The Structure of Communicative Choice

Group therapy session:

Joe: Ken face it, you're a poor little rich kid.
Ken: Yes, Mommy. Thank you.

— Harvey Sacks Class Notes No. 11

Classroom scene:

Mrs. Tripp: Miss Hayashijima?
Student: Yes, sir.

Insult and humor must be based on agreement about the underlying rules of speech and on the social meaning of linguistic features. Linguistic selection is deeply enmeshed in the structure of society; members can readily recognize and interpret socially codified deviations from the norm. While one can use sociolinguistic data to learn about social structure, or to learn about linguistic rules which otherwise defy analysis, it is the purpose of this essay to examine some aspects of sociolinguistic rules as a domain of structured behavior to be studied on its own terms.

The focus here will be on micro-sociolinguistics, the study of the components of face-to-face interaction as they affect or are affected by the formal structure of speech. These components may include the personnel, the situation, the function of the interaction, the topic, the message, and the channel. Many of the factors that influence face-to-face communication are strongly affected by larger events such as conquest, and official policies affecting immigration, schooling, publication rights, employment, and housing. But macro-
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Sociolinguistic relationships can in fact contain diverse linguistic consequences. Studies which treat "language spoken" as a unitary variable, for instance, risk masking the phenomena of shifting, and of co-occurrence of features which have produced language change as a consequence of group contact. The dynamism of change requires both the larger and the detailed perspective. When diverse linguistic possibilities exist in the community, one can examine the structure of diversity both between and within individuals. Social contacts and their content obviously have a bearing on the range of diversity between individuals. In turn, an individual can allude to this existing range as a communicative device in his own individual repertoire. For example, in racially integrated schools from the first day of contact we have observed students using dialectal feature-shifting as an expressive device; their repertoire of communicative means has been enlarged. Communicative choice by an individual can be seen in terms of structured alternatives on a variety of time scales. At certain points in their life history people may make major changes in linguistic knowledge and commitments—for example at school entry, or when they emigrate. Within a shorter time span, we find that participation in speech events such as church services, commercial transactions, and social conversations may commit them to code or register changes, and so on down to smaller units like greetings and insults. These alternations are structured.

During the sixties, psycholinguists were persuaded that both verbal output and comprehension were guided by rules which allowed unique sentences to be produced and understood. Recently, performance or processing models are being developed, (Morton 1970, Morton and Smith 1971) to account for a variety of performances which depend on language, such as speech, verbal imitation, comprehension, and verbal memory. Various aspects of rehearsal, storage, and processing strategies have been studied from this perspective.

We have evidence in this essay to suggest that rules of verbal output and comprehension must be so written as to specify social features and the embedding of utterances in speech events and social contexts. The fact that rules of address involve discrete selections between these social features is encouraging, for it shows that the non-linguistic world of human action is structured and hence accessible to rules. Indeed, these sociolinguistic rules provide an approach to what that structure is, and lead us to non-arbitrary units.
Linguists have begun to find that some linguistic problems cannot be resolved without attention to the pragmatic features of situated discourse. We can assume that processing models for sentences are only a beginning. Sentence processing models translate the structural description of the linguist’s grammar into a model of real-time events in a speaker or hearer; we can expect to find models of sociolinguistic processing bearing an analogous relation to sociolinguistic rules. We can also expect to see studies of the development of sociolinguistic competence in children (e.g. Slobin 1967) and migrants to new societies, and research on sociolinguistically deviant behavior. But the first step, of course, is to develop an extensive set of studies of sociolinguistic rules.

**ALTERNATION RULES**

**American Rules of Address**

A scene on a public street in the contemporary United States:

"What's your name, boy?" the policeman asked....
"Dr. Poussaint. I'm a physician...."
"What's your first name, boy?...."
"Alvin."

— Poussaint 1967:53

Anybody familiar with American address rules can tell us the feelings reported by Dr. Poussaint: "As my heart palpitated, I muttered in profound humiliation.... For the moment, my manhood had been ripped from me.... No amount of self-love could have salvaged my pride or preserved my integrity.... [I felt] self-hate." It is possible to specify quite precisely the rule employed by the policeman. Dr. Poussaint's overt, though coerced, acquiescence in a public insult through widely recognized rules of address is the source of his extreme emotion.

Brown and Ford (Hymes 1964) have done pioneering and ingenious research on forms of address in American English using as corpora American plays, observed usage in a Boston business firm, and reported usage of business executives. They found pri-
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marily FN (first name) reciprocation, or TLN (title plus last name) reciprocation. However, asymmetrical exchanges were found where there was age difference or occupational rank difference. Intimacy was related to the use of multiple names.

![Diagram of American address system]

Fig. 1. An American address system.

Expanding their analysis to account for details from my own rules of address, I have found the structure expressed in the diagram in Fig. 1. The advantage of formal diagramming is that it offers precision greater than that of discursive description (Hymes 1967). The type of diagram presented here, following Geoghegan (1971), is to be read like a computer flow chart. The entrance point is on the left, and from left to right there is a series of binary selectors. Each path through the diagram leads to a possible outcome, that is, one of the possible alternative forms of address.

Note that the set of paths, or the rule, is like a formal grammar in that it is a way of representing a logical model. The diagram is not intended as a model of a process, of the actual decision sequence by which a speaker chooses a form of address or a listener interprets one. The two structures may or may not correspond.
In any case, the task of determining the structure implicit in people's report of what forms of address are possible and appropriate is clearly distinct from the task of studying how people, in real situations and in real time, make choices. The criteria and methods of the two kinds of study are quite different. Just as two individuals who share the same grammar might not share the same performance strategies, so two individuals might have different decision or interpretation procedures for sociolinguistic alternatives but have the identical logical structure to their reports of behavior.

The person whose knowledge of address is represented in Fig. 1 is assumed to be a competent adult member of a Western American academic community. The address forms which are the "outcomes" to be accounted for might fit in frames like "Look, _____, it's time to leave." The outcomes themselves are formal sets, with alternative realizations; for example, first names may alternate with nicknames, as will be indicated in a later section. One possible outcome is no-naming, indicated in Fig. 1 by the linguistic symbol for zero [∅].

The diamonds indicate selectors. They are points where the social categories allow different paths. At first glance, some selectors look like simple external features, but the social determinants vary according to the system, and the specific nature of the categories must be discovered by ethnographic means. For example, "Older" implies knowledge by the range of age defined as contemporary. In some southeast Asian systems, even one day makes a person socially older.

The first selector checks whether the addressee is a child or not. In face-to-face address, if the addressee is a child, all of the other distinctions can be ignored. What is the dividing line between adult and child? In my own system, it seems to be school-leaving age, at around eighteen. An employed sixteen-year-old might be classified as an adult.

Status-marked situations are settings such as the courtroom, the large faculty meeting, and Congress, where statuses are clearly specified, speech style is rigidly prescribed, and the form of address of each person is derived from his social identity, e.g., "your honor"
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or "Mr. Chairman." The test for establishing the list of such settings is whether personal friendships are apparent in the address forms or whether they are neutralized (or masked) by the formal requirements of the setting. There are, of course, other channels by which personal relations might be revealed, but here we are concerned only with address alternations, not with tone of voice, connotations of lexicon, and so on.

Among nonkin the dominant selector of first-naming is whether alter is to be classified as having the status of a colleague or social acquaintance. When introducing social acquaintances or new work colleagues, it is necessary to employ first names so that the new acquaintances can first-name each other immediately. Familiarity is not a factor between dyads of the same age and rank, and there are no options. For an American assistant professor to call a new colleague of the same rank and age "Professor Watkins" or "Mr. Watkins" would be considered strange, at least on the American west coast.

Rank here refers to a hierarchy within a working group, or to ranked statuses like teacher-pupil. In the American system, no distinction in address is made to equals or subordinates since both receive FN. The distinction may be made elsewhere in the linguistic system, for example, in the style of requests used. We have found that subordinates outside the family receive direct commands in the form of imperatives more often than equals, to whom requests are phrased in other ways, at least in some settings.

A senior alter has the option of dispensing the speaker from offering TILN by suggesting that he use a first name, or tacitly accepting the first name. Brown and Ford (Hymes 1964) have discussed the ambiguity that arises because it is not clear whether the superior, for instance a professor addressing a doctoral candidate or younger instructor, wishes to receive back the FN he gives. This problem is mentioned by Emily Post: "It is also effrontery for a younger person to call an older by her or his first name, without being asked to do so. Only a very underbred, thickskinned person would attempt it" (Post 1922:54). In the American system described in Fig. 1, age difference is not significant until it is nearly the size of a generation, which suggests its origins in the family. The presence
of options, or dispensation, creates a locus for the expression of individual and situational nuances. The form of address can reveal dispensation, and therefore be a matter for display or concealment in front of third parties. "No-naming" or \( \emptyset \), is an outcome of uncertainty among the options.\(^1\)

The *identity* set refers to a list of occupational titles or courtesy titles accorded people in certain statuses. Examples are "Judge," "Doctor," "Professor," and so on.\(^2\) A priest, physician, dentist, or judge may be addressed by title alone, but a plain citizen or an academic person may not. In the latter cases, if the name is unknown, there is no address form (or zero, \( \emptyset \)) available, and we simply "no-name" the addressee. The parentheses used here refer to optional elements, the bracketed elements to social selectional categories.

- [Cardinal]: Your excellency
- [U. S. President]: Mr. President
- [Priest]: Father (+ LN)
- [Nun]: Sister (+ religious name)
- [Physician]: Doctor (+ LN)
- [Ph. D., Ed. D., etc.]: (Doctor + LN)
- [Professor]: (Professor + LN)
- [Adult] etc.: (Mr. + LN)
- (Mrs. + LN)
- (Miss + LN)

Wherever the parenthetical items cannot be fully realized, as when LN is unknown, and there is no lone title, the addressee is no-named, by a set of rules of the form as follows: Father + \( \emptyset \) → Father, Professor + \( \emptyset \) → \( \emptyset \), Mr. + \( \emptyset \) → \( \emptyset \), etc. An older male addressee may be called "sir" if deference is intended, as an optional extra marking.

These are my rules, and seem to apply fairly narrowly within the academic circle I know. Nonacademic university personnel can be heard saying "Professor" or "Doctor" without LN, as can schoolteachers. These delicate differences in sociolinguistic rules are sensitive indicators of the communication net.
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The zero forms imply that often no address form is available to follow routines like "yes," "no," "pardon me," and "thank you." Speakers of languages or dialects where all such routines must contain an address form are likely in English either to use full name or to adopt forms like "sir" and "ma'am," which are either not used or used only to elderly addressees in this system.

One might expect to be able to collapse the rule system by treating kin terms as a form of title, but it appears that the selectors are not identical for kin and nonkin. A rule which specifies that ascending generation only receives title implies that a first cousin would not be called "cousin" but merely FN, whereas an aunt of the same age would receive a kin title, as would a parent's cousin. If a title is normally used in direct address, and there are several members of the kin category, a first name may also be given (e.g., Aunt Louise). Frequently, there are additional features marked within a given family, such as patrilineal vs. matrilineal, near vs. distant. Whenever the address forms for an individual person's relatives are studied, this proves to be the case, in my experience.

Presumably, the individual set of rules or the regional dialect of a reader of this chapter may differ in some details from that reported in Fig. 1; or a better formulation is possible. Perhaps sociolinguists will begin to use a favorite frame of linguists — "In my dialect we say ..." — to illustrate such differences in sociolinguistic rules. For example, I have been told that in some American communities there may be a specific status of familiarity beyond first-naming, where a variant of the middle name is optional among intimates. This form then becomes the normal, or unmarked, address form to the addressee.

"What's your name, boy?"
"Dr. Pousaint. I'm a physician."
"What's your first name, boy?"
"Alvin."

The policeman insulted Dr. Pousaint three times. First, he employed a social selector for race, in addressing him as "boy," which neutralizes identity set, rank, and even adult status. Addressed to a white man, "boy" presumably would be used only for a child, youth, or menial regarded as a nonperson.
Dr. Poussaint's reply supplied only TLN and its justification. He made clear that he wanted the officer to suppress the race selector, yielding a rule like Fig. 1. This is clearly a nondeferential reply since it does not contain the FN required by the policeman's address rule. The officer next treated TLN as failure to answer his demand, as a nonname, and demanded FN; third, he repeated the term "boy," which would be appropriate to unknown addressees.

According to Fig. 1, under no circumstances should a stranger address a physician by his first name. Indeed, the prestige of physicians even exempts them from first-naming (but not from "Doc") by used-car salesmen, and physicians' wives can be heard so identifying themselves in public so as to claim more deference than "Mrs." brings. Thus the policeman's message is quite precise: "Blacks are wrong to claim adult status or occupational rank. You are children." Dr. Poussaint was stripped of all deference due his age and rank.

Communication has been perfect in this interchange. Both were familiar with an address system which contained a selector for race available to both blacks and whites for insult, condescension, or deference, as needed. Only because they shared these norms could the policeman's act have its unequivocal impact.

Comparative Rule Studies

The formulation of rules in this fashion can allow us to contrast one sociolinguistic system with another in a systematic way. We can assume that a shared language does not necessarily mean a shared set of sociolinguistic rules. For instance, rules in educated circles in England vary. In upper-class boarding schools, boys and girls address each other by last name instead of FN. In some universities and other milieux affected by the public school usage, solidarity address to male acquaintances and colleagues is LN rather than FN. To women it is Mrs. or Miss + LN by men (not title + LN), and FN by women. Thus sex of both speaker and addressee is important.

In other university circles the difference from the American rule is less; prior to dispensation by seniors with whom one is acquainted, one may use Mr. or Mrs. rather than occupational title.
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as an acceptably familiar but deferential form. Note that this is the
usage to women by male addressees in the other system. The two
English systems contrast with the American one in allowing basically
three, rather than two, classes of alternatives for nonkin: Occupa-
tional title + LN, M + LN, and FN/ LN. M + LN is used for inter-
mediate cases, the familiar person who must be deferred to or treat-
ed with courtesy.

Two Asian systems of address have been described recently.
The pioneering work of William Geoghegan (1971) describes the naming
system of a speaker of Bisayan, a Philippine language. As in most
systems, children routinely receive the familiar address form. The
Bisayan system, like the American and English, chooses on the basis
of relative rank, relative age, and friendship. But there are im-
portant differences. In the United States, all adult strangers are ad-
dressed with deference; in the Bisayan system, social inferiors
do not receive titled address. In the American system for nonkin,
added age, like higher rank, merely increases distance or delays
familiar address; in the Bisayan system inferiors or friends who
are older receive a special term of address uniting informality and
dference.

The Korean system is more unlike the American (Howell
1967). In Korea, relative rank must first be assessed. If rank is
equal, relative age within two years is assessed, and if that is equal,
solidarity (e.g., classmates) will differentiate familiar from polite
speech. This system differs both in its components and its order
from the American and Bisayan rules. Both inferiors and superiors
are addressed differently from equals. Many kinds of dyads differ
in authority—husband—wife, customer—tradesman, teacher—pupil,
employer—employee. In each case, asymmetrical address is used.
Addressees more than two years older or younger than the speaker
are differentially addressed, so that close friendship is rigidly age
graded. Solidary relations arise from status, just as they do be-
tween equal colleagues in the American system, regardless of per-
sonal ties. There are more familiar address forms yet to signal
intimacy within solidary dyads. If the English system has three lev-
eils, there are even more in the Korean system. Since the criteria
were multiple in the Howell study, not a single frame, the comparison
is not quite exact.
As Howell points out, the Korean system illustrates that the dimension of approach that Brown and Gilman (1960) called solidarity may in fact have several forms in one society. In the Korean system intimacy is separable from solidarity. This separation may also exist in the American system, but in a different way. One is required to first-name colleagues even though they are disliked. As Brown and Ford (Hymes 1964) showed, however, nicknames may indicate friendship more intimate than the solidarity that requires or is shown by FN. They found that various criteria of intimacy, such as self-disclosure, were related to the number of FN alternates, such as nicknames and sometimes LN, used to an addressee, and proposed that greater intimacy creates more complex and varied dyadic relations which speakers may opt to signal by a greater number of address variants. Thus in the American system two points of major option for speakers exist: the ambiguous address relation between solidary speakers of unequal age or status, and intimacy. We can expect that systems will vary in the points where address is prescribed or where options exist; Brown and Ford suggest a universal feature, however, in saying that in all systems relatively more frequent interaction should be related to more address variation. This they suggest is related to a semantic principle of greater differentiation of important domains.

Two-Choice System

The brilliant work of Brown and Gilman which initiated the recent wave of studies of address was based on a study of T and V, their abbreviation for familiar vs. formal second person verbs and pronouns in many European languages. In English the same alternation existed before "thou" was lost. The contrast is realized in German by du and sie, in French by tu and vous, and in Russian by ty and vy.

One might expect two-choice systems to be somewhat simpler than a system like Bisayan, which in Geoghegan's (1971) description gives nineteen output categories. But the number of outcomes can be few, though the number of selectors is many or the kinds of rules relating them complex. Figure 2 gives a description of the nineteenth-century rules of the Russian gentry, as I derive them from the excellent analysis by Friedrich (1972), which gives suffi-
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ently full detail to permit resolution of priorities. Special statuses refers to the tsar and God, who seem not to fit on any status continuum. Status-marked settings mentioned by Friedrich were the court, parliamant, public occasions, duels, and examinations. Rank inferiors might be lower in social class, army rank, or ethnic group or be servants. Solidarity applied to classmates, fellow students, fellow

Fig. 2. Nineteenth century Russian address.

revolutionaries, lovers, and intimate friends. Perhaps it is more properly called familiarity or intimacy since there does not seem to be the prescription present in the Korean and American solidary relation. A feature of the system which Friedrich’s literary examples illustrate vividly is its sensitivity to situational features. Thus T means "the right to use ты" but not the obligation to do so. Within the kin group, household is of considerable importance because of the large households separated by distance in traditional Russia.

A slightly later eastern European system described by Slobin (1963) is given in Fig. 3. The Yiddish system, as described by immigrants, is somewhat more like the American than like the
Russian system in that deference is always given adult strangers, regardless of rank. However, an older person received deference, despite familiarity, unless he was a member of the kin group. In the American system familiarity can neutralize age.

How have these systems changed? We have some evidence from the Soviet Union. The Russian revolutionaries, unlike the French, decreed V, implying that they wanted respect more than solidarity. The current system is identical to the old with one exception: Within the family, asymmetry has given way to reciprocal T, as it has in most of western Europe, at least in urbanized groups. For nonkin in ranked systems like factories, superiors receive VV and give TV:

When a new employee is addressed as "TV," she says, "Why do I call you 'VV' while you call me 'TV'?" Kormilitzyn gleefully shoots back a ready answer: "If I were to call everyone 'VV' I'd never get my plan fulfilled. You don't fulfill plans by using 'VV'" (Kantorovich 1966:30).

Evidently, the upper-class habit of using VV until familiarity was established (a system reflecting the fact that the T/V contrast itself came in from above as a borrowing from French) has seeped downward. "A half-century ago even upon first meeting two workers

![Diagram of Yiddish address system](image-url)
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of the same generation would immediately use 'ty.' Today things are different. Middle-aged workers maintain 'vy' for a long time, or else adopt the intermediate form which is very widespread among people within a given profession: 'ty' combined with first name and patronymic" (Kantorovich 1966:81).

Kantorovich, true to the 1917 decree, complains about three features of the current system: ty to inferiors regardless of age, ty to older kin, and first names alone among young acquaintances. Thus he favors the more deferential alternative in each case. Social change in Russia has been relatively slow in sociolinguistic rules, has affected family life more than public life, and has spread the practices of the gentry among the workers.

The Puerto Rican two-choice system shown in Fig. 4 is quite simple, either because it is a system of children or because my analysis is based on statistical tables not individual interviews. The data were generously supplied by Wallace Lambert and his collaborators from a large-scale study of comparative address systems in several cultures. Elementary and high school students filled in questionnaires about the forms of address given and received. In this chart, interlocale and intersubject differences have been suppressed. The striking feature of this system is that it requires only three discriminations. It is likely, of course, that adult informants would

Fig. 4. Puerto Rican address system (children).
elaborate further details. Intimacy in this system refers to close
ties of friendship, which can occur with others of widely varying
age, e.g., with godparents, and is quite distinct from solidarity,
which arises from status alone. Adolescent girls, for example,
do not give tu to a classmate unless she is a friend.

Lambert and his collaborators have collected slightly less
detailed data from samples of schoolchildren in Montreal, from a
small town in Quebec, from Mayenne, France, and from St. Pierre
et Michelon, an island colony with close ties to France, much closer
than to nearby Canada.

The system of kin address varies considerably. In both
Mayenne and St. Pierre, all kin and godparents receive tu. In
Quebec, the urban middle class is moving in this direction, but the
urban lower class and the rural regions from which it derives retain
an address system like Puerto Rico's in which distance (including
age) within the family is important. In some families, even older
siblings receive vous. For kin address, of course, the sanctions
are intrafamily, so one would expect between-family differences
to be greater during social change than in nonkin address. Generally,
"intimate" means parents, then aunts, uncles, and godparents, then
grandparents. Some interfamily differences might be accounted for
by finding which family members live in the household, which nearby,
and which far away.

Sex of addressee appears to be a feature of adult systems,
or may influence the probabilities of intimacy where there is a se-
lector. In Quebec, adults generally give tu to children and young
men regardless of familiarity. In St. Pierre (except with upper-
class girls, who are less likely to receive tu under any conditions)
acquaintance legitimizes tu and is necessary even in addressing chil-
dren. In Mayenne, middle-class little boys said they received tu
from everyone (and reported often reciprocating to strangers), but
otherwise familiarity seems to be required, as in Puerto Rico, in the
Mayenne system. Boys generally receive T from employers,
and in the country and the urban lower class they receive T from
service personnel. It should be noted that the analysis from the chil-
dren's standpoint of what they think they receive is an interesting
reflection of the fact that people know what they should say themselves,
and they also expect some standard form from others. In analyzing
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the adult rule systems, however, the children’s data are not the best; the adults of rural or lower class background may have different rules (e.g., service personnel?) than others.

Elsewhere Lambert (1967b) has discussed the development of address rules with age. There are several interesting problems in the learning of these systems, such as the visibility of the various social selectors. One can assume the rank gradations in an adult system might be learned late (at least in terms of generalizability to new addressees), as would generation differentiations not highly related to age.

A second problem emphasized by Lambert is the structure of alternation itself. Children in most language communities learn fairly early to employ the asymmetry of first and second person (for a case study, see McNeill 1963). Thus if they always received T and gave V, there might be less difficulty; however, they see others exchanging reciprocal V and T as well as asymmetrical address, and they give T to some alters. Comparative research should be done in natural language communities where the language structure provides different category systems and social selectors (Slobin 1967).

The compressed presentation here of Lambert’s work has indicated several directions for research on social criteria of address selection. Lambert has shown that these rules are sensitive indicators of differences between social groups, and of social change. One must look beyond the address system for independent social features correlated with address systems of a defined type. In order to do such studies, a clear-cut formal system for typologizing properties of address systems (like language typologies) is necessary.

Brown has already suggested that the dimensions of power and solidarity are likely to be present in all address systems since they are the basic dimensions of social behavior. If these are universals, we can look elsewhere for ways of typologizing systems, as suggested here, according to:

1. The order of universal selectors in the rule;
2. The location of personal options (such as dispensation, located at rank and age in the rule on Fig. 1);
3. Outcome types (for a given social selector, what lin-
guistic or paralinguistic features most commonly realize the contrast?;  
4. Formal features of the informational system (e.g., the relation of input alternatives to outcomes, or the amount of neutralization);  
5. Formal type of rule for realizing insults, condescension, deference, and so on by operations on the output of rules for normal, unmarked address (or on the rules themselves) (see the last section of this chapter).

Socialization

Adults entering a new system because of geographical or occupational mobility may have to learn new sociolinguistic rules. A contrastive analysis of formal rules, in combination with a theory of social learning, would allow specification of what will happen.

First, we can predict what the speaker will do. We can expect, on the basis of research on bilinguals, that the linguistic alternatives will at first be assimilated to familiar forms, to "dia-
morphes." Thus a Frenchman in the United States might start out by assuming that monsieur = Mr., madame = Mrs., and so on.

However, the rules for occurrence of these forms are different in France. In polite discourse, routines like "merci," "au revoir," "bonjour," and "pardon" do not occur without an address form in France, although they may in the United States. One always uses "au revoir, madame" or some alternative address form. Madame differs from "Mrs." in at least two ways. Unknown female addressees of a certain age are normally called madame, regardless of marital status. Further, Mrs. + ♂ = ♂; madame + ♂ = madame. As a matter of fact, the rule requiring address with routines implies that when LN is not known, there cannot be a "zero alternant" — some form of address must be used anyway, like the English "sir." As a result of these differences in rules, we can expect to hear elderly spinsters addressed: "Pardon me, Mrs."

How do listeners account for errors? Shifting at certain points in sociolinguistic rules is regularly available as an option. Normally, it is interpreted as changing the listener's perceived identity, or his relation to the speaker. The result may be complimen-
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ary, as "sir" to an unknown working-class male, or insulting, as "Mommy" to an adolescent male. If the learner of a sociolinguistic system makes an error that falls within this range of interpretable

shifts, he may constantly exchange predictably faulty social meanings. Suppose the speaker, but not the listener, has a system in which

familiarity, not merely solidarity, is required for use of a first

name. He will use TNL in the United States to his new colleagues

and be regarded as aloof or excessively formal. He will feel that

first-name usage from his colleagues is brash and intrusive. In the

same way, encounters across social groups may lead to misunder-

standings within the United States. Suppose a used-car salesman

regards his relation to his customer's as solitary, or a physician so

regards his relation to old patients. The American using the rule in

Fig. 1 might regard such speakers as intrusive, having made a

false claim to a solitary status. In this way, one can pinpoint abra-

sive features of interaction across groups.

Another possible outcome is that the alternative selected is

completely outside the system. This would be the case with "excuse

me, Mrs.," which cannot be used under any circumstances by rule 1.

This behavior is then interpreted by any additional cues available,

such as the face, dress, or accent of a foreigner. In such cases, if

sociolinguistic rules are imperfectly learned, there may be social

utility in retaining an accent; wherever the attitude toward the group

of foreigners is sufficiently benign, it is better to be so designated

than to risk insulting or offending addressees.

Integrated Sociolinguistic Rules

The rules just given are fractional. They are selective regard-

ling the linguistic alternations accounted for. They define only

specific linguistic entries as the universe of outcomes to be predicted.

If one starts from social variables, a different set of rules might

emerge. This is the outlook of William Geoghegan (1971), Ward

Goodenough (1965), and Dell Hymes (1964), who suggests taking "a

specific or universal function, such as the distinguishing of the sta-

tus or role of man and woman, derogation, respect, or the like, and

investigating the diverse means so organized within the language

habits of the community,... [rather than] looking for function as a cor-

relative of structure already established." This is the point of view

taken in the last section of this paper.
Using such an approach, Goodenough examined behavior toward a range of statuses and found that it was possible to rank both the statuses and the forms of behavior into Guttman scales and equivalence classes, grouped at the same scale point (1965). In this way, various kinds of verbal and nonverbal behavior can be shown to be outcomes of the same social selectors.

Deference, the feature studied by Goodenough, may be indicated by pronoun alternations, names or titles, tone of voice, grammatical forms, vocabulary, and so on (Capell 1966:104ff; Martin, in Hymes 1964). Rubin suggests even language change may serve the same purpose (1962). Deferential behavior as in the Spanish-Guaraní choice in Paraguay may in some systems only be realized in special situations such as in introductions or in making requests. If one compares an isolated segment of two sociolinguistic systems, it cannot legitimately be concluded that a given social variable is more important in one system than the other. It may simply be realized through a different form of behavior.

It is not clear how the different realizations of social selectors might be important. Language, address terms, pronominal selection, or consistent verb suffixing (as in Japanese) can be consciously controlled more readily, perhaps, than can intonation contours or syntactic complexity. Frenchmen report "trying to use tu" with friends. Such forms can be taught by rule specification to children or newcomers. Forms which allow specific exceptions, or which have options so that too great or too little frequency might be conspicuous, cannot be taught deliberately so easily. Such rules can be acquired by newcomers only by long and intense exposure rather than formal teaching.

Some alternations are common and required; others can be avoided. Howell reports that in Knoxville, Tennessee, Negroes uncertain whether or not to reciprocate FN simply avoided address forms to colleagues (Howell 1967:81-83), just as Brown and Ford noted in the academic rank system. In a pronominal rank system, like French or Russian, such avoidance is nearly impossible. Among bilinguals, language switching may be employed to avoid rank signaling (Howell 1967; Tanner 1967). The avoidable selector can be considered a special case of the presence of options in the system. Tyler (1965) has noticed that morphological deference features
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(like the Japanese) are more common in societies of particular kinship types, such as lineage organization.

This description is primarily made from the standpoint of predicting a speaker's choice of alternatives in some frame. It is also possible to examine these rules from the standpoint of comprehension or interpretation, as have Blom and Gumperz (1972) in their discussion of social meaning. Just as one can comprehend a language without speaking it, as actors we can interpret the social meaning of the acts of others without necessarily using rules identical to our own. The relation between production and comprehension rules remains to be studied.

Co-occurrence Rules

Types of Rules

"How's it going, Your Eminence? Centrifuging OK? Also have you been analyzin' whatchummed took tf'achieve?" The bizarre ness of this hypothetical episode arises from the oscillations between different varieties of speech. It violates the co-occurrence rules that we may assume English to have.

In the preceding section, we were concerned with the selection of lexical items, pronouns, or inflectional alternatives. We conceived of each instance as involving social selectors. Once a selection has been made, however, later occurrences within the same utterance, conversation, or even between the same dyad may be predictable. Whenever there is predictability between two linguistic forms, we can speak of co-occurrence rules (Gumperz 1987).

Co-occurrence rules could be of two kinds. The instance of predictability through time might be called horizontal since it specifies relations between items sequentially in the discourse. Another type might be called vertical, specifying the realization of an item at each of the levels of structure of a language. For instance, given a syntactical form, only certain lexicon may normally be employed, and a particular set of phonetic values may realize the lexicon. If one has learned political terms in New York and gardening terms in Virginia, the phonetic coloring of the lexicon may reflect their provenance in the individual's history. The most striking case
lies in the well-practiced bilingual who uses French syntax and pronunciation for French vocabulary and English syntax and pronunciation for English vocabulary.

In the example, the following are violations of vertical co-occurrence:

a. "How's it going" is a phrase from casual speech, but the suffix "-ing" is used, rather than "-in'," which is normal for casual speech;

b. An elliptical construction is used in the second utterance, which contains only a participle, but the formal "-ing" appears again;

c. A technical word, "centrifuge," is used in the elliptical construction;

d. The "-in" suffix is used with the formal "analyze";

e. Rapid informal articulation is used for the pedantic phrase "undertook to achieve".

Horizontal co-occurrence rules refer to the same level of structure, and might be lexical or structural. The vocabulary in the example oscillates between slang and technical terms, the syntax between ellipsis and parallel nonellipses. In bilingual speech one may find structural predictability independent of lexicon, as in an example of Pennsylvanian German: Di kau ist over di fens chumpt. Here the syntax and grammatical morphemes are German, lexicon English. Horizontal co-occurrence rules governing selection of grammatical morphemes are common, with lexical switching and phrase switching allowed. Diebold (1963) also gives examples in which Greek-Americans who can speak both Greek and English with "perfect" co-occurrence rules, if they employ English loan words in the Greek discourse, realize them in the Greek phonological system. This would suggest that for these speakers horizontal, or syntagmatic, phonological rules override vertical realization rules.

One of the startling aberrations in the example is the use of slang to a cardinal. We would expect to find that deferential address forms would be co-occurrent with formal style. One pictures a cardinal in a microbiology laboratory addressed by a janitor who knows technical terms but cannot fully control formal syntax and phonology! Like ungrammatical sentences, sociolinguistically deviant utterances
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become normal if one can define setting and personnel to locate them.
This, of course, is the point. Wherever there are regular co-occurrences, deviant behavior is marked and calls attention to its social
meaning.

The most extreme forms of sanctions for co-occurrence
specification are likely to be found in ritualized religious speech in
traditional societies. Here it would be blasphemous to utter the
wrong speech. Indeed, Gumperz has suggested that linguistics first
began with the Sanskrit scholars' efforts to identify the formal fea-
tures of religious texts and transmit them unchanged. Thus from the
special social constraint on alternations sprang the concept of "lan-
guage."

At the opposite extreme are the conditions in American
college lecturing, where technical terms, slang, and informal and
formal syntax alternate to some extent. Friedrich also gives ex-
amples (1972) of delicate communication of changing relationships
by shifts within conversations.

Style

Formal Style. Style is the term normally used to refer to
the co-occurrence changes at various levels of linguistic struc-
ture within one language. The vertical properties of such shifts have
been pointed out by Joos (1962). Hymes (1964) has commented that
probably every society has at least three style levels: formal or
polite, colloquial, and slang or vulgar.

If Hymes is right about a polite style which contrasts with
the unmarked or "normal" colloquial, it might be proposed that this
is the style preferred in public, serious, ceremonial occasions. Co-
occurrence restrictions are particularly likely because of the seriousness
of such situations. The style becomes a formal marker for
occasions of societal importance where the personal relationship
is minimized. We would expect that the distant or superior form of
address and pronoun is universally employed in public high style. In
Fig. 1 and 2 "status-marked situations" which call for titles and V
may also call for polite style. Thus speakers who exchange colloquial
style normally might change to this style in certain public occasions
such as funerals or graduation ceremonies.
It might in general be the case in English that in otherwise identical situations, an alter addressed with TLN receives polite style more than one addressed with FN. Howell (1967:99) reported such correlations in Korean.

In Geertz' (1960) analysis of *prijat* speech etiquette in Java, a distinction is made between affixes and function morphemes controlled by co-occurrence rules, and honorific vocabulary (like "sir"), which is sporadic and which is governed in effect by rules of frequency rather than categorical co-occurrence. Since a single selection is made in the first case, he refers to a "styleme."

Formal lexicon and "-ing" should be related. Fischer (Hymes 1964) found that criticizing, visiting, interesting, reading, and correcting and flubbin', punchin', swimmnin', chewin', and bittin', occurred in a single speaker's usage. It is not clear here whether it is lexical style or topic that is at issue since there were no examples of denotative synonyms realized through different vocabulary. Such examples, of the sort given in Newman (Hymes 1964) and found plentifully in English lexicon for body functions (e.g., urinate vs. weeshee), provide clearer evidence for co-occurrence restrictions between lexicon and structure.

Labov (1966b) did include the "-ing" vs. "-in" variation in his study of style contrasts in different social strata, and found it worked precisely as did the phonological variables. Polite style in a speaker might require a certain higher frequency (Figs. 5 and 6) of postvocalic [r] or of [ŋ] rather than [t] in, e.g., "thing," and of "-ing." While the variables differentiating polite from casual style tended to be the same in different classes, the precise frequency reached for each variable was a function of class too (Labov 1966a). Thus his evidence suggests co-occurrence rules for grammatical morphemes and phonology. Labov (1966b) and Klima (1964) consider the formal description of phonological and syntactic style features, respectively.

**Informal Style.** In trying to sample different styles while interviewing, Labov made the assumption that speakers would use a more formal style during the interview questioning than at other times. He used several devices for locating such shifts contextually: speech outside the interview situation, speech to others usually in
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![Graph showing the distribution of [th] in thing, three, etc., for adult native New York City speakers (Labov, 1966).](image)

the family, rambling asides, role playing (specifically, getting adults to recite childhood rhymes), and answers to a question about a dan-
gorous experience. He found that when "channel cues" (changes in tempo, pitch range, volume, or rate of breathing) indicated a change to casual or spontaneous speech within a speech episode, the phonological features changed. In the examples illustrating the shifts, lexicon and syntax changed too.

It is commonly the case that as one moves from the least deferent speech to the most, from the informal to the ceremonial, there is more structural elaboration and less abbreviation. Prob-
ably, this difference is a universal, for two reasons. One is that elaboration is a cost, and is therefore most likely in culturally valued situations or relationships (Homans 1958). The other is that a high degree of abbreviation is only possible in in-group communi-
cation. While ceremonials may be confined to a sacred few, wherever they have a public function and must communicate content, we assume that this principle of elaboration holds. Elaboration could be defined with respect to a surface structure, or to the complexity of imbedded forms in the syntax, or some such criteria. A very brief poem might, in fact, in terms of rules and "effort" of compression, be more complex than a discursive report of the "same" content. Some forms are
unambiguous: suffixed versus unsuffixed forms, as in Japanese honorifics or polite verb suffixes; titles versus nontitles; and so on.

From a formal grammatical standpoint, ellipsis is more complex than nonellipsis since the grammar must contain an additional rule. It is not clear how ellipsis might be handled in a performance model. However, ellipsis in the syntactical sense is clearly more common in informal speech.

From Soskin and John's (1963) text of a married couple we find the following:

Bet you didn't learn it there.
Your name?
Want me to take it... Wanna take your shoes off?
Not that way!
Directly into it.

The formal rules for sentence contractions and ellipsis are readily written.

Another form of ellipsis is that used in conversational epi-
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sodes in second-speaker forms or to complete one's own earlier ut-

terances. From Soskin and John (1963):

That fish, Honey.
Like this?
Undulating!
Towed!
With both of them!
Well, I could.

These forms of ellipsis are learned. Brent and Katz (1967)
found that anaphoric pronominalization is rare in young children; it
is obligatory in adult second-speaker rules. Bellugi (1967) found
also that contractions occur later than uncontracted forms in chil-
dren, except as unanalyzed morphemes.

Semantic compression is also available, in casual speech
among intimates (see Ervin-Tripp 1965). In slang the alternates
are primarily lexical. As Newman (Hymes 1964) has pointed out
the actual forms used are not necessarily different, but in sacred
or slang contexts they take on a different meaning, so in speaking of
slang vocabulary one must include both form and its semantic fea-
tures. Since slang is highly transitory by definition, it will be under-
stood and correctly used only within the group or network where it
developed or to which it has moved at a given time. One might pre-
dict that the selection rules for slang should restrict it to address-
eses to whom one claims a solidarity relation. Thus a college lecture faced
with slang is a claim on the identification of the audience.

Phonetically, a form which occurs in casual speech more than
in polite styles is rapid speech, which entails horizontal changes.

What are you doing? [h wedar ju 'duwin]
Whaddya doing? [h wedj' 'duwin]
Whach doon? [w ed 'dun]

There are regular phonetic alternations related to rate, e.g.,

1. Retention of syllable of major stress and peak pitch
2. As degree of speeding increases, loss of weakest stress
3. Loss or assimilation of semivowels
[r] in postvocalic position lost
[d] + [l] → [l] e.g., Whadja do?
[t] + [l] → [l] e.g., Whatcha doin’?

4. Possible loss of marginal phonological distinctions like

/ hw/ vs. / w/, perhaps as part of casual speech style

5. Centralization of unstressed vowels

There is a reverse set of rules available to speakers used to these alternations. The extra-slow style may be employed in sounding out for a dictionary or over the telephone. Thus normal "school" may become slow [śkwold]. Many of these rules derive from the rules of English stress (Chomsky and Halle 1968).

**Styles Related to Occupation.** Language changes related to work arise for three reasons. One is that any activity brings with it objects, concepts, and values which are talked about by specialists in that activity, and indeed may be known only to them. Another is that whatever solidarity an interacting work group may achieve, or whatever identification a reference group (e.g., psychologists or transformational linguists) may stimulate, it can be alluded to by selection of appropriate alternatives in speaking or writing. Many instances of abbreviations in factories, or of work-group slang, or of technical terminology synonymous with colloquial vocabulary, must have this second feature. Further, the particular communicative conditions might give rise to some features — signal tower communication, headline style, the special syntax of short-order restaurant speech. While the slang and lexical features of restaurant speech can be found in kitchens, fast unambiguous oral communication needed between waiter and cook alone may lie behind the special syntax Brian Stross reported (see Ervin-Tripp 1969). Examples are the structure (number) + (category) + (modifier) which he found in such orders as "two bacon and " for bacon and eggs and "LT plain" for lettuce and tomato sandwich. Virtually all registers, including that of social science writing, have syntactic as well as lexical features. The details of the co-occurrence rules for such styles remain to be studied.

**Baby Talk.** In many languages a special style is employed in talking to infants, which changes its features with the age of the child. A cross-linguistic comparison has been made by Ferguson (1964). In English, baby talk affects all levels of structure.
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Most speakers are likely to be conscious of baby-talk lexicon, as they often are of the lexical features of styles. Baby lexicon includes words like potty, weewee, bunny, night-night, mommy, and daddy. Many other words in adult speech become appropriate for speaking to infants when the suffix "-ie" is added. Drach and his colleagues (1969) found that speech to children is syntactically simpler and more repetitious, and contains fewer errors and hesitation pause and more ellipsis resulting in shorter sentences than speech to adults.

Phonological effects and paralinguistic features are especially conspicuous. Samples of talk to infants show certain general phonetic changes such as palatalization. Most striking is the higher pitch the younger the infant, and the use of a singsong, wide-ranging intonation. Observations of the social distribution of this style show it more common in addressing other people's children than one's own. For instance, nurses use the paralinguistic features at least in persuading children; and in cooperative nurseries, comparison of own-child and other-child addressees indicates a distinct shift to more age attribution with own child.

Children themselves use many of the features of adult baby talk very early. In addressing younger siblings they may adopt lexical and paralinguistic features of the adult baby talk as early as age two. In role play they use phrases and address terms from baby talk, e.g., "Goo-goo, little baby," and freely employ the sing-song intonation in addressing "babies." In other respects their role play is stereotyped rather than strictly imitative, for example in the frequent use of role names, and it may be that the use of the intonational and lexical features of baby talk may function simply as role markers in their play.

Linguistic Repertoire. Co-occurrence rules refer to the selection of alternates within the repertoire of a speaker in terms of previous or concomitant selections. The range of possible alternates should be known in such a study. In an American monolingual, the range is likely to include the styles just discussed, and perhaps an occupational register. Labov has pointed out, however, that it is rare to control a very wide stylistic range unless one is a speech specialist and that upwardly mobile persons usually lose the "ability to switch 'downwards' to their original vernacular" (1964:92).
In many parts of the world, a code that is relatively distinct from the casual vernacular is used in formal situations. This condition, called "diglossia" in Ferguson's (1959) classic article, may, because of the greater code difference, be accompanied by more co-occurrence restriction than is style shifting, where the common features of the styles may outweigh their differences. Examples where the codes are related are Greece, German Switzerland, Haiti, and Arab countries. Standard languages coexisting with local dialects are somewhat less perceptually separable; historically, the dialect does not usually maintain itself except phonetically, though there may be ideological resistance to borrowing from the standard (Blom and Gumperz 1972). Differential access to the everyday use of the standard, in combination with valued social meanings of a dialect, as in the case of nonstandard urban English or creoles such as those of Hawaii and Jamaica, may preserve variation.

Where diglossia takes the form of bilingualism (Fishman 1967), one might at first assume that the co-occurrence rules would primarily govern situations requiring the high form. Such a condition exists in many American bilingual communities, with English as the high form. However, these are not usually pure cases since English is the vernacular if there are casual contacts outside the immigrant community. Under these conditions there can be considerable interpenetration (Gumperz 1967).

Co-occurrence rules in common-sense terms refer to "language mixing." Some bilingual communities have strong attitudinal opposition to switching (usually they mean lexical co-occurrence). Blom and Gumperz (1972) found that in a Norwegian village speakers were unconscious of the use of standard forms and were very upset to hear tapes showing lack of co-occurrence restrictions in behavior. In practice, the maintenance of coordinate or segregated systems depend on social factors. Coordinate bilingualism is possible if there is a complete range of equivalent lexicon in both systems, and social support for the bilingualism. If this is not the case, some topics cannot be discussed, some emotions cannot be conveyed, and borrowing, perhaps surrounded by a routine disclaimer frame, will occur. The other social condition permitting such segregation in diglossia are the closed network circumstances reported by Blom and Gumperz where certain topics and transactional types simply would not occur in casual discourse. Thus American researchers can find rich
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grounds for the study of behavioral support or loss of co-occurrence
rules, either in English style, registers, dialects, or multilingualism.

Shifting within Discourse

Situational Shifting. The social features alluded to in the
alternation rules so far discussed have primarily been features of
situations or personnel present. Sociolinguistic alternations based
on these kinds of "situational shifting" (Blom and Gumperz 1972)
can be seen in the two-year-old's use of baby-talk intonation to his
baby sister, the multilingual child's selection of language for a new
servant, the slum Afro-American child's loss of classroom copulas
when on the playground, the Hawaiian college boy's selection of
standard lexicon when a mainland stranger arrives, and replacement,
in addition, of the creole's intonation if the stranger is a girl. These
consistent behavioral shifts may or may not be related to normative
rules of the type shown in Figures 1 to 4 derived from informant's
reports.

Speech Acts. In addition, however, such shifts can occur
within occasions. They might be related to functions, speech acts,
or topics. "What did he say?" "He asked her for a match." "Why
did he do that?" "He wanted to meet her, talk with her." The first
characterization describes a speech act, request. The second refers
to the function of the act. We assume that all members of social
groups can identify speech acts, that they are units in the cultural
system. "What are you talking about?" "We were just saying hello.
"We were telling jokes." "I was introducing Joe." Saying hello,
telling jokes, and introducing are speech acts subordinate to or-
organized exchanges like parties and joint work, often located within them
by sequencing rules (Schegloff 1972) or rules of propriety (e.g.,
one introduces guests at a formal dinner, but not the waitress).

In these examples, the speech acts are labeled units. It
is possible that some consistencies in rules of behavior imply the
existence of a unit, though it may not appear in the folk taxonomy
of speech acts. For example, suppose that one cannot say to a
stranger on the street, "My name is George Landers. What time is
it?" or "Hello, sir. Where is the post office?" Then to formulate
the rule, one needs a category of information requests addressed
to strangers in order to indicate that greetings and self-introductions are excluded. Another indication that such units may exist is that they commonly occur in bilingual interaction; there may be a language shift between two different speech acts.

There is no reason to assume that speech acts are the same everywhere. Certain special forms of discourse, like poetry and speechmaking, may have components known only to specialists. Whether and why there are labels used in the teaching of these performances is itself an interesting cultural study.

Speech acts in English include greetings, self-identification, invitations, rejections, apologies, and so on. The ones identified so far tend to be routines, but we can expect to find other more abstract units as research proceeds.

**Topics.** When conversations have an explicit message with informational content, they can be said to have a topic. "What are you talking about?" "Nothing." "Gossip." "Shop talk." "The weather." "The war." "We were having an automobile discussion about the psychological motives for drag racing in the streets." In everyday discourse, the question of topic is most likely to occur in invitations or rejections so that the answers are such as to exclude a new arrival or give him enough information to participate. Besides selecting personnel for participation, topics may be governed by a continuity rule. In a formal lecture in a university there is a constraint on continuity and relevance, just as there is in technical writing, where editing can enforce the constraint. Evidences of constraint are apologies for deviation: "That reminds me..." "Oh, by the way..." "To get back to the question..." "To change the subject..." Cultural rules regarding speech events may include constraints as to the grounds for relevance.

Kjolseth (1967) has found in analysis of some group interaction that topical episodes are key factors in speakers' tactics.

A performer's tactic may be to direct his episode as a probe into the preceding episode. In contrast, in another situation his tactic may be to extend and elaborate some antecedent episode. On still another occasion his tactic may be to close off and limit a previous episode.... These tactical
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types are based on, or defined in terms of, two qualities
abstracted from the performances: (a) the episode locus of
relevances drawn from the existent conversation resource,
and (b) the purpose of the episode with respect to surrounding
episodes.

The three examples given by Kjolseth would involve topical
continuation, recycling, or change, respectively. These general
features of speech events require that members be able to identify
relevance but not necessarily to label topics.

There is yet a third form of evidence that topic may be a
cultural unit. Bilinguals can frequently give reliable accounts of
topical code switching, and their behavior often corresponds in
general to their accounts (Erivin-Tripp 1964).

We can thus argue that topic, like speech act, must be a
basic variable in interaction on the grounds that speakers can iden-
tify topical change as generating code shift, that speakers can some-
times report what they are talking about, and that topical continuity,
recycling, and change may be normative features of speech events,
or at least relevant to values about good conversations. One might,
in fact, find that there are rules for topic selection just as there are
for address.

Messages. The analysis of messages refers to two-term
relationships, whereas topic is a single term allowing for simple
taxonomies. Here we intend to refer only to the manifest or explicit
message. Our reason for the distinction is that latent content cate-
gories typically refer to intent (see, e.g., Dollard and Auld 1959; Katz
1966; Leary 1957; Marsden 1965). Our position here is that intent or
function is part of the constellation of social features out of which in-
teraction is generated. It can be realized in a variety of ways, of
which verbal interaction is only one. We seek regular rules by which
one can relate underlying categories to their formal realizations, or
the formal features of interaction with their social meanings. Failure
to discover such rules has led to considerable discouragement with the
evident arbitrariness of content classifications in studies of natural
discourse.

The manifest message, however, is the product of the social
features of the situation as well as of intent, and is therefore inseparable from the interaction product. All the selections made in realization of the functions of communication can carry some kind of information, whether about the speaker, the situation, the hearer, or the topic. In detail, given alternations cannot do all at once, though they may be ambiguous as to which is intended. In this case, we intend the message only to refer to what is said or implied about the topic. There have been numerous summaries of ways of classifying messages (e.g., Pool 1959). A recent innovation is logical analysis (Véron et al. 1965). The underlying structure of logical linkages between terms in utterances was analyzed, then semantic relations were described in terms of logical relations between pairs of units (e.g., equivalence, inference, conjunction, specification of conditions, sequential relations, explanation, opposition, causes, ...). A Markov semantic analysis revealed very large and consistent differences between subject groups, which were, in the study reported, clinical categories, but could be texts in a different society.

Function of Interaction

Criteria. If sociolinguistic alternation rules have intents or functions as their input, then one strategy in identifying such rules is to isolate a functional category and examine its realizations. We assume that the theory of functions itself must lie outside of sociolinguistics, in another social science. However, an examination of the various functions realized by speech is of considerable importance in view of the evidence that these functions change with age and vary with culture.

Firth (1935) was among many who sought to identify the functions of speech. He included phatic communion (creating solidarity or alluding to it); pragmatic efficiency (accompanying work); planning and guidance; address; greetings, farewells, adjustment of relations, and so on; speech as a commitment, (courts, promises). Primarily, his view of function was the social value of the act.

Function is likely to be viewed by a psychologist from the standpoint of the interacting parties, either the sender or the receiver. Soskin has played tapes to listeners and asked them to report what they would say and what they would think. This method assumes that function is effect. It is close to Blom and Gumperz' (1972) criterion of social meaning.
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A second method is to analyze actual instances of acts, and infer whether the receiver's response satisfied the speaker, either from his overt behavior or by questioning him. This method includes action, response, and reaction. It is derived from Skinner's (1957) theory that speech is operant behavior which affects the speaker through the mediation of a hearer. Feedback and audience consistency presumably "shape" effective speech in the normal person. In this method, function is identified by classes of satisfactory listener responses.

If intent is imputed to a speaker on the basis of some features of the content or form of his speech, a third form of functional analysis appears. This, of course, is the method of latent content analysis (e.g., Katz 1966).

A set of function categories was devised to account for the initiation of dyadic interaction, on the basis of a corpus of instances of action, response, and reaction (Ervin-Tripp 1964). The list includes eliciting goods, services, and information; implicit requests for social responses; offering of information or interpretations; expressive monologues; routines, and speech to avoid alternative activities.

Mands. One of the simplest functional categories to examine is one which Skinner (1957) called the mand since it is defined by the fact that normally it elicits goods, services, and information. One could broaden the definition by specifying that the intent is to obtain these since it is clear that under some conditions, the actor does for himself.

Soskin and John (1963) devised a category system, intermediate between the strata suggested here, which will serve to illustrate the breadth of possible realizations of mands. Suppose the actor wants the loan of a coat:

"It's cold today" (structone).
"Lend me your coat" (regnone).
"I'm cold" (signone).
"That looks like a warm coat you have" (metrone).
"Br-r-r" (expressive).
"I wonder if I brought a coat" (excogitative).
It is immediately obvious that these ways of getting a coat are socially distributed in a nonrandom way and would be quite ineffective under many circumstances.

If we look at the category which most explicitly realizes a mand, and can be said to be pragmatically unambiguous, the regnones, we find that there are a variety of speech acts that might be regnones, including requests and orders: "Ask him to close the window" vs. "Tell him to close the window," "Shut the window!" vs. "Would you mind closing the window?"

At a lower stratum, the syntactical, the request often involves some kind of speech act neutralization. For example, one can joke by misinterpreting a speech act, by saying "yes" to "Would you mind closing the window?" or to "Do you have a match?" or "Do you know where the post office is?" or to "Is George there?" on the phone, and doing nothing further. In each of these cases, the request is realized through a yes/no question. From the standpoint of syntax, such a response is quite appropriate. Under specifiable social conditions, however, these become the normal, unmarked form for realizing requests in the mature speaker. When one does not in fact want to speak to George but merely to know whether or not he is home, some other form must be chosen, or a fast footnote added.

These instances are highly stabilized cases of an apparent neutralization which has become the normal form for request and therefore would in fact be described by many speakers as "asking X to close the window" and so on, if they were told to convert these into indirect speech.

In addition, one finds many instances of the selection of the normal form for realization for some other function to represent a mand. Quite possibly, of course, in closed networks these become as usual as the "asking" examples.

Bessie Dikeman and Patricia Parker (1964) found that within some families mands were neutralized between equals most of the time, less than half the time from seniors to juniors, and in a minority of cases when juniors spoke. Examples from their papers were these:
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"Where's the coffee, Dremel?" (it is visible) (to wife)
[gloss: bring me the coffee].
"Is that enough bacon for you and Thelma?" (to husband)
[gloss: save some for Thelma].
"It's 7:15" (to daughter) [gloss: hurry up].
"Mother, you know I don't have a robe. Well, we're having
a slumber party tomorrow night" [gloss: buy me a robe].
"Oh dear, I wish I were taller" (to adult brother) [gloss:
get down the dishes].

In factory settings, subordinates usually received commands,
sometimes requests. Carol Pfuderer (1968) found that in a university
office commands were reserved for familiar peers. Within this
category of addressee, however, if the speaker was within the terri-
ory of the receiver, requests were used instead. If distance sep-
...ated them, a command might be altered by a tag question making
a request ("Ask Marcy, why don't you?") "please," address
terms, or rising pitch. If the addressee was not a peer, requests,
pragmatic neutralizations, or displacement of addressee occurred.

Pragmatic neutralizations included information questions ("Has anyone
gone to the accounting this week?" "Whose turn is it to make coffee
this week, Ruby?") and statements ("It's stuffy in here." "Some-
one has to see Dean Smith."). In cases where the obvious receiver
was much higher in rank, there might be displacement to a peer ad-
dresssee but use of a highly deferent request form ("Joan, would you
please get the stapler for me?"). In this example the nearest person
to the stapler was a standing senior professor, not Joan, who was
seated farther away.

Mands require action on the part of the alter so that the
obligations and privileges inherent in the social relations of the per-
sonnel are likely to result in different linguistic realizations of the
same function. We might expect displacement where possible in
cases of extreme deference, perhaps pragmatic neutralization allowing
the receiver an option of interpretation. In situations of high
mutual nurturance where intimacy makes interpretability likely, as
in many families, the basis for pragmatic neutralization may be
quite different, perhaps serving to mask mands outside the normal
duties of the receiver. In the same way, Stross (1964) found that
"please" was used only for requested acts extraneous to duties.
We can expect that where variant address forms exist, they might alternate in mands. Milla Ayoub (1962), in a discussion of bipolar kin terms in Arabic, points out that in addition to proper names, a mother can call her son by either of two terms that also can mean "my mother." When a parent wishes to cajole or placate a child, but not command him, he uses these bipolar terms. This is particularly the case with sons. They are never used in direct commands.

In discussing current address practices in the Soviet Union, Kantorovich (1966) mentions that friends might switch from by to vy with first name and patronymic when help is asked for.

Episodes. Watson and Potter (1962) used the term episode as a unit of analysis, which can terminate whenever there is a change in the major participants, the role system of the participants, the focus of attention, and the relationship toward the focus of attention. This term, rather than topic, was chosen to differentiate cases where a similar apparent topic might be within a person's own experience, part of an ongoing activity, or an abstract referential category, as in a discussion.

The different episodes that Watson and Potter's units identify probably will find some reflections in formal changes. These shifts arise from:

a. Sequencing rules concerning speech acts within a speech event.
b. Changes in the activity, if any, accompanying the interaction (e.g., a ball game or dinner preparation).
c. Disruptive events such as the arrival of new personnel, accidents like bumps or sneezes, and phone calls, which require routines to right the situation.
d. Shifts arising from unexpected responses of alter, leading to changes in function.
e. Function satiation. Presumably, functions oscillate in patterned ways in stable groups.
f. Topic-evoked shifts in functions. Under the impact of instructions or of associative dynamics, the topic may change in the course of the conversation. These changes can alter the available resources for the participants and thereby
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change their intent. If the topic shifts from child rearing to economics, e.g., a bachelor may find he has greater re

sources for displaying knowledge and receiving recognition. He may speak more, use more technical vocabulary, perhaps even to the point that listeners do not understand. There were many such instances in studying the speech of bilinguals, in which topic and language were controlled by instructions (Ervin 1964; Ervin-Tripp 1964, 1967).

Blom and Gumperz (1972) found that among university-trained villagers, many features of standard Norwegian appeared when topics shifted from local to nonlocal. In the offering of information, speakers with a large repertoire of speech alternatives can maximize credibility by adopting the most suitable role. Thus discussion of university structure might elicit use of more standard Norwegian forms than would gossip about instructors, where student speech features would be adopted, especially those shared with addressees.

As functions change, address too may change through a conversation. David Day described in a term paper changes when an argument occurred in a class regarding an instructor's views of a student's beliefs. Address progressed from FN to Dr. LN to Professor LN. In comments with other students as addressee, LN was used in reference to the instructor, in front of him. Concurrently, slang decreased.

When there is agreement about the normal, unmarked address form to alters of specified statuses, then any shift can convey intent. Friedrich (1972) gives convincing cases of momentary shifts at times of personal crises. He points out that in a public setting friends would mask their intimacy with V; in talking of personal topics they would invoke their friendship with ty and remove it for impersonal topics with vy.

Kantorovich (1966:43) gives similar examples in current practice:

I say "ty" to my subordinates, but certainly don't do this in order to belittle them. I know that they'll answer me with "vy," but this isn't grovelling — it's a mark of respect...
Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice

Somebody I call "by" is somehow closer to me than someone I have to call "tv." . . . If I get mad at one of my workers, and he needs a bawling out, I frequently switch to "tv."

When cursing, many people who customarily use "by" suddenly switch to "tv," and many who are on a mutual "tv" basis switch to "by" (Kostomarova 1967).

In systems with age or rank asymmetry of address, the use of the more deferential form to an equal or subordinate can either mean that they are receiving respect or being put off at a distance. To account fully for the interpretation of such actions by the receivers, we need to know the other signals, such as tone of voice, other address features, and the available ambiguities of the relationship. In the case of courtship, e.g., the important dimension is closeness or distance, and address changes would be so interpreted.

Rules for switching. I have emphasized throughout this chapter that linguistic interaction is a system of behavior in which underlying functions are realized through an organized set of output rules within a social situation. If the function requires conveying an explicit message with informational content, some semantic information is presented in the alternatives selected. Other alternatives require the representation of social information.

In addressee-dominated rules like those in Figures 1 to 4, effects of function switching can be represented as transformations upon the unmarked outputs of the addressee rules. They may take the form of simple replacements, e.g., if familiarity exists, different names may be employed as a direct representation of varied functions. Thus a node or selector for familiarity and for function is added to the branching rules. Tyler's (1966) rules are of this type.

Blom and Gumperz (1972) have suggested that metaphorical switching simply consists of treating the addressee as though his social features were different. In this case, the rule acts upon the selection points. In the case of Dr. Poussaint, hostile intent was represented in the selection of "adult-" rather than "adult+" at the first selection point. Presumably, this possibility suggested itself by the existence of a traditional southern system of address to Blacks in which all but the very old (aunty) were addressed as children. When
Harvey Sacks asked his UCLA students to play the role of boarders with their families in vacation, their silence, politeness of address and requests, and withdrawal from gossip and semantic ellipsis in conversation were interpreted by their families as evidence of sickness or hostility.

The Russian example implies that a simple transformation upon the output forms can express hostility; however, the inversion may be a consequence of transformation of selection features, making the friend a nonfriend, and the formal associate an inferior. Such general rules are a necessity if familiarity is absent since they permit the interpretation of new instances on the basis of the hearer's general knowledge of the system of sociolinguistic rules.

"Rules" could refer to structures for generating or interpreting speech, to reports of beliefs about practices, or to standards of correctness. We have given examples of all three kinds of rules, not always clearly distinguishing them. Labov's (1966b) index of linguistic insecurity compared the last two.

Behavioral rules and reports about behavior are likely to be systematically different. If the norms contain a probability or frequency factor, speaker's beliefs are, instead, categorical (Labov 1966b). Beliefs about the social selectors in sociolinguistic rules are more likely to include features of personnel, since categorization devices realize these (Sacks) features, than to note functional variation. Syntactical variables are not remembered (Sacks 1967) beyond the time needed for decoding unless they are markers, helping us classify the speaker. In multilingual communities phonological, syntactic, and semantic shifting is often not observed (Gumperz 1964a, 1967). Even borrowed vocabulary is unnoticed by members if values oppose borrowing (Blom and Gumperz 1972). Some speakers cannot remember the language in which they just spoke, let alone report it to an interviewer.

These phenomena are not merely grounds for distrusting members' reports. Just as reference to a relative (Tyler 1972) is affected by more than the semantic dimensions of reference, so the act of describing, even to oneself, is a product which could realize a variety of functions. Member's reports are likely to be as sensitive to social variation as any speech act mentioned in this chapter, and
therefore prove as amenable to study. We expect then that rules based on report will have a systematic relation to behavioral consistencies, but not a one-to-one correspondence.

LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

A. The Fundamentals of Communication

The fundamental fact about language is its obvious diversity. Moving from country to country, region to region, class to class, and caste to caste, we find changes in language. Linguistic diversity apparently is related to social interaction.

Linguistic similarity must be explained, for it is clear that separated sets of speakers will develop different languages. Two quite different bases for similarity can be examined: the fundamental requirement of mutual intelligibility among people who belong to the same social community, and the consequences of variability in overt behavior in terms of social values.

A test for mutual intelligibility might be the Two Person Communication game. First used by Carroll (1958), it has recently been revived (Maclay and Newman 1960; Krauss and Weinheimer 1964; Brent and Katz 1967). A hearer out of sight of a speaker selects, constructs, or in some way responds to instructions from a speaker regarding a set of materials. Feedback may or may not be allowed. The advantage of this method is that one can examine the relation between success in the objective task and various speech features, and that the social relation of speaker and hearer can be controlled. For our question about the degree of similarity required for intelligibility, we shall assume optimal social attitudes (Wolff 1959) and simply concern ourselves with features of linguistic structure. No feedback is allowed, and we shall ask what the bare minimum of linguistic similarity might be that would allow successful transmission of messages about referents.

(1) There must be shared categories of meaning so that speakers will attend to the same features of the referent materials.

(2) There must be shared lexicon identifying the significant referents, attributes, relationships, and actions, and shared central
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meanings for this lexicon. Languages which are related and have
many cognates are instances.

(3) The shared lexicon must be recognizable. Thus its
morphophonemic realizations must be similar, and the phonological
and phonetic systems must be sufficiently alike to allow recognition
of the similar items. Precisely what these limitations entail is not
clear. Wurm and Laycock (1961) have shown that both phonetic and
phonemic differences can lead to asymmetrical intelligibility of cog-
nates among related dialects. They have found instances where A
understood B but not vice versa. They suggested use of a phonetic
hierarchy of rank to account for such cases. For instance, they
found that the speaker using a stop could understand a speaker using
a homologous fricative, but not the reverse. This suggestion is
important and needs further testing. I would have predicted the re-
verse, on the grounds that a speaker's repertoire in comprehension
includes child variants, which tend to be of 'higher rank' phonetically
than their adult models.

A second point they make is that the phonological system re-
lationships, i.e., those found in contrastive analysis, may allow pre-
dictions. We can suppose that one-to-one high frequency substitutions
might be easy to recognize where the phonetic realization, but not
the phonological system, is affected. Comprehension of foreign
accent is easiest in such cases. O'Neil (in press) found that Faroese
could understand Icelanders, but not vice versa, because of many-
to-one conversion rules.

Further, there must be some similarities in phonotactic
rules so that the lexical forms can be related. In instances of child-
ren's renditions of adult words, we often find that adults cannot com-
prehend because of the radical alteration in the word formation. Thus
[man] and [g an] are unlikely to be recognized as "banana" and "gun",
and [me] and [ni] in another child are even less likely to be recog-
nized as "blanket" and "candy", although each arises from regular
replacement rules (Ervin-Tripp 1966). In each case, the initial con-
sonant is nasal if a nasal occurs anywhere in the adult word, and it is
homologous with the initial consonant of the model word. Other word
length and syllable-forming canons differ for these two children.

(4) There must be shared order rules for the basic gram-
mathematical relations. By basic relations (McNeill 1966), we mean subject-verb, verb-object, and modifier-head. Unless these minimal structures can be identified, the communication of messages is not possible, although topics or labels could be listed. Of course, these order constraints do not apply where the lexical items could only express one of these relations, as often is the case.

There has been, to my knowledge, no research raising precisely the above structural questions and using the Two Person Communication game. Esper (1966) studied the transmission of linguistic forms through a series of speakers experimentally, employing referents and artificial languages but in a different procedure. He found surprisingly rapid morphological regularization, which suggests that this is the "natural" tendency historically, within socially isolated groups.

Stewart (1967) has commented on two natural instances of cross-language communication where precisely these factors might impair intelligibility. "Ah 'own know wey 'ey lib", he argued, contains sufficient changes in phonetic realizations, word-formation rules, and so on, to seriously impair recognition of "I don't know where they live". "Dey ain't like dat" is likely to be misunderstood as "They aren't like that" rather than "They didn't like that." The dialect translation of the first would be "Dey not like dat" or "Dey don't be like dat," depending on a semantic contrast, not realized in standard English, between momentary and repeated conditions. This second example indicates that the basic grammatical relations may be the same, but misunderstanding still remains possible. Of course, Stewart was not discussing the highly restricted referential situation of our experiment.

The fascinating permutations on this experimental procedure would permit testing many analogs of natural language change and language contact. We have predicted that when speaker A addresses listener B, under optimal social conditions, the success of the initial communication depends on structural relations between languages a and b. If B has had earlier experience with other speakers of a, we might expect him to have learned to translate features of a into b, to some extent. It must take some frequency of instances to recognize structural similarities. We already know that A will provide better instructions, even without any feedback, with time (if he is old
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enough) (Krauss and Weinheimer 1964). Where exchange is always unidirectional, B learns to understand language a to some degree, and becomes a 'passive bilingual'. Note that B is not just listening but is required by the task to perform actions; thus he is not like a television watcher.

If give-and-take can occur, it is conceivable that a third language, c, might develop, with shared properties drawn from a and b. Such a development would be like the growth of a pidgin between two monolinguals under the press of trade or other limited encounters (Reinecke 1938). One test of the degree to which c is actually intermediate between the other two, or a composite, is to test whether when c is the code, A can communicate more successfully with B than he first did with B. That is, we assume that if c is closer to b than was a, it should be a more efficient means of communication, even to a neophyte listener.

The encounter of speakers from different language communities has had a variety of outcomes in natural conditions, including mutual bilingualism, the evolution of a pidgin, and one-way bilingualism (Reinecke 1938; Weinreich 1953). It might be possible to explore the social conditions yielding these varied results by controlled manipulation of conditions.

An important feature of this procedure is that it can allow separate assessment of comprehension and speech similarity. If system a is understood or perhaps translated into b by the listener, there is no implication that B necessarily can speak language a. It is quite a separate issue whether features of a enter into the speech of B; under some social conditions, features could perhaps be transmitted without comprehension.

Several recent studies of intergroup 'comprehension' make the issue of objective measurement of intelligibility important. Peisach (1965) has studied replacement of omitted items (the Cloze procedure) in passages of children's speech. She found that middle class children do better than lower class children in replacing every nth word verbatim in the middle class samples of speech, and on the lower class speech they do as well as the lower class children. When similarity of grammatical category alone is considered, she found Negro speech replaceable equally by all, but white speech easier
for the middle class children (and for white children). The Cloze procedure requires actual emission of the appropriate response. It can be considered a form of comprehension test only if one believes in the "analysis-by-synthesis" theory of comprehension; it is not, on its face, a comprehension measure. Another way of stating the results is that middle class children can predict and imitate lower class and Negro speech, but lower class and Negro children are unwilling (or unable) to produce middle class and white speech by the fifth grade. Harms (1961) found the opposite among adults, who "understood" speakers of high social rank best, or of their own level when using Cloze.

Labov and Cohen (1967) have some striking evidence suggesting that many Negro children, also in New York, can comprehend but not produce standard English. Many of the children highly motivated to imitate sentences gave back "I asked Alvin if he knows how to play basketball" as "I asks Alvin do he know how to play basketball." These translations are regarded by the children as accurate imitations. Likewise "Nobody ever saw that game" would become "Nobody never saw that game". For the grammatical differences not arising by deletion rules out of the standard grammar, the children frequently understood but were not able to produce the standard forms. Nor did they notice the difference, going directly to the meaning (Jacqueline Sachs 1967).

Two groups can communicate extremely well, indeed perfectly, though they speak different languages. Multilingual conversations are an everyday occurrence in many social milieux. There may be interspersed lexical borrowings in both languages, but if there is a common semantic core, mutual communication can survive very different realization rules.

If it is the case that the social life of a community could be carried on without speech similarity, then we cannot explain language similarity solely by the demands of basic communication. A more profound account is needed.

B. Communicative Frequency

A common explanation for the evidence of linguistic similarity and its distribution is the frequency of communication between
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speakers. The most obvious determinants of frequency are proximity, work, power, and liking. If one undertakes to write a rule predicting who will speak to whom, with a given intent, proximity always enters into the rule. Thus in housing projects, people at positions near high-traffic points are talked with more; in classrooms, neighbors become acquainted; and in small groups, seating controls interchange frequency (Hare and Bales 1963).

Some selection factors may make proximity secondary, except as a cost component, so that we find people commuting hours to a place of work or flying six thousand miles to a conference. In small groups, resources or status, assigned or assumed, may increase frequency of interchange (Bales et al. 1951). Considerable research suggests that people select "similar" addressees for social interaction, which, in turn, increases their liking. Homans, in fact, pointed out that the interaction arising from sheer proximity could create "sentiments" (1950) and thereby increase liking. All of these features which measurably increase interaction in studies of face-to-face groups have cumulative effects that are visible sociologically.

These features of face-to-face interaction compounded over many individuals should be evident in the geographical distribution of linguistic features. One of the oldest forms of sociolinguistics is dialect geography. The distribution of particular speech features is mapped, the boundaries being isoglosses. Normally these are not identical for different speech features. Extensive studies have been made of such distributions in Europe and in the United States—for instance, of bag vs. sack, grea/s/y vs. grea/z/y. In general, linguistic features reveal the patterns of migration, intermarriage, and transportation routes. If there are natural barriers or social barriers to marriage or friendship, isoglosses may appear. Thus, McDavid (1951) noted that the rise of the large northern ghettos in the past 40 years has led to an increase in the linguistic distance between northern whites and Negroes. Individual lexical items may follow the salesman: 'tonic' is used in the Boston marketing area for soft drinks, and 'chesterfield' for couch or sofa in the San Francisco wholesale region.

The political boundaries between communities are sharp but may not seriously affect interaction frequency over time. This we
can infer from the fact that isoglosses do not match political boundaries. Isoglosses often do not even correspond with each other; that is, individual features may not diffuse at the same time or in the same way. Changes, as one would expect on a frequency model, are gradual. Gumperz (1958), in a study of phonemic isoglosses, found that changes were gradual even within the isoglosses. The functional load or practical importance of the contrast gradually decreased until it disappeared, and the phonetic distinctiveness also decreased.

The most extreme test of the argument that frequency of communication reduces speech diversity occurs in bilingual contacts. Gumperz (1967) located a border region between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian speaking sectors of India in which speakers were bilingual, using Marathi and Kannada in different settings. These border dialects have become increasingly similar in centuries of bilingualism. They have the same semantic features, syntax, and phonology, and differ only in the phonemic shape of morphemes, what we might call the vocabulary and function words. Each dialect is essentially a morpheme-by-morpheme translation of the other. However, other speakers of Kannada still identify this dialect as a form of Kannada because they recognize its morphemes—it is simply a deviant form, as Jamaican Creole is a deviant form of English.

This example illustrates both convergence of speech with high interaction frequency, and the maintenance of contrast. The convergence occurs at those levels of language we believe are least conscious and least criterial for the identification of the language. Speakers tend to identify languages by the shape of the morphemes, by the vocabulary, but even more by its function words and inflectional and derivational morphemes. The Kannada-Marathi example demonstrates that in spite of high contact frequency, speakers may insist on maintaining linguistic diversity, and that they may, in fact, believe it to be greater than it is.

There are many instances, to be discussed later, where frequency is high but speech distinctiveness is maintained. Castes in India interact with high frequency; Negro servants in the United States interact with employers; lower class pupils interact with teachers; and Spanish-speaking grandmothers interact with English-speaking grandsons—yet diversity persists.
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High frequency of communication is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for increased linguistic similarity. High frequency of communication must result, at a minimum, in passive bilingualism of both parties, active bilingualism of one party, or a lingua franca. The only necessity is that each understand the speech of the other.

We do not yet know what the consequences of passive control of two systems must be. Active control typically leads to convergence at certain levels, starting with semantic boundaries and frequency of syntactic options (Earle 1967; Ervin 1961; McNeill 1966; Ervin-Tripp 1967). We have argued that there are cognitive reasons for such fusions and that they tend to take place when social conditions, such as contact with monolinguals, reading, and strong values about co-occurrence restrictions, do not provide strong support for system separation. Presumably, passive control of a second language has less impact.

Only one study has directly related the communication frequency of individual persons who all communicate to speech similarity. Hammer et al. (1965) measured the observed centrality of individuals, and also the person-to-person frequency for every pair in a New York coffee shop with a regular clientele. They obtained speech samples and used the Close procedure. Central persons were most predictable, and each person most successfully predicted the omitted items from the speech of persons with whom he interacted most.

It is not quite clear what is measured in Cloze. All phonological features are missing. What is included are semantic factors that influence collocations, vocabulary, and perhaps some aspects of grammar. This study at first seems to support frequency as a critical variable in similarity, but it may not actually meet the critical limitations. The study was done in a social setting, interaction was social, and the members were parts of friendship networks. That is, some third variable may have determined both interaction frequency and similarity on Cloze. The hidden variable seems to be cohesiveness.

C. Cohesiveness and Linguistic Diversity

It seems that people talk like those with whom they have the closest social ties. We do not know precisely why this is the case;
it may be that the features of social relationships which bring about this result are not the same for all types of speech similarity. In social networks and groups, there is a high frequency of interaction. The high attraction of others in the group or network means that they not only serve as models but can also act as reinforcing agents in their responses to speech, affecting attitudes toward features in the community repertoire. In addition, there might be secondary reinforcement in sounding like a valued person.

All levels of speech appear to be affected. With respect to the phonetic realization of phonemes, age may constrain changes in the system. Even under optimal conditions, many persons over 12 years old seem to have difficulty changing their phonetic realization rules except under careful monitoring.

Labov (1966) has argued that the everyday vernacular is stabilized by puberty on the basis of the peer model. Cultures where peer ties are weaker (if any exist) would provide a valuable comparison.

The functions of communication in cohesive networks necessarily include a high frequency of requests for social reinforcement, and of expressive speech. The social group may or may not be concerned with information and opinion exchange for its own sake. Davis (1961), in a study of the maintenance or dissolution of 'great books' discussion groups, found that if there were many members of a social network in such a group, its durability was enhanced for college-educated members and decreased for noncollege-educated. He suggested that for the latter there might be a conflict between interaction practices in the network and the constraints of the discussion group. Boscard (1945) commented on large differences between families in the extent of information-exchange in dinner table conversation.

The most ingenious work on interfamily differences in communication has been conducted by Basil Bernstein. He has pointed out (1968, 1972) that communicative patterns and socialization methods within families are related to occupational roles and to the character of a family's social network. Empirical support was found in mothers' reports of use of appeals to children, emphasis on different functions of language, and encouragement of interaction. In turn, London five-
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year-olds differed by social class (and by mothers' reports) in the variety of nouns and adjectives, use of relative clauses, use of pro-
nouns with extraverbal referents, and in ability to switch style with task. That some of these differences may reflect performance customs rather than capacity is suggested by the report of Cowan (1967) that American working class children, though less successful than middle class children on the Two Person Communication game, learned fast when paired with middle class partners.

Hess and Shipman (1965), who observed actual mother–child interaction in Negro preschool families, found considerable social class variation and between-family variation in the extent to which mothers used the situation to elicit labeling and informational communication from the children. The measures correlated two years later with oral comprehension. Schatzmann and Strauss (1955) found social class differences in oral narratives that may be related to Bernstein's distinction. See also Lawton (1964).

There has been too little study of natural interaction within social groups to extricate what the important differences are—whether they lie in the amount of interaction of children with adults vs. peers and siblings, whether there are differences in encounters with strangers and training of children in competence with outsiders, or whether there are differences in emphasis in intragroup speech functions.

Because evidence about the verbal skills of lower class Negroes came from formal testing situations and classrooms, there have been widespread misconceptions about "verbal deprivation" in American society, with expensive educational consequences. Recent investigators such as Labov and Cohen (1967) in Harlem and Eddington and Claudia Mitchell in San Francisco and Oakland have recorded natural interaction. All have found that Negro lower class speakers are highly verbal in terms of speech frequency. Both adolescents and children engage with great skill in verbal games for which they have complex traditions. "Controlled situations" may, in fact, obscure the very skills which have been most developed within a particular group.

"General verbal deprivation" could conceivably exist. It most probably would be found in unusual social isolation, or in cases
of social marginality, particularly where a language has been lost but there has not been full access to a range of functions in a second language. For further detailed discussion of research on this point and some new data, see Cazden (1966, 1967).

Topics of discourse are likely to be different in cohesive networks as a result of differing values and interests. This produces considerable impact on the semantic structure and lexicon.

One way of studying differences in messages arising from communication is to examine content shifts, under acculturation, where there may be radical changes in social allegiances. A study of this phenomenon in Japanese women married to Americans showed that there was considerable difference between women who gave messages typical of their agemates in Tokyo and those who were more like American women, even when speaking Japanese (Ervin-Tripp 1967). Word associations, sentence completions, TATs, story completions, and semantic differentials were all used in both languages. In general, the women who remained more Japanese in response content would rather be Japanese than American, preserve more Japanese customs, and keep up strong ties to Japan. The chief characteristics of the women who shifted to American responses were that they identified with American women, had close American friends, read American magazines, and met somewhat less opposition to their marriage from Japanese friends and family. The last point implies that in Japan they may have been less conservative. Though both sets of women would seem, on the surface, to have had a cohesive tie to an American partner, the interviews revealed striking differences.

Marriages in Japan involve far more social separation of husband and wife than here; for example, there is little joint socializing with non-kin. Many of the Japanese women in this country do not regard their husbands as confidants in trouble, and may, indeed, seldom see them. When either the husband or an American friend was regarded as a close confidant, the messages were more American. It is, in fact, not easy to give 'typically American' responses on many of these tests, so their ability to do so represents a considerable degree of subtle learning.

Semantic innovation is one of the striking features of cohesive groups. There may be new activities requiring new names; there may be finer discriminations required along continua; and there may
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be new conceptual categories. These are realized by lexical innovations which spread within the network. Examples are "she's in high drag" in the homosexual network, referring to a male homosexual in women's clothing (Cory 1952); "prat", "breach", "insider", "tail pit", and "fob", pickpocket jargon for pockets (Conwell 1937); "cooling the mark out" by the confidence man (Goffman 1952); and "trivial" or "motivated", and "reflective", terms used among transformationalists and ethnographers respectively, with special meanings. Many examples can be found in Mauer (1962).

A glimpse of the working of this process can be seen in the Two Person Communicative game.

Krauss and Weinheimer (1964) found that reference phrases became abbreviated with practice. Given the limitation on necessary referential distinctions, abbreviated coding is efficient. The result is not merely a change in the external shape of the form but a semantic shift, since the simplest term comes to have the specific meaning of the highly qualified phrase. The authors mention analogies like "hypo" among photographers and "comps" among graduate students.

Brent and Katz (1967) made comparisons of types of coding of drawings by middle class whites and by Negro Job Corps teenagers. Unfortunately, they used geometric shapes, which gives a distinct advantage to subjects who are formally educated. They found that the Negro subjects were relatively successful although they used non-technical names like "sharp-pointed piece", "a square wiggling", and "the funny looking piece". It would be an advantage to use materials equally strange or equally familiar to both groups and to control network features of the speaker and listener. We have strong evidence that members of the same social group prefer nontechnical communication. Where materials are neutral (e.g., nonsense forms), nontechnical, highly metaphorical communication is most efficient in terms of both brevity and success in a nonfeedback condition.

Even though the semantic distinctions made are not new, group jargon or new morphophonemic realizations for lexical categories are common in cohesive groups. Occasionally, such terminology arises to allow secrecy before outsiders (though Conwell and Mauer commented that secrecy is better served by semantic shift employing conventional morphemes). New morphemes are the most
apparent mark of an ingroup, whether or not they realize novel semantic distinctions. In fact, the best test for the symbolic value of the marker is whether it has referential meaning and, if so, whether it is translatable. Conwell (1937) pointed out that the pickpocket's terminology is not used before outsiders, but it is used to test the trustworthiness of a member of the network and to find how much he knows. In simple terms, the use of such terms can symbolize membership if the group is large or boundary maintenance is important; if the group is small, like a family, and its members known, the terms are used to indicate solidarity. Bossard (1945) cited examples of family words; many baby words or nicknames survive with such social meanings.

Where the incidence of social or regional dialect difference coincides with density of friendship network, the structural dialect features, including syntax and phonology, may come to be markers of cohesiveness. Blom and Gumperz (1972) found that the local dialect of Hemniserget, Norway, had this significance to its residents.

Labov (1963) observed that the rate of dialect change was different in Martha's Vineyard among young men, depending upon their social loyalties. There was a change in progress very markedly differentiating young men from their grandparents. The men who went along in this direction were those who had the strongest local ties and did not want to move off-island. It is not clear whether or not interaction frequencies were also affected by the different values. The effects showed up in articulation.

Strong social ties affect all aspects of linguistic systems; our evidence suggests that the most quickly affected are the semantic system and lexicon — in short, the vocabulary. The structural morphemes evidently are not as sensitive to the forces of cohesion as are other morphemes.

D. Identity Marking

Every society is differentiated by age and sex; in addition, rank, occupational identities, and other categories will be found. Since the rights and duties of its members are a function of these identities, it is of great social importance to establish high visibility for them. Sometimes this has been done by legislation controlling permissible clothing, house type, and so on. Everywhere it seems to
be the case that information about social identity is contained in speech variables. In urban societies, the social function of such marking is greater, since it may be the only information available; on the other hand, the social sanctions for violation may be reduced. McCormack (1960) has noted the spread of upper caste dialect features in urban lower caste speakers in India.

In some cases, there may be more frequent communication within, rather than between, categories. Clearly, this is not always the case; within the western family, communication occurs with high frequency across both sex and age categories. Therefore, something other than frequency of communication or group cohesion must account for the preservation of speech diversity which marks social identity.

It is not precisely clear what features of speech mark sex in the United States. In some languages (Haas 1957; Martin, in Hymes 1964) lexicon, function words, and phonological rules are different for males and females. The study of the training of boys by women in such societies would be enlightening. There are clearly topical differences arising from occupational and family status and, therefore, possibly semantic differences and differences in lexical repertoire. Masculinity-femininity tests have leaned heavily on differences in lexicon, particularly in the meanings realized, or in collocations. Sociolinguistic rules are probably not the same; e.g., speech etiquette concerning taboo words. Men and women do not use terms of address in quite the same way, and young women, at least, use more deferential request forms than young men. In fact, it is commonly the case in many languages that women employ more deferential speech, but one can expect that such differences are related to other indicators of relative rank. For example, in jury deliberations (Strodtbeck et al. 1957), women are several steps lower in social class, in terms of their speech frequency and evaluation by fellow jurors. Labov (1966) and Levine and Crockett (1966) found more situational style shifting by women; Fischer (1958) recorded the formal "-ing" suffix relatively more often from girls than boys.

Age differences in speech arise both through language change and age-grading. Though grandparent and grandchild may communicate, they are unlikely to have the same system. Labov (1963, 1966a) related
several such changes to current distributions. For instance, he points out the spread of "n" in New York City. In the top social class, in casual speech, "n" was used by only 43% of the respondents over 40 years old but by twice as many of the younger respondents. Changes like ice box–refrigerator (for the latter object), and victrola–phonograph–record player–stereo are apparent to all of us.

In addition, certain lexicon or structures may be considered inappropriate at a particular age. Newman (1954) remarked that slang is for the young Zunis. Children over a certain age are expected to stop using nursery terms like "bunny", "piggy", "potty", and "horseie", except in addressing infants. Pig Latin and other playful transforms (Conklin 1959) may be age-restricted. Stewart has claimed that a form he calls "basilect" is learned among Washington, D.C. Negroes from their peers in early childhood and begins to disappear, under negative sanctions, around age 7 or 8. Adolescents studied in New York (Labov and Cohen 1967) had forms similar to the adolescent speech of some Washington D.C. speakers, including two features absent in standard English: a completive or intensive–perfective "I done seen it" or "I done forgot it" (semantically contrasted with the simple past or perfect); and a distinction with be analogous to the distinction between habitual use and momentary or ongoing action (a distinction made in the standard language only for other action verbs): "He be with us all the time", vs. "He with us right now" (He walks every day vs. He's walking right now).

Many statuses entail the learning of specialized languages or superposed varieties. The Brahmin, for example, is likely to have studied English and to have many more borrowings in his speech than the non-Brahmin. Brahmins can sometimes be identified by such borrowed forms or by literary vocabulary (McCormack 1960), just as psychologists' occupational register can identify them. In addition, the functions and topics imposed by occupations can alter the speech of parents in the home, and in "anticipatory socialization" the children from different occupational milieus may be affected.

One way to differentiate similarity arising from cohesion from difference arising from identity marking is the presence of negative sanctions. Ramanujan pointed out (1967) that Brahmin parents specifically reject non-Brahmin items or use them with pejorative connotations. The Brahmins show, in several respects, that
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they value the preservation of markers of their identity. They con-
sciously borrow more foreign forms and preserve their phonological
deviance so that their phonological repertoire is very large. They
have maintained more morphological irregularities (like our strong
verbs) in their development of various inflectional paradigms, even
though the evidence suggests that the earlier language (now written)
was more regular. The evidence from the Esper experiment (1966)
and the evolution of the non-Brahmin dialects is that regularization is
the more normal destiny unless some factor interferes. In cases of
phonological difference from the non-Brahmin dialects, in the real-
ization of cognates, they have, in morphemes where the realizations
fall together in the two dialects and would thus be indistinguishable,
novated a distinction. The semantic space is far more differentiated,
as in the lexicon. The learning of a language full of irregularities
is obviously more difficult — every child spontaneously regularizes.
Like the Mandarin learning Chinese characters, the Brahmin puts
additional effort into the maintenance of an elite dialect because the
reward is its distinctive marking of his identity.

One might assume that lower castes would adopt prestige
speech, and there is, as cited earlier, some evidence of such tenden-
cies in urban milieus. One way of preventing such spread is the use of
a non-Brahmin style when addressing non-Brahmins which, of course,
reduces frequency of exposure. In addition, there are sanctions
against such emulation.

American Negro speech may provide an example of identity
marking although the evidence is ambiguous. Stewart has argued
(1967) that Negro speech is based on creoles used in the early slave
period, and that this history accounts for some of the basic semantic
and syntactical differences Labov and Cohen (1967) have recently
cited, which appear in various black communities all over the country.
Labov has suggested that working class casual speech features connote
solidarity, reducing the impact of standard English heard in school
on casual style.

Certainly the clearest evidence of the identity-marking func-
tion of language is language maintenance during contact. Fishman
(1966) has extensively discussed various features of language main-
tenance programs. Although the dominant groups in the United States
have strongly favored language shift by immigrants, to the point of
legislating against vernacular education, some groups continued to resist the loss of their language. Those who succeeded best, according to Kloss (in Fishman 1966), did so either by total isolation (like the Canadian Dukhobors) or by living in sufficiently dense concentrations to allow a high frequency of ingroup communication and the use of their language for the widest range of social functions. In particular, many maintained their own educational facilities, e.g., Chinese, Japanese, and Russians, promoting in-group cohesion among the children. A critical turning point lies in the speech practices of teen-agers. Where they are forced to mix with outsiders in large urban schools or consolidated rural school districts, the group language tends to disappear.

In parts of the world where there is a stabilized condition of great language diversity, as in Africa and Asia, it is quite normal to retain the group vernacular as a home language but to be bilingual for wider communication. Probably the degree of language distance in these cases is relatively small, as Gumperz has pointed out (1967). In these instances, the shape of morphemes is an important identity marker; shifting between co-occurrent sets of morphemes by such bilinguals is merely a more extreme instance of the small group vocabulary of the family, stabilized through time by endogamy and by the high value placed on group identity markers.

An extreme case in the opposite direction occurs in initial invention of pidgins. Here values of identity may be unimportant, and the practical need to communicate dominates. In fact, pidgins tend to develop when the norms which sustain co-occurrence rules are missing. Thus they appear in the transitory encounters of traders away from home, in the fortuitous combination of diverse speakers in the setting of work—in plantations, mines, and harbor cities. In this respect, African urbanization and slavery shared a feature, and we may guess that earlier circumstances of urbanization also gave rise to pidgins. Pidgins are characterized structurally by morphological simplification and regularization, and by use of material from more than one language. At first, they are spoken with the phonetic features of the respective mother tongues. Of course, with time the pidgin can come to symbolize the subordinate-employer relation. Temporary communication systems much like pidgins occur widely in contact conditions in the United States. These situations have never been given the serious study they deserve.
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When a pidgin becomes the mother tongue of its speakers
(and thereby technically a creole), it may acquire all the values of
group identity of other vernaculars. Meredith (1964) quoted a speak-
er of Hawaiian Pidgin (a creole language) who was subjected to a
university requirement of mastery of standard English: "Why you
try change me? I no want to speak like damn haole!" Meredith re-
ported "hostility, disinterest, and resistance to change" in the re-
medial class. The changes in the functions and structure of pidgins
which become mother tongues can be studied by comparing second-
language speakers with their children for whom it is a mother tongue
(Sankoff and Laberge 1971).

E. Attitudes Toward Speech Diversity

In studying phonological diversity in New York City speech,
Labov (1966) identified three different categories of social phenomena
arising from diversity. These he called "indicators", "markers", and "stereotypes"

Indicators are features which are noted only by the trained
observer. For example, few people are aware that "cot" and "caught"
are distinguished in some areas and not in others. Indicators are fea-
tures which are functions of social indices like class or region but neither
vary with style in a given speaker nor enter into beliefs about language.

Markers, in Labov's system, vary with both group mem-
ship and style of the speaker, and can be used in role-switching. In
the New York City system, he found that "r", "oh", and "eh" were
very powerful markers, in that they changed radically according to
the self-monitoring of the speaker. In Fig. 5, the use of less [t] and
more [th] with increased self-monitoring is shown by the slopes. A
speaker who in rapid excited speech might say, "It wasn't a good
day but a bid one", or "Ian saw tree cans goin by," might in reading say
"bad", and "Ann saw three cars going by".

Stereotypes, like their social counterparts, may or may not
conform to social reality, and tend to be categorical. Thus, although
a working class man might use [t] or [d] only 40% to 50% of the time,
he will be heard as always saying "dis", "dat", and "ting". Evi-
dence suggests that children notice differences like "bath" vs. "baf".
and "window" vs. "winda", though they may ignore simple phonetic shifts.

**Hypercorrection** involves the spread of a speech feature from a higher prestige group to another, with overgeneralization of the feature based on a categorical stereotype. In Fig. 6, the upper middle class used "r" considerably less in self-conscious speech than did the lower middle class, who believed it to be characteristic of the best speech. A more common example can be seen in the contrast between standard English "He and I came" and nonstandard "Him and me came". Hypercorrect versions can be found which yield "She wrote to him and I" or "She wrote to he and I". Lexical examples were given by Ian Ross (1956) and even by Emily Post (1922); usually these are instances of the extension of formal, literary, or commercial vocabulary into casual speech. Labov (1966) has shown that hypercorrection is greatest among speakers who score high on a Linguistic Insecurity Index, derived from comparison of what they report they say and what they select as correct in pairs which, in fact, are not markers. Levine and Crockett (1966) also found that the second highest group shifted most with style.

Blau (1956) has observed a very similar phenomenon among upwardly mobile persons in quite different measures of insecurity: These people report more nervousness, are more likely to discriminate against Negro neighbors than any other types, and in these respects the members of high and low social classes are more alike than the intermediate people, provided they are mobile.

Labov (1966) has suggested that there may be "unconscious" stereotypes which account for borrowings which are not from prestige groups. He suggested that the masculinity connotation of working class casual speech might be such an instance. His measure of subjective reaction to speech samples required subjects to rank the speaker occupationally, thus, clearly asking for social class stereotypes rather than features implying some other social meaning.

The richest variety of work along this line is that of Lambert (1963, 1967a) and his collaborators, who have had the same speaker use "guises" to produce samples. These then are rated for a great range of features like personality, intelligence, and physical traits. French Canadians, he found, rated a "French guise" as less intelli-
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...gent and less a leader than the English-Canadian guise. In a study in Israel (Lambert et al. 1965), on the other hand, it was found that Arabic-speaking and Hebrew-speaking subjects had mutually hostile stereotypes when judging the guises. Tucker and Lambert (1967) found that evaluation by northern white and southern Negro college students differed in that Mississippi Negro college speech was least favored by the whites, and southern educated white speech least favored by the Negroes. Top-valued forms were the same for both groups.

Harms (1961) recorded speech from different social classes and found that 10-15 second samples could be differentiated by listeners. Regardless of their own class, they rated high-ranked speakers as more credible. This method, like that of Lambert's, does not allow isolation of the critical linguistic features. Lambert, on the other hand, has been able to identify a far wider range of social meanings in the speech variations than did the single scales of Labov and of Harms.

Triandis et al. (1966) tried to balance various sources of judgment by counterbalancing race, messages (on discrimination legislation), and standard vs. nonstandard grammar. Slides were shown while a tape was played. College students who were uninfluenced by race as "liberals" were still much influenced by grammar, even more than by the message, in their judgment of the man's character, ideas, value, and social acceptability. Three-fourths of the variance on admiration and evaluation is carried by the linguistic contrast. A new test for liberals might be this: "Would you want your daughter to marry a man who says ain't?"

Some consequences of these stereotypes about language can be seen in Rosenthal and Jackson's (1966) finding that IQ scores of pupils during a year rose 15 points when teachers were told arbitrary children were "fast gainers". Linguistic variables may convey the same message.

F. Rules for Diversity

William Labov has begun to use his large collection of material on speech of different New York City groups to discover rules accounting both for stylistic and intergroup diversity quantitatively.

...
He has been able to use quantitative functions because he has been measuring articulation ranges and frequencies of occurrence as speech variables, as well as using quantitative measures of social variables. Thus the rules he has found are not categorical in structure like those in an earlier section.

Figure 5 shows that a phonetic feature is a linear function both of social class and of style. Because of the apparently regular change with style, Labov hypothesized that there is a single dimension he called "self-monitoring" underlying the style differences. Obviously, the relationship can be expressed by a linear equation in which the phonetic variable = \( a \) (class) + \( b \) (style) + \( c \).

In the case of hypercorrection of the kind shown in Fig. 6, the measure of linguistic insecurity can be used as a function of style, increasing its slope. For such phonetic variables, the function is \( a \) (class) + \( b \) (style) (Linguistic Insecurity Index) + \( c \). Some adjustments are made for age as well, since there is an interaction of age, class, and norms.

These rules are important innovations. They treat linguistic phenomena as continuous variables. Whether the use of continuous measures is possible except at the phonetic and semantic edge of linguistics is not clear; frequencies certainly are quantifiable for discrete categories too. The rules, like those in an earlier section, introduce social features as integral components. Normally, social features are mentioned in linguistic descriptions as a last resort, such as in a few style variations like those in Japanese where morphological rules must consider addressees. Finally, they include, in a single formal description, the differences between speakers and the differences within speakers. The fact that this is possible is impressive evidence of the existence of an over-all sociolinguistic system larger than the cognitive structure of members individually. As Labov has pointed out, a single member sees the system only along the coordinates of his own position in it; he only witnesses the full style variation of his own social peers. In fact, the possibility of writing rules which transcend class suggests a new criterion for a speech community.

We have argued that the distribution of features of speech and of mutual intelligibility across people shows discontinuities, and that
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these are based on social cohesiveness in networks and on boundary-marking to maintain group identity, as well as on frequency of interaction. These same forces must affect the distribution of sociolinguistic rules. A particular greeting form may be used uniquely in a particular group; the conditions determining when greetings shall occur could also vary, and serve as boundary markers. One suspects, however, that these rules are somewhat less subject to conscious control than vocabulary selection, and may be considerably harder for an outsider to learn.

Such delicate differences as whether one can say "Yes, Professor" without a last name can indicate group membership as surely as features of accent or vocabulary. This address form is impossible under the rule in Figure 1, and could be used only by an outsider, or as an allusion to outsiders.

Performance in speech events which are special to a group may be a kind of test of membership, of secret knowledge. Members who disseminate cultural knowledge to outsiders could be viewed by some as displaying the group's prowess, or by others as betraying secrets useful for defining boundaries. The attitude of members to cooperation on research on sociolinguistics thus becomes itself a datum about the functions of those rules in the group.

Just as alternation rules and the structure of speech events must be learned, so code and register shifting is not random. The linguistic features available for shifting, the types of co-occurrence rules, and the social meaning of various kinds of shifting could vary in various networks since shifting is used for communicative purposes (Gumperz and Hernandez-Ch. 1971).

Linguistic features provide us with new and sensitive indices of class or group identification, socialization and role-shifting. The precision with which these features can be specified makes them valuable for the study of on-going interaction. Linguistic interaction is deeply embedded in nearly all our social processes, in socialization in the family, into new occupations, and into a new social community. Sociolinguistic rules are central to, even if they do not totally compose the organized structure which generates our social acts and through which we interpret others. Just as the study of linguistic structure is seen by many as a penetrating route to cognitive struc-
ture in the speaking human, so may sociolinguistic rules lead to rules for social action. Through these rules we may be able to identify the acts which are the functional units of interaction, since rules, unlike arbitrary coding schemes, reflect the actor's own natural system.

NOTES

I am deeply indebted to John Gumperz and to William Labov for detailed commentary on a draft of this article, and to Dell Hymes and other members of the Sociolinguistics Committee of the Social Science Research Council, as well as to our work group in Berkeley, for discussions which have radically altered my view of this field. This article was written with the support of the Institute of Human Development and some aid from the Laboratory for Language-Behavior Research of the University of California. Elizabeth Closs Traugott provided some address data. Student work contributing to generalizations in the text included studies by Renée Ackerman, Lou Bilter, Camille Chamberlain, Judith Horner, Andrea Kaciff, Terrence Keene, Jane Logan, Dana Meyer, Paula Palmquist, Elaine Rogers, Joan von Schlegell, Elisabeth Selkirk, and Billi Wooley. Soviet material was provided by Dan Slobin. The major sections of this article have appeared before with minor revisions as: On sociolinguistic rules: alternation and co-occurrence, in Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication, edited by J.J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971, 218-250, and in Sociolinguistics, in Advances in experimental social psychology, edited by Leonard Berkowitz, New York, Academic Press, 1965, 4, 91-165.

Reference rules involve additional considerations such as the relation of the addressee and referent. If the addressee is of lower rank or age than both the referent and the speaker, then the speaker in Figure 1 employs the addressee's address term, e.g. Mrs. Jones may refer to her husband to address the addressers who know him as "Charles" to a friend, "Mr. Jones" to a servant, or "Daddy" to his child.

English occupational titles usually neutralize sex. The first woman appointee to the British High Court of Justice produced an address crisis because the traditional occupational titles contained terms that in other contexts are selected by sex. "Mrs. Lane, like
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linguistic rules lead to rules may be able to identify the situation, since rules, unlike one's own natural system.

William Labov for detailed work and Dell Hymes and other members of the Social Science Rep- in Berkeley, for discussions of this field. This article of Human Development (a Behavior Research: Cross Traugott provides insight to generalizations in n, Lou Bilter, Camille f, Terrence Keeney, Jane Rogers, Joan von ley. Soviet material was as of this article have appearance-linguistic rules: as in sociolinguistics: by J. J. Gumperz and Dell eston, 1971, 218-259, and mental social psychology. Academic Press, 1968, 4. 11 considerations such as If the addressee is of the speaker, then the is address term, e.g. addressees who know him a servant, or "Daddy" fully neutralize sex. The Court of Justice produced occupational titles contained by sex. "Mrs. Lane, like the other justices, were by the lord chancellor's decree to be called 'My Lord' and 'Mr. Justice Lane.' His Lordship, Mr. Justice Lane, is also entitled by ancient judicial tradition to a bachelor knighthood." (Time, August 27, 1965.) Justices in British law wear wigs and robes, elaborating the status marking of the settings in which they act. The decision shows that to members, the terms are not sex indicators, and that the alternatives, "My Lady" and "Mrs. Justice Lane," would be sex marked rather than neutral, just as "chairwoman" is.

In the system shown in Fig. 1, it is possible to create asymmetrical address by using FN to a familiar addressee who cannot reciprocate because of rank or age difference and lack of dispensation, e.g. a domestic servant. Everett Hughes has noted a shift from TLN to FN by physicians whose patients moved from private fees to Medicare. Since this usage cannot be accommodated on Fig. 1, the patients have no recourse but to feel demeaned like Dr. Poussaint.

William Gechev has proposed that under very high conditions of familiarity as in village families, paralinguistic and other non-lexical cues are used, not lexical alternatives.

These rules will not account for the devoicing of [?] in ellipsis of underlying "what are" but not of "what did", so it is clear that rate rules should be rules operating on the realization of underlying features rather than surface changes as described here.
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