, shows variation. There are variations in relation to geographic area, age, race, gender, and particular schools (Swisher, 1989). Although as Lucas, Bayley, Valli, et al. (2001) note, there is not yet a complete understanding of all of the units that may vary in American Sign Language, for example, or of how these variations interact with other variables such as age, race, and gender. Variation in sign languages can be see in relation to a number of linguistic units, including lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic units. In a study of how gestures can be used to accompany signed language story telling, Quinto-Pozos and Mehta (2010) examined the variation of gestures across settings and audiences. They found that these gestures that accompanied constructed action stories occurred across all of the registers they examined, including formal registers, but that there was variation by setting and audience. Essentially they found how the different body parts used to support constructed action patterned differently across audiences and settings (p. 577).

3.1 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

How is your language different, for example, when you are talking to your professor in office hours than when you are talking to your friends?

In this section, we have looked at some of the earliest work in sociolinguistics. We have seen how this early work made connections between language use and social life. Though much of this early work, such as that done by Labov, did not explicitly discuss identity, we can see that his early work paved the way for modern discussions on the connection between language and identity. In looking at this early sociolinguistic work, we've discussed examples from Martha's Vineyard. In particular, we've looked at how Martha's Vineyard has been the site of sociolinguistic studies of variation. And finally, we've examined how this community has also provided examples of variation in sign language as well.

studied by Labov in Martha's Vineyard, however, say this diphthong starting in a more central position that sounds more like the "u" in "cut," and still end on the "ee" sound of see, then you use the diphthong, /əy/. In this case, the "ə," called a *schwa*, represents the "u" in "cut" sound.

Since the /a/ sound is pronounced low in the back of the mouth and the /ə/ is pronounced more toward the center of the mouth, linguists say that the /əy/ diphthong of Martha's Vineyard speakers is more *centralized* than the /ay/ of other speakers.

For many people in Martha's Vineyard, this centralization means that a word like "fight" was pronounced with the diphthong beginning with /ə/ sound and ending with /y/. This would sound something like "fueet," if you say the diphthong quickly. Labov also found that many people on Martha's Vineyard also centralized the diphthong /aw/ that you can hear in "pout" and "found" pronouncing it more like /əw/.

Labov, however, was curious to know why many people on Martha's Vineyard had this pronunciation. When he looked more carefully, he found that the centralized vowels occurred only in particular linguistic contexts. In other words, they only occurred in combination with particular consonants. For example, if the diphthong was followed by the consonant sounds /t/, /s/, /p/, or /f/, it was more likely to be centralized. In "fight" and "pout," then, the diphthongs were likely to be centralized. If, however, the vowel was followed by the consonant sounds /l/, /r/, /n/, or /m/, it was less likely to be centralized. In "pine" or "crown," then, the diphthongs were less likely to be centralized.

The story, however, does not end there. Labov considered variables such as where the individuals lived, what they did for a living, whether they lived on the island full time or part time, and, of course, their ages. What he found was that the people with centralized diphthongs were typical of people who lived in rural areas of the island full time, who typically fished as their profession, and who were in their 30s and 40s. In other words, these were people who lived and worked on the island and took pride in being from the island community. Their way of talking made them stand out as individuals who sounded uniquely like people from Martha's Vineyard. Although Labov did not discuss these language sounds as markers of identity, we can see that individuals who used these sounds constructed themselves as valid members of the island community. Their language constructed their identities as people who came from the island.

It is also interesting that Martha's Vineyard has been the site of studies of bilingualism as well. In this case, due to the high numbers of individuals who were born deaf due to hereditary patterns, (Groce, 1985) a large number of people in Martha's Vineyard, particularly in the more rural areas, were bilingual in English and in the local sign language. Sign language, like any other language, shows variation. There are variations in relation to geographic area, age, race, gender, and particular schools (Swisher, 1989). Although as Lucas, Bayley, Valli, et al. (2001) note, there is not yet a complete understanding of all of the units that may vary in American Sign Language, for example, or of how these variations interact with other variables such as age, race, and gender. Variation in sign languages can be see in relation to a number of linguistic units, including lexical, phonological, morphological, and syntactic units. In a study of how gestures can be used to accompany signed language story telling, Quinto-Pozos and Mehta (2010) examined the variation of gestures across settings and audiences. They found that these gestures that accompanied constructed action stories occurred across all of the registers they examined, including formal registers, but that there was variation by setting and audience. Essentially they found how the different body parts used to support constructed action patterned differently across audiences and settings (p. 577).

variation

3.1 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

How is your language different, for example, when you are talking to your professor in office hours than when you are talking to your friends?

In this section, we have looked at some of the earliest work in sociolinguistics. We have seen how this early work made connections between language use and social life. Though much of this early work, such as that done by Labov, did not explicitly discuss identity, we can see that his early work paved the way for modern discussions on the connection between language and identity. In looking at this early sociolinguistic work, we've discussed examples from Martha's Vineyard. In particular, we've looked at how Martha's Vineyard has been the site of sociolinguistic studies of variation. And finally, we've examined how this community has also provided examples of variation in sign language as well.

3.1.2 Early variationist sociolinguistics, data collection, and analysis

At this point, you might be wondering how these early sociolinguists collected their data. The usual method for collecting data was for the researcher to conduct a sociolinguistic interview. Sociolinguists were interested in collecting examples of peoples' day-to-day speech. The difficulty was that in conducting these interviews, sociolinguists were creating a situation that was not typical in people's daily lives and which affected the formality of the speech they used. Labov called this the *observer's paradox*. The observer is trying to observe everyday speech, but the researchers' presence meant that people changed their speech for the situation. This means that researchers had to create different ways of interviewing. They assumed that when participants were paying attention to the quality of their speech, they were more likely to monitor their speech, which resulted in a more formal speech sample. They found, for example, that eliciting speech read out loud produced the most monitored, formal speech sample. However, asking people to talk about very emotionally laden moments in their lives, such as times when they almost died or times when they got into a fight produced a much more day-to-day level of speech. Researchers realized that when people became emotionally involved in talking about these sorts of topics, they were less likely to monitor their language and more likely to speak informally. Questions asking people about times when they had almost died or when they had been in a fight seemed to allow people to become involved in their stories and engage in the more informal language the researchers were hoping to collect. In this way, the type of question had an effect on the observer's paradox.

Early variationist work was usually quantitative in its orientation. It was typical to look for variables, such as the vowel sounds of Martha's Vineyard, and to identify their variants. To do this, Labov and others doing sociolinguistics engaged in variable rules analysis. This kind of analysis was designed to determine the probability of the use of a particular linguistic feature taking linguistic and social context into account. The mathematicians, Henrietta Cedergren and David Sankoff (1974) and Sankoff (1978) developed a computer program, VARBRUL, that allowed quantitative sociolinguists to carry out variable rules analysis quite easily.

This program, and its counterpart Goldvarb, can be used to find relationships among independent variable and a range of dependent variables. Norma Mendoza-Denton (2008), for example, examined the variation in the language used by two specific groups of Latina high school girls' group affiliations; Norteñas and Sureñas. In particular, she examined their use of various vowel sounds. She used ten independent and one dependent variable group to determine the relationships between, among other things, speaker individuation, social affiliation, realization of the phoneme, the preceding and following phonological segment, as well as phrase-level and topic-level code-switching. After running the Goldvarb program and analyzing the results of the step up and step down regression processes, she found that the girls from the two groups used language in very particular ways. She also found that as girls move their affiliation from one group to another, they shift their pronunciation to more closely match the pronunciation patterns of their target groups. Mendoza-Denton found that the particular way in which the girls spoke marked their membership in a particular group. This work shows that the variables in interactions can be very complex as individuals construct particular identities.

3.2 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider your own language use. Come up with some words that you use that are connected to your affiliation with particular groups. Also, consider what your variety sounds like. Do you recognize other people as from your home area based on the way that they sound? Which particular sounds help you make the distinction?

In this section, we have discussed early work in sociolinguistics. We have seen that early sociolinguists recognized the observer's paradox and developed ways to collect data in sociolinguistic interviews, which could be designed to elicit speech at different levels of formality. Early sociolinguistic work tended to be quantitative in orientation, analyzing variables to determine their patterns of use.

3.1.3 Language variation and social life

In looking at the way that people speak, we can talk about *interspeaker variation*: the ways that people speak differently from one another. The Martha's Vineyard study of vowel sounds, for example, looked at interspeaker variation. We should note, however, that we can also see *intraspeaker* variation as well. This variation can be seen in the ways that single individuals speak in

different ways in the various social and linguistic contexts of their lives. For instance, the sociolinguistic interviews that we discussed earlier considered intraspeaker variation in terms of whether people read aloud or were asked the danger-of-death or been-in-a fight types of questions. It was assumed that their language would vary in formality according to the level of monitoring that they engaged in. The level of formality of speech affects the sounds, vocabulary, and grammatical structure of what is said. For instance, in a formal utterance, an individual might say a greeting as, "Hello. How are you?" In an informal greeting, the same individual might say, "Hey. How's it goin'?" People don't speak in exactly the same way all the time. Our language variation is determined by the social situation. We use particular varieties in conjunction with the person we are talking to, the topic, the setting, and even our mood.

As you read in Chapter 2, language variation is one of the ways that people construct their identities through language. The fact that there are various ways of speaking has important implications for identity construction. For example, in Chapters 6 and 7, we will look at the relationship between language variation and constructions of power.

In this section, we have discussed the fact that both interspeaker and intraspeaker variation occur. We discussed the link between language variation, identity construction, and constructions of power.

3.2 Language varieties: standard and non-standard language

Society has created different values for different varieties of language labeling some of them as standard and some as non-standard. Standard and non-standard language labels, however, are not linguistic labels. They are social labels. Languages that are constructed as the standard variety of any given language exist all over the world. From a linguistic standpoint, these standard varieties are no more fully developed or well formed than any other variety.

Lippi-Green (1997a) has written about the "standard language myth." In her work, she presents the myth of standard U.S. English as the language that is spoken and written by persons

- who have no regional accent;
- who reside in the Midwest, far west, or perhaps some parts of the northeast (but never in the south);
- with more than average or superior education;
- who are themselves educators or broadcasters;
- who pay attention to speech, and are not sloppy in terms of pronunciation or grammar;
- who are easily understood by all;
- who enter into a consensus of other individuals like themselves about what is proper in language (p. 58)

Lippi-Green labels the notion of a standard language a "myth" because it does not actually exist. There is, for example, no such thing as unaccented language. All language speakers have an accent, even sign languages can be said to have accents (Lucas, et al., 2001). The point is that some people's language is socially constructed as sounding "normal" and others' language by default is constructed as sounding "accented." It is also possible to take the list above and use its opposite to more fully understand the biases inherent in the use of a standard language. The notion, or myth, of a standard language is used by some people to pass certain kinds of judgments on the language of others.

The notion of a standard language is maintained in part because it is normatively enforced by the educational system. Blommaert (2005) affirms that children from elite backgrounds typically control the standard language, and the educational system systematically attributes higher value to the standard language (p. 13). A clear function of the written system of languages is to enforce or sustain standardization (Milroy & Lesley, 1985). The maintenance of a standard language provides for the social production and reproduction of linguistic capital for people who are invested in it. As Lippi-Green puts it, "The myth of a standard language exists because it is carefully tended and propagated. Individuals acting for a larger social group take it upon themselves to control and limit spoken language variation, the most basic and fundamental of human socialization tools" (2007a, p. 59).

In some countries, there are even particular academies that have been legally established to protect the standard language. Consider for example, the Real Academia Española or the Académie Française whose purpose is to maintain a particular version of Spanish and French respectively. As these academies show, while there is nothing linguistically superior about standard language, it is socially constructed as superior.

Since the notion of a standard is socially constructed, we should be able to see it functioning as individuals use it in particular ways. This is, indeed, the case. Reyes-Rodríguez (2008), for example, examined how politicians'

control of standardized varieties of Spanish provided them with legitimacy, social capital (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980), and finally "authority" in their political speeches.

As seen in Reyes-Rodríguez's work, the idea that standard languages are social constructions, then, means that their use has social consequences. Bourdieu (1977a), examines the social economics of particular types of language use. He uses the notion of *social capital* to talk about the social consequences of particular language uses. Since the standard variety of a language is socially constructed as the language of the elite and the educated, for example, the control and use of a standard language in contexts where it is socially constructed as the proper form to use has positive social value. It represents social capital. The choice of the non-standard variety in the same circumstances can be seen as having a lower social capital. The use of varieties, however, can also signal group membership and solidarity, a different kind of social value. So the interactions between standard varieties, and the social constructions about them, are complicated by various groups' dynamics and the values that they place on their individual varieties for particular purposes.

3.3 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider how you talk when you are interacting with family members. Is your language use exactly the same as it is when you are speaking in a presentation in class? How does this show your understandings of different linguistic contexts?

As languages, like English, become world languages, the standard and non-standard distinction and the power issues related to the distinction, become even more complicated. In this post-colonial era, these issues of standard and non-standard types of languages take on additional layers of meaning. Particular languages are no longer identified with one nation-state but can be identified with several places. English, for instance, is used worldwide as a first language. People learn it as a first language in Singapore and India, among other places. Therefore, several varieties of World Englishes have developed. In some contexts, particular varieties of English may be considered standard. However, outside of that context, the same variety is often constructed as "non-standard." For example, Indian English is normative in its use within India. However, outside of India, the variety is considered to diverge from the standard. Standard British English and Standard American English, for instance, are considered standards worldwide, though they are neither identical nor consistent among speakers, whereas Indian English is considered non-standard to some English speakers outside of India.

3.4 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider your own knowledge of standard and non-standard varieties. Do you consciously try to use one variety or another? In what social contexts might you make these choices?

In this section, we have discussed concepts of standard and non-standard language. We have seen this as a social rather than a linguistic distinction. We have also looked at world language varieties in terms of how they provide a more complex understanding of these notions as socially constructed.

3.3 Language change in progress

Work in the history of languages has demonstrated that changes have occurred in languages. For instance, if we look at the history of English, it is easy to see that Old English is very different from the Englishes that are currently spoken today. As noted in Chapter 1, we can see that Shakespeare's English was different from the English of Virginia Woolf representing changes over the past 400 years or so. This does not mean, of course, that the study of language change is only a historical venture. It is also possible to see language change in progress.

Labov (2007), for instance, has shown that it is possible to see change in progress in the work that has been done on the Northern Cities Vowel Shift by a number of sociolinguists. This shift represents changes in vowel sounds in a number of cities in the northern region of the United States. Labov talks about this shift extensively in the PBS series *Do You Speak American?* In that series, he discusses one rather salient example in which a northern cities speaker says a word that to other speakers sounds like "bosses." When the word is contextualized within an utterance, "I remember the bosses with the antennas," people who do not have this vowel shift might have a difficult time figuring out this utterance taken out of its larger conversational context. However, the utterance is a clear example of the vowel shift. What sounds something like "bosses" here is actually "busses." For these speakers, the vowel in bus, /ə/—that

schwa sound we saw in the example of Martha's Vineyard—which is typically made in the center of the mouth has shifted to the "ah" sound in boss. In this shift their word "boss" has also changed sound. In a longer conversational context, speakers from these regions are clearly understood, of course. They are just typically perceived as having an accent from that region. What is important to understand about vowel shifts is that they are patterned.

Eckert (2000a) explored how social identity was constructed in a Detroit suburban high school, Belten High, located in a northern city that is part of the area in which the Northern Cities Vowel shift can be seen. She examined the language of high school students and considered how they used these vowel sounds as part of the way that they distinguished themselves as part of different high school social groups: the "jocks," the "burnouts," and the "in-betweeners."

Eckert notes that one important finding of her study was an understanding of the small extent to which the speech of Belten High students reflected their parents' socioeconomic characteristics. She identified two major variables that could be used to define the difference she saw in the speech of these student groups. One of these variables was gender, and the other was the students' group affiliation. This means, that while Eckert examined a number of speech variables, such as (aeh) raising, (o) fronting, (oh fronting), (e) backing, and (ay) monophthongizing, to name a few, what she found was that some of these categories of change correlated with gender, such as the (aeh) raising and the (o) fronting, while others such as (e) backing correlated with group affiliation. Some, of course, correlated with both gender and group affiliation. Eckert's work shows that the language change in progress in the larger community can be used in different ways by different groups to distinguish themselves and their group memberships.

3.5 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider how you talk as compared with how your grandparents talk. Which linguistic features differ between you and your grandparents, or other older members of your family? These could include sounds, vocabulary, or grammatical constructions.

In this section, we have discussed the fact that it is possible to see change in progress and that these processes are patterned. The types of changes that give any region its trademark accent are really the result of certain types of language changes. Essentially, where there is variation, there is change.

3.4 Language contact and language change

Situations in which languages come into contact with each other arise all over the world. In fact, language contact is a major factor in language change. At this point, we will discuss language contact *diachronically*, across time, including how it contributes to language change as well as *synchronically*, at a given time, including the social implications of language contact. *Language contact* is a term that refers to a situation in which language users within a particular geographic area are exposed to more than one language variety in their daily lives. Such language contact can be high intensity, meaning that speakers of languages in contact have many opportunities to engage in social interaction with each other. For most speakers of signed languages, for instance, the language contact with various verbal languages is often high intensity. For example, high intensity contact between American Sign Language and American English affects the syntax of American Sign Language, among other things (Swisher, 1989).

Low intensity contact, on the other hand, describes situations in which speakers of languages in contact do not have many opportunities to engage in social interaction with one another. The intensity of the contact is very important in understanding the implications of language contact. As you can probably imagine, situations of high intensity language contact often result in more extreme shifts, such as pidginization (see the discussion in section 3.4.1). Low intensity contact, conversely, often results in less extreme shifts. Duration of contact is also an important determinant of how the contact situation influences language change. In situations of high intensity contact that continue for long periods of time, new varieties may emerge. In situations of low intensity contact that last for a short duration, there may be no shift or very little shift, such as the adoption of a few loanwords.

3.6 Doing Sociolinguistics: A Thought Exploration

Consider varieties in contact in the region in which you live. What is the duration, intensity? How have the various varieties spoken in your region been affected by contact with other varieties?

In the Southwestern region of the United States, Spanish and English have been in contact for centuries. This is a situation of long duration of contact. However, the intensity of the contact between English and Spanish in this region is variable. In some cases, the contact is high intensity. Intensity of contact can also include socioeconomic and often political pressure on one of the contact language groups to shift to the other language (Paredes & Valdes, 2008). For instance, for most primary Spanish speakers in the Southwestern United States, contact with English is high intensity, although higher intensity for some than for others. For primary English speakers in the United States, on the other hand, contact with Spanish is likely to be low intensity, though lower intensity for some than for others.

There are several results of this contact, depending on the intensity of the contact. The long duration, yet low intensity of contact with Spanish has resulted in the use of Spanish loanwords in English. In many cases, since the words have been incorporated into the English language for such a long period of time, they take on English phonological characteristics. For instance, the word "patio" is a loanword from Spanish, but its pronunciation, /pærio/, follows the rules of the English sound system. English words have been borrowed into Spanish as well. Again, because of the long duration of the contact between Spanish and English, the loanwords often take on the phonological characteristics of Spanish. It is not uncommon to hear Spanish speakers in the Southwestern United States say "parquiar" for "park" as in "park the car."

However, "parquiar" takes on Spanish morphology as we can see as well as Spanish phonology as it is pronounced /parkiar/. This is evidence that "parquiar" is a relatively new borrowing into Spanish. It is typical for borrowings to be adapted to the language that they are borrowed into.

In any contact situation, there is a power dynamic that results in a hierarchical differentiation between languages. In the Southwest United States, English is the language of power. It is higher in the power hierarchy than Spanish is. Because of this, Spanish speaking children in the Southwest United States learn English when they begin school. English is the language of the elite, of education, of power. In situations in which Spanish speaking families immigrate to the United States, this power differential leads to Spanish language use diminishing the longer families live in the United States. The first generation of Spanish speaking immigrants might be primarily Spanish speaking. However, by the third generation, the family is often monolingual English speaking. Therefore, the contact with Spanish becomes lower intensity through the generations.

The story, however, is often more complex than that. In situations of high intensity contact, it is not unusual for new language varieties to form. Let's consider the case of New York Spanish. Otheguy, Zentella, and Livert (2007) demonstrate that New York Spanish speakers' participation in various speech communities in their daily lives has led to the formation of a new New York Spanish speech community. Otheguy et al. (2007) focused on the variable use of subject pronouns in the language variety associated with the New York Spanish speech community. The corpus of language use that they collected came from people born and raised in New York with familial origins in six Latin American countries as well as newcomers to New York from the same six Latin American countries. One finding is that the second generation New Yorkers used more overt subject pronouns when speaking Spanish. Note that Spanish is a language in which the subject pronoun can be dropped. In English, the subject pronoun is obligatory, or overt. The following sentences in English and Spanish demonstrate the difference.

English: I eat fish.
Spanish: Como pescado

In Spanish, the morphological marker –o indicates that the verb is first person singular. English, on the other hand, has no morphological marker to distinguish first person singular. The overt subject pronoun makes the distinction. However, for the second generation New York Spanish speakers, contact with English has made it more likely that New York Spanish speakers will include the overt subject pronoun, so that "I eat fish" would be "Yo como pescado" with the overt first person singular subject pronoun, "yo."

New York Spanish is also characterized by the contact between Spanish speakers from different countries. The result is the formation of a New York Spanish that combines features of the various Spanish dialects used within the city. Clearly, high intensity contact is a driver of dramatic shifts in the way that people use language. Another interesting finding that Otheguy et al. discussed is the fact that Caribbean Spanish speakers in New York tend to shift in the direction of the more prestigious Spanish spoken by Spanish speakers from the mainland. In contact situations, the power relationships between languages can have an important impact on language development at the societal level.

3.7 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider the language varieties that you encounter on a daily basis. Can you identify any instances of one language or variety affecting another? How do the linguistic features associated with these language varieties influence one another?

In this section, we have considered how language contact impacts language change. We have seen that these types of contact are often mediated by issues such as duration, intensity of contact, and power hierarchies. We have also seen that language contact can result in the formation of entire new varieties, as was the case with New York Spanish.

3.4.1 Pidgins and creoles

One of the dramatic shifts that occurs as a result of high intensity contact is the development of pidgin and creole languages. A pidgin language develops when groups of people who speak different languages have a relatively sudden need to communicate with each other. Historically, a major driver for the development of pidgin languages has been economic. Groups of people who speak different languages yet need to engage in economic exchange with each other must find a way of communicating. These instances, then, become ripe for the development of pidgins.

Pidgins become Lingua Francas within the regions where they are spoken. We can define a Lingua Franca as a common language that people who come from different language backgrounds use in communication with each other. Lingua Francas can be languages other than pidgins. For instance, English is considered a Lingua Franca in certain parts of the world, including India, Nigeria, and Singapore. English is often used as a Lingua Franca for international business, science, and technology, and it is almost always the Lingua Franca for aviation.

It makes sense that pidgins tend to become Lingua Francas because they develop in response to the need for a Lingua Franca. They develop when people who speak different languages come into contact and have a typically economic incentive to communicate with each other.

Interestingly, all pidgins share some common features. For instance, all pidgins are formed when features of at least two languages combine. One important factor in the formation of pidgin languages is the fact that the contributor languages combine in such a way that the language or languages of the more powerful group or groups usually provide much of the lexicon, or vocabulary. In relation to the pidgin, then, the language that provides the lexicon is called the *superstratum*. The language or languages of the less powerful group usually become the syntactic, morphological, and phonological elements of the pidgin. They are called the *substratum* of the pidgin. Therefore, the languages that contribute to the formation of the pidgin are in a superstrate-substrate relationship. The superstratum languages are the lexifiers, and the substratum languages are donors of syntactic, morphological, and phonological structure to the pidgin.

Another crucial characteristic of all pidgins is that no one is a first language user of a pidgin language. All users of pidgin languages speak another language or languages as their first language. They are, then, second language users of pidgin. This is always the case because pidgins develop when people who already speak other languages need to communicate in economic transactions. Pidgins are not the language of the home and family. They are the language of business and trade.

Scholars often refer to pidgins as simplified languages (Romaine, 1999). However, this classification may have more to do with the fact that pidgins are used in limited contexts, such as in particular kinds of trade. Users of pidgins are multilinguals who have multiple linguistic resources available to them in their daily lives. It may be that people only use the pidgin for trade purposes, but they use other varieties for their other life functions. The fact that the pidgin is used for such limited communicative needs would contribute to it having a simpler structure and fewer vocabulary words than linguistic varieties that meet a wider array of communicative needs.

Pidgins, like any other linguistic varieties, meet the communicative needs of their speakers. When they fail to meet those needs, they become expanded. Pidgins typically begin with a *jargon phase*. During this jargon phase, there is quite a bit of individual variation in the use of the pidgin, and pidgin varieties are quite simplified in their structure and contain quite reduced vocabularies at this stage. As the pidgin becomes the wholesale linguistic variety for people engaged in economic activity, there comes to be less individual variation and more standard grammatical, phonological, and lexical features. This is termed the stable pidgin phase. Stable pidgins often have reduced vocabularies, sounds, and grammars. However, as pidgins come to be used in more contexts in people's daily lives, they become expanded grammatically, phonologically, and lexically. This is the expanded pidgin

phase. People who use pidgins are capable of adapting these varieties so that they can meet their communicative needs. It is highly unusual to see societal linguistic varieties that are not well suited to the communicative needs of the people who use those varieties.

Scholars often differentiate pidgins and creoles with the distinction that creole languages develop when children of pidgin users begin to use the pidgin as their first language. However, in multilingual societies, this can be difficult to decipher. Children in multilingual societies may use the pidgin from early childhood or they may not, depending on the languages that their families use in the home. However, one crucial element seems to exist as a variety moves from expanded pidgin to creole, which is that the variety comes to be used in more contexts in daily life. It becomes a means by which people construct identities, not only for economic purposes, but also for the purposes of building personal relationships and providing cohesion for a speech community. As the variety comes to be used in more nuanced and complex human ways in people's daily lives, the variety itself becomes more nuanced and complex. This often corresponds with the variety becoming the language of the home and a first language for children.

Pidgins and creoles have arisen in multiple places throughout the world. Sebba (1997) defines pidgins as being of seven types: military or police pidgins, seafaring and trade pidgins and creoles, plantation pidgins and creoles, mine and construction pidgins, immigrants' pidgins, tourist pidgins, and urban contact vernaculars. Sebba (1997) asserts that the first known pidgin was Sabir, a military pidgin, which was spoken among soldiers in Southern Europe during the Crusades. Sebba also lists Russenorsk, a Russian-Norwegian pidgin that developed as a seafaring and trade pidgin.

In nineteenth-century Hawai'i, a plantation pidgin, Pidgin Hawai'ian, developed. Kanahele-Stutz (2009) indicates that immigrants came to Hawai'i from China, Portugal, and several Pacific Islands. As these immigrants began to oversee plantations and as speakers of several languages labored together, they developed Pidgin Hawai'ian in response to the need for a Lingua Franca. The superstrate and lexifier was Hawai'ian. The other languages acted as substrates and contributed to the grammar and phonology of the pidgin. As Kanahele-Stutz indicates, the Hawai'ian monarchy was quite powerful in the eighteenth century, allowing the indigenous population to maintain sovereignty. Therefore, Hawai'ian language maintained a prestigious status. Sakoda and Siegel (2003, p. 6) cite examples of the difference between Pidgin Hawai'ian (PH) and Hawai'ian.

Example 3.1

PH	Kela lio oe hele hauhau lela palani wau ma ka ponei.
	(That horse you[rs] went eat that bran I [my] in the last night.)
Hawai'ian	Ua hele kou lio e 'ai i ka'u palani i ka po nei.
	(Went your horse to eat my bran [last] night.)

From this example, it seems clear that Hawai'ian is the lexifier. However, as English speakers increasingly came to Hawai'i from the mainland, English came to be used more often in eighteenth-century Hawai'i. It, too, became a substrate in a changing Pidgin Hawai'ian. As Kanahele-Stutz (2009, p. 20) explains it, the overthrow of the Hawai'ian monarchy by American business people (assisted by American marines) led to English replacing Hawai'ian as the official language in 1896. These events dealt a blow to Hawai'ian sovereignty and eventually to Hawai'ian identity. Pidgin Hawai'ian gave way to Pidgin English. By the mid- twentieth century, the variety was no longer known as a pidgin but as Hawai'ian Creole English. Kanahele-Stutz provides an example of Hawai'ian Creole English from a Hawai'ian concert-goer in 2009 (p. 22)

Example 3.2: Modern Day Hawai'ian Creole English
Eh, you bettah watchyo mowt, yo maddah goeen geev you
likens if she catchyou talkeen Pidgin laidat.
(Hey, you had better watch your mouth, your mother is going to give you physical punishment if she catches you talking Pidgin like that.)

Hawai'ian Creole English was born out of colonization. Kanahele-Stutz conducted a survey among Hawai'ians living in the mainland United States. She found that Hawai'ian Creole English is an important identity marker for Hawai'ians. Its use allows Hawai'ian people living in the mainland United States to form a group identity as "Hawai'ians living on the mainland." However, they also consider Hawai'ian Creole English to be inferior. They find its use in schools, government, and professional contexts to be inappropriate. As such, a colonized indigenous Hawai'i remains and is indexed through the use of Hawai'ian Creole English.

3.8 Doing Sociolinguistics: Thought Exploration

Consider how colonization has led to the formation of other language varieties besides Hawai'ian Creole English. What do people's attitudes toward these varieties tend to be? How do these attitudes reflect the prestige that these varieties carry?