

УДК 81'27:81-11

ББК 81.001.2

DOI: 10.26140/bgз3-2020-0901-0051

**О ФЕНОМЕНЕ БИЛИНГВИЗМА: СОЦИОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ
И ПСИХОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТЫ**

© 2020

AuthorID: 401914

SPIN: 3474-3640

ResearcherID: V-4350-2017

ORCID: 0000-0002-3228-4277

ScopusID: 57193909061

Дзюбенко Анна Игоревна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры межкультурной коммуникации и методики преподавания иностранных языков

Богатырева Мессалина Александровна, магистрант 2 года обучения по направлению
«Педагогическое образование»

Южный федеральный университет

(344006, Россия, Ростов-на-Дону, ул. Б. Садовая, 105/42, e-mail: messalina.hamilton@gmail.com)

Аннотация. Одной из наиболее важных тенденций современного общества является особая роль в овладении вторым иностранным языком, который выступает в качестве своеобразной гарантии конкурентоспособности коммуникантов во все более глобализирующемся мире. Основная цель предлагаемой статьи состоит в стремлении приблизиться к раскрытию понятия билингвизма. Авторы анализируют существующие подходы к интерпретации данного понятия с различных точек зрения, особенно акцентируя его содержание в рамках двух теоретических позиций, которые позволяют раскрыть его сущность в аспекте его влияния на психические процессы коммуникантов и социальную структуру языкового сообщества в целом – с позиций психолингвистики и социолингвистики. Билингвизм, с одной стороны, является в достаточной степени однозначным термином, но, с другой стороны, является переменным и динамично развивающимся с течением времени, в связи с этим трудно дать его точное определение. Представители разнообразных научных направлений и школ пытались уточнить подходы к интерпретации данного понятия, принимая во внимание различные аспекты, такие как лингвистический, социологический, политический, культурный, психологический и педагогический. Более того, раскрывая понятие билингвизма, следует учитывать различие между билингвизмом отдельного индивида, владеющего двумя языками, и билингвизмом социальной группы, в которой используются два разных языка.

Ключевые слова: билингвизм, психолингвистика, социолингвистика, овладение вторым языком, диглоссия, инструментальная мотивация, интегративная мотивация.

**ON THE PHENOMENON OF BILINGUALISM: FROM SOCIOLINGUISTIC
AND PSYCHOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE**

© 2020

Dzyubenko Anna Igorevna, Ph.D in Linguistics, Assistant Professor, Intercultural Communication and Methodology of Foreign Languages Teaching Department

Bogatyreva Messalina Aleksandrovna, Post-Graduate Student

Southern Federal University

(344006, Russia, Rostov-on-Don, B. Sadovaya St., 105/42., e-mail: messalina.hamilton@gmail.com)

Abstract. One of the most unique characteristics of contemporary society is the importance assigned to the acquisition of a second language as the assurance of competitiveness in an increasingly globalized world. The main objective of this article is to approach the concept of bilingualism. Initially, a theoretical journey has been made to the definition of the concept of bilingualism. Subsequently, bilingualism has been analyzed from two theoretical perspectives that study the influence of bilingualism on the mental processes and social structure of a community: psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Bilingualism, on the one hand, is a slightly univocal term, but on the other, is variable and has evolved dynamically over time. As a result, it is difficult to determine with accuracy a unique definition since in the last decades several authors from different disciplines have tried to specify this concept. Various aspects, such as linguistic, sociological, political, cultural, psychological and pedagogical have been taken into account for its definition. Similarly, the distinction between bilingualism referred to a single individual and his relationship with two different languages, and the connection of bilingualism with a social group where two different languages are used is another factor to be considered when talking about bilingualism.

Keywords: bilingualism, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, acquisition of a second language, diglossia, instrumental motivation, integrative motivation.

INTRODUCTION

Initially, it is necessary to review the concept of bilingualism in order to determine whether there is a unified definition of it or if several descriptions of this concept can be established, taking into consideration that the term “bilingualism” is defined depending on a number of different factors: types, characteristics, disciplines, forms, etc. The article suggested is intended to make an analysis of bilingualism from two different theoretical perspectives, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. Psycholinguistics is understood as the science that analyses how bilingualism influences upon mental and cognitive processes while sociolinguistics studies the different aspects of bilingualism and its impact on the community or society, cultural norms and the context of interaction.

Bilingualism, on the one hand, is a slightly univocal term, but on the other, is variable and has evolved dynamically over time. As a result, it is difficult to determine with

accuracy a unique definition since in the last decades several authors from different disciplines have tried to specify this concept. Various aspects, such as linguistic, sociological, political, cultural, psychological and pedagogical have been taken into account for its definition. Similarly, the distinction between bilingualism referred to a single individual and his relationship with two different languages, and the connection of bilingualism with a social group where two different languages are used is another factor to be considered when talking about bilingualism.

L. Bloomfield [1, p.5] defined bilingualism as “native-like control of two languages”, while, in contrast, M. Mackey [2, p. 5; 3, p. 17] defined it as “the ability to use more than one language”. Similarly to Mackey, U. Weinreich [4, p. 24] defined bilingualism as “the practice of alternately using two languages” while E. Haugen [5, p.7] suggested “the point where a speaker can first produce complete meaningful utterances in the other language” to be a starting point for

defining bilingualism. H. Beaton Beardsmore compared these two extremes and described them as minimalist (Mackey, Weinreich, Haugen) and maximalist (Bloomfield) in approach [6, p. 63]. In contradistinction to Bloomfield's definition which implies only 'perfect bilinguals' J. Macnamara [7, p. 59] proposed that a bilingual is anyone who possesses a minimal competence in only one of the four language skills (listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing), in a language other than his mother tongue. For R. Titone bilingualism is the capacity of an individual to speak a second language while following the concepts and structures of that language rather than paraphrasing his or her mother tongue.

F. Grosjean [8, p. 4; 9, p. 63] regarded a bilingual as one of "those people who need and use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives". Still, there are more maximalist views that presuppose that bilingualism is a complete mastery of two different languages without interference. Likewise, P. Christopherson explained bilingualism as knowing two languages with approximately the same degree of perfection as unilingual speakers of each of those languages. There are also stances according to which bilingualism is interpreted as the phenomenon of competence and communication in two languages, that consists in the ability of the speaker to use two languages interchangeably, hence, a bilingual is the person who is capable of encoding and decoding linguistic cues from two different languages and, finally, the one who learns a set of meanings with two different linguistic representations. All these definitions were given by linguists, psychologists, sociologists and pedagogues based on the relationship of bilingualism with their disciplines.

METHODOLOGY

As already noted, there has been some gradual development in the definition of bilingualism. The initial concepts seem to be radical postulates that emphasize the idea of a balanced bilingual that has a complete command of both languages. For their part, the most recent statements cease to categorize or label bilingual individuals, and rather focus on describing or specifying their psychological development, cognitive organization or the impact of their cultural environment.

From a sociocultural perspective, A. Ramírez [10, p. 47] highlighted four types of bilingualism: stable, dynamic, transitional and vestigial. Stable bilingualism concerns the linguistic differentiation that occurs between two groups that share the same terrain, and the bilingual group is obligated to distinguish the use of one language and the other according to the sociolinguistic domains. Dynamic bilingualism is meant to be the differentiation between roles and use of different languages within the social situation shifts towards linguistic assimilation. As for transitional bilingualism, it reflects a shift towards the exclusive use of one of the languages to fulfil different communicative functions. What concerns vestigial bilingualism, it is the one that fulfils a symbolic function associated with a small minority that is about to become extinct.

Currently, there are several theoretical perspectives and directions of study on bilingualism. In this regard, G. Martínez [11, p. 39] distinguishes between three aspects: the psycholinguistic perspective, the sociolinguistic perspective, and the critical linguistic perspective. The linguistic perspective takes the language system as an object of study and does not deal with the problems of the individual concerning bilingualism. The sociolinguistic perspective focuses on how the language system is used in different social spheres depending on communicative circumstances and purposes. Finally, the critical linguistic perspective does not see bilingualism as the ability to speak two languages but to be aware of the sociocultural, political and ideological contexts in which language and speakers are placed and of the multiple meanings that emerge of these contexts.

The psycholinguistics of bilingualism is aimed at studying the processes involved in the production,

perception, comprehension and memorization of the bilingual's languages (spoken, written or signed) when used in a monolingual or a bilingual language mode [12, p. 164]. The issue of the independence of the bilingual's languages has been in the spotlight, with much research conducted, for example, on the coordinate-compound-subordinate distinction. According to it, there are three types of bilinguals: coordinate (the one who has two sets of meaning units and two modes of expression, one for each language (this means that the words of the two languages are separate entities), compound bilingual (has one set of meaning units and two modes of expression; it implies that for the same meaning there are "equivalent" words in different languages) or subordinate bilingual (has the meaning units of the first language and two modes of expression: that of the first language and that of the second, learned by means of the first; thus words of the stronger language are used to interpret the words of the weaker language). Nonetheless, there has not been conclusive evidence to substantiate such classification.

Many psycholinguistic studies have shown that bilingualism brings considerable advantages to cognitive and linguistic development of children. B. Bain [13, p. 8], J. Cummins [14, p. 42; 15, p. 33], E. Tunmer and M. Myhill [16, p. 176] demonstrated that bilingualism promotes the advancement of cognitive and linguistic skills for the most part superior to those of monolingual speakers. Contrasting views on bilingualism and its possible negative implications, such as social marginalization, intellectual and emotional difficulties, psychological and linguistic problems, among others, have been losing validity and interest in the field of psycholinguistics.

The sociolinguistics of bilingualism analyses different variations that occur between the social structure and the linguistic structure. According to S. Romaine [17, p. 17; 18, p. 258], bilingualism cannot be explained only from the science of linguistics but must be observed much further, within the cognitive, social and cultural dimensions.

In this sense, the sociolinguistic perspective of bilingualism includes such aspects as biculturalism, monoculturalism, acculturation, multiculturalism, linguistic choice, the relationship between language and identity, mastery and status of the language.

Another aspect recognized in the research carried out on bilingualism and its relationship with sociolinguistics is the phenomenon of diglossia, the coexistence of two varieties of the same language throughout a speech community. The first form (highly codified) is usually the literary or prestige dialect, and the other form (vernacular language variety) is a common dialect spoken by most of the population. Diglossia describes a particular type of sociolinguistic situation in which there is a clear differentiation in function between the languages or language varieties used in a bilingual/multilingual community.

The English equivalent of term 'diglossia' was introduced by the sociolinguist Charles A. Ferguson in 1959. The original description of diglossia according to him [19, p. 334] is: "Diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community for ordinary conversation."

According to Ch. Ferguson [19, p. 339], the H-variety (highly codified lect) and the L-variety (low variety, or vernacular language variety) are two divergent forms of the same language that are above the level of a standard-with-dialects distinction, but below the level of two separate (related or unrelated) languages. Characteristically, the H-variety is never used for everyday conversation and in this respect, a diglossic situation differs from a standard-with-

dialects situation in which the standard may also be used for everyday conversation.

Joshua Fishman [20, p. 31] presented a modification of Ch. Ferguson's original concept, proposing an expansion of Ferguson's fundamentalist definition of diglossia in two respects:

(1) A diglossic speech community is not characterized by the use of two language varieties only. There may be more than two language varieties used within a diglossic community.

(2) According to J. Fishman [20], diglossia refers to all kinds of language varieties which show functional distribution in a speech community. Diglossia, as a consequence, describes several of sociolinguistic situations, from stylistic differences within one language or the use of separate dialects (Ferguson's 'standard-with-dialects' distinction) to the use of (related or unrelated) separate languages.

When analyzing the phenomenon of bilingualism from the perspective of sociolinguistics it is important to mention the factors that affect the learning of a second language, including motivation, considered as the set of reasons that lead a person to be interested in learning a new language. In this regard, two kinds of motivation are discerned: instrumental motivation and integrative motivation. The term "instrumental motivation" refers to the decision to learn a second language in order to gain specific benefits such as improving their professional status, academic improvement, access to scientific and technological information, et cetera; viewing the language as an instrument to achieve pragmatic objectives. The term "integrative motivation" refers to the interest or desire to approach the culture of the target language, and even integrate it into the speaker's own culture.

RESULTS

In the modern world, the demand for bilingualism has grown due to economic, social, political and cultural factors. For instance, bilingual people have opportunities to earn more money, especially in populations with great numbers of immigrants, globalization and international business, etc. In many cases, the process of becoming bilingual is influenced by the social value that may arise from such a condition. A clear example of how the social context determines the vision on bilingualism can be seen in the same social definition. In Canada, a person who speaks English and French is considered bilingual, but a person who speaks English and knows the American Sign Language (ASL), or speaks French and knows la Langue des Signes Quebecoise (LSQ) is not. Analogously, a person who speaks standard Canadian French and Chiac, vernacular Acadian French, a variety of French perceived controversially by the dominant society, neither is considered bilingual. As it has been established, the main criteria to define bilingualism are competence and fluency in more than one language. However, sociolinguistic criteria for bilingualism are subjective and depend on the social validity, status and perception of social identity, culture, attitude, stereotypes and norms of interaction of different social groups.

For many decades linguists, psychologists and sociolinguistics have been trying to define or categorize bilingualism according to the relationship established between language and thought, the age of the acquisition of languages and the level of linguistic competence developed. The table below is a mainstream version of those classifications.

In this article, the description of characteristics of different types of bilingualism, based on various dimensions and facets, both at the individual as well as at social levels has been presented. Those dimensions are continuous and are not categorical constructs, moreover, most of them are usually interrelated. Therefore clear boundaries between different types of bilingualism within a given dimension cannot be drawn. We are witnessing the gradual development in bilingualism's interpretation as the originally proposed concepts seem to be radical postulates that emphasize the

idea of a balanced bilingual that has a complete command of both languages. However, the most recent statements cease to categorize or label bilingual individuals, and rather focus on describing or specifying their psychological development, cognitive organization or the impact of their cultural environment.

Table 1 – Classification of bilingualism types

Dimension	Typology	Description
According to the language level of each language	Full	A bilingual who uses both languages for communicative purposes.
	Incomplete	A bilingual whose mother tongue has been consolidated, but the second language is still under development.
The effect of learning L2 on the retention of L1 (in relation to the sociocultural status of two languages)	Additive	The two languages are valued equally, considering bilingualism as a cultural enrichment.
	Subtractive	One language is valued more than the other, and bilingualism is perceived as a threat of the loss of identity.
Functional ability	Receptive	A bilingual can understand but not produce L2 either in oral or written domains.
	Productive	A bilingual can understand and produce L2.
Age of acquisition	Early	Exposure to two languages from birth. Bilinguals who acquire two languages until the age of nine.
		Simultaneous (native) bilingualism
	Adolescent	When the two languages are learned at the same time, that is, simultaneously.
		Successive (sequential, acquired) bilingualism
Relationship between proficiencies in two languages	Balanced	When one of the languages is first learned and the other is acquired gradually afterwards.
	Dominant	A bilingual who acquired two languages between the age of ten and seventeen.
	Late	A bilingual who acquired L2 during adulthood.
Cultural identity	Bicultural	A bilingual who is equally proficient and competent in both languages.
	Monocultural in L1	Proficiency in one language is higher than the other language.
	Accultural in L2	Cultural identity is shaped by two cultures.
	Deculturated	Identity in one culture (L1).
Language social status and learning environment; literacy support of L1	Folk (circumstantial)	Loss of L1 culture, identity in L2.
	Elite (elective)	Identity in neither cultures.
		No or little additive value of L1 as a language minority status.
		A bilingual who belongs to a minority community whose language does not have a high status in the predominant language society in which they dwell.
		Additive value of L2.
		A bilingual who speaks a dominant language in a given society.

The concept of bilingualism has been approached from the standpoint of different disciplines and described from two theoretical perspectives: psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. An endeavour has been made to provide a holistic or comprehensive definition or understanding of bilingualism, which takes into account not only the linguistic perspective but also psychological, social and cultural aspects.

REFERENCE:

1. Bloomfield L. *Language*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.
2. Mackey William Francis *The Description of Bilingualism*. Toronto, 1962 // *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, Spring, Vol. 7, Issue 2, 1962. – P. 51-85.
3. Mackey W. F. *Bilingualism as a World Problem*. Montreal, Canada: Harvest House, 1967.
4. Weinreich U. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York, USA: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.
5. Haugen E. *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.
6. Baetens B. H. *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. 2nd ed. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, 1986.
7. Macnamara John *The bilingual's linguistic performance: A psychological overview, 1967* // *Journal of Social Issues*, Issues 23:2(58), 2010. — P. 58-77.
8. Grosjean F. *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
9. Grosjean F. *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
10. Ramirez A. *El español de los Estados Unidos: el lenguaje de los hispanos*. Madrid, Spain: MAPFRE, 1992.
11. Martinez G. *Mexican Americans and Language: Del dicho al hecho*. Tucson, USA: The University of Arizona Press, 2006.
12. Grosjean F. *The bilingual individual* // *International Journal of Research and Practice in Interpreting*, # 2 (1/2), 1998. – P. 163-187.
13. Bain B. *Toward an integration of Piaget and Vygotsky: Bilingual considerations*. *Linguistics*, Volume 13, Issue 160, Berlin, Germany: Mouton Publishers, 1975. – P.5-20.
14. Cummins J. *Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters* // *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, #19, 1979. – P. 21-129.
15. Cummins J. *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2000.
16. Tunmer E., Myhill, M. *Metalinguistic awareness and bilingualism* / Tunmer W.E., Pratt C., Herriman M.L. *Metalinguistic awareness in children*. Berlin, Germany: Springer Verlag, 1984. – P. 169-187.

17. Romaine S. *Bilingualism: Language in society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 1995.

18. Romaine S. *Bilingual language development* / M. Barrett (Ed.) *The Development of Language*, Sussex, UK: Psychology Press, 1999. – P. 251-275.

19. Ferguson C. *Diglossia* // *Word*, # 15, 1959. – P. 325-340.

20. Fishman J. A. *Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism* // *Journal of Social Issues*, # 32 (2), 1967. – P. 29-38.

Статья поступила в редакцию 22.10.2019

Статья принята к публикации 27.02.2020