

Overview

Among various studies involving human language, **Bilingualism** is plausibly the most multidimensional, too diverse to suitably cover in only one course in a single semester, so course content is selected with the intent to concentrate the field. In order to shrink the search-space for content, participants may first consider a place for bilingual studies within Linguistics, one briefly occupying a central location and affiliated with programs-of-study in Anthropology.

In 1953, the LSA, AAA and Joint Committee on American Native Languages convened, a one-time event concluded in a memoir. Therein, Roman Jakobson reported, "Bilingualism is for me the fundamental problem of linguistics." Direct focus on bilingual studies by this community became keenly reinforced later that year by the publication of Uriel Weinreich's *Languages in Contact* and Einar Haugen's *Norwegian Language in America*, scholarship directing bilingual studies near psychology: the former stating, "the locus of language contact is in the mind of the bilingual"; and the latter, "the locus of bilingualism is in the individual mind" (Lehiste, 1988, p. 28). By the end of the decade, however, bilingual studies grew increasingly marginal in Linguistics, which in turn continued to grow progressively less behavioral (i.e., anthropological/sociological) and acutely more formal (i.e., computational) starting about 1957.

Description

Because this course in Bilingualism is aligned with Linguistics, course work and content moderately involve methods of language analysis applicable to the speech of people who maintain more than one language as a way of expressing "ideas, emotions and desires" (Sapir, 1921, p. 8), or human language at large practically defined. Bilingual speakers are typical of humanity, but they might not typically speak two or more languages natively: What typifies their speech is departure from a native norm of one language due to the influence from another, or **INTERFERENCE PHENOMENA** (Weinreich, 1968). A presence of **LINGUISTIC INTERINFLUENCING** (Sapir, 1921) affects languages' lexical level (e.g., borrowing) as well as phonological and morpho-syntactic levels, but the impact is not always observed evenly; an element X in language L_A altering L_1 behavior may be exclusively unidirectional (e.g., an equivalent element X in L_1 need not alter L_A behavior). Sapir attributed as the source of such incongruities "a psychological attitude" (Sapir, 1921, p. 195).

Content

In the Overview, the tendency in describing studies of Bilingualism is obviously toward brain sciences (i.e., "mind" in Weinreich and Haugen; a "psycho-physical basis" in Sapir, 1921, p.11), but the course entails no neurolinguistics. Rather than the cerebral cortex, such content relates more to cognition, namely models of both (i) speech-processing (on-line behavior in real time) and (ii) information-processing (conversion of human experiences of the environment into mental representations, or knowledge). Broadly, to speak, humans employ knowledge (therefore psychology). While vital, speech alone (bilingual speech aside) as a linguistic-course object of study in is insufficient to fathom language as a system because; for speech to entail systematic properties, it must rise above articulatory, acoustic, and even cortical levels and associate with **MEANING**: That is, we assume as essential to linguistic inquiry that **form x** maps onto **function y** for any psycho-physical processes to clearly be an element of human behavior (Sapir, 1921).

As we study bilingual speech as a consequence of a **grammar** (form-function mapping), we also consider instances in which experience of linguistic behavior cultivates grammatical elements (properties of human language systems). Accordingly, the course may portray the brain in terms of language development, or the psycholinguistic processing that leads to learning; additionally, it may consider to what extent learning is guided by perceptual factors as well as by precursors (a priori knowledge) to human experience of percepts that we associate with language behavior.

For example, at the start of the term, we survey a research agenda concerning **secondary bilingualism**, or developing a non-native language typically through instruction (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982, p. 8), the native language existing as a precursor to learning and affecting behavior (e.g., accent) and knowledge (stages transited by a language system). Initially, we commit some grammatical elements from two distinct language systems (L_1 and L_A) to an analysis that, at first, fits the linguistic data well as a grammar of a human language system (i.e., form-function) wherein a **form x** maps onto a **function y**: Later in the course, we will likely regard a general feature of

LING 477 BILINGUALISM FALL 2017 Social Sciences ROOM 258

human language, **variability** (wherein two **forms x** maps onto one **function y**), posing difficulties to initial analysis and necessitates alternate methods, allowing us apply two methods for analyzing grammatical elements of L₁ and L_A and also steers us promptly toward both secondary bilingualism and interference phenomena, typically referred to as **negative transfer** in a field of study resulting from early bilingual studies¹.

From that point forward, we assess models of speech- and information- processing and roles of general cognition (knowing/learning) in bilingual behavior to study **cross-linguistic influence** (Sharwood Smith & Kellerman, 1986), a flexible term useful for larger varieties of bilingual behavior possibly analyzed late in the term. One such variety of behavior includes a phenomenon called **code-switching**, feasibly similar to interference but also much concerned with speech involving grammatical elements of L₁ and L_A (not one affecting another; functioning simultaneously).

Should the course extend this far, these data will require some *very basic knowledge of Turkish*, so particular content (esp. respecting problem sets) will entail appropriate formal linguistic analysis.

Content: Addendum

The focus of your Bilingualism course regards one general type, **INDIVIDUAL**, contrasting with another general type, **SOCIETIAL** (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982); in fact, one book (Hamers & Blanc, 2000) uses Bilingualism as a label only for the latter (the former, BILINGUALITY). Another, "The Handbook of Bilingualism" (Kroll & DeGroot, 2005) concentrates solely on psycholinguistic approaches (language processing in a bilingual brain); studies of Bilinguality involve psychological matters (involving diverse cognitive constructs and specific areas of the cerebral cortex).

While seemingly content for a Bilingualism course, it supposes a considerable background in psychology, neurobiology and research methods noticeably reliant on statistical analyses; rather than maintain such a presumption, let's engage in an introductory study of Bilinguality to serve as groundwork for potential future schoolwork taken from the book.

Regarding the latter type, societal BILINGUALISM, a core component connecting it to Bilinguality is bilingual speech as faced by models of accommodation/communication, where issues of attitude, identity and group membership are judged as equal or more primary factors when compared to cognitive ones related to language processes contributing to speaking and learning. Another book, also titled "The Handbook of Bilingualism" (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2004), is not fully given to (developmental) psycholinguistics like the other; rather, it approaches Bilingualism societally, crucially as a sense of "belonging" (Edwards, p. 30). Its contributions describe how sociolinguistic situations shape bilingual speech, such as a perceived need of one interlocutor speaking in a particular setting on a certain topic to either **converge on** or **diverge from** the speech behavior of the other participant(s) occupied by the conversation.

Our recourse is to regard bilingual data as emblematic of human speech and view specific circumstances as credibly responsible for it. Content first observes particular language forms indicative of Bilingualism and, once practicable, it examines settings where forms suggest a SPEAKING² model of **communicative competence** (Hymes, 1971/1974).

The Graduate Increment

This level of enhanced competence is principally gauged by the ensuing valuation procedure: Graduates' point totals are calculated statistically (i.e., on a **bell curve**) with undergraduates' in gauging graduates' final grades (point totals for undergraduates **only** are similarly *curved* for +/- ratings); that is, total scored by individual graduate students must be of equal/greater amount of undergraduates in order to be considered for the same/similar grade.

In addition, each graduate must summarize a journal article selected by the instructor concerning material associated with content covered during the first quarter or midterm (Secondary Bilingualism); also, one, some or all exams include a graduate-increment portion appended to the undergraduates' portion: However, graduates may be permitted to elect to substitute a position paper with a presentation, individually or in groups.

¹ Second Language Development is the most fully-fledged language-related science stemming from the varied lines of inquiry launched during the 1950s by a bilingual-studies research agenda.

² S, scene; P, participants; E, ends; A, act series; K, key; I, instrumentalities; N, norms; G, genre