

Chapter 2

Dialect Contact, Accommodation, Koinéisation and New Dialect Formation: A Theoretical Framework

2. Introduction

This chapter examines previous research and theoretical background most relevant to the themes of this thesis: dialect contact processes such as accommodation and levelling, koinéisation and New Dialect Formation. The present study focuses on dialect contact in a highly mixed language and dialect setting, namely Anglophone and Non-Anglophone children and adolescents in an international school in southern Spain. As demonstrated in chapter 1, the dialect contact situation of this international school is rather unusual, in that it brings together children and adolescents from a variety of different UK dialect locations that spend a sustained period of time together. They mix with Non-Anglo children and adolescents in a setting where the ambient language is Spanish. This study aims to observe processes of dialect contact as they are happening. Britain (1997: 1-2) points out that "We now have a fuller understanding of the likely *outcomes* of koineisation...We know much less, however, about the intermediate stages of the koineisation process itself". We see here, from Britain's comment, that there is a need for more research of dialect contact processes *as they are happening*. Most previous dialect contact studies of English have been post-hoc, mainly two or three generations after the initial dialect contact (with the exception of Kerswill and Williams' Milton Keynes project). The aim of this chapter is to present the dialect contact framework for the analyses and discussion of this rather striking speech community that follows.

This chapter will be divided into three broad sections. The first section of the chapter will examine previous research and methods in sociolinguistics of studying speech communities.

It will also discuss previous sociolinguistic research of children and adolescents in school settings and other dialect contact settings.

The second section will explore and define different types of dialect contact. It will discuss short and long-term accommodation, focussing and diffuseness, koinéisation and levelling, as well as outlining Trudgill's (2004) proposed stages of new-dialect formation. Social factors that facilitate or militate against koinéisation will also be discussed.

The third section examines previous research of especially highly fluid communities. The present study is particularly interested in what happens to linguistic variation when a fluid community with no target variety continues to be fluid? Previous linguistic studies of highly fluid communities will be discussed briefly (Mæhlum 1992; Berthele 2002; Hirano 2011).

The chapter will conclude with the research questions for the present study, outlining what the research aims to find out through the analyses. Lastly, there will be a summary of the theoretical issues relevant to this research.

2.1 Sociolinguistics and the authentic speaker

This section discusses how speaker 'authenticity' has previously been sought within linguistics. The present study includes *almost* all that is found in the speech community under examination. In this fluid and transient speech community, with different languages and dialects in the melting pot, one might question who are the 'authentic' speakers here. This part of the chapter aims to point out the value of moving away from the 'pursuit of the authentic speaker' approach, in that the present study explores the messy linguistic landscape that mobility and migration has created here. According to Chambers (2002: 17) "Mobility is the most effective leveller of dialect and accent...Face-to-face interactions are taking place on a

global scale because of unprecedented social and occupational mobility". Therefore, the impact of migration and mobility can hardly be avoided in linguistics. Recent UK sociolinguistic studies that have looked at the impact of migration have been fruitful and innovative. (See for example Cheshire, Kerswill, Fox and Torgerson 2011; Drummond 2010; Fox 2007; Kirkham 2013; Schlee, Meyerhoff and Clark 2011). Chambers argues "Where dialectologists once preoccupied themselves with the linguistics of isolation and immobility, contemporary dialectologists (sociolinguists) find few opportunities for studying isolated dialects and dwindling social relevance in doing so. Instead we are embarking on fecund new ground in studies of contact and convergence". (Chambers 2002: 117). The present study embraces Chambers' argument.

Eckert (2003: 392) claims that research is a zoo, with elephants in the room and moose on the table that we choose to ignore in our pursuit of the 'Authentic Speaker'. She describes the authentic speaker as "the dialectal poster child – our direct access to language untainted by the interference of reflection or social agency....authenticity is an ideal construct that is central to the practice of both speakers and analysts of language" (ibid. : 392). She gives examples of authentic speakers in linguistic studies as locally located and oriented, such as the street kid in the inner city (Labov 1972 cited in Eckert 2003), and the 'burned-out burnout in a midwestern high school (Eckert 2000 cited in Eckert 2003). Coupland (2010: 1) claims that "In Eckert's image the authentic speaker, if such a person could be found, would be someone that variationists would revere and iconise, because she had the core attributes they wanted all their informants to have".

Several sociolinguistic studies in the UK have focussed upon local, often working class informants, excluding those that do not fit the genre. For example, Mees (1983, 1987, 1990) and Mees and Collins (1999), in their Cardiff study only included Middle Middle Class, Lower Middle Class and Working Class native Cardiff informants. Milroy, Milroy, Hartley and Walshaw (1994) included only working class and middle class young and old Tynesiders in their Glottal stops and glottalization paper and L. Milroy (1980), in her social network study included only working class Belfast informants. In this way, these studies assume, for example, that working class people mix with other working class people. Or they are ignoring the role that contact with other groups of people plays in these individuals' linguistic repertoires.

Bucholtz (2003: 399) claims that despite the field's development since its earlier directive to find the authentic speaker "remote from urban modernity", the search for this kind of authenticity has remained a central element of much research on regional and social dialects. Chambers and Trudgill (1998: 29), comment upon the selection of these kind of informants in all major studies of dialect geography stating "No matter how diverse the culture, how discrepant the socioeconomic climate, and how varied the topography, the majority of informants has in all cases consisted of *non mobile old rural men*...we refer to them as NORMS'. L.Milroy (1987: 3) points out the inadequacy of methods within traditional dialectology, stating "In general, the methods of traditional dialectology are not designed to deal with the fact that the same speaker may use a very wide range of different pronunciations. This is not to say that dialectologists are unaware either of intralectal variability, or of the fact that such variability can usually be linked to a number of social factors". She goes on to cite Orton's account of field methods used by the *Survey of English Dialects*. "Great care was taken in choosing the informants. Very rarely were they below the

age of sixty. They were mostly men: in this country men speak the vernacular more frequently, more consistently and more genuinely than women. Bilingual speakers could not be shunned: as a result of our educational system the inhabitants of the English countryside can readily adjust their natural speech to the social situation in which they may find themselves" (Orton 1962: 15 cited in Milroy 1987: 4). Milroy concludes that despite some social factors such as age, sex and situational context being pinpointed here "In general, any reference in the dialectological literature to the social significance of variability is anecdotal." (Milroy 1987: 4).

Bucholtz (2003: 410-11) claims that Sociolinguistics has traditionally "rested on a foundation of nostalgia. Turning to the past and to communities viewed as preserving the past has allowed the field to contribute importantly to social and humanistic science by demonstrating the competence and creativity of social groups often devalued by modernity". She claims that this nostalgic approach in linguistics cannot adequately describe or explain "the complex identity practices in which language users engage...and if we shifted our focus from the language users who confirm our expectations to those who unsettle them-that is, the so called inauthentic speakers...such a field would look very different from the way it has in the past". The present study embraces the idea of shifting away from the language users who may confirm certain expectations, and focuses upon those who may unsettle them, a very heterogeneous, fluid and messy community, with different languages, dialects, age groups and identities. The present study is in stark contrast to the nostalgic perception of authenticity in sociolinguistics and the search for the non-mobile dialectal ideal in the community. Bucholtz (2003: 411) comments upon sociolinguists' shift away from the nostalgic towards a reflexive sociolinguistics claiming that "Inevitably, the original concept of 'real language' that has long shaped sociolinguistic theory and method will itself be transformed in this

process, enabling a much broader definition of sociolinguistics as quite simply the social study of language, 'real' and otherwise". The present study does not rest upon the assumption that any speakers within the speech community are more 'authentic' than others, and includes all that is found there.

Bucholtz (2003: 407-8) claims that contrary to the way most Sociolinguistic research has proceeded "authenticity is not there to be discovered, nor even be cleverly coaxed into range of our recording equipment; rather, it is conferred – by language users and their audiences, and by us, the sociolinguists who study them". The present study observes what is happening in this particular speech community by all the members. It includes Eckert's elephant in the room as well as the moose on the table. It embraces Bucholtz' belief that it is "neither desirable or possible to eradicate ideology from sociolinguistic research altogether. However, these ideologies also limit the kinds of questions sociolinguists tend to ask and the kind of answers we tend to come up with. Rather than attempt to track down authentic speakers, sociolinguists might instead devote more time to figuring out how such individuals and groups have come to be viewed as authentic in the first place, and by whom".

Bucholtz (2003: 407) argues "....when sociolinguists encounter such unexpected identities, our reaction should be one of delight, not dismay – or disdain". For the purposes of the present study, it may not have initially intended to include "such unexpected identities", but due to curiosity and fear of maybe omitting data that may produce interesting outcomes, speakers of different ages and ethnic groups were eventually included in the final sample, when in fact, the original idea for the study involved seeking out the authentic speaker.

2.2 Previous linguistic studies of Anglos and Non-Anglos

There have been several previous linguistic studies of Anglos coming into contact with Non-Anglos. Fox (2007) used a community of practice based approach in her Tower Hamlets study of a predominantly Bangladeshi speech community mixing with Anglos and other ethnic groups. Fox found linguistic variation to have a correlation with social network. More recently, Cheshire, Kerswill, Fox and Torgerson (2011) undertook a study of what they refer to as Multicultural London English. Their results, in line with Fox's, showed social network to have an impact upon variation. The differences between the 8 and 12 year olds were quite small in term of ethnicity, but then increased for the 16 year olds. This was maybe due to different and more diverse friendship groups when they start secondary school. (Eivind Torgerson, personal communication). Schlee, Meyerhoff and Clark (2011) compared locally born and migrants' variation of (ing) in Edinburgh and London. Their results revealed that Polish migrants were sensitive to the non-standard rates of the city that they had moved to. They also replicated constraint patterns of their Anglo counterparts, as well as introducing novel constraint patterns. Drummond (2010) studied linguistic variation of Poles in Manchester. Exploring four linguistic features, Drummond found that they all demonstrated some degree of change towards the local variants in the speech of many of the participants, but to greatly differing degrees. Multiple regression analyses helped to determine which factors might be influencing the patterns of variation, with the social constraints of length of residence, level of English, gender, attitude, and identity among those believed to be playing a part.

2.3 Language and Social Networks

Milroy's (1980) study of the Belfast vernacular in 3 neighbouring working class communities moved away from the traditions of previous linguistic work and focused on "the observation and analysis of language in its social context as it is used in everyday situations" (Milroy 1980: 1). She recognized the need for studying language in the community beyond the sociolinguistic interview claiming "we still know very little about the *total* linguistic repertoires of individuals or communities" (ibid.). Milroy criticised traditionally used categories within linguistics, such as social class, and advocated the idea to instead, look at the effect of interpersonal relationships on language choice. Despite the fact that Cheshire (1982), in her Reading study and Labov (1972), in his study of Harlem gangs both looked at group membership as a factor for linguistic variation, Milroy's work is thought to be the first systemic account of social network and its impact for variation.

Milroy employed the participant observation method in her Belfast study. She introduced herself to the groups initially, as a "friend of a friend", which gave her an element of insider status. Employing this strategy, she was considered to some extent, a member of the community.

The strength of a person's network has largely been measured by *plexity* and *density*. Plexity is measured by the amount of situations in which one person knows another. For example, if two people are tied in a network by one social connection, e.g. a neighbour, this link is referred to as *uniplex*. If however, these two people are neighbours, work colleagues and brothers, the link is said to be *multiplex*. The term *density* refers to the number of connections between people in a social network. If the friends of one individual's are also friends with each other, this type of network is *dense*. If they do not, the network is *loose*.

Milroy constructed a measure, with reference to the key notions of *multiplexity* and *density* which she referred to as a *network strength scale*. (Milroy 1980: 139). The measure consisted of a six point scale from zero to five. Each speaker was assigned a score on the scale, depending on the multiplexity and density of their social networks. Two criteria were adopted in selecting the indicators used in constructing the scale.

1. They must reflect the conditions which have repeatedly been found important in a wide range of network studies;
 2. They must be recoverable from data collected in the field and easily verifiable.
- (Milroy 1980: 141).

Milroy calculated informants' network scores by assigning them one point for each of the following conditions that they fulfilled:

1. Membership of a high-density, territorially based cluster.
2. Having substantial ties of kinship in the neighbourhood.
3. Working at the same place as at least *two* others from the same area.
4. The same place of work as at least two others of the same sex from the area.
5. Voluntary association with work mates in leisure hours. This applies in practice only when conditions three and four are satisfied.

Milroy found, as previous studies have (see Cheshire 1978; 1982; 1998; Labov 1972) that in general, strong networks within the community function to retain the local vernacular variant of the linguistic variable, and resist change from outside, whilst a social network with loose-knit ties is susceptible to innovation, and thus facilitates change. Exploring social network as a social factor proved to be valuable for both the variables examined in the present study.

2.4 Communities of practice

The notions of social network and community of practice are closely related. Both emphasise individual agency as a means of locating social meaning in variation. Eckert (2000) used a community of practice based approach in her study of Jocks and Burnouts at Belten High. Her definition of a community of practice is "an aggregate of people who come together around some enterprise. United by this common enterprise, people come to develop and share ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values - in short, practices - as a function of their joint engagement in activity" (Eckert 2000: 35).

Mendoza-Denton (2008: 210-11), in her study of Latina youth gangs poses the question "what is a community of practice"? Answering her question, she claims that "All of us participate in communities of practice, that is to say, communities of co-present, joint engagement centered on specific activities that provide us with structured action, and through which we craft social meaning....A community of practice might be a group of close knit friends sharing in group jokes; a family; a group of work colleagues...a Buddhist temple that prays together". (ibid.)

According to Wenger (1998), there are three criteria that must be fulfilled in the definition of a community of practice. There must be:

- Mutual engagement between the members of the community of practice;
- A joint negotiated enterprise which relates to the purpose around which mutual engagement is structured and involves "the complex relationship of mutual accountability that become part of the practice of the community" (Wenger 1998: 80);

- A shared repertoire of the community of practice's members. This may not only pertain to language but also other practices such as dress and fashion (Mendoza-Denton 2008).

Communities of practice are not static. They can be a transient construct from which people may come and go. Members may also be members of other communities of practice.

According to Fox (2007: 74), "the use of the CofP is an attempt to analyse language through the study of individuals within a local practise-based framework". The present study employs the community of practice approach in this way. Applying this approach yielded some interesting and significant results, which will be presented in the subsequent analysis chapters of this thesis.

2.5 Language, children and adolescents

2.5.1 Adolescent peak

Adolescents have long been of particular interest within linguistics and labelled as the transmitters of language change (see Kerswill 1996). Kerswill (1996: 198) claims that adolescents often have a highly sophisticated knowledge of adult norms. Despite this knowledge they are influenced more linguistically by their peers than by adults. Kirkham and Moore (2013) claim that "Labov's (2001: 454) discussion of the transmission of a sound change identifies a pattern that recurs in a range of studies. When a change-in-progress is underway, the innovative variant is used with greater frequency as the generations get younger, until adolescence, where the innovative form peaks in frequency and is then used less frequently by preadolescents." This peak around adolescence is found in studies of phonological variation (Trudgill 1974; Ash 1982; Cedergren 1988), and in studies of morphosyntax and discourse features (Tagliamonte & D'Arcy 2009). Labov (2001: 415-417)

claims that this peak is the outcome of vernacular reorganisation, the process by which children begin to speak like their peers rather than their caregivers, and in doing so they advance a linguistic change. According to Kirkham and Moore (2013), "stabilization of the vernacular is believed to occur between the ages of 14 and 17...However, types of linguistic modification are clearly age-related, such that vocabulary is easily acquired whereas lexically unpredictable phonological rules are not (Kerswill 1996: 200). In this sense, the adolescent peak is the result of the vernacular stabilization of those features that are less easily acquired later in life".

2.5.2 The Critical Period

Chambers (1995) claims, based on his developmental study two years apart of six Canadian youngsters that moved to the south of England, that there may be a critical period for dialect acquisition. He explored whether the children acquired the Southern British English opposition between /ɔ:/ and /ɒ/, as in *Don* and *Dawn*, absent in their own dialect. Of the Canadian children, only those who arrived by about 13 made any progress in separating the two lexical sets. Chambers' data led him to posit a "critical age of dialect acquisition" and place it somewhere between the ages of 7 and 14, beyond which complex rules and oppositions are rarely acquired as dialect features. In the present study, I shall demonstrate in the subsequent analysis chapters how useful the critical period was for understanding the acquisition of the glottal stop and the TRAP-BATH split. I shall also explore, through the discussion of the results from these two very different variable (that as we shall see behave very differently to each other) if Chambers' notion of the critical period was valuable for understanding variation of both variables.

2.5.3 The Ethan Experience

Chambers proposes that one of the properties of sociolinguistic competence must be an innate accent filter, claiming that its existence follows the 'Ethan Experience'. He claims that these filterings take place beneath consciousness. He named the concept after a child who was born and raised in Toronto, his parents were European immigrants. The parents were fluent ESL speakers, with 'medium to strong accents'. Ethan, born and raised in Toronto, spoke with the same accent as all his native born peers. Even as a pre-schooler, Ethan never acquired any of his parents accent features, not even in isolated words. Ethan is not unique. Chambers claims that this fact is so common that it usually goes unremarked. "The innate filter works so efficaciously as to inure the developing native speakers to sounds and forms that would be false steps in the acquisition process as the children go about acquiring the indigenous accent of their peers...instead of learning to ignore the foreign-accent features in their parents' speech....children simply fail to hear them" (Chambers 2002: 122). Chambers questions how it never happened, not even momentarily, that Ethan acquired features from his parents' speech, such as pronunciations with tap /r/ or close versions of lax vowels. He suggests that due to the fact that this type of linguistic behaviour holds equally for countless other children, "it is principled language behaviour that needs to be accounted for in a theory of language convergence...Its generality, perhaps universality, shows that it is not merely idiolectal but sociolectal, and presumably part of sociolinguistic competence" (ibid.) He concludes that "Evidently, Ethan and the others come equipped with an innate filter so that when he hears his mother say 'cherry' with tap /r/ , he hears it as a retroflex and pronounces it that way. When he hears his father say a word like 'cell' with the tonic vowel pronounced [e:], he hears the vowel as [ɛ], and says it like that (even though 'sail' is a possible word)" (ibid.).The Ethan Experience will be discussed in the subsequent analysis chapters, with

reference to whether Non-Anglo children appear to be emulating what they hear from their peers at school or from the accent features of their caregivers spoken at home.

2.6 Dialect Contact

The study of dialect contact has evolved from research into language contact. The prominence of the field of dialect contact research has risen in recent years, partly due to Trudgill's seminal (1986) book, *Dialects in Contact*. Trudgill's book, "an account of the role linguistic accommodation plays in new dialect formation, as well as an analysis of koine development in a number of contact scenarios around the world" (Britain 1997: 141), has stimulated new research on the topic of contact-induced linguistic change, particularly on New Town dialects (see Kerswill 1994, 1996; Kerswill and Williams 1992, 1997; Simpson and Britain forthcoming) and the dialects of newly settled reclaimed areas (Britain 1991, 1997; Scholtmeijer 1990, 1992). Increases in mobility and migration have created new and diverse dialect contact settings, unexplored and linguistically interesting.

2.6.1 Accommodation Theory

The notion of linguistic accommodation developed from the work of social psychologist Howard Giles and his colleagues (Bourhis, Giles and Lambert 1975; Giles 1973; Giles and Powesland 1975; Giles, Taylor and Bourhis 1973). Giles (1973) cited in Trudgill (1986: 2) claims "if the sender in a dyadic situation wishes to gain the receiver's approval, then he may adapt his accent patterns towards that of this person, i.e. reduce pronunciation dissimilarities". Giles calls this process 'accent convergence'. The reverse scenario, whereby speakers pronunciation features become more distinct from those of their interlocutors is

called 'accent divergence', and according to Giles (1973) cited in Trudgill (1986: 2) may take place if, for example "speakers wish to dissociate themselves from or show disapproval of others". Trudgill (1986: 2) claims that these processes can take place at a grammatical and lexical level, and that they are part of a wider pattern of behaviour modification "under the influence and in response to others."

Convergence and divergence may be either upward or downward (Giles, H., Coupland, N. & Coupland, J. 1991: 11; Giles and Powesland 1975: 174). Upward accommodation refers to the process whereby there is "a shift toward a consensually prestigious variety" and downward accommodation refers to "modifications toward more stigmatized or less socially valued forms in context" (Giles et al. 1991: 11). Trudgill (1986: 2-3) claims that whilst Giles (1973) and others have spent considerable time researching what factors determine who accommodates to whom, in situations where speakers with accents that differ socially come together "the direction in which accommodation will take place is often problematical...From the perspective of the linguist, however, it is clear that accommodation can also take place between accents that differ regionally rather than socially, and that it can occur in the long term as well as in the short term".

Trudgill (1986) claims that short-term accommodation occurs with a particular speaker in a particular setting, but that this linguistic adjustment is temporary. Speakers adjust their language to the person they are talking to. This convergence normally has no communicative purpose (though it may sometimes occur to facilitate comprehension), modification may be to minimise regional or social distance. In communities with speakers of multiple dialects this may be repeated countless times and may lead to long-term accommodation. "It can readily be observed that related, mutually intelligible dialects do have an effect on one another in contact situations Very often, for example, when two speakers of different varieties of the same language which are completely mutually intelligible come into contact

and converse, items may be transferred from one of the varieties to the other" (Trudgill 1986:1).

According to Trudgill (1986), it is clear that accommodation can take place between accents that differ regionally. He claims that this accommodation can occur in the long term as well as in the short term, and that in long-term contact situations, who accommodates to who is not usually problematic, in that contact is usually between mobile speakers of different regional varieties who through reasons of migration etc. go to live amongst a non-mobile majority. He claims that "The problem is then one of determining how speakers accommodate, the extent to which they accommodate, and why some situations and some individuals produce more – or different types of – accommodation than others" (Trudgill 1986: 3). Although these questions are all relevant to the present study, given that the setting for the research is a fluid and transient community, with the absence of a dialectal norm and no non-mobile majority (but rather a constantly changing community of mobile speakers from different UK dialect regions), the question of who accommodates to who, both in the long term and the short term is very important here.

2.6.2 Accommodation and children

Trudgill (2004: 34-5) claims that "The conventional sociolinguistic wisdom is that young people speak like their peers rather than, for example, like their parents or teachers.....This is necessarily correct since otherwise regionally distinct dialects would never have survived in the face of the increased geographical mobility of modern societies". Trudgill goes on to say that evidence for this is overwhelming: "in the context of families moving from one dialect area to another, the phenomenon of total childhood accommodation to the new dialect is the

object of so much and such widespread observation and comment on the part of non-linguists that it does not really need scientific confirmation" (ibid.).

Trudgill does however acknowledge that there are limits to accommodation, and that sometimes individuals may not accommodate to their peers. Payne (1980) cited in Trudgill (2004: 34) suggests that "after a certain age, children may not master perfectly all the intricate details of phonological conditioning in a new variety they are exposed to". Trudgill concludes that the general trend is very clear, and that up to a certain age, that Trudgill tentatively suggests may be around eight years old, normal children will accommodate rapidly and completely to their new peer group.

Kerswill (1996) claims that even though only very young children acquire the 'hardest' features of language change (lexically unpredictable phonological changes), adolescents may be the most influential transmitters of change. One of the outcomes of Kerswill's study which investigated 10 variables, was that children on average fronted their vowels more than adults. Kerswill suggests that the fronted variant is likely to be a characteristic of the new Milton Keynes dialect. The oldest girls had the highest degree of fronting, the younger ones had similar scores to the caregivers. According to Kerswill (1996), the speech of older children, around the age of 12, quite closely represents the characteristics of the new 'speech community' developing in Milton Keynes. Kerswill concludes from this that these older children do most of the sociolinguistic work in new dialect formation. This theory of Kerswill's will be useful for the present study in that the sample are of two different age groups, eight years old and sixteen to nineteen years old. Therefore, we might expect the teenage informants' variation to be different to that of the youngsters'.

2.6.3 The Founder Principle

According to Mufwene, his notion of “Founder Principle” is similar to Zelinsky’s “Doctrine of First Effective Settlement” (Mufwene 2001: 27) according to which "Whenever an empty territory undergoes settlement , or an earlier population is dislodged by invaders , the specific characteristics of the first group able to effect a viable, self-perpetuating society are of crucial significance to the later social and cultural geography of the area, no matter how tiny the original band of settlers may have been...in terms of lasting impact, the activities of a few hundred, or even a few score, initial colonizers can mean much more for the cultural geography of a place than the contributions of tens of thousands of new immigrants generations later."

According to Britain (2001: 11-12) many researchers studying dialect contact situations “have emphasised the need to fully take into consideration the social and geographical make-up of the input populations (migrants, settlers and so on) and the dialects they brought with them, if we are to fully understand the dialects which emerge as a result of contact between these speakers”. Britain looks to Mufwene’s ‘founder principle’ “to capture this concern for socio-demographic and sociolinguistic accountability when assessing the genesis of new languages and dialects”.

Mufwene suggests that a fully accountable description of the ecology of the new variety would include:

- ‘the characteristics of the vernaculars spoken by the populations in which they developed’ (1996: 84);

- ‘the ethnographic setting in which the....displaced population has come into contact with...other populations whose structural features enter into competition with its own features’ (1996: 85);
- ‘the demographic proportion of the newcomers relative to local populations, their attitudes towards each other, and their social status’ (1996: 86).

Mufwene (2001: 30) claims “The contact of language varieties, hence of linguistic systems, in the mind of a speaker produces a set-theory union of features that is analogous to a gene pool in population genetics.” He refers to this notion of ‘gene pool’ as a ‘feature pool’. He goes on to say that “The coexistence of linguistic systems in a set-theory union fashion....seems in fact to be the simplest explanation for interference. Regardless of their origins, the coexistent features compete with each other. When the tagging conventions that associate them with different, yet overlapping, systems have failed, there is confusion, identified in the context of language contact as interference. That coexistence of features and its consequences is an important ecological factor that accounts for some of the evolutionary processes that produced creoles”.

Mufwene’s (2001) notion of ‘feature pool’ is useful to explain the linguistic behaviour of speakers in a dialect contact situation. Mufwene refers to a mixture of linguistic features in a language contact situation as a ‘feature pool’. New language and dialect varieties which emerge from a contact situation would be made up of features selected from that particular feature pool. Mufwene (2010) claims that the idea is that all speakers of a language contribute to a pool of features from which 1) each learner selects a particular subset that will form his/her respective idiolect and 2) a speaker can select new variants as he/she accommodates his/her interlocutors while they interact.

Schneider (2007) adopts Mufwene's idea of 'feature pool' in his model of the evolution of postcolonial Englishes. According to Schneider (2007: 21) "In selecting from this pool, speakers keep redefining and expressing their linguistic and social identities, constantly aligning themselves with other individuals and thereby accommodating their speech behaviour to those they wish to associate and be associated with." A number of linguistic and non-linguistic factors determine the dominance of the features within the feature pool. New language and dialect varieties would evolve through a competition-and-selection process between features available to speakers in a feature pool of possible linguistic choices. We shall find out later in this thesis whether the notion of the founder principle is helpful at all to this study, in that some of the sample have lived in Spain and attended the school all of their lives. We may class these informants as the founders. We shall find out what types of variation patterns these founders display, and they are at all emulated by members of the community who have joined later.

2.6.4 Focusing and diffuseness

Concepts integral to the progress of long-term accommodation towards new dialect formation are the notions of *focusing and diffuseness* (LePage 1978; LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985). A *focused* linguistic setting refers to a relatively homogeneous linguistic variety used by a community of speakers. The dialect variety is distinct and the members of the speech community "show a high level of agreement as to what does and does not constitute 'the language'." (Trudgill 1986: 86). Communities such as these usually have strong network links which "serve to reinforce the focused variety as the linguistic norm within the group" (Sudbury 2000: 44).

Trudgill (1986: 86) claims that within a relatively diffuse linguistic situation "speakers may have no very clear idea about what language they are speaking; and what does and does not constitute the language will be perceived as an issue of no great importance". Trudgill uses Belize as an example of a speech community where there is a great deal of heterogeneity and little consensus of what constitutes "the language". "Belize is a relatively unfocused speech community, and speakers may at any time use different proportions of English, Creole, and Spanish. Some situations, it is true, may demand 'pure' English or Spanish.....But many other situations do not make this requirement and may indeed require 'mixtures' of different proportions." (ibid.).

The initial stages of dialect contact are typically characterised by extreme linguistic diffuseness. Many variants exist and there is little sense of shared community norms. Trudgill (1986: 86) claims that social factors play a part in the potentiality for focusing to occur within a community. Using Belize as an example, he claims that it is possible but unlikely that the language will become focused, due to social factors such as Belizean nationalism. In many dialect contact situations, through face-to-face interaction over time and a period of long term accommodation, focussing will take place and the linguistic heterogeneity will be replaced by a new crystallised variety. As Sudbury claims, (2000: 45) "This coincides with the development of social groups and stronger network ties within the community, which act as norm enforcing mechanisms, strengthening the use of the focused variety".

The linguistic correlates of this crystallisation process towards a focused variety are known as *koinéisation* or *new dialect formation*. The next sections of this chapter will discuss these concepts. The notions of focusing and diffuseness are important to the present study in that we might question, given the diffuse and heterogeneous nature of the speech community coupled with social factors, whether there is the potentiality for focusing here.

2.6.5 Koines and koinéisation

The formation of new dialects in dialect contact situations has been described in terms of *koines* and *koinéisation* (Blanc 1968; Domingue 1971; Ferguson 1959; Nida and Fehderau 1970). Use and definitions of these terms have varied between researchers. Siegel (1985: 357) claims that the term *koine* has been applied "to the process of levelling which may result in a koine". Most researchers agree that a *koine* is a relatively homogeneous outcome of *koinéisation processes* as a result of sustained contact between dialects of the same language. Trudgill (1986: 106-8) uses the term *koinéisation* to describe the processes of *levelling* and *simplification* in a dialect contact situation. Trudgill claims that "The result of the focusing associated with koinéisation is a historically mixed but synchronically stable dialect which contains elements from the different dialects that went into the mixture, as well as interdialect forms that were present in none". Kerswill (2000: 65) refers to *koinéisation* as "the development of a new, mixed variety following dialect contact". Following Britain (1997b: 141) I shall use the term *koinéisation* to refer to "the linguistic processes provoked by dialect contact". These processes are *mixing*, *levelling*, *simplification* and *reallocation*. I shall use the term *koine* to refer to the result of these processes, the new dialect, distinct from the contributing dialects. Throughout the present study I shall use the terms *new dialect formation* and *koinéisation* interchangeably. Below is a discussion of the koinéisation processes that lead to new dialect formation as the outcome.

2.7 What is New-Dialect Formation?

New-dialect formation is a possible (although by no means inevitable) outcome of dialect contact over time. Certain long term dialect contact situations, such as migration, new town development and land reclamation lead to new-dialect formation. The first stage of new-

dialect formation is linguistic accommodation. The full process of new-dialect formation occurs over time, usually generations (Trudgill claims that it takes three generations although Kerswill claims that the process is possible over two generations). Adult accommodation is often not very permanent nor complete. Nor is it particularly accurate or successful. The crucial stage comes when children are brought up in the mixed dialect community. The child has no stable target variety on which to model his or her language. The target variety used by the adults in the mixed dialect situation may be an inconsistent semi-accommodated variety. The role of children in resolving and rationalising dialect mixtures is very important. It is argued that they are better at it than adults. According to Kerswill (2000) “Adults are thought to have passed a “critical period” for language acquisition and so are not likely to be able to make major grammatical and phonological changes to their speech after migration.....Contrasted with this is the considerable plasticity of children’s phonologies and grammars up to, approximately, puberty.” (Kerswill 2000: 67-8). The child’s dialect one in a mixed dialect community will be variable, but less variable than the unstable variety of the adults. Children will accommodate over time, and in turn, their children will acquire an accommodated form which will be less messy. Kerswill states “..it is the migrants’ children who are central to the linguistic focusing that precedes the formation of any new, stable variety, as has been pointed out by a number of linguists” (Kerswill 2000: 68). Over time, the dialect will have less variation and be more structurally coherent. Over generations, the dialect becomes more focussed. The ideal situation for new-dialect formation is a situation where people from mixed dialects have moved and then there is stability in that community for a number of years.

2.7.1 Stages of New Dialect Formation

Trudgill (1986) suggests that certain sorts of sociolinguistic situation involving contact between mutually intelligible dialects can lead to the development of new dialects. The types of situations he cites are colonial situations, new towns and rapid urbanisation. As a result of his work based on an analysis of the Origins of New Zealand English project corpus, Trudgill (2004) arrives at the conclusion that new-dialect formation consists of six key processes. (The description of the six processes below is adapted from Trudgill 2004: 84-9). These processes are:

1. Mixing

Dialect mixing involves the coming together of speakers of different dialects of the same language, or mutually intelligible languages. The term is used within the literature to describe the very early stages of contact.

2. Levelling

Levelling involves the loss of demographically minority variants. In a dialect contact situation, there will be a large number of variants from different dialects. Over time, the variants will be subject to reduction. Factors such as proportions of different dialect speakers in the dialect mix will influence reduction. Trudgill (2004: 85) points out that “It should be understood that this is not a matter of one dialect supplanting all other dialects, but of a particular dialect variant of an individual feature supplanting all other variants.” Within the levelling process, the forms most likely to survive are either majority or unmarked forms. Within the contact literature, 'marked' refers to forms that are less common . Sometimes majority forms will be lost and unmarked forms will "win out" . Features that tend to survive are the features common to all involved dialects in the mix.

3. Unmarking

The reduction of variants over time may involve degrees of markedness, regularity or simplicity. More complex forms may not survive, even if they are present in a majority dialect within the dialect mixture. Unmarked and regular forms tend to survive over marked and complex forms. Unmarking can be regarded as a subtype of levelling.

4. Interdialect development

Interdialect forms are forms that were not originally present in the contributing dialects, but have arisen from the contact situation. Trudgill (1986: 62) states “The label ‘interdialect’ is intended to refer to situations where contact between two dialects leads to the development of forms that actually originally occurred in neither dialect.” He claims (2004: 86-7) that such forms are of three types:

a) They may be forms which are simpler and more regular than any of the forms present in the original dialect mixture.

b) Interdialect forms may also be intermediate forms. Trudgill (1986) suggests that imperfect accommodation may lead to the temporary or permanent development of forms that are intermediate. Intermediate forms may occur where accommodation is taking place, but where it has not gone to completion. “What is involved is the development in dialect contact of forms that are *phonetically intermediate* between those of the original and target dialects.” (Trudgill 1986: 60).

c) Interdialect forms may also be forms which are the result of hyperadaptation.

Hypercorrection is probably the best known form of hyperadaptation. Hypercorrections “consist of attempts to adopt a more prestigious variety of speech which, through overgeneralization, leads to the production of forms which do not occur in the target prestige

variety.” (Trudgill 1986: 66). An example of this, according to Chambers and Trudgill (1998), is that many speakers of Northern English hypercorrect by trying to produce statusful RP pronunciations by introducing /ʌ/ into their speech not only in words such as *but* and *butter*, but also in words such as *could* and *hook*. Trudgill (2004: 87) points out that this can have permanent consequences for colonial varieties. He demonstrates this by highlighting the fact that in many forms of Jamaican English, and also Tristanian, all stressed-vowel-initial words can actually begin with /h/.

5. Reallocation

The term 'reallocation' refers to the contact induced outcome when variants from the original mixture that have survived are functionally redistributed and take on new social or stylistic status. For example, Australian English has /æ/ in words such as ‘dance’, ‘France’ and ‘sample’, typically associated with northern areas of the British Isles, but also has /ɑ:/, the latter being more common in south Australia. Everywhere else in Australia the two variants have been reallocated socially. Wells (1982) claims that many Australians “consider /ɑ:/ high-class, even indicative of affectation, pedantry, or snobbishness, as against the popular pronunciation with /æ/” (Wells 1982, cited in Trudgill 1986: 153). Trudgill concludes that both variants were likely to have been present in the original mix of dialects brought to Australia, and that, as focussing was taking place “both forms survived by acquiring social-class differentiating functions.” (Trudgill 1986: 153).

In some new varieties, regional variants may be geographically reallocated. Reallocation can also result in allophonic variation. In the transition zone of the English Fens, a "Canadian Raising" pattern has been found. Two allophones of (aɪ), a particularly salient local variable, were found to exist. These two allophones were [aɪ] and [əɪ]. Like in the case of Canadian Raising, speakers used raised onsets of (aɪ) before voiceless consonants but open onsets

before voiced consonants, schwa and morpheme boundaries (Britain 1997: 16). Britain claims that during the formative period of the dialect, the regional variants [aɪ] from the west and [əɪ] from the east became present in the dialect mix. Both of these variants survived the levelling process, but were functionally redistributed as allophonic variants, following principles of phonological naturalness (Britain 1997: 37). He argues, based on compelling evidence from the demographic history of the area, that this phenomenon is an example of phonological reallocation brought about by dialect contact and focusing.

6. Focussing

The final stage of new dialect formation, focussing, is "the process, by means of which the new variety acquires norms and stability." (Trudgill 2004: 89). Trudgill points out that focussing is not to be identified with levelling. "although focussing implies levelling, the reverse is not the case: a reduction in the number of variants does not in itself lead to stability and societally shared norms." (ibid.).

According to Trudgill (2004: 89), processes 1-5 can collectively be referred to as *koinéisation*, and *koinéisation* plus focussing constitute *new-dialect formation*. There is no clear-cut time scale for *koinéisation* and new dialect formation, although Trudgill suggests that it may take three generations for the new dialect to appear as a stable, crystallised variety, and Kerswill suggests that this is possible over two generations. Each individual dialect contact scenario is different, and as previously mentioned, social factors can serve to militate against or accelerate dialect contact processes. An example of acceleration of dialect contact processes is suggested by Kerswill and Williams (2000) from their research of the New Town of Milton Keynes. They claim that *koinéisation* processes have been accelerated with the result that a fairly focused variety has emerged in the speech of the first native children to the area. They claim that children of the first migrants are rapidly focusing

towards a consensual norm with less inter- and intra- variability than has been found elsewhere. They contribute the similarity of the input dialects of the town to the rapidity of change, suggesting that this factor accelerates focusing of dialects. They also claim that a high level of linguistic difference and complexity retards focusing (Kerswill and Williams 2000: 75). They suggest that an unusually high proportion of children in a community, typical in migration areas, may promote focusing in the second generation. In addition to this, they attribute the presence of the possibility for children and young people to form new networks such as through schooling as an influential factor for accelerated koinéisation in Milton Keynes.

2.7.2 What are favourable conditions for new-dialect formation?

Not all dialect contact situations result in koinéisation as the outcome. Dialect contact alone is not sufficient. The ideal situation for new-dialect formation to occur is a contact situation where people have moved for whatever reason, and then there has been peace and stability for a number of years. At the time of the initial coming together, the social networks of the speakers would have been weak, in that they would have joined a new community. Weak social networks have the potential for language change (see 2.3). Over time, perhaps two or three generations, a new dialect may emerge.

The types of long term dialect contact situations that have produced new dialects are migration, new town development e.g. Milton Keynes, reclaimed areas such as the Fens, and colonisation as in the population of petty criminals deported to Australia. Increased mobility has contributed to the birth of new dialects. Dialect contact can also lead to obsolescence of traditional local dialect forms.

In a dialect contact situation, certain factors may inhibit or promote linguistic accommodation. Trudgill (1986) notes that certain factors may accelerate the process of linguistic accommodation. These factors include comprehension difficulties and phonological naturalness. Inhibitory factors include phonotactic constraints, homonymic clash (when similar features are present in the existing dialect as the new dialect, and are close enough to cause confusion) and extra-strong salience. These inhibitory and accelerating features, may lead to speakers acquiring features in the same order. Children, due to the relative flexibility of their ability to acquire features, are not always subject to the same inhibitory factors as adults. However, even young children are subject to limits of degree of linguistic accommodation, and may not fully acquire certain complex phonological contrasts and allophonic conditioning patterns unless they are present in the speech of their parents.

Kerswill (2002) claims that there are limits to the degree and success of linguistic accommodation, and points to certain conditions which may promote the process. He cites solidarity as an accelerating factor and claims that for a koine to form, speakers must waive their previous allegiances and social divisions to show mutual solidarity. Where this does not happen, koinéisation may be slowed or may not be the outcome at all. Kerswill discusses another accelerating factor for linguistic accommodation, particularly relevant to children and adolescents. This is the rapidly changing social identities of children, as they move from child to adolescent, from the strong attachment to the caregiver of the young child, to the fierce independence of the teenager. Kerswill explains “ Each stage is reflected in differences in language use that are associated particularly in the child’s orientation to other people. Starting from a parent-centred orientation, young children expand their range of social contacts to other, often older children, eventually forming distinctive teenage peer groups, with their attachment to youth culture and adult norms.” (Kerswill 2000: 68). He goes on to say that this is reflected in the adolescent’s preference for non-standard speech.

Among linguists (Aitchison 1981; Kerswill 1996; Eckert 1997), it has been argued that this is the stage “...that is most influential from the point of view of the genesis of linguistic innovations, if not their geographical spread” (Kerswill 2000: 68). Kerswill adds that in contrast, adults have quite fixed social identities which they bring to the new location, making them less likely and less motivated to change their speech habits than children.

Kerswill (2000) claims that there is a link between the child’s maturing sociolinguistic competence (the knowledge of the forms, the symbolic functions and the social distributions of language varieties currently used in the speech community) and the processes that underlie the formation of new language varieties. Trudgill (1986) believes that it is the migrants’ children who are central to the linguistic focusing that precedes new dialect formation.

2.8 Fluid and mixed language and dialect communities

We now turn our attention to studies which have focussed on very fluid and very mixed speech communities. The dialect contact literature has until now, been mainly concerned with scenarios where dialects come into contact, but then after a period of time there is relative stability. But some speech communities, for differing reasons, will never be stable. The question arises then, what happens when a fluid speech community with no target variety continues to be fluid? I shall discuss here, some language and dialect studies where the outcome has not been linguistic stability.

Berthele (2002) chose a Swiss elementary school as the setting for his research. He recognises the benefits of using a school as the setting for research due to the “intensive communicative interaction among members of a school class....we have quite good social-psychological hypotheses about the social processes which are going on within a class of

schoolchildren.” (Berthele 2002: 328). Due to the special socio-cultural status of the school, all the children belong to non-native families moving in from other parts of Switzerland and Europe. The children were about seven years old when entering the class, still at the age that allows perfect acquisition of a new dialect, and nine years old at the point of data collection.

For religious and historical reasons, there has been a tradition of speaking Bernese dialect in the town rather than the local Fribourg German. Berthele claims that this Bernese dialect is the prestige variety in this setting. The school, according to Berthele, is located in a town with a very strong Catholic tradition. It was founded in the 19th century by Protestant immigrants from Berne. Bernese or Bernese-speaking teachers still give important linguistic input. The children from Bernese families form an important minority group among the children at the school. Some of the pupils only learned German after having joined this elementary school. In the school environment, the diglossic situation in Switzerland leads to the parallel use of two varieties: Standard High German as the language of instruction and Swiss German as the language of informal exchange between pupils and pupils and teachers. The data showed that after a period of about two years, the children use a relatively consistent Swiss German dialect in peer group interaction, often different from the dialect used at home. Variation in this dialect co-varies not with the parents’ speech, but with the social structure within the classroom. Individual children adopt individual strategies with varying linguistic outcomes, including various degrees of mixture of different dialects. Berthele outlines the importance of studying the individual members of a social group, to try to explain why they behave in a specific way, and “how the cumulation of individual actions forms collective phenomena such as language, language change and social stratifications of language.” (Berthele 2002: 328). Berthele talks about the “model of idiolectal dissonance” in the sense that the competing linguistic features which stem from different dialectal systems are “acoustic dissonances in the literal sense of the word.” (Berthele 2000: 330). Trudgill

(2004) cites this contact situation as one example where the general trend, for children up to around eight to accommodate rapidly and totally, cannot happen. The children were unable to accommodate to a peer-group dialect because there was no common peer group dialect for them to accommodate to. My study shares characteristics with Berthele's in that the majority of the informants are a very heterogeneous group of children whose families share the feature of not being locals. Unlike Berthele's study, the present study focuses on a sample where all dialects are mutually intelligible. One might hypothesise if such idiolectal dissonance could occur in an environment of mutually intelligible dialects, such as that of the present study.

2.9 Summary and research questions for the present study

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate the possible outcomes of dialect contact. It has also considered previous research in the field, and how, until relatively recently, analysts of language have been concerned with seeking out the 'authentic speaker' at the expense of other individuals in the speech community. In addition to this, the chapter examined highly fluid and unstable speech communities, and mixed language and dialect speech communities where stability may never be the outcome. The chapter endeavoured to show that dialect contact alone is not the only factor for koinéisation; social factors have a part to play.

Throughout the remainder of this thesis, I will endeavour to answer the following questions, most relevant to the present study:

- To what extent does focussing occur within groups of speakers with no stable dialect model? Previous linguistic research has mainly investigated single, discreet acts of mobility. In this highly mobile speech community, can we still expect to find evidence of focussing?

- To what extent does community of practice membership have an impact upon the patterns of usage of variants in dialect contact situations where there is no stable target model? To what extent is the community of practice approach a useful tool in dialect contact research?
- Are the number of years spent in the contact setting a factor for variation? If so, does this apply to all informants? Is there a critical period for the acquisition of some variants.
- Of the social factors which have been shown to influence new dialect formation in other studies, which ones play a role in this highly fluid community?

This chapter has outlined the need to look at social and historical information of the environment for study, and how that may impact upon whether or not there is a potentiality for koinéisation in that particular speech community. Dialect contact situations are usually a single act of contact, followed by some element of stability. The present study is highly turbulent. It involves a group of children and adolescents coming and going in a multilingual context. New people are constantly renewing the mix dynamic. It remains fluid. There are no founders as such; the founders are an unknown community. The community is so turbulent and so recent, it shakes the foundations of previous dialect contact work. Given all this transience and messiness of the speech community, one might be led to question if the principles of what the dialect contact literature tells us still holds. The following chapters will address this question.