

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE



National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

National Library
of CanadaBibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Division

Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

60214

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

NEUFELD, Darien

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

5-04-42

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

CANADA

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

B.P. 125
R.R.#1
Chelsea, Quebec

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE CODE-CHOICE
IN BILINGUAL INTERACTION

University — Université

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M.A. (Linguistics)

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1983

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Dr. Douglas Walker

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

March 8, 1982.

Signature

Darien Neufeld

ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE

CODE-CHOICE

IN BILINGUAL INTERACTION

by

Darien Neufeld

Thesis presented to the School of
Graduate Studies of the University
of Ottawa in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts.

Ottawa, January, 1982

© Darien Neufeld, Ottawa, Canada, 1983.

7

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA / UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
École des études supérieures/School of Graduate Studies
et de la recherche and Research

NAME OF AUTHOR NEUFELD, Darien

TITLE OF THESIS ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE CODE-CHOICE IN
BILINGUAL INTERACTION

DEGREE M.A. (Linguistics) YEAR GRANTED 1983

The author hereby permits the consultation and the lending of this thesis pursuant to the regulations established by the Librarian of the University of Ottawa. The author also authorizes the University of Ottawa, its successors and assignees, to make reproductions of this copy by photographic means or by photocopying and to lend or sell such reproductions at cost to libraries and to scholars requesting them.

The right to publish the thesis by other means and to sell it to the public is reserved to the author, subject to the regulations of the University of Ottawa governing the publication of theses.

(Signed) Darien Neufeld
(Author)

Date: March 8, 1982.

Permanent Address:

B.P. 125

R.R. #1

Chelsea, Quebec

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA / UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
École des études supérieures/School of Graduate Studies

Title of thesis ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE CODE-CHOICE IN BILINGUAL
INTERACTION

Name of candidate NEUFELD, Darien

Degree M.A. Department LINGUISTICS

Date of defence March 8, 1982.

This thesis prepared under the supervision of D. Walker has been approved by a jury
composed of the following examiners:

L. KELLY

S. POPLACK

Paul Hagen
(Dean of Graduate Studies)

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Douglas Walker for his guidance and encouragement throughout the writing of this thesis. As well, I wish to thank Professors Louis Kelly and Eta Schneiderman for their invaluable comments on various points in the thesis. And finally, I would like to extend my thanks to all of the professors and administrative personnel at the University of Ottawa who so graciously participated in the study.

ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE CODE CHOICE
IN BILINGUAL INTERACTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 - CODE SWITCHING, LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ACCOMMODATION
THEORY

I.	Introduction	p.	1
II.	Sociolinguistic Approaches to Code-Switching	p.	4
III.	Two Neglected Variables Affecting Code Choice	p.	18
IV.	Accommodation Theory	p.	24
V.	Moholingual vs. Bilingual Interaction: The Need for Further Exploration of the Accommodation Model	p.	36

CHAPTER 2 - THE STUDY: AIMS, METHODS AND PROCEDURES

I.	Aims of the Study	p.	44
II.	Methodological Considerations	p.	44
III.	Selection of Data Base and Subjects	p.	48
	A. Choice of Data Base	p.	48
	B. Selection of Subjects	p.	52
IV.	Instruments	P.	54
	A. Measure of Language Use and Attitudes toward Language Use	p.	54

B.	Measure of Attitudes toward Bilingualism	p.	58
C.	Scale of Attitude toward Language Learning, or "Linguaphilia"	p.	59
D.	Measure of Perceived Proficiency	p.	60
E.	Personality Measure	p.	63
V.	Procedures	P.	65
A.	Interview	p.	65
B.	Administration of Personality Measure	p.	67

CHAPTER 3 - ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I.	Preliminary Analysis	P.	69
A.	Transcription of Taped Interviews	p.	69
B.	Development of Primary Factors	p.	70
1.	Scales of Language Use	p.	71
2.	Scales of Attitudes on Bilingualism	p.	72
3.	Scales of Attitude toward Second Language Learning and "Linguaphilia"	p.	74
4.	Perceived Proficiency Scales	p.	76
5.	Personality Factors	p.	79
C.	Development of Secondary Factors	p.	82
II.	Results of Statistical Analysis	p.	85
A.	Language Use Factors: Ethnolinguistic Differences	p.	86
B.	Language Attitudes: Ethnolinguistic Differences	p.	89
C.	Perceived Proficiency	p.	91

D.	Personality Traits and Language Use	p. 91
E.	Personality Traits and Language Use: Ethnolinguistic Differences	p. 95
1.	Anglophones	p. 95
2.	Francophones	p. 99
3.	Summary	p. 101
F.	Language Attitudes and Personality Traits	p. 103
G.	Perceived Proficiency and Personality Traits	p. 106
H.	Language Use Factors, Attitudes and Perceived Proficiency: Ethno- linguistic Differences	p. 108
1.	Anglophones	p. 108
2.	Francophones	p. 117
 CHAPTER 4 - INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS		
I.	Introduction	p. 123
II.	Language Use Factors	p. 124
A.	Factor 1	p. 124
B.	Factor 2	p. 126
C.	Factor 3	p. 132
D.	Factor 4	p. 135
E.	Factor 5	p. 138
F.	Factor 6	p. 143
III.	Language Attitudes	p. 146
1.	Attitude Toward Teaching at a Bilingual University	p. 146

2. Attitude Toward Children
 Becoming Bilingual p. 152
3. Linguaphilia: Attitude Toward
 Second Language Learning and
 Attitude Toward Foreign Language
 Learning p. 157

CHAPTER 5 - ACCOMMODATION: MOTIVATION AND BEHAVIOR

- I. Introduction p. 166
- II. Measurement of Accommodative Motivation p. 168
- III. External Pressures on Speakers p. 174
 - A. The Social Side of Accommodation p. 175
 - B. Ethnolinguistic Pressure on Speakers p. 185
 - C. Second Language Proficiency
 of the Interlocutor p. 190
 - D. Situational Pressures p. 193
 1. Language of the Relationship p. 193
 2. Purpose of the Interaction p. 194
 3. Expected Language or Basic Ground
 Rules of the Situation p. 195
 4. Topic p. 197
- IV. Internal Pressures on Speakers p. 198
 - A. Second Language Proficiency
 of the Speaker p. 199
 - B. Personality Factors p. 204
 - C. Context in Which L2 was Learned p. 209
 - D. Aversion to Accents p. 210
 - E. Verbal Strategies p. 214
 - F. Mood p. 218

V.	Accommodative and Non-Accommodative, Personality Types	p. 221
A.	Profile of the Accommodative Individual	p. 221
B.	Profile of the Non-Accommodative Individual	p. 225
C.	Accommodative versus Non-Accommodative Personality Types	p. 228
VI.	Towards a Structure of Accommodation	p. 232
A.	Behavior, versus Motivation	p. 233
B.	Intent versus Perception	p. 234
C.	The Constants of Accommodation	p. 237
D.	The Variability of Accommodation	p. 239
CHAPTER 6 - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION		
I.	The Study	p. 243
II.	Summary of Findings	p. 245
III.	Discussion	p. 247
A.	Accommodation Theory	p. 247
B.	A Model of Code Use	p. 270
IV.	Limitations of the Study	p. 274
V.	Implications for Future Research	p. 278
BIBLIOGRAPHY		p. 283
APPENDIX 1 - PRELIMINARY OBSERVATION PHASE		p. 293

APPENDIX 2 - LANGUAGE BACKGROUND: INTERVIEW GUIDE	p. 298
APPENDIX 3 - LINGUAPHILIA SCALE (FRENCH FORM)	p. 300
APPENDIX 4 - POTENTIALLY ACCOMODATIVE LANGUAGE SITUATIONS (ENGLISH FORM)	p. 301
APPENDIX 5 - SCALE OF PERCEIVED SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY	p. 303

CHAPTER 1

CODE SWITCHING, LANGUAGE CHOICE AND ACCOMMODATION THEORY

I. INTRODUCTION

The urge to understand the mechanisms and motivations which lie behind bilinguals' code choice and switching of codes has prompted a great deal of research by linguists and sociolinguists over the years. Although the question has been approached from various angles, the mainstream of research in code switching has concentrated on isolating the factors which influence appropriate code use in various situations, with a view either to predicting switches, or to interpreting switches in terms of the social meaning they convey.

Recently, certain social psychologists working on the interface between sociolinguistics and social psychology have begun to question the approach to code switching which seeks to explain code use primarily in terms of social norms and rules. While admitting that there are many explicit as well as implicit social norms which dictate appropriate code usage, Howard Giles and various associates (Giles, 1973, 1977; Giles, Taylor and Bourhis, 1973; Giles and Powesland, 1975) have developed a

theory which proposes that much speech variation conventionally attributed to compliance with social norms is actually due to interpersonal accommodation, that is, to the tendency of speakers to modify their speech to become similar to that of interlocutors whose approval they desire. The model was originally developed to explain accent convergence in monolingual situations but was quickly applied to code switching in bilingual interaction situations. Although the concept of accommodation appears to go far towards explaining speech modification in monolingual contexts, the model seems to require further elaboration before it can be broadly applied to bilingual interaction. In the first place, the few experiments carried out by Giles involving speakers from different ethnolinguistic groups leave many questions unanswered, and due to characteristics imposed by the laboratory setting, suggest certain conclusions which run counter to the writer's observations of interaction in bilingual contexts. In addition, it is clear that other factors such as second language proficiency, ethnolinguistic differences in attitudes towards second language use, and individual variation in basic personality traits all interact with accommodative tendencies in determining code choice in conversations between bilinguals.

This thesis has been undertaken in order to explore

the concept of interpersonal accommodation as applied to code choice between bilinguals, taking into account certain other major variables which interact with accommodation, in an attempt to delimit the theory and make it better applicable to bilingual interaction. The central concerns of the thesis are first, to determine to what extent accommodation is a factor in code choice in interaction between bilinguals of different ethnolinguistic groups, and second, to explore the nature of accommodation in spontaneous (non-experimental) bilingual interaction. As delineated in further detail in Chapter 2, the data for this study were derived primarily from personal interviews with 20 English- and French-speaking bilinguals who regularly use two languages in their daily interactions as professors at the University of Ottawa, a bilingual institution where French and English have equal status. In these interviews, the subjects discussed at length their choice of code in various specific interaction situations, as well as their attitudes and motivations for use of L1 and L2.

This chapter consists of the following sections:

- o A brief review of some of the major sociolinguistic approaches to language choice and code switching;

- o A discussion of two variables often neglected in studies of code choice;
- o A review of accommodation theory and its experimental applications;
- o A consideration of some differences between monolingual and bilingual interaction and the need for further exploration of the accommodation model.

II. SOCIOLINGUISTIC APPROACHES TO CODE-SWITCHING AND LANGUAGE CHOICE

Well before the term "code switching" came into use, students of language and language behavior were interested in code choice in bilingual and multilingual societies. Early attempts to come to grips with this question took the form of classification of code use in terms of the functions served by each of the languages within the particular society. Studies of the intragroup functional specialization of languages date back to West (1926), Kloss (1929), and Schmidt-Rohr (1933), and include such more recent classics as Weinreich's Languages in Contact (1953), Haugen's Bilingualism in the Americas (1956) and Ferguson's "Diglossia" (1959).

These studies vary in both the number and the type of functions they specify. For example, Frey's (1945)

analysis of Amish "triple talk" distinguished only the three categories of home, school and church, while Weinreich (1953) distinguished seven categories in his discussion of the use of Swiss German and Standard German in Switzerland: literature, church, administration, school, public addresses, family and everyday business. As in the above two examples, most such functional studies have tended to distinguish the major institutional contexts or spheres of activity with which particular languages are associated in a given social context. In addition, the dimensions of medium of communication (oral, written), style (formal, informal) and interpersonal distance (intimate, non-intimate) have been used in such classifications. As Ferguson (1959) showed in one of the best known discussions of functional specialization, many of these dimensions go together. In situations of "diglossia", a "high" variety of a language is associated with formality, ritual, and literary tradition, including most written communication, whereas a "low" variety of the same language is associated with informality, intimacy and ordinary everyday affairs.

Despite their diverse classificatory systems, these studies of the functional specialization of languages had a common orientation, an emphasis on discovering the social

norms which lie behind code use. Generally they concentrated on larger social groupings and were interested in the behavior of individuals only insofar as they could be contrasted with overall societal patterns. This focus on the larger societal regularities has been termed a "macro" approach to code use by Fishman (1972), whose studies on the use of Spanish and English by Puerto Ricans in New York City are directly in this tradition of functional specialization but utilize in addition the survey techniques and correlational approach typical of modern sociological research.

A second source of input into research in code choice came from the burgeoning of concern in the 1960's with specifying the conditions under which various registers, speech styles, dialects or languages -- in short, any of the alternate codes at an individual's disposal -- are seen as appropriate by their users. Attention to the existence of registers and varieties in every language, as revealed in work on language varieties by British linguists (Halliday, McIntosh and Stevens, 1964; Catford, 1965; Gregory, 1967), as well as in work by anthropologists and ethnographically oriented linguists studying bilingual speech communities (Hymes, 1962, 1967; Gumperz, 1968, 1971), led to a realization that switching between languages on the part of bilinguals is not

7

qualitatively different from the shifting of style or level which monolinguals regularly engage in. As Hymes expressed it:

Cases of bilingualism par excellence ... are salient, special cases of the phenomena of variety in code repertoire and switching among codes. No normal person, and no normal community, is limited in repertoire to a single variety of code. (1967)

When seen in this light, not only is research on the appropriateness of particular linguistic alternates directly applicable to contexts where two or more languages are in regular use by the same population, but bi- and multilingual communities become ideal laboratories for discovering these basic regularities, which then may be applied to understanding language use in general. In fact, the distinctness of the codes in alternation in multilingual speech communities may offer particular advantages to researchers in terms of comparative ease of assigning linguistic forms to one language or another.

The search for sociolinguistic rules constraining choice among alternatives in particular contexts first took the form of identifying the various factors or non-linguistic components present in a communicative situation. One of the most influential classification schemes was that elaborated by Jakobson (1960), who isolated six basic

factors involved in verbal communication, each of which is associated with a different function of language. Building on this, Hymes (1962; 1967; 1972) developed several models of varying complexity, ranging from 7 to 16 components of speech acts to be considered for a complete descriptive theory of speaking. Various lists of components have been proposed based on those suggested by Jakobson and Hymes, but all generally include the following factors: setting, including locale and situation of the interaction; participant, including the statuses and the roles of the participants relative to one another, as well as their roles specific to the situation; topic; function or purpose of the interaction. Other factors which have been isolated include: channel (whether spoken or written); tone (whether jocular or serious); and speaker intent, or the impression the speaker wishes to convey about himself (Jakobson, 1960; Hymes, 1962, 1967, 1972; Ervin-Tripp, 1964; Sankoff, 1972). Code or variety is also generally included in theoretical models, but in practical work it has often been treated as the dependent variable, that which the analyst wishes to explain or predict. It is interesting to note that linguistic competence or proficiency in the codes in question was rarely taken into account in these models, being generally taken for granted. In one of the few models which mentions competence (Sankoff, 1972), it was

9

treated as a characteristic of the speaker only; the receiver's second language proficiency was not considered.

Initially there was optimism that, with careful and intensive work, all the factors accounting for speaker variation could be isolated and a model formulated which would be capable of predicting "who speaks what language to whom and when" (Fishman, 1965). This goal of prediction seems to have been the motivating force behind studies both at a "micro" or interpersonal level and at a "macro" or larger societal level.

It was Fishman (1965, 1972) who stressed the contribution to be made by studies which seek to account for language choice, not at the level of face-to-face interaction, but rather by determining underlying societal patterns and sociolinguistic norms. He proposed that, instead of taking topic as a factor regulating language use, researchers should look deeper to locate domains of language behavior, or socio-culturally defined spheres of activity which in a given speech community are linked to use of a particular language. Recognition of such domains, with the associated role relations and value clusters, allows the language behavior of individuals to be contrasted with the wide-spread sociolinguistic norms governing language choice within a particular community.

Prediction of language choice in studies focussing on the "macro" level of analysis thus actually implies no more than the isolation of the social norms constraining language use within a particular community, so as to be able to state the "normal" language used by specified participants entering into certain role relationships in particular settings. As long as a correlational approach, which zeroes in on the average responses of large groups of informants, is used, the limitations of a predictive model of code switching are not immediately apparent. However, when researchers focus on face-to-face interaction, a number of difficulties with a strictly predictive goal become evident.

Sankoff (1972) began by following a predictive approach in her attempt to hierarchize the factors which determine choice of language in a stable multilingual setting in New Guinea but came to the realization that prediction was possible only up to a certain point. Not only were there some situations where, even when interlocutor, situation, topic and tone were specified, either of two languages would be acceptable, but furthermore, Sankoff found still other situations where no one code could be specified as fully appropriate, but rather, alternation between codes was the most effective and valued linguistic behavior. One example from her data

involved a village "big man" addressing a crowd on economic and government affairs who alternated between two languages, one to stress his local identity and the other to emphasize that he had links with the outside world of modern business. What exactly was said in each language was unimportant; what made the communication effective was the fact that both were used. Sankoff concluded from this that factors such as interlocutor, situation and topic "could not be taken as predictive in the strict sense, and they served rather to define certain types of situations in which particular code choices were normally acceptable, appropriate -- even likely" (Sankoff, 1972, p. 41). Within such situations, other factors having to do with individual speech strategies come into play, bringing with them code switches reflecting speaker intent, change in tone, etc. To illustrate this Sankoff uses the example of a joke, which cannot normally be predicted in advance but which, once it has occurred, can be interpreted in light of the

 1
 A less exotic example revealed by the observation phase of this study is that of the chairperson of a bilingual department at the University of Ottawa, who switches from French to English and back again many times during a faculty meeting in a conscious attempt to make both Anglophone and Francophone professors feel equally at home. Such norms of alternating code switching may be extended to written channels as well. For example, it is considered good form at the University of Ottawa to alternate French and English paragraphs in news bulletins on University affairs, minutes of faculty meetings, etc.

social meaning it carries and the linguistic means by which it was marked as a joke (i.e. code switch).

In using such an interpretative approach, Sankoff is following the lead of Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez (1969), who seem to have been the first to isolate the phenomenon of multi-code conversations which are characterized by rapid switching in situations in which interlocutors, setting and topic remain constant. They proposed that despite their unpredictability, such switches carry social meaning, and that, by working with participants of conversations, one could first isolate the unmarked or normal language in a particular situation and then interpret the social meaning carried by use of a "marked" language. For example, in conversations between Mexican-American professionals, Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez showed how switches to Spanish in an otherwise English conversation served to stress solidarity and the ethnic identity of the participants.

This type of code use, termed "conversational code-switching" by Gumperz (1977), has only received serious attention since about 1975. As Gumperz points out, this sort of switching had previously been treated as a marginal or transitory phenomenon, either as a form of linguistic interference due to imperfect learning of a second code, or

simply as substandard "code-mixing". Gumperz points out, however, that such code switching is not only extremely frequent, even among those who have near native control of the second code, but that it occurs in the speech of educated urbanized professionals just as frequently as in that of less educated rural populations. Its persistence cannot be explained only by considerations of the speaker's proficiency in the codes in question (as important as this may be in some cases) or by lack of education, but must instead be sought in the fact that such code-switches convey semantically significant information. Conversational code switching is most prevalent among bilinguals who live in situations of language and culture contact, where knowledge of the majority language is necessary for work and business, but where the minority language is used actively in peer, friendship or kinship networks which stress separate values and communicative norms. It is this separation between in- and out-group values and the tendency for the minority language to be regarded as the "we" code (associated with in-group and informal activities) and the majority language to be regarded as the "they" code (associated with more formal, less personal out-group relations), which allows bilinguals to use code switching as an additional linguistic resource. Speakers build on shared social norms of code use to convey

subtle shades of meaning to members of the same group; these norms are, in fact, part of the linguistic competence of speakers. As Gumperz expresses it:

Sociolinguistic norms in this sense are more than just rules that are either obeyed or violated. They are an integral part of the knowledge that a speaker must have to achieve his ends in interpersonal relations. (p. 30)

Since Gumperz's pioneering work, there has been an enormous amount of work done on conversational code switching between in-group members, mainly in studies of the Spanish-English switching of Mexican-Americans and Puerto Rican residents of New York (Rayfield, 1970; Timm, 1975; Pfaff, 1975, 1976; McClure and Wentz, 1975; Valdes-Fallis, 1976, 1978; Valdes, 1981; Wentz, 1977; McClure, 1977, 1981; Poplack, 1977, 1980, 1981). This work has centered around two major questions: why switches occur, or the social function of changing languages (functional or pragmatic constraints) and where switches occur in discourse (formal or syntactic constraints). In addition, the questions of what constitutes a minimal code switch and at what linguistic level a code switch should be defined have preoccupied investigators.

Various general syntactic constraints, such as the following, have been posited by these researchers: a phrase structure boundary constraint providing that code switches

occur primarily at phrase structure boundaries and that higher-level constituents have a greater probability of being switched than lower-level constituents (for example, Gumperz and Hernandez-Chavez, 1972; Poplack, 1977, 1981); an equivalence of structure constraint stating that switched portions of discourse must not violate a syntactic rule of either language (Poplack 1977, 1981; Lipski, 1978); a frequency constraint, which provides a limit to the number of shifts in code which will occur in any given stretch of discourse (Lipski, 1978).

In addition, researchers have also suggested more specific syntactic constraints. These include a constraint on switching between pronominal subject or object and verbs (Timm, 1975; Gumperz, 1977; Lipski, 1978), a constraint on switching between finite verbs and their infinitive complements (Timm, 1975; Lipski, 1978), a constraint against switching the simple adjective (Gumperz, 1977; Lipski, 1978), a constraint on switching between auxiliaries and verbs (Timm, 1975; Lipski, 1978), and a constraint requiring that a conjunction be in the same code as the conjoined sentence (Gumperz, 1977). However, since counter examples to many of these constraints have been found (Pfaff, 1975, 1976; Poplack, 1981; McClure, 1981), Poplack suggests that a more realistic approach

would be to formulate a free morpheme constraint, according to which "a switch may occur at any point of the discourse at which it is possible to make a surface constituent cut and still retain a free morpheme" (Poplack, 1981, p. 175). She maintains that, rather than there being only a few selected points at which switches may occur, there are a large number of permissible switch points, limited only by the equivalence of structure constraint and the free morpheme constraint.

When these researchers began looking carefully at both formal and functional constraints on switching, they discovered the necessity of considering the proficiency of the speaker in the codes in question (Poplack, 1980; McClure, 1981). It has been a common hypothesis that a certain amount of code switching occurs due to lexical unavailability in L2 and that, consequently, less fluent bilinguals may well show a greater frequency of code switches. However, in a recent study aimed at exploring this question, Poplack (1980) revealed a far more interesting relationship between degree of bilingual ability and code switching. She found that both fluent and non-fluent bilinguals were able to code switch frequently and still maintain grammaticality in both languages. What differed, however, was the type of switch engaged in: while fluent bilinguals favoured intra-sentential code-

switching (a more complex or "intimate" type of switching, and one which has commonly been looked on as the most deviant), non-fluent bilinguals were more likely to switch between sentences and to use more tag switches and single noun switches ("emblematic" switches serving to emphasize group membership). Thus, non-fluent bilinguals chose a less demanding type of switching which allowed them to "participate in the code-switching mode, without fear of violating a grammatical rule of either of the languages involved" (p. 581). Poplack concludes that, far from being deviant behavior, code switching involves having a sophisticated knowledge of the grammatical systems of the two languages which allows the speaker to draw from each system only those rules which the other shares when alternating languages. Furthermore, the better the speaker's knowledge of the two codes, the more complex the type of switch which he will tend to engage in, so that, in fact, code switching behavior can be seen as an indicator of degree of bilingual competence!

In summary, we may say that the early aim of prediction of code switches has been found to be an overambitious goal. As closer attention has been paid to switching at a micro level, researchers have become increasingly aware of the complexity of switching behavior,

and have generally turned their attention to interpreting rather than attempting to predict switches, utilizing speaker intuitions to discover both the social meaning and the semantic significance carried by the use of two codes. The most recent work in code-switching has concentrated mainly on determining syntactic constraints on switching.

III. TWO NEGLECTED VARIABLES AFFECTING CODE CHOICE

There are at least two factors contributing to switching behavior which have received little attention in sociolinguistic research on code choice and code-switching: the second language proficiency of the interlocutors, and the individual personalities of the persons interacting.

As we mentioned in the previous section, for the first time recently a few researchers examining code-switching have begun to consider the bilingual's second language proficiency to be a relevant variable. However, in general in the sociolinguistic literature on code-switching, proficiency in the languages involved has been treated as a static given. The assumption seems to have been 1) that all speakers are fluent bilinguals and 2) that the language proficiency of individuals does not affect their interaction with other speakers. However, the need for studying bilinguals who are less than fluent

speakers of the second language has been recognized by at least one member of the sociolinguistic community. Pipping (1969) points out that few bilinguals are equally proficient in both languages, that only a minority live in a completely bilingual society, and that most are called upon to interact frequently with monolinguals as well as with other bilinguals. He maintains that, in most situations of bilingual interaction, the language proficiency of the interlocutors is a factor which sets limits on interaction and as such must be treated as a basic independent variable in any research on the language use of bilinguals.

Moreover, Pipping stresses that often an individual's perception of his own second language proficiency in relation to that of his interlocutors is as important as, if not more important than, his actual proficiency in determining how much he will be inclined to use the language. Pipping points out that proficiency is linked to several other variables, each of which affects the others. Thus, the second language proficiency of a speaker affects his sensitivity, or ability to judge the quality of his interaction partners' speech, which in turn affects his self-evaluation or perception of his proficiency; this self-evaluation then affects his inclination to use the language, which influences his

actual use or practice; which comes full circle to affect his proficiency. Suggesting that all of these five variables work together to make up the compound variable one might term "competence", Pipping emphasizes that research should "pay due attention to the complicated and subtle feed-back mechanisms that always operate when bilinguals interact" (1969, p. 219).

Based on these reflections, we feel that future research on code switching should not only take into account second language proficiency, but would do well to explore the role of speakers' own evaluation of their proficiency as a variable influencing code choice and switching behavior.

Sociolinguistics has not generally included affective variables under its domain; quite naturally its first concern has been to establish the social rules involved in language behavior. However, when sociolinguists focus on face-to-face interaction in their attempts to understand the motivations underlying code-switching, the relevant domain of concern necessarily becomes wider. Both social psychological theories concerning interaction between individuals and groups, and affective variables such as the personalities of the

interaction partners, become important for a more thorough understanding of code use. Recent work on accommodation theory and code use is proving the relevance of the former, but there is as yet little work on the latter. I know of no research that has addressed the question of the relation of code choice to the personality of the speaker. The few studies which have been carried out concern the relation of personality to second language learning.

Guiora and his associates at the University of Michigan's Personality and Language Behavior Research Group have conducted a variety of studies on the relationship between personality parameters and language behavior. In particular they have found a positive correlation between "empathetic capacity" and authenticity of pronunciation of a foreign language (Taylor, Catford, Guiora, and Lane, 1970; Guiora, 1971). They explain this relation by the notion that both pronunciation ability and empathy are influenced by the same underlying processes of "permeability of ego boundaries". The concept of permeability of language ego boundaries suggests the "ability to move back and forth between languages and the 'personalities' that seem to come with them" (Guiora and Acton, 1979, p. 199); empathetic people are presumed to have greater ability to do this because of more permeable language ego boundaries.

Further studies by this same group of researchers showed that pronunciation ability was also increased under the influence of a small amount of alcohol (Guiora, Beit-Hallahmi, Brannon, Dull and Scovel, 1972), and under hypnosis (Schumann, Holroyd, Campbell, and Ward, 1978). These findings were felt to provide support for the validity of the concept of permeability of ego boundaries by showing that experimentally induced lowering of inhibitions enhances the permeability of ego boundaries, leading to a corresponding enhancement of pronunciation flexibility. Thus, these studies suggest that there is a direct' relationship between inhibition and pronunciation ability in a foreign language. This conclusion has been questioned by Brown (1973), who points out that alcohol also affects muscular tension, and that this factor, rather than lowering of inhibitions, may have caused the superior result in pronunciation in the 1972 study by Guiora et al.

Regardless of the status of the construct of "permeability of ego boundaries", if it is indeed true that either more empathetic or less inhibited individuals tend to be able to achieve a more accurate pronunciation of a foreign language, such individuals may well tend to use the language more (see Pipping's argument, earlier). Although the results of the work being carried out by Guiora and his

associates are certainly not conclusive, it would seem worthwhile to pursue the personality trait of empathy as a possible variable in any study of code choice.

A further study which examined the relation of personality factors to success in second language learning is that of Edwards, Wesche and Smythe (1976), who used Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire to survey a wide range of personality factors. They found the factors of introversion versus extraversion as well as anxiety about second language study to correlate with various objective measures of success in learning French by Anglophones: the more introverted an individual was, and the less anxious about using French as a second language, the more likely he or she was to perform well. Furthermore, they found that the factor of dependency versus self-sufficiency affected self-evaluation of progress in French, with more dependent respondents evaluating their progress more highly.

Other affective variables meriting study in their relation to second language learning have been pointed out by Brown (1973). In addition to the concepts of inhibition and empathy based on Guiora's work, he too discusses the possible influence of the personality traits of introversion versus extraversion, as well as the role of

aggression, and the possibility that individual differences in cognitive style, including reflective versus impulsive personalities and "open" versus "closed" mindedness, influence second language learning. His reflections lead him to the conclusion that all of these affective variables may be fruitful areas for research in language learning. It seems to us highly probable that personality differences of this sort would also influence eventual use of the second language in situations of interaction between bilinguals of different first languages. Thus, we feel that individual personality variables have a legitimate place in future research on code choice and code switching.

IV. ACCOMMODATION THEORY

Accommodation theory, as it has come to be known, was first proposed in Giles (1973) and Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973), and was subsequently elaborated in Giles and Powesland (1975). Most recently, the accommodation model has been used in conjunction with Tajfel's theory of intergroup distinctiveness (Tajfel, 1974) to lay the foundation for a more comprehensive theory of the role of language in ethnic group relations (Giles, Bourhis, and Taylor, 1979). Much productive work in applying accommodation theory to various aspects of language use is

continuing at the present time.

The original concern of Giles and his co-workers was twofold: first, to provide a genuinely explanatory theory which would get at some of the underlying reasons for speech variation, rather than another descriptive model listing factors which influence it; and second, to account for certain shifts in speech style or code which cannot be ascribed to compliance with social norms. To fulfill these two aims they turned to social psychological theory for a conceptual framework they have termed "interpersonal accommodation through speech". The theory is based on four social psychological theories already developed in the literature: similarity attraction, social exchange, causal attribution and intergroup distinctiveness. We will first discuss each of these theories as input to the accommodation framework, and then go on to discuss the range of phenomena to which accommodation theory has been applied.

Similarity attraction theory proposes that the more similar our attitudes and beliefs are to others, the more likely it is that we will be attracted to them (see reviews by Byrne, 1969 and Simons, Berkowitz and Moyer, 1970). From this it follows that a person can induce another person to evaluate him more favourably by reducing

dissimilarities between them. One of the devices which people use to become more similar to others is what Giles has termed speech convergence, or the process whereby an individual modifies certain aspects of his speech, either consciously or unconsciously, so that his speech becomes more similar to that of his interlocutor. This may occur at various linguistic as well as non-linguistic levels (see Dabbs, 1969). For example, many studies have shown that when two people interact verbally, there is a tendency for them to become more similar in their accents (Giles, 1973), speech rates (Webb, 1970), pause and utterance lengths (Jaffe and Feldstein, 1972; Matarazzo, 1973), and vocal intensities (Natale, 1975), among other dimensions. The term "response matching" was introduced by Argyle (1969) for the general phenomenon, and was subsequently made more precise by the distinction made in Giles (1971) between "positive response matching", or modelling to improve the relationship between the persons interacting, and "negative response matching" or retaliatory speech acts such as mutual verbal aggression (Mosher, Mortimer and Grebel, 1968). Speech convergence is thus a manifestation of positive response matching in the more general sense.

Since increasing similarities increases attraction, Giles suggests that convergence is probably rooted in

speakers' desire for social approval. He proposed that since approval from others is valued by most individuals, he proposes that there is probably a general set to accommodate one's speech to that of others in most situations. Further, the higher an individual's need for social approval, the more his speech should show convergence to that of the other. Larsen, Martin and Giles (1977) have shown that the greater speakers' desire for social approval, the more likely they are to perceive the voices of others as similar to their own. Need for social approval may either be the result of social power over a speaker (as in boss-employee interactions) or the likelihood of future interactions with that person, or the result of internal psychological disposition, such as a strong need for approval from others. For example, Natale (1975) found that speakers with high needs for social approval modify the length of pauses to those of their interlocutor more than do speakers with low needs for social approval.

Accommodation theory also relies on social exchange theory, which maintains that people weigh the costs and rewards of any act before engaging in it (Homans, 1961): Converging one's speech to that of another provides rewards in the form of the listener's approval but may also entail costs such as the effort expended or, in some cases, loss

of group identity. We can easily imagine situations in which the social approval of the interlocutor might be so highly valued as to outweigh any costs in terms of effort or loss of identity. For example, in a job interview situation, a candidate being interviewed is presumably ready to go to considerable lengths to present him- or herself in a favourable light, including unconsciously converging his speech toward that of the interviewer. Studies in various cultures have shown that people tend to judge those who have a more prestigious accent, dialect or language more favourably in terms of intelligence, competence and other traits than those with a less prestigious accent (see Giles and Powesland, 1975, for a summary of this research).² The tendency of a person with a low prestige accent to modify certain features of his speech to approximate that of persons with a high prestige accent has been termed by Giles "upward convergence", while a shift in the opposite direction, toward the less prestigious speech, is called "downward convergence". The latter shift is probably most often a strategy to reduce social embarrassment felt by a speaker when considerable accent prestige distance separates him and his receiver; it

² These studies have also shown, however, that traits involving personal integrity and social attractiveness are frequently positively correlated with non-standard or regional accents.

may also be adopted as an expression of social equality to establish a common basis for communication between individuals of differing backgrounds and socioeconomic statuses.

The question might well be asked whether such downward convergence would be perceived as favourably by the listeners as upward convergence has been shown to. Causal attribution theory provides some notions which suggest that the accommodation model as presented so far requires some elaboration to take into account various possible perceptions of convergent behaviour. The theory of causal attribution (Heider, 1958; Jones and Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1973) proposes that we evaluate people's behaviour, and thus the individuals themselves, in terms of the motives we attribute as the cause of their actions. Heider proposes that the three factors of the other's ability to perform the action, the effort he puts forth in doing it, and any external pressure there may be on him to perform it, will all influence the way we assess his behavior. This suggests that, just as we may be willing to excuse the poor behaviour of individuals on the basis of external pressures beyond their control, so we may less positively evaluate normally praiseworthy behaviour when it is perceived as either requiring no effort or sacrifice, or as

being the result of external pressure.

At least two studies have demonstrated that attribution processes operate in the perception of speech convergence and nonconvergence. It is no accident that these experiments were carried out in a bilingual context, since the factors of ability and effort which play a part in causal attribution are clearly of special importance in interactions between members of different ethnolinguistic groups, where possession of the necessary linguistic repertoire (ability) cannot be assumed, and where more effort may be required by speakers in order to exhibit convergence on a linguistic level. It was in these two studies that the accommodation model was first tested.

The study of Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) was designed to see whether a bilingual speaker of one group would be perceived more favourably, if he was seen as exerting an effort to accommodate in communicating with listeners from another ethnic group, as well as to discover whether these listeners would in turn put a commensurate amount of effort into reciprocating this accommodation. The experimenters found that a French Canadian stimulus speaker who provided a taped message to bilingual English Canadians in French ("no accommodation"), in a mixture of French and English ("partial accommodation"), in fluent

English ("full accommodation") or in non-fluent English ("full accommodation, more effort displayed") was rated higher in terms of considerateness and effort to bridge the cultural gap, the more he accommodated to his listeners. Because the English Canadians were informed both that the French Canadian had the ability to speak English and that he was free to select one language or the other, they appeared to have assessed his accommodative or non-accommodative behaviour purely in terms of the amount of effort he was willing to expend. And, according to the amount of effort they perceived, they themselves exerted a commensurate amount of effort; they "accommodated" most (that is, spoke in French when sending a return message) when the French Canadian had spoken non-fluent English to them, and least (spoke in English) when their interlocutor had spoken French to them.

While in this study the amount of accommodation varied and the cause to which it was attributed stayed the same, a further study by Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) was designed specifically to determine whether accommodation is perceived differently depending on the motives attributed to it by the listener, as well as to see whether the same tendencies would be evident when the ethnic groups were reversed. They found that French

Canadian listeners evaluated an English Canadian who spoke French, more favourably when they thought that he voluntarily made the effort to speak it, than when they thought that he was under pressure to do so. Furthermore, the listeners both decoded the message better and were more likely to accommodate in return (i.e. speak English) when they thought the speaker chose rather than was forced to converge linguistically. Conversely, when non-accommodation (ie. speaking English to French Canadian listeners) was attributed to outside pressure to speak English, the speaker was less negatively evaluated in terms of effort to bridge the cultural gap than when he failed to accommodate of his own free choice. The researchers concluded that the type of causal attribution a listener makes will affect how speech convergence or lack of it is perceived: non-accommodation is not necessarily always negatively evaluated, and accommodation, while normally viewed positively, is also weighed in terms of the motives to which it is attributed.

Based on these findings, Giles and Powesland suggested that there might be such a thing as "over-accommodation", or converging one's speech style to that of the other either too extremely or in too obvious a fashion. Perhaps some convergence depends on being covert rather than overt in order for it to avoid being interpreted as a

sign of insincerity and thus be attributed to poor motives. The question of optimal levels of accommodation was investigated by Giles and Smith (1979), who found that convergence by an English Canadian to British English speakers on three levels (speech rate, content and pronunciation) was less favourably viewed than convergence on only two levels (speech rate and content). They concluded that there was indeed such a thing as over-accommodation.

In light of the fact that convergence is not indiscriminately perceived in a positive manner, Giles further posed the question of whether modification of one's speech away from that of the interlocutor, termed by him "speech divergence", can ever be positively evaluated by participants in an interaction. Tajfel's (1974) theory of intergroup distinctiveness suggests that it can. In essence, Tajfel proposes that when members of different groups are in contact, they make "inter-group social comparisons", and search out valued dimensions on which to make their own group distinct from the outgroup. These elements of positive distinctiveness give groups a sense of social identity and provide a means for members of the group to dissociate themselves from members of other groups when they interact with them. Many studies have shown that

speech -- whether style, accent, dialect or language -- is one of the most valued dimensions of social identity for groups (see particularly Haugen, 1975; Giles, Taylor, Lambert and Albert, 1976; Fishman, 1977; Ryan and Carranza, 1977). Indeed, in dozens of cases all over the world, ethnic minorities have made maintenance of their language or dialect the focus of their struggle for identity and social power; French in Canada, Welsh in Wales, Breton in France and Catalan in Spain are only few of the many cases that spring to mind. Giles (1977) cites a particularly cogent case of language used as a symbol of cultural identity and power when he mentions the Arab member states of OPEC, who only recently for the first time issued their communiqué on the price of oil in Arabic rather than in English.

At least two recent studies have shown that speech divergence -- whether by means of accent or language choice -- is an important strategy for emphasizing group identity. Bourhis and Giles (1977) found that in an experiment where students of Welsh who were proud of their national group membership were challenged about their reasons for learning the language by a speaker with a very strong English RP accent, the Welshmen's replies showed immediate divergence. Since these students did not have a productive command of the Welsh language, their divergent behaviour was for the

most part restricted to noticeable broadening of their Welsh accents in English; yet a number of subjects sprinkled Welsh phrases into their English, while one respondent answered by conjugating Welsh verbs! This tendency to reply in Welsh as much as possible suggested to the researchers that, in genuinely bilingual contexts, speakers who had two codes at their disposal might well resort to complete language switches to express their psychological differentiation from the outgroup.

To test out these speculations, a second study carried out in Belgium (Bourhis, Giles, Leyens and Tajfel, 1979) focused on eliciting divergence in the form of language switching. They found that when the experimental conditions strongly favoured the desire of ingroup members to differentiate themselves psychologically from the outgroup (explicit intergroup categorization and belief that the speaker was unsympathetic to the subject's language, combined with ethnically threatening statements), switches to ingroup language did occur. In other words, in this experiment, code switching was shown to be the ultimate level of divergence or non-accommodation.

V. MONOLINGUAL VS. BILINGUAL INTERACTION: THE NEED FOR FURTHER EXPLORATION OF THE ACCOMMODATION MODEL

We have reviewed here some of the main theoretical underpinnings of accommodation theory, and have discussed some of the phenomena which it attempts to explain. Most of the evidence thus far presented in its favour derives from the study of interaction between speakers of the same language, since it had its origin as an explanation for accent mobility within a single language (Giles, 1973). Almost immediately, however, it was proposed as equally applicable to bilingual contexts on the basis of the two experiments carried out on French Canadian and English Canadian bilinguals (Giles, Taylor and Bourhis, 1973; Simard, Taylor and Giles, 1976). Yet, certain differences between monolingual and bilingual interaction, as well as certain methodological aspects of the two studies in question, served to raise doubts in our mind about the validity of applying the conclusions drawn from these experiments directly to interactions between speakers of two different languages. We will now briefly consider certain ways in which the monolingual and the bilingual situations differ conceptually, and then go on to reconsider particular aspects of the two experiments on the basis of which accommodation theory has extended its explanatory domain to cover bilingual interaction.

Much attention has been paid to the notion that the code switching of bilinguals is basically the same type of phenomenon as the style or register switching which occurs regularly in the speech of monolinguals. Yet this basic similarity should not obscure the fact that there are certain real differences which obtain between the two situations. For the purposes of our study of accommodation, three essential differences between monolingual and bilingual interaction situations were found to be relevant. If we exclude diglossic situations, where the codes in question are varieties of the same language, these differences revolve around the questions of mutual intelligibility, control of the requisite codes, and the distinctness of the codes in question. Other differences concerning such aspects as language loyalty will not be considered here.

First of all, in an interaction between speakers of related dialects of the same language, linguistic convergence or accommodation on the part of one or the other is usually not necessary to ensure mutual comprehensibility. Although nuances may be lost and in some cases listeners may have to strain their linguistic intuitions to the utmost, the message will usually be transmitted successfully. In an interaction involving speakers of different languages, however, one speaker or

the other must normally converge totally to the other's code by switching languages in order for communication to take place. Unless a speaker has prior knowledge that the interlocutor controls both codes, accommodation is a practical necessity. In addition, there is the further practical constraint that only one speaker at a time may converge; if both accommodate by using the other's language, again communication is impeded. Speakers are aware of these two facts, and this knowledge colours much of their language choice in interactions with speakers of a different language.

Secondly, the question of control of the requisite repertoires or the proficiency of the speakers in the codes in question also intervenes more strongly in the bilingual than in the monolingual contact situation. When individuals of two different social or regional dialects of the same language interact, speakers can rather easily modify their speech to approximate that of their interlocutor, even without having a complete command of the other's dialect; usually convergence takes the form of use of certain salient phonetic variants or lexical items superimposed on a code which both participants basically control. Thus, second language proficiency is not normally a factor affecting accommodation in monolingual

interaction. However, in interaction between speakers from two different ethnolinguistic groups, language proficiency competence is a primary^c factor. Although traditional sociolinguistic research has tended to neglect it as a factor in code switching in stable multilingual societies, in interaction in border areas the importance of second language proficiency must not be underestimated. For example, a speaker may have the desire to accommodate to his interlocutor, but not the ability, or he may have more or less ability. Furthermore, the second language proficiency of both interaction partners must be taken into account, not merely that of the speaker, for it is often their proficiency relative to one another which is a decisive factor in code choice.

And finally, due to the distinctness of the codes in question, shifting in a bilingual context is both more complete and more visible than in monolingual situations. Whereas in a situation of monolingual variation, convergence can easily occur unconsciously as one speaker modifies his accent to approximate that of the other, when speakers of two different ethnolinguistic groups interact, they are normally quite aware when they switch languages. Thus, a speaker who switches in such a situation is making a conscious and public statement about his willingness

to accommodate.³

Taking into account these differences between the monolingual and the bilingual interaction situations, we felt that in several important ways, the methodology used in the experiments by Giles and his collaborators did not permit a true testing of accommodation theory in interaction between speakers of different languages. In the first place, both experiments used taped messages as stimuli and required subjects to prepare taped messages in response. By avoiding direct contact between speakers and listeners, the experiments excluded the immediacy which is a vital characteristic of face-to-face interaction. The experimenters concluded as a result of their laboratory studies not only that reciprocal accommodation would occur, but also that it would take the form of addressing the interlocutor in the latter's first language. However, we asked ourselves whether, when faced with a Francophone speaker who has initiated a conversation in English, an Anglophone genuinely interested in accommodating his interlocutor would really respond in French? We thought

3

We exclude from consideration here conversational code switching in Gumperz's terms, where speakers treat the two codes as part of the same communicative system and may switch back and forth with little conscious awareness of which language they are using.

not. We felt that legitimate testing of the application of accommodation theory to bilingual interaction must occur in a realistic conversational setting where the dynamics of conversation would exert their influence.

A second factor which plays a large part in determining language behaviour in interaction between bilinguals which these experiments did not adequately handle is the relative second language proficiency of the two parties in the interaction. Although the studies adequately controlled for subjects' second language proficiency (there were no significant differences between treatment groups in terms of mean scores on a self-evaluation scale of second language proficiency), the general level of competence of the subjects undoubtedly affected their willingness to respond in French. We feel that without treating proficiency as an independent variable, the degree to which second language proficiency affects accommodation cannot be truly evaluated. For example, it would be interesting to know whether those subjects who have a high level of proficiency in French would be more likely to accommodate by speaking French than those with a lower level. The relevance of the subjects' proficiency relative to that of the stimulus speaker was recognized by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973), who noted in passing that most of the speakers who did not

accommodate linguistically in the fluent English condition "tended to justify their English language maintenance by reference to the fact that they considered their FC speaker's command of English to be far superior to their own French skills" (p. 186). Clearly, the relation between the second language proficiency of the two interlocutors in bilingual interaction needs to be more systematically explored.

In sum, the notion of interpersonal accommodation as a factor in code switching is a powerful one, and deserves to be explored more fully. It is suggested, first, that the role of accommodation in bilingual interaction may have been misrepresented by Giles et al because of the experimental conditions of their studies, and, therefore, that it needs to be investigated in a non-experimental way. Second, it is suggested that factors such as speakers' self-evaluation of their second language proficiency, individual variation in basic personality traits, and ethnolinguistic differences in language use also need to be taken into account in applying the theory to bilingual interaction. For these reasons this study was undertaken.

The thesis consists of the following parts:

- o Chapter 2 outlines the aims of the study and the

methodology chosen, as well as the instruments and procedures in the study;

- o Chapter 3 contains the statistical analyses of the data, while Chapter 4 treats the data in a more interpretive way;
- o Chapter 5 contains a discussion of the insights we have gained on the components of accommodation, and Chapter 6 provides a summary and conclusions.

CHAPTER 2

THE STUDY: AIMS, METHODS AND PROCEDURES

I. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The study had four principal aims:

1. To further explore the social psychological concept of accommodation as a motivating factor in language choice in interaction between bilinguals of different first languages.
2. To investigate the extent to which language choice is determined by individual psychological factors such as personality traits, motivation and attitudes.
3. To study the relevance of the individual's perception of his second language proficiency as a variable influencing use of that language.
4. To investigate the extent to which language choice patterns within a bilingual university community are traceable to ethnolinguistic differences.

II. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The aims of the study required that we collect four

major types of data: 1) data on language use in interaction between members of two different ethnolinguistic groups; 2) data on attitudes and motivation for language use; 3) data on personality traits; and 4) data on perceived second language proficiency.

For the first two types of data, language use and attitudes, we felt that a two-pronged approach would be the most effective: first, an observational phase, in which individuals would be observed in meeting situations and their use of French and English (including language switches) noted; and second, an interview phase, in which the same individuals would respond to open-ended questions on both their use of, and attitudes towards use of, their second language.

The observational phase was seen as preliminary to the study proper and was designed to serve three basic purposes: 1) as a method of sensitizing the researcher to some of the types of factors at play in interaction between bilinguals of different languages; 2) as an aid in the selection of a sample of subjects who were both fluent enough to switch from one language to another and who actually did engage in switching behavior; and 3) as a global check on the information provided by subjects on their language choice. The data from the observational

phase were not correlated with the results of the interview phase, which constituted our major data source. A description of the procedures used in this phase, considered as peripheral to the study proper, is found in Appendix 1.

We chose an open-ended interview as our primary data collection tool because we felt that this was the best way to get insight into people's feelings and attitudes about use of their second language. We felt that it was legitimate to use reports by respondents themselves on the subject of their language use for several reasons. First, the kind of language use we wished to study, involving choice of language between interlocutors of different first languages, is much more accessible to introspection than conversational code switching between in-group members, where switching is frequently unconscious. Second, we chose for our research base a bilingual university where the issues of bilingualism and language use are frequently discussed and people are generally very aware of language choice. And third, the observations we had made of individuals' language use in the first phase of the study confirmed in every case the type of behavior subjects reported about themselves.

Although using an open-ended interview technique meant that we would have to construct quantitative scales post hoc, this drawback was far outweighed by the advantages of such an approach. An open interview allowed us to gain insight into subjects' feelings and attitudes about use of their second language, as well as information about when and in what circumstances they switched from one language to another. If, on the other hand, we had used a self-administered questionnaire on language use and switching behavior, it would still have been necessary to conduct preliminary interviews to get enough background on the relevant factors to be able to frame adequate items for such a questionnaire. As well, we wished to avoid forcing respondents into the mold of inflexible multiple-choice-type questions, which allow little room for the expression of unique experiences, attitudes or feelings. It was felt that much of the value of the study would lie in exploring just such attitudes and feelings.

However, when it came to measuring personality traits, it was clear that only a standardized instrument would be adequate. It was deemed impractical to administer individual psychological interviews, both from the point of view of cost, as it would have meant hiring a trained psychologist to administer and interpret such interviews, and from the point of view of the time and commitment it

would have required from the respondents. In addition, it is not at all clear that such interviews, had we administered them, would have revealed any more useful information than standardized tests, since we were not dealing with cases of psychopathology. A self-administered paper and pencil personality test was also felt to be less threatening to respondents, and thus less likely to lead to refusal to take part. In addition, it was felt important to administer a measure covering the whole range of personality traits rather than to construct mini-instruments measuring one or two aspects, since too little is known about the relationship between personality and switching behavior for us to have made a priori choices about which traits to select.

For collecting data on perceived proficiency in the second language, the interview approach also seemed to be the most fruitful. (See the discussion in Section IV. D. of this chapter.)

III. SELECTION OF DATA BASE AND SUBJECTS

A. CHOICE OF DATA BASE

To conduct this kind of study, we felt that there were two prerequisites in terms of a data base: first, a reasonably large population of fluent bilinguals who use

two languages on a daily basis, and second, an environment where the languages are used with a minimum of social constraints.

The first condition was necessary because, as mentioned in Chapter 1, much of the research done in accommodation theory has used second language learners who often did not have enough basic competence in the second language to show either convergent or divergent behavior at a linguistic level. On the other hand, most sociolinguistic research has dealt with diglossic or multilingual settings, where a high level of competence in the languages or language varieties in question was taken for granted. Since one of our aims was to isolate the variable of perceived proficiency, we clearly needed a population where there was a range of levels of competence in the second language.

The second requirement, that the study be carried out in an environment where the two languages are used with a minimum of social and political constraints, was just as important to the validity of our study. It is essential because it makes it possible to focus on social, psychological and individual factors with minimum interference from socially dictated behavior. It is clear that factors such as the social status of the interlocutor

operate in choice of code, yet if a factor such as pressure to "speak the boss's language" is sufficiently strong, it can serve to mask other relevant independent variables which might otherwise come to the fore.

A brief discussion of the situation in a federal government department which was originally considered, but rejected, as a possible research base may serve to illustrate the problems which can be generated by extreme pressures of both political and social nature. In this department, sensitivity to the issue of bilingualism had become so acute that the natural interplay of individuals was affected. For example, at the time this milieu was being considered, the institution of a "bilingualism bonus", awarded to bilingual incumbents of bilingual positions, had become such a bone of contention that a number of groups of individuals who were not awarded the \$800 annual bonus because they did not occupy positions designated as bilingual, had entered into a boycott of use of their second language. It is clear that in this case, a superstratum of political considerations was overlying other language attitudes and suppressing the normal use of the two languages. Of course, language contact between different ethnic groups often entails stressful feelings about maintenance or loss of group identity (see Tajfel,

1964), and such factors are a legitimate object of study, but when sensitivity to the issue of who speaks which language to whom becomes so acute that language boycotts occur, then the atmosphere is too highly charged to allow many of the relevant variables to operate. In order to contribute to a theory of accommodation, which is a social psychological theory of presumably great cross-cultural generality, a data base is needed which is relatively uncontaminated by political pressures.

We found such a research base in the University of Ottawa. As befits its location in Ottawa, Ontario, on the Quebec border, it is a bilingual university, where members of the Francophone and the Anglophone communities of the area have the opportunity to study in their native language. Being a bilingual university, there is both an interest in facilitating bilingual communication and an acceptance of the fact that the members of each ethnic group have the right to speak their own language. We would expect that in this kind of environment a tendency to accommodate one's interlocutors on a linguistic level would have free play and interact naturally with other social and individual variables. Informal observation suggested that there was considerable freedom in using one's own language, as well as a tolerance for the use of two languages in more formal situations such as meetings.

On practical grounds, too, the University of Ottawa seemed to offer the most suitable milieu for observation and subsequent interviewing and testing of subjects. Preliminary observations had indicated that situations in which both languages were used were frequent. This was true not only in informal gatherings but also in more formalized contexts such as departmental meetings and other meetings involving students, professors and administrative staff. In addition, there was generally a positive response to the idea of observation and interviewing. And finally, there was acceptance of the idea of taping certain meetings, as well as the interviews, in addition to administering a personality test.

For all these reasons, then, it was decided to use individuals at the University of Ottawa as the population from which subjects for the study would be chosen.

B. SELECTION OF SUBJECTS

Subjects for the study were chosen from among professors and administrators of the University of Ottawa observed in a variety of meetings taking place on the university campus. On the basis of these observations, subjects manifesting certain types of language use (for example, switching or refraining from switching where it would be expected) were asked to participate in the study.

Those people who never talked during the meetings, or only spoke one language and always in response to the same language, were not asked to participate because the number of participants in the meetings had to be reduced by some method. Thus, only people who obviously possessed some bilingual capacity and who furthermore demonstrated some interesting switching or non-switching behavior were interviewed.

On this basis, thirty professors and administrators were interviewed and tested. Subsequently certain subjects were eliminated because of missing data, because the speakers were not native speakers of English or French, or because they had undergone a language dominance change (for example, had French as a native language but now considered English their "first" language). Our final samples consisted of 10 Francophone and 10 Anglophone professors and administrators.

Because of the make-up of the university population, as well as the type of meetings which were observed, the samples of the two ethnolinguistic groups were not balanced in terms of sex and role at the university. Of the ten Anglophones, three were women and seven men, and there were one Dean and two Chairpersons of departments in the sample.

The Francophone sample consisted entirely of men, and leaned more heavily toward administrators: there were one Vice-Rector, one Dean, and two Vice-Deans among them.

IV. INSTRUMENTS

A. MEASURE OF LANGUAGE USE AND ATTITUDES TOWARD LANGUAGE USE

As outlined under "Methodological Considerations", information on the subjects' language background, language use and attitudes toward language use was collected by means of a taped interview.

Questions on linguistic background and history of language learning were asked in order to establish the subject's native language and dominant language (which were not always the same), the age and circumstances under which the subject had learned his second language, the language of his formal education, and the language spoken at home now. These items, while not formalized into variables analyzed statistically, served to enrich our understanding of the subjects' attitudes and use of the second language, and thus helped us to arrive at more meaningful interpretations of the principal data. (See Appendix 2 for a complete list of the questions on linguistic

¹ It should be mentioned that the offices of Vice-Rector, Dean and Vice-Dean are held by former professors.

background.)

The main emphasis in the interview, however, was on gaining insight into subjects' feelings and behavior in communication situations where there was a choice of language. Since we wished to find out whether subjects were likely to accommodate linguistically to interlocutors speaking another language, we posed a number of situations in which accommodation might come into play ("potentially accommodative situations"), and asked subjects how they usually reacted in such situations. Since we were asking subjects to reflect on their own behavior, we concentrated on situations in which there was a conscious choice of language to be made, rather than on situations where the phonetic context might trigger responses in a particular language (Clyne, 1976). We posed a number of questions which revolved around the six situations described below.

1. Language used when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the other language.

We felt that the subjects' inclination to spontaneously use L2 when encountering a native speaker of that language would be a strong indicator of accommodativeness.

2. Willingness to respond in L1 when addressed by an L2 speaker having difficulty in that language.

We saw this item as potentially our best indicator of accommodativeness. For a bilingual Anglophone to endure poor English, when French would be more efficient, for instance, he must be extremely tolerant and sympathetic towards his L2 interlocutor's desire to speak his second language.

3. Perseverance in speaking L2 when interlocutor switches to speaker's L1.

We wished to know how subjects would respond to a situation in which they attempted to practice their second language by addressing an L2 speaker in his language, only to have him switch back to their own native language. We felt that what a speaker does in this conflict situation would tell us something about his or her accommodativeness.

4. Language of response when L1 interlocutor initiates a conversation in L2.

In border bilingual communities, it often happens that a member of one ethnolinguistic group addresses a stranger of the same language background in their (mutual) second language. For example, an Anglophone who finds himself approached in French by another Anglophone must decide whether to "play the game" and respond in that

language, perhaps out of deference to the effort exerted by the initiator of the conversation, or to return to the first and most efficient language for them both. We surmised that responding in French under these circumstances would be a good indicator of accommodativeness.

5. Adherence to L1 in group discussion when speaker of L2 arrives.

Our primary aim for this item was to pursue our hypothesis that accommodative behavior would vary considerably depending upon the ethnic group membership of the speaker. For example, would the arrival of a speaker of the majority language, English, be sufficient to prompt a group of Francophones to switch from French to English? Would a similar group of Anglophones expect a bilingual Francophone to speak English because of the historically dominant status of that language, or would these bilingual Anglophones accommodate the newcomer by switching to French? Clearly, such questions are context bound and will have different answers in different language contact situations.

6. Switching languages with a particular individual.

It was felt that the degree to which a bilingual feels at ease switching languages with the same individual,

whether be taken into account when assessing accommodativeness. It was hypothesized that ethnolinguistic differences would show up with this item. (See Appendix 3 for the English form of the questions on "potentially accommodative situations".)

B. MEASURE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD BILINGUALISM

Two aspects of attitudes toward bilingualism were also explored by means of interview. The first concerned the professor's attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university (Attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university). The second item concerned subjects' interest in having their children become bilingual, including willingness to have them educated in bilingual schools (Attitude toward children becoming bilingual).

These items were selected in preference to questions concerning general attitudes toward French or English Canadians partly because it was felt that they were more likely to elicit honest answers. It was not thought likely that members of a university community would be prone to admit to prejudices against members of the other ethnolinguistic group, if they had any. In addition, available measures of ethnocentrism, cultural allegiance, etc. were just too transparent to use with a population of university professors. (For examples, see Jakobovits,

1970.) Questions of a political nature such as attitudes toward Quebec separatism were rejected as being too far afield, since the link between political stance and language use is not necessarily direct. (Certainly there are militant Quebec separatists who as a consequence of their political views insist on speaking French under the most difficult circumstances, yet there are other completely apolitical souls who likewise insist on speaking French.)

C. SCALE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD LANGUAGE LEARNING OR
"LINGUAPHILIA"

Another factor we believed to be important in determining how much a bilingual uses his second language is interest in learning other languages, or "linguaphilia". It seemed probable that if bilinguals enjoyed second or foreign language study, and derived pleasure from speaking other languages, then their behavior in second language interaction situations would be markedly different from that of bilinguals who manifested a utilitarian attitude towards the second language. A five-point scale was prepared so that it could be carefully read by subjects, who were asked to choose the alternative which most closely applied to them. The scale was designed to be presented in the interview rather than to be treated as a pencil and paper test, so as to encourage maximum discussion by the

subject. The scale reads as follows:

- A. Language learning fascinates me and I seek out every opportunity to use my second language.
- B. I enjoy using my second language and, except for a few situations where I feel inhibited, I use it whenever it is appropriate.
- C. It doesn't make any difference to me which language I use as long as there is efficient communication.
- D. I would rarely initiate a conversation in another language but, addressed in that language, I would respond in it.
- E. I much prefer to use my first language if the person I'm talking to knows that language.

See Appendix 4 for the French version of the linguaphilia scale.

With use it became clear that the scale encompasses more than just "linguaphilia." See Chapter 4, III. C. for a discussion of the problems inherent in the scale.

D. MEASURE OF PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY

For a number of reasons we decided not to administer a second language proficiency test to our subjects but instead to measure their own perception of their second

language abilities. First and foremost, we felt that actual language proficiency is probably less important as a determiner of linguistic behavior than is the user's perception of his proficiency. (See discussion of Pipping (1969) in Chapter 1.) Secondly, the kind of second language proficiency we were interested in is not measured by generally available language tests; we were concerned with communicative competence and an ability to function in the work context rather than knowledge of specific grammatical or vocabulary items. And finally, we doubted that we would be able to find a second language proficiency test sufficiently discriminating to be able to rate accurately the second language skills of a significant number of our subjects whose L2 proficiency was very near native-speaker level.

We considered two possible basic approaches to measuring perceived proficiency: administering a questionnaire or probing subjects' perceptions of their second language capabilities in an interview. (Observation, of course, was not a possible technique since it was perceived rather than actual proficiency that we were after.) Before arriving at a decision, we tried out both of these techniques. In our attempts to construct a questionnaire we rejected the idea of asking subjects to

rate themselves on an overall scale of second language ability as too general and too subjective. We felt that a situational approach, which required subjects to rate their ability to perform in the second language in particular situations, was both more closely linked to reality and specific enough for subjects to be able to visualize in concrete terms their ability or lack of ability to perform in the situations mentioned. However, an attempt to try out such a set of situations showed us that a problem existed, not in creating realistic situations of language use in job contexts, but in designing a scale of difficulty which was sensitive enough for our purposes. During the trial run of the questionnaire, subjects had difficulty choosing any of our ready-made categories, and since the interviewer was present, they tended to amplify their choices with extensive oral explanations. Since the explanations were of more interest than the descriptive point of the scale chosen, which tended to be rather misleading, we rejected the pencil and paper questionnaire approach and instead incorporated the measure of perceived proficiency into the taped interview. The advantages of this procedure are clear; starting from specific questions relating to their everyday academic activities, subjects were able to explain their ability or non-ability to handle a wide variety of job-related situations. The amount of detail provided allowed us to gain a very clear picture of

a subject's abilities in each situation, as well as to get insight into his feelings and concerns about his second language competence.

The questions asked concerned the subjects' perception of their ability to follow and participate in intellectual discussions, both in and out of their field, ability to participate in meetings and convince others of their point of view, ability to understand foreign or regional accents, ability to give lectures and counsel students in the second language, and other items of this nature.

E. PERSONALITY MEASURE

Our choice as a measure of personality was Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, published by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. The test ensures comprehensive coverage of personality by measuring sixteen functionally independent fundamental dimensions of human personality which have been developed out of over thirty years of research on unitary source traits making up the structure of personality. It was chosen over similar instruments because it has been widely used in educational research on adult populations, is designed for use on normal rather than pathological populations, and is self-

administered and objectively scored. And, perhaps most important for our purposes, it is available in French as well as in English, with norms established for a French-Canadian population, both university students and the general adult population, by the Institut de Recherches Psychologiques, Inc. in Montreal.

Several forms of the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire exist, designed for various populations. We selected Form A, which, along with the alternate Form B, is the most appropriate form for an educated population consisting of individuals with a minimum of high school graduation. The questionnaire contains 187 multiple choice items, with from 10 to 13 questions measuring each personality factor, arranged so as to insure variety and interest for the examinee as well as to allow scoring by a stencil. Each factor is conceived of as a personality dimension, or continuum from one pole to the opposite pole on the trait. Thus, for example, Factor A is the dimension "Reserved versus Outgoing", with a low score indicating a tendency to be more "reserved, detached, critical or cool" and a high score indicating a tendency to be "outgoing, warmhearted, easy-going or participating". The Handbook for the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire contains both extensive and capsule descriptions for each of the sixteen primary personality factors, as well as for four "second

order" factors, which are derived from a combination of the primary factors, (For example, "Low anxiety versus High anxiety" and "Introversion versus Extraversion"). A complete listing of the 20 personality factors is contained in Chapter 3, I, B, 5.

For each item on the questionnaire, three choices are provided, with one answer contributing a score toward one pole, one toward the other pole, and the "middle of the road" choice toward both poles simultaneously. The test yields 20 scores, 16 primary factors and 4 "second-order" factors. Scores on each factor are normally converted to standard scores ranging from 1 to 10, with a score of 5.5 representing the neutral point between the two poles. The test takes from 45-55 minutes to administer.

V. PROCEDURES

A. INTERVIEW

All of the interviews were conducted by the investigator in the subject's dominant language in his or her university office. They were recorded on a very small Sony T55 tape recorder with a built-in microphone, for later transcription.

The interview opened with questions on the linguistic background and language learning history of the

subject, then proceeded to the questions on his perception of his proficiency in the second language. From there the discussion was turned to how subjects behaved in certain situations where choice of code was at issue. Finally, a card containing the linguaphilia scale was handed to the subject, who picked one alternative, then talked about the reasons for his choice. The questions concerning the subject's attitudes about working at a bilingual university and having children become bilingual were posed whenever the conversation seemed to turn in an appropriate direction.

The tone of the interview was kept as informal as possible. To encourage real discussion of the issues, questions were posed conversationally, never read aloud. An abbreviated interview guide was used for this purpose; although questions were not always phrased identically for each subject, it was felt that the spontaneity gained by this approach compensated for any shortcomings. The order of questions also varied somewhat from interview to interview, since it was felt important to follow the natural flow of the conversation. At the end of the interview a quick check was made to be sure that no questions had been omitted.

The subjects were very cooperative and interested in discussing their language use and attitudes. In quite a number of cases subjects went well beyond the 45 minutes projected for the interview.

B. ADMINISTRATION OF PERSONALITY MEASURE

At the close of the interview, the subject was asked if he would mind taking a short pencil and paper personality test, i.e. the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire. If he agreed, he was given the questionnaire booklet and answer sheet and requested to write his name and age on the answer sheet. The interviewer remained present but demurred from giving any explanations of what a particular question meant, or which aspect of personality it purported to measure.

In general, the test was not well received by the subjects. Professors as a group seem to be too sophisticated, perhaps even cynical, test takers, for this transparent a type of measure. Many of the items provoked laughter, others evoked expressions of frustration. Most subjects completed the questionnaire with good grace; but one respondent was moved to write a letter describing the inadequacies of the test in precise and logical detail, pointing out questions where the two polar choices were not compatible and indeed could both be espoused

simultaneously. Although the test cannot be said to have² been a success with this highly critical population, we have confidence in the instrument, whose validity has been shown on many different populations over the years, including academics.

2

Four out of the original population of 30 professors and administrators refused outright to take the test, three of them after trying a few questions and the fourth out of an aversion to any and all tests of personality. It is interesting to note in passing that the population of students, who also participated in the study, but whose results are not analyzed in this thesis, expressed very few complaints about the questionnaire.

CHAPTER 3
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Because the major part of the information for this study was gathered by means of taped interviews, a preliminary phase of analysis was necessary before correlational analysis of the data could begin. Scales had to be developed for the language use situations, attitudes on bilingualism, linguaphilia and perceived proficiency, and each subject had to be rated on each scale. As well, the personality measure had to be scored and personality profiles for each subject drawn up. The variables resulting from these procedures, termed primary factors, were used to develop certain secondary factors. Both of these types of factors were subsequently submitted to correlational analysis.

A. TRANSCRIPTION OF TAPED INTERVIEWS

Transforming the data collected on tape into a usable form was necessary before the primary factors could be drawn up. Given the willingness of our subjects to freely engage in conversation and the variety of subjects engendered by the discussion, it was decided to transcribe the tapes selectively. 4 X 6 index cards were used to record each subject's responses to each question, as well

as all other relevant remarks (for example, attitudes towards members of the other ethnolinguistic group, comments concerning an individual's own language learning ability or personality). In order to make it easy to find the material relating to particular questions, all remarks the subject made on a given topic were transcribed onto the same card. The location of the remark on the tape was noted next to each comment. Responses were copied verbatim, and the tapes were replayed as often as necessary to get an accurate transcription.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF PRIMARY FACTORS

In general, in developing scales for each interview question we created the categories of response from those items mentioned by the subjects. For any given factor, we recorded the quintessence of each subject's feelings and attitudes on the matter, arranged the various responses in logical sequence according to the content of the question, and then abstracted the points of the scale from these responses. For purposes of correlational analysis numerical scores were assigned to each point and subjects were then placed on this scale. The verbatim quotations of subjects' attitudes, motivations, etc. were later used in the interpretive phase of analysis.

1. Scales of language use (Factors 1-6)

For the first five language use situations, straightforward five-point scales involving degree of use of L1 and L2 were used. For example, the following scale was used for Primary Factor 1 (Language used when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the other language).

Always speak L2	5
More likely to speak L2	4
Either L1 or L2	3
More likely to speak L1	2
Always speak L1	1

The other factors had very similar scales, except that the high value of the scale was assigned to L2 use in Factors 1, 3 and 4 and to L1 use in Factors 2 and 5, following the logic of the question asked.

For the sixth factor, which involved willingness to switch languages with the same individual, a scale was constructed which measured frequency of switching. It ranged from "frequently switches" (5 points) to "rarely or never switches" (1 point).

The following are the six language use factors:

Primary Factor 1 - Language used when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the opposite language ("Initiating").

Primary Factor 2 - Willingness to respond in L1 to an L2 speaker having difficulty in L1 ("Use of L1 to L2 speaker having difficulty").

Primary Factor 3 - Perseverance in speaking L2 when interlocutor switches to speaker's L1 ("Perseverance in speaking L2").

Primary Factor 4 - Language of response when addressed in L2 by L1 speaker ("Use of L2 with L1 speaker").

Primary Factor 5 - Adherence to L1 in group discussion when speaker of L2 arrives ("Adherence to L1 in group").

Primary Factor 6 - Willingness to switch languages with the same individual ("Switching").

2. Scales of attitudes on bilingualism

The two scales reflecting aspects of living and working in a bilingual environment were developed and scored by the procedure described under "Development of Primary Factors".

Primary Factor 7, Attitude towards working at a bilingual university ("Bilingual university"), was assigned scores ranging from 1 to 5 over the following scale:

<u>Category Description</u>	<u>Points</u>
Chose to come to the University of Ottawa at least partly because of its bilingual character. Wouldn't want to teach at a unilingual university.	5
Appreciates the bilingual atmosphere of the university and would miss it; however, this is not the factor which causes him/her to remain here..	4
Would not mind teaching at a unilingual university; would be equally at ease there.	3
Would be more comfortable at a unilingual university.	2
Dislikes the bilingual atmosphere and wishes he/she were at a unilingual university.	1

Primary Factor 8, Attitude toward children becoming bilingual ("Children bilingual"), was difficult to develop a scale for, because attitudes of Francophones and Anglophones differ so radically on this question. These differences are discussed in Section II., C., 2. of this chapter. Scores were assigned ranging from 1 to 5 on the following scale:

<u>Category Description</u>	<u>Points</u>
Strong concern about children becoming bilingual; would send them to school in the opposite language; no reservations about effect on first language.	5
Desire to have children become bilingual but would not necessarily send them to school in the opposite language.	4
Interest in having children become bilingual, but not at the detriment of their first language.	3
Bilingualism is desirable but by no means necessary; concerned that children have strong grounding in their first language.	2
Strong concern about maintaining first language rather than about child becoming bilingual.	1

3. Scales of Attitude toward Second Language Learning and "Linguaphilia"

Despite the fact that a scale of "linguaphilia" had been prepared in advance, because subjects talked freely about their reactions to the choices suggested by the instrument, their responses were recorded and a new scale developed in the same way as for the previous factors. The original instrument had had 5 possible choices; however, since the viewpoints expressed by subjects were often located between two points on the scale, scores were assigned ranging from 1 to 10. For example, a subject who said, "I think I'm B. B and A are not contradictory. I think I'm going from A to B," was scored between A and B.

Points were assigned according to the following scale (see Chapter 2. III. C. for the descriptions of points A-E):

<u>Response</u>	<u>Points</u>
A	10
Between A and B	9
B	8
Between B and C	7
C	5.5
Between C and D	4
D	3
Between D and E	2
E	1

However, when the different response patterns of the two ethnolinguistic groups to this item were analyzed, it became immediately evident that the scale as designed actually measured "attitude toward learning and using the second language". This factor became Primary Factor 9 and another factor was created for linguaphilia in general, or attitude toward foreign language learning.¹ Primary Factor

¹ In a bilingual region, the distinction is often made between the second language, or the language of the other ethnic group making up the population which is normally learned as the "second" language, and foreign languages, which do not form part of the local linguistic scene. Attitudes toward second and foreign languages may differ quite considerably.

10, "Linguaphilia", was developed with a scale running from 5 ("Finds language learning fascinating") to 1 ("Dislikes learning other languages"). More discussion of the problems involved with the linguaphilia scale are found in Section II. B. of this chapter.

4. Perceived proficiency scales

Ten sub-scales for different aspects of perceived proficiency in the second language were developed using the same procedure as for the attitude and language use scales. Following this, one overall score was derived from the combined sub-scale ratings. The sub-scales covered certain aspects of production and comprehension, for production, especially, the dimensions measured were limited to those which were likely to occur in a professional context. An overall self-assessment of second language proficiency was also included. Sub-scales were developed for the following ten items, each of which had a range from 1 to 10:

Production in L2

1. Ability to convince someone, make a point in a meeting.
2. Discuss one's field with another colleague.
3. Discuss subjects outside of one's field.
4. Teach in the second language.

Comprehension

5. Follow a rapid exchange between two native speakers.
6. Understand unfamiliar accents (Quebec/European French/Other) (British/American/Other).
7. Follow radio, TV, movies.

General

8. Vocabulary.
9. Situations in which feel inhibited about using L2.
10. Overall self-assessment.

After subjects had been rated on each of the subscales, these scores were used to place each subject on an overall scale of Perceived Second Language Proficiency (Primary Factor 11). This scale ranged from a high of 10, indicating that the subject felt he used the second language essentially as a native speaker does, to a theoretical low of 1; in fact, the lowest of any of our subjects rated themselves was 3, since we were dealing with people who were at least functionally bilingual. It was this overall score that was used for correlation with the other primary factors.

For ease of comparison of subjects, the ten scores used for correlational analysis were also regrouped into five more general levels of perceived proficiency as

2
follows:

- Level A - Close to native speaker. (Scores 9 & 10)
- Level B - Functions competently in almost all respects but is conscious of some gaps in L2 competence. (Scores 7 & 8)
- Level C - Copes with most work and social situations, despite frequent errors and gaps in lexicon. (Scores 5 & 6)
- Level D - Able to discuss areas encountered frequently in the work context, but not at ease in social situations where discussion may cover a wide range of topics. (Scores 3 & 4)
- Level E - Possesses only rudimentary knowledge; able to function only in limited domains where stock phrases may be used. (Scores 1 & 2)

While these five levels do not pretend to be precise descriptions of proficiency, they were thought to be useful as a means of seeing general tendencies and comparing groups. The complete description of the 10 levels of Perceived Second Language Proficiency is contained in Appendix 5.

2

Because this scale was designed specifically to handle the range of subjects we had in our sample, it is skewed somewhat toward the high end of the scale. Clearly this scale would not be appropriate to use on a population which includes subjects with very little knowledge of the second language.

5. Personality factors

Several steps were necessary to obtain scores for the personality factors for each subject. First, the answer sheets for the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire were hand scored by means of a stencil, which resulted in raw scores for the sixteen primary personality dimensions. Since personality factors have slight age trends, which the authors of the instrument feel can be "of critical importance in research" (Cattell and Eber, 1962, p.12), the raw scores were then corrected for age. Finally, these age-corrected scores were transformed into standard scores, or "stens", using the General Adult Population norms (Form A). Separate norms were used for the French and English versions of the test. (The French norms were standardized on a French Canadian population, while the English norms represent an American population.)

The standard scores obtained on each factor were used to create a "personality profile" for each subject, a graphic representation of where the subject stands on the range between poles on each personality dimension. A sten of 5 or 6 represents an average score (obtained by approximately 38.2% of the adult population), while a sten of 7 or 4, each of which is obtained by 15.0% of adults, represents some leaning towards either the positive or the negative pole of the dimension in question. Stens of 9 or

2 represent quite an extreme leaning and are obtained by only 4.4% of the population, while stens of 10 and 1 are only obtained by 2.3% of adults.

In the description of the sixteen personality dimensions which follows, the first pole is the low score direction, and the second pole is the high direction. The factor names are those referred to in the 16 P F test.

<u>FACTOR</u>	<u>LOW SCORE</u>	vs.	<u>HIGH SCORE</u>
A -	<u>Reserved,</u> detached, critical, aloof.		<u>Outgoing,</u> warmhearted, easy- going, participating.
B -	<u>Less intelligent,</u> concrete-thinking.		<u>More intelligent,</u> abstract-thinking, bright.
C -	<u>Affected by feelings,</u> emotionally less stable, easily upset.		<u>Emotionally stable,</u> faces reality, calm, mature.
E -	<u>Humble,</u> mild, accommodating conforming.		<u>Assertive,</u> aggressive, stub- born, competitive.
F -	<u>Sober,</u> prudent, serious, taciturn.		<u>Happy-go-lucky,</u> gay, impulsively lively, enthusi- astic.
G -	<u>Expedient,</u> disregards rules, feels few obligations.		<u>Conscientious,</u> persevering, moralistic, staid.
H -	<u>Shy,</u> restrained, timid, threat-sensitive.		<u>Venturesome,</u> socially bold, uninhibited, spon- taneous.

- I - Tough-minded,
self-reliant, no-
nonsense, realistic. vs. Tender-minded,
clinging, over-
protected, sensi-
tive.
- L - Trusting,
adaptable, free of
jealousy, easy to
get along with. vs. Suspicious,
self-opinionated,
hard to fool.
- M - Practical,
careful, regulated
by external realities,
proper. vs. Imaginative,
wrapped up in inner
urgencies, careless
of practical mat-
ters, Bohemian.
- N - Forthright,
natural, artless,
unpretentious. vs. Shrewd,
calculating, pene-
trating, worldly.
- O - Self-assured,
confident, serene. vs. Apprehensive,
self-reproaching,
worrying, troubled.
- Q1- Conservative,
respecting estab-
lished ideas, tolerant
of traditional diffi-
culties. vs. Experimenting,
liberal, free-
thinking, analy-
tical.
- Q2- Group-dependent,
a "joiner" and
sound follower. vs. Self-sufficient,
prefers own deci-
sions, resourceful.
- Q3- Undisciplined
self-conflict,
follows own urges,
careless of protocol. vs. Controlled,
socially precise,
following self-
image.
- Q4- Relaxed,
tranquil,
unfrustrated. vs. Tense,
frustrated, driven,
overwrought.

Each subject was also scored on four broader "second order factors", which were derived from the sixteen basic personality dimensions by applying specified weights to the

stems for particular primary factors. The following are the second-order factors which were distinguished:

<u>FACTOR</u>	<u>LOW SCORE</u>	vs.	<u>HIGH SCORE</u>
I.	<u>Adjustment</u>		<u>Anxiety</u>
II.	<u>Introversion</u>		<u>Extraversion</u>
III.	<u>Tenderminded emotion- ality</u> (emotionally sensitive, guided by emotions)		<u>Alert poise</u> (decisive, imper- turbable)
IV.	<u>Subduedness</u> (passive, dependent)		<u>Independence</u> (self-directing, independent)

The twenty personality factors were numbered as Factors 15 through 34 for the purposes of correlational analysis. However, in this text they will be referred to as PF A, PF Q4, Second order PF III, etc.

C. DEVELOPMENT OF SECONDARY FACTORS

The six primary language use factors all concerned the use of either L1 or L2 in various situations of language choice. However, it was felt that overall indices of extent of use of L2 and extent of use of L1 would be desirable as an aid to exploring the relationship between language use and accommodation. These indices were arrived at by utilizing the scores obtained on the primary factors, either in their original form or in their inverse (e.g. 5 instead of 1, or 1 instead of 5), depending on whether L1

or L2 use is measured by that question. Thus, when calculating L2 use, raw scores were used for those factors for which a high score indicated strong adherence to L2, while for those factors for which high values signified maximal use of L1, inverse scores were used.

1. Extent of Use of L2/Extent of Use of L2 with L2 Speakers

The secondary factor for "Extent of Use of L2" (Factor 12) is composed of four factors in the following way:

- 1) Raw score on Factor 1, "Initiating": The higher the score, the more likely the subject is to use L2 when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the opposite language.
- 2) Inverse score on Factor 2, "Use of L1 to L2 speaker having difficulty": A low score indicates an inclination to switch into L2, while a high score indicates readiness to use L1 with an L2 speaker.
- 3) Raw score on Factor 3, "Perseverance in speaking L2": A high score indicates perseverance in speaking L2 even when the interlocutor answers in the subject's L1.
- 4) Raw score on Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker": The higher the score, the more likely the subject is to respond in L2 when an L1 speaker addressed in L2.
- 5) Inverse score on Factor 5, "Adherence to L1 in group discussion when speaker of L2 arrives": A low score indicates a willingness to switch to L2, whereas a high score signifies adherence to L1, the language of the group.

The maximum score possible on Factor 12, "Extent of Use of L2", was 25.

Although Primary Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker" was included in the index of "Extent of Use of L2", it represents a use of the second language which is seen as abnormal in many speakers' eyes. While it is useful as an indication of accommodative use of L2, failure to use L2 with an L1 speaker cannot justifiably be used as an indicator of a low use of L2 in the wider sense (ie. with L2 speakers). For this reason it was thought necessary to create an additional overall index for "Extent of Use of L2 with L2 Speakers" (Factor 13). This secondary factor is made up of the same scores indicated above for "Extent of Use of L2", excluding Factor 4. Thus, the maximum score possible for "Extent of Use of L2 with L2 Speakers" was 20.

2. Extent of Use of L1

The secondary factor for "Extent of Use of L1" (Factor 14) is composed of the same factors as for "Extent of Use of L2" except that inverse scores are used. Thus, "Extent of Use of L1" is composed of the following factors:

- 1) Inverse score on Factor 1, "Initiating": The lower the score, the more likely the subject was to use L1 when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the opposite language.
- 2) Raw score on Factor 2, "Willingness to respond in L1 to an L2 speaker having difficulty": High score indicates inclination to use L1 with an L2 speaker, while a low score indicates a tendency to switch into L2.

- 3) Inverse score on Factor 3, "Perseverance in speaking L2": Low score indicates a tendency to use L1 when interlocutor responds in the same language.
- 4) Inverse score on Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker": The lower the score, the more likely the subject is to respond in L1 when an L1 speaker addresses him in L2.
- 5) Raw score on Factor 5, "Adherence to L1 in group discussion when speaker of L2 arrives": High score signifies adherence to L1, the language of the group, whereas a low score indicates a willingness to switch to L2 for the benefit of an L2 speaker.

Although it was originally intended to create a secondary factor of "Accommodativeness" by rating each subject on the accommodativeness of his response to each of the language use situations, and then summing these scores for an overall score, this approach was ultimately abandoned. Chapter 4, I. contains a discussion of the complexities involved in such an undertaking and the reasons for our decision not to proceed in this direction.

II. RESULTS OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The preliminary stage of analysis yielded scores for the twenty subjects on a total of thirty-four variables: six primary and three secondary language use factors, four attitude factors, a perceived proficiency factor, and sixteen primary and four second-order personality factors.

Three different statistical procedures were used in analyzing the data. First, a chi square analysis was performed on the scores of the two groups of subjects (Anglophones and Francophones) for the language use, attitude and perceived proficiency factors to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the two ethnolinguistic groups. Second, for the personality factors, which are normally distributed data, t-tests were used to determine whether the two groups differed. Finally, in order to determine potential relationships between the various language use, attitude and perceived proficiency factors, and between these and the personality dimensions, correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) were computed for the first fourteen variables with each other, and for these fourteen variables with the personality factors.

A. LANGUAGE USE FACTORS: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

Significant differences were found between the responses of the two ethnolinguistic groups on two of the six primary language use factors (Factors 3 and 4), while trends were found for two more primary language use factors (Factors 5 and 6) and two of the secondary language use factors (Factors 12 and 14).


~ Throughout this discussion we will use .05 as the

cut-off level for statistical significance. When we speak of "trends", however, we mean that there is a relationship at the .1 level or better. We feel that such trends are worth mentioning because, although they do not reach the level of statistical significance with our sample, there is enough of a relationship present that with another population they might well do so.

Anglophones were significantly more likely to persevere in speaking L2 when their interlocutor switched to their L1, while Francophones were more likely to follow the lead of their interlocutor in switching back to their own language (Factor 3: $X^2(3)=8.57$, $p<.05$).³ Anglophones were also significantly more likely to use L2 and answer in French when addressed in that language by another English speaker, whereas Francophones were much more likely to immediately switch to their L1, French, when addressed in English by another Francophone (Factor 4: $X^2(3)=10.77$, $p<.05$). In addition, there was a strong trend for Francophones to use L1 and address a bilingual Anglophone in French when the latter joined a group discussion going on in French, whereas Anglophones, in the parallel situation

3

Although Factors 1-8 all had 5 categories of response, those factors where one category was empty for both Anglophones and Francophones had to be considered to have only four categories in the X analysis; thus, $df.=3$ in those cases.



of a group discussion in English, were more likely to use their L2 and address a newly arrived bilingual Francophone in French (Factor 5: $X^2(4)=8.06$, $p.<.1$). And finally, Francophones tended to switch languages with the same individual more frequently and to be more positively oriented toward switching than were Anglophones, although here again the relationship does not achieve statistical significance at the .05 level (Factor 6: $X^2(4)=8.33$, $p.<.1$).

We see, thus, that in three out of the four situations mentioned above, Anglophones showed a substantially greater use of L2 with bilingual interlocutors than did Francophones. This same tendency was found in the two remaining language use situations, Factor 1, "Initiating", and Factor 2, "Use of L1 to L2 speaker having difficulty", even though for these factors the relationship was clearly less strong. To sum up, overall Anglophones were more likely to use L2 in a variety of communication situations than were Francophones: they initiated conversations in L2 more, both in individual and group situations; they were more likely to persevere in using L2 when their interlocutor switched to their L1; they were more likely to switch to L2 for the benefit of an L2 speaker having trouble in his second language; and they

were more likely to respond in L2 to a member of their own ethnolinguistic group who addressed them in L2. (However, Francophones were more at home switching languages with the same individual than were Anglophones.) Since this type of behavior presents a pattern typical of minority group speakers rather than members of the linguistic majority, these results require some comment. We feel that this finding is probably due to the particular population from which our subjects were drawn, since bilingual Anglophones at the University of Ottawa may be much more motivated to use the second language than are Anglophones in the culture at large. As well, this finding may indicate a stepped up use of language as an ethnic identity marker on the part of Francophones, again typically manifested most strongly by university members. This matter will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

B. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

Two language attitudes were found to have different patterns of response for the two ethnolinguistic groups (Factors 8 and 9), while for the two remaining attitudes the groups did not differ (Factors 7 and 10).

Anglophones manifested stronger desire to have their children become bilingual than Francophones, who tended

instead to be concerned that their children have a good grounding in their own language (Factor 8: $X^2(4)=9.10$, $p.<.06$). Although this correlational coefficient does not achieve statistical significance, it is a strong enough trend that it warrants serious consideration, and it will be discussed further in Chapter 4. Note that this does not imply that Francophones were against having children become bilingual, but that their concerns ran in the other direction, toward maintaining their first language.

The second attitudinal factor about which Anglophones and Francophones were found to have different reactions was in attitude toward learning the second language. Here too Anglophones were significantly more positively motivated toward learning and using the second language than were Francophones (Factor 9: $X^2(4)=12.20$, $p.<.05$).

However, in attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university (Factor 7), as well as in attitude toward learning foreign languages in general, or "linguaphilia", (Factor 10), the two groups did not differ significantly. Both groups were positively motivated toward working at a bilingual university and both groups manifested generally high interest in learning foreign languages.

C. PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

The two ethnolinguistic groups did not differ significantly in their self-evaluations of their second language proficiency, whether the analyses were done on the distribution of the subjects across the ten possible overall scores, or across the five more general levels. (See Chapter 2, III. D.)

D. PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LANGUAGE USE

An examination of the personality traits and the scores on the language use situations for each subject provided support for our hypothesis that there are definite links between personality and use of the second language which hold across ethnolinguistic groups. Since tests of significance between Francophone and Anglophone means on all factors of the personality inventory yielded no significant differences, we were able to treat the two groups as one population when correlating their personality scores with those language use situations which also did not differ significantly between the groups. However, when correlating personality traits with the language use situations, attitudes, etc. which did differ between the Anglophone and Francophone groups, we were obliged to treat the two groups separately.

7

In the discussion which follows, reference to a "positive" correlation indicates correlation with the "high" or second mentioned pole of the personality dimension, while a "negative" correlation signifies a relationship with the "low" or first mentioned pole of the dimension. For example, a positive correlation with Factor E, "Humble versus Assertive", indicates a relationship with assertiveness. All quotations elaborating on the characteristics of a particular personality pole are from the Manual for Forms A and B, 16 PF Questionnaire (Cattell and Eber, 1962), unless otherwise specified.

Two personality factors showed a significant positive correlation with Factor 1, "Initiating": PF E, "Humble versus Assertive", ($r(19) = .43$, $p < .05$) and Second Order PF II, "Introversion versus Extraversion", ($r(19) = .46$, $p < .05$). Thus it appears that, for members of both linguistic groups, people who are more "assertive, aggressive, competitive and dominant" rather than "humble, accommodating, submissive and conforming", as well as more "extraverted" as opposed to "introverted", tend to initiate conversations in L2 with bilinguals of the opposite language significantly more often. This finding contradicts the findings of studies by Giles and other researchers, in which initiating a conversation in the first language of the interlocutor is assumed to be highly

accommodative behavior. This question will be discussed at length in Chapters 5 and 6.

A significant positive relationship was also found between Factor 3, "Perseverance in speaking L2", and the personality dimensions PF Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense", ($r(19)=.58$, $p.<.01$) and Second Order PF I, "Adjustment versus Anxiety", ($r(19)=.50$, $p.<.02$). Thus it seems that individuals who are both more "tense, frustrated and impatient" rather than "relaxed, tranquil and unfrustrated", and more anxious rather than less anxious (better adjusted) are significantly more likely to persevere in speaking their second language when their interlocutor switches to L1. (We note here that, although Factor 3 showed significantly different language use patterns for Anglophones and Francophones, and strictly speaking they should not be considered as one group for this factor, we can have confidence in the relationship with personality revealed here since these same two correlations were found to be equally strong for the two groups separately. (See Section E, which follows.)

One final relationship between personality and language use did not reach the .05 level of significance but may be considered a trend. Factor 13, "Extent of use

of the L2 with L2 speakers", tends to be related to PF Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense", ($r(19) = .40$, $p < .1$), such that tenser individuals are more likely to have a high index of use of the second language to second language speakers. Although it is only a trend, we have a certain amount of confidence in this relationship because the same relationship was found in the two groups independently, at the .05 level of probability for Francophones and at the .1 level of probability for Anglophones.

In sum then, the relationships which we found occurring between language use and personality traits which hold across ethnolinguistic groups are as follows:

1) More assertive or aggressive as well as more extraverted individuals tend to initiate conversations in L2 with bilinguals of the other language significantly more frequently than less dominant, introverted people.

2) Those who tend to persevere in using the second language when the interlocutor switches to their first

4

Certain other relationships between personality and language use which showed up as significant when the data for both groups were pooled were discarded, because the language use factors, while not significantly different, showed some tendency to be different. When the language use/personality correlation coefficients for the two samples separately were inspected, these relationships were found to be primarily accounted for by either one group or the other.

language tend to be both tenser and more anxious than their counterparts who are more apt to follow the lead of their interlocutor and fall into their first language.

E. PERSONALITY TRAITS AND LANGUAGE USE: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

When we considered the two ethnolinguistic groups separately, many differences were revealed between the Anglophone and Francophone samples in the relation of language use to personality traits, which did not exist when the data from the two groups was pooled. Since, as we have mentioned, tests of significance between the means of Anglophones and Francophones on all 20 factors of the personality inventory yielded no significant differences whatever, we concluded that differences in language use patterns, attitudes or other phenomena related to ethnolinguistic group membership are accounting for these differences. Some of the more interesting results are presented and discussed below.

1. Anglophones

The personality factor Q1, "Conservative versus Experimenting", was found to be quite a powerful predictor of language use for Anglophones. This factor correlated positively with Factor 1, "Initiating", ($r(10) = .57$, $p < .05$) and Factor 3, "Perseverance in using L2", ($r(10) = .70$,

p.<.001) and negatively with Factor 6, "Switching", ($r(10)=-.82$, p.<.001). That is, Anglophones who were more "experimenting, critical, liberal or free-thinking" rather than "conservative or respecting established ideas", tended significantly more often to initiate conversations with bilinguals of the other language in L2, to persevere in using L2 with interlocutors who switch to L1, and to avoid switching languages with the same individual.

This same trait of being "experimenting" and "liberal" was also the only personality factor to correlate significantly with all of the secondary factors, or overall indices of language use. It correlated with "Extent of use of L2 overall" (Factor 12: $r(10)=.60$, p.<.05), even more strongly with "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speakers" (Factor 13: $r(10)=.69$, p.<.02) and negatively with "Extent of use of L1" (Factor 14: $r(10)=-.61$, p.<.05).

As mentioned in the previous section on personality correlates for both ethnolinguistic groups combined, two personality factors, PF Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense", and Second Order PF I, "Adjustment versus Anxiety", correlated very strongly with "Perseverance in using L2" (Factor 3); those who persevere in using L2 when their interlocutor switches to L1 tended to be significantly tenser (PF Q4: $r(10)=.73$, p.<.01) and significantly more anxious (Second

Order PF I: $r(10) = .70$, $p < .01$) than those who switch to L1 following their interlocutor's lead. In addition, these same personality factors correlated, although less strongly, with Factor 13, "Extent of Use of L2 to L2 speakers", which represents the more natural use of L2; those Anglophones who had a high overall use of L2 with L2 speakers were significantly more anxious (Second Order PF I: $r(10) = .57$, $p < .05$) and also showed a tendency to be tense (PF Q4: $r(10) = .56$, $p < .06$). And finally, there was some tendency for PF Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense", to correlate with two additional language use factors; Anglophones who were rather tense had a greater tendency to initiate conversations in L2 with a bilingual of the other language (Factor 1: $r(10) = .52$, $p < .1$), as well as to avoid switching languages with the same individual (Factor 6: $r(10) = -.50$, $p < .1$).

In addition to correlating with PF Q1, Factor 1, "Initiating", showed a significant negative relationship with PF Q3, "Undisciplined self-conflict versus Controlled" ($r(10) = -.58$, $p < .05$). That is, Anglophones who tended to initiate conversations in L2 were more likely to be "casual" or "undisciplined" and to "follow their own urges", rather than to be "compulsive, controlled and socially-precise".

There were also significant relationships between Factor 4 and three personality factors. "Use of L2 with L1 speakers" correlated positively with PF I, "Tough-minded versus Tenderminded" ($r(10)=.57, p.<.05$) and PF N, "Forthright versus Shrewd" ($r(10)=.71, p.<.01$), as well as negatively with Second Order PF III, "Tenderminded Emotionality versus Alert Poise" ($r(10)= -.57, p.<.05$). This means that Anglophones who were willing to speak L2 to another Anglophone who addressed them in French were more prone to be "tenderminded" (dependent, day-dreaming, sensitive) rather than "toughminded" (practical, realistic, no-nonsense) as well as "emotional, indecisive, or frustrated" as opposed to "enterprising, decisive, and resilient". Intuitively this finding appears correct; it seems quite likely that more sensitive, emotional individuals would tend to empathize more with the position of an L1 interlocutor speaking L2 and to avoid switching to L1 so as not to hurt that person's feelings, whereas practical, realistic, no-nonsense type individuals would simply switch to L1 as the most obvious thing to do, without a thought for the finer sensibilities of their interlocutor. The third correlation, however, that with "shrewdness", seems at first glance to be in contradiction with the traits of sensitivity and emotionality cited above. Yet, the description of PF N makes it clear that the person who scores high on this factor tends to be

"socially aware", "calculating" and "insightful regarding self and others" (Cattell and Eber, 1962, p.16), while those scoring low on this factor tend to be "naive, forthright, natural, artless and spontaneous", as well as "unskilled in analyzing motives". It seems probable that a forthright, natural, artless person would find it unnatural to answer another native speaker in L2, and would be less likely to analyze the other's reactions to a switch to L1, whereas a more socially aware, insightful, even calculating person would have less difficulty speaking the less "natural" language, as long as he thought that it corresponded to the other's wishes.

2. Francophones

Two of the language use variables, as well as the secondary factors involving extent of use of L2, were found to correlate with certain personality traits for Francophones only. The most marked set of relationships with personality was found for Factor 6, "Switching languages with the same individual". This variable correlated negatively (that is, correlated with the low end or first mentioned pole of the dimension) with four of the primary and two of the secondary personality factors: PF C, "Affected by feelings versus Emotionally stable" ($r(9) = -.66, p < .05$), PF F, "Sober versus Happy-go-lucky" ($r(9) =$

-.82, $p < .01$), PF H, "Shy versus Venturesome" ($r(9) = -.60$, $p < .05$), PF N, "Forthright versus Shrewd" ($r(9) = -.67$, $p < .05$), Second Order PF II, "Introversion versus Extraversion" ($r(9) = -.63$, $p < .05$), and Second Order PF III, "Tenderminded emotionality versus Alert Poise" ($r(9) = -.70$, $p < .02$). This means that, for our Francophone population, those who were more at ease with switching languages with the same individual tended to be more "affected by feelings, emotionally less stable, easily upset", "sober, prudent, serious, taciturn", "shy, restrained, diffident, timid", and "forthright, natural, naive, or artless"; or, as the Second Order Factors sum up their characteristics, they tended to be more "introverted" as well as "emotional" and "sensitive". These characteristics seem intuitively to correspond to with the expected image of a person who would be more apt to accommodatively adapt his language to use that of his interlocutor.

The second language use variable to correlate significantly with several personality traits was Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker". Strong correlations were found with the low end of the scale for PF O, "Self-assured versus Apprehensive" ($r(9) = -.74$, $p < .01$), PF Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense" ($r(9) = -.79$, $p < .01$) and Second Order PF I "Adjustment versus Anxiety" ($r(9) = -.75$, $p < .01$). Clearly,

the more "self assured", "relaxed" and "less anxious" members of the Francophone sample were more likely to respond in English to another Francophone who addressed them in English.

Personality Factor Q4, "Relaxed versus Tense", also correlated significantly with Factor 13, "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speakers", ($r(9) = .64$, $p < .05$), and showed a strong tendency to be related to Factor 12, "Extent of use of L2 overall" ($r(9) = .58$, $p < .1$) and to Factor 13 "Extent of use of L1" ($r(9) = -.58$, $p < .1$). Thus, it appears that Francophones who were more relaxed were more likely to use their second language in a variety of communication situations with Anglophones, and tended, to a lesser extent, to even use English occasionally with other Francophones.

3. Summary

To summarize these results concerning the relationship between personality traits and language use, we found that:

1. Anglophones who were more experimenting, liberal or free-thinking were significantly more likely to use L2 with bilingual Francophones in a variety of communication situations, and significantly less

likely to switch languages with any particular interlocutor, than were their more conservative counterparts.

2. Anglophones who tended to be rather tense and anxious were significantly more likely to persevere in speaking L2 when an interlocutor switched to L1, than were their more relaxed, better adjusted colleagues. They also tended to have a high index of use of L2 with L2 speakers but avoided use of L2 with other Anglophones.

3. On the other hand, Anglophones who were willing to respond in L2 to another Anglophone who addressed them in French tended to be sensitive and emotional, as well as socially aware and insightful.

4. Francophones who were more emotional, sensitive, shy, introverted and natural or spontaneous were significantly more at ease switching languages with any one individual than were those Francophones who were less emotional and shy, and more extraverted, venturesome and calculating.

5. Francophones who were more self-assured, relaxed, and better adjusted (less anxious) were significantly more willing to respond in English to other Francophones who

addressed them in English, than were their more apprehensive, tense and anxious colleagues.

6. Francophones who were more relaxed had a significantly higher index use of L2 with L2 speakers and a generally high index of use of L2 overall, including to other Francophones.

F. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

As one would expect, attitudes about language learning and bilingualism are more closely related to ethnolinguistic group than to personality. Only one language attitude proved to be statistically significantly related to personality across ethnolinguistic groups; however, several important relationships with personality surfaced for Anglophones and Francophones separately.

Of the two attitudes measured which did not differ across the two groups, only Factor 7, "Attitude toward working at a bilingual university", showed a significant positive correlation with a personality dimension for both ethnolinguistic groups combined with PF Q1, "Conservative versus Experimenting" (PF Q1: $r(19) = .51$, $p < .02$). In other words, those faculty members who tended to be "experimenting, critical, liberal or free-thinking", rather

than "conservative and respecting established ideas", were significantly more positively oriented toward working at a bilingual university. We should note here that university professors in general have very high ratings on the trait "Conservative versus Experimenting"; according to Catell, Eber and Tatsuoka (1970, p. 185), the average score on this trait for university professors is 7.5. Our subjects were no exception: the mean score on this trait for Anglophones was 7.8, while for Francophones it was 6.2, giving an overall mean of 7.1.

Factor 9, "Attitude toward learning and using L2", which differed across the two ethnolinguistic groups, was found in the case of Francophones only to exhibit a significant relationship with three personality dimensions: it correlated positively with PF H, "Shy versus Venturesome", ($r(9) = .63$, $p < .05$) and PF N, "Forthright versus Shrewd", ($r(9) = .62$, $p < .05$), as well as negatively with PF Q2, "Group-dependent versus Self-sufficient", ($r(9) = -.66$, $p < .05$). Thus it seems that Francophones who tended to be more "venturesome, socially-bold and uninhibited" rather than "shy, restrained and diffident", as well as more "shrewd, calculating, socially aware and insightful" as opposed to "forthright, natural, naive and artless", and more "group dependent", or "joiners", rather

than "self-sufficient, independent, and preferring their own decisions", showed significantly more positive attitudes toward learning and using the second language. And finally, there is also a strong trend, although it fails to reach the level of statistical significance, for Francophones who are more extraverted to have more positive attitudes toward use of L2 (Second order PF II, 5 "Introversion versus Extraversion": $r(9) = .58$, $p < .1$).

Most of the above relationships seem to correspond to the stereotypic picture of a minority group member using the second language, for example the fact that "group dependent" Francophones tended to be more positively oriented toward using the second language, while those who were more independent, as well as shrewder and more socially aware, had a less positive orientation toward the second language. Perhaps personality variables play an important role in determining whether any given minority group member will maintain his own language to the greatest degree possible, or whether he will use his second language more, and perhaps eventually even become linguistically assimilated into the majority community.

5

The same correlation showed up when the two groups were pooled ($r(19) = .45$, $p < .05$); however, the relationship cannot be considered valid for the two groups as a whole since Francophones and Anglophones differed markedly on this attitude and Francophones seemed to be accounting for most of this relationship.

Two language use factors failed to reveal significant correlations with personality traits, however. Factor 8, "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual", did not correlate significantly with any personality traits; it is clearly an attitude which is strongly rooted in ethnolinguistic group membership. Factor 10, "Attitude toward foreign language learning", or "Linguaphilia" also did not correlate significantly with any personality factor, although there was some correlation with Factor I, "Toughminded versus Tenderminded" ($r(19) = .41$, $p < .1$), indicating that those who love learning foreign languages may tend to be more "dependent, day-dreaming and sensitive" rather than "practical, realistic and no-nonsense".

G. PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

The variable of perceived proficiency in the second language showed one significant correlation with personality for both ethnolinguistic groups, with PF G, "Expedient versus Conscientious", ($r(19) = .45$, $p < .05$). In other words, individuals who felt their competence in the second language to be very high tended also to be "conscientious or persevering", rather than "expedient, quitting or disregarding of obligations". This result is not surprising, since it is probably to be expected that conscientious, persevering people should attain a high

degree of competence in an academic endeavour, such as mastery of another language, which requires a sustained effort.

For Anglophones only, a significant relationship was found between perceived proficiency and PF Q1, "Conservative versus Experimenting". Similar to the pattern found in the language use factors, Anglophones who were "experimenting, liberal or free-thinking" had a significantly higher rating on the factor of perceived second language proficiency. This finding becomes understandable when we relate it to the way in which this subgroup of Anglophones learned their second language, namely in a true "immersion" situation where French was the only language spoken. It is not surprising that those individuals who would place themselves in the position of residing in a province or country where another language is spoken, and where another culture is the norm, would be more open, experimenting and liberal.

For the Francophones in our study, however, who generally learned the second language under very different circumstances, the relationship between perceived proficiency and a conservative versus experimenting nature falls below the level of chance. However, a significant

relationship was found with PF C, "Affected by feelings versus Emotionally stable" ($r(9) = .72$, $p < .02$). Thus, those Francophones who rated themselves highest on second language proficiency tended to be significantly more "emotionally stable, calm, and mature", whereas those who rated themselves less highly tended to be more "affected by feelings, emotionally less stable and easily upset".

H. LANGUAGE USE FACTORS, ATTITUDES AND PERCEIVED PROFICIENCY: ETHNOLINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES

Strong patterns emerged for each of the ethnolinguistic groups in interrelationships between language use, language attitudes and perceived proficiency. Because Anglophones and Francophones differed significantly on most of these variables, these data were not pooled but instead were analyzed separately.

1. Anglophones

For our Anglophone subjects, the two language use factors which proved to have the strongest relationship with language attitudes and perceived proficiency were Factor 1, "Initiating a conversation in L2 with a bilingual of the other language", and Factor 3, "Perseverance in speaking L2 when interlocutor switches to speaker's L1". Of the two, Factor 3 exhibited the stronger relationship, correlating very highly with Factor 7, "Attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university" ($r(9) = .74$, $p < .01$),

Factor 9, "Attitude toward learning and using the second language" ($r(9) = .76$, $p < .01$), and Factor 11, "Perceived proficiency in the second language" ($r(9) = .72$, $p < .02$). Thus, Anglophones who tended to persevere in using L2, even when their interlocutor switched to L1, were significantly more likely to have very positive attitudes both toward working at a bilingual university and toward learning and using the second language, as well as to rate their proficiency in the second language very highly.

Factor 1, "Initiating a conversation in L2", also correlated highly with Factor 9 ($r(9) = .72$, $p < .02$), and moderately with Factor 7 ($r(9) = .62$, $p < .05$). It also showed a strong trend, which failed to attain statistical significance, toward a relation with Factor 11 ($r(9) = .56$, $p < .1$). Thus, for those who initiated conversations in L2 with bilinguals of the other language, substantially the same relationships applied as for "perseverers", although they were somewhat less likely to rate their second language competence highly. Since Factors 1 and 3 correlated highly with one another ($r(9) = .77$, $p < .01$), those who persevered in using L2 were also significantly more likely to initiate conversations in L2. In fact, we suspect that, generally speaking, they tend to be the same people, a suspicion which the interpretive analysis in

Chapter 4 confirmed.

Despite their strong relationship with the other language attitudes, "Initiating" (Factor 1) and "Persevering" (Factor 3) correlated negatively with Factor 8, "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual", ($r(9) = -.67$, $p < .05$, in both cases). This means that those individuals who were most likely to initiate conversations and persevere in L2 were less concerned about their children becoming bilingual than those who used their second language less aggressively. Note that because of the positively skewed nature of the responses to Factor 8, even those who made responses at the low end of the scale were not against having their children become bilingual, but rather tended to express concern that they obtain a strong grounding in their first language.

Thus we see that, paradoxically, those Anglophones who initiate and persevere in use of L2 the most are generally not interested in sending their children to immersion programs or to schools in the second language. Since Factor 11, "Perceived proficiency", also showed a strong negative correlation with Factor 8 ($r(9) = -.71$, $p < .02$), we may add to this the finding that those whose L2 competence is highest (in their own view) have the least concern for their children becoming bilingual

and correspondingly greater concern for high quality in the first language. Upon reflection, this finding is quite comprehensible: those who have attained a high degree of second language competence probably have little anxiety about their children's ability to do the same, and feel less need to push attaining bilingual competence through immersion schooling; however, those for whom mastery of the second language is still problematic may well hope to avoid this difficulty for their children by sending them to school in the second language.

Two further factors correlated negatively with "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual". Factor 10, "Attitude toward foreign language learning", or "Linguaphilia", showed a significant negative correlation ($r(9) = -.64$, $p < .05$), while Factor 9, "Attitude toward learning and using the second language", showed a strong trend in the same direction, even though the relationship did not attain statistical significance ($r(9) = -.56$, $p < .06$). Thus, it seems that those who are most positively oriented toward language learning in general, and to a lesser degree toward learning and using the second language, exhibit least concern about their children becoming bilingual. In general, this finding seems to be related to the finding mentioned above that those

individuals who use their second language the most aggressively and who rate their second language proficiency the most highly, feel least need to push their children into becoming bilingual.

We noted with interest that Factor 10, "Attitude toward foreign language learning", or "Linguaphilia", did not prove to have a significant relation to anything except "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual" (Factor 8). We suspect that this may be due to the difficulties we encountered in scoring this factor, based on an interview question which confused attitudes toward foreign and second language learning. (See the discussion in Chapter 4, III. C.)

However, "Perceived proficiency", Factor 11, proved to be a very good indicator of both language use and language attitudes for our Anglophone subjects. It correlated significantly with the three overall indices of language use, as well as with the first three language use variables. "Extent of use of L2 overall" and "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speakers" both showed a very strong positive correlation with perceived proficiency (Factor 12: $r(9) = .76$, $p < .01$, and Factor 13: $r(9) = .81$, $p < .01$), while "Extent of use of L1" correlated negatively (Factor 14: $r(9) = -.72$, $p < .02$). Thus it seems that the higher

that individuals rated their second language proficiency, the more they used L2 with bilinguals of the opposite language, while the lower they rated their proficiency, the more they used L1.

The individual language use variables which showed the strongest relationship with "Perceived proficiency" were Factors 2 and 3. "Use of L1 to L2 speaker having difficulty in L1" (Factor 2) showed a strong negative correlation ($r(9)=-.72$, $p.<.02$), indicating that those speakers who rated their second language proficiency highest were least likely to continue in L1 with an L2 speaker having difficulty in L1, switching to L2 instead, while those who rated their second language proficiency lower were significantly more likely to continue in L1. "Perseverance in L2" (Factor 3), showed an equally strong correlation with perceived proficiency but in a positive direction ($r(9)=.72$, $p.<.02$), indicating that those who rate their second language proficiency highly are significantly more likely to persevere in using L2, even when their interlocutor switches to their L1. There was also a strong trend toward a positive relationship between Perceived Proficiency and Factor 1, "Initiating", ($r(9)=.57$, $p.<.1$), as well as a strong trend toward a relationship with Factor 5, "Adherence to L1 in group

discussion" ($r(9)=-.56$, $p.<.1$). Thus it seems that those Anglophones who rate their second language proficiency highly also tend to be those who initiate conversations in L2 and those who switch to L2 for the sake of a bilingual Francophone joining a group discussion going on in English.

And finally, "Perceived proficiency" is also a good predictor of language attitudes. A significant correlation was found with "Attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university (Factor 7: $r(9)=.64$, $p.<.05$). That is, Anglophones who felt themselves to be the most competent in the second language rated working at a bilingual university most highly and generally did not want to teach at a monolingual university. There was also a trend toward a positive relationship with "Attitude toward learning and using the second language" (Factor 9: $r(9)=.58$, $p.<.1$), while, as mentioned earlier, there was a strong negative correlation with "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual" (Factor 8: $r(9)=-.71$, $p.<.02$). Thus, those individuals who rated their second language proficiency highly also tended to have positive attitudes toward learning and using their second language, yet they exhibited more concern about their children acquiring a thorough grounding in their first language than about them becoming bilingual.

In addition to the major correlations outlined above, two other observations concerning the individual language use factors warrant mention. First, from a statistical point of view, Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker", proved to tell us very little about anything for Anglophones. It correlated neither with the other language use factors, nor with language attitudes, nor with perceived proficiency. It was not until the actual responses of individual subjects were looked at and their motivations examined that this factor showed us something about accommodative tendencies. (These results are discussed in Chapter 4, II. D.) Second, for Anglophones Factor 6, "Switching", correlated very highly with only one other language use factor, "Adherence to L1 in group" (Factor 5: $r(9) = .78$, $p < .01$). Thus, those Anglophones who were most positively oriented toward switching languages with any one individual were significantly more likely to continue speaking L1 when a bilingual L2 speaker approached the group in which they were discussing. In other words, these individuals seemed more flexible in their use of the two languages, and did not invariably associate L2 speakers with L2 uniquely. As well, there was a trend for "Switching" to be negatively related to Factor 13, "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speakers", ($r(9) = -.59$, $p < .1$) and positively related to Factor 14, "Extent of use of L1" ($r(9) = .55$, $p < .1$),

indicating that people who disliked switching languages tended to use L2 more with L2 speakers and avoided using it with L1 speakers, while those who did not mind switching tended to use relatively more L1 with bilingual speakers of the other language.

When it came to the secondary or overall extent of language use factors, we found that all three, "Extent of use of L2", "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speakers", and "Extent of use of L1", correlated significantly not only with four out of six individual language use factors (Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5), but also with the following factors: "Attitude toward working at a bilingual university" (Factors 7 and 12: $r(9) = .84$, $p < .001$; Factors 7 and 13: $.79$, $p < .01$; Factors 7 and 14: $-.72$, $p < .02$); "Attitude toward learning and using the second language" (Factors 9 and 12: $.68$, $p < .02$; Factors 9 and 13: $.62$, $p < .05$; Factors 9 and 14: $-.71$, $p < .02$); and "Perceived Proficiency" (Factors 11 and 12: $.76$, $p < .01$; Factors 11 and 13: $.81$, $p < .01$; Factors 11 and 14: $-.72$, $p < .02$). In sum then, we may say that the Anglophones who used their second language the most had a very positive attitude toward working at a bilingual university, loved to learn and use the second language, and felt themselves to be very competent in their second language. As we shall see, for

Francophones none of these relationships obtained.

2. Francophones

For our Francophone subjects very different relationships were revealed between language use, language attitudes and perceived proficiency than for the Anglophones. In addition, far fewer correlations proved to be statistically significant.

We have seen that for Anglophones, use of the second language correlated with both language attitudes and self-assessment of L2 proficiency. However, for Francophones, neither "Attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university" (Factor 7), "Attitude toward children becoming bilingual" (Factor 8), nor "Attitude toward learning and using L2" (Factor 9) showed significant correlations with any of the overall extent of language use factors. As well, "Perceived proficiency" (Factor 11), which was one of the very best predictors of language use for Anglophones, proved to have no statistically significant relationships with either the overall extent of language use factors or any of the individual language use factors for Francophones. Only one trend was discernable, that of a negative relationship between Factor 11 and Factor 6; "Switching", ($r(9) = -.52, p < .1$), indicating that there was some tendency for Francophones who rated their second

language proficiency highly to be less favourably disposed toward switching languages with any particular individual. This non-relationship between most of the attitude factors and second language use for Francophones will be discussed in Chapter 4.

However, one attitude factor did show some interesting trends for Francophones. Although Factor 10, "Attitude toward foreign language learning" or "Linguaphilia" proved to have no significant relationship with language use for Anglophones, for Francophones this variable showed a tendency to be related both to the overall and to certain individual language use factors. Factor 10 narrowly missed attaining a statistically significant relationship with all of the secondary factors, "Extent of use of L2", "Extent of use of L2 with L2 speaker" and "Extent of Use of L1" ($r(9) = .59$, $p < .06$ in all 3 cases). In other words, individuals who were more interested in foreign language learning in general showed some tendency to use the second language less and the first language more with bilinguals of the opposite language.

This same trend was evident with Factor 1, "Initiating", ($r(9) = -.54$, $p < .1$) and Factor 5, "Adherence to L1 in group", ($r(9) = -.54$, $p < .1$), indicating that those who initiated conversations in L2 with bilinguals of the

other language tended to like foreign language learning least, while, conversely, those who tended most rigidly to adhere to their first language in a group discussion when a bilingual Anglophone joined the discussion, tended to have a more positive orientation toward foreign language learning in general. One further correlation makes the situation even more explicit: Factor 10 also showed a tendency to be negatively related to Factor 9, "Attitude toward learning and using the second language", ($r(9)=-.59$, $p.<.06$). In other words, those individuals who most enjoyed learning foreign languages showed a tendency to dislike learning and using the second language. Clearly, as one might expect from a minority population, our Francophone subjects made a radical distinction between the second language and other foreign languages. This distinction did not seem to exist for the Anglophones, for whom "Attitude toward learning and using the second language" was a very good predictor of L2 use. That being said, there is still no obvious reason why an inverse relationship between foreign language learning and second language learning should exist for our Francophone population; the analysis of the individual responses of subjects as discussed in Chapter 4 clarifies the reasons for this relationship.

~~X~~

In general the data for our Francophone subjects showed far fewer interrelationships between the various language use factors than for the Anglophones. However, Factor 2, "Use of L1 to an L2 speaker having difficulty in L1", did show two significant correlations, both in a negative direction. The first, very strong correlation was with Factor 3, "Perseverance in L2", ($r(9) = -.82$, $p < .01$), indicating that those who were willing to continue in L1 to an L2 speaker having difficulty in L1 (that is, those people who did not tend to switch to L2), were significantly less likely to persevere in using L2 with an interlocutor who switched to L1. In other words, those Francophones who were willing to accommodate their interlocutor by going along with his choice of language in the first situation, were very likely to do the same in the second situation. The second correlation was with Factor 1, "Initiating", ($r(9) = -.62$, $p < .05$), indicating that those who were most willing to continue speaking L1 to an L2 speaker having difficulty in L1, were significantly less likely to initiate conversations in L2 with bilinguals of the other language; in other words they tended to use their first language in both situations.

There was one further significant correlation between language use factors: Factor 3, "Perseverance",

correlated negatively with Factor 4, "Use of L2 with L1 speaker" ($r(9)=-.63$, $p.<.05$). Thus, those who were more willing to use L2, at least initially, with a fellow native speaker of L1 who addressed them in L2, were significantly less likely to persevere in using L2 if their interlocutor switched to L1. In other words, here too we have a case of accommodation, or going along with the other's choice of language.

Since the overall indices of extent of first and second language use were composed of the scores on the first five individual language use factors, there were of course strong correlations between the overall and the individual factors. As for Anglophones, Factors 1, 2 and 3 all correlated significantly with the extent of use factors, with Factor 2 turning out to be the best predictor, correlating at the .001 level of significance with Factor 12 ($r(9)=-.90$), Factor 13 ($r(9)=-.91$) and with Factor 14 ($r(9)=.90$). Thus, those Francophones who were the most willing to continue in L1 to an L2 interlocutor having difficulty with L1, had the lowest scores for overall use of L2 and the highest scores for use of L1. Factor 1, "Initiating", and Factor 3, "Persevering", also correlated strongly with the overall language use factors, with all correlations significant at the .01 level.

Following the statistical analyses, the patterns of response of the two ethnolinguistic groups for the language use and attitude variables were analysed from an interpretive point of view. Some of our most interesting data concerned the differing motivations and attitudes toward language use revealed in the subjects' discussion of their behavior. Much of this constitutes additional information which is not conveyed by numerical manipulation of objective scores. In addition, such data often provide insights which allow us to confidently arrive at meaningful interpretations of trends revealed by statistical analysis.

CHAPTER 4
INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

When we looked at the distribution of responses of our Anglophone and Francophone subjects to the questions on language use and attitudes we were often struck by the differences in patterns of the two ethnolinguistic groups. On an intuitive level, the differences between the groups seem more meaningful when one can see how the scores are distributed across response categories in addition to comparing the groups statistically. And such patterns are rendered yet more meaningful when we are also able to take into account the actual words of the subjects, clarifying why they behave in the way they do.

We tried always to keep in mind that our subjects' expressions of their motivations, behavior, opinions and feelings constituted our real data. The numerical scores which we had assigned to subjects' reported language behavior and attitudes represented an abstraction which, while permitting us to use the valuable tool of statistics, could not replace the direct data we received in the interviews. The motivations for their language behavior as expressed by the subjects themselves represented an additional set of data which statistics could not convey,

and which, furthermore, offered the possibility of providing explanations for the language use patterns observed.

In this chapter we will discuss the patterns of response found for the members of the two ethnolinguistic groups for the language use situations and the language attitudes. We will include some discussion of differing motivations expressed by our Anglophone and Francophone subjects. Many of the notions touched on here will be taken up again in more detail in Chapter 5, where the discussion will be focused specifically on the concept of accommodation, both as behavior and as motivation.

II. LANGUAGE USE FACTORS

A. FACTOR 1: LANGUAGE USED WHEN INITIATING A CONVERSATION WITH A BILINGUAL OF THE OTHER OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

As evident in Table 4.1, French-speaking and English-speaking subjects had quite different patterns of response to the question of which language they would use when initiating a conversation with a bilingual of the other official language, despite the fact that these differences were not found to be statistically significant. For Francophones, the language used appeared to be a matter of personal choice, since subjects were spread in equal numbers across every point on the scale, from "Always speak

L2" to "Always speak L1". However, a full half of the Anglophone subjects would either always speak L2 or were more likely to speak it, while for the remainder, it depended on the situation. In other words, not a single Anglophone said that he always initiated conversations with bilingual Francophones in English, or even that he was more likely to speak English.

TABLE 4.1 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 1: "INITIATING"			
<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Always speak L2	5	#5, #9, #10, #1	#20, #23
More likely to speak L2	4	#8	#18, #27
Either L1 or L2	3	#2, #3, #4, #6, #11	#25, #26
More likely to speak L1	2		#22, #24
Always speak L1	1		#19, #21

The reasons given for their choice of language show definite patterns related to group membership. The responses for the mid-scale point, "Either L1 or L2", were particularly revealing. The two Francophones in this category said that the language they would speak depended

upon the language they associated with the particular individual. However, four out of five Anglophones indicated that whether they used English or French depended on their evaluation of their own fluency vis-a-vis that of their interlocutor. The remaining Anglophone said that it depended on her mood, which again had its roots in her feelings about her proficiency in the second language. Differences in level of perceived second language proficiency seem to be the cause of these different motivations for use of one language or the other. The Anglophones who chose "Either L1 or L2" ranged from having low to moderate scores on the perceived proficiency scale (scores of 3, 5, 5, 6 and 7), while both Francophones had the moderately high score of 7.


B. FACTOR 2: USE OF L1 TO L2 SPEAKER HAVING DIFFICULTY IN L1

This question is a particularly interesting one from the point of view of accommodation because, in the situation in which a person is addressed in his native language by a second language speaker manifesting some difficulty with the language, whichever language is chosen by the person addressed can be interpreted either positively or negatively by the interlocutor. A switch to the interlocutor's first language may be motivated by desire to help the language learner who is having trouble

expressing himself, yet the super-sensitive learner may interpret it as a slap in the face. On the other hand, continuing in the interlocutor's second language out of a desire not to insult him may backfire; if the conversation eventually grinds to a halt and the speaker is belatedly forced to switch to the interlocutor's L1 anyway, he may discover that the interlocutor is terribly relieved and would have switched long since had he only known he was dealing with a fluent bilingual!

We see that there is no simple, direct relationship between language use and accommodation in this situation; it is necessary to know the speaker's intent before his behavior may be judged as either accommodative or unaccommodative. By looking at our subjects' explanations of their language choice, we were able to see just how accommodative their intent was.

In contrast to an opinion commonly heard from less fluent Anglophones that Francophones tend to cut them off at the first signs of problems with their French, fully half of our sample of Francophones (5 out of 10) maintained they would continue in French in such a situation. In fact, Francophones were more likely than Anglophones to continue in L1 (5 Francophones as opposed to 1 Anglophone),



and four out of these five Francophones seemed to be motivated by accommodative tendencies. Take the following example:

"J'ai des collègues avec lesquels le français est un peu délicat. On continue à parler français. C'est le vieux problème des gens qui apprennent une langue étrangère. Ils essaient de parler votre langue et puis, parce qu'ils font une erreur, on les interrompt et on fait la conversation dans leur langue. J'essaie de pas faire ça parce que c'est désagréable. Alors, on souffre ensemble." (#22 F)

The expression "on souffre ensemble" ("we suffer together") clearly reveals the speaker's accommodative motivation;

TABLE 4.2 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 2: "USE OF L1 TO L2 SPEAKER HAVING DIFFICULTY IN L1"

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Continue in L1	5	#8	#18, #19, #21, #22, #25
More likely to continue in L1	4	#2	#26
Either continue in L1 or switch to L2	3	#3, #6, #10	
More likely to switch to L2	2	#1, #11	#23, #24
Switch to L2	1	#4, #5, #9	#20, #27

even though it requires effort and patience on his part, he will allow the weaker bilingual to use the language of his choice, his second language.

However, the fifth Francophone subject who said he would continue in L1 seemed motivated not by inclination to accommodate but rather by strong desire to push the use of French. We know this from his other responses, many of which show more extreme evidence of this inclination.

"S'il parle français, je vais continuer en français avec lui, parce que je trouve, je suis tellement heureux de voir sa démarche que je vais certainement l'encourager dans le même sens."
(#21 F)

The one Anglophone who said he would continue in L1 was clearly doing so to accommodate his interlocutor.

"I'll tend to stay in English and give an English lesson. I feel as if I'd rather help them get it than switch."
(#8 A)

However, a second Anglophone who was scored as more likely to continue in L1 clearly preferred to remain in L1 because of his low competence in L2, rather than out of any desire to encourage his interlocutor to speak his second language. His offer to let the other person revert to his own language is a moderately accommodative gesture. Yet, it is almost nullified by the fact that he himself would

remain in the language he feels most comfortable in, his own. He clearly recognizes this but is not concerned about it.

"I would probably say, in French, you can speak French if you want to...No, I'm not very concerned with hurting feelings because it can be interpreted either way. If I insist on English or if I allow him to switch back, either way, he can interpret it as an affront if he's out to interpret it as an affront. So I think that in that situation I would normally say, you know, go ahead and speak French if you want to, it's fine with me. I may continue talking in English but then that will probably force him back into English again. A lot of people don't like that situation, but I have no objection to it...You've got the choice. Do it in the one you can do it well in." (#2 A)

It is clear from the above examples of responses that choosing to remain in one's L1 in this situation is not automatically synonymous with accommodative motivation. In fact, some of the subjects who evidenced the greatest desire to accommodate their interlocutor were located at the midpoint on the scale, "either continue in L1 or switch to L2". For the three Anglophones who fit into this category, both offering to switch and actually switching into French were strategies employed to help their interlocutor feel more comfortable in his attempts to use the second language.

"I'd ask him if he prefers to speak in French, because he may be trying to speak English. Actually it's very insulting or patronizing if I

start speaking to you in French and you speak back to me in English, especially if I'm rather proud of my French. I always feel put down a bit if people speak to me in English, when they know I speak French, especially if they don't speak English very well. Unless I'm having a lot of trouble, I speak the language that they speak to me in." (#10 A)

In other words, he would speak whichever language his interlocutor desired. Another subject admitted to feeling conflict every time this happened.

"I never know whether to switch or not. I think I'm very sensitive because I have felt this myself so many times -- a Francophone doing that to me where my French happens to be at least as good as their English but they have this stereotyped notion that I can't because I'm an Anglophone, and they insist on speaking English to me, and it really pisses me off." (#3 A)

Even though, from a statistical point of view, language use for Factor 2 did not differ significantly between Francophones and Anglophones, we see that there were some important differences in the expression of accommodative tendencies for the two groups. Francophones tended to express their desire to be accommodative to Anglophones having difficulty speaking French by allowing them to continue in their second language, i.e. by not switching to English. However, Anglophones usually demonstrated their willingness to accommodate by offering to switch to their interlocutor's first language but not doing so unless that individual wished. In other

words, while both Francophones and Anglophones shared the same perception that switching to the speaker's first language was potentially the most insulting and thus the least accommodative response, Anglophones had the additional insight that a speaker who is really having a hard time may appreciate having his interlocutor allow him to switch, as long as he, the speaker, has the choice. In general, Anglophones valued being sensitive to the second language speaker's wishes more highly than Francophones.

C. FACTOR 3: PERSEVERANCE IN SPEAKING L2 WHEN INTERLOCUTOR SWITCHES TO SPEAKER'S L1

Basic ethnolinguistic differences emerged in the behavior of Francophones and Anglophones in the situation where a speaker addresses a bilingual of the other language in his second language only to have the interlocutor switch to the speaker's first language.

First, Anglophones were more likely to persevere in using the second language than were Francophones. For example, three Anglophones maintained that they would continue in L2 until they forced the interlocutor to return to his own native language, yet no Francophones maintained this extreme position. At the other end of the scale, five Francophones said they would follow the interlocutor's lead and immediately switch to L1, while only two Anglophones

said they would switch. When we look at the reasons given by the members of the two groups, it is clear that these are not accidental differences but reflect two basically different attitudes toward use of the second language.

TABLE 4.3 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 3: "PERSEVERANCE"

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Continue in L2 until interlocutor is forced into L2	5	#1, #5, #9	
More likely to continue in L2	4		#23, #24, #27
Either continue in L2 or switch to L1	3	#3, #6, #8, #10, #11	#19, #20
More likely to switch to L1	2		
Switch to L1	1	#2, #4	#18, #21, #22 #25, #26

Not surprisingly, the principal motivation for perseverance in using the second language on the part of Anglophones seemed to be that of improving their mastery of the language. Indeed, those who insisted on speaking L2 until their interlocutor switched back rated their second language proficiency the highest of all our Anglophone

subjects. In the following example, the subject describes her use of responding in the second language as a learning strategy, which even went so far that she deliberately suppressed any recognition of accommodative motivation on the part of interlocutors who switched to her L1.

"When that happened to me, I would just continue talking French. I decided that I would automatically hate anyone who did that to me because I figured that if I started thinking that they were doing it to be nice I would never be able to resist speaking to them in English. So I would have to think that they were doing it to be mean." (#1 A)

In general, Francophones seemed to think it was quite strange of the Anglophones to want to speak French if addressed in English. They normally assumed that the person was being stubborn and unreasonable. Not surprisingly, they often reacted with considerable impatience and a switch to the speaker's L1: "Moi, j'ai horreur des gens qui veulent pratiquer la langue en me parlant!" (#24 F) Of course, the assumption on the part of the Francophones who responded in this way was that these Anglophones had a low level of competence in the second language. Most Francophones did not object to switching to French if their Anglophone interlocutor was very fluent.

D. FACTOR 4: LANGUAGE OF RESPONSE WHEN L1 INTERLOCUTOR INITIATES CONVERSATION IN L2 ("USE OF L2 WITH L1 SPEAKER")

The situation in which an individual is addressed in the second language by someone whom he recognizes as a first language speaker engenders completely different responses in Anglophones and Francophones.

For Francophones, the idea of responding in L2 to another French speaker was totally aberrant; every single subject said he would respond in French to a Francophone addressing him in English, provided that he recognized the other as a Francophone. The issue of recognition of the other speaker's native language was raised by 6 out of 10 Francophones (for example, "Si je reconnais un accent français, je vais lui parler en français automatiquement" #18F), but was mentioned by only two of the Anglophones. Clearly, the superior performance of many Francophones in English makes this an issue of importance for Francophones. Three Francophones indicated that they would initially respond in English, then ask the other speaker if he spoke French and switch if he did. These three subjects were scored as "more likely to respond in L1", since basically they would speak L1 to an L1 speaker if they recognized him as such. They were scored as "2", rather than "1", in recognition² of the fact that their responses were less categorical than the rest of the speakers.

TABLE 4.4 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES.

FACTOR 4: "USE OF L2 WITH L1 SPEAKER"

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Answer in L2	5	#1, #4, #6, #8, #9, #10	
More likely to answer in L2	4		
Either L1 or L2	3	#3	
More likely to answer in L1	2	#11	#18, #22, #26
Answer in L1	1	#2, #5	#19, #20, #21, #23, #24, #25, #27

For Anglophones, on the other hand, responding in the second language when addressed in L2 out of desire to help fellow language learners practice was the most common response. It was indicated by 6 out of 10 speakers, for example, the following responses:

"I think I'd speak French. I feel that's important. I've had so much trouble trying to speak French myself." (#10 A)

"I'd do my best to keep speaking French. If they're willing to make the effort, so am I. If they're here trying to practice, etcetera, I like to encourage them." (#4 A)

Two Anglophones said that they would answer in L1, but their responses seemed to be from an aversion to

imperfect accents rather than from the feeling that this was only the normal thing to be expected, as the Francophones' responses seemed to indicate. For example:

"If I detect any trace of Anglophone accent, I'm going to jump into English, somehow. Because there's a very low, low tolerance level that I have for imperfect or foreign sounding language, and if I know the first language of the person, I'll jump into it." (#5 A)

The original motivation for the question was to measure strength of accommodative tendencies, and for the Anglophones the question seemed indeed to tap this. As mentioned above, desire to accommodate to a second language learner's drive to practice was evident in many respondents' indication that they would answer in L2. The response of one other subject, who said that it depended, which language she would use, also shows a clear awareness that this situation involves the question of whether or not to accommodate to the other speaker.

"I might answer in French. It depends on my mood... the mood of: do I want to hurt this person's feelings, is his French so bad, or do I want to make it easier for him." (#3 A)

And even the most adamant user of L1, who was quoted above as having a low tolerance for foreign accents, is aware that accommodation is at stake. He went on to say:

"If I hear them with any mistake at all -- phonological or lexical or syntactic -- it

bothers me sufficiently when it's from an Anglophone that I'll jump into English. And I'll do so sometimes knowing perfectly well that I'm offending them by doing it." (#5 A)

For Francophones, on the other hand, the question of accommodating to the other's wishes is never in question because Francophones simply do not feel the need to practice their English with other Francophones. They do not even seem to be aware of the possibility that switching to French might insult another French speaker. Thus, we see that the kind of language sensitivity Anglophones take for granted seems to be merely a result of the attitudes of their particular ethnolinguistic group in this particular context, and not universally rooted in the human psyche.

E. FACTOR 5: ADHERENCE TO L1 IN GROUP DISCUSSION WHEN SPEAKER OF L2 ARRIVES

The reactions of Francophones and Anglophones were again very different in the situation in which a group of L1 speakers having a discussion is joined by a bilingual L2 speaker. The overwhelming majority of Francophones would address the newcomer in French (7 out of 10), while only two Anglophones would always speak L1 and one more would be more likely to speak L1. For Francophones the motivation is quite clear: they feel that a person who wishes to join a group should be willing to adapt himself to the language of the group. The following is a typical response.

"Je pense que je parlerai en français. Parce que de toute façon je parlais en français et qu'une personne qui se joigne à un groupe francophone doit, je pense, accepter le fait de fonctionner selon la langue d'usage du groupe. Une personne qui veut s'adjoindre au groupe est bienvenu en autant qu'il fonctionne selon les règles du groupe." (#26 F)

There is a sound historical reason for this attitude: Francophones in Canada have for many years lived in a society in which they were expected to bend to the linguistic needs of the majority culture. Now, with a changing linguistic consciousness, no situation seems to be so detested by them as the one in which three or four Francophones end up speaking English to one another on account of one Anglophone in their midst. Even the single Francophone in our study who would be more likely to switch to English for a bilingual Anglophone made it clear that this would not extend to his Francophone colleagues.

"Mais ce que je ne ferais pas, par exemple, c'est de parler aux autres qui sont là en anglais... je me suis souvent trouvé dans des situations comme celle là, où nous étions quatre, trois francophones et un anglophone, et à cause de l'anglophone, les francophones se parlent en anglais. Ça, je déteste ça." (#25 F)

However, it is clear that most of these Francophones were willing to speak English if the newcomer were unilingual, communication with the new arrival being generally seen as more important than the possibility that

the whole group might switch to English.

"Si, d'autre part, dans un groupe de francophones il arrive un anglophone unilingue, et que tous les francophones qui font partie du groupe sont bilingues, ce qui arrive la plupart du temps, je n'hésiterai pas à suivre la loi normale, et je ne ferais pas écart-type, enfin de compte, je parlerai anglais; comment voulez-vous qu'on communique autrement? Maintenant, toute la situation socio-historique qui aboutit à un tel paradoxe, c'est une autre histoire. Je m'en fous." (#27 F)

Only one Francophone went so far as to indicate that he would continue to speak French when in a group, even if the Anglophone was not bilingual; he feels that since University policy is that professors should be at least passively bilingual, he has every right to insist on French.

"Français bien sûr. Encore plus dans un groupe... Dans une situation où le corps professoral par principe doit avoir une connaissance passive de l'autre langue, je considère ceci comme acquis." (#21 F)

The reactions of our Anglophone subjects, on the other hand, covered a much wider range of opinions. Only two seemed to share the feeling of the Francophones that the language of the group should be maintained for newcomers, and at least one of these seemed to be motivated more by convenience than by principle:

TABLE 4.5 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 5: "ADHERANCE TO L1 IN GROUP DISCUSSION"

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Continue in L1	5	#8, #11	#18, #19, #20 #21, #22, #26 #27
More likely to continue in L1	4	#2	
Either L1 or L2	3	#3, #4, #6, #9, #10	#23, #24
More likely to switch to L2	2		#25
Switch to L2	1	#1, #5	

"I would basically think that it would be of greatest convenience to use the majority language, particularly since it is my own."
(#11 A)

For most of the Anglophones, code choice in this situation seemed to be determined by the language they associated with the individual. For three subjects this meant that they would address some bilingual Francophones in French, others in English.

"It depends. If he's one of the people who is marked Francophone, I speak to him first in French."
(#4 A)

"It depends on the person and whether our past relationship has been in French." (#3 A)

However, for two subjects this meant that they would always switch to French because all of their relationships with Francophones are in French. And, as one subject pointed out, among her colleagues a reversal of the historical trend has occurred: the Anglophone group will switch to accommodate a single bilingual Francophone!

"Usually, the conversation will switch into French, the rest of us will switch. It's partly the department, because of the consciousness of Anglophone members of the department, partly the political context -- a little bit of historical bending over backwards." (#1 A)

It must be noted that, underlying the responses of the Anglophones to this question is the assumption that the rest of the Anglophone group is likely to be unilingual, whereas the Francophones appeared to take it for granted that their group would be composed of bilinguals. Thus, for the Anglophones, speaking L2 with the newcomer was complicated by the issue of integration with their own group:

"I find it awkward because if I switch to French I feel it looks as if I'm showing off to the bunch of Anglophones who are around, and that makes me feel uncomfortable." (#9 A)

"I wouldn't speak French to him if I wanted him to join in with all of us in a general discussion which was already ongoing if the others couldn't cope in French because it would be to exclude him." (#6 A)

We see that the issue of comprehension of the others in the group seemed to remove the situation from the purely voluntary for these Anglophones, while for the Francophones it remained at the level of choice and this could become an issue of principle.

F. FACTOR 6: SWITCHING LANGUAGES WITH THE SAME INDIVIDUAL

The sixth language use question differed from the previous five in that it did not attempt to measure the tendency to use either L1 or L2, but rather tried to assess the degree to which subjects felt comfortable switching languages with a given interlocutor. As with the other language use situations, certain differences were evident between the behavior of Anglophones and Francophones; however, these differences did not reach the level of statistical significance.

In general, the Francophones seemed to be more positively oriented toward switching languages with the same individual than the Anglophones. Although an equal number of Francophones and Anglophones admitted to

switching frequently (three each), an additional four Francophones tended to follow the lead of their interlocutor, switching if he did, while the Anglophones instead tended to switch only with a few individuals. In addition, no Francophones stated that they disliked switching, whereas three Anglophones actively disliked it.

The comments of the Anglophones who disliked switching revealed that for them the language they speak to a member of the other ethnolinguistic group is a highly emotionally charged matter. One Anglophone saw it as a power question; if her interlocutor continually switched back and forth, she felt that he controlled the conversation. In addition, she made it clear that for her the issue of accommodation was at stake in this situation:

"The switching is more effort, almost, than anything. If they keep switching back and forth because they can't express everything they want to in English, then I get really annoyed. It's sort of an ambiguous situation... Speaking a language has a lot more weight to it than just which language you're speaking. It's sort of a power thing, and...there's always who's going to get to accommodate, who's better? I don't like the ambiguity of it. I like to know which language I'm going to speak with somebody, and what language they're going to respond to me in."
(#3 A)

TABLE 4.6 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 6: "SWITCHING LANGUAGES WITH THE SAME INDIVIDUAL"

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Frequently switches; is positively motivated toward switching	5	#6, #8, #11	#19, #23, #26
Follows the lead of the interlocutor and switches if he does	4		#18, #22, #24 #25
Switches with a few individuals, most are typed for language	3	#2, #4, #10	#27
Switches only occasionally; not very comfortable with it	2	#9	#20, #21
Rarely or never switches; dislikes it	1	#1, #3, #5	

For another speaker, the choice of language of interaction was closely bound to the question of identity.

"I will rarely speak in a language I am not accustomed to speaking with a person, because I see it as an identity thing; and I get almost jealous about that identity if they break from one language and go to the other... The code with which one speaks is part of the identity that you have with that person, and if they go to a different code, unless they're equally, equally fluent, where the style comes out the same, you're uncomfortable. In other words,

where there is the slightest mechanical problem in the second language, I think it makes them look different than they normally are." (#5 A)

The third subject may have put her finger on the cause of the difference in attitude between certain members of the two ethnolinguistic groups; she ascribes her aversion to switching to the way in which she learned her second language.

"I find it much easier to talk, to be all in one language, or to be all in the other. I have a little difficulty switching. I would rather speak all one language one day - basically...It comes back to how I learned the language. Having learnt French in essentially an almost unilingual French milieu, I don't really like switching back and forth." (#1 A)

The relation of switching and context of second language learning will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 5.

III. LANGUAGE ATTITUDES

A. ATTITUDE TOWARD TEACHING AT A BILINGUAL UNIVERSITY

Both Anglophone and Francophone subjects had a very positive attitude toward working at a bilingual university. 75% of subjects were found in the upper end of the scale, at scores of 5 and 4, and only one subject admitted that he would be more comfortable at a unilingual university (Score 2). No one actively disliked being at a bilingual university. (See Table 4.7)

TABLE 4.7 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 7: "ATTITUDE TOWARDS TEACHING AT A BILINGUAL UNIVERSITY"			
<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Chose to come to the University of Ottawa largely because of its bilingual character; wouldn't want to teach at a unilingual university.	5	#1, #5, #9, #10, #11	#18, #21, #24
Appreciates the bilingual atmosphere of the university and would miss it.	4	#3, #4, #6, #8	#19, #22, #23
Would not mind teaching at a unilingual university; would be equally at ease there.	3		#20, #25, #26, #27
Would be more comfortable at a unilingual university.	2	#2	

There are some interesting differences in the responses of the two ethnolinguistic groups, however, especially when the reasons given by the individual members are considered. More Anglophones than Francophones (5 as opposed to 3) chose to come to the University of Ottawa primarily because of its bilingual character and definitely would not want to teach at a unilingual institution. Of these five Anglophones, four chose it specifically because they wanted to be able to use French as well as English.

"One of the reasons I came here was, in fact, to become bilingual and to be able to teach in both languages." (#10 A)

"I much prefer to be here because I love using two languages, you know." (#5 A)

"I enjoy being able to teach in French and English both very much. The language...is one of the really big plusses for me." (#9 A)

Only one Anglophone mentioned a more cultural interest, the "relatively high ethnic diversity" (#11 A) of the area, in addition to his interest in the two languages, as a reason for coming to the University of Ottawa, whereas two Francophones out of three cited interest in the cultural effect of a bilingual university rather than interest in using two languages as their reason for not wanting to teach at a unilingual institution.

"Moi, je pense que ça prend une université bilingue, et une université bilingue véritablement, et pas simplement deux profils, un français et l'autre anglais...Ce que l'on veut c'est un caractère bilingue à l'université, que l'on puisse avoir des étudiants et des professeurs qui vivent ensemble, qui finissent par se respecter." (#24 F)

"Je suis convaincu que l'université, si elle vivait le bilinguisme, ça serait extraordinaire, biculturalisme. La langue pour moi est un véhicule d'une culture. La langue pour la langue, moi, ça me dit rien." (#21 F)

For Francophones, speaking the second language does not seem to hold the same fascination as it does for

Anglophones; the university as a purveyor of biculturalism appears to be of more importance for the Francophones in our sample.

Four Anglophones and three Francophones indicated a moderately positive attitude toward teaching at a bilingual university (Score 4), that is, they appreciated the bilingual atmosphere of the university and would miss it if they left, yet it was not the factor causing them to remain at the University of Ottawa. The Anglophones tended to stress the idea that using two languages was "fun" and that it made the university a more interesting place to be.

"It adds a little more fun to it. I think it would be kind of dull and flat to teach at a monolingual university." (#3 A)

"I think the bilingual character of the university makes it a far more interesting place to be. I don't really see how anyone could find bilingualism a disadvantage." (#6 A)

This aspect was also stressed by one of the Francophones, a Dean who found that it made his job as an administrator more interesting:

"Pour un administrateur, le fait que ce soit une institution bilingue, ça accroît le 'challenge' ...Ça met du piquant dans la sauce, comme on dit en français." (#23 F)

However, the remaining two Francophones stressed the idea

that teaching at a bilingual university offered them professional advantages such as a library equipped in two languages and contact with both North American and European points of view in their fields.

"Sur le plan strictement professionnel je me réjouis du fait que notre bibliothèque, par exemple, soit bien équipée en français et en anglais. Parce que ça me permet de rassembler une documentation beaucoup plus riche dans mon domaine, mais quand même d'assurer mon enseignement en anglais ou en français. Alors le bilinguisme pour moi, c'est avant tout un atout professionnel. Pour essayer de devenir un meilleur historien, le milieu d'Ottawa est particulièrement favorable." (#19 F)

It is significant that, while no Anglophones are found at 3, the neutral point on the scale, where a subject wouldn't mind teaching at a unilingual university, although he doesn't mind being at a bilingual institution either, four Francophones expressed this attitude.

"Non, je pense que je serais tout aussi à l'aise à l'université unilingue française... Parler anglais, ça ne fait pas partie de mes plaisirs." (#27 F)

"J'irais certainement travailler dans une université unilingue française sans difficulté." (#26 F)

On the whole, Francophones seem to be much more open to the idea of working in a unilingual French environment than are Anglophones to the idea of working in a unilingual English environment. As one Anglophone said:

"No I don't think so. I've thought about that, because there are jobs that one could get elsewhere. And it would be so awful!" (#9 A)

However, at the same time, the least positive attitude of any subject was expressed by an Anglophone, who said that he would feel more comfortable at a unilingual English university "...in the sense that I would feel that I could do my job better. I'm a better lecturer in English than I am in French." (#2 A) His preference for a unilingual university is clearly rooted in his uneasiness about his proficiency in French rather than any other reason. (This subject had the lowest perceived second language proficiency score of any of our subjects.)

In sum, although both Anglophones and Francophones were positively motivated toward teaching at a bilingual university, their reasons tended to differ along ethnolinguistic group lines; while for Anglophones the opportunity to speak and teach in French was seen as the chief attraction of the university, for Francophones the advantages were to be found primarily in living in a bicultural environment and in having the broadened professional opportunities of a bilingual work milieu.

B. ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN BECOMING BILINGUAL

In light of the generally positive attitudes towards teaching at a bilingual university expressed by our subjects, and considering that most of them chose to reside in an environment where two languages are spoken, it is not

TABLE 4.8. DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 8: ATTITUDE TOWARD CHILDREN BECOMING BILINGUAL

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Strong desire to have children become bilingual, and would send them to school in the other language; no reservations about effect on first language	5	#2, #3, #4, #6, #10, #11	#26
Desire to have children become bilingual but would not send them to school in the other language	4		#25
Desire to have children become bilingual, but not at the detriment of their first language	3	#1, #9	#18, #24, #27
Bilingualism is desirable but by no means necessary; concern that children have strong grounding in their first language	2	#5, #8	#23
Concern primarily about maintaining first language rather than about child becoming bilingual	1		#19, #20, #21, #22

surprising to discover that none of our subjects expressed unwillingness for their children to become bilingual. However, at the same time it is clear that in terms of both the strength of their feelings and the nature of their concerns, the two ethnolinguistic groups differ sharply.

The answers given by French speakers, who generally feel that their children's mother tongue is in danger, reflected the feelings of a linguistic minority living in a bilingual environment where the majority language dominates. Table 4.8 shows that, while they generally affirmed the desire to have their children become bilingual, their concern tended to be primarily with maintenance of the first language.

The most common concern of Francophones was that learning the second language not occur at the detriment of the first language.

"J'aimerais beaucoup qu'ils apprennent l'anglais, comme langue seconde, très tôt... Mais jamais au détriment de leur français. Je pense que le pire service qu'on puisse rendre à quelqu'un c'est d'en faire un médiocre bilingue." (#18 F)

"Si j'avais des enfants, je les enverrais carrément à l'école française, c'est sûr, et j'insisterais pour qu'ils apprennent, ici au Canada, le plutôt possible l'anglais... Je ne voudrais pas que l'apprentissage de la langue seconde se fasse au détriment de la langue première." (#27 F)

Only two Francophones did not express reservations about the effect of learning the second language on the first language, and only one of them would send his child to an English school.

Five Francophones expressed great concern about the problems which learning the second language created for the first language (Points 1 and 2 on the scale). As one subject expressed it:

"S'il n'a pas une très bonne base dans sa propre langue, moi, je subçonne qu'il va avoir des problèmes dans l'autre de toute manière. Du côté de la langue maternelle, ça ne se rattrappe pas..." (#23 F)

Four of these five were concerned more with maintenance of the first language than with acquisition of the second, a position held by none of the Anglophones. English was to some degree seen as a danger against which one had to defend oneself.

"Le pouvoir d'attraction de l'anglais est tel qu'il faudrait vraiment se défendre contre l'anglais pour ne pas le parler à Ottawa." (#19 F)

One subject observed that even sending children to a French school was by no means a sure way of maintaining French because:

"La langue de communication dans les écoles primaires et secondaires francophones d'Ontario, c'est l'anglais." (#20 F)

This type of remark, however, highlights the fact that those Francophones who professed no concern with their children learning the second language were in fact assuming that the children would become bilingual as a matter of course. Thus, even subjects at the lowest point on the scale cannot be construed as being against bilingualism for their children. Some subjects seemed to regard it as a necessary evil.

Anglophones fell into two groups. Six out of ten Anglophones strongly desired their children to become bilingual, and were willing to send them to French schools ("immersion programs"), without expressing any concern for the possible effect on the first language. In the Ottawa milieu, where English is the dominant language, it is not surprising to find such an attitude expressed by English speakers. As was pointed out in Chapter 3, the Anglophones who fell into this category were in general those with moderate to low perceived proficiency scores.

The remaining four Anglophones, three of whom had the highest perceived proficiency scores of our Anglophone subjects, generally expressed doubts about the effect of second language learning on the first language. Two of them were all for their children becoming bilingual as long as it was not at the detriment of the first language (3 on

the scale). In particular they doubted the necessity of early bilingualism.

"Sure I would like them to be bilingual but it's not necessary to start them at two months old. After all, I didn't start until I was seventeen!" (#9 A)

The remaining two Anglophones expressed serious concern for the quality of the first language, similar to the concern voiced by certain Francophone subjects. One in particular, while feeling that learning a second language was desirable, felt that "bilingualism", in one sense of the term, held certain dangers.

"I make a distinction between being bilingual and being able to speak two languages. For me, 'bilingual' is a person who is equally at home in two languages, having learned both pari passu* as a child. But I suspect that that's not so good. Because I've seen the results of that in my first year classes, where students are not quite certain which their native language is. They make mistakes in English which are the result of French contamination, but their French teachers tell me that they make mistakes in French which are the result of English contamination. I think a person should have a strong first language with a good solid base in it. And then a very competent knowledge of a second language so he can speak it well."

(#8 A)

We see that attitudes toward having one's children become bilingual are clearly related both to

*with equal steps

ethnolinguistic group membership and to second language proficiency. Because of the minority status of French in the community, Francophones were generally more concerned than Anglophones with maintenance of the first language, while Anglophones, especially those with more doubts about their proficiency in French, tended to embrace the idea of "immersion" schooling for their children. However, those Anglophones with strong confidence in their abilities in French tended to express less concern with early bilingualism and correspondingly more concern with quality of the first language.

C. LINGUAPHILIA: ATTITUDE TOWARD SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING
AND ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING

In Chapter 3 it was mentioned that two scales were formed out of the subjects' responses to the original "Linguaphilia" question: the original scale became Factor 9, "Attitude towards learning and using the second language", and a second scale was created for Factor 10, "Attitude toward foreign language learning" ("Linguaphilia"). Although we had been aware ever since the scale was administered that it was less than satisfactory from several points of view, it was not until the group response patterns emerged that we began to understand the true nature of the scale and what it actually measured.

As is clear from Table 4.9, the answers of the two groups actually occupy opposite halves of the scale; with the exception of Anglophone #2, the two distributions overlap only at choice C. Fully half of Anglophones were located at either A or B, the two points of the scale indicating the most positive attitude towards language learning, while not a single Francophone selected these viewpoints. Since we could not imagine that love of learning foreign languages would be a characteristic solely limited to English speakers, these extreme results forced us to take a hard look at the linguaphilia scale.

The first problem with the scale was that the choices were not mutually exclusive. Respondents frequently indicated that more than one point on the scale applied to them. For example:

"B and A are not contradictory. I think I'm going from A to B." (#8 A)

"Je sympathise le plus avec E. C'est ce que je fais. Mais le C, c'est aussi l'attitude que je fais." (#24 F)

In fact, two respondents initially indicated that all points on the scale applied to them! When they elaborated upon the choices, it was clear that this was not literally

TABLE 4.9 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES FOR FACTOR 9:
 "ATTITUDE TOWARD LEARNING AND USING THE SECOND LANGUAGE"

<u>Level</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
A	Language learning fascinates me, and I seek every opportunity to use my second language.	10	#5, #9	
A/B		9	#10	
B	I enjoy using my second language and, except for a few situations where I feel inhibited, I use it whenever it is appropriate.	8	#3, #8	
B/C		7	#1, #6	
C	It doesn't make any difference to me which language I use as long as there is efficient communication.	5.5	#4, #11	#18, #20, #25
C/D		4		#22, #23
D	I would rarely initiate a conversation in another language but, addressed in that language, I would respond in it.	3	#2	#19
D/E		2		#27
E	I much prefer to use my first language if the person I'm talking to knows that language.	1		#21, #24, #26

true, yet the fact that subjects could respond in this manner was indicative that each point on the scale did not correspond to a unique point in reality.

Secondly, it was clear that the scale mixed three things rather than measuring only one: attitude toward language learning in general, attitude toward using the second language, and degree of use of the second language. Although we had attempted to measure "linguaphilia" or love of language learning, in fact only choice A made reference to this concept, while all five choices referred to use of the second language! It was clear that the scale could not be used to draw valid conclusions about any of these three factors without some drastic revision.

A third crucial problem with the scale was revealed by Choice A, which makes the erroneous assumption that fascination with language learning is always accompanied by desire to use the second language at every opportunity. The responses of our subjects clearly showed this to be an attitude expressed by members of the majority culture (Anglophones) but not by those belonging to the ethnolinguistic minority (Francophones). For example, one Anglophone stated:

"I've always wanted to learn any foreign language I heard. I'll seek out any opportunity

to learn a new language or to use one I know
 ...If I know the language of the person, I'll
 jump into it." (#5 A)

However, Francophone #21, who prefers to speak French if
 his interlocutor can speak it at all (Choice E),
 maintained:

"Honnêtement, pour les langues, par nature j'ai
 toujours aimé les autres langues -- je parle
 l'italien et l'espagnol, et je lis l'allemand,
 le grec, et le latin, bien sûr. Mais le
 problème de la langue seconde, ça c'est un
 problème en lui même. C'est politique, c'est
 patriotique, également." (#21 F)

Thus, while he loves to speak foreign languages, the second
 language is another matter. The same applies for
 Francophone #27, who again prefers to speak French ("Plus
 on va de A vers E, plus on s'approche de moi") yet also
 maintains:

"L'apprentissage des langues me passionne' --
 oui, ça c'est vrai, mais pas pour l'anglais...Je
 ne peux pas dire non plus que j'éprouve du
 plaisir à utiliser l'anglais. Si vous le
 remplacez par l'allemand, pour moi ça marche
 très bien." (#27 F)

These two subjects have hit upon what is probably
 the central condition for interpretation of responses to
 the scale: for members of a minority ethnolinguistic
 group, the learning of foreign languages and of the second
 language must be sharply differentiated. While for

Anglophones the second language often holds all the same positive associations of excitement, travel and cultural enrichment that foreign languages do, for Francophones, even those who love learning foreign languages, use of the second language often has disagreeable associations. It was clearly necessary to separate these two concepts in order for the data to be meaningfully interpreted.

Choice C on the scale also contained a false assumption which caused problems for members of both ethnolinguistic groups alike. The statement "It doesn't make any difference to me which language I use as long as there is efficient communication" implies that efficient communication is the concern uppermost in speakers' minds when choosing one language over another. Although this may be true in some cases, subjects frequently expressed the idea that using the language they associated with a particular individual was far more important than efficient communication.

"It could just as well be efficient communication speaking the other language but, sort of, I have these relationships where there's a marked and an unmarked language, and I would prefer to speak English with L. and I would prefer to speak French to M." (#4 A)

"C'est vrai, mais pas complètement vrai. Cela m'est pas égal qu'on parle une langue ou l'autre. Je préfère parler la langue de mon interlocuteur." (#20 F)

TABLE 4.10 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES

FACTOR 10: "ATTITUDE TOWARD FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING"
("LINGUAPHILIA")

<u>Description</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Anglophones</u>	<u>Francophones</u>
Finds language learning fascinating, and seeks out every opportunity to learn foreign languages	5	#2, #5, #8,	#19, #21, #26, #27
Used to find language learning fascinating, but the drive is less strong now	4		#18, #22
Neutral attitude; no strong indication one way or the other	3	#1, #3, #4, #6, #10, #11	#23, #24, #25
Learns foreign languages only when it is necessary	2		#20
Dislikes learning other languages	1		

In light of the major problems with the Linguaphilia scale outlined above, it was found necessary to create two separate scales from subjects' responses: one for "Attitude toward learning and using the second language" and the other for "Attitude toward foreign language learning" or "Linguaphilia". Tables 4.9 and 4.10 contain the results of these scores. It is clear from these tables first, that love of language learning is indeed a characteristic which cuts across linguistic boundaries, and

second, that the Francophones in our sample expressed a much less positive attitude than the Anglophones toward use of the second language.

In conclusion, our experience with the "linguaphilia" question taught us two valuable things. First, it showed us the danger of taking our own assumptions as widely held attitudes, with the resultant problems caused by using scales written by members of the majority group to investigate attitudes of minority group members. And secondly, it revealed just how difficult it is to prepare attitude questions and, by contrast, emphasized the value of the open-ended interview as a data collection tool. If all of our questions had been formulated in terms of pre-established categories like the "linguaphilia" question, it is doubtful that any of our data would have been interpretable. We should constantly have been fighting against the bias introduced into subjects' responses by the way in which we had formulated the response choices. And if the same items had been administered as a written rather than an oral questionnaire, and subjects had been unable to qualify and explain their answers, we would have gone on to interpret the data without being aware that the answers chosen by the subjects corresponded almost not at all with their real

attitudes and feelings.

In this chapter we have seen some of the ways in which the members of the two ethnic groups differ in expression not only of linguistic behavior but also of accommodative and non-accommodative motivation. In the following chapter a more systematic approach will be taken to exploring the concept of accommodation, seen both from the angle of the observer (accommodative behavior) and from that of the speaker (accommodative motivation).

CHAPTER 5

ACCOMMODATION: MOTIVATION AND BEHAVIOR

I. INTRODUCTION

The central questions this study sought to answer have concerned the nature of linguistic accommodation and its manifestations in situations of language choice. In addition to our interest in defining linguistic accommodation in a larger sense, we had a number of specific questions for which we wished to find answers, in particular:

- 1) Does linguistic accommodation between bilinguals of different languages necessarily take the form of use of L2, as Giles and Powesland predict?
- 2) Is all use of L2 with bilinguals of the other language necessarily motivated by accommodation?
- 3) Are there contexts in which ethnolinguistic differences in terms of manifestations of linguistic accommodation are evident?

In order to answer these questions, we felt that we needed to distinguish between desire to be accommodative, or accommodative motivation, and actual language use. Our original approach to this problem was to attempt to draw up two scales for each language use situation, one for use of

L1 or L2, and the other for the degree of accommodative motivation expressed by the subject. It was hoped that, by running correlations between the scores on the two types of factors, we would be able to measure concretely the degree of relationship between particular language use and accommodation. However, when we attempted to apply the scale of accommodativeness, the true complexity of the notion of accommodation became more and more apparent, and we found ourselves constrained to abandon this approach.

Accordingly, in order that the reader may gain a better appreciation of the difficulties involved in measuring accommodative motivation, the first section of this chapter will outline some of the obstacles we encountered in devising and applying the motivation scale. The main part of the chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the types of pressures, both internal and external, acting upon bilinguals in situations of language choice, as well as to a consideration of the question of whether certain individuals are more accommodative than others. In the final pages of the chapter we will attempt to answer the questions we posed at the beginning and to outline some of the insights we have gained on the components of linguistic accommodation as we understand it.

II. MEASUREMENT OF ACCOMMODATIVE MOTIVATION

In order to quantify accommodative motivation we had, first, to set up criteria for scoring responses as either accommodative or non-accommodative, and second, to assign scores based on these criteria. While the first task was deceptively simple, the second turned out to be insoluble.

Tentatively, a five-point scale was set up, ranging from strongly accommodative (+2) to strongly non-accommodative (-2), with the mid-point (0) as neutral. We decided to classify as "strongly accommodative" those responses which indicated a desire to help the interlocutor (for example, by being patient with his efforts in the second language), or which expressed concern about the interlocutor's reactions to a particular language. "Non-accommodative" responses we defined as reasons for language choice which originated directly in the needs of the speaker rather than in concern for the interlocutor. Thus, non-accommodative elements included both political commitment to speaking a particular language and personal aversion to "accents". It must be understood that "non-accommodative" was not interpreted to mean deliberately unaccommodative, but rather simply that ego-centered motivations were overriding other-centered motivations. Responses which indicated that use of a particular language

had a practical motivation, such as concern for efficient communication or habitual association of an individual with a given language, were to be scored as neutral responses. They were felt to be neutral because neither the interlocutor nor the ego of the speaker was the focus of the choice. (We recognized, however, that this was not a totally satisfactory way to handle the question of language use based on habit, since some other motivation was acting at the time the association was originally formed.) Responses indicating that the speaker would accommodate only part of the time, and responses which were less strong, we decided to score as "mildly accommodating" (+1) or "mildly non-accommodating" (-1).

While these criteria seemed straightforward enough at first glance, their faults became evident as soon as we tried to apply them. In attempting to score actual responses, we discovered that individual answers varied widely in the degree to which motivation for language use was made explicit. This led to two problems. First, we had to determine what score to assign when subjects gave no reason for their language choice. We tentatively decided to score such responses as "neutral", on the assumption that our generally outspoken subjects probably would have voiced any strongly accommodative or strongly non-

accommodative reasons for their language choice. Secondly, certain responses which did not contain an explicit motivation, nevertheless, in the context of particular language use, tended to sound "accommodative". For example, in answer to the question of which language the subject would use with an L2 speaker having difficulty in his second language, the statement "Je vais le laisser aller" ("I'll just let him keep going") sounds like desire to accommodate is behind it (as in fact it is, for this respondent). Because of examples like this, we felt that if we were to follow our instincts as to where we detected accommodation, we should have to score as "accommodative" any response accompanied by "typically accommodative" behavior. However, this proposed criterion is clearly in contradiction with our previous decision to score responses with no stated motivation as "neutral". Even more serious, we can no longer make any claim to experimental objectivity once behaviour is used as a criterion, since it is no longer an independent factor which can be correlated with language use.

1
In many cases, probing by the interviewer did not produce more useful answers. Often subjects responded with "I don't know" or "That's a good question". When subjects did not have an easily accessible answer, the interviewer did not probe any further in order not to push subjects into inventing answers just to satisfy the interviewer.

The question may be posed: why were we so sure that certain responses were due to desire to accommodate even when no motivation was expressed? It is because we were taking into account our knowledge of that particular subject's overall attitudes, which allowed us to get a good feel for his or her motivations for specific language use. It was borne home to us that we were using the hidden criterion of overall attitudes by the fact that the response of Subject #20F, "Si je sais qu'il est anglais, je vais lui parler en anglais", was at first interpreted as accommodating because it was originally attributed to Subject #22F, a linguistically very accommodating individual who had made similar statements out of desire to make his interlocutor feel good. However, when it was realized that the response actually originated with Subject #20, the statement was seen as non-accommodative, stemming from this latter subject's impatience with Anglophones speaking poor French! Thus, we came to the realization that coding non-explicit responses in terms of accommodative motivation required using knowledge of the subject's overall attitudes to disambiguate them. We began seriously to doubt whether it was possible to arrive at objective quantification of accommodative motivation which could be correlated with language use.

Furthermore, we ran into yet another major problem: responses frequently could not be scored as uniquely accommodative or uniquely non-accommodative but instead included both of these elements simultaneously. This occurred typically whenever the subject enumerated possible alternative behaviours, depending on certain aspects of the situation which were subject to variation. For example, in the following quotation, a Francophone describes how he prefers to speak English to Anglophones in work situations but is willing to accommodate to their desire to practice French in social situations.

"Moi, j'ai horreur des gens qui veulent pratiquer la langue en me parlant. Et puis ça arrive parfois que vous rencontriez des gens qui sont au gouvernement et qui ont suivi un cours de français et alors il faut qu'ils s'adressent à vous en français, d'abord pour montrer qu'ils connaissent un peu de français et deuxièmement parce qu'ils veulent le parler. Et là alors, j'ai pas toujours la patience, sauf si c'est une réunion sociale. Ça, ça me dérange pas, mais si vraiment c'est un rapport d'affaires, je préfère parler anglais." (#24 F)

Here at least two factors seem to be at work at the same time -- desire for efficient communication and desire to behave in an accommodative manner toward the interlocutor -- and depending on the purpose of the interaction, one or the other will win out. For other speakers, we found that their perception of the interlocutor's language competence, or of the intent behind

a language switch, were crucial factors which redefined the parameters of the situation for them and affected their willingness to accommodate linguistically.

For yet other subjects, two conflicting motivations were present in the same situation and were expressed as a wish to behave in one way, while the subject actually behaved in another way. For example, Subject #6A said that he often wished to respond in French to a Francophone having difficulty in English but then confessed that he actually rarely did so because he felt too shy to speak French when other Francophones were present. Here the subject felt a drive to accommodate linguistically, yet did not. Can we consider his overall motivation as "accommodative", when his second motivating force, the self-interest involved in preserving his image in front of the group, won out? Clearly there are often two or more conflicting motivations present simultaneously in a speaker in many situations of language choice; consequently, quantifying the degree of accommodative motivation when, under some conditions one motivation dominates, while under other conditions another dominates, is virtually impossible.

Given the kinds of problems outlined above, it was decided that our original plan to assign quantitative

scores for accommodative motivation and then correlate them with the scores for language use was not feasible. Even if the problem of scoring responses without explicit motivation could be solved and some kind of compromise scores could be worked out for responses containing both accommodative and other types of motivation, this approach would only conceal rather than reveal the true complexity of motivations underlying language use. It seemed to us that the most fruitful approach to understanding accommodation would not be quantitative, but rather would involve a more qualitative exploration of the role played by accommodative tendencies in interaction with the myriad factors influencing code choice. Accordingly, we began to look at the types of motivation and pressures acting on our subjects in various situations of language choice.

III. EXTERNAL PRESSURES ON SPEAKERS

In making a distinction between 'external' and 'internal' pressures acting on speakers in situations of language choice, we are differentiating between factors originating in the wider social and situational environment of an interaction, and factors which have their roots within the individual. We found four major types of external factors: social norms stipulating polite behavior toward interlocutors, pressures originating in

ethnolinguistic group membership, second language proficiency of the interlocutor, and pressures arising from features of the particular situation in which the interaction takes place. Internal pressures seem to stem primarily from two sources, the personality characteristics and the perceived as well as actual second language proficiency of the speaker. However, there are a variety of other internal pressures which affect speakers unequally, such as context in which the second language was learned, aversion to accents, mood, etc. We shall discuss external factors first.

A. THE SOCIAL SIDE OF ACCOMMODATION

Giles has proposed the concept of "interpersonal accommodation" as an explanation for shifts in speech style or code which stem from the speaker's need for social approval from his interlocutor rather than from compliance with social norms. We do not disagree with Giles' contention that there is probably a general set to accommodate to listeners in most situations; on the contrary, our data support this. However, they suggest in addition that such accommodation has in fact become such a well-recognized part of speakers' behavior that social rules have grown up around it. In other words, what had its origin in purely interpersonal needs has become

codified into social norms.

The existence of social rules codifying accommodative tendencies was attested to in two ways by our subjects, both positively and negatively. On the positive side, subjects mentioned "politeness" or "courtesy" toward their interlocutor as a factor influencing their choice of code. While politeness has its roots in certain universal human reactions, it is nonetheless a socially defined behavior; what counts as courteous behavior in one society may not be seen as polite in another society. On the other hand, the social nature of the rules defining appropriate language use was also shown by the fact that subjects were conscious when they were contravening the "rules" or expectations concerning language use.

It seems clear that where bilingualism is a part of everyday life, a set of norms will develop concerning appropriate code choice, just as they develop for appropriate use of particular forms of any one language. Many of these will reflect universal accommodative tendencies, while some may be peculiar to the individual communities involved, depending on the historical background of interaction patterns, culturally defined ways of showing deference, etc. Given that the social animal, man, has a deep-seated universal drive to be accommodative

to other human beings, we asked ourselves what the natural expression of these accommodative tendencies would be in the particular situation of interaction between speakers of different languages? We were able to formulate four natural rules governing appropriate or "polite" code choice in bilingual interaction.

One of the strongest natural rules operating with bilinguals seems to be to address speakers of another language in their own language. As one speaker put it:

"Naturellement, si c'est juste pour lui, pour être poli vis-à-vis lui, je vais utiliser sa langue."
(#24 F)

This is an expression of accommodation in its most basic form as formulated by Giles, that is, convergence on the part of one speaker to the language of the other. This pressure to accommodate by addressing speakers in their own language may be felt even when the speaker is unable to act on it. For example, most individuals travelling abroad feel the urge to communicate with the local inhabitants in their own language; even if they know nothing of the language they will usually quickly learn to use the equivalents of "please" and "thank you" in the foreign language. Some individuals feel such a strong instinctive prohibition against using their own language with speakers of other languages that, without conscious effort they tend

to slip into any other foreign language they know, because it simply "feels" more appropriate to use a foreign language with a foreign speaker.

Clearly, such behavior is a naive or instinctive accommodative response rather than a normative response, since such speakers are not part of a bilingual community where these norms have been taught to them. However, the same accommodative behavior finds expression in social norms in communities where more than one language is in regular use. Such norms are taught, and breaches of the rules are subject to comment. For example, the writer has observed French-Canadian children being reprimanded for addressing their parents in French when unilingual Anglophone visitors were present; the children were informed explicitly that such language use was lacking in courtesy toward the guests, who might assume that the children were making rude comments about them in a language they did not understand. Note that this has repercussions for speakers' feelings about switching languages with a given individual as well.

The feeling that it is only polite to speak the first language of the interlocutor seems to be especially strong when his second language competence is the lower of

the two speakers involved in the interaction. As one subject put it, "There's a certain courtesy: you speak the language of the one who's weakest." (#10 A) We can formulate from this a second rule, to speak the first language of the weaker bilingual. This has its origin in practical necessity, and allows speakers to gracefully revert to their own language if their interlocutor is more at ease with their language than they are with his. However, this is clearly a lower order rule, since once a certain threshold of communicative ability is attained by the speaker, it is frequently overridden by other pressures.

A third rule, perhaps the most powerful of the natural rules we have found concerning accommodative linguistic behavior, is to answer in the language in which one is addressed. As one Anglophone said: "I answer in French. I'll go along with whatever anybody starts." (#8 A) Even when their proficiency in L2 is not high, speakers feel this pressure. A subject who rarely initiated a conversation in L2 because of his doubts about his abilities in the second language still stated: "If somebody starts to speak French to me, I try to reply." (#6 A)

When an Anglophone is addressed by a Francophone in French, Rules 1 and 3 dictate the same behavior, to respond in French. However, when a Francophone addresses an Anglophone in English, these rules are in conflict. The bilingual interlocutor is likely to experience two contradictory impulses, both of them stemming from accommodative norms: to answer in French because the speaker is French, and to answer in English because he has been addressed in English. Which impulse actually wins out depends on a variety of factors. (These are treated later in the chapter.)

However, there is no doubt that answering in the language in which one is addressed was felt to be the most polite and appropriate response by the majority of our subjects. Anglophone subjects in particular indicated that it was insulting to have their interlocutor switch to another language after they had initiated a conversation in one language. As one person put it:

"Actually, it's very insulting or patronizing if I start speaking to you in French and you speak back to me in English, especially if I'm rather proud of my French. I always feel put down a bit if people speak to me in English, when they know I can speak French, especially if they don't speak English very well. Unless I'm having a lot of trouble, I speak the language they speak to me in." (#10 A)

Here the subject has defined accommodative behavior in this situation as responding in the language addressed in, from both the speaker's and the receiver's point of view. In other words, to be polite, listeners should be willing to put up with less than perfect second language performance. The same subject goes on to say:

"People should be prepared to accommodate themselves, to listen to the other language. So I don't feel I'm imposing anything. I suppose this is the point, I don't feel I'm imposing on C. He's French. If he wants people to speak French, he's got to put up with people speaking bad French." (#10 A)

The factor of effort raised by Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) plays a role here. The speaker seems to act on the assumption that if he is making an effort, the interlocutor should exert a commensurate amount of effort by being patient and allowing him to take the necessary time to express himself in the second language.

Awareness of the insulting nature of a language switch is shared by the potential switcher. In the following example, a Francophone subject changes his mind about switching to English out of concern for the feelings of his Anglophone interlocutor, who has addressed him in French:

"Je vais essayer de parler en anglais, à moins que ça l'insulte. Alors à ce moment là je parlerai français." (#24 F)

When subjects did not follow the rule of answering in the language they were addressed in, they were clearly conscious of being unaccommodative. As one speaker noted concerning his tendency to switch to L2 when he hears an L2 speaker having difficulty in the second language: "That will last about two seconds. I should be more tolerant of that." (#5 A) Another speaker admitted:

"Je sais que peut-être ça peut les vexer, de l'autre côté de faire de grands efforts de parler avec moi en français et que je réponds en anglais." (#27 F)

The socially based nature of the rule to answer in the language in which one is addressed is highlighted by the fact that it exerts a stronger pressure when the interlocutor is of higher status. In the following quotation we see how a speaker feels caught in a dilemma because the two rules, that of speaking the interlocutor's first language and that of responding in the language addressed in, have come into conflict. The situation is more delicate for the speaker because his interlocutor is the Dean of his Faculty.

"The other day I was in a meeting and the Dean came up to me. I was speaking English with somebody so he began speaking English. His English is perfectly fluent...slow but fluent...and he began speaking English with the people that I was talking to. They went away and he then stayed in English with me. There

was no longer any need to do that. I'd never spoken English to him before and I had a decision to make. He was speaking to me in English. Clearly he knew me in French, we had known each other for a long time. He was obviously making some kind of effort and he had a reason for doing it...not a very strong reason I think...I had to calculate whether I would offend him in terms of "I don't like his English" by turning back into French. So, I remember now what I said was, "Eh bien, puisqu'on se connaît en français" and I went back into French; I found some kind of justifying reason for going back into French, and he wanted me to get back into French." (#5 A)

From this we may formulate a fourth rule, to speak the language associated with the individual. In this case this rule proved to be the strongest rule eventually. The combined force of the rules to speak the interlocutor's first language and to speak the language associated with the individual ultimately outweighed the pressure to respond in the language addressed in.

This example illustrates the kind of bind bilinguals often unwittingly find themselves in because of unwillingness to break the rule of responding in the language in which they are addressed: even when the language they are speaking is not their usual language of communication, they will often continue on in it until one of the participants becomes uncomfortable enough to switch to their more usual language. Another subject describes this situation:

"The other day I met someone who's Francophone and I always speak to him in French whenever I see him, but for some reason or other the first question that came out of me was in English. And he started replying in English; and I was thinking to myself, 'Gee, this is stupid. His English isn't good, why are we speaking English?' And I couldn't switch! It was funny: I just carried on. And he was struggling. It was really weird." (#9 A)

Here the subject feels bound to adhere to the rule of responding in the language addressed. It seems that there is an element of individual variability involved in which rule wins out.

It is important to point out here that responding in the language in which one is addressed seems to be a reflection of a deeper principle rooted in the neurophysiological code-switching mechanisms in the brain. Researchers such as Kohlers (1966), MacNamara (1971) and G. Neufeld (1976), have shown by means of studies involving measuring the time taken to decode and encode passages containing various types of language switches, that such a mechanism must operate independently for input and output. The input switch is automatically triggered when the receiver hears a message in a language he understands; once in that mode the easiest thing to do physiologically is to remain in that mode. Since the individual does not function on two channels at once, going from one language in the input mode -- listening to and understanding French

-- to another language in the output mode -- answering in English -- requires a voluntary decision to switch. We see from this that there is a neurological basis for behavior which is often conceived of as a socially or linguistically determined phenomenon. The feeling that there is somehow something "unnatural" about a conversation in which one interlocutor speaks one language while the second speaks another, is legitimate. It is indeed unnatural because it requires continual voluntary and active switching (G. Neufeld, 1976). In other words, when a bilingual English speaker is addressed in French, his language switch is involuntarily activated, and in order to suppress a response in the same language, there must be strong counter pressures of a social or psychological nature acting on the individual. Thus, the nature of the neurophysiological code-switching mechanism may well determine more about language switching than many people working with social constraints may normally consider.

B. ETHNOLINGUISTIC PRESSURE ON SPEAKERS

A second type of external pressure on speakers in situations of language choice is that stemming from attitudes about language use shared by members of a particular ethnolinguistic group. We found that certain of our language choice situations tapped accommodative motivation and behavior for one group and not the other.

Clearly, the majority or minority status of each group has an influence here.

For example, language use situation #4, which involves the question of use of L2 with an L1 speaker, brought out accommodative responses from seven out of ten Anglophones but no accommodative responses from Francophones. For Francophones, the situation in which two French speakers are speaking English to one another was perceived as totally aberrant, one which should be normalized as soon as possible by switching to French.

"Si je reconnais un accent français, je vais lui répondre en français automatiquement." (#27 F)

Anglophones, however, generally perceived the situation as one involving being supportive to a second language learner doing his best. They were particularly empathetic and conscious of the ego involvement this may represent for the speaker because they had frequently had the same experience themselves. The following two comments are typical:

"I think I'd speak French. I feel that's important. I've had so much trouble trying to speak French myself. It's maddening to begin a conversation in French and then have someone patronize you and go back to English." (#10 A)

"I'd do my best to keep speaking French...If they're willing to make the effort, so am I. If

they're here trying to practice, etcetera, I like to encourage them." (#4 A)

Even those Anglophones who would switch to English were aware of the feelings the other, was probably experiencing. For example, the following speaker is quite conscious that what he is doing is unaccommodative.

"No way I'm going to have a conversation in French with another Anglophone! I have to say that when I lived in Quebec, I greatly enjoyed Anglophones coming up to me and saying something to me in extraordinarily bad French, which I would let them suffer and struggle through, and then say 'Sure, Mac!' and answer in English. I have to say I take a certain joy in that because it's been done to me enough times." (#2 A)

Despite the diverse reactions of different Anglophones to the same situation, it is clear that all members of the group share a certain basic set of attitudes concerning the appropriateness of using French to other Anglophones who have just addressed them in French when one wishes to be accommodative.

In another example of ethnolinguistic attitudes creating pressures which affect inclination to accommodate, Francophones as a group reacted linguistically very unaccommodatively to the situation in which a bilingual Anglophone joins an ongoing discussion among a group of French speakers. Their tendency to expect a bilingual

English speaker to adapt himself to the language of the group was in marked contrast to the attitude of our Anglophone subjects, almost all of whom expressed their willingness to adapt to the language of the newcomer. Clearly, we have here an example of changing norms of language use, which are directly related to ethnolinguistic group membership. A consciousness of a need to redress the wrongs done to the linguistically downtrodden Francophone minority, a bit of "historical bending over backward" (#1 A), as one subject put it, seems to have permeated Anglophones in the University community, while Francophones as an ethnolinguistic group are now consciously asserting their rights as French speakers. Among these they include the right to be accommodated to in situations in which social norms of politeness dictate such behavior, for example, when they are the interlocutors of higher status, or in situations in which the majority of speakers interacting have French as a first language, etc. In short, they are asking that the natural conversational rules be allowed to operate in interactions between the two ethnolinguistic groups, without French speakers being required to do the lion's share of the accommodating.

Some Francophones go even farther than this in using language choice to affirm their ethnic loyalty. One of our

subjects maintained that he uses French in all group situations on principle, even where there are unilingual Anglophones present. It seems clear that he is using French with Anglophones the way English speakers have used English to Francophones for many years.

"Je vais, très volontiers, par principe, quand je dirige une réunion qui a trait à l'administration, je mène la réunion en français, même si je sais pertinemment qu'il y a des professeurs qui ne comprennent pas, ou à peu près. Je le fais exprès. Je le fais par principe. Je me dis 'Si on cède à ce moment là, inévitablement la réunion va se dérouler en anglais.'...Là-ou je cède, évidemment, tout le monde comprend, c'est en rencontre privé...Je maintiendrai pas le français quand je sais qu'il ne comprend pas, ça c'est clair...Dans une réunion, si l'autre me pose une question, moi, je me rends jusqu'à là, je sais que c'est pas toutes les autorités administratives qui font la même chose, mais quelqu'un va me poser une question en anglais et je vais répondre en français. Par principe." (#21 F)

This kind of overt statement of group membership seems to be rare among Anglophones in the University community, primarily, no doubt, because it is unnecessary. However, one of our Anglophone subjects explained his use of English in a Faculty Council meeting² carried out in French in just those terms, to stress his group affiliation.

² This behavior was observed by the writer in the observation phase of the study.

"In such a situation, even though I perceive that the majority of the population there is much more fluent in French than in English and some might even have some difficulties with English, I basically assert my rights as an Anglophone. So my tendency there would be to speak in English primarily but occasionally switch to French just to indicate that I understand other people's arguments. (#11 A)

C. SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY OF THE INTERLOCUTOR

The second language proficiency of the interlocutor is one of the most important variables which affects second language speakers' willingness to accommodate linguistically to L2 interlocutors. This point came up over and over in our data. Speakers frequently mentioned two alternative courses of action in a given situation of language choice, depending on the interlocutor's capabilities in the second language. This was particularly true of Francophones in our sample since they generally had experience with many Anglophones who were not very fluent in French. For example:

S'il parle français de façon raisonnable, je vais essayer de parler en français parce que pour moi il est plus facile, S'il est parfaitement bilingue, voyez-vous... Ça dépend de leur compétence bilingue." (#24 F)

And from another Francophone:

"That depends. If the person is fluent in French, I'll talk in French. If really they are having difficulty, struggling to enunciate their

thought, then I'll switch to English." (#20 F)

We see that for fluent L2 speakers efficiency of communication is frequently a very important factor in choosing which code to use. Yet the degree to which efficiency takes precedence varies enormously from individual to individual. Compare the responses of two individuals to the question of language choice in a situation in which an L2 speaker is having a hard time in his second language. The first subject puts efficiency of communication above all else, including his interlocutor's preferences:

"Il n'y a rien qui m'énerve autant que quelqu'un, qui, sachant que je suis francophone, va essayer de m'expliquer quelque chose de compliqué en français, alors qu'il est anglophone. Qu'il me parle en anglais! Moi, je comprends l'anglais beaucoup mieux que lui il le parle. (#20.F)

For the second subject, efficiency of communication gives way to the desire to be accommodative, based seemingly on empathy for his interlocutor's position as a second language speaker.

"On continue à parler français. C'est le vieux problème des gens qui apprennent une langue étrangère. Ils essaient de parler votre langue et puis, parce qu'ils font une erreur, on les interrompt, et on fait la conversation dans leur langue. J'essaie de pas faire ça parce que c'est désagréable. Alors, on souffre ensemble. (#22 F)

For speakers who are not terribly comfortable in L2, efficiency of communication is usually less important. For them the degree of second language competence of their interlocutor serves a different purpose: it can be crucial in either encouraging or stifling their willingness to speak L2. In our sample this was true of a number of Anglophones. Among them the following subject's response is typical.

"The situations in which I feel the least comfortable are situations where the people with whom I'm speaking are better in English than I am in French. That is the psychological problem. But where the listener is not as good in English as I am in French, I have the psychological advantage and I relish it. I will then speak a lot of French...I don't mind making mistakes, because I'm the one who's the more bilingual of the two of us. And you feel good in those situations." (#6 A)

Here, although the speaker's prime motivation may be an internal one, to practice his L2, the natural drive to accommodate to his interlocutor by speaking his language is either allowed to surface or repressed, depending on the second language competence of his interlocutor. We see that the relative competence of speaker and interlocutor may perhaps be more important than actual second language proficiency in determining whose language will predominate. This notion will be discussed further later on in the chapter (Section IV. A.).

D. SITUATIONAL PRESSURES

We have seen how the attitudes of individuals are subject to pressures both from their ethnolinguistic group membership and from general social norms concerning appropriate language use, as well as from the crucial factor of the second language proficiency of their interlocutor. However, the strength of motivation to accommodate linguistically to an interlocutor is also influenced by certain other external factors which we have grouped under the blanket term of situational pressures. By this we mean factors stemming from the particular situation in which the speaker finds himself, and which impinge upon his language choice. We have distinguished here four types of situational pressures, but there are certainly others. Strictly speaking, second language proficiency of the interlocutor is also a situational factor, in that it varies from situation to situation, but, because of its importance, we have treated it separately.

1. Language of the relationship

Speakers normally develop associations of particular individuals with specific languages. Our subjects, both Francophone and Anglophone, often mentioned "the language of a relationship" as a factor in the choice of one language or another.

The following responses were made to the question of which language the Anglophone subjects would use to a bilingual Francophone joining a group discussion among Anglophones.

"It depends on the person and whether our past relationship has been in French." (#3 A)

"It depends. If he's one of the people who is marked 'Francophone', I speak to him first in French." (#4 A)

"It doesn't work that way [according to the language of the group]. It works on the basis of really two elements: the language you're used to speaking with people, and also where the conversation will go easiest." (#10 A)

As one subject expressed it, the language one associates with a person is part of his identity, and changing languages, especially since the person is not likely to be equally competent in both languages, changes this identity.

"It's a question of identity. I mean one's speech style, one's language, the code with which one speaks, is part of the identity that you have with that person, and if they go to a different code, unless they're equally, equally fluent, where the style comes out the same, you're uncomfortable." (#5 A)

Thus, we see that there is often a close relationship between second language proficiency and history of the relationship.

2. Purpose of the interaction

Another pressure arising directly from the situation which influences desire to accommodate is the nature or purpose of the interaction. We refer to the overall purpose rather than to conversational strategies. For example, as we have already seen, people are often willing to be more accommodating to a none-too-fluent L2 speaker who wants to practice his second language when the interaction is purely social. As one Francophone said:

"If it's irrelevant, just chitchat and he wants to practice his French, then okay. If it's serious or anything to do with business, then I'll switch to English right away." (#20 F)

Likewise, in such social situations this same none-too-fluent speaker is often more willing to be venturesome in following his natural inclinations to accommodate linguistically. When the interaction is a business meeting where the consequences of misunderstanding may be great, the speaker's desire to accommodate and/or to practice L2 may give way to the more urgent need to be sure all parties understand. For example, the following explanation comes from an Anglophone who is a member of a University Senate committee where French is spoken most of the time at the meetings.

"Unfortunately, I almost always make [my point] in English. But the reply would be in French...If my interjection is a relatively short one, then I may speak in French. But if I have something that may be a little bit on the

lengthy side or may be complicated, then I tend to speak in English because I guess I don't want to make a fool of myself, that's part of it, and partly the serious nature of what we're discussing is such that I want to be sure that I'm understood. I don't want to make any mistakes and mislead people." (#6 A)

3. Expected language or basic ground rules of the situation

Certain situations seem to have an "expected language" attached to them. For example, subjects from certain faculties reported that the expected language of administrative meetings at the Faculty level was defined by long tradition as French. As one subject stated, "The meetings are always in French." (#1 A) Here, for an individual to speak English would be remarked upon, would constitute a violation of the unspoken ground rules of the situation. Many researchers have used locale as the factor covering such situations but we prefer to separate ground rules of the situation from locale, because within one location, the University, ground rules differ from department to department. Some departments function mainly in French, some mainly in English, others equally in both languages, and the expected language of interactions will vary accordingly.

For the majority of university meetings, our subjects seemed to feel that the ground rules of the situation provided for participants to speak their own

language without any fear of censure. (This is in line with the official policy of the university of passive bilingualism, where individuals are expected to be able to understand the other language but not necessarily to speak it.)

"Les deux réunions du comité ont lieu dans les deux langues." (#19 F)

"I basically assume the policy of the university is one of bilingualism, passive bilingualism at least, so I assume that everybody should understand the second language, and consequently, in group bodies I by and large assert my, not my rights, but rather do what is more effective in terms of expressing myself." (#11 A)

Subjects often defined the ground rules of a situation themselves. For one Anglophone, who is married to a Francophone, shopping and business is done in French.

"I almost always speak French in taxis, stores, etcetera, unless I know they're Anglophone. I'll do that even more, when I'm with my husband." (#10 A)

A Francophone subject also said that he did all his shopping in French. For him, living in a bilingual area means that he should have the right to be served in French.

"Et il m'est déjà arrivé de quitter le magasin parce que personne ne parlait français. C'est un quartier bilingue ici, et si je vais acheter quelque chose dans un magasin, et que personne

ne peut me servir dans ma langue, je n'aime pas ça. Mes billets d'un dollar sont dans les deux langues. Je ne pense pas être fanatique, mais lorsque j'ai envie de m'acheter quelque chose un peu précieux et que personne ne peut me servir dans ma langue, c'est possible que je quitte le magasin... Si je me rends dans l'ouest de la ville, par exemple, je vais pas insister sur la langue française." (#19 F)

We see that expected language can be combined with other, more personal motivations. In this case, insistence on being served in French becomes a statement of ethnic rights. As mentioned earlier, we rarely found such statements from Anglophones in our study because, as majority group members, their ethnolinguistic rights are seldom trampled upon.

4. Topic

Topic or subject of the conversation sometimes conditions the language of the interaction. In this university context topic seemed to be particularly relevant when an academic subject was discussed for which the terminology was principally in one language. For example, one subject said of his choice of language, "Ça depend du sujet qui est abordé", then went on to explain why he almost always speaks English with a particular Anglophone colleague when discussing English history.

"Jusqu'un certain point ça demande un effort supplémentaire et un peu idiot, si vous voulez, de tout traduire en français. Par contre, si

cet anglophone et moi, nous nous entretenons de sujets d'histoire de France, c'est bien possible alors que nous parlions français ensemble."

(#19 F)

Or, in another example, a subject described how his habitual language with a certain individual changed when a particular topic was discussed.

"Avec M. c'est toujours en français sauf quand il s'agit des questions techniques sur la syntaxe. Toute la terminologie de la syntaxe est en anglais."

(#27 F)

IV. INTERNAL PRESSURES ON SPEAKERS

We mentioned earlier in the chapter that there are often several conflicting motivations present in a speaker in a situation of language choice. Indeed, this state of conflict may well be the norm, since in addition to the various external pressures acting on the individual, there are certain strong internal pressures which intervene in any language choice situation. The two overriding internal factors which are present in all individuals are the second language proficiency of the speaker and the basic make-up of his personality. In addition, the context in which speakers have learned the second language, aversion to accents, verbal strategies, and mood all seem to be factors conditioning use or non-use of the second language.

A. SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY OF THE SPEAKER

It is commonly assumed that second language proficiency is the primary factor affecting code choice in interactions between speakers of unequal competence. When the level of L2 proficiency is below a certain threshold, this is undoubtedly true. Several of our subjects illustrated this. For example, among Anglophones, the subject with the lowest perceived second language proficiency (3 on a scale of 10) also had the lowest scores in the Anglophone group for use of and attitudes toward use of the second language.³ In general, he expressed little motivation to accommodate to L2 speakers in the various situations of language choice. His most accommodative response was to allow a struggling L2 speaker to revert to his first language while he continued in his own first language.

"I would probably say, in French, you can speak French if you want to...I may continue talking in English but then that will probably force him back into English again. A lot of people don't like that situation, but I have no objection to it...You've got the choice. Do it in the one you can do it well in." (#2 A)

Clearly this subject's low L2 proficiency makes him feel

3

His score on the secondary factor "Extent of Use of L2" was 9 out of a possible 25, while the next lowest score by an Anglophone was 14, and his score on "Attitude toward learning and using L2" was 3 out of 10, again the lowest in the Anglophone sample.

more comfortable carrying on most interactions in his first language. We note also that he seems to feel the need to justify his lack of accommodativeness, and that he does it by referring to his level of L2 proficiency.

Yet, it seems to be more accurate to say that relative rather than absolute proficiency, and perceived rather than actual proficiency in the second language, are the relevant factors in influencing speakers' L2 use. It seems that even quite fluent speakers make judgments about their proficiency relative to that of their interlocutor, and that these are probably one of the key factors in whether they choose to speak or switch to L2 in any given situation. The following two speakers are quite explicit on this point.

"I would generally try to perceive what our respective levels of capability are in the other language, and if I felt that my competence in French were greater than his English, I would switch to French even before he went into trouble." (#11 A)

"There's a whole package of conflicting factors there, sort of an appreciation of the quality of my French vis-a-vis his English, that sort of thing. Sometimes the situation determines it; sometimes the material determines it...I don't think there's any absolute one principle, and I think basically the thing that determines it frequently is sort of a self-evaluation of my capabilities in French." (#4 A)

And for speakers with doubts about their capabilities in the second language, when they perceive their L2

proficiency to be greater than that of their interlocutor, they normally feel far more willing to use the language.

"I'd say that the situations in which I feel the least comfortable are situations where the people with whom I'm speaking are better in English than I am in French. That is the psychological problem. But where the listener is not as good in English as I am in French, I have the psychological advantage and I relish it. I will then speak a lot of French...I don't mind making mistakes, because I'm the one who's the more bilingual of the two of us. And you feel good in those situations." (#6 A)

Even the Anglophone with the lowest perceived proficiency, whom we quoted earlier as preferring to speak English with Francophone bilinguals, admitted:

"I have very little shame speaking French when everyone around either speaks worse French than I do or worse English than I speak French." (#2 A)

However, once a certain threshold of proficiency is reached, degree of proficiency in the second language diminishes considerably as a factor influencing accommodation. Once speakers are at ease in L2, their incidence of use of L2 generally rises. Yet their motivation to accommodate to second language speakers may not increase at all. As we have seen earlier, ethnolinguistic group attitudes may either increase or depress desire to accommodate to the members of the opposite group by speaking their language, while pressures

originating within the interaction situation itself, such as L2 competence of the interlocutor, may influence actual behavior. Thus, a competent speaker may speak L2 frequently while preferring all the time to speak L1, as we found in a certain number of Francophones. At the same time a speaker of mid-level competence in the second language may use his L2 only moderately frequently, but may feel much more desire to accommodate to his L2 interlocutor than his behavior indicates.

We found, in fact, that speakers with a moderate level of competence in the second language usually tended to express highly accommodative feelings. However, such feelings were not automatically synonymous with increased switching to L2. Rather, these subjects often tended to show their drive to accommodate to their interlocutor by offering to switch, by being willing at all times to speak whichever language the other party wished. In our sample, such behavior was most typical of Anglophones. Throughout their responses we see the consciousness of knowing how it feels to have people switch languages on them.

"I would probably, by switching into French, offer them the chance if they wanted to talk French. If they didn't, then I'd continue in English. I would probably at one point switch into French."
(#1 A)

"I'd ask him if he prefers to speak in French, 'cause he may be trying to speak English. Actually it's very insulting or patronizing if I start speaking to you in French and you speak back to me in English, especially if I'm rather proud of my French." (#10 A)

Sometimes an inability to decide which language to use indicates a high degree of accommodative motivation. The speaker is in a situation of conflict where whichever language is chosen is open to misinterpretation, as in the following two examples.

"I never know whether to switch or not. I feel caught every time this happens. I think I'm very sensitive because I have felt this myself so many times -- of a Francophone doing that to me where my French happens to be at least as good as their English but they have this stereotyped notion that I can't because I'm an Anglophone, and they insist on speaking English to me." (#3 A)

"I find it awkward because if I switch to French I feel it looks as if I'm showing off to a bunch of Anglophones who are around and that makes me feel uncomfortable. But on the other hand, you know the whole business about Francophones being so miserable having to speak English in a gathering...I'm a bit of a misanthrope. I probably wouldn't say anything." (#9 A)

Here the subjects clearly wish to be accommodative, only they are not sure which language use will be perceived as most accommodative. In the group situation mentioned in the second quotation, the subject feels that whichever language she chooses will be subject to bad feelings by one group or the other. Her decision to avoid initiating in

either language is the most accommodative response possible.

We found that highly competent L2 speakers in our sample indeed tended to use L2 more than less proficient speakers. Yet, although this behavior might seem superficially to be more accommodative since it involves using L2 to L2 speakers almost exclusively, we found that certain other factors originating in the individual, with personality factors among the most powerful, were in fact dictating much of this use of the second language.

B. PERSONALITY FACTORS

A second source of internal pressure acting on people in situations of language choice is the personality make-up of the individual. All of the factors which are discussed in this chapter are filtered through the individual; thus, no predictions can be made about how any particular person will react in a given situation without knowing something about how he rates on certain important personality traits.

As an example of the effect of individual personality characteristics on language behavior, let us take the striking case of the reactions of two different

individuals to the same situation. Both are Anglophones, so ethnolinguistic differences can be discounted. In terms of perceived proficiency in the second language they are quite close, with Subject #11 being rated at 6 out of 10 and Subject #6 rated at 5. The following quotations show the reactions of the two speakers to the situation in which they have just addressed someone in French, only to have this person turn around and respond in English.

"That's a very disheartening thing...sometimes I get the distinct impression that it's a putdown. Other times I get the impression that the person is genuinely trying to accommodate me. He isn't trying to hurt my feelings...If it's a situation where I have the impression that the person is quite willing to go on speaking French but has switched because he or she thought they were doing me a favour, I would probably continue in French. But if it's a put-down, I find that rather devastating. If what I'm being told implicitly is, I don't want to speak French to you because your French is so bad, well, you know, the wind goes out of your sails. Then I would probably continue in English." (#6 A)

"I take it depending upon the way I perceive the objective to be in the other person's mind. So, for example, if I feel that the other person basically perceives that I don't speak French adequately, my tendency would be to continue speaking French...If I feel that he seems to be creating an environment in which he feels more at ease, then I let go and probably continue speaking in English thereafter." (#11 A)

Notice that both speakers have envisioned the possibility of either accommodative or non-accommodative intent lying behind their interlocutor's switch. However,

while Subject #6 would become discouraged and go along with the language switch when he perceived it as a put-down, Subject #11, on the other hand, would get his dander up and persevere in French. These different reactions to the same situation are clearly personality related. When we examined the personality profiles of these two individuals we discovered that, among other things, Subject #11 tended to be more assertive, more confident and more self-sufficient than Subject #6. Personality characteristics such as these may well go a long way toward providing an explanation for the differences in behavior of two individuals when faced with the same situation of language choice.

In some cases personality can intervene and dramatically alter the effect normally exerted by a particular variable. For example, we mentioned that, in general, high scores for "Extent of Use of L2" were associated with high self-ratings on second language proficiency, while people with low perceived proficiency scores used their second language less. However, our sample included one glaring exception to this rule. This subject had an extremely low rating on perceived proficiency (4 out of 10) but a high score on "Extent of Use of L2" (19 out of 25, a score which was surpassed only by the three subjects with the highest scores on perceived

proficiency). This subject expressed his attitude toward using the second language as follows:

"To learn French you have to be aggressive, you have to be psychologically aggressive...And secondly, you have to be able to expose yourself to ridicule, to be inferior. The main reason people don't learn to speak French is that they're afraid of putting themselves in awkward positions, or feeling ill at ease. But you have to be aggressive. You have to make up your mind that you're going to speak it -- that's the way I did -- that you're going to make mistakes. And you also have to have an attitude that you don't really care if you make mistakes. It's never bothered me that I speak French badly. I'm never self-conscious about it...It's a very good attitude. It's the only attitude to have when you learn. (#10 A)

This speaker has an exceptionally strong drive to persevere in using his second language, even without the feedback derived from knowing that he is performing well. How can we explain this drive?

The personality profile of Subject #10 reveals several characteristics which may help to explain his lack of inhibitions and the very tough-skinned attitude he has toward L2 use. He is exceptionally expedient (1 on the scale of PF G, Expedient vs Conscientious), which indicates that he "feels few obligations" and that "his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upset from stress" (Manual, p. 15). Thus, he is likely to persevere

in using his second language without regard for social appropriateness, censure of others, etc. He also scored very high on PF M (8 on the scale of Practical vs Imaginative), which means he tends to be unconventional, self-motivated, imaginative, wrapped up in inner urgencies and careless of practical matters, traits which may explain some of his lack of inhibition in using the second language whenever he feels like it. And finally, Subject #10 scored very high on self-sufficiency (8 on PF Q2, Group-dependent vs Self-sufficient) as well as extremely high on independence (9.8 on Secondary Factor IV, Subduedness vs Independence), which means he is resourceful and prefers his own decisions, is aggressive, independent and incisive. These characteristics again seem to support this individual's tendency to persevere in his desire to practice L2 wherever he wishes, despite how others may react.

These are only two examples of how differences in personality traits influence use or non-use of the second language. Certainly personality affects the reactions of speakers and interlocutors to some degree in most situations of language choice. As we have seen, the factor of personality can even override strong accommodative pressures. We feel, in fact, that personality is so vital to understanding accommodation that we have distinguished

between accommodative and non-accommodative personality types. In Section VI of this chapter portraits of these personality types will be drawn.

C. CONTEXT IN WHICH L2 WAS LEARNED

In addition to the factors of second language proficiency and personality which influence almost all speakers, there are certain other internal factors which may affect language use for some individuals but not necessarily for others. One of the factors leading to increased second language use for certain subjects found in our sample is the tendency to associate L2 speakers with L2 uniquely. This association seems to be present primarily in those speakers who learned the second language in a true immersion context.

Among our Anglophone subjects, the three most proficient speakers learned French by living in either a French-speaking country or province. All three manifested a drive to speak French to Francophones in all circumstances which far surpassed that of Anglophones who had not learned French in such a context. This drive expressed itself in initiating conversations only in L2, switching to L2 when an L2 speaker initiated a conversation in L1, and persevering in L2 when the interlocutor switched

to L1; it even overrode group pressures to speak L1. These three Anglophones also expressed extreme unwillingness to switch languages with the same individual, a factor which seems to be directly tied to their association of L2 speakers with L2 only. We found no corresponding drive to always speak English to Anglophones on the part of Francophones in our study, who for the most part had learned English in a bilingual environment where switching languages with the same individual was normal.

We mentioned the language of the relationship as a major factor influencing speakers' choice of one language or another. The crucial point for those speakers who learned the second language in an immersion situation is that they have such a strong drive to associate L2 speakers with L2 only, that they virtually establish no relationships with L2 speakers in L1. Thus, context in which the second language was learned and language of the relationship go hand in hand to produce a situation in which such speakers always speak the second language with second language speakers.

D. AVERSION TO ACCENTS

Aversion to foreign-sounding speech or "accents" is another very strong pressure which, for some speakers, results in increased use of L2 which is not attributable to

accommodative tendencies. While only a few subjects mentioned it, it seems to be a powerful enough factor when it does exist to warrant serious consideration. We found two Anglophones who said that this was an important factor influencing their language choice. In the case of a highly competent speaker such as Subject #5, who already has a strong association of Francophones with French because of the context in which he learned the language, this sensitivity to accents reinforces his drive to speak only L2 to L2 speakers. As he put it:

"There's a very low, low tolerance level that I have for imperfect or foreign-sounding language, and if I know the first language of the person, I'll jump into it." (#5 A)

This factor provides equally strong pressure on him to speak only English to Anglophones; it seems to be the overriding factor in the situation in which another Anglophone addresses this speaker in French:

"If I detect any trace of Anglophone accent, I'm going to jump into English, somehow...If I hear them with any kind of mistake at all...phonological or lexical or syntactic, it bothers me sufficiently when its from an Anglophone that I'll jump into English. And I'll do so sometimes knowing perfectly well that I'm offending them by doing it." (#5 A)

We say it is the overriding factor because it clearly takes precedence over the pressure to "Answer in the language in

which one is addressed" which many Anglophones seem to feel even when other Anglophones address them in French. Here the speaker is well aware that he is being unaccommodative but the internal pressure to avoid accented speech is stronger.

This aversion to accents seems to be independent of proficiency in the second language. The other two highly competent Anglophone L2 speakers did not mention it, and they are quite ready to converse in French with an Anglophone speaker. Yet it was an important factor for the Anglophone with the lowest second language proficiency of any in our sample, although it had rather a different effect. He also felt the same drive to speak only English to Anglophones; however, the chief effect of his aversion to accents was to act as a deterrent to his speaking French.

"I would much rather have them hear good English than bad French and I would much rather listen to somebody else's good English than their bad French. As it turns out, all the Francophones are fluent enough in English so that their English is most pleasant to me. So that it doesn't matter a bit to me whether A. speaks English or French. Or P. or D. But some of the others, who probably speak better French than I do -- their accent bothers me. I think it is partly because there was a certain amount of snobbism and whatnot associated with my early contact with French, and I'm embarrassed by a bad accent, a bad English accent in French, you know, the pronunciation. Even if somebody is very good in all other aspects, if their

pronunciation is bad, I simply get embarrassed, totally distracted from what they're saying...It's very simple: I just don't like listening to it." (#2 A)

This sensitivity to accents probably has at least two causes. Firstly, some individuals simply hear the differences more acutely, whether because of a natively "good ear" or by training. Of the two subjects who mentioned this, the first speaks four foreign languages virtually without accent, while the second is a phonetician. Secondly, sensitivity to accents, in addition to being a highly individual factor, may well be associated with second language learning patterns. For people who learned their L2 in a bilingual environment, in association with many speakers who did not have a perfect command of the second language, more tolerance of imperfect pronunciation may have developed. This may have been the case for our Francophone subjects, none of whom mentioned this aversion to bad accents. Also, as one of the above subjects suggested, language learning in the classroom, where teachers make a big deal over "correct" pronunciation, may contribute to a lessened acceptance of pronunciation errors; while all of the Anglophones in our sample learned French primarily in school, many of the Francophones in the study grew up with two languages spoken around them.

E. VERBAL STRATEGIES

As we mentioned earlier in the chapter, people sometimes use language deliberately to accomplish certain ends within a given conversation. A few subjects made comments about using one language or the other in a conscious attempt to manipulate their interlocutor. For example, one administrator mentioned using L1 rather than the L2 he normally used with a particular interlocutor in order to gain the upper hand.

"Every so often I do it [switch languages] for very sort of Machiavellian purposes...Not automatically and not even the majority of the time, but I can remember situations where I have deliberately said to myself, I'm going to do this in English because I don't want any arguments from this guy...Sort of because I know that if he wants to argue with me, he's at a disadvantage because he's going to be arguing in his second language, and I'd be at an advantage because I'll be arguing in my first. I've done this with a couple of people with whom I frequently enough speak French." (#4 A)

Speakers also mentioned deliberately switching to L2 as a tactic to show the other party that they speak his language. This was only mentioned by Anglophones; presumably Francophones do not need to show that they speak English in this particular bilingual context. With reference to switching to French so that everyone knew he was bilingual, one subject stated:

"I don't do that much any more because everybody knows I am. But I know years ago I used to do

it. And I still do it in situations where I want a little extra punch. I want the sympathy of Francophones that are there, for example, for my argument, and if they've heard me speak in English, I'm going to be damn sure that they know I can get on their wavelength." (#5 A)

Here the second language is used with the intent of being well thought of by the members of the other ethnolinguistic group. However, the very calculatedness of the action seems to push it beyond the normal definition of accommodation; perhaps we could call it "calculated accommodation" or accommodation as a "conscious verbal strategy."

More often code choice as a verbal strategy to persuade or influence an interlocutor occurs not so much deliberately as naturally, often unconsciously. For example, a strong need to make sure that the other person really understands, especially in meetings involving serious university business, is evident in many of our subjects' answers. Quite often this will cause the speaker to switch to his interlocutor's language, as in the following example:

"J'ai l'impression que ce qui peut me faire changer de langue à l'occasion c'est quand je veux être bien certain qu'il comprenne... Avec H., par exemple, je sais que je parle anglais avec lui, pas toujours, mais des fois. Et j'ai l'impression que c'est toujours lorsqu'il faut le convaincre de quelque chose en particulier. Alors je vais lui expliquer en anglais." (#23 F)

Yet for some individuals this same need to convince their audience will cause them to switch to their own language.

"Mais si je veux vraiment démontrer quelque chose, comme par exemple, au réunion des profs, quand j'ai l'impression que ce que je vais expliquer, là, n'est pas très clair, que ça va se préciser en disant et que je veux vraiment -- là, tu vois, je viens de dire "make a point", si je veux vraiment convaincre, je vais tout de suite dire 'Bon, en français' dans mon esprit, et là j'explique en français." (#18.F)

While it is fairly typical to slip into one's own language to be more convincing, it should be noted that the above individual is extremely fluent in English, considerably more so than the previous subject. Thus, language proficiency is unlikely to be the deciding factor here. We see that there are certainly individual factors which come into play in using language choice to influence one's interlocutor.

Sometimes use of the second language is seen by one ethnolinguistic group to carry one meaning, while for the other group it has a different meaning. For example, one Anglophone subject speculated that English might be used as an isolating device by some French speakers.

"Probably certain people that you come in contact with refuse to speak French with you regardless of your French because you're an Anglo, so they're gonna isolate themselves from you by speaking your language...not to accommodate, but to isolate." (#5 A)

From the other side of the linguistic fence, however, this use of English is perceived as having a different value. A Francophone explains that his inability to speak colloquial French with Anglophones originated in the way in which he learned English. Again we see how context of learning affects subsequent language choice.

"J'ai appris vraiment à être "buddy-buddy" avec quelqu'un en anglais. Je suis plus "buddy-buddy" avec un anglophone en anglais qu'en français. J'associe vraiment les gens à un niveau de langue en anglais...C'est dans ce contexte là que moi j'ai appris l'anglais, avec des bons copains, tu vois, et je connais des expressions assez bien...Tandis qu'en français, si l'autre pourrait fonctionner en français, à mon niveau, au niveau populaire, tu sais, le niveau du copain de "locker-room", si tu veux, alors là, d'accord, aucun problème, mais comme je m'adapte plus au niveau "colloquial" de l'anglais que l'anglophone va s'adapter à mon niveau "colloquial" ou populaire, là, je préférerais parler anglais." (#18 F)

We see from this that speaking English to Anglophones, while it may be viewed by the Anglophone as unaccommodative or as a device to isolate or keep him out, actually is the Francophone's way of establishing closer contact, of feeling the most at ease and breaking down as many barriers as possible between two individuals who have different native tongues. In other words, we have here a type of motivation which is accommodative, despite how the Anglophone interlocutor may perceive it.

Another Francophone expressed the same need to use the second language to establish intimate contact, although here the context is more clearly that of interaction with individuals of low second language proficiency.

"Voilà deux cas, où aussitôt que eux, ils me parlent en français, moi, j'ai l'impression d'être très artificiel lorsque je leur répons en français. J'ai l'impression enfin de compte de ne pas parler ou même de ne pas établir un contact aussi intime que celui qui s'établirait si je leur parlais en anglais. De sorte que, je sais que peut-être ça peut les vexer, de l'autre côté, de faire de grands efforts de parler avec moi en français et que je répons en anglais."
(#27 F)

F. MOOD

Throughout this chapter we have spoken as if the choice of one code or another were more or less determined, whether by external or internal factors impinging on the individual, or by his conscious decision. However, language choice is rarely that cut and dried.

The intangible factor of mood frequently plays a large part in determining how a person will react to the other factors acting upon him. We may liken swings in mood to temporary mini-changes in personality: for example, a person who is normally rather assertive and decisive may sometimes feel rather down and, as a consequence, less

assertive or more indecisive. Mood may be an especially important factor when the individual involved feels conflict in the particular situation. For example, in the situation in which a speaker addresses an interlocutor in one language only to have him respond in another, many subjects said that how they would react depended on their mood. Clearly, they were often both chagrined and angry, and which emotion won out was subject to the way they were feeling at the time.

"It would depend on my mood. If I felt like pretending that my native language was German and I couldn't speak English either, then I might continue in French. But if I were in a hurry, I might just make the switch." (#8 A)

"Depends on how belligerent I'm feeling at the time. Because sometimes I just let it go and sometimes I get mad and insist on speaking French." (#3 A)

"It depends on my mood. Sometimes I say: 'I'm sorry, I don't speak English. I'm an immigrant. I'm sorry my French is bad.'" (#10 A)

In other situations, too, mood was cited by subjects as a factor influencing their language choice. One subject suggested that it was mood which determined whether or not she responded in L2 to an L1 speaker who had addressed her in L2. It seems that, in a conflict situation where she is aware that switching languages is unaccommodative, she has to decide whether or not she really does feel like creating

this unaccommodative impression. As she expresses it:

"I might answer in French. It depends on my mood...the mood of: do I want to hurt this person's feelings, is his French so bad, or do I want to make it easier for him?" (#3 A)

For moderately proficient second language speakers, it may depend on just how tired they are or just how energetic and confident they are feeling, whether they make the effort to initiate a conversation in the second language. As the same subject indicated:

"It depends. Sometimes I feel like speaking French, sometimes I don't...I plan on a certain interaction being in French just because it's getting easier and I want to try it. It's sort of a minor triumph if I can pull it off and the person doesn't switch into English. But sometimes I'm too lazy to bother." (#3 A)

Clearly, fluctuations in mood may have a more direct influence on code use for second language speakers at a mid-level of proficiency. Yet the factor of mood is certainly not restricted to speakers for whom second language proficiency is an intervening variable; mood was also cited as a factor in language choice by subjects who are completely at ease in both languages, in situations where there is no clearly expected language. Concerning the language he used for teaching, one subject said:

"The thing that dictates the language mainly is how do I feel that year, do I want to speak more English than French? I've noticed that I tend to, from year to year, sort of vacillate, going back and forth...This last year, oh again it was half and half. It's a mood situation; it's not a mechanical problem." (#5 A)

And again in a general context he continued:

"I think my command of the language is such that it's not mechanical difficulties which would make me decide which one to use. It's to whom I'm speaking, what I feel like speaking at the time...It's almost a mood thing for me unless it's obvious that I must speak French or should speak French with somebody or some group. If I have the option, it varies which one I'll use." (#5 A)

V. ACCOMMODATIVE AND NON-ACCOMMODATIVE PERSONALITY TYPES

A. PROFILE OF THE ACCOMMODATIVE INDIVIDUAL

In an attempt to get at the personality traits which characterize the accommodative individual, we compared the personality profiles of the two subjects (one Anglophone and one Francophone) who seemed to be the most accommodating from a linguistic point of view. On seven out of the fifteen primary traits we compared, these two subjects had identical stens, and their scores were only one sten apart for four more traits. The remaining scores were either two or three stens apart. In every case, the

4
We omitted Trait B from consideration ("Less versus more intelligent").

scores tended toward the same pole on the personality dimension measured. Even more revealing, all of the scores for the second-order factors were within one step of each other. Although we would not claim that such close parallels between personality profiles are to be expected in all accommodative individuals, nevertheless these results were striking.

Table 5.1 contains a comparison of the scores obtained by these two accommodative subjects, #4 A and #22 F, on the fifteen primary factors and the four second order factors. The pole of each personality factor toward which the two subjects tended has been underlined.

We see from this table that these two accommodative individuals tend to be extremely imaginative and interested in ideas, rather than practical and down-to-earth (very high M factor) and extremely "tender-minded" or sensitive and gentle, rather than "tough-minded" or unsentimental, insensitive and hard (very high I factor). They tend to be trusting, adaptable, tolerant and easy to get along with (low L), as well as accommodating, mild, considerate and non-dominant (low E). They tend to be self-assured, confident, and characterized by feelings of untroubled adequacy (low O), as well as self-sufficient,

TABLE 5.1
 PROFILE OF TWO ACCOMMODATIVE INDIVIDUALS

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Personality Dimension</u>	<u>#4 A</u>	<u>#22 F</u>
A	<u>Reserved</u> vs. <u>Outgoing</u>	2	3
C	Affected by feelings vs. <u>Emotionally stable</u>	8	6
E	<u>Accommodating</u> vs. <u>Assertive</u>	3	4
F	<u>Serious</u> vs. <u>Happy-go-lucky</u>	4	3
G	<u>Expedient</u> vs. <u>Conscientious</u>	4	4
H	<u>Shy</u> vs. <u>Venturesome</u>	4	4
I	<u>Toughminded</u> vs. <u>Tender-minded</u>	9	9
L	<u>Trusting</u> vs. <u>Suspicious</u>	2	2
M	<u>Practical</u> vs. <u>Imaginative</u>	9	9
N	<u>Forthright</u> vs. <u>Shrewd</u>	6	6
O	<u>Self-assured</u> vs. <u>Apprehensive</u>	3	3
Q1	<u>Conservative</u> vs. <u>Experimenting</u>	7	6
Q2	<u>Group-dependent</u> vs. <u>Self-sufficient</u>	9	7
Q3	<u>Undisciplined self-conflict</u> vs. <u>Controlled</u>	6	9
Q4	<u>Relaxed</u> vs. <u>Tense</u>	2	5
<u>Second Order</u>			
I	<u>Adjustment</u> vs. <u>Anxiety</u>	2.3	3.3
II	<u>Introversion</u> vs. <u>Extraversion</u>	2.0	2.5
III	<u>Tenderminded Emotionality</u> vs. <u>Alert Poise (Decisiveness)</u>	3.9	3.1
IV	<u>Subduedness</u> vs. <u>Independence</u>	8.9	7.8

resourceful and preferring their own decisions (high Q2) and quite emotionally stable, mature and realistic about life (medium to high C). They also tend to be reserved, detached and objective rather than outgoing and participating (low A), moderately shy, careful and restrained as opposed to venturesome, socially bold and impulsive (moderately low H), moderately serious and taciturn as opposed to lively and talkative (moderately low F) and moderately expedient and refusing to be bound by rules (moderately low G). They are average on the dimension of naivete versus shrewdness (forthright and unpretentious as opposed to astute and worldly) (mid scores on N). The two subjects vary somewhat on the factors Q3 and Q4, ranging from average to highly controlled, exacting and socially precise (mid to very high Q3) and from average to very relaxed, tranquil and frustrated, as opposed to tense, driven and frustrated (mid to low Q4). Both subjects tend to be average to moderately liberal or experimenting on the dimension "Conservative versus Experimenting" (6 and 7 on Q1).

On the second order factors the tendencies of the two accommodative subjects are remarkably similar. They tend to be very well adjusted (2.3 and 3.3 on Second Order PF I), very introverted (2.0 and 2.5 on Second Order PF II), quite emotional and sensitive (3.1 and 3.9 on Second Order

PF III), and very independent (7.8 and 8.9 on Second Order PF-IV). Since the second order factors represent a summing up of the primary personality factors, we can take these second order results as indicative of extremely similar personality scores for our two most linguistically accommodating subjects:

B. PROFILE OF THE NON-ACCOMMODATIVE INDIVIDUAL

To characterize the non-accommodative individual, we followed the same procedure of comparing the two subjects, one from each ethnolinguistic group, who had had the most unaccommodative responses. As with the accommodative individuals, we found striking similarities between the two subjects for many personality traits. However, for certain traits, opposite tendencies were found.

As shown in Table 5.2, the two non-accommodative individuals are assertive, aggressive and dominant in the extreme (10 on Factor E), as well as quite tense, driven and impatient (moderate to high Q4). They also tend to be suspicious, self-opinionated and hard to fool (moderate to very high L). They are venturesome, socially-bold and uninhibited (high H), quite experimenting, liberal and free-thinking (moderate to high Q1), and tend to be self-sufficient, resourceful and preferring their own decisions (mid to high Q2). They are also characterized by

"undisciplined self-conflict", that is, they follow their own urges and are careless of social rules rather than being controlled and socially precise (very low 3). They are average on the dimension of guilt-proneness versus untroubled adequacy, with scores about midway between the two poles of self-assured, confident, and serene, and apprehensive, worrying, and self-reproaching (mid scores on O). In common with the accommodative subjects, they are imaginative and interested in ideas (moderate to high M), as well as rather reserved, detached and objective (low to moderate A). However, they are also rather lively and talkative as opposed to serious and taciturn (mid to moderate F).

On four personality dimensions, the subjects had scores which tended toward opposite poles of the dimension. One subject was rather emotionally stable (moderately high C), moderately "tough-minded" or unsentimental and insensitive (moderately low I), quite conscientious (moderately high G) and very shrewd and calculating (high N), while the other subject was less emotionally stable and more affected by feelings (low C), average in terms of "tender-minded" or sensitivity and gentleness (mid score on I), somewhat expedient rather than conscientious (moderately low G) and very forthright and unpretentious (low N).

TABLE 5.2
 PROFILE OF TWO NON-ACCOMMODATIVE INDIVIDUALS

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Personality Dimension</u>		<u>#20 F</u>	<u>#5 A</u>
A	<u>Reserved</u>	vs. <u>Outgoing</u>	2	4
C	Affected by feelings	vs. Emotionally stable	7	3
E	Accommodating	vs. <u>Assertive</u>	10	10
F	Serious	vs. <u>Happy-go-lucky</u>	7	6
G	Expedient	vs. Conscientious	7	4
H	Shy	vs. <u>Venturesome</u>	8	8
I	Tough-minded	vs. Tender-minded	4	6
L	Trusting	vs. <u>Suspicious</u>	10	7
M	Practical	vs. <u>Imaginative</u>	7	8
N	Forthright	vs. Shrewd	8	2
O	Self-assured	vs. Apprehensive	6	5
Q1	Conservative	vs. <u>Experimenting</u>	7	9
Q2	Group-dependent	vs. <u>Self-sufficient</u>	8	6
Q3	<u>Undisciplined self-conflict</u>	vs. Controlled	2	1
Q4	Relaxed	vs. <u>Tense</u>	8	7
<u>Second Order</u>				
I	Adjustment	vs. <u>Anxiety</u>	7.4	7.1
II	Introversion	vs. <u>Extraversion</u>	7.5	7.9
III	Tender-minded Emotionality	vs. <u>Alert Poise</u> (<u>Decisiveness</u>)	9.5	5.1
IV	Subduedness	vs. <u>Independence</u>	10	10

However, despite these differences on certain primary personality dimensions, the scores of these two non-accommodative subjects are virtually identical on three out of the second order factors. They both tended to be quite anxious (7.4 and 7.1 on Second Order PF I), quite extroverted (7.5 and 7.9 on Second Order PF II), and extremely independent (10 and 10 on Second Order PF IV). The subjects differed only on Second Order PF III, "Tender-minded Emotionality versus Alert Poise (Decisiveness)". On this factor one subject showed himself to be extremely enterprising, decisive and resilient (score of 9.5), while the other was just average on the dimension (score of 5.1).

It is interesting that there was less agreement on certain of the personality factors for non-accommodative individuals than for accommodative individuals. It may be that motivation to be non-accommodative can have a variety of origins, so that extreme scores on one factor may be the cause for one person, while extreme scores on a different factor may lead to non-accommodative motivation for another person. We see this question as a fruitful area for further investigation.

C. ACCOMMODATIVE VERSUS NON-ACCOMMODATIVE PERSONALITY TYPES

When we compare the two personality profiles we have

drawn, quite a clear picture of two different types of individuals emerges. To summarize, we found that the most accommodative and the most non-accommodative subjects differed most markedly on the following primary personality dimensions:

1. The linguistically accommodative individuals tended to be quite psychologically accommodating, mild, considerate and non-dominant, while the non-accommodating individuals were extremely assertive, aggressive and dominant (PF E).
2. The non-accommodative individuals were apt to follow their own urges and be careless of social rules, while the accommodative individuals were more controlled, exacting, and socially precise (PF Q3).
3. The non-accommodative individuals were apt to be suspicious, self-opinionated and hard to fool, while the accommodative individuals tended to be very trusting, adaptable, tolerant and easy to get along with (PF L).
4. The non-accommodative individuals tended to be both more venturesome and uninhibited and more lively and talkative, whereas the accommodative individuals tended to be moderately careful and restrained, as well as rather serious and taciturn (PF's H and F).
5. The non-accommodative individuals tended to be quite

tense as well as moderately apprehensive and worrying, whereas the accommodative individuals tended to be both more relaxed, and more self-assured and confident (PF's Q4 and O).

However, it is in the second order factors that the contrast between the accommodative and non-accommodative personality types was most clearly evident.

1. The accommodative individuals tended to be introverted while the non-accommodative individuals tended to be extraverted (Secondary PF II).
2. The accommodative individuals were considerably better adjusted and less anxious than the non-accommodative individuals, who tended to manifest a much higher anxiety level (Secondary PF I).
3. The accommodative individuals were more emotional, sensitive and indecisive, while the non-accommodative individuals ranged from average on the dimension, to extremely enterprising, decisive and resilient (less emotional) (Secondary PF III).
4. While both types of individuals were high on independence, as is the population of university professors in general,⁵ the nonaccommodative individuals

⁵
16 PF Manual p. 184.

were much more extreme in this leaning (Secondary PF IV).

In one way we found a similarity between the two types of individuals. It may have struck the attentive reader that very few stens of 5 and 6 were mentioned for the accommodative and non-accommodative personality types described above, but that there were correspondingly many more stens of 2, 3 and 4 or 9, 8 and 7. Our most accommodative as well as our least accommodative subjects had, by and large, many more extreme scores than those subjects who gave average responses. Since stens of 5 and 6 are each obtained by 19.1% of the adult population, an average subject should have 38.2%, or between seven and eight, of the 20 personality traits falling on stens 5 and 6. In fact, when we looked at the personality profiles of some subjects who tended to give moderately accommodative responses, we found a much higher proportion of stens 5 and 6 than those of the extremely accommodating or non-accommodating individuals. For example, Subject #6 A had eight, stens of 5 and 6 and no scores lower than 4 or higher than 8, while Subject #25 F had nine stens of 5 and 6 and no scores lower than 3 or higher than 8. Our most accommodative and most non-accommodative subjects, however, had an average of between two and three stens of 5 and 6, and all profiles included scores of 2 or 1 and 9

or 10. Evidently, as one would expect, extremes of personality go hand in hand with extremes in terms of accommodative and non-accommodative motivation on the part of individuals in situations of language choice.

We conclude from looking at the personality profiles of our subjects, first, that there are indeed accommodative and non-accommodative personality types, and second, that such personality leanings are reflected in the accommodative or non-accommodative motivations expressed by subjects. However, because of the numerous other factors, internal as well as external, acting on individuals in situations of language choice, such motivations cannot be translated directly into use of L1 or L2. In order to make predictions about specific code choice, all of the relevant factors must be taken into account.

VI. TOWARDS A STRUCTURE OF ACCOMMODATION

At the beginning of this chapter we posed three questions concerning the relationship between accommodation and second language use. After exploring the types of factors which influence code choice in situations where linguistic accommodation is at stake, we are in a much better position to answer the questions with which we opened the chapter.

Our first question was whether linguistic accommodation always takes the form of use of L2 with bilinguals of the other language, and our second was whether all use of L2 with bilinguals of the other language is necessarily motivated by accommodation. It will be clear by now that the answer to both of these questions is "No". Our exploration of what we have termed the "natural rules" of bilingual interaction, has revealed a much more complex structure of accommodation, one in which there can be no simple equation of use of the second language with accommodation. We are much closer now to being able to attempt the task of most interest to us, that of defining a structure of linguistic accommodation in a more general sense. We have found that there are several aspects of accommodation which must be distinguished.

A. BEHAVIOR VERSUS MOTIVATION

The first basic distinction we must make is between behavior and motivation. Speakers may feel a drive to accommodate but yet fail to behave in an accommodative manner. This usually occurs in a situation of language choice where the speaker feels the pull of various conflicting motivations simultaneously. For example, a speaker may wish to speak L2, to accommodate his interlocutor but may feel too shy, if he feels his command of the second language is poor. On the other hand, a

speaker who uses the second language with a bilingual of the other language may not be doing so out of desire to be accommodative; this drive may stem primarily from his own needs to practice the language, his association of all second language speakers with L2, his aversion to accents, etc. Thus, it is important to separate accommodative motivation and accommodative behavior when attempting to measure accommodation.

B. INTENT VERSUS PERCEPTION

However, when we come to measure accommodative behavior we discover that a second distinction is necessary, that between accommodative intent and perception of accommodation. For the curious thing about a linguistically accommodative act is that it must both be intended to be accommodating and be perceived as accommodating in order for genuine accommodation to occur. If a speaker switches to his interlocutor's L1 with the intent to be accommodative but the interlocutor in fact perceives it as a put-down, as a negative comment on his mastery of the second language, then we feel that the speaker has not actually accommodated to his interlocutor. We feel rather that the condition of mutuality must be placed on "accommodative" acts before they qualify as true accommodation.

In fact, misperception of the speaker's intent (misattribution of his motives) occurs fairly frequently, and is a major cause of linguistic misunderstanding. Why does this occur? There seem to be two major causes: ethnolinguistic differences in attitudes about appropriateness in code use, and the fact that the natural rules governing choice of code in bilingual interaction situations are overlapping, such that different speakers may order them differently, depending on their perception of the situation.

As an example of differences in ethnolinguistic attitudes, let us take the common situation of an Anglophone who is moderately fluent in French conversing with a Francophone who is extremely fluent in English. Even when addressed in French by the Anglophone, through long experience with English speakers who stumble and hesitate in French, the Francophone is likely to apply the rule "Speak the first language of the weaker bilingual" and switch to English. However, the Anglophone is applying the more basic rule "Address speakers of another language in their own language", the rule which normally will apply if no other conditions take precedence. The Francophone may have an accommodative intent (to make his interlocutor feel more at ease) or again he may be motivated simply by the

desire to ensure efficient communication (neutral in terms of accommodation). The perception by Francophones of the act of switching to the first language of the weaker bilingual as being either accommodative or neutral is rooted in ethnolinguistic group attitudes, for Anglophones typically have quite a different response to the situation.

As is to be expected, Anglophones generally feel that they are being accommodative by addressing their interlocutor in his own language. Consequently they often feel as if they have received a slap in the face if the Francophone switches to English, even when the Francophone had no such negative intent. Or if the Francophone opens the conversation in English, they may feel bound to answer in English in order to be polite, yet feel quite frustrated because they wish to speak French to Francophones. Their motivation may be accommodative in the pure interpersonal sense (ie. to gain the other person's approval) or it may be given a much stronger force by the existence of certain ethnolinguistically based attitudes. Since there is considerable pressure on the Anglophone members of this bilingual academic community to learn French, and to be seen to know French, mastery of the second language brings status and high regard in the eyes of Francophones and Anglophones alike. (However, no such extra status seems to be gained by Francophones, who seem to be expected as a

matter of course to speak English.) Thus, Anglophones frequently feel an extra pressure to use French and a sense of insult when not allowed to use French with Francophones which Francophones do not feel about using English to Anglophones. For the latter, it is more often a practical necessity to speak English rather than a status-conferring activity with special value. Thus, each group's attitudes about the second language condition the way in which members of the group perceive situations of language choice; these attitudes therefore constrain the order in which the members of each linguistic community apply the rules of bilingual interaction.

C. THE CONSTANTS OF ACCOMMODATION

Because of the very deep-rooted psychological principles upon which accommodation is based, there seems to be a basic natural ordering of the rules of bilingual interaction. These constants are embodied in norms of accommodative language usage, as discussed in Section II, A. of this chapter. We shall list the rules here in terms of the natural priorities for usage which seem to exist. These rules apply between strangers and acquaintances alike in all but the most familiar of relationships, where people may develop their own idiosyncratic rules of behavior.

We designate as Rule 1, Answer in the language in which one is addressed. This seems to be universally viewed as the most accommodative response. No matter what their ethnolinguistic group, all of our subjects recognized this as the normative response; either they themselves responded in that language or they were conscious of being unaccommodative when they did not conform to this rule.

The second rule in the hierarchy is Rule 2, Address speakers of another language in their own language. When a speaker is initiating a conversation, this is the rule which is applied if there are no intervening constraints. This rule is ordered second, however, because in cases where an individual is addressed by a member of the other ethnolinguistic group in the latter's second language, i.e. the individual's L1, the most accommodative behavior is to respond in L1; in other words, Rule 1 rather than Rule 2 applies.

A variant of Rule 2 is Rule 3, Speak the language associated with the individual (habitual language). While the application of Rule 2 normally means that a second language speaker will be associated with L2, his own first language (in which case the two rules are collapsed into one), particular circumstances may have conspired such that a particular individual becomes associated with a

language other than his native one. In that case Rule 3 applies.

Rule 4 is Speak the first language of the weaker bilingual. This rule will override higher level rules in clear-cut cases where one individual has not mastered his second language well enough to carry on a rudimentary conversation. On the other hand it ceases to be applicable once the weaker bilingual has attained a certain threshold of mastery. In such cases, even if the interlocutor is the stronger bilingual, the difference ceases to be relevant. In between these two poles lies a whole range of degree of L2 mastery. Whether or not Rule 4 applies in any particular case seems to be dependent upon a variety of other factors, including personality traits and attitudes peculiar to the ethnolinguistic group.

D. THE VARIABILITY OF ACCOMMODATION

Despite the fact that certain constants in the form of strong norms concerning accommodative behavior, which are themselves based on deep-seated psychological principles, appear to be operating in bilingual interaction situations, there are several major sources of variability in any actual situation involving accommodation. We will briefly summarize here the factors which have been discussed in more detail earlier in the chapter.

Ethnolinguistic group attitudes are a major source of variability. Basing themselves on the natural rules, particular attitudes may develop because of the historical situation of the languages in contact. Attitudes of minority and majority groups normally differ along certain parameters. We have already alluded to the difference in attitudes toward a switch to the first language of the weaker bilingual, with majority group members feeling this as an insult and minority group members having a neutral attitude toward it. We also mentioned earlier the case of children in minority group families where all family members are bilingual, who are taught that it is not "polite" to speak their native language to their parents when visitors from the majority culture are present. It is from just such situations as this that minority group members learn a different set of attitudes than members of the majority culture about language switching and the appropriateness of using more than one language to the same individual.

The second language proficiency of the interlocutors is a second major source of variation in situations of accommodation. Attitudes toward accommodation and drive to accommodate by using the second language vary with the stage of second language learning at which the individual

is. Speakers in the early stages of learning a second language may be hesitant about using the language and may attempt to find other ways to accommodate their receivers. Speakers at a mid-level in terms of proficiency, however, may be extremely motivated to use the second language yet may be very touchy about interlocutors who switch to their L1. They tend to have a sensitivity and empathy with other language learners which makes them very accommodative as well as eager to be accommodated to. And finally, speakers who have reached a position of being thoroughly at home in the second language often drop off in degree of accommodation shown through use of the second language. The language becomes a tool to be used rather than a means of expressing their own needs to practice, to be thought well of, to achieve recognition and status through use of the second language. The sensitivity of these speakers to switching (in the sense of interpreting it as a slight) usually decreases, and their willingness to be accommodative to others by letting them practice their second language may also decline, depending on the psychological makeup of the individual.

The personality characteristics of the individuals involved in any bilingual interaction are a third major source of variation in accommodation. Certain individuals seem to possess a cluster of personality traits which tend

toward an accommodative personality type, while others possess traits which make them tend to be non-accommodative. Verbal interactions contain an infinite variety of opportunities to make one's personality felt; accommodative personalities may tend to follow the norms regarding language use more closely, while non-accommodative individuals may let their personal drives dictate their choice of code more often.

We have emphasized throughout the chapter that personal drives and motivations, second language proficiency, and attitudes about language use and language learning particular to one's ethnolinguistic group all interact with the natural accommodative tendencies to produce a very complex behavior. It should be clear now that accommodation can take multiple forms, whether it be use of L2 or use of L1, and that, conversely, use of either L1 or L2 cannot be assumed to be accommodative without knowledge of the speaker's intent.

CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

1. THE STUDY

In this study we set out to explore the interface between language use and accommodative tendencies in interactions between bilingual Anglophones and Francophones at the University of Ottawa. Following up hypotheses put forward by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) and Giles and Powesland (1975), we wished particularly to investigate the extent to which interpersonal accommodation on a linguistic level was necessarily linked to use of L2, as well as to arrive at an understanding of the structure of accommodative behaviour on a linguistic level in interaction situations between bilinguals of different first languages. We also wished to examine the interrelationships between language use, accommodative tendencies, and the variables of individual personality traits and perceived proficiency in the second language. Lastly, we wanted to find out to what extent the ethnolinguistic background of our subjects played a role in determining accommodative and non-accommodative language choice, in the hope of isolating the relationships which hold across ethnolinguistic groups.

Data from the study were collected in interviews in which ten Anglophone and ten Francophone professors at the University of Ottawa discussed their use of L1 and L2 in various situations, their attitudes about language use and their perception of their proficiency in the second language. Further data consisted of personality profiles for each subject based on the results of Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Inventory. Statistical analyses were performed on the data to determine potential relationships between the various language use, attitude, perceived proficiency and personality factors. Following the statistical analyses, the language choice behavior of our subjects was interpreted in light of the motivations they expressed, and differences in the responses of speakers of the two ethnolinguistic groups were examined.

Based on these data we have come to certain conclusions regarding a possible structure of accommodation. In this chapter, after summarizing our findings briefly, these conclusions are discussed more thoroughly in relation to the hypotheses put forward by Giles and other researchers doing work in accommodation theory. Finally, after discussing the limitations of the study, a number of implications for future research are raised.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study of language choice and accommodation may be summarized as follows:

1. There can be no simple equation of use of the second language with accommodation, since:
 - a) Not all people who desire to accommodate their interlocutor linguistically do so by using L2; in some situations use of L1 is typically more accommodative, while in others offering to switch languages (but not necessarily doing so) is the most accommodative behavior;
 - b) Not all use of L2 reflects desire to accommodate an interlocutor; desire for efficient communication, aversion to accented speech, the context in which the language was learned, the history of the relationship, and many other factors condition use of L2.
2. In studying accommodation by means of language, we must distinguish between accommodative behaviour and accommodative motivation, as well as between accommodative intent and perception of accommodation; in order for a particular linguistic act to be accommodative, it must both be intended to be accommodative by the speaker and perceived as accommodative by the interlocutor.

3. The expression of accommodation, which has its origin in the deep-rooted psychological need of individuals for social approval, has become codified into social norms dictating appropriate language choice in interactions between bilinguals of different language communities; these norms may be expressed in terms of natural rules such as the following, which form a constant basis for accommodation:

Rule 1 Answer in the language in which one is addressed.

Rule 2 Address speakers of another language in their own language.

Rule 3 Speak the language associated with the individual.

Rule 4 Speak the first language of the weaker bilingual.

4. Major sources of variability in expression of accommodation in interactions between bilinguals of different ethnolinguistic groups include attitudes based on ethnolinguistic group membership and related language learning experiences, the perceived second language proficiency of the interlocutors, and personality characteristics of the individuals involved.

5. There are strong relationships between personality and language use which transcend ethnolinguistic group membership, such that portraits of typical linguistically accommodative and linguistically non-accommodative individuals may be sketched:

- a) Linguistically accommodative individuals tend to be psychologically accommodating and non-dominant, introverted, socially controlled, tolerant, and easy to get along with, well adjusted, and emotional and sensitive.
- b) Linguistically non-accommodative individuals tend to be assertive and aggressive, extraverted, anxious, apt to follow their own urges rather than social rules, and extremely independent, decisive and resilient.

6. Accommodative tendencies are not static but fluctuate with the individual's mood, as well as evolving according to the stage at which an individual is in his learning of the second language.

III. DISCUSSION

A. ACCOMMODATION THEORY

Most of the work which has been done in the field of accommodation since the theory was elaborated by Giles and Powesland (1975) has focused upon monolingual speech

variation (accent convergence and divergence) rather than upon bilingual behavior. Only one experimental study known to this writer, that of Bourhis, Giles, Leyens and Tajfel (1979), has dealt with interaction between speakers of different languages. Because the methodology of this study, as in previous ones, used tape-recorded stimuli in a laboratory context, many of the questions raised by earlier studies in a bilingual context by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) and Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) remained unanswered. Our study differs from these previous ones in that it did not use a laboratory setting; by using an interview technique, we were able to tap speakers' reported language choice (which prior observation generally confirmed), their attitudes toward their language use and their motivations for use of L1 and L2; in addition we investigated the dimension of personality and its relation to language choice.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, on the basis of earlier experiments¹ Giles and Powesland (1975) presented a model of accommodation applied to bilingual interaction. Using this model, they made several specific predictions with

¹ The study of Simard, Taylor and Giles, though published in 1976, actually predates Giles and Powesland (1975) and is discussed by them.

regard to language choice in face-to-face interactions between bilinguals from different ethnolinguistic groups. To the extent that these were considered serious hypotheses by Giles and Powesland, we have felt it incumbent upon us to evaluate them in relation to our findings. Giles and Powesland present the model first in the basic unelaborated form as used by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973), then in a modified form which takes into account the effects of causal attribution, as developed in Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976). We will first discuss the predictions from the basic model because, in large measure, the same points apply to the elaborated model as well.

The first case that Giles and Powesland deal with is that of two bilinguals, one French Canadian and the other English Canadian, "each equally proficient in both French and English". They predict that, "if each is set to accommodate", (i.e., neither wishes to emphasize his ethnolinguistic group membership by using his own language or has personal reasons for being unaccommodative), they would both begin by using their second language, before then settling on one language or the other for the remainder of the conversation. Regarding the language chosen, Giles and Powesland suggest:

It could be that the participants would then agree to adopt the first language of the one who

first accommodated, as a kind of reward for his willingness to adjust to the other. Thus there may be some advantage for the individual who initiates bilingual accommodation. (pp. 160-161)

Our study revealed nothing to support such an hypothesis. Rather, our study points to the opposite conclusion, that the interaction would continue in the second language of the one who first accommodated.

As mentioned in the discussion of natural rules of bilingual interaction in Chapter 5, the most powerful rule governing accommodative behavior is to answer in the language in which one is addressed. Once the language of the interaction has been set by the first remark, accommodative behavior is manifested by responding in that language. It requires extremely strong internal counter-pressure on the interlocutor to cause him to switch languages, since he will in essence be telling the first speaker that he is unwilling to play by the rules the latter had laid down. In the case of a speaker addressing his interlocutor in L2 in order to accommodate him, the most accommodative response on the part of the interlocutor is to respond in his own first language. Thus, it is true that the advantage is to the first speaker, but not for the reason Giles and Powesland suggest; it is simply because he calls the shots rather than because his own language will be used. Indeed, accommodation theory as

laid down by Giles and Powesland would predict that he would prefer to use the first language of the other!

When it comes to predicting the language which will be used by the first speaker, we see that the hypothetical interaction proposed by Giles and Powesland is so neutral as to have excluded most of the significant variables determining language choice in real life contexts. First of all, there is the question of whether the interlocutors will actually be "set to accommodate". As we have seen earlier, personality type, the second language proficiency of the speaker relative to that of the interlocutor, various attitudes stemming from ethnolinguistic group membership, as well as the context in which L2 has been learned, are all important in determining whether or not the participants of a bilingual interaction will be disposed to be accommodative.

Secondly, Giles and Powesland are clearly talking about an idealized context when they discuss interaction between individuals who are both equally proficient in the two languages in question. There is little evidence in the literature of bilingualism to support the notion of a completely "balanced bilingual" who masters every aspect of two languages equally well (Pipping, 1975). Most bilinguals

who function well in two languages will confess to lexical domains in their second language in which they consider themselves very deficient, while others who work mainly in their second language will admit that there are work-related topics for which they simply do not have the terminology in their first language. Our subjects mentioned such perceptions time and time again. It would be more accurate to propose as an idealized context an interaction in which L2 proficiency is not an intervening factor. However, it must be kept in mind that the majority of interactions between members of different ethnolinguistic groups are between individuals of unequal second language skills, so that L2 proficiency normally intervenes.

Thirdly, Giles and Powesland have neglected to mention whether this proposed interaction is between people who have already interacted before. They seem to be proposing a situation in which the participants know each other's language background, which would in most cases mean that they had met before. If that is the case, by disregarding history of the relationship in their idealized bilingual interaction, Giles and Powesland have excluded a powerful factor acting on language choice between two individuals in any given situation. As we have mentioned before, the pressure to speak the language associated with

the individual is usually a stronger factor than the relative L2 competence of the interlocutors and even overrides pressure to address speakers of another language in their own language.

And finally, we find that the situation as set up by Giles and Powesland is totally and unnaturally devoid of any contextual trappings. Every interaction is embedded in some context, and contextual constraints are among the first to make themselves felt in any situation of interaction. Subjects in our study frequently mentioned that the language which they associated with particular bilinguals of the other first language was probably often just "accidental", depending on the particular circumstances in which they had first met the individuals concerned. Before being in a position to suggest which language a given individual will use to initiate a conversation with a person he does not yet know, we must ask a number of questions concerning the context of the interaction: Are there other people present with whom a language of interaction has already been established, or whose first language must be catered to in the interests of efficient communication? Is there an unspoken "expected" language of the situation? Does the dress or manner of an individual allow a potential interlocutor to ascertain his

language affiliation? What are the relative statuses and roles of the two participants in an interaction? It is rare that there are no clues from the context as to an "appropriate" language of interaction. In sum, we suggest that given the unrealistically simplified interaction set up by Giles and Powesland, it is impossible to test out any speculation on language choice.

The second situation about which Giles and Powesland made predictions was one in which "imbalanced bilinguals" (bilinguals who are stronger in one language than the other) interact. They proposed that in such a situation, "it might be that they would both use an alternating mixture of languages" (p. 161). The study of Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) provides only very limited support for such a notion, in that about one-third of their subjects who heard a stimulus message in a mixed English/French condition responded in kind. While the experimental groups were matched for second language proficiency, ~~it~~ is not clear whether their generally low level of second language proficiency affected their behavior. The results also showed that subjects had more difficulty decoding the mixed messages and felt less relaxed than the subjects listening to the other stimulus conditions.

Our study does not in general support the idea of

use of an alternating mixture of languages as a favoured means of linguistic accommodation. While some of our Anglophone subjects with weaker L2 proficiency did not mind switching languages with a given individual, in the sense of using French on one occasion and English on another, most did not like mixing languages in the same conversation. As one subject complained:

"The switching is more effort, almost, than anything...If they keep switching back and forth because they can't express everything they want to in English, then I really get annoyed." (#3 A)

Only one Anglophone recounted feeling at ease with a conversation which switched back and forth, with the Francophone initiating one topic in French, followed by the Anglophone initiating a different topic in English. Because of the low L2 proficiency of this individual, we are reasonably sure that his reaction was due to relief that he did not have to sustain conversation in L2 without interruption. Thus we are not prone to take the attitude of this one individual as typical. Indeed, our Anglophone subjects with high L2 proficiency universally disliked using different languages with the same individual, due, as mentioned earlier, to the context in which they learned the second language. However, a number of our Francophone subjects at varying levels of L2 proficiency either

switched themselves or were willing to follow switches initiated by their interlocutor. The context in which members of the minority group learned the majority language prevailing norms concerning language mixing and other attitudes on appropriate language use may all be involved in accounting for this more positive orientation toward switching. In general, our results show that ethnolinguistic attitudes and L2 proficiency are both involved in willingness to either switch languages with the same individual or to use alternating languages within the same conversation. So far we have seen little sign of using a mixture of two languages as an accommodative strategy, as Giles and Powesland suggest. This would undoubtedly be a fruitful area for future research.

Giles and Powesland go on to speculate further that where interaction takes place between one balanced bilingual and one imbalanced bilingual from the other language group:

The latter may still attract the former's approval simply by expressing his regret for not being able to match his ability to accommodate. The interaction could then continue comfortably in the second language of the speaker with equal proficiency in both languages. (p. 161)

Giles and Powesland suggest that both interlocutors would feel comfortable because both would have

accommodated, but on different levels. This conclusion is based on the results of Giles, Taylor and Bourhis' (1973) experiment, where 14 different categories of "accommodation" were distinguished, ranging from speaking totally in L2, to expressed intentions of slowing the speech rate in L1. Using a mixture of the two languages, providing a salutation and benediction in L2, giving key lexical items in L2 and expressing regrets at not speaking L2 were the other categories of accommodation distinguished. (The total of 14 categories resulted from various combinations of these behaviors.) Giles, Taylor and Bourhis conclude from this that accommodation is in fact not an "all or nothing" proposition, and that accommodation may take place on various levels and to different degrees.

We suggest that some caution must be exercised before generalizing the results of this artificial experiment to natural contexts of bilingual interaction. In a laboratory setting the subject is likely to manifest more concern about his L2 performance than in a normal conversational situation; even without knowing the focus of the experiment, he is aware that he is being tested in some way, and apprehensions about using his second language may loom larger than usual. Furthermore, he has time to reflect on which language he should choose and on whether

he should slow down his speech if he chooses to use his first language. Sending a tape is rather like writing a letter, in which people are likely to begin with apologies ("I'm sorry I haven't written to you", etc.). In fact, the regrets for not speaking French expressed by subjects in this experiment probably served the same function that apologies do in a letter, as a kind of transition bridging the gap in time and space between the two individuals. Once in a real interaction situation, this type of behavior largely disappears under the pressure to communicate with the other person. The immediacy of the contact demands instantaneous reaction, and as stressed before, an initiation in one language will generally bring about a response in the same language.

While Giles, Taylor and Bourhis' experiment suggests that apologies for using L1 instead of L2 may be emitted by the weaker bilingual as a form of linguistic accommodation, we found no such behavior. Instead, our subjects almost always mentioned that, if the weaker bilingual cannot sustain the conversation in his L2 and gets into linguistic trouble, it is the stronger bilingual who will initiate a language switch to help out the struggling speaker. In fact, as we have noted, the stronger bilinguals were prone to switch to L1 even when the weaker bilingual wished to

carry on in L2. From our observations in the first phase of the project, we noticed that apologies and regrets seemed to play very little part in these interactions; when they did it was almost always later in the exchange, when the conversation had ground to a halt, rather than at the outset. Even in the case of the non-fluent L2 learner greeting his bilingual interlocutor in L2 and exchanging a few formulaic remarks about the weather, etc. before opening the real conversation in L1, we found that there is generally no apology, since both participants realize from the speaker's limited repertoire that there can be no question of continuing a discussion in his second language.

To sum up the predictions of Giles, Taylor and Bourhis' experiment, our study does not support their conclusion that there is a vast range of possible accommodative responses from which a speaker will choose, depending on the amount of effort he perceives his interlocutor to have made in the initial remark. As well, we did not find evidence for conversations between imbalanced bilinguals continuing in a mixture of the two languages.² Giles, Taylor and Bourhis' interpretation of

2

There is ample evidence for the existence of "conversational code-switching" between fluent bilinguals of the same first language, but we are not dealing with that situation here.

conversations in a mixture of French and English as being more accommodative may well be true from the speaker's point of view, but, according to their own results, such mixed responses probably would not be interpreted as terribly accommodative by the listener. Thus, conversations which continue in a mixture of languages do not seem to be a logical prediction of the accommodation model itself.

The notion of effort as a factor affecting language choice surfaces first in Giles, Taylor and Bourhis; later it becomes the focus of attention in Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976). Giles, Taylor and Bourhis suggest two possible explanations for their experimental result that more Anglophone subjects responded totally in French with a non-fluent English stimulus condition than with any other. They proposed this result as support for the notion that subjects are willing to put more effort into responding to an interlocutor who seems to be manifesting more effort himself in the conversation. However, they concede that:

It is also possible that more Ss were prepared to fully accommodate in this condition since their FC speaker's 'poor' English may have reduced social embarrassment at airing their own 'poor' French. (p. 184)

Our study supports the latter conclusion. As we discussed in Chapter 5, the relative rather than absolute level of second language proficiency of the two speakers seems to be the key in willingness to use L2. Several of our least competent Anglophone subjects stated emphatically that they were much more willing to speak French with Francophones whose English was not very good, preferably poorer than their own French. (See Chapter 5, Sections III. C. and IV. A.)

It seems likely that reduction of inhibitions is a more powerful factor than perception of the amount of effort expended by the interlocutor, in causing speakers with doubts about their competence to use L2. Especially where a second language learner is aware that his interlocutor is fluent in L2, the learner does not think about the degree of effort the interlocutor would expend if the latter were speaking the second language. We found that in situations where learners were working to upgrade their second language proficiency, use of L2 seemed to be more a reflection of internal drives than of a "desire for social integration", as Giles, Taylor and Bourhis suggest (p. 187).

However, in one particular context our study does strongly support the notion that the amount of effort

expended by an interlocutor influences the degree of accommodation. This is in the situation in which a fluent bilingual accommodates to a weaker bilingual of the opposite language by allowing the conversation to continue in the latter's L2 when communication would be more efficient in the speaker's L2. Speakers in our study were quite conscious that they were accommodating by using their first language in this situation; their comments made it clear that they were suppressing their initial impulse to switch to L2, out of appreciation for the effort put forth by their interlocutor. To cite a quotation already familiar to the reader, "If they're willing to make the effort, so am I" (#4 A). Thus, our findings support the notion that perception of effort on the part of the interlocutor tends to lead a speaker to accommodate to him. However, as mentioned several times, in a real life interaction this implies accommodation by responding in the language in which one was addressed, rather than necessarily by using the speaker's first language.

Using insights from causal attribution theory, Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) proposed a revision of the basic accommodation model which takes account of speakers' attributions of accommodative and non-accommodative linguistic acts in terms of the factors of ability, effort

and external pressure. With this elaborated version of the theory, they make more refined predictions concerning evaluations of speakers by their interlocutors and their subsequent linguistic behavior. They predict that when accommodation is attributed to external pressure rather than to voluntary effort, reciprocal accommodation will occur, but that the favourable impression created by accommodation will be attenuated owing to uncertainty about the speaker's motives. On the other hand, non-accommodative linguistic behavior which is attributed to lack of language ability or to external pressure will be viewed less negatively than it would otherwise be, and reciprocal accommodation is probable. The one case in which they predict non-accommodation by an interlocutor is that in which the first speaker's failure to accommodate linguistically is attributed to lack of effort. They suggest, finally, that there is probably a general tendency for people to attribute non-accommodation to the speaker's limited repertoire rather than to lack of effort, since attributing it to lack of effort would imply that the speaker does not value the listener's approval.

The experimental results of Simard, Taylor and Giles support these predictions. How, then, do our findings, which give us insight into speakers' attitudes and motivations, fit into this model? We feel that, while the

model works in an experimental setting, it does not take into account several aspects of contact between members of two language communities which complicate matters in real-life situations. First of all, we found that, in normal (i.e. non-hostile) intergroup conditions, it is not true that people perceive an interlocutor addressing them in his native language as non-accommodating. In general, probably because they appreciate the fact that language is a vehicle of group loyalty, people find it entirely appropriate that speakers should use their own language in many situations. In fact, as the unelaborated accommodation model predicts, subjects often reacted as if it were incumbent upon them to speak their interlocutor's language, rather than vice-versa.

We found conflict and negative feelings to arise most often not because speakers failed to make the effort to address their interlocutors in their second language, but rather because both parties wished to speak L2! These hostile feelings seem to arise out of conflicting attitudes about what constitutes accommodation, as well as out of misattribution of participants' motives.

The first case of negative feelings we found occurs when a fluent L2 speaker switches to his interlocutor's L1,

either out of concern for efficient communication or out of a desire to make things easier on his interlocutor. Our weaker bilingual subjects often reported themselves to be extremely upset and hostile in such situations, while their interlocutors, the stronger bilinguals, were genuinely astonished at the reaction caused by their well-intentioned language switch. Clearly the conflict hinges on the speaker's and the interlocutor's conflicting definition of accommodation in this situation: the non-fluent bilingual feels that, to be accommodating, his listener should answer in the language in which he was addressed (Rule 1) while the strong bilingual feels that giving his interlocutor the chance to speak his first language is more accommodating (Rule 4). (See the discussion of rules in Chapter 5.)

Implicit in the non-fluent bilingual's hostile feelings is the assumption that both parties put a high value on second language acquisition. However, it seems that this assumption is not necessarily true. The strong bilinguals in this situation often felt annoyed with having to put up with inefficient communication and accused their interlocutor of obnoxious insistence on practicing L2. In other words, they did not see such L2 use as accommodative, but rather as self-centered and consequently as non-accommodative. Thus, we found that the increased effort on

the part of a speaker in using L2 does not automatically give rise to a more positive evaluation on the part of his interlocutor.

The interaction between fluent and non-fluent bilinguals described above bears a strong resemblance to an observation by Hymes on language use between an English-speaking European and an East African official (recounted by Giles and Powesland, p. 167). Hymes points out that if the English speaker addressed the official in Swahili, with the intention of accommodating to him, he is more likely to be met with hostility than with approval. In this context, the official would be likely to interpret use of Swahili as an act of condescension implying that the European thought him incapable of understanding English. To gain the official's approval and show a desire of solidarity, Hymes suggests that the European should instead begin by addressing the official in English, to allow him to show his competence in that language, and then switch to Swahili.

By reason of its dealing with Swahili speakers in far-off East Africa, this interaction has an exotic ring, as though speakers in such multilingual communities might be motivated by more complex feelings than North Americans

or Europeans. Despite the fact that norms regarding appropriate language use will vary to some degree according to particular historical situations and cultural differences, the same human drives are clearly operating. The Swahili-speaking official is moved by the same emotion as the Anglophone professor at the University of Ottawa who is acquiring French. Both have invested a great deal of time, effort and emotional energy into learning a second language, the acquisition of which has given them a certain amount of status. They quite naturally wish to use and to gain credit for using the second language they have worked so hard to acquire.

Giles and Powesland suggest that the Swahili incident represents an example of difficulties in application of the model to real-life situations. In fact, however, the Swahili speaker's desire to use English with English speakers is entirely consonant with the accommodation model's prediction that a speaker will tend to use his interlocutor's first language to gain his approval. What is missing from the model is an accounting of the internal motivation to use L2 for various private reasons such as enhancement of status in one's own eyes, sheer pleasure in speaking the second language, etc., which have nothing to do with desire for social integration with a member of the other culture. The model as formulated by

Giles and Powesland thus does not account adequately for the other types of internal pressures acting on individuals which, because they also result in use of L2 to L2 speakers, are confused with accommodation based on desire for social approval. In addition, it neglects the gap which can exist between speaker intent and the interlocutor's perception of the speaker's intent.

We also feel that the accommodation model discussed by Giles and others does not properly handle the factors of the second language proficiency of the two interlocutors. First, not only does the speaker's actual proficiency in his second language influence his willingness to use the language, but his perception of his proficiency as compared to that of his interlocutor may be an even more important factor in his decision to use L2 or L1. And secondly, the importance which the factor of second language proficiency plays in the speaker's hierarchy of influences on his language use varies with the stage of acquisition. If our data are any indication, internal pressure to be accommodative and win the listener's social approval by using L2 is usually strongest in the middle stages of learning the language. Before this stage the speaker has too little confidence in his ability to attempt to use L2 and will try to gain his listener's approval by other

means, while later, when a high level of proficiency is established, the second language is often regarded more as a tool for efficient communication than as a means of winning social approval.

And finally, the present accommodation model does not allow for the dimension of personality, which we found to play a major role in determining speakers' and interlocutors' choice of language in bilingual interaction situations. As we have seen, whether speakers adhere rigidly to the most polite, or normative language choice, or whether their own internal drives (often in conflict with the normative choice) take precedence, depends largely on the strength of particular personality traits in their make-up. We feel that personality variables have a legitimate place in any theory of language choice between bilinguals.

We find, then, that the accommodation model as formulated by Giles et al needs to be augmented by several components before it will be capable of explaining the role of accommodation in language choice in realistic contexts. Distinctions need to be made between behavior and motivation, and intent and perception in accommodation, as well as between situations of initiation and response, between interactions with individuals met for the first

time and individuals with whom a prior history of language choice exists.

B. A MODEL OF CODE CHOICE

These limitations of the accommodation model as developed by Giles, Taylor and Bourhis (1973) and Simard, Taylor and Giles (1976) should not be construed as criticisms of their valuable work. It is chiefly to their pioneer work that we owe the present interest in social psychological factors relating to bilingual interaction; interpersonal accommodation has been clearly shown by them to be an important factor in determining the language an individual will choose to employ in interaction with members of a different ethnolinguistic group. If the relation between use of the second language and linguistic accommodation has not turned out to be quite as straightforward as Giles et al originally assumed, the fact remains that bilinguals' choice of language in interaction situations encompasses more than just linguistic and sociolinguistic considerations.

In our attempt to discover in just which way language choice and interpersonal accommodation overlap, we found it necessary to consider variables from a variety of areas. We find, in fact, that in order to explain code use

between bilinguals in any comprehensive way, we need an explanatory model encompassing elements from five different disciplines. Although the aim of this study is not to develop a complete model of code choice in interaction between bilinguals, on the basis of our findings we would like to suggest at least some of the components such a model would have to contain.

First, the purely linguistic aspect of language choice would have to be considered. Under this we include not only the competence of the two interlocutors in the codes in question, but also the influence of the syntactic and semantic aspects of the two languages, and the relation of second language proficiency to these formal aspects of codes. Quite a lot of work has already been done in this latter field (see, for example, Poplack, 1981). As for the former, choice of a language of communication is inevitably determined in part by the relative linguistic abilities of the two bilinguals, even though, as we have seen, once a certain threshold of communicative competence has been reached, the importance of the factor of second language proficiency diminishes greatly.

Secondly, the psycholinguistic aspect of code choice cannot be neglected. The nature of the neurophysiological mechanism which controls switching in the brain may

determine to quite some degree the pressure most speakers feel to speak the same language their interlocutor is using, even when they feel less at ease in that language. While the psycholinguistic aspect of code choice may lie outside most linguistic or sociolinguistic approaches to code choice, it should not be omitted in a comprehensive model which attempts to account for code choice.

Thirdly, the socially determined side of code use is clearly a major component in any theory of code choice between bilingual interlocutors. Language use is very often -- although certainly not always -- a result of compliance with social norms. These expectations of what constitutes acceptable linguistic behavior may dictate use of the interlocutor's language because of his superior status or rank or his role as the boss, or norms of solidarity between two interlocutors may indicate the language to be used, etc. As we have seen, interpersonal accommodation has been incorporated into social norms of politeness, so that polite behavior between bilinguals of different languages virtually requires that interlocutors be addressed in their own language, and so forth. Situational factors such as the expected language of the situation and the context in which the second language was learned are also included under social factors. The

one aspect which must be considered when attempting to explain code use by individuals.

Closely allied to the social side of language use is the social psychological aspect. When individuals interact, their behavior reflects not only the accepted norms of the larger society for the situation and interlocutors they are dealing with, but the attitudes of the groups and subgroups they belong to. The individual expression of group norms in the form of actual behavior and attitudes is the proper domain of social psychology. Attitudes such as those reflecting membership in an ethnolinguistic group, or in a particular subgroup (such as Francophone professors at the University of Ottawa) often play a large role in the code choice of particular individuals. Other attitudes, such as speaker's attitudes towards use of the second language, also fall under this heading.

The final component we feel is essential in any model of code choice falls into the domain of the purely psychological. We found that the dimension of personality plays a major role in determining speakers' and interlocutors' choice of language in bilingual interaction situations. As we have seen, whether speakers adhere rigidly to the most polite or normative language choice, or

whether their own internal drives (often in conflict with the normative choice) take precedence, depends largely on the strength of particular personality traits in their make-up. We feel that personality variables have a legitimate place in any theory of language choice between bilinguals.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although the study seems to have clearly revealed the potential for individual factors such as attitudes and personality traits to influence language choice in bilingual interaction, because of the unique character of our sample and the setting we studied, these results cannot be generalized to a larger population without great caution. While we regarded our data base, the University of Ottawa, as an ideal setting for our study because of its relative freedom from social and political constraints, at the same time these characteristics meant that individual factors such as personality traits, motivation, and attitudes concerning language use would increase in importance. Conversely, in a highly politically charged context, these factors may be reduced in intensity by the pressure on individuals to subscribe to the norms determining appropriate language use. For example, in an employment situation where an employee is quite dependent

on the boss's good will for his or her job, the pressure to speak the superior's language may be quite strong; no parallel situation exists in the University context where professors work quite independently and no boss²-employee relationship exists. In other contexts, for example in certain federal government departments, where there is strong pressure of a political nature to push the use of the minority language, individual preferences may likewise be muted. Hence, we suggest that any attempt to predict a bilingual's choice of language in interaction with members of a different ethnolinguistic group requires that the researcher be able to gauge the intensity of the socio-political climate.

Not only did the university environment differ in certain respects from that found in society at large, but, in addition, certain of the striking differences in attitudes and language use traceable to ethnolinguistic group membership which we found in our population may not apply in other bilingual areas. For example, we found that Anglophones showed a substantially greater use of their second language with bilingual interlocutors than did Francophones, as well as a significantly more positive attitude towards such use. It is not at all clear that such attitudes would be found in Anglophones in other contexts; we suggest as well that the greater use of the

second language by Anglophones would almost certainly not be generalizable to the Anglophone population across Canada. We are quite conscious that Anglophone professors at the University of Ottawa are a special subgroup of highly motivated second language learners and users, most of whom chose to come to the University partly if not primarily because they wished to work in both languages.

As a result of the above considerations, we do not feel that we can make anything more than tentative statements about what Anglophone and Francophone bilinguals really do in face-to-face situations without knowing something about the socio-political climate in which they are interacting. We do feel on firm ground, however, when discussing the underlying motivations and psychological factors which influence code choice. It is with respect to the latter that we feel our study to make the greatest contribution. Despite these reservations about the generalizability of our research, the fact remains that psychological factors were clearly shown to obtain, and hence deserve a place in either a predictive or an interpretive model of code choice.

A further limitation of the study may lie in the nature of the data upon which the research is based.

Because our data on language use and attitudes, as well as perceived proficiency is based on subjects' insights into and reports on their own behavior, it is clear that these data are not "hard" in the conventional sense, since they do not necessarily reflect actual language use. The weaknesses of introspective data, which only give indirect access to subjects' behavior, are well known. Informants are notoriously unreliable in reporting frequency of use of lexical items, for example, and they may have only a very vague idea of the percentage of the time they speak their second language. However, despite the inherent weaknesses of introspective data, we feel that we were justified in proceeding with an interview approach in which subjects gave us insights into their language use and attitudes. In the first place, we were dealing with educated bilingual subjects who were not only accustomed to thinking about their language use but who were also unusually articulate in expressing their feelings and attitudes. In the second place, the questions we posed our subjects did not concern general items such as frequency of use but rather dealt with their reactions to specific situations of language choice in which they were frequently involved. Thirdly, prior observation of each of the subjects' language choice in meeting situations did confirm in a general way their reported use of their first and second languages. And finally, it is clear that a "hard" data approach using only

observations of actual language provides data which are difficult to interpret without full knowledge of the bilingual's language learning background, attitudes and motivation. It is because we felt that much of the interest in our study lay in exploring just such introspective responses to situations of language choice that we structured most of our research around in-depth interviews.

Ideally, of course, a study such as this might have been conducted at both levels, with precise observations of subjects' language choice being made in a variety of situations of interaction with bilinguals of the opposite language which would then be correlated with the same subjects' introspective observations on the motivations and behavior, as well as with objective measures of personality and second language proficiency. Unfortunately, such an undertaking was beyond the scope of this study.

V. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While we feel that the relation between interpersonal accommodation and language use between bilinguals of different ethnolinguistic groups has been clarified to some extent, there are still many questions which remain unanswered. Our study, by concentrating on individual variation in code use as well as pointing out

individual variation in code use as well as pointing out some of the constants in accommodative language choice, has opened up even more questions on how the social psychological theory of interpersonal accommodation is applicable to interaction between bilinguals. In the following section we will suggest just a few of the questions which might be explored by interested researchers.

The relationship of personality to language choice is an area which certainly merits further exploration. Our study has documented the existence of a relationship between accommodative and non-accommodative personality types in general and certain kinds of uses of the second language. However, many aspects of this relationship are still unclear. For example, are only one or two of the traits making up a particular personality type responsible for this language use, or is it the set of traits as a whole? Why did the most linguistically accommodating individuals show more similar personality profiles than the linguistically non-accommodating individuals, and which of those traits are the crucial ones for non-accommodative language use? Would the same relationships between personality type and language use hold for very different populations, in other bilingual contexts, or is the set of motivational and attitudinal variables unique to the

university population interacting with the personality dimension and affecting these relationships? In addition to the above types of questions, many other facets of personality and language use could be looked at. For example, the role of other variables suggested by Brown (1973), such as reflective versus impulsive personalities and "open" versus "closed" mindedness, as well as the factors of inhibition and empathy arising out of Guiora's work, definitely merit investigation.

Many questions raised by the various studies by Giles and his associates also remain to be investigated. We have already mentioned the possibility of studying the mixing or alternating of languages as an accommodative strategy, for example. Other research might look seriously at the notion of the effort displayed by the speaker and its effect upon the interlocutor. The question of the difference between actual second language proficiency and perceived proficiency could also be explored, while still other research might concentrate on non-accommodative strategies and the motivations underlying them. For example, are there particular political attitudes which lead to desire to be non-accommodative? Are such attitudes more or less powerful than personality factors as influencers of code choice? Is it correct to call language

choices "non-accommodative" when they arise out of positive loyalty to one's own group? How exactly do we treat the disparity between a speaker's intent and the interlocutor's perception of a particular code choice? The possibility of such misperceptions has been broached, but no systematic way of handling this problem has been suggested. In fact, the concept of accommodation still requires much more consideration before a complete definition can be proposed.

The dynamic interplay of interlocutors' code choices is a final area in which research would be profitable. As we have seen, language choices do not depend solely on the speaker; the reaction of the interlocutor to an initial code choice may in large part condition the speaker's subsequent choice. Take the example of a Francophone (Speaker A) who addresses an Anglophone (Speaker B) in English. If the Anglophone responds in English, then no further choices are involved. However, if we assume that the Anglophone switches to French, then Speaker A is required to make a second decision: should he go along with the switch to French or should he maintain the code he initiated? How is his decision affected by Speaker B's desire to use his second language? If Speaker A still maintains English, will Speaker B be tempted to abandon his attempt to use French? Clearly this type of speculation could be pursued ad infinitum. When we begin to take into

consideration how Speaker B's reaction to A's language choice influences A's further choices, accommodation becomes a highly dynamic concept. Certainly a complete theory of language choice cannot stop at the initial decision, but rather must provide for the complex interplay of social norms and individual variation which occurs over a whole interaction sequence. This aspect of a theory of language choice has scarcely been studied to date.

It is clear then, that although we have carried the concept of interpersonal accommodation through language originated by Giles et al somewhat further, our study has not attacked the perhaps more interesting aspect of the dynamic interplay between bilingual interlocutors of different ethnolinguistic groups, nor yet arrived at a complete operational definition of accommodation through language. Before such promising work can be profitably undertaken, however, it will be necessary to develop an integrative model which brings together both normative and individual factors which account for decisions about language choice. It is our hope that this study constitutes one step in this direction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyle, M. Social Interaction. London: Methuen, 1969.
- Blom, J.P. and J.J. Gumperz. "Social Meaning in Linguistic Structure: Code-Switching in Norway", in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Bourhis, R.Y. and H. Giles. "The Language of Intergroup Distinctiveness", in H. Giles (ed.), Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations, London and New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Bourhis, R.Y., H. Giles, and W. E. Lambert. "Social Consequences of Accommodating One's Style of Speech: A Cross-National Investigation", International Journal of the Sociology of Language, Vol. 6, 1975, 55-72.
- Bourhis, R., H. Giles, J. Leyens, and H. Tajfel. "Psycholinguistic Distinctiveness: Language Divergence in Belgium", in H. Giles and R. St-Clair (eds.), Language and Social Psychology. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979, 158-185.
- Brown, H.D. "Affective Variables in Second Language Acquisition", Language Learning, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1973, 231-244.
- Byrne, D. "Attitudes and Attraction", Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 4, 1969, 35-89.
- Cattell, R. B., H. W. Eber and M. M. Tatsuoka. Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). The Hague: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1970.

- Clyne, M. Tranference and Triggering. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1967.
- Dabbs, J.M., "Similarity of Gestures and Interpersonal Influence", Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, Vol. 4, 1969, 337-8.
- Duran, R.P. (ed.) Latino Language and Communicative Behaviour, Norwood, N.J.: ABLEX Publishing Co., 1981.
- Edwards, H.P., F. Smyth and M.B. Wesche, Psychological Predictors of Success in Second Language Training, Vol. 3 of the Report of the Independent Study on the Language Training Programmes of the Public Service of Canada, Ottawa: Public Service Commission, Govt. of Canada, 1976.
- Elyan, O., P. Smith, H. Giles, R.Y. Bourhis. "RP-accented Female Speech: The Voice of Androgyny" in P. Trudgill (ed.), Sociolinguistic Patterns in British English, London: Arnold, in press.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M., "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic and Listener", supplement to American Anthropologist, Vol. 66, No. 6, 1964, 86-102.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M., "On Sociolinguistic Rules: Alternation and Co-occurrence", in J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972, 231-250.
- Fishman, J.A., "Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?" La Linguistique, Vol. 2, 1965, 67-88.
- Fishman, J.A., "Domains and the Relationship Between Micro- and Macro-sociolinguistics", in D. Hymes and J. J. Gumperz (eds.), Directions in

Sociolinguistics New York: Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, 1972.

- Fishman, J.A., "Ethnicity and Language", in H. Giles (ed.), Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations, London & New York: Academic Press, 1977, 15-57.
- Giles, H. , "Patterns of Evaluation in Reactions to R.P., South Welsh and Somerset Accented Speech", British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, Vol. 10, 1971, 280-281.
- Giles, H. , "Accent Mobility: A Model and Some Data", Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 15, 1973, 87-105.
- Giles, H. , "Communicative Effectiveness as a Function of Accented Speech", Speech Monographs, Vol. 40, 1973, 330-331.
- Giles, H., "Social Psychology and Applied Linguistics: Towards an Integrative Approach"; ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, Louven, Belgium, 1977, 27-42.
- Giles, H. (ed.), Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations, London & New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Giles, H. , "Sociolinguistics and Social Psychology: An Introductory Essay", in H. Giles and R. St-Clair (eds.), Language and Social Psychology, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979, 1-20.
- Giles, H. and R.Y. Bourhis, "Voice and Racial Categorization in Britain", Communication Monographs, Vol. 43, 1976, 108-114.
- Giles, H., R.Y. Bourhis, and D.M. Taylor, "Towards a Theory of Language in Ethnic Group Relations", in H. Giles (ed.), Language, Ethnicity and

- Intergroup Relations, London and New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Giles, H. and P.F. Powesland, Speech Style and Social Evaluation, London & New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- Giles, H. and P. Smith, "Accommodation Theory: Optimal Levels of Convergence", in H. Giles and R. St-Clair (eds.), Language and Social Psychology, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979, 45-65.
- Giles, H. and R. St.-Clair (eds.), Language and Social Psychology, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979.
- Giles, H., D.M. Taylor and R.Y. Bourhis, "Towards a Theory of Interpersonal Accommodation Through Speech: Some Canadian Data", Language in Society, Vol. 2, 1973, 177-192.
- Giles, H., D.M. Taylor, W.E. Lambert and G. Albert, "Dimensions of Ethnic Identity: An Example from Northern Maine", Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 100, 1976, 11-19.
- Guiora, A.Z., The Role of Personality Variables in Second Language Behavior, Report for the U.S. Defense Language Institute, Washington, D.C. Defense Language Institute, 1971.
- Guiora, A.Z. and W. R. Acton. "Personality and Language Behavior: A Restatement", Language Learning, Vol. 29, No. 1, 1979, 193-204.
- Guiora, A.Z., B. Beit-Hallami, R.C.L. Brannon, C.Y. Dull and T. Scovel, "The Effects of Experimentally Induced Changes in Ego States on Pronunciation Ability in a Second Language: An Explorative Study", Comprehensive Psychiatry, Vol. 13, No. 5, 1972.
- Gumperz, J.J. "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communities", Supplement to American Anthropologist, Vol. 66, No. 6, Part 2, 1964, 137-153.

- Gumperz, J.J. "On the Linguistic Markers of Bilingual Communication", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, 1967, 48-57.
- Gumperz, J.J. "Verbal Strategies in Multilingual Communication", Georgetown Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, Vol. 23, 1970, 129-148.
- Gumperz, J. J. "The Relation of Linguistics to Social Categories", in Language and Social Groups, Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1971.
- Gumperz, J.J., "The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching", RELC Journal, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1977.
- Gumperz, J.J. and E. Hernandez-Chavez, "Cognitive Aspects of Bilingual Communication", Working Paper No. 28, Language Behavior Research Laboratory, Berkeley, 1969.
- Gumperz, J.J. and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnology of Communication, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Haugen, E. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide, American Dialect Society, Vol. 26, 1956.
- Heider, F. , The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations, New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Herman, S., "Explorations in the Social Psychology of Language Choice", Human Relations, Vol. 14, 1961, 149-164.
- Homans, G. C., Social Behavior, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1951.

- Hymes, D. , "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting", Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1967, 8-28.
- Jaffe, J. and S. Feldstein, Rhythms of Dialogue, New York and London: Academic Press, 1970.
- Jakobson, R., "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics" in T. A. Sebeok (ed.), Style in Language, Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1960, 350-377.
- Jones, E. E. and K.E. Davis, "From Acts to Dispositions: The Attribution Process in Perception", in L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, New York and London: Academic Press, 1965.
- Kelley, H.H., "The Process of Causal Attribution", American Psychologist, Vol. 28, 1973, 107-128.
- Kimble, J. (Jr), R.L. Cooper and J.A. Fishman, "Language Switching and the Interpretation of Conversations", Lingua, Vol. 23, 1969, 127-134.
- Kohlers, P.A., "Reading and Talking Bilingually", American Journal of Psychology, Vol. 79, 1966, 357-376.
- Lambert, W.E., "Language as a Factor in Intergroup Relations", in H. Giles and R. St-Clair (eds.), Language and Social Psychology, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1979, 186-192.
- Larsen, K. , H. Martin and H. Giles, "Anticipated Social Cost and Interpersonal Accommodation", Human Communications Research, Vol. 3, 1977, 303-308.
- Lipski, J. M. "Code-Switching and the Problem of Bilingual Competence", in M. Paradis (ed.),

Aspects of Bilingualism. Columbia, S.C.:
Hornbeam Press, 1978.

- McClure, E. "Formal and Functional Aspects of the Code-Switched Discourse of Bilingual Children", in R. Duran (ed.), Latino Language and Communicative Behaviour, Norwood, N.J.: ALEX Publishing Co., 1981, 69-93.
- McClure, E.F. and J. Wentz, "Functions of Code-Switching among Mexican-American Children", in R. Grossman, L. San and T. Vance (eds.) Functionalism. Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Linguistics, 1975.
- MacNamara, J. and S.L. Kushnir, "Linguistic Independence of Bilinguals: The Input Switch", Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, Vol. 10, 1971, 480-487.
- Matarazzo, J.D., "A Speech Interaction System", in D. J. Kiesler (ed.), The Process of Psychotherapy, Chicago: Aldine, 1973.
- Mosher, D.L., R.L. Mortimer and M. Grebel, "Verbal Aggressive Behavior in Delinquent Boys", Journal of Abnormal Psychology, Vol. 73, 1968, 454-460.
- Natale, M., "Social Desirability as Related to Convergence of Temporal Speech Patterns", Perceptual and Motor Skills, Vol. 40, 1975, 827-830.
- Neufeld, G.G., "The Bilingual's Lexical Store" International Review of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1976, 15-35.
- Pfaff, C. "Syntactic Constraints on Codeswitching: A Quantitative Study of Spanish/English", Paper presented at LSA annual meeting, 1975.

- Pfaff, C. "Functional and Structural Constraints on Syntactic Variation in Codeswitching", Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, 1976.
- Pipping, K., "Commentary on Session 4: How Can we Measure the Roles Which a Bilingual's Languages Play in his Everyday Behavior?", in L.B. Kelly (ed.), Description and Measurement of Bilingualism, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Poplack, S. "Quantitative Analysis of Constraints on Code-Switching", Centro Working Papers, New York: City University of New York, Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenas, 1977.
- Poplack, S., "Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in English Y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: Toward a Typology of Code-Switching", Linguistics, Vol. 18, 1980, 581-618.
- Poplack, S., "Syntactic Structure and Social Function of Code-Switching" in R. P. Duran (ed.), Latino Language and Communicative Behaviour, Norwood, N.J.: ALEX Publishing Co., 1981, 169-184.
- Rayfield; J.R., The Languages of a Bilingual Community, The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Rubin, J., "Bilingual Usage in Paraguay", in J. Fishman (ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language, The Hague: Mouton, 1970, 521-530.
- Ryan, E. and M.A. Carranza, "Ingroup and Outgroup Reactions to Mexican American Language Varieties", in H. Giles (ed.) Language, Ethnicity and Inter-group Relations, London and New York: Academic Press, 1977.
- Sankoff, G., "Language Use in Multilingual Societies: Some Alternative Approaches", Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings, in J.B. Pride

- and J. Holmes, (eds.), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972, 33-51.
- Sankoff, D. and S. Poplack, "A Formal Grammar for Code-Switching", Working Paper No. 8, Center for Puerto Rican Studies, New York, 1980.
- Schumann, J.H., J. Holroyd, R.N. Campbell and F.A. Ward, "Improvement of Foreign Language Pronunciation Under Hypnosis: A Preliminary Study", Language Learning, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1978.
- Segalowitz, N., "Social Implications of Bilingualism in Canada", in W.H. Coons, D.M. Taylor, and M.A. Tremblay, (eds.), The Individual, Language and Society in Canada, Toronto: York University 1977, 179-195.
- Segalowitz, N., "Communicative Incompetence and the Nonfluent Bilingual", Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, Vol. 8, 1976, 122-131.
- Simard, L., D.M. Taylor and H. Giles, "Attribution Processes and Interpersonal Accommodation in a Bilingual Setting", Language and Speech, Vol. 19, 1976, 374-387.
- Simons, H.W., N.N. Berkowitz and R.J. Moyer, "Similarity, Credibility and Attitude Change: A Review and a Theory", Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 73, 1970, 1-16.
- Tajfel, H., "Social Identity and Intergroup Behavior", Social Science Information, Vol. 13, 1974, 65-93.
- Taylor, L. L., J.C. Catford, A.Z. Guiora and H.L. Lane, "Psychological Variables and Ability to Pronounce a Second Language", Language and Speech, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1971.

- Taylor, D. M. and L. Simard, "Social Interaction in a Bilingual Setting", Canadian Psychological Review, Vol. 16, 1975, 240-254.
- Timm, L. A., "Spanish-English Code-Switching: el Porque y How-not-to", Romance Philology, Vol. 28, 1975.
- Tucker, G.R., E. Hamayan and F. Genesee, "Affective, Cognitive and Social Factors in Second Language Acquisition", Canadian Modern Language Review, Vol. 32, No. 3, 1976, 214-226.
- Webb, J. T., "Interview Synchrony: An investigation of Two Speech Rate Measures in an Automated Standardized Interview", in A. W. Siegman, B. Pope (eds.), Studies in Dyadic Communication, Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1970.
- Weinreich, U., Languages in Contact, The Hague: Mouton, 1963.
- Wentz, J., Some Considerations in the Development of a Syntactic Description of Code-Switching, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1977.
- Valdes-Fallis, G. "Code-Switching and Language Dominance: Some Initial Findings", General Linguistics, Vol. 18, 1974, 90-104.
- Valdes-Fallis, G. "Code-Switching Among Bilingual Mexican-American Women: Towards an Understanding of Sex-Related Language Alternation", International Journal of Society and Language, Vol. 17, 1978, 65-72.
- Valdes, G. "Code-Switching as Deliberate Verbal Strategy: A Microanalysis of Direct and Indirect Requests Among Bilingual Chicano Speakers", in R. Duran, Latino Language and Communicative Behavior, Norwood, N.J.: ALEX Publishing Co., 1981, 95-107.

APPENDIX 1

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATION PHASE

A. Interactions Observed

Observations were carried out on University members in a variety of meetings taking place on the University of Ottawa campus. These ranged from informal club meetings to meetings of the University Senate, and participants were students, administrative personnel, professors, heads of departments and deans. Meetings can be roughly grouped into five types, depending both on the participants and the level of formality.

<u>Type</u>	<u>Participants</u>
1) Student club meetings	- Students
2) University committee meetings	- Students, - University administrators, - Some professors as representatives
3) Departmental meetings	- Professors, chairpersons, - Some students as representatives
4) Student government meetings	- Students
5) Faculty Council and University Senate meetings	- Professors, Deans, Vice Rector and Rector

A total of 27 such meetings were observed over a period of two months, with 16 separate organizations

being sampled. Although some organizations were observed several times, there was usually a change of members present so that different patterns were often observed. Within these meeting types, there was a range in terms of formality from informal club and committee meetings, through departmental meetings, to the extreme formality of the University Senate and the Grand Council (the University student government equivalent of the Senate).

B. Observation Procedures

Permission to observe each meeting was requested of the chairperson, and the investigator was introduced as being an observer, so that all participants were aware of her status. In some cases, the meetings were tape recorded; in which case permission was asked of the chairperson before the start of the session. However, the principal data collection tool was an observation schedule. The recordings were only used to verify interactions noted on this form; tapes were not analyzed intensively.

A basic information sheet was filled out for each meeting. It identified the date, time, setting (meeting room, office, etc.), and type of meeting, as well as the following information about participants:

identifying characteristics (or name, if known), sex, first language, visible second language proficiency, university role (student, professor, etc.), and role in the situation (e.g. chairperson). This information was noted only for the principal participants in the interaction. On the basis of this information sheet subjects who manifested interesting code choice or switching behavior were later approached about being interviewed.

Interaction between participants was noted on a form which contained columns for the following types of information:

- 1) Speaker
- 2) Language: English/French
- 3) Turn type: First turn/Continuation/Aside
/Interruption
- 4) Form: Question/Answer/Appellation
- 5) Function: Request for information/Request
for action/Agreement/Suggestion
/Explanation/Summary/Speaker
recognition
- 6) Topic
- 7) Switch: Mid-utterance/Between speakers

It was neither possible nor necessary to note all of these categories for every utterance, but the main categories of 1), 2) and 5) were noted regularly and

other categories were noted when appropriate (for example, asides, switches, change in topic). The category of "form" proved to be largely superfluous, as the function generally implied a particular form.

Systematic analyses of these observation data were not done, but switches in code or other interesting language choice behavior were looked at carefully. (for example, a person of obviously limited second language proficiency who persevered in L2 despite his interlocutor's switch to L1, or a competent bilingual's sudden switch to L1 in an L2 conversation, etc.). An impressionistic overview was obtained of the factors which might be influencing speakers' language choice, as well as of the switching styles or code use of particular individuals. On the basis of this behavior, a total of 62 meeting participants were contacted and subsequently interviewed and tested. (A subsample of professors and administrators were used for this study. The data on the 32 students interviewed were not analyzed at this time.)

During the interview, subjects were often asked about any particularly interesting code choice or

switching behavior they had manifested. In this way they were able to offer insights on their own behavior. Their comments almost always proved to corroborate behavior which had been observed in the meeting situations.

APPENDIX 2

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Where did you grow up?

Ontario:

Quebec:

Elsewhere in Canada:

Other Country:

2. What is your native language?

E: F: Not Sure: Other:

Best 2nd Language:

3. Did you speak a second language with anyone at home while you were growing up?

Mother: Father: Siblings:

Grandparents: Other info.:

4. What language did you receive your formal education in?

Kindergarten: E F Other

Grade school: E F Other

Secondary school: E F Other

University: E F Other

5. When did you first start learning French (English)?

Age?

In what circumstances? At school?

Around the neighbourhood?

6. What type of instruction?

Grammar translation:

Audiolingual/visual:

7. What language(s) do you speak at home now? E F

Spouse Children

Other people sharing place of residence

APPENDIX 3

LINGUAPHILIA SCALE (FRENCH FORM)

- A. L'apprentissage des langues me passionne et je suis constamment a la recherche des situations ou je peux utiliser ma langue seconde.
- B. J'eprouve du plaisir a utiliser ma langue seconde, et a l'exception de quelques situations ou je me sens mal a l'aise, je m'en sers aussi souvent que possible.
- C. Pourvu qu'on se comprenne, ca m'est egal qu'on parle une langue ou l'autre.
- D. D'habitude ce n'est pas moi qui debuterai une conversation en anglais, mais si on m'adresse la parole en anglais je repondrai dans cette langue.
- E. Si la personne avec qui je parle sait parler francais, je preferais parler cette langue.

APPENDIX 4

POTENTIALLY ACCOMMODATIVE LANGUAGE SITUATIONS
(ENGLISH FORM)

1. When you encounter a Francophone, whom you know to be fluently bilingual, which language would you be inclined to use when initiating a conversation? Why?

2. Imagine that a Francophone starts speaking to you in English but after a few minutes starts having some difficulty. Do you think you'd be inclined to switch into French or to stay in English as long as communication didn't break down?

Why?

Would you worry at all about hurting his feelings?

3. In a situation where you address a Francophone in French and instead of responding to you in French he responds in English, what would you be likely to do? Switch into English or keep on speaking French?

Why?

4. If an Anglophone whom you don't know speaks to you in French, do you think you'd answer in English or carry on in French?

Why? What if this person keeps on speaking French to you?

Have you ever met an Anglophone who insisted on using French to you?

5. Imagine that you were conversing with several English-speaking friends when a bilingual Francophone joins you. One of your friends, who likes speaking French, starts speaking that language with the newcomer. What

do you think you'd do?

- switch into French?
- continue speaking English?
- start another conversation in English?
- just listen?

6. Are there people to whom you sometimes speak one language, sometimes another?

Are you comfortable when others speak to you in one language on some occasions, in another on other occasions?

APPENDIX 5

SCALE OF PERCEIVED SECOND LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

<u>SCORE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
10	Uses the second language essentially as a native speaker does. Feels completely at ease in the second language. Can adapt his/her speech to fit the situation and the person addressed. Able to use a wide variety of registers or levels. Can convey nuances and subtleties. Able to teach, discuss intellectual subjects both in and outside of his/her field, participate fully in administrative meetings, and convince people of a point equally effectively in either language. Can write in his/her field in both languages with equal facility.	#5, 20, 22
9	Functions almost equally in the second language in most respects (teaching, discussing, convincing, adjusting variety to fit situation or interlocutor) but does not feel he/she is quite as competent in writing as in speaking the second language. Conscious of making an occasional error in speaking.	#9, 18, 24
8	Is at ease with the language and able to function very competently in most respects (teaching, discussing, convincing in administrative meetings) but feels unable to be quite as subtle, has not got the same range of vocabulary, does not control as wide a range of registers (although quite adequate for all university situations.) Some accents provide a bit of difficulty because he/she has not had as wide an exposure to them.	#1

- 7 Functions competently in most respects without major problems. However, feels that there are gaps in his/her competence, for example, lexical fields not mastered. Can discuss certain areas perfectly well in either language but others only in one language. The major factor which distinguishes this level from the previous one is that the person sometimes has doubts about whether his second language is capable of coping with the situation. In certain situations he/she may become too conscious of form, suddenly doubt his ability to handle the situation, and "block". #4, 21, 25
- 6 Is comfortable with general give and take, discussions on general topics or fields where the terminology is familiar; however, has difficulty with discussing topics requiring specialized vocabulary. Is generally able to make just about any point he/she wishes but feels that he/she is not as effective or convincing in the second language. Although he/she is able to teach in the second language, often runs into specific problems which make it difficult. Is at a level where being tired can make a difference in finding the right expression. However, is at ease in social situations; can joke in the second language. #8, 11, 27
- 5 Can run a meeting with the help of formulaic expressions; finds it easier when he/she has control of topics. Conscious of major gaps in lexicon (as above). Not at ease in situations he/she hasn't had experience with. Conscious of making errors: often blocks when upset or tired. If the subject becomes too complicated, will switch to L1. #3, 6, 19, 23, 26
- 4 Doesn't feel his command of the second language is very good, is conscious of making many grammatical errors. #10

Controls only a rather formal register and can discuss his field or areas he encounters frequently in the work context, but doesn't feel as able to participate at a party or social situation where the conversation can cover a broad range of subjects. Cannot interrupt, play with the language or joke.

3 Does not feel competent enough to use the second language in meeting situations or intellectual discussions, even in his/her field. Has difficulty using the language in social situations, even chatting about the weather, etc. Has many inhibitions. Is not able to say what he wants in many situations. Usually prefers to use L1.

#2

2 (N/A)

1 (N/A)