

Bilingualism: A Cognitive and Psycholinguistic Perspective
Dr. Bidisha Som
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology, Guwahati

Module - 01
Part - 02
Lecture - 02
Attitude, Acculturation and Bilingualism

Welcome back, we are still in the module 1. Today we will move ahead with module 1 part 2. So, so far, we have seen that bilingualism, the very idea of bilingualism, is not a very simplistic one. It requires a lot of background processes so to say, in terms of social mobility, interaction with people, different types of interaction giving rise to different kinds of outcome. Some of those outcomes may not be very the usual ones, like the creation of pigeons and creoles, to the extent of creating mixed languages.

On the other hand, it can also create a stable society with bilingualism. And, but at the same time, it is it may not stop there, language changes might continue to happen with one of the one of the outcomes of which can be that people shift from one language to another completely. So, leading to language shift and language gradually, language loss.

So, those are the background information that we have already shared with you. So, basically what we saw was that language contact creates a continuum of changes. Nothing is static, whenever humans are concerned and society is concerned. So, language changes are a continuum. Bilingualism is one point in that continuum which may or may not remain stable, right?

So, language contact and the resultant bilingualism; that means, needs certain kinds of other factors to remain stable at least for some time. Theoretically speaking, all language contact leading to bilingualism has language shift as one's very strong possibility. But societies that have stable bilingualism over a long period of time, actually have shown that there is one very crucial factor that needs to be taken into account.

This factor is what we call the conducive social attitude. So, attitude is a very important aspect of stable bilingualism. Because language after all is a social phenomena and society has its norms. Societies have norms with respect to everything, behavioural pattern, be it

the accepted way of you know behaving in a particular given the context, which also includes language.

So, if language the society's norms with respect to language are conducive for bilingualism, then bilingualism will thrive. If it is not, then it will not thrive. So, how it actually has worked out in certain scenario, we will see now.

Now, one important thing about attitude is that, it is connected to what is called as value, social value. Does your society value bilingualism? Does it attach any importance for your capacity in speaking two languages? What is the role that your second language plays in your overall acceptance or appreciation within the society and so on, those are the important factors that create what we call, that make up what we call social value. This value is also called valorisation by some researchers. So, how receptive the social context is, how receptive the context of bilingualism is, it basically is what valorisation is.

And this valorisation in turn is associated or let us say it stems from the historical, various historical and political aspects. Societies are politically, historically, sociologically, culturally, motivated. There are various angles from which you need to look at a society. And all that part of it at least, if not all, comes from the historical aspects. So, which society has been historically monolingual and how suddenly if bilingualism is imminent, then how will the society react, as opposed to a society that has been multilingual for centuries, their attitude will be certainly different.

So, one example for this is the US, the case in the USA versus many Scandinavian countries. So, attitudes basically as we have seen are nothing but positive or negative evaluation of the behavior, linguistic behavior in that case. So, in the US for example, bilingualism was not considered a very socially valuable asset, primarily because of the population with whom bilingualism was associated with.

But on the other hand, many Scandinavian countries, use of two languages or more are often encouraged, ok, and even expected much like in India. It is very common in India for anyone to know more two languages. In fact, most of the people here, a large number of people here, actually speak more than two.

However, this is very essentially a nuanced thing. For example, in Canada all of us know that Canada has a much more open policy with respect to languages and cultures and

immigration and so on and so forth. Still, even though it Canada accepts both English and French as official languages, clashes erupt quite often.

So, pointing to the fact that English probably is still accorded more prestige. In US things are a lot more straightforward. They have single language policy, but within that single language policy a French person speaking in English will obviously, have French accent and that is considered kind of sophisticated, is even exotic. But the same is not true for an Asian for example, for an Indian or Chinese or Japanese for example.

So, an accent Asian accent is not considered as fashionable as that of the French speaking American English. So, this is how... now this kind of a scenario in the society which is often expressed through subtle cues, also affect how the group looks at itself, how the group evaluates its own bilingualism.

So, this is how it works. So, the larger society and its acceptance level and that in turn affecting the group's own identity factors. So, let us talk about US first. Social attitude towards bilingualism in the US has largely been negative and primarily because they, the bilingualism was also connected with the Hispanics, the Mexicans, Asians who all those various groups of immigrants. And typically, there were studies which showed that many Hispanic children did not do very well in school.

These are old studies, but and they are also very often bilingual because the home language was Spanish and the language in school was English. So, often those children did not cope very well as opposed to their monolingual American counterparts. So, as a result of which bilingualism was considered a negative attribute for these groups. So, these and many other incidents actually colored the society's perception about bilingualism.

And also, it is about power; which group has power over which group. So, the bilingual group in the US typically has been the less powerful group as opposed to the monolingual English, American English speaking group. So, this is why it took the turn it did. And there is one important thing here that many researchers have pointed out, that it is also very important as to how it all begins.

So, which group voices their opinion about bilingualism in whichever way that tends to stick. In American case, the initial voices were all negative and that colored the subsequent views about of the society about bilingualism in general. But all is not lost. Some case

sometimes the initial reactions; however, new the situation may be need not always be negative.

So, in US what happened, the large scale public opinion which was negative towards bilingualism also affected their policies, policy decisions. So, in US bilingualism has been actively suppressed by law in many parts of the country. In many many states bilingualism is not appreciated at all and there are legal provisions for that.

So, basically that takes us to the forces of acculturation. Many countries, many nations force the immigrants to acculturate, to become part of the host culture. This is expected out of the immigrants, whoever wherever they come from, but they must in order to be considered a part of the culture, in order to be part of in order to be considered American you have to also learn the American language and cultural norms and so on.

So, US uses this metaphor called ‘melting pot’ metaphor where all kinds of racial and cultural and linguistic identities should merge into one identity, which is the American identity and that is how you can chase your American dream.

So, we have a quote here by the 42nd president of US William Clinton: “Our new immigrants must be part of One America. We have a responsibility to make them welcome here and they have a responsibility to enter the mainstream of American life. That means learning English.” It is absolutely clear what is expected of the immigrants, whoever is coming into USA for better life or opportunities or whatever, they must learn English and speak American English. Now, this policy has always been there in the US with different results for different groups of immigrants.

Why? There are other things with respect to groups of people. Ethnic identity is one of them. People might speak different languages. However, ethnically there are some groups are more different compared to others.

So, as we all know, the entire population of USA barring the actual native population everybody traces their roots to immigrants. USA is an immigrant population entirely. The real population of course, is now called I mean native American Indians. So, initial migrants were European migrants.

So, for them this rule of accepting American English, accepting English as their only language did not really have much of a problem because they were mostly Europeans so, from Ireland, from Italy, from many other countries.

There over a period of time they merged. They merged and they became part of the in-group, in-group as in the white English speaking group. That is the in-group.

But the same rule, when applying to Mexicans or Chinese or Asians in general, Indians, this created a very very new problem because; however, much they might discard their own language, they might, do speak American English, they still stand out, because the phenotype is different. Phenotype as in they look different.

Asians will look alike Asians. So, their ethnic difference cannot be erased in just by learning a new language. Now, this creates a problem because using the language even after accepting or acculturating within the American culture, they still stand out and which more often they are not makes them open to discrimination.

Now, this as a result of which these kind of groups typically have maintained bilingualism. They have maintained their mother tongue in keeping in mind the group solidarity, because they need to have a one group because they can never be part of the in-group.

So, they must be having some kind of a solidarity within the group, in order to shield against any sort of discrimination, as a result of which and which needs social support as well. So, as a result of all this they maintain bilingualism. And this has happened in spite of the 'English only' policy of the US government.

Because they simply could not fit into the European-American model. Now, as a result of these, these groups Mexicans or Asians or you know Africans, they not many African groups of course, but they still applies to them. They have maintained bilingualism and bilingualism is valued in these groups, as opposed to in the many white groups, because of the cultural identity factor.

Now, this brings out finer dynamics of attitude of in-group and out-group members. So, there you see the attitude is not a homogeneous idea. Attitude refers to the attitude of the majority group as well as how that attitude, in turn, gets imprinted on the out-group, the

immigrant group and how they see themselves and what as a result what turn bilingualism takes in terms of that.

Today America of course, is more tolerant towards diversity of various kinds and this has also resulted in bilingualism in other groups and cultures who have newly started to re-identify with their own language and culture. So, even if the acceptance level has gone higher this also has resulted in thriving bilingualism within the American scenario.

Another interesting example of this attitude affecting language situation comes from a study in 1997 by Fields. In certain schools with major majority African American students there was a there was a proposal to use Ebonics as you as a medium of instruction. Ebonics is the African American version of the English spoken by African American children.

Now, because many children were not doing pretty, so good and in order to help them cope in the academic scenario, in the school scenario, the school decided the policy was taken up that Ebonics will be used for teaching those children. The idea behind this was, there will be a gradual shift from Ebonics to standard English for those kids. Because in the initial stages it will be helpful for them to study in their own language, in the home language, and gradually, they may shift.

However, the large amount of protest actually came from within the Ebonics group itself, because many parents felt that using Ebonics will further you know strengthen Ebonics in the children and they will probably not be able to migrate to the standard English language.

So, this is an example of you know in attitude of the within the group where they strongly oppose bilingualism. In this case it was a finer respect of bilingualism. Ebonics and standard English are still both of them are still English, but in any case, this shows the how important the attitude factor is, in case of maintaining or not maintaining languages and also that of bilingualism.

So, many countries of the world adopt multilingual language policy like Canada, like India and many Scandinavian countries. This of course, all goes back to the historical, political and other reasons. Now, because of this, use of more languages is valued here, but this is not the case in US there are there this discussion actually can be can go on.

But for those of you who are interested you can follow the book by Altarriba and Heredia. I will give the references at the end of the module. This book deals at length with American language policy. So, this is about the background with respect to attitude of the society, majority group as well as the minority group and how they interact given different kinds of scenario.

Now, the society, let us say, has become bilingual, ok. And we are now talking about looking at a society that is largely bilingual. What are the markers? What are the markers of a bilingual society, that easily uses more than one language in different kinds of scenario? One of the tell-tale signs is the use of code switching and code mixing. So, what is code switching and code mixing?

Code mixing and code switching are nothing but the use of two different languages in the same context. So, this is a manner of speaking that allows the speaker and the listener to easily switch between languages depending on various parameters, whether it is on because of the topic of the discussion or the participants in the discussion and so on.

So, code mixing and code switching are sometimes used interchangeably, sometimes they, the distinction is maintained a little more. So, when the distinction is maintained, code mixing is taken to mean that people incorporate small units from one language or dialect into another.

So, you are speaking let us say in its very common in India to be speaking in Hindi and in between you might add one or two English words here and there; its quite common, that is called code mixing. This is often unintentional and that is why it is a good marker of bilingual society because you do not really think and incorporate one word. This is just how it happens. This is just how we talk.

So, this advertisements in the TV commercials or in the print media you might have all noticed in LIC, the tagline goes 'life ke saath bhi life ke baad bhi' . So, in this life is English word and the rest is Hindi. So, we call it a matrix. So, the Hindi matrix sentence has a English has an English word into it. That is an example of code mixing.

So, the very reason that a large company like LIC uses this kind of a code mixed sentence in their advertisement points to the fact that this will make sense to the society on a large scale, because this is exactly how we speak. So, code mixing technically speaking, code

mixing refers to the mixing of various linguistic units. So, there may be morpheme, words, modifier, phrases, clauses and so on; primarily from two participating grammatical system within a sentence.

So, this is a critical factor in code mixing that it happens within one sentence or it is also called intra-sentential, right? And this is sometimes constrained by grammatical principles and may be motivated by social and psychological motivations. So, sometimes we code mix there are what do we mean by social motivations?

You will see code mixing, Hindi English code mixing happens in certain scenario, but in not in others. For example, just take the case of TV commercials. If a product is aimed at younger generation, chances are higher that the company will use more English words into it, because in today's youth, use of English is always more rather prevalent.

But if a product is targeting the elderly population, let us say some sort of an aid for medication or some other kinds of help, they will typically not use the code mixed version. They will use only one language, be it whatever, the Hindi or Kannada or Telugu, Tamil whatever. That is what the social motivation is.

Not only use of language reflects social identity factor, but also how the other companies and so on reinforce that. Code switching on the other hand, the is inter-sentential. So, let us say, you a conversation is going on between two people in one language and then another participant joins in who does not share that language. Then you change to another language. This is typically what code switching refers to. Hence it is inter-sentential and another important factor is that code switching is intentional. That is, you decide to shift. Now, this shift can be either dependent on the participants, it can also depend on the topic.

For example, if you are discussing about cricket in India, anybody and everybody talks about cricket and politics. So, people, Indians are politically aware. Hence when you discuss in these areas, chances are high that you might stick to your own native language. But let us say you want to discuss about some about technology or about you know education or higher education and so on. It could very well be in English language.

So, that is what we mean by context dependent code switching. So, code switching can happen dependent on the participant or dependent on the context.

But either ways, code mixing and code switching are very common in any stable bilingual scenario. And as I had mentioned in the switching language shift part that when a population starts to shift, starts to codes code switch between from participant dependent scenario to context dependent scenario, it is a sign of gradual shift towards the second language.

So, when you can no more talk in your own mother tongue on a number of topics and you are rather comfortable in your second language, to discuss any matter related to a large number of areas, that is a sign that the society is moving towards the other language, because the first language is not anymore found to be sufficient.

So, these are some text book examples of code mixing. 'Train me seat mil jaye to'. So, there is the 'train' and 'seat' are both English words in a matrix in the sentence. 'Third class ka dibba', 'yeh mamla nazuk hai let us not talk about it' and so on.

So, these are some examples, very common examples that we will find in any text book. Similarly, there is the similar things are possible in Spanish English bilingualism as well.

So, these are some just Hindi. 'I told him that Ram bahut bimar hai'. Now, this example is from a text book which says that 'I told him ki Ram bahut bimar hai' is ungrammatical. But today I do not think it is any more considered ungrammatical. This is also quite a normal structure to hear. So, 'I told him that Ram bahut bimar hai' and I told him ki Ram bahuit bimar hai' both are possible in Hindi English code switching. That is one.

Another scenario within bilingual societies is that of Diglossia. Now, Diglossia is a very interesting phenomena which characterizes languages based on their usage pattern. You know how the usage the linguistic categorization of the social usage in terms of the prestige factor right, socio, cultural different socio, cultural levels.

So, basically it deals with which language to use where and in with whom, by whom. In many societies there are the different languages specifically used for different purposes. In some cases, there are different dialects of the same language which are accorded different kinds of role in that scenario.

So, these two varieties are typically called the high variety and the low variety. So, basically a scenario, a society where either two varieties of one language or two different

languages have two different functions. The higher function, as in the administrative, academic, judiciary, this kind of functions are carried out in one language. That language will be called the 'higher variety' and the language that is used for all colloquial purposes will be called the 'lower variety'.

Now, Diglossia has been discussed for a some quite some time. In the initial stages which is called the classic Diglossia, it was proposed by Charles Fergusson in 1959, where he said that a 'community with two genetically related varieties of the same language have strict usage in terms of domain allocation'.

So, basically, he is saying that this is a dialectal variation. One dialect, one vary one variation of the language has higher prestige, another has lower prestige. This is quite common everywhere in the world. For example, take the case of Hindi or Assamese or Bengali.

The language that the kind of Bengali that is used in the official domain, is slightly different as opposed to the Bengali used by the same people in colloquial terms. In fact, Bengali also had codified versions, the Shuddha bhasa and chalit bhasa. Sadhu bhasa and chalit bhasa, two varieties. So, this is how the high and low variety was thought of at that time.

This idea was carried forward by Joshua Fishman in 1972 and this is called 'extended diglossia'. He extended this idea to include different languages. Because it is quite possible that in a bilingual society, one language which is more powerful will have the higher status. Another language, which is less powerful of the weaker group that will be used for the colloquial purposes, everyday purposes. So, in this case, the two languages are the high and low varieties are two different languages.

Now, as you see, as you have already must have noticed, that Diglossia does not necessarily need bilingualism for that matter, but it often does, often they co-occur. So, given this whether they coexist or not we can have four different possibilities that a society has bilingualism and it is also diglossic. Sometimes neither bilingualism nor diglossia exists and then bilingualism without diglossia is possible. Similarly, diglossia without bilingualism is possible.

So, both bilingualism and diglossia is very easily understandable, these are communities that are both bilingual and diglossic because the entire society uses two languages and one of them is for official purposes. One in one particular case, the country Paraguay, it has the entire population speaks both Spanish and Guarani. Guarani is the local language.

So, in Paraguay the formerly rural population has learnt Spanish in order to enter status stressing spheres, much like in India because of colonialism. So, Paraguay was controlled by the Spanish. So, as a result of which Spanish has been imposed as the language of opportunities, language of education, jobs, job opportunities and so on. So, Spanish in Paraguay and simultaneously the population has also maintained the use of their own language, which is Guarani.

So, as a result of which the Spanish is used for higher purposes, Guarani for lower purposes and the entire country is bilingual. In the Arab world, all throughout the Arab world, the Koranic Arabic is used for the higher purposes all the higher purposes, but all these different countries the like Libya, Syria and Egypt and so on, also have their own local varieties, local variations of Arabic which are used for the colloquial purposes. So, Koranic Arabic is the higher variety and the lower variety is the vernacular version of the Arabic language.

Neither bilingualism nor diglossia is another scenario which is typically found in very very small communities, which have which is very tight knit, a very small community with only one language, there is hardly any stratification in the society so that needs a codified specific language and so on. So, this is quite rare, but they do exist. So, because they are self-sufficient, they do not need to interact with the other communities. So, no need for a second or the third language.

Now, bilingualism without diglossia is also possible. So, there are sometimes it is possible that you can use all the languages for all purposes, you do not really need to have a stratified scenario where you will have this only one language for a high variety. The case in point is that of Singapore.

So, the People's Action Party created English medium schools with mother tongue as a second language for all Singaporean children, a system mentioned in the introduction. The

report mentions that the formal domains like school etcetera maintain Tamil. So, Singapore has many languages Tamil, Malay, English all of these languages are given almost equal status. So, that is no diglossic scenario there. Singapore is a good example of such a situation.

And diglossia without bilingualism is also possible. Now, this happens when two or more communities are united religiously, politically or economically into a single functioning unit, even though they are socially disparate. So, these at this macro level, two language or varieties are said to exist; however, one or both groups are marked by impermeable boundaries, the groups do not really interact so much.

So, before World War I, many European communities had this kind of arrangement, where the elites and their countrymen had a diglossic situation. The elites would often speak French or French was French remained high variety language throughout Europe for a very long time in many countries and their intergroup purposes also they would use French. But since these communities really interacted and had severely restricted repertoires.

So, the elite did not really interact with the masses and hence there was no bilingualism. The elites used French for higher purposes, the masses spoke in the another language they did not really speak English. So, this is the scenario where diglossia may exist, but no bilingualism.

Now, we come to what is called intercultural communication. So, when there are bilinguals when there are different kinds of communities and groups that are brought together, due to bilingualism there is something called intercultural communication.

So, multiple languages sharing the same space, there is a chance of cross cultural communication or intercultural communication. Now, this is the intercultural communication is a broad term, that can be utilized that to understand various scenario. One scenario is where there is a conversation going on between speakers, who may not share the first language.

So, two people talking in one language which is the first language of one participant, second language for another. For example, two people speaking in English and which is the L1 for one person, L2 for another person like the example that I have given here Ravi

and Sushma are talking in Marathi for example, where Marathi is the first language of Ravi and second language for Sushma.

Now, when that happens, there are a lot of negotiation at the simultaneously going on in terms of conversation, because there are rules and regulations for each language, meaning each community and social structure. So, that is where intercultural communication becomes a very important thing.

Why? Because languages are part of cultures, part of societies and societies have rules, societies have conventions and norms about behaviour at every aspect. So, that reflects through our use of language in the conversation setup. So, for one speech can have two types of meaning. One is the referential meaning, the other is the intentional meaning.

So, the sentence might mean what is the group of entire all the words taken together mean, but at the same time you can have an implication or intention that is reflected through your use of the sentence. So, referential meaning may not create much of a problem, but where what creates problem in intercultural communication is the implication.

Quite often that is the case, though not always. Because implicatures are largely dependent upon social norms and the more different the cultures are, the more chances of this kind of implications being misunderstood.

Because the cultures that are similar, let us say English and let us say Dutch and German, they might have less problem in an intercultural communicative system, because the social norms might be similar. As opposed to a Dutch and Swahili bilingual let us say, because Swahili language reflects the social structure of a very different community as opposed to the Dutch. And then some kind of problems might crop up.

So, there are some I have just put in some of those markers in that might create problem, that might be misunderstood or there are certain domains that we express through language in a conversation which may or may not be accepted as the same as implied by the speaker. One such domain is the idea of respect.

How do we accord respect in a conversational setup? Quite well-known television broadcast that featured Professor Maya Angelou and where she was where she was talking

to a lot of audience, large audience and the one member of the audience, a small girl not very small young girl, she asked some questions to the professor and she addresses Professor Angelou as Maya.

Now, after she finishes her question, Maya Angelou starts replying and she said 'its Miss Angelou, I am 62' and then she goes on to explain that she is not only much older to the person who is speaking, but also the achievements and the experiences and so on and so forth make it compulsory, make it mandatory for the person to address her as 'Miss Angelou', as you know to accord respect in the conversational setup.

In the US context it is addressing the person as Miss Angelou or Professor Angelou or Dr. Angelou or whatever she gives her all the options and says, but not Maya, right? So, this is something that I think many Indians can also identify with, calling somebody with their first name is sign of disrespect if the person is at a higher plane in the social hierarchy.

That is what is basically it is all about. So, Professor Angelou's the remark shows a difference of 'politeness strategy' within the same English speaking American population divided by generation gap. Maya Angelou was 62 at that time and that girl was probably 14 or 15.

Another conversation that Myers-Scotton quotes in her book. This goes like this: this is the scenario of a telephone conversation. This is a lab and the telephone in the lab rings, the technologist who was supposed to be there was not there and another person with a Vietnamese, his name is Ky, he picks up the phone and this is how the conversation goes.

So, "Lab, Ky speaking" Dr. Smith who is the boss of the lab he says "How is everything going?" And then Ky replies "Oh, pretty good", then Dr. Smith says "This is Dr. Smith" and Ky says "Yes Sir!". Now, this conversation after this ends, then person named Ky remains quite disturbed by that he had not recognized Dr. Smith's voice and had replied in a rather informal way.

His reaction was informal, because 'oh pretty good' is not how you are expected to talk to your senior that is that to the boss of the lab in which he is working. So, this person spent many days worrying about his job and whether he will be fired and so on. On the other hand, Dr. Smith probably did not even notice it.

So, in this case, the language used is English, even though the people in this conversation belong to different cultural identities: one person is Vietnamese, the other is the American English... American person. So, this Vietnamese person brings into this conversation his own understanding of what should have been the ideal way of reacting in this particular given scenario.

So, another thing is another important idea to explore in this is what is called the 'Markedness principle'. Markedness principle is basically nothing but what is expected in a given scenario, what should be used and what should not be used. Now, knowing a language does not only mean knowing the grammatical aspects of that language, which refers to the 'grammatical competence'.

Knowing a language also takes us to what is called the 'communicative competence'. Communicative competence means you should know what to speak when to whom, where and how; that is communicative competence. So, communicative competence has this marked and unmarked choices.

Unmarked choice is what is expected and what is appropriate choice for a particular given conversation scenario within a community and so on. And on the other hand, 'marked' is what is not expected. So, 'unmarked' is the usual way of speaking in any given scenario, marked is the unusual way of speaking.

So, choice of marked versus unmarked usage of language in any given scenario, either within the same culture or across different cultures using the same language, that conveys different social messages. The choice of marked versus unmarked options reflects the message that the person is giving. In the previous conversation, Ky thought he gave a wrong message, because this was a marked choice, from his perspective.

And that is where it brings us to that societies have different norms as to what is marked and what is unmarked. So, unmarked is the how do you know what is unmarked? So, in Indian scenario for example, in any language it is common to use 'aap' for elders or superiors 'aap'.

So, Indian languages have this three way pronoun difference 'tu', 'tum' and 'aap' and 'aap' is the highest in terms of honour. So, 'aap' is used for anybody who is older to you or senior to you in terms of position or social prestige, you name it. So, 'aap' is the

unmarked choice for any conversation that involves the different hierarchical status of the two participants.

So, adhering to this principle will not cause any problem and any ripple in a conversation scenario or it will not get any adverse reaction from the society. Similarly, there are examples that Myers Scotton gives in her book, that if the boss wears suit to office and says that wearing suits reflects an attitude of seriousness, professionalism, then the juniors who aspire to be in those that position someday, will follow suit they will also do the same thing.

This is quite common in today's world also in across whether it is corporate world or in many other. There are codes of behaviour that includes how to dress and how to speak and so on. So, these are unmarked choices, these are what is expected.

Marked choice on the other hand is when speakers in a conversation use what is not expected and sometimes what is not even acceptable. But they anyhow do it in any way because either they want to convey something, either they want to send a different message or they simply do not understand, they simply do not have the communicative competence in the given language; both of these are possible. So, it can be intentional, it can be unintentional.

So, this is also, researchers have pointed out that this can also be a negotiation principle between the speakers own persona and his or her relation to other participants. So, you really want to put yourself in a position, you want to negotiate your position with respect to the other person within that kind of a scenario.

So, for example, in India it is expected that the students accord some respect to the teachers and they do not address them by their first name or in a casual way or let us say they will not say 'hi there' to the professor. But if he does; that means, or that can be taken as meaning that the student is ignoring the principle of 'rights and obligations rule'.

In any conversation there are rights and obligation, rights of the participants in the conversation and their obligations at the same time, rights and duties for example. So, that is something that plays in the background when you speak. So, in this scenario if the student uses a very informal 'hi there' to his professor, it can be taken as challenging the status quo.

So, basically it can be understood as the student is negotiating his own position vis-a-vis the professor. So, he is signalling that this is like an informal meeting, he the professor is simply another, can be equated with any stranger that he meets on the street and so on.

And sometimes also the necessity to sound 'cool' is another factor that might motivate such language, linguistic behaviour. In other cases, also this may not may be unintentional, if there is a cross-cultural communication happening. So, somebody from American universities coming to India and using this kind of a conversation strategy with the Indian professors may not necessarily be challenging the professor, but it is he is just bringing his own conversational rules into the scenario.

Now, this kind of things might affect a conversation; there might be you know the etiquettes are since etiquettes are different across culture, they might create problem in a conversation. So, just to give you an idea about conversation etiquette, in certain countries it is perfectly normal for all the people to speak at the same time. But in other countries it is a one person whoever is speaking, must complete his sentence before another person chips in. So, these are simple conversation etiquettes.

Keeping all these things in the in mind, these are four areas of potential difference that might cause problem in case of a cross-cultural or inter-cultural conversation, that have been observed by many researchers. Silence, what is considered a good conversation, what are the politeness strategies in a given culture and verbalizing the power differential as we have already seen.

So, now let us just go over them one by one. So, silence is considered golden in many many countries many communities, but this may not always be so. So, silence as a valence in many conversational set up and that valence may be different. So, it is a very important marker in a conversational set up. In Navajo for example, long periods of silence is considered a common part of conversation. So much so that a large part of conversation may be actually silence.

Similarly, the some Scandinavian countries, silence is preferred if the person has nothing important to say. This is specifically true of people from Finland, the Finns prefer silence

over talkativeness, if they have nothing important to say. On the other hand, typical North Americans will speak just to fill up silence, they do not like silence too much.

In fact, it is so much so that many Americans find the Asians too silent in a conversation; too silent and they often think that you know 'he does not hold up his side of the conversation' to quote somebody, you know where he is talking about the Asians. They do not talk much, they do not you know they do not opine, they do not voice is their opinions about their own observation.

In some Native American groups, Scotton quotes, that the 'real Indian must know that neither he nor others have an obligation to speak is perfectly fine to keep quiet not to speak unnecessarily'. This is how many Native Americans also, many Native Americans believe and they say that.

In other extent the other extreme of this situation is the is comes from Antigua, the where loud talk becomes a competition between many participants in the conversation as to who will dominate the floor. This is not very uncommon in India too, you will see a lot of people talking loudly at the same time, each trying to defeat the other and to become more a powerful in that scenario.

Secondly the what is considered a good conversation. So, good conversation has also different roles. In many countries, paying attention to the other person, what they are saying, maintaining eye contact, appropriate gesture, these are considered fundamental aspect of a good conversation.

So, for example, if I am talking to somebody and who considers these three parameters as very as sacrosanct, as very important and I am fidgeting with my with the table, with saying this or that, I am looking here and there, this will be taken as inappropriate gestures and that reflects lack of attention. As a result, I will be considered a bad conversation partner given those kind of scenario.

However, in many other cultures may have other parameters. So, in the French in French for example, when two people meet it is quite common to kiss. Similarly, in Indian societies you have there are some parts of the country where the elderly where the female members of the family are not supposed to make an eye contact with the elderly male members of the same family, with even within the family, let alone the society. So, that is

also considered an appropriate, so lack of eye contact can also be an appropriate conversation mechanism in certain cases. So, that is how different how the how varied things are.

Another within this good conversation is the idea of thanks, request and apology; how do you use these ideas in a conversation. Do you use do you overtly thank people for what they have done or whatever you know you think they have done to you, for others and so on?

One interesting example that I would like to share with you, is it is for a quite common in the western countries, after let after the flight lands, if the flight has a smooth landing it is quite common for the passengers to cheer, they will loudly cheer and then they thank the pilot and so on, it is quite common.

This never happens in India, whether there is a smooth landing or whether there is a rough landing, nothing no reaction from the passengers. In the way in many western countries, it is also quite common for even for bus passengers, the when they get down from the bus they will thank the bus driver.

In India sometimes you should actually thank because for example, in Delhi, the driving the bus drivers are so rash that they will barely stop for you to get down. So, in those cases a thank you might be might save your life.

In any case, there are situations are different in different countries and communities these strategies are different.

Politeness strategy is yet another marker of conversational principles as followed by different groups of people. So, this politeness strategy, again going back to Myers Scotton's theory on this, is basically it is it refers to the attention paid to the self respect of the addressee as well as to oneself, the speaker.

So, the self respect of both the people, both the persons in the conversation must be paid attention to, they must be taken into consideration in a given situation. So, at no point it should hurt that. So, she talks about two 'faces' of people in the conversation, one is called the positive 'face', the other is negative 'face'.

Positive 'face' talks about one's need to have the self worth addressed, recognized. So, how do you preserve the self worth of yourself as well as your addressee is by politely addressing them, by complimenting the addressee or you know because of her achievements or appearance and so on. Another way is to use languages like pronouns like 'we' rather than 'I' to include the addressee in the conversation, in the scheme of things, as a marker of inclusion.

So, these are some very subtle cues of use the subtle cues of reinforcing the positive 'face' of the participants. Negative 'face' is the basically it refers to one's need not to be imposed up. So, the other person should not impose his way of talking or his way of looking at the world, his ideas, his views on me.

So, the idea that 'imposition is bad' is what should be followed. This is; obviously, I do not really need to stress this that it does not always work that way, but that is exactly where the difference lies. So, in certain communities, even when you are imposing your views or your ideas on another person, there are subtle ways of you know going round about it. So, that the other person is not offended.

So, basically keeping the politeness part of it intact. For example, refusing food as guest is quite possible in western culture, positive face. So, negative for example, you go to somebody's house and they are offering you food and if you are not hungry or you do not want to eat can you refuse? If you refuse you are basically not taking care of the negative face. So, you are imposing your will on your host. Can it be done? Western cultures in western cultures you can use politeness strategy to tackle that.

You may say that 'it looks delicious, but I am trying to lose weight' that is one possibility. But in some other cultures, it is simply impossible to refuse food or drink. One example comes from our language Nahuatl, where the western guests visited the community and their house and they were give they were offered lots of food and drink. They were in no position to eat, but they had to eat anyways, because it is impossible to refuse food or drink in this place.

So, when the person could not drink anymore and another person requested here the western guests to eat to drink more the guests said 'I cannot I will vomit', because she was full, she could not eat or drink anymore. The reply was: 'you can vomit here it is your house'. You can see it sounds sort of funny to our ears, but it is quite a normal response in

those situations, because not eating is imposing your own will on the host and it is taken as an offence.

So, because they are welcoming you into their house as a member of their own community, as a member of their own group and hence you have you can go to the extent of doing all these things.

Another important pointer here is the verbalizing power. How do you show power hierarchies always exist, no matter how small the society, how egalitarian societies may try to appear as, every society has inequality. Societies are hierarchical by nature, even animal animals live in a hierarchical structure. So, societies have hierarchy and there are different ways of you know imposing power, of showing that power or utilizing that power through verbal scenario.

One is that children, the either largely studied area is that of the behaviour of children with respect to elders and what are the motivating factors with respect to how children are expected to behave in a scenario. So, sometimes the children are supposed to, are expected to be obedient not only in childhood, but throughout their life to their elders and other relatives and so on.

Sometimes that equation, that dynamic changes as the child grows. So, when he is or he or she is small, the obedience factor remains high as they grow older, there it there is more equality between him or her and the parents; that there are differences across culture with respect to this.

Similarly, you have differences in workplace ethics, workplace discord and how do you solve that discord, how does the your boss, how does the boss take care of subordinates' points of view and how does he make them do what he wants him to do and so on, this is also where we see a lot of change a lot of differences across culture. So, explicit expressions of power inequality can be met with different reactions.

So, there is there are these case studies from, there are many companies that are on the border of US and Mexico. Many of these companies are owned by Americans and many are also owned by Japanese and many other people belonging to different nationalities. So, that is this example that Myers Scotton gives, in a company that is owned by Japanese.

Now, this company has Japanese, German and many other different communities of people working together, in the same company. Now, if the Japanese there is a boss which in Japanese boss dealing with subordinates from other communities, their strategy will be different from other groups. For example, she talks about the Japanese boss because the Japanese value harmony.

So, even when the status difference is well established, he knows that he is superior compared to the others, the Japanese will still try not to make it too evident, he will rather be very polite and still get the work done. So, what they do is: they use consensual agreement. They arrive at an agreement and then that is how they get the work done.

On the contrary, Mexicans Mexican workers in the company same company will use a very different strategy, because Mexicans are used to authorities, authorities wielding power. So, there is no questions asked. If the boss says, you have to do it. So, they are they are things are the strategy, the use of language and the strategy to get work done is very very different in the workplace.

On the US side for example, the workers openly disagree. So, the Mexican scenario there is no open disagreement allowed or entertained. In the Japanese case there is a conversation, there is a polite way of arriving at an agreement. In the US case; however, on the US side the workers can openly voice their discontent, they can disagree, they can not agree to do the work and so on.

And it is a lot more individualistic in nature, because that power hierarchy is not stable. In the Japanese culture, the seniority based promotions are more common. So, the seniors get promoted first and so on. In the Mexican society as well, the authority of the higher up is solidified. It is a collectivist culture so to say. But in the US case, it is individualistic culture. So, in the US it is quite common for people to get promoted based on their merit rather than seniority. So, somebody can be superseded just because he or she is more talented and more result oriented.

So, these are certain things. These are certain visible types of differences across culture that may affect a conversation in a bilingual setup. But these are only some; these are only the tip of the icebergs so to say. In the, these are value, these are seen in the social sphere. But this is not all. There are also certain other aspects of conversation, other aspects of that the bilingual speakers take into account in any given conversation setup.

Even in a monolingual setup when they are processing information while in bilingual processing in as in they are understanding or they are speaking in a language. There are other cues that are also taken into account. Those cues are not the visible ones. They are the cognitive cues. So, one of them could be attentional mechanism, the other is executive control mechanism and so on. So, there are various other mental functions that interact with the language functions.

So, language on the outside and these mental functions on the inside, they are also interconnected, which plays out in the language processing scenario, language understanding or language speaking scenario. So, together these indices, be it the be it the social indices or the mental and psychological indices, together they make a conversation scenario very interesting and particularly it makes studying bilinguals very interesting.

Because they are because of this number of various factors affecting a simple thing like understanding language or speaking. So, as a part of society, because bilinguals are part of society and then all these factors that we have talked about are always in our head, we carry them along as part of our language.

So, each language has its own social norms, cultural norms and so on and so forth and on the other hand there are also other mental functions. So, together they create what a bilingual person is. So, here this will help us understand the bilingual mind. So, understanding bilingual mind needs us to get deeper into the intricacies of these various functions, which is embedded in different types of cultures.

So, from here we go on to from the social to we go on to the individual. And in the next module we will talk about the bilingual person: who is a bilingual and what it means to be a bilingual and what are further nuances into this, ok? So, from the social intricacies to the bilingual mind's intricacies is what the journey from part 2 to part 3 will be.

Thank you.