FACTA UNIVERSITATIS
Series: **Linguistics and Literature** Vol. 4, N° 1, 2006, pp. 33 - 46

QUESTIONING MACRO-SOCIOLOGICAL ACCOUNTS OF LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE: PEASANTS, ROCK 'N' ROLL, AND CHURCH LUNCHES

UDC 81'27:81'246.2

Jovana Dimitrijević Savić

FILUM, Kragujevac

Abstract. *This paper presents the findings of five sociolinguistic explorations of bilingualism with a specific focus on language maintenance and language shift. The studies cover a range of language contact situations and each focuses on a different language pair or pairs. Common to all five studies is the argument that the processes of language maintenance and shift need to be considered in relation to individuals' networks of relationships, the social mechanism by which language choice is negotiated and sustained.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Predictive frameworks of the outcomes of language contact in terms of language maintenance or language shift (e.g. Bourhis, Giles and Rosenthal, 1981; Fishman, 1990, 1991, 2001a) are built around patterns of sociolinguistic structure uncovered by studies relying on macro-level categories. Although the general accuracy of the patterns which emerge against a background of multifarious individual language choices need not be disputed, there remains a certain inevitable distortion that results from the provisional nature of the social categories employed in this type of research.

It is possible to distinguish between two kinds of social category: those constituted by involuntaristic characteristics and those characterized by some degree of choice on the part of the people who belong to them, in other words, between aggregate groups and social collectives (Greenwood, 1994; Carter and Sealey, 2000; Sealey and Carter, 2001). Whereas aggregate groups are non-social in that their members are not party to any set of arrangements, conventions, or agreements, such arrangements, conventions, or agreements constitute other groups of people as intrinsically social collectives (Greenwood, 1994: 87). In identifying aggregate categories, priority is given to the analysts' own depiction of that category – the feature or set of features defining membership in an aggregate group must be "contingent, external, and measurable" (Sealey and Carter, 2001: 6).

Received, 30 August 2006

Quantitative sociolinguistic studies customarily draw on such a theoretical conception of social categories: as macro-level analyst constructs. Sealey and Carter (2001: 5) argue that the invariable presence of counterexamples to these studies' findings indicates that there is no entailment involved in belonging to an aggregate group and using a particular sociolinguistic variable. This means that if researchers wish to go beyond the level of description (identifying patterns) and attempt explanation (accounting for examples and counterexamples both), they must introduce a strong sense of social agency and speakers' own understandings, that is, reconstitute the theoretical description of social categories as collectives rather than as aggregates.

Recent sociolinguistic research has increasingly emphasized that the way in which aggregate categories relate to linguistic variation is determined by local norms resulting from local practices. In other words, there is a meaningful 'local dimension' underlying global sociolinguistic patterns recurrent across broad populations (Milroy and Gordon, 2003: 115). Two frameworks offer a means to reach an understanding of the local dimension of language variation and change, the social network and the Community of Practice (e.g. Eckert, 2000): both provide "procedures which allow us to examine the specifics of local practice and local conditions, and which are sensitive to the local social categories and locally contracted ties with which speakers operate in their everyday lives" (Milroy and Gordon, 2003: 116). This paper presents the findings of a number of studies, representative of a growing body of research, which rely on social network analysis in their investigation of the outcomes of language contact and their contribution to our understanding of language maintenance and shift.

2. Social Network Analysis

Originating from social anthropology and developed in particular in the work of Barnes (1954), Mitchell (1969), and Bott (1971), the social network is defined as "a specific set of linkages among a defined set of persons, with the additional property that the characteristics of these linkages as a whole may be used to interpret the social behavior of the persons involved" (Mitchell, 1969: 2). At the center of a personal network is the anchor person or ego, whose linkages to the people in the various spheres of his/her life constitute the network web of ties. The people who participate in each sphere of the anchor person's life, e.g. the home or the work sphere, can be seen as a subgroup of the social network; the smallest unit of interest is the connection between the anchor of the network and one other person. There are different ways of describing social networks, depending on the theoretical and practical purposes the researcher wishes to pursue. Social network analysis of the kind usually adopted by sociolinguists tends to focus on the relational, or content, and structural characteristics of networks. Boissevain (1987: 165) and Cochran et al. (1990: 27-8) describe two approaches to social network description co-opted by sociolinguists.

The relational characteristics of social networks describe the nature or content of linkages, i.e. the relationships between the anchor person and network members. The anchor person may not only contract different types of relationships with different people, but may also be in a number of different role relationships vis-à-vis the same individual. A network tie is 'multiplex' (many-stranded) if ego interacts with a particular contact in multiple capacities or roles; the opposite of a 'multiplex' tie is a 'uniplex' (single-stranded)

tie. Multiplexity, therefore, attempts to measure the strength of network ties, not their number. Network members who "most consistently provide the critical elements of support" (26) are the ones judged to have the greatest intensity of contact with ego and are considered members of ego's primary network. It follows that, depending on the intensity of network ties, it is possible to differentiate between the primary and nonprimary network.

A network's structural characteristics, such as the size of the network, as well as the size of the primary and nonprimary networks, describe its quantitative makeup. An important structural feature is the network's 'density', alternatively referred to as 'connectedness' or 'knitedness'. Network density corresponds to the number of network members with linkages to each other independent of the anchor person. 'Close-knit' networks are characterized by high density, whereas the relative density of 'loose-knit' networks is low.

Some network segments usually stand out from the rest of the network due to density higher than overall network density. These segments are referred to as 'clusters'. Clusters are characterized by relationships which are denser than those existing externally of the cluster and which may also be considered relationships of like content, for example, kinship, occupation, or any other specific group membership (Milroy, 1987a: 50). The significance of clusters lies in their considerable capacity to construct their own conventions (linguistic and other) and enforce them on individual members. Sociolinguistic network studies generally focus on clusters or groups of clusters.

As an analytic tool (Milroy, 1987b: 45), the social network concept has two important advantages for sociolinguistic research. Firstly, it allows the researcher to focus on an important aspect of the shifting process: the "social mechanisms which allow speakers to maintain or to change their language behavior" (Li Wei, 1996: 805). Social network analysis proposes pre-existing social groups, i.e. social groups which speakers perceive as their personal communities (Mitchell, 1986: 74) and with which they identify, to be the social mechanism by which language choices are negotiated and sustained (Stoessel, 2002: 1): "network analysis offers a procedure for dealing with variation between individual speakers, rather than between groups constructed with reference to predetermined social categories" (Milroy, 2001b: 556). Secondly, although network analysts make no attempt to deny that macro-level factors constrain individual behavior in significant ways, they contend that it is the purposefulness of social networks which makes them a more direct, and therefore more powerful, influence on individuals' language use. In the words of Gumperz (1982: 42), "[w]henever networks of relationships reflect long-term interpersonal cooperation in the performance of regular tasks and the pursuit of shared goals, they favor the creation of behavioral routines and communicative conventions that become conventionally associated with and serve to mark component activities".

3. Peasant Ties and the Maintenance of Hungarian in Austria

Susan Gal's (1979) study of language shift among Hungarian speakers in the Austrian town of Oberwart was among the first to explore the explanatory potential of the social network concept for language use in a multilingual setting. Abetted by the town's urbanization and ensuing social diversity and class stratification, an opposition of peasant/worker values emerged in Oberwart, with Hungarian representing the more traditional peasant values and German representing worker values. Although the symbolically im-

portant dichotomy between German, associated with the rich local Austrian elite, and Hungarian, the language of the *paraszt*, the peasants, was a corollary of Oberwart's historical heritage, its applicability to their own in-group was not recognized by the peasants until, after World War II, industrial, commercial and bureaucratic jobs became available and preferable to working the land. Initially considered an economic necessity by the children of Oberwart's Hungarian-speaking peasants, a prerequisite for entering the Austrian workforce, German was being afforded higher prestige and Hungarian scorned in the attempt to "adopt the way of life and values of the ... German-speaking Austrian urban center that for over a century has been developing around them" (63).

Participant observation in Oberwart led Gal (1979) to surmise that the social distinction most relevant to the on-going language shift from Hungarian to German is precisely that between peasants and workers. In terms of observable language choice patterns this meant that invariable choice of Hungarian or German, on the one hand, and code-switching between Hungarian and German, on the other, expressed speakers' invariable claim to peasant, that is worker status, and variable claim to social status, respectively (172-3). Oberwarters for whom the way of life and values prevalent in the community in the first decades of the twentieth century were still sources of prestige and pride invariably spoke Hungarian with most[1] interlocutors; Oberwarters who wished to claim urbanite status, did so not only in nonlinguistic ways, but also by invariably speaking German to most interlocutors; finally, Oberwarters who were 'in the middle': "[n]either totally peasants nor solidly workers" (173) were the ones who most often engaged in variable choice of language.

As discussed in the previous section, in order to measure the degree of integration and thus focus on the differences between individual speakers and compare them, the researcher constructs indicators of this integration. Since such indicators are likely to be culturally determined and to vary between communities, they must be identified independently by the researcher for the particular group under study. To measure degree of involvement in peasant life, Gal (1979) constructed two emic indices, one of which measured the 'peasantness' of an individual's network, while the other was a more complex index, using a large number of indicators, of each individual's own position on a peasant-to-worker continuum. The correlation between speaker status and language choice proved less significant than the correlation between language choice and the speaker's social network, leading Gal (171) to conclude that in Oberwart "[l]anguage choice implicitly relates the interactants to the social groups associated with each language. One need not be a member of a social category, such as peasant, to claim that identity; those with heavily peasant networks do so as much as those who qualify as peasants by other measures. But whatever reasons individuals have for presenting themselves as members of a social category, it is choice of language that symbolizes such membership in verbal interaction".

[1] Oberwarters who generally refrain from code-switching may do so when speaking with people whose preferred language is clearly different from theirs. In such cases, variable choice of language tends to be unreciprocal and to occur with someone far from the speaker in age.

4. Rock 'n' Roll, Buckarooing and the Maintenance of a Dying Language in Australia

Schmidt's (1985) study of a dying language, Dyirbal, spoken along with English in the Jambun Aboriginal community in the north-east of Queensland, also explores how the symbolization of social group membership can be effected through choice of language. Schmidt found that younger members of the Jambun community were shifting to English as a result of a deculturalization process. At the same time, Dyirbal was being limited to fixed networks of interaction: while the speakers of traditional Dyirbal[2] (TD) spoke it freely among themselves, speakers of Young Dyirbal (YD) did not use YD to all other young speakers. Instead, there were set lines of Dyirbal communication for these YD speakers. Schmidt's research, therefore, came to focus on social networks as the conditioning force which governs linguistic variation among speakers of YD (1985: 127).

The investigation revealed that all 15 speakers of YD in the Jambun community used Dyirbal only to persons with whom they shared 'primary relations': that is, with family and peer-group members who were part of the individual's primary network. Furthermore, YD speakers in the 24 to 35 age group were found to use Dyirbal mainly to older members of the community, indicating vertical communication between older YD speakers and TD speakers. Interestingly, the same was not the case with YD speakers in the 15 to 24 age group: these younger speakers were observed to use YD to their peers in the isolated in-groups they formed with certain of their primary network ties, making communication at this level predominantly horizontal. Vertical communication was, in fact, weak for members of these groups, possibly owing mainly to the fact that they did not use Dyirbal in communication with primary-network contacts in the family; only one of the younger YD speakers claimed to reply in Dyirbal when addressed in the language by a TD speaker, the others responded in English. It was, therefore, not the family but the respective peer in-groups which were seen as the main domain of Dyirbal communication (131).

Language use in two such peer groups was studied in detail: a group of four female members who identified themselves as 'Buckaroos' and a group of three female members who called themselves 'Rock 'n' rollers'. Both peer-groups were close-knit and had common interests, buckarooing[3] and rock music, respectively. They were, however, mutually exclusive, set apart by distinct aims and aspirations. Dyirbal was, for these subgroups within the young Jambun population, an important means of symbolizing membership; crucially, "[e]ach group had its own distinct brand of Dyirbal" (Schmidt, 1985: 129). The important identity function that Dyirbal had for the in-group was, therefore, instrumental in checking the use of Dyirbal as a common code of communication for young Dyirbal speakers at Jambun. In other words, use of Dyirbal to individuals outside the group may have been resisted, and a variety of English used across in-group boundaries, due to the binding role of the language within the group.

Not surprisingly, peer-group norms of language use in in-group interaction were highly focused[4]. Considerable variation was found to exist between the YD of the Rock

[2] Traditional Dyirbal is termed the "'pre-decay' language" (Schmidt, 1985: 149), while Young Dyirbal is the variety whose grammatical structure has been radically altered by intense contact with English.

[3] Schmidt (1985: 134) explains that 'buckarooing' involves cattle mustering and similar horseback work performed on cattle stations.

[4] Focusing refers to the adjustment of individual speech towards a standard linguistic norm shared by members of close-knit network structures. In the words of Le Page (1968: 192), "[t]he individual creates his systems of

'n' rollers and that of the Buckaroos, but surprisingly little variation was detectable in the language of the speakers within each group. What emerges from Schmidt's analysis is that "the norm of each in-group is similar to the careful Dyirbal style of the least fluent member... This suggests an interlocutor rule that: speakers of the in-group modify their Dyirbal to a level that all members can respond to. The norm must be within the competence of all peer-group members" (Schmidt, 1985: 147). A good case in point is that of a Buckaroo who, regardless of having good command of TD morphological constructions, does not use them in the in-group situation; instead, she adjusts her speech to the Buckaroo norm which calls for less morphological complexity than that which she commands. The distinct varieties of YD spoken by members of the two peer-groups were revealed as symbols of solidarity and loyalty to the group, that is, symbols of their social identities *as* Rock 'n' rollers and Buckaroos, distinct from the rest of the Jambun community (TD speakers, older YD speakers, English monolinguals) and from each other.

5. ISOLATED MIGRANT WOMEN AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE

Whereas Gal (1979) and Schmidt (1985) adopted a non-quantitative approach to social networks, Stoessel (1998, 2002) opted for a much more formal application of the concept in her research on the impact social networks have on language maintenance and shift among isolated immigrants. In the multiple case-study of ten immigrant women in the United States, Stoessel undertook to reduce the differential effect of some of the macrosociological factors most commonly mentioned as implicated in language shift, in order to isolate the effect of social networks and, specifically, investigate which network features in particular would pattern with language maintenance ratings.

The participants in Stoessel's (1998, 2002) study all lived outside their respective ethnic communities, were all married to English-speaking American men, had all come to the United States as young women, either to pursue educational opportunities or to accompany their husbands, and were highly English-proficient and educated (MA minimum); the household language in all ten cases was English. Stoessel (2002: 8) contends that due to the selection of participants with the above characteristics, factors of political and economic pressures, difficulties with the L2, and ethnic pressures or obligations did not play a significant role in the women's individual decisions to maintain or shift language, leaving the researcher free to see whether the observed language behavior of the ten women might stand in any relation to their social networks.

Analysis established that there indeed was an association of network features and observed language behavior. Three factors, in particular, were found to affect language maintenance: the number of L1 speakers in the new linguistic environment, the vicinity of these L1 speakers, and an indication of a solid, intact home-country network (Stoessel, 2002: 15). Perhaps the most striking finding was not only that the more successful maintainers had a higher prevalence of L1 speakers in their total networks, but, more significantly, that it was the non-primary, or interactive, network in the US which was the main setting to correspond to the maintenance pattern (27).

Stoessel's assumption that since "[t]he decisions regarding language maintenance are made on an individual level, as the result of an interaction between larger societal and

---

verbal behavior so as to resemble those common to the group or groups with which he wishes from time to time to be identified".

smaller-scale network features and highly individual choices" (2002: 25), an explanation of the factors affecting language maintenance decisions cannot be complete without insight into the individual histories of those making the decisions. The questionnaire employed by Stoessel included items which targeted aspects of the social network other than those best expressed quantitatively: the quality of ties, their intensity and importance to the individual (2002: 11-12). Two open-ended, qualitative questions were also included: participants were asked for an opinion about their networks, in particular, how satisfied with them they were, and how their networks in the United States compared to their networks in the home country. A semi-structured interview was subsequently undertaken to investigate the participants' linguistic experiences before and after moving to the United States, their feelings about learning English, English and L1 skills, and any expectations they perceived members of their home network or US network to have regarding language use (15).

Two important conclusions emerged from the qualitative data. Firstly, the data accentuated the dynamic character of language maintenance and language shift, indicating that observations made relate to one particular moment in time and are, therefore, prone to change depending on changes in individuals' lives (Stoessel, 2002: 25). Secondly, the relevance of presence or lack of emotional attachment to the L1 also emerged as a factor of some significance. Stoessel (17-18) proposes two alternative scenarios that may lead to emotional attachment to the mother tongue (or realization of it) and which may explain the clustering of emotional attachment to the L1, fear of L1 loss, and non-satisfactory self-portrayal in English. It may be that, as ability in the mother tongue wanes (a consequence of living in an L2 environment), the immigrant who does not feel that formal and cultural use of the L2 enables full and adequate self-portrayal experiences fear for the receding ability to use the L1, which may, in turn, result in emotional attachment to the mother tongue. It is likewise possible that for individuals who hold their respective mother tongues to be the primary conveyors of their identity and their culture, emotional attachment to the L1 may lead to fear of L1 loss: since language represents the identity, loss of language would result in identity loss. This is a very interesting line of reasoning, but Stoessel's (1998, 2002) data unfortunately does not allow her to commit herself to any interpretation of the influence these factors exert on one another, although they appear interconnected.

Considering the experiences, attitudes and decisions of the ten women together and separately, Stoessel (2002: 25) is led to conclude that "each of these individuals exhibits a different combination of factors, making it difficult to clearly determine which factors individually favor or hinder language maintenance". More precisely, it is the "richness and variety in each of these women's reports that does not easily lend itself to a unified account of factors contributing to language maintenance or shift, respectively" (25). It is, however, specifically this 'richness and variety', brought out by Stoessel's method of triangulating quantitative and qualitative data, that is often missing from purely quantitative studies. Stoessel's combined methodology enabled her to uncover different social-network factors which seem to stand in relation to the degree of language maintenance observed for the participants and show that the interaction of these factors varies from individual to individual, highlighting the importance of taking personal histories into consideration (29).

6. THE GENERATION GAP AND THE MAINTENANCE OF CHINESE IN BRITAIN

The relative effect on language use in a multilingual setting of speakers' integration into a set of informal relationships which constitute a group capable of exerting normative pressure as opposed to macro-level category membership is explored by Li Wei (1994). Li Wei's analysis of bilingual behavior in the Tyneside Chinese community revealed three types of language choice patterns to be characteristic of the group, Chinese monolingual/dominant, Chinese-English bilingual, and English dominant. Variation in patterns of language choice was found to be associated primarily with age: Chinese monolingual/dominant patterns were specific to the oldest members of the community (the grandparent generation), while bilingual and English-dominant patterns featured prominently in the speech of younger members of the community. Two further social characteristics included in the analysis, sex and period of residence in Britain, did not appear to affect language choice significantly (103). The social networks to which speakers belonged, on the other hand, emerged as a more reliable predictor of language choice pattern than any other variable, including age.

Two network indices were constructed for the study: an 'ethnic' index and a 'peer' index, as ethnic-group membership (Chinese/non-Chinese) and age group (peer/non-peer) were found to be relevant as surface markers of an underlying variable of social integration. Analysis revealed that three differing age-related social network types were characteristic of the community: members of the grandparent generation contracted predominantly kin and ethnic, i.e. Chinese, ties in both their interactive and exchange networks[5]; the interactive network ties of the parent generation were both Chinese and non-Chinese, but their exchange network ties, although characterized by fewer kin-based relationships, were mostly with members of the same ethnic group; significantly, both types of networks of the British-born generation were overwhelmingly non-kin, non-Chinese, and intragenerational. Li Wei (1996: 809) recognizes that "[t]his general pattern of change from ethnic and kin-oriented networks to non-Chinese peer-group based ties across generations corresponded broadly to the process of language shift from Chinese monolingualism, to English-dominant bilingualism which was observed to be taking place in the community". The general social explanation proposed for the detected pattern of generational difference is based on the types of network contacts of each of the three age-groups, underscoring that the basis of variable language choice patterns lies in social interaction, rather than in the effect of any particular aspect, or any combination of aspects, of the social situation (Li Wei et al, 2000: 198).

7. CHURCH-SCHOOL COMMUNITY BONDS AND THE MAINTENANCE OF SERBIAN BY WOMEN IN AUSTRALIA

Dimitrijević (2005) provides an account of bilingual language practices at the macro-social and community level of Serbian-English bilinguals in a migrant context in Australia. The study focuses on the bilingual language practices of 20 women, all connected in

[5] Following Milardo (1988: 26-36), Li Wei (1994: 118-191) defines the exchange network as usually made up of relatives and close-friends, that is people with whom ego exchanges direct aid, advice, support, criticism; the interactive network, on the other hand, is not relied on for material and symbolic resources even though, as with the exchange network, interaction is frequent and occurs over longer periods of time. The exchange and interactive network largely correspond to the primary and nonprimary network, respectively.

some capacity to a Melbourne church-school community [*crkveno-školska zajednica*]. Based on responses to a language use questionnaire, patterns of language choice were considered in terms of implicational scaling. A comprehensive overview of the language choices the informants see themselves as habitually making in interaction with a range of interlocutor types was thus obtained. Informants were grouped according to the language behavior they report, rather than according to any predetermined social categories. Once individual speakers are ordered on the basis of their linguistic usage, relevant social characteristics may be explored in order to account for the variation.

Table 1 renders an implicational ordering, horizontally (from left to right), in terms of interlocutor types, and vertically (up and down), in terms of language use. Each row of table 1 gives information about the language choices a speaker makes in interaction with different interlocutors; that is, individual speakers' language choice patterns can be read by reading across each row. Reading down each column gives information about any differences that exist between speakers regarding choice of language with a particular (type of) interlocutor. The resulting implicational scale is three-valued: it allows for reported use of both Serbian and English (SE), as well as of only Serbian (S) or only English (E). The horizontal implicational relations in the scale indicate that if a speaker reports using both Serbian and English to a particular interlocutor type, she also reports using either

Table 1. Self-reported language choice according to interlocutor type

Informants			**Interlocutors**													**Language maintenance rating**
Name	Generation	*Age*	Grandparent	Friend of parent	Parent	Partner	Acquaintance	Child of relative/friend	Close friend	Sibling	Child	Friend of child	Professional service encounter	Colleague/ fellow student	Minor service encounter	
Desanka	1	83	/	/	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	1
Slavica	1	47	/	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	SE	SE	0.83
Zorana	1	49	/	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	/	E	0.9
Melanija	1	51	/	/	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	SE	SE	E	0.63
Miona	1	35	S	S	S	S	SE	SE	(S)	(S)	/	/	/	(S)	E	0.6
Mirjana	1	20	S	S	S	/	SE	SE	(S)	/	/	/	/	E	(SE)	0.37
Nada	1	53	/	S	S	S	SE	SE	SE	(S)	SE	SE	(S)	E	E	0.25
Biljana	1	20	S	S	S	SE	SE	/	SE	SE	/	/	(S)	E	E	0.2
Dragana	2	21	S	S	S	/	SE	SE	SE	E	/	/	E	/	(SE)	0.11
Tijana	2	21	S	S	S	/	SE	SE	SE	E	/	/	E	/	E	0
Gordana	2	61	/	S	S	(S)	SE	SE	SE	E	E	E	(S)	E	E	-0.08
Svetlana	2	43	/	S	S	/	(S)	/	/	/	/	/	E	/	E	0.2
Vera	2	59	/	SE	SE	SE	SE	(E)	SE	E	E	E	E	(SE)	E	-0.5
Jelena	2	29	/	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	E	E	E	E	E	E	E	-0.58
Ivana	2	29	/	SE	(E)	SE	SE	SE	E	E	/	/	E	E	(SE)	-0.5
Jana	2	26	/	SE	SE	/	SE	SE	E	E	/	/	E	E	E	-0.55
Marija	2	28	S	SE	(E)	SE	SE	/	E	E	/	/	E	/	E	-0.44
Aleksandra	2	26	S	SE	(E)	/	SE	/	E	E	/	/	E	E	E	-0.55
Milena	2	25	SE	SE	E	/	E	E	E	E	/	/	E	E	E	-0.8
Nevena	2	27	/	SE	E	E	E	E	E	E	/	/	E	E	E	-0.9

Serbian and English or only Serbian to interlocutors ranked to the left, and either Serbian and English or only English to interlocutors ranked to the right. Vertically, the reported use of Serbian and English with an interlocutor by a particular speaker implies that speakers ranked above report using either Serbian and English or only Serbian, while speakers ranked below report using either Serbian and English or English only. Empty cells appear where the speaker has indicated absence of the specified relation (no data). Unscalable cells, enclosed in parentheses, represent language choices which deviate from the implicational prediction.

The scalability of the data presented in table 1 is 91 per cent. This figure represents the proportion of non-deviant cells (183) out of the total of filled cells (201); it is a way to measure the goodness-of-fit between the scaling model and the data. As the statistically accepted rate for scalability is 90 percent, language choice in relation to interlocutor type for the Serbian-English bilinguals interviewed appears to follow a non-random, implicational pattern, making prediction possible.

Using the language use data in table 1, it is possible to arrive at an initial assessment of the degree of community language maintenance by the 20 Serbian-English bilingual women in the sample. By calculating ratios of community language (CL), i.e. Serbian, to dominant language (DL), i.e. English, use according to interlocutor, the 20 women can be positioned on a maintenance-shift continuum, that is, characterized as maintainers or shifters (cf. Stoessel, 1998: 52). As language shift can be thought of in a number of different ways, it is necessary to qualify what is meant here by shifter, or the opposite, maintainer of the CL.

Language shift can be viewed as a community phenomenon, or it can be considered from the perspective of the individual speaker; likewise, it is possible to consider language shift both diachronically and synchronically. In the Serbian language community in Australia generally, a shifting from Serbian to English is in progress. The language choices of the 20 informants form a synchronic implicational pattern which can also be interpreted dynamically (Bickerton, 1971, 1973) as depicting the ongoing process of language shift at the community level. The synchronic implicational pattern presented in table 9.1 can be taken to represent the diachronic spread of English from interactions represented by the interlocutor types at the far right toward interactions represented by interlocutor types to the left. The individual language choice patterns of the 20 women can be seen as reproducing stages of the diachronic change from full maintenance to full shift. A speaker's language maintenance rating (CL/DL ratio) indicates whether the stage her pattern of language choice reproduces is closer to the maintenance or shift end of the continuum; hence the terms maintainer and shifter, respectively.

The ratio which represents speakers' language maintenance ratings was calculated using a formula for calculating linear transformation of proportions (a-b)/(a+b) (Ferguson and Takane, 1989: 199), where the value 'a' is the number of interlocutor types for which the use of the CL (Serbian) is reported, and 'b' is the number of interlocutor types for which the use of the DL (English) is reported[6]. A speaker who uses relatively more Serbian in interaction with different interlocutors thus has a language maintenance rating closer to +1; a speaker who uses relatively more English with the same interlocutors has a rating closer to -1. Likewise, a language maintenance rating closer to +1 places the

[6] For speakers who report use of both Serbian and English with an interlocutor type, each language choice is counted separately as a 0.5 value.

speaker closer to the maintenance end of the continuum, and a rating closer to -1 places her closer to the shift extremity, identifying the former as a 'maintainer' and the latter as a 'shifter'. Speakers' language maintenance ratings are presented in the final column of table 1.

Table 1 presents the 20 informants as they are ranked on the maintenance-shift continuum. On the basis of their language maintenance ratings, the informants can be grouped into two groups: the maintainers, Desanka, Zorana, Slavica, Melanija, Miona, Mirjana, Nada, Biljana, Svetlana, and Dragana, and the shifters, Tijana, Gordana, Marija, Vera, Ivana, Jana, Aleksandra, Jelena, Milena, and Nevena. Within these two groups, it is possible to distinguish six subgroups: (1) strong maintainers, with language maintenance ratings of 0.83 and above; (2) moderate maintainers, with language maintenance ratings between 0.63 and 0.37; (3) weak maintainers, with language maintenance ratings between 0.25 and 0.11; (4) weak shifters, with language maintenance ratings of (approximately) 0; (5) moderate shifters, with language maintenance ratings between -0.44 and -0.58; and finally (6) strong shifters, with language maintenance ratings of -0.8 or higher. All first-generation bilinguals are ranked as maintainers. Of the second-generation bilinguals, two, Svetlana and Dragana, are ranked as weak maintainers, while the remaining ten are ranked as shifters.

The use of implicational scaling, which afforded an immediate initial focus on informants' language use, rather than on informants' membership in any externally defined, pre-selected social categories, makes possible a case not variable driven grouping of informants. It is important to clarify that in no way are these divisions between speakers meant to suggest cut-off points in terms of language maintenance ratings which could be generalized across the entire population which this small sample represents, or other populations.

It was correctly hypothesized that material for language maintenance or shift patterns would be not overall multiplexity and density of the primary network, which includes both CL and DL contacts, but the multiplexity and density of specifically those ties which can support language maintenance or, conversely, exert a pull in the opposite direction. Albeit there are significant differences in terms of degree and form of participation, all 20 informants were members of a local Serbian Orthodox church-school community, which is not only a religious institution, but also serves important cultural and socialization purposes of the Serbian language community in Australia. In other words, all 20 women had ties to a community institution which operates as a mechanism to maintain the community language and culture (cf. Milroy, 2001a: 51). A plausible approach, then, was to develop an instrument which can measure informants' depth of involvement in the St Vitus community.

Degree of integration into the local church-school community is measured using a 10-point community integration index. Each informant's score on the index reflects the density and multiplexity of the informant's ties to the St Vitus community, as network analysis has found that the density of key sectors or clusters of the network and relative multiplexity correspond with variability in people's behaviors, linguistic and other (Milroy, 1987a: 140). The index relies on five indicators which indirectly express community integration. The indicators were selected in accordance with the two criteria set out by Milroy (1987a: 141): the indicators both build on the findings and implications of previous network studies and are recoverable from the data collected in the course of participant observation in the St Vitus community and the sociolinguistic interviews, as well as being easily verifiable (none are affective measures). The five indicators are:

1. Attendance at Sunday worship; informants were assigned one point if they attended regularly (3 or more times a month), half a point if their attendance was sporadic (they attended less than 3 times a month), and zero points if they attended only at Easter, Christmas, or *slava*.
2. Membership in a high-density cluster within the St Vitus community; informants were assigned one point if they participated in the activities of *Kolo srpskih sestara*, but zero points if they were members only nominally.
3. Socializing in the church hall after Sunday worship; informants were assigned one point if they socialized regularly (3 or more times a month), half a point if sporadically (less than 3 times a month), and zero points if they did not remain to socialize with other members of the St Vitus community.
4. Having primary network contacts who attended Sunday worship regularly; informants were assigned one point if 2 or more of their primary network contacts attended Sunday worship 3 or more times a month.
5. Having primary network contacts who were involved in community activities; informants were assigned one point if 2 or more of their primary network contacts participated in the activities of *Kolo srpskih sestara*, the church choir, or were members of the church-school community board.

In order to investigate the degree to which informants' positioning on a continuum from language maintenance to language shift, expressed in terms of a language maintenance rating, is interdependent with features of their primary social networks, expressed in terms of a ratio of CL versus DL contacts and a score on a community integration index, statistics of covariance were used.

Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient was used to determine the degree to which informants' language maintenance ratings covaried with the ratio of CL versus DL contacts they reported for their primary networks. The rank order correlation, $\rho = 0.833$, $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed), shows that there is a real and reliable relationship between Serbian language maintenance and the predominance of contacts in the primary network to whom Serbian is used, that is, between shift to English and the predominance of primary network contacts to whom English is used: as the CL/DL ratio increases, so do speakers' language maintenance ratings.

Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient was once again employed to investigate the degree to which speakers' language maintenance ratings covaried with the second network variable, degree of integration into the St Vitus community, expressed in terms of a score on a 10-point scale of community integration. The rank order correlation showed that informants' language maintenance patterns covaried significantly with degree of community integration, $\rho = 0.502$, $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed), but the result was not as highly significant as for the ratio of CL versus DL contacts in the primary network.

Appropriate statistical analyses were also used to explore the relationship between language maintenance and shift and social categories such as age, generation, and length of residence in Australia, categories relied on regularly in macro-sociolinguistic accounts of language maintenance and shift. The analyses showed that none of these social variables covaried with informants' positioning on the maintenance-shift continuum.

8. CONCLUSION

Writing about reversing language shift, Fishman (1990, 2001b) places special emphasis on the building of family-neighborhood-community-based intergenerational links as crucial in efforts to maintain community languages in the face of pressures to shift to the dominant language. Most taxonomies of factors affecting language maintenance and shift have, however, chosen to focus on macro-level features rather than community bonds. In this paper I have tried to show that a number of studies, each focusing on a different language pair and on quite different contact situations, have revealed the most reliable predictors of the outcome of a language contact situation in terms of language maintenance or language shift to be not macro-level aggregate categories, but social network features. This directly supports Fishman's (2001b: 466) insistence on the intergenerational and demographically concentrated home-family-neighborhood–community as the basis for community language transmission and as the locale for its continued use. The findings of the sociolinguistic exploration of bilingualism presented in this paper suggest that there is much to be gained from turning the focus of investigation to the local social matrix in which variation, maintenance, shift, and change take place.

REFERENCES

1. Barnes, J. S. 1954. Class and committee in a Norwegian island parish. *Human Relations* 7: 39-58.
2. Bickerton, D. 1973. The nature of a creole continuum. *Language* 49(3): 640-69.
3. Bickerton, D. 1971. Inherent variability and variable rules. *Foundations of Language* 7(4): 457-92.
4. Boissevain, J. 1987. Social network. In Ammon U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. J. (eds.). *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society.* Berlin.
5. Bott, E. 1971. *Family and social networks*. London: Havistock.
6. Bourhis, R.Y., Giles, H. and Rosenthal, D. 1981. Notes on the Construction of a 'Subjective Vitality Questionnaire' for Ethnolinguistic Groups. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 2: 145-50.
7. Carter, B. and Sealey, A. 2000. Language, structure and agency: what can realist social theory offer to sociolinguistics? *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4(1): 3-20.
8. Cochran, M., Larner, M., Riley, D., Gunnarsson, L and Henderson, C.R. 1990. *Extending families: the social networks of parents and their children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Dimtrijević, J. (2005) Bilingual language practices in a migrant community: Language shift and code-switching in a Serbian language community in Melbourne, Australia. PhD thesis, University of Melbourne.
10. Eckert, P. 2000. *Linguistic variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Ferguson, G.A. and Takane, Y. 1989. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
12. Fishman, J. A. 2001a. *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
13. Fishman, J. A. 2001b. From theory to practice (and vice versa). In J. A. Fishman (ed.). *Can Threatened Languages Be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
14. Fishman, J. A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
15. Fishman, J. A. 1990. What is Reversing Language Shift (RLS) and how can it succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11:5-36.
16. Gal, S. 1979. *Language Shift. Social Determinants of Linguistic Change in Bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
17. Greenwood, J.D. 1994. *Realism, Identity, and Emotion: Reclaiming Social Psychology*. London: Sage.
18. Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Li Wei 1996. Network analysis. In H. Goebl, P. Nelde, S. Zdenek and W. Woelck (eds.). *Contact Linguistics: A Handbook of Contemporary Research.* Berlin: de Gruyter.
20. Li Wei. 1994. *Three Generations Two Languages One Family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

21. Li Wei, Milroy, L. and Pong Sin Ching. 2000. A two-step sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching and language choice: the example of a bilingual Chinese community in Britain. In Li Wei (ed.). *The Bilingualism Reader*. London: Routledge.
22. Milardo, R. M. 1988. Families and social networks: an overview of theory and methodology. In R. M. Milardo (ed.). *Families and social networks.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
23. Milroy, L. 2001. Social networks. In J. Chambers, P. Trudgill and N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), *Handbook of Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
24. Milroy, L. 1987a. *Language and Social Networks*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
25. Milroy, L. 1987b. *Observing and Analysing Natural Language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
26. Milroy, L. and Gordon, M. 2003. *Sociolinguistics: Method and Interpretation*. London: Blackwell.
27. Mitchell, J. C. 1986. Network procedures. In D. Frick et al. (eds.). *The quality of urban life*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
28. Mitchell, J. C. (ed.). 1969. *Social Networks in Urban Situations.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
29. Schmidt, A. 1985. *Young People's Dyirbal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30. Sealey, A. and Carter, B. 2001. Social categories and sociolinguistics: applying a realist approach. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 152: 1-19.
31. Stoessel, S. 2002. Investigating the role of social networks in language maintenance and shift. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 153: 93-131.
32. Stoessel, S. 1998. The investigation of social networks as a factor in language maintenance and shift. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Boston University.

PREISPITIVANJE OBJAŠNJENJA O OČUVANJU JEZIKA: SELJACI, ROKENROL I CRKVENI RUČKOVI

Jovana Dimitrijević Savić

Rad predstavlja pet sociolingvističkih istraživanja bilingvizma sa posebnim osvrtom na očuvanje jezika sopstvene etničke zajednice i prelaz na jezik grupe dominantne u širem društvu. Svaka studija obrađuje različit društveni okvir obeležen kontaktom među jezicima i svaka se bavi različitim jezičkim parom odnosno parovima. Sve nalaze da procese očuvanja jezika i prelaska na drugi jezik treba razmatrati u kontekstu mreža društvenih odnosa koje povezuju pojedince, društveni mehanizam putem koga se izbor jezika dogovara i održava.