

Language in Ethnicity

Contributions to the Sociology of Language

44

Editor

Joshua A. Fishman

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York · Amsterdam

Language in Ethnicity

A View of Basic Ecological Relations

by
Harald Haarmann

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York · Amsterdam

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.



Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Haarmann, Harald
Language in ethnicity.

(Contributions to the sociology of language ; 44)

Bibliography: p

Includes indexes.

1. Anthropological linguistics. 2. Sociolinguistics. 3. Ethnicity. I. Title. II. Series.

P35.H24 1986

401'.9

86-18179

ISBN 0-89925-097-1 (alk. paper)

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Haarmann, Harald:

Language in ethnicity: a view of basic ecological relations /
by Harald Haarmann. — Berlin ; New York ; Amsterdam :
Mouton de Gruyter, 1986. —

(Contributions to the sociology of language ; 44)

ISBN 3-11-010688-4

NE: GT

Printed on acid free paper.

© Copyright 1986 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin. All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form — by photoprint, microfilm, or any other means — nor transmitted nor translated into a machine language without written permission from Mouton de Gruyter, a Division of Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin.

Typesetting: Arthur Collignon, Berlin. — Printing: Ratzlow-Druck, Berlin. — Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer Buchgewerbe GmbH, Berlin.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
1. Language and ethnicity in a network of ecological relations .	1
2. The role of language in processes of ethnic fusion and fission .	37
3. Language planning, prestige planning, and the limits of planning activities	83
4. Bilingual profiles and changing bilingual patterns – an approach to formalize bilingual identity	119
5. The adoption of foreign cultural patterns as reflected in massive contact languages	155
6. The use of foreign languages as symbols of prestige in Japan – problems of ethnic identity in modern Japanese society	209
7. Language in ethnicity: conclusions and perspectives	257
Bibliography	267
Subject Index	277
Index of Ethnic Groups, Languages and Countries	281
(Administrative Territories)	
Index of Names	286

Preface

The flow of books and articles which have been published on ethnicity related subjects in the last decade is astonishing and can hardly be fully covered by any one scholar. A comprehensive bibliography in the field is long overdue, as is a systematic outline of the major theoretical positions taken in interdisciplinary research on ethnicity. In order to avoid misunderstandings about the nature of the present study: it neither will nor can be either of these. Both the annotated bibliography and the systematic outline should be produced by groups of researchers representing such different disciplines as sociolinguistics, sociology, psychology, political science, etc. There is a great amount of literature on ethnicity problems written in English and in Russian (to say nothing of other major languages of the world, such as German). Researchers in the Western world who have little or no knowledge of Russian tend to discuss subjects related to ethnic identity in isolation from and ignorance of the views on these issues in socialist countries. At the same time, Soviet researchers and those from other Eastern bloc countries prefer to see the situation in the Soviet Union and in socialist countries in general as unique and uncomparable to the situation in the West. For the most part, it is the language barrier of Russian which impedes the reception of Soviet publications in the West, while it is the ideological barrier which presents an obstacle in the East to the balanced exchange of scientific views about ethnicity problems. I hope that the present study, in evaluating both Western and Soviet positions, will contribute to an effective exchange of ideas.

There are, however, other aims more central to this study. First, it is intended to provide a general background for the understanding of ethnicity problems. Based on the assumption that ecological relations constitute the most basic network of interaction in human society, ethnicity is assigned a specific place in that network. The discussion of ecology in general and of language related aspects in particular (language ecology) is not intended to be a definitive treatment of these subjects, but merely to serve as an introduction to the problems treated in this volume. I am hoping that my analysis of ethnicity in a framework of ecological rela-

tions will also challenge preconceptions and encourage a new appraisal of sociolinguistic reasoning. Although there is already abundant research available on ecological problems, there are very few studies questioning currently accepted methodologies in the field. Despite many sociolinguistic and sociological theories about the role of language in its environment there are too few attempts to evaluate methods and categories. Although offered only tentatively, I hope that my framework of ecological relations will be regarded as and employed as a tool for further research on the covariance of language use and the dynamics of environmental factors. Differing from previous attempts is the view presented here that ethnicity related factors should be evaluated as internal ecological variables distinct from external variables like demographic or political factors. The discussion of ecological problems mainly aims at the clarification of concepts and ideas concerning ecological relations (including ethnic identity) as well as of their adequate application in ethnicity research.

A second aim of this study is to suggest that research about patrimony (distinctive cultural pattern), up to now primarily carried out in the field of ethnicity, be carried into the area of microsociolinguistics or – depending on the standpoint of the researcher – to specify sociolinguistic aspects on the microlevel analysis which are relevant for the study of cultural patterns and their transmission. As a matter of fact, attempts have already been made to correlate language data with data which are part of the value system of a speech community (phenomenology). One example of this has been the correlation of data about dialectal variation in a language to extralinguistic attitudes of the speakers. Opening the field of patrimony related research also should be understood as an attempt to correlate language data and (ethno)cultural data in an area of ethnicity studies where this has been hitherto neglected. In this connection, special attention is paid to the problem of how to formalize the concept of “acculturation”, a term which is used here to mean the adoption of foreign cultural patterns. Evidence of acculturation in massive contact languages is analyzed for a number of such languages and their structures (*i. e.*, the system of numerals and of deictic categories as well as the lexical fields of parts of the body and kinship terms). Research on these subjects may provide a broader insight into phenomena of changing patrimony (that is, of changing cultural patterns).

Given the diversity of my two mentioned aims, a third synthesizing and overall aim of this volume has been to generally broaden the horizons of ethnicity related studies. In this regard, the methodological discussion of ecological relations should be seen as an attempt to clarify the

purpose and range of ethnicity research on an extreme *macrolevel*, whereas the formalization of acculturation phenomena in sociolinguistic terms is an attempt to shed light on special implications of ethnic identity on a specific *microlevel*. It is precisely the most general macrolevel and the most specific microlevel which are presently neglected in publications on ethnicity. Other chapters in this volume deal with basic problems of ethnicity, and they refer to ancestry (chapter 2) and patrimony (chapter 4) as well as phenomenology (chapter 6). The discussion about language planning and prestige planning (chapter 3) focuses on problems which illustrate close links between features of patrimony (language as a cultural pattern) and of phenomenology (prestige as a catalyst of planning). In this volume findings from a broad range of ecological settings in Europe and Asia (and also occasionally Africa) are evaluated. It is hoped that this study will provide some stimulating ideas for scholars and students in the field of ethnicity research.

I am grateful to the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung (Bonn) as well as to the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Tokyo) for granting me a fellowship to carry out a long-term sociolinguistic research program. This study includes some findings and evaluations related to that program (see chapter 6). I would also like to express my thanks to Beverly Nelson, Michael D. Ashby, and Dr. Beverly Hill for their kind editorial assistance as well as for their critical comments on the text.

Tokyo, April 1985

Harald Haarmann

1. Language and ethnicity in a network of ecological relations

A great deal of research work has been carried out and further investigation will be needed to elaborate existing relations between language and ethnicity. Although many isolated features in the supposed relationship have been described accurately, the larger context seems to have been neglected in the discussion of this complex subject. When discussing ethnicity problems many scholars tend to concentrate on the analysis of identity factors in ethnic processes rather than on the assignment of ethnicity to a given place in the broader network of human relations. In the vast amount of publications on ethnicity, studies tend to be limited to monographs on social, political or language-oriented subjects. This is not to say that there have been no attempts to give an overall look at ethnicity (see p. 9ff.). It is significant, however, that such general outlines either neglect language relations or fail to consider political implications except in passing and then simply subsumed under “societal factors”. In this chapter I will try to provide a description of a network in which ethnicity as a cluster of several factors has to be assigned a specific place.

A general and comprehensive framework of human relations can best be established in terms of ecology. Following the basic assumption that the interaction between ethnic groups is the result of environmental factors influencing their members, phenomena which are related to a collective ethnic body's identity have to be analyzed in terms of ecological relations. The ethnic identity of any ethnic group comprises elements which are the reflection of a sum of experiences in the group's ecological settings. This statement implies that the identity of an ethnic group cannot be adequately described when environmental factors which have shaped ethnicity to a decisive degree have been left out. Whereas the concept “ecological factor” is mostly understood as “outside environmental factor” it has to be pointed out here that such a view actually is an inadequate simplification of the basic concept of “ecology”. The isolation of an ethnic group may be due to geographical separation from other groups. This is an outside ecological factor. The isolation of an eth-

2 *Language in ethnicity: a view of basic ecological relations*

nic group, on the other hand, may be due to the people's aversion to contact with other ethnic groups. In this case isolation is what can be called an inside ecological factor. The network of ecological relations outlined below comprises inside as well as outside ecological factors. As language is involved in interethnic relations, it is only a language-oriented view of ecology which can provide the key for understanding ethnicity and its place in the network of ecological relations.

As the result of intensified studies in the field of the sociology of language during the last few decades, a number of special areas of study have emerged where research has concentrated on specific problems and subjects. Thus, research is carried out in increasingly specialized fields like ethnolinguistics, contact linguistics (study of language contacts), the study of language politics and policy, language planning, ethnicity (study of self-categorization and identification of ethnic groups), multilingualism, etc. Some of the fields mentioned are sometimes referred to as independent disciplines (*e.g.*, ethnolinguistics, contact linguistics or the study of multilingualism). If this is aimed at emphasizing research activities with different orientations (more societally or more linguistically oriented research) then such divisions are useful but it should not be forgotten that these seemingly separate fields of study are actually only different approaches to a common subject, namely language as a social phenomenon in human society.

Language ecology is not specified as a special subject or area of language sociology. The ecology of language is not a field of research with a limited sphere of application or of objects investigated. Rather, it is based on principles of sociolinguistic analysis. Thus language ecology is valuable as a methodology in the sociology of language dealing as it does with the principles underlying the sociological study of language. The concept of "ecology" was first used in the natural sciences. Thus, in biology one speaks about the ecology of plants or animals, about ecological systems, etc. Hawley first transferred that concept into sociology in 1950, and since then ecological principles have been given increasing attention. This transfer of the principles and methods of ecology from the natural sciences to the social sciences has required special adoptions to make them and associated concepts amenable to the research of social subjects. Whereas it is comparatively easy to describe a lake as an ecological system in terms of plant and animal ecology, it is much more difficult to analyze environmental influences on the behavior of two contacting speech communities and their languages. A lake as an ecological system is less complex than the contact setting of ethnic groups. It can be

said that any setting involving social networks in human society is much more complex than a setting without such social relations.

When Haugen (1972) first applied the concept of "ecology" to the field of sociolinguistics it was with some reservations because of the complexity of society related issues. It should be pointed out, also, that scholars of the sociology of language had already investigated environmental conditions affecting language before, though not using the term "ecology".

"Linguists have been concerned with it [*i.e.*, the ecology of language] in their work on language change and variability, on language contact and bilingualism, and on standardization." (Haugen 1972, 327)

One can view language ecology as an attempt to find ecological principles applicable to the social study of language, an attempt to construct models of ecological relations for the purpose of elaborating a general theory about such relations. With such a theory, language ecology could serve as an integrating research perspective, one which promises progress in reaching the general goal of sociolinguistic studies. If one shares the view of Grimshaw that this general goal is the "examination of the interaction of language structure and social structure and of the interimplications of speech behavior and social behavior" (1971, 93), then the application of ecology related principles is likely to become a favored methodology for sociolinguists. Although the previous studies mentioned by Haugen contain valuable material and useful evaluations of empirical findings, there is in them a lack of ecological reasoning and methodological discussion. Haugen himself took the first decisive step in that direction.

Language ecology should cover the whole network of social relations which control the variability of languages and their modal speakers' behavior. The overall network of social relations, however, is not a clearly defined set of factors which can be mechanically employed by scholars in the social sciences. As social relations (including language) are characterized by a high degree of complexity, efforts have to be made to distinguish ecological factors in a range of ecological functions (see p. 7 ff.). Also, as even the range of environmental factors is not clearly defined and as the sociology of language as a scientific discipline cannot be separated from other fields of social studies and linguistics proper, language ecology has to cover the whole range of subjects studied in different areas of language sociology.

When referring to the “interactions between any given language and its environment” (Haugen 1972, 325) it may seem obvious at first which relation is indicated thereby. Thinking about the consequences resulting from such a statement, however, the specification of environmental factors appears quite difficult for the analyst. Besides the problem of deciding whether ecological variables are linked to both the ethnic group and the corresponding national language, or to the language only (see p. 18 for either predominantly group related or language related variables), it is not easy to find a solid basis for specifying ecological variables according to their different functional ranges. In this connection, functional ranges have to be considered for single ecological variables which constitute the tentative inventory of ecological factors (see p. 11 ff.). The problem of environmental factors even affects the general question of isolating and identifying which social relations shape the network of conditions determining the existence of natural language. The specification of environmental factors according to their functional range is thus a methodological problem of general sociolinguistic importance as it is directly related to the theoretical foundations of the sociology of language. The dispute about how to define micro-and macro-sociolinguistics as fields of study (that is, whether research should be more linguistically or societally oriented) has its counterpart in the ecology of language with the possible difference that language ecology has also to concentrate on the dynamics of variables in an ecological system.

In my opinion, there is no question but that political factors and their functional range should be included. The same is true for ethnolinguistic variables. Ethnolinguistics is sometimes considered as a field of study separate and independent from that of sociolinguistics and language ecology. This view appears to me too formalistic, leaving out the many areas of interdependence between sociolinguistic and ethnolinguistic phenomena (*e.g.*, in the study of language contacts). The problem of specification is therefore linked to the general question of whether or not to provide a general (overall) network of ecological factors. And then we must ask where the limits of a general ecological system should be set.

As the fundamental variables of language ecology are linked to the speakers of a given language (see p. 18), I consider the following basic relations to be the most comprehensive as a general framework for an ecological system:

INDIVIDUAL : GROUP : SOCIETY : STATE

This string of concepts leading from the most specific (individual) to the most general (state) could be interpreted as a hierarchical structure with different levels of complexity. The links between the different levels are each of a special nature. In Haarmann (1980 a, 39 ff.), I pointed out that the study of language contact and bilingualism with reference to groups of speakers is of a different nature than similar phenomena in the language behavior of an individual speaker, and that the methodologies employed to study them should reflect this difference. There are also certain factors that are only relevant to group or to individual language relations. This is the case, for instance, with diglossia. Diglossic or polyglossic settings can only be referred to in terms of group relations in speech communities and not in terms of individual relations or conditions of individual speakers (see Haarmann 1983 a, 375 ff.). It is also important to note the conceptual difference between the terms "group" and "society". Society in this connection is the general concept comprising the subordinate concept of group. Thus society is considered to be the most complex organization of social groups (ethnic, professional and political groups, speech communities, etc.).

At first sight the relation between society and state (or state organization) seems obvious but in the traditions of sociolinguistics proper it is seen to be a relation of a special nature. Most theoreticians consider society to be the most complex social organization, implicitly including all political relations that maintain the functioning of the society. The hierarchical structure of basic ecological relations given above indicates, however, that the political implications of state organization are not included in the concept of society but represent a component of their own. This view also implies that the societal organization is considered to be subordinate to the political relations of a given state. A society cannot exist without or outside the governmental leadership of a state. One speaks of a society as democratic when it has a democratic government, democratic political institutions. Conversely, a society under totalitarian rule cannot be considered to be democratic. But, as the political organization of a given state may exist without support from the society (*i. e.*, a military regime), it is more practical to set up a special relationship between the society and the state (as in the above string of concepts) rather than to subsume political relations totally under societal conditions. The differentiation of society and state as separate concepts has important consequences in the specification of environmental factors (see p. 11 ff.). Of course, this interpretation of the links between society and state is particularly suited to conditions in modern industrialized societies, but in

general for the purpose of making an inventory of variables, the identification of special political variables in addition to a variety of societal factors is useful.

Language is not mentioned in the string of basic ecological relations. This is due to a special interpretation of the relations between language and its environment. As any natural language has no abstract existence but is always linked to individual speakers or groups of speakers, there is no direct relation between language and its environment. Instead, language is affected by ecological factors only in the sense that the speakers of that language are influenced by different factors of their environment. The general description of language ecology presented by Haugen (see p. 4) must therefore be considered as an elliptic expression leaving out the special position of the speakers. Although the concepts (*i. e.*, individual, group, society, state) are not language related they nevertheless imply basic links with language. Language ecology is primarily concerned with language in its fundamental forms of existence which correspond to the different levels in the above string of concepts: language behavior of the individual speaker, the role of language in group relations, the functional range of language(s) in a given society, and language politics in a given state. Other special aspects of the interdependence of language as used at different levels of the hierarchy are discussed below.

Another stipulation has to be made before specifying the functional ranges of environmental factors. It has already been pointed out that language as the means of communication for an individual speaker is of a different nature than language within group relations in a speech community. The proposed basic or general inventory of ecological variables in this study comprises those factors which are related to groups of speakers rather than to individual speakers. In my view, a general framework of ecological factors can only be realized on the basis of intra- and intergroup relations which are indicated by the concepts of group, society, state. Individual relations can easily be separated from the general group relations and may be illustrated in a special ecological model which is based on the general model of ecological processes (*e. g.*, individual relations like language skills among bilingual individual speakers, language choice among bilingual speakers for communication with friends, etc.). Besides this methodological explanation there are technical reasons for concentrating on group related variables rather than including both group and non-group related factors. As it is generally more complicated to specify factors influencing the individual speaker, and also because there is a greater variety of non-group related varia-

bles, it would be difficult to illustrate special variables influencing individual speakers and general factors affecting groups of speakers in one and the same inventory of ecological variables. Some misunderstandings arise from earlier attempts to set up an inventory of factors affecting bilingualism which failed to clearly distinguish the two sets of variables. Mackey (1976, 275ff.) includes group related and non-group related variables but the priority given by him to the bilingual speaker is not explained. The same is true for an earlier version of a general ecological framework by Haarmann (1978, 54ff.).

In order to make the inventory of variables most comprehensive, the following wide range of functions should be taken into consideration:

- | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Ethnodemographic variables | 5. Ethnopsychological variables |
| 2. Ethnosociological variables | 6. Interactional variables |
| 3. Ethnopolitical variables | 7. Ethnolinguistic variables |
| 4. Ethnocultural variables | |

(see p. 11ff. for the specific variables included in each category).

1. Ethnodemographic range of ecological functions

The relevance of factors in the network of ethnodemographic functions for language ecology results from the general importance of demographic factors in the evolution of communities. With respect to ecological relations, the general demographic factors must be related to the differentiation of ethnic groups and thus be transferred from the general field of study, demography, to the ethnically oriented sub-field, ethnodemography.

2. Ethnosociological range of ecological functions

The influencing factors which are combined in this range of functions refer to the social conditions of ethnic groups in their concrete contact settings. This factor range carries important implications for the principles and subjects as studied in population sociology. The focus on ethnic groups as reference groups makes ethnosociology a specific field of research, different from general population sociology which deals with communities without reference to ethnicity.

3. Ethnopolitical range of ecological functions

Those variables important in shaping the relations between the social structures of ethnic groups and the political structures of the state organizations they exist under (variables of the interrelations between social and political structures) are specified here as ethnopolitical factors. The dynamics of these factors have affect on the political status of ethnic groups and their languages.

4. Ethnocultural range of ecological functions

Ethnic groups are distinct because of their specific cultural traditions and behavioral norms. Ethnocultural variables constitute a network of relations which are vital for the evolution of cultural patterns and cultural profiles of ethnic groups and which also includes variables of cultural exchange in interethnic contacts. The cultural pattern does not only comprise ethnically specific features or conditions but also specific cultural activities of ethnic groups (*e.g.*, language cultivation).

5. Ethnopsychological range of ecological functions

Group solidarity of individuals towards ethnic groups as well as intra-group communication (interaction among members of the same ethnic group) and intergroup communication (interaction between members of different ethnic groups) are controlled by a variety of attitudes about and evaluations of the roles of the reference group and other contact groups. These control mechanisms are specified here as ethnopsychological variables.

6. Interactional range of ecological functions

The network of dynamic factors which control interaction in a speech community is specified as a distinct functional range of ecological factors. The factors refer to the conditions of intra- and intergroup interaction as well as to communicational capacities (including multilingual mobility) of single speech communities.

7. Ethnolinguistic range of ecological functions

The variables in this range of ecological functions comprise factors which are directly related to the language (communicational means) of an ethnic group and its structure. There is a variety of ethnolinguistic features but only those variables are included in this network which – according to hypothetical assumptions based on empirical findings – play a key role in varying structures of verbal behavior in a speech community. Factors determining the profiles of speech acts under differing conditions of language contacts are taken into consideration.

Note:

The specification of different ecological ranges (or functional ranges of ecological variables) is an important preliminary step towards setting up a general (or basic) model of ecological relations. The factors by which the integration into the different ranges can be illustrated are specified below (see p. 11 ff.). It should be pointed out that there is a close interdependence between all ecological ranges and that no range dominates the others. The only value of concentrating on the analysis of factors in a special range is in technically limiting the area of research in order to gain deeper knowledge about variable relations in one category. Findings then have to be correlated for perspectives on the inter-range dynamics of ecological factors.

Several previous attempts have been made to clarify the network of ecological variables in some of the categories specified above. The approaches chosen tend to reveal the scientific background of the scholars who set up a given tentative inventory of variables or ethnicity-influencing factors. Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977) tried to specify the role of language in ethnic group relations. Their approach was ethnopsychological. However, valuable as their theoretical framework is, it neglects to mention specific language relations, with only one special factor “language status” mentioned in the model of “structural variables affecting ethnolinguistic vitality” (Giles, Bourhis and Taylor 1977, 309). Language status as it is described, has to be viewed as a cluster of variables rather than as a single variable. Although for the purpose of a macrolevel analysis such a lack of specification of the full range of language related factors may be acceptable, the value of the theoretical discussion will remain limited when applying the network to problems on the microsociolinguistic level. When Giles, Bourhis and Taylor use terms “ethnolinguistic group” and “ethnolinguistic vitality” they apply them

both to general language-ethnicity relations and to features of language structure (and status). This use, however, is misleading, because the structural features of language have first to be shown to be related to social phenomena before lumping them together with ethnicity components. If Giles, Bourhis and Taylor were linguists or ethnolinguists they would most probably have preferred to define language-oriented variables more accurately and to separate ethnolinguistic variables clearly from other clusters of societally relevant factors.

The extension of the meaning of "ethnolinguistic" to a kind of general cover word for language in ethnicity makes the term useless. The way Giles, Bourhis and Taylor use the term "prestige" seems to indicate the same tendency toward an over-generalized meaning, in this case covering the whole variety of status factors. As a matter of fact, prestige is only one special aspect in the whole network of ecological variables and has to be assigned a specific place in relation to phenomenology (see also chapter 3 and 6 for prestige related phenomena). Prestige as one element in the value system of ethnic groups has furthermore to be viewed in a general ecological framework where self-identification and the categorization of others play the role of a filter in interaction (see model of ecological relations on p. 27).

Any theory of language ecology must specify the ecological variables affecting language in its environment. Although several attempts have been made to establish an inventory of ecological variables, most previous classifications lack specific differentiation and can only be employed for general descriptive purposes. This is true of Ferguson's so-called sociolinguistic profile formulas which are a "summary description of the language situation" (1966, 309), Stewart's "sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualism" (1962 and 1968), Kloss' criteria for the establishment and identity of language communities (1966), Fishman's inventory of variables of language behavior (1965), Mackey's "variables du bilinguisme" (1976, 371 ff.), Allardt's criteria for ethnicity (including language related variables) (1979, 52 ff.), the "structural variables affecting ethnolinguistic vitality" established by Giles, Bourhis and Taylor (1977, 309), and several other attempts. Differences between these classifications mainly result from different methodological approaches and are due to different ideas about the aims of such inventories. Most of the ecological inventories thus far assembled could be considered as partial, as panels in a broader general panorama of ecological variables, and will be treated as such in the following discussion.

A crucial choice in establishing an inventory of language ecology is that of whether to take into consideration all possible variables which could indirectly as well as directly affect language choice and behavior in groups (*i.e.*, among members of speech communities), or to restrict the inventory to only language related categories. I consider an overall inventory more adequate because it allows the inclusion of general as well as specific variables, and at the same time illustrates the links between variables referring to the general conditions of ethnic groups and those referring to their language. In Haarmann (1980b) I proposed a general inventory of basic ecological variables, the categories of which shall be discussed below.

1. Ethnodemographic variables

- 1.1. The size of an ethnic group (number of members in a community, *i.e.*, language community, national minority, etc.)
- 1.2. The polarity between focused and dispersed population in ethnic groups (concentration versus dispersion as features of settlement)
- 1.3. The polarity between ethnic homogeneity and heterogeneity in the area of an ethnic group's settlement (monoethnic versus polyethnic area of settlement)
- 1.4. The polarity between urban and rural settlements within an ethnic group
- 1.5. The polarity between static settlement and migration movement in an ethnic group

2. Ethnosociological variables

- 2.1. The polarity between stability and dynamic change in the ethnic profile of areas of settlement (*e.g.*, the distribution of speech communities in a region)
- 2.2. The distribution of the population in an ethnic group by sex
- 2.3. Age-group distinctions as an ecological variable influencing language choice and speech behavior
- 2.4. The specifics of social stratification in an ethnic group
- 2.5. The specifics of family relations in the social structures of an ethnic group (*e.g.*, endogamy versus exogamy as features of family relations)

3. Ethnopolitical variables

- 3.1. The ethnos-state relation
- 3.2. The speaker-language-state relation (group- and non-group related bilingualism)
- 3.3. The institutional status of a community's language (*cf.*, categorizations like language of the state, official language, language for administrative usage, etc.)

12 *Language in ethnicity: a view of basic ecological relations*

- 3.4. The reproduction potential of a community's language (referring to its special status as a medium of instruction or as a subject at school)
- 3.5. The characteristics of the division of labor (hierarchical versus segmented division of labor in the relations of an ethnic group with other ethnic communities in a state)
4. Ethnocultural variables
 - 4.1. Ancestry (descent) as a criterion of group solidarity
 - 4.2. The polarity between ethnocultural patterns and social distance in interethnic relations
 - 4.3. The relevance of cultural and/or political organizations for the promotion of a community's interests
 - 4.4. The relevance of a language's ausbau status
 - 4.5. The specifics of a language's sociocultural potential (*e. g.*, characteristics of the written language according to different categories of usage, as for science, commerce, etc.)
5. Ethnopsychological variables
 - 5.1. The relevance of enculturation for ethnic identification
 - 5.2. The relevance of self-categorization (self-identification) among the members of a community
 - 5.3. The relevance of and ways of categorizing other ethnic groups among the members of a community
 - 5.4. Language maintenance as a measure of ethnic identity
 - 5.5. The attitude of the members in a community towards interaction with members of contacting ethnic groups (inclination towards interethnic communication versus rejection of contact)
6. Interactional variables
 - 6.1. The relevance of communicational mobility in a language community (low-level mobility of monolingual speakers versus high-level mobility of multilingual speakers in a community)
 - 6.2. Interactional determination in the use of communicational means (*cf.*, language varieties in diglossic and polyglossic settings)
 - 6.3. The relevance of intra- and interethnic role relations for interaction
 - 6.4. The degree of routine interaction with members of other ethnic groups (degree of familiarity with interethnic communication among members of a community)
 - 6.5. The degree of publicity (publicness) of speech settings
 - 6.6. The relevance of topic for intra- and intergroup interaction (with topics ranging from general political to special private subjects)
7. Ethnolinguistic variables
 - 7.1. The relevance of linguistic distance between contact languages (problem of contacting languages with different degrees of linguistic distance/abstand)

- 7.2. The relevance of ethnically specific pragmatic strategies of verbal interaction
- 7.3. The role of grammatical determinism within the framework of deictic categories (specifics in the system of deictic categories and their usage in contacting languages)
- 7.4. The characteristics of language contacts with respect to the sociocultural status of the contacting languages (sociocultural categorization of language contacts)

Note:

Henceforth, when the above ecological variables are referred to in this study, they will be indicated by using the numerical code given here.

The above mentioned environmental factors are called ecological variables because their influencing effect causes variations in multilingual settings (especially in the language behavior of speech communities). There is no space here to explain all possible variations of all environmental factors. Only those variations which require additional information beyond what is given in the above inventory will be mentioned. Variations of single factors will be illustrated with concrete examples for better understanding.

Variable 2.1. (Variations)

Strong population growth (high birthrate) in one ethnic group as a triggering factor for changes in the ethnic profile of a multinational region (*e.g.*, Uzbeks in Uzbekistan)

A stagnating population in a given ethnic group as a factor for slow change in a contact region (*e.g.*, Sorbs in Lower Lusatia)

An ethnic group which is characterized by a high degree of negative growth (high rate of population decline) (*e.g.*, Karelians in the Karelian A.S.S.R.)

Variable 3.1. (Variations)

The ethnic group is given autonomy rights in a multinational state (*e.g.*, the autonomy of the Swedish-speaking population on the Åland islands as an autonomous region of Finland)

The ethnic group has partial autonomy in a jurisdiction in which nationality is promoted (*e.g.*, the Welsh community in Wales)

The ethnic group has partial autonomy in a jurisdiction in which nationality is tolerated (*e.g.*, Friulians in Italy)

The ethnic group does not possess any special right to maintain its language and culture (*e.g.*, the Kurds in Turkey)

Variable 3.5. (Variations)

The members of an ethnic group are represented by all social groups or classes in a country's society (*e.g.*, segmented cultural division of labor as illustrated by the situation of Finland Swedes in Finnish society)

The members of an ethnic group are socially represented only in the private not in the public sector (*e.g.*, partially segmented cultural division of labor as among the Poles in Germany before 1914)

The members of an ethnic group are only represented in lower social classes (*e.g.*, hierarchical cultural division of labor as illustrated by the situation of Moroccan guest-workers in West Germany)

Variable 4.2. (Variations)

There is a strong social distance between two ethnic groups because of great differences in their ethnocultural patterns (*e.g.*, the relations of Turks and Germans in West Germany)

There is a moderate social distance between ethnic groups (*e.g.*, the relations between Castilians and Catalans in Spain)

There is a weak social distance between ethnic groups (*e.g.*, relations between Finns and Estonians in the Estonian S.S.R.)

Variable 5.1. (Variations)

Ethnic identity on the basis of an ethnically specific monocultural education/upbringing (*e.g.*, Faringians on the Faroese islands as an autonomous region of Denmark)

Ethnic identity on the basis of a bilaterally specific bicultural education/upbringing (*e.g.*, Finland Swedes in bilingual areas in southern and western Finland)

Ethnic identity on the basis of an ethnically unspecific mixed education/upbringing (*e.g.*, culturally mixed education as among members of the second generation of Greek guest-workers in West Germany)

Variable 6.2. (Variations)

A language only functions as a high variety (H-variety) in the functional distribution of languages (language varieties) in a society (*e.g.*, French in Belgium as the only official language in the 19th century)

A language only functions as a low variety (L-variety) in the functional distribution of languages (*e.g.*, diglossia in Switzerland with Schwyzertütsch as L-variety)

A language has a special function in a polyglossic setting involving several varieties (*e.g.*, Gagauz as an L₁-variety in a polyglossia involving also Moldavian as a L₂-variety and Russian as a H-variety in the southern part of the Moldavian S.S.R.)

Variable 6.3. (Variations)

The ethnic group plays a leading role in a multinational society (*e.g.*, Jews in the U.S.A., Russians in the Soviet Union)

The ethnic group plays an equal role together with other groups in a multinational society (*e.g.*, Flemings and Walloons in Belgium)

The ethnic group plays a non-dominant role in a multinational society (*e.g.*, Kurds in Iran)

Variable 6.5. (Variations)

A language is used in all domains of public and private life (*e.g.*, French in Québec, Canada)

A language is used preferentially in the public sector (*e.g.*, French in Luxembourg)

A language is used preferentially in the private sector (*e.g.*, Letzeburgish in Luxembourg)

A language's use is restricted to the private sector (*e.g.*, Breton in France)

Variable 7.1. (Variations)

A language is characterized by a great linguistic distance from a contacting language (*e.g.*, the distance between Basque and Spanish, the contacting language, in Spain)

A language is characterized by a medium degree of linguistic distance from a contacting language (*e.g.*, the distance between Occitan and French, the contacting language, in France)

A language is characterized by a small linguistic distance from a contacting language (*e.g.*, the distance between Frisian and Dutch, the contacting language, in the Netherlands)

Variable 7.2. (Variations)

The verbal strategies for interaction differ strongly among contacting ethnic groups (*e.g.*, the language behavior of Eskimos in contrast to that of Franco-Canadians in northern Québec)

The verbal strategies for interaction differ moderately among contacting ethnic groups (*e.g.*, the language behavior of Galicians and Spaniards in Northwest Spain)

The verbal strategies for interaction differ only slightly among contacting ethnic groups (*e.g.*, the language behavior of Occitans and Catalans in southern France)

Variable 7.3. (Variations)

The system of deictic categories in a language is strongly affected by a contact language (*e.g.*, the deictic categories of Romany under the influence of various co-territorial languages; see chapter 5)

The system of deictic categories in a language is moderately affected by a contact language (*e.g.*, the deictic categories of Izhorian under the influence of Russian; see chapter 3)

The system of deictic categories in a language is scarcely affected by a contact language (*e.g.*, the slight influence of French on the deictic system of Breton)

The variations illustrated here can be further refined for each ecological factor. A refinement, however, mainly depends on the experience resulting from the application of the inventory to a variety of concrete settings. Empirical findings for a number of ethnic groups may reveal special cases of variations which do not yet show up in the present categorization. Empirical research based on the inventory of variables should be in two directions. On the one hand, it is necessary to apply the inventory of variables to single groups with the aim of identifying as many factors with their specific variations for a given group as possible. This would make possible broad comparisons between single groups. On the other hand, research into single ecological factors is needed to discover potential variations in a great number of compared settings. That is to say, study of a single variable in a variety of settings is needed. The advantage of this kind of multilateral comparison which is restricted to one or a few criteria is that it enables researchers to extend and elaborate the inventory of categories of potential environmental factors.

The number of possible variations for a given variable may be specified. I have shown four possible variations for the factors 3.1. and 6.5., and have labeled them 1, 2, 3 and 4. In other cases variables may show a three-fold variation. For convenience, an ethnic group could be characterized on the basis of the inventory as a community with the typical features 3.1.1., 3.5.1., 5.1.1 or 7.3.3. These particular features are associated with settings like that of the Swedish-speaking population on the Åland islands (geographically situated between Finland and Sweden, culturally strongly related to the Swedish community in Sweden and politically integrated as an autonomous region into the Finnish state). There are many advantages to applying a numerically coded inventory of variables to concrete settings of ethnic groups in their ecological relations. Details of such an application are discussed in connection with the implications of a basic model of ecological relations. The most far-reaching application of this kind of formalized inventory of ecological factors in terms of their variations is the production of a typology of patterns for language maintenance, language shift, etc. In the framework of such

types of language behavior, variations of single ecological factors may be seen to be clearly associated with behavioral patterns, making the network of conditions easy to identify. For an understanding of typological perspectives and other implications, further explanations are needed with respect to the nature of the variables.

The inventory includes ecological variables with different conceptual associations, one of the main polarities being the relation to the speech community, on the one hand, and to the language on the other. When referring to the conceptual differences between the functional ranges (e.g., between the ethnodemographic and the ethnosociological ranges) one can see the conceptual polarities they describe as a kind of superstructure. As can be clearly seen in the following table (cf. Tab. 1), this superstructural polarity of community and language related variables normally does not fit neatly into the framework of ecological functional ranges. Whereas the ranges of ethnodemographic and ethnosociological variables (1 and 2) are one-sidedly community related, language related variables predominate in the ethnolinguistic range (7). The other functional ranges (3, 4, 5 and 6) are characterized by both community and language related variables. It does not seem appropriate to split up the latter ranges only because they include both kinds of variables. The distribution of variables in ranges 3, 4, 5 and 6 illustrates the interdependence of variables related to the speech community (see 3.1, 3.5) and to the mother tongue (see 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4). In fact, the polarity of variables with different conceptual concentrations within the same functional range stresses the fact that an overall description of multilingual settings in ecological terms must always take into consideration not only the language but also the speakers of the language (*i.e.*, those who are representatives of the living language). It has already been pointed out that there is no direct relation between the language and its environment but rather an indirect relation involving the speech community which is directly influenced by environmental factors.

As the main aim of the inventory of ecological variables here introduced is to represent group relations, all variables which do not concentrate on the language itself refer to the ethnic group or speech community, and not to the individual speaker. Relations between the speech community and its individual members have to be illustrated separately. When referring to language group phenomena, phenomena of language behavior related to groups rather than individuals are indicated. This is a basic presupposition for the relations in Tab. (1).

Tab. 1. Relations of ecological variables to the speech community and their language

Conceptually related to the speech community	Ecological variables	Conceptually related to the mother tongue
XX	1.1	X
XX	1.2	X
XX	1.3	X
XX	1.4	X
XX	1.5	X
XX	2.1	X
XX	2.2	X
XX	2.3	X
XX	2.4	X
XX	2.5	X
XX	3.1	X
X	3.2	XX
X	3.3	XX
X	3.4	XX
XX	3.5	X
XX	4.1	X
XX	4.2	X
XX	4.3	X
X	4.4	XX
X	4.5	XX
XX	5.1	X
XX	5.2	X
XX	5.3	X
X	5.4	XX
XX	5.5	X
X	6.1	XX
X	6.2	XX
XX	6.3	X
XX	6.4	X
X	6.5	XX
X	6.6	XX
X	7.1	XX
X	7.2	XX
X	7.3	XX
X	7.4	XX

When specifying single ecological variables, setting up a systematic inventory of ecological factors, and characterizing ecological relations in a model, one encounters the problem of how to illustrate the potential influence exerted by different factors on the behavior of ethnic groups. By potential influence I mean that any specified ecological variable may influence the language behavior of a given group. Under certain conditions in concrete ecological settings, however, the influence of some variables may be blocked by the dynamics of other variables or their influence may be negligible. The given inventory of ecological variables comprises factors that, from a theoretical standpoint, are potentially relevant for intergroup relations. The actual influence of any given variable can only be tested by the application of the inventory and the related model in characterizing and analyzing concrete settings. I have found, in using the inventory of variables and relating the findings to the variable network of the basic model, that in a given concrete setting (*e.g.*, variant structures of bilingualism) some variables exert a clearly distinguishable influence while the influence of other factors seems to be insignificant.

In order to illustrate the phenomenon which I will call the potentiality of influence or the potential dynamics of ecological variables, let me refer to two concrete settings of language maintenance (preservation of the mother tongue) among ethnic groups in the Soviet Union. These are the Moldavians and the Gypsies. In the diagrams illustrating variant structures of language maintenance among the two ethnic groups, two different variables are taken into consideration. These are one ethnodemographic (1.4 The polarity between urban and rural population) and one ethnosociological variable (2.2 The distribution of the population within an ethnic group by sex). Both variables are specified with respect to different regional settlements of Moldavians and Gypsies. As in this context the discussion concentrates on the problem of potential influence (or dynamics), the specific rates of language maintenance for single

←

Note:

As explained in the text, the terms "speech community" and "the language" (or mother tongue) do not indicate an opposition between two extremes but rather a dichotomy of concepts which are interdependent. The presentation above should therefore not be misunderstood as a selection of opposite features. The number of crosses merely indicates the strength of impact of single ecological variables in the inventory.

groups are not relevant. Neither is the comparative level of language maintenance among Moldavians and Gypsies relevant here. I will merely comment on the dynamics of the applied variables.

A comparison of the diagrams representing demographic milieu (*i. e.*, the differentiation between urban and rural population) immediately reveals that this ecological factor leads to different structures of language maintenance for the two ethnic groups. The significance of this factor is clearly illustrated by differing proportions or rates of language maintenance among the urban and rural populations. At the same time, the comparison reveals that proportional differences are specific for the Moldavians and also specific (that is, specifically differing) for the Gypsies. This results from differing dominances of language maintenance in urban or rural areas. Whereas there is a clear polarity among the Moldavians (with a dominance of language maintenance in rural areas), shifting dominances and proportions can be seen in the Gypsy settlements (see graphs on p. 21 ff.).

A comparison of the diagrams representing differing ratios of male and female population also reveals differences in language maintenance among Moldavians and Gypsies, but these differences are due to special restrictions in the dynamics of this ethnosociological variable. Significant differential structures in connection with the sex distinction only occur among the Moldavians, with varying dominances of language maintenance for males and females in different regions of settlement. Among the Gypsies there is only a minimal variation of rates for language maintenance by sex group, and the variable is of negligible significance. In comparing rates of language maintenance, differences of up to 1% or 1.5% are considered insignificant. It is immaterial for this discussion what special conditions, in the case of the Gypsies, caused the blocking of the working of this variable (sex distinction as an ecological factor). I only mention it to illustrate a case of insignificance of an ecological variable. The tentativeness of the factor "sex distinction" is indicated by the fact that variations in language behavior result from it among Moldavians, but not among Gypsies.

When the whole network of ecological variables is applied to concrete settings, one has to keep in mind the above described phenomenon of "potentiality" of influence. *A priori* judgments as to which variables may or may not reveal a significant influence are not possible and any attempt in that direction would distort the results. Such judgments can only be made after application of the variables to a concrete setting, and then any statement as to the potential influence of a single variable will be