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1996
the pattern of movement of people in the 1990s.

5.2. Two major events of this decade, the breakup of the Soviet Union and its satellites in East Europe and refugees from politics and hunger in Africa and West Asia present potential sources of population movements into Western Europe. Already, people from Ethiopia, Somalia and Albania are moving towards the urban centres in Italy, which two decades ago was itself a source of population for the industrial centres of North and West Europe. A large part of what was the immigrant population in Western Europe has become part of the modern urban European population. In Germany for example, about 60 percent of people of Turkish origin and about 80 percent of people of Yugoslavian origin have been there for ten years or more while between 25 and 30 percent of people of Greek, Italian and Spanish origin have been residents there for at least twenty years (Salt 1989, 448). This, along with the recently reunited spouses and children, has brought about new dynamics of language use and maintenance. The new arrivals to the Western European urban centres will only add to the multilingual mosaic the existence of which in Europe is well-established and centuries old.
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1. Introduction

We begin by expressing our gratitude to the editors for their foresight in including Communication Accommodation Theory (CAT) amongst the theories appropriate to contact linguistics. While we will show below the magnitude to which we feel this theory is relevant to language contact, relatively few researchers in this field have utilized CAT in their endeavors – an omission that we hope may be rectified by its inclusion in a work such as this.

The underlying assumptions of both these fields are remarkably similar, since the notion of convergence is central to both as below:
Linguistic accommodation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>languages</th>
<th>speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;converge&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;converge&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Linguistics</td>
<td>CAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 39.1: Scheme of general linguistic accommodation phenomena

Contact linguists take as their starting point the fact that languages converge, via borrowing or interference for instance. CAT theorists begin with the fact that speakers converge. In other words, for the linguist looking at language convergence in a contact situation, the bilingual speaker is the producer of some interesting object of study — a language variety that is altered in some way due to the speaker's experience as a member of a community that is in contact with a separate language community. From the point of view of accommodation theorists, the bilingual speakers in a contact situation are the interesting objects of study; they themselves are altered — and thus their speech is altered — as a result of their status as a member of a community in contact with members of a different language community.

Historically, linguists had been turning to the internal structure of the language to account for the patterns that are found in contact-induced change. Certain structures, however, are claimed to be resistant to change (so-called “basic morphology”, for instance), and many scholars make an appeal to even the “innateness” of certain structures. In addition, there may be cognitive reasons, of course, for language in a contact situation to look as it does. That is, if two speakers of two different codes are in contact, and if there is to be communication, then at least one of the speakers is required to accommodate the other, even if that means learning a new code. And, at least initially the new code is influenced by the structure of the old code. However, the fact that each situation yields very different results has lead linguists to search for other explanations.

Weinreich's seminal work on language contact suggested that researchers search for social, in addition to structural, reasons for influence differences. But Thomason/Kaufman (1988, 13), in their own ground-breaking book on language contact, note that while Weinreich (1953) "still stands as the best known and most authoritative study of the subject ... [it] provides no means of predicting, however, roughly, what types of contact-induced changes will occur". They offer as a tentative means of predicting types of changes what they term "intensity of contact," defined as length of contact, population of the respective communities, and most crucially in their model, the amount of bilingualism. But they admit that what is needed is "research on current or recent contact situations that permit a more ambitious analysis of sociolinguistic context than [they] have attempted" (213). Communication accommodation theory stands at the ready to assist in that goal.

Theorists have, in fact, suggested that CAT is uniquely positioned to take the principles that apply to a single speaker and apply them to a group of speakers (see Trudgill 1986, examined further below), and the creators of CAT have themselves set this application as a goal: "the mechanics of everyday interpersonal convergences in important social networks provide the breeding ground for longer-term shifts in individual as well as group-level language use" (Giles/Coupland/Coupland 1991, 20). Large-scale accommodation involving language shift and transmission in an entire community must happen, after all, one speaker at a time. CAT, in its capacity as a proven research paradigm for examining individual shift and transmission, should prove a valuable tool in the quest for predicting language change.

Thus we begin by sketching a brief history of accommodation theory, and a summary of its basic principles (see for example Coupland/Giles 1988; Giles 1984; Giles/Coupland/Coupland 1991). This is followed by a summary of some of the work relevant to contact linguistics that has taken CAT into account, including work on dialect contact (e.g. Trudgill 1986), multilingualism (e.g., Preston 1981, 1989), and pidgin and creole studies (e.g., Siegel 1987). Finally, we end with suggestions for applications in specific areas as yet uninformed (to our knowledge) by CAT.

2. History of accommodation theory

As early as 1949, there had been work demonstrating that speakers matched their speech styles to tape-recorded stimuli in a variety of ways, such as their speech rate (Webb 1972) and intensity levels, and even when instructed explicitly not to (Black 1949; Seigel/Pick 1974). In addition, Feldstein
(1972) showed that speakers vary their pause duration in response to the pause duration of their interlocutors, and Natale (1975) discovered that speakers raised or lowered the intensity of their speech in response to an interviewer doing the same.

The basis for what was to become known as Speech Accommodation Theory (SAT), however, first appeared in Giles (1973). Here, Giles introduced his "accent mobility" model, as a constructively critical response to the Labovian paradigm (e.g., 1966). He suggested that it was not the formality-informality context, which in Labovian sociolinguistics plays a major role in the choice of "prestigious" or "nonprestigious" speech styles, but rather the interviewer's style and, crucially, the informant's (subconscious or conscious) response to that style, that seemed to play a central role in the variety the speaker used. According to SAT, speakers modify their speech styles not in response to the context of the event, but in response to the addressee's style.

In their work with bilingual speakers in Montreal, Giles/Taylor/Bourhis (1973) confirmed empirically some of the fundamental principles of SAT and, in fact, a number of convergent strategies were discovered. In addition, this and later work (Giles/Powesland 1975) showed that such converging was positively evaluated, and when this happened, the addressee was likely to converge in return. Thus, this research was able to show that speech style variation and language attitudes were intricately intermeshed, albeit complexly (Bourhis 1984).

Bourhis/Giles (1977) and Bourhis/Giles/Leyens/Tajfel (1979) revealed a corollary to the notion of accent convergence – that of accent divergence. Not only did speakers move towards the speech styles of their interlocutors for a variety of reasons, see below), but they were also found to move away from their interlocutors if they had a negative attitude towards their addressee. Simard/Taylor/ Giles (1976) further revealed that accommodation is evaluated positively or negatively based on the motives for the accommodation that the addressee attributes to the speaker (see below).

Status differentials between the speakers were examined in Thakerar/Giles/Cheshire (1982); and Giles/Mulac/Bradaic/Johnson (1987) discussed the notion of accommodating towards a communicative stereotype of addressees who have been socially catego-

rized in some way (e.g., ethnically, by gender or age). Additionally, they argued for a number of functions of divergence, including sustaining or resisting supposed status differences of interlocutors and attempts to control or influence the speech variety of the addressee. The application of the theory to broader domains of communication, including nonverbal (e.g., Gallois/Callan 1988) and discursive dimensions (see Ferrara 1991) prompted its relabelling as CAT (communication accommodation theory).

A number of dimensions were added to the theory in 1988 by Coupland/Coupland/Giles/Henwood. To the "approximation strategy" whereby a speaker accommodates to productive performance dimensions of an interlocutor's speech were added additional "attuning strategies," including an attunement to: an interlocutor's ability to interpret messages; the conversational needs of the speakers; and the role relationships existing between the speakers. However, the predominance of the role that the addressee plays in the speech variety of the speaker remains central in CAT and other frameworks. As Krauss (1987, 96) stated:

"the addressee is a full participant in the formulation of the message – that is, the vehicle by which the message is conveyed – and, indeed, may be regarded in the very real sense as the cause of the message. Without the addressee that particular message would not exist. But the message, in the concrete and particular form it takes, is as much attributable to the existence of the addressee as it is to the existence of the speaker."

As Boves (1992) points out, then, it is not merely the interlocutor, but the speaker's perception of the interlocutor (as well as his or her perception of the topic and setting) that is a crucial aspect of CAT.

Communication accommodation theory thus stands as a paradigm that is, according to Giles/Coupland/Coupland (1991, 4):

"perhaps uniquely able to attend to (1) social consequences (attitudinal, attributional, behavioral, and communicative), (2) ideological and macro-societal factors, (3) intergroup variables and processes, (4) discursive practices in naturalistic settings, and (5) individual life span and group-language shifts."

As such, it is a tool that should be exploited by researchers in the field of contact linguistics.
3. Basic principles

3.1. Convergence

"Convergence" in the CAT paradigm has been defined as a strategy whereby speakers adapt to their interlocutors' communicative behaviors, encompassing a wide range of linguistic-prosodic-nonverbal features. It has been argued, and often found, that increasing behavioral similarity (or put another way, reducing dissimilarities) along dimensions as salient as communicative dimensions in social interaction is likely to increase speakers' perceived attractiveness (Feldstein/Welkowitz 1978), predictability and supportiveness (Berger/Bradac 1982), level of interpersonal involvement (LaFrance 1979), intelligibility and comprehensibility (Triandis 1960), and, perhaps most importantly in language contact situations, the speaker's ability to gain addressee's compliance (Buller/LePoirot/Aune/Eloy 1992). Factors that can influence the intensity of the need for addressee approval include the probability of future interaction and the addressee's high social status — two factors found universally in contact situations. In other words, if a community is dependent on another community for its economic or educational support, for instance, then there will be a greater need to gain approval, and hence a greater cause for language convergence.

Thus the power variable is one that emerges in both contact situations and in accommodation research. Hamers (personal communication) found that in a bilingual industrial setting in Quebec, those who were in subordinate positions converge more to those in superordinate positions, i.e., foremen converged to managers, managers converged more to higher managers. In Taiwan, it was found that salespersons codeswitched into the language of the customer, rather than vice versa (van den Berg 1986), and Cohen/Cooper (1986) showed that in Thailand, tourists did not acquire much competence in the Thai language, while those residents of Thailand whose economic destiny depended on tourism often became proficient in the foreign tourists' language. In addition, Wolfram (1973) showed that since Puerto Ricans and blacks both agree that the latter hold more economic power in New York City, Puerto Ricans adopt the dialect of the blacks far more than vice versa.

In fact, much of the literature on long- and mid-range language and dialect convergence can also be interpreted in convergence terms, whereby immigrants seek the economic advantages and social rewards (although there are clearly costs) the linguistic assimilation brings. Thus, since historically language contact develops as a consequence of the relationship between conquerors to conquered, or colonizers to colonizeds, at least one (and often more than one) group of people is dependent on speakers of a different language for its economic survival.

Just as there are motivations for a speaker to converge, there are potential competing motivations against it. These may well include the loss of personal identity and the effort expended, particularly if the accommodation is widespread, not reciprocated, and long-term. There can also be negative evaluations by addressees to convergence. It is well-established, for instance, that speakers of certain language varieties, while evaluated positively along the power dimension — in terms of prestige or intelligence for instance — are rated lower than corresponding low-status varieties in terms of solidarity (e.g., friendliness and trustworthiness) (Giles/Hewstone/Ryan Johnson 1987). Thus, converging away from a low-status variety is not without its social costs. It could also be attributed by the addressee to suspicious intents as in the case of a speaker converging toward that outgroup member variety (see Preston 1981 below). Overhearsers from the same ingroup, on the other hand, may view convergence toward an outgroup norm as a betrayal of ingroup membership.

The perceived motives for convergence are crucial to positive versus negative evaluation, and there are at least three factors a perceiver takes into account: the other's language abilities, perceived effort, and the external pressures impelling the person to act in a particular way. Simard/Taylor/Giles (1976) examined these attributional principles for the evaluation of bilingual convergence and non-convergence in Montreal. They found that listeners in an interethnic laboratory task who attributed another's convergence toward them as a desire to break down cultural barriers perceived this act favorably. When the same shift was attributed to external situational pressures, the act was perceived far less favorably. Similarly, when a nonconvergent act was attributed to external situational pressures, the negative reactions were not as pronounced as when the maintenance of the speaker's speech variety was attributed to lack of effort. This has ramifications for lan-
guage contact situations as well. It can be predicted that if members of language community A are perceived by members of language community B to be converging merely to get jobs, for instance, then the convergence of community A speakers will be looked less favorably upon by community B speakers. The converse is readily apparent in the case of nonstandard dialect speakers in the United States, who are perceived to speak “improper English” because, for some observers, “they don’t try hard enough”.

Although most studies have been conducted in the West and in English-language settings, convergence on temporal, phonological, or language-switching dimensions has been noted in many different languages, including Hungarian (Kontra/Gosy 1988), Frisian and Dutch (Gorter 1987), Catalan and Castilian (Woolard 1989), Hebrew (Yaeger-Dror 1988), Taiwanese Mandarin (van den Berg 1986), Japanese (Welkowitz/Bond/Feldstein 1984; Cantones (Feldstein/Crown 1990), and Thai (Beebe 1981) and in different kinds of social settings (see for example Bell 1991, Bourhis 1991, Linell 1991 and Street 1991 for media, organizational, legal, medical contexts, respectively).

3.2. Divergence

“Divergence” is the term used to refer to the way in which speakers accentuate speech differences between themselves and others. Bourhis/Giles (1977) showed that, compared to their responses to emotionally-neutral questioning, Welsh speakers increased the use of their Welsh accent in English, diverging from the English accent of the interviewer, in response to the latter's question about why they would “want to learn a dying language such as Welsh”. Language divergence was also investigated by Bourhis et al. (1979) in a study involving trilingual Flemish-English-French speakers and outgroup Walloon speakers in an ethnically-threatening and a neutral encounter. In this study, the conversations began in English (as an emotionally neutral language) with the Walloon speaker using a Francophone pronunciation. When the Walloon speaker made ethnically-threatening remarks to the Flemish speakers, listeners rated him as sounding more Francophone—a phenomenon known as “perceptual divergence”. Additionally, the speakers were more likely in the threatening situation to codeswitch into an ingroup language. Interestingly, if the Walloon speaker made the eth-

tically threatening remarks in French, nearly 100% of the Flemish speakers diverged into Flemish.

Siegel (1987) found that in Fiji, native Fijians are using salient features of Pidgin Fijian to maintain group boundaries between themselves and the Indians brought there as indentured servants. They diverge from standard Fijian when talking to outgroup members—the Indians—in a deliberate attempt to impede access to standard Fijian, and to create a social barrier between themselves and this outgroup. Siegel reports that this tactic is in fact successful, both in denoting ethnic boundaries, and in maintaining them. Meyerhoff/Niedzielski (in progress) contend that speakers of superstrate languages diverge from pidgins based on their language if the pidgin represents a “corrupt” version of the superstrate language. In other words, divergences towards and away from pidgins (as above respectively) may be just as commonplace as divergences between languages (see Ross/Shortreed 1990 in Japan) and dialects (see Seltig 1985 in Germany and Doise/Sinclair/Bourhis 1976 in Switzerland).

3.3. Distinctions in convergence and divergence

There are a number of distinctions that have been made in the CAT literature which could be relevant for contact situations as well. The first is a distinction between an upward and a downward convergence, where the former refers to a shift towards the prestigious variety and the latter to less socially-valued varieties. In a contact situation involving colonization, for instance, it would be predicted that in viewing the entire set of communities in contact as a whole, the language of the colonizers (or the conquerors) will be seen as the more socially-valued language, and thus convergence will be deemed upward. It is the case, however, that there is substratum interference in target languages; in other words, the language of the community that is shifting often “learns imperfectly” the language that they are shifting to. Giles/Coupland (1991), however, contend that attitudinal factors toward the target language play a much bigger role than cognitive or language structure factors in the success with which a second language learner acquires the target language.

Convergence and divergence can be unimodal or multimodal. Giles et al. (1987) made this distinction in reference to con-
vergence on some dimensions of communication, and nonconvergence (or divergence) on others. Contact linguistics and CAT are in a unique position to inform one another on this distinction, if the idea of mode is extended to include phonological, syntactic, and lexical dimensions of language as well. Grammatical interference is less attested (though not unattested) in contact situations. Various theorists have concluded that grammar, then, is more a "core subsystem," and thus, impervious to interference. Work in American dialectology has shown, on the other hand, that speakers are more self-conscious about grammatical categories in their language, and less so about phonological and lexical features (Shuy 1967). As a more salient category, is this a mode that speakers are less likely to alter? And is this a dimension that would cause negative evaluation on the part of the addressee? These are among the kinds of questions that could be profitably pursued within the context of, and likely also be informed by, an accommodation theory perspective.

If one counts the sociolinguistic indicator-stereotype dimension as an additional mode, Trudgill (1986) provides further evidence for this convergence distinction. He has found, for instance, that speakers are more likely to converge sociolinguistic markers, rather than indicators, towards their interlocutors. Trudgill suggests that this is due to the fact that as variables that have social meaning, markers are likely candidates to vary in conversation as a result of the awareness that speakers possess of them. Stereotypes, on the other hand, are afforded the highest level of speaker awareness, and thus converging towards these in an interlocutor's speech may lead to a negative evaluation by the addressee.

Another distinction related to the previous one is the distinction between partial versus full convergence, and optimal levels of these. Preston (1981) revealed that full convergence, in the case of foreign language learning, is not in fact always desired by either the speaker or the addressee. He states that full convergence, or native-speaker-like fluency, is often highly suspect, and can in fact be seen as controlling. This is due to the unmet expectations that addressees have regarding nonnative speakers — specifically, "a message for confirming information about the NNS is blocked" (Preston 1989, 82). Furthermore, "the more socially distant the [addressee] is from the [speaker], the more likely the [addressee] will see the [speaker's] moves as controlling" (112). He suggests that nonnative speakers, then, subconsciously acquire an "optimally received variety, purposefully distinct from that of the [native speaker]" (1989, 82). He attributes this to Giles/Powell's (1975) stance that accommodation need to be overtly perceived in order for it to be evaluated positively. In directly violating an expectation, speakers with native speaker-like fluency make overt their accommodations.

Convergence or divergence may be symmetrical or asymmetrical as well. White (1989) revealed that in American-Japanese interactions, Americans converged toward the relatively high amount of back-channeling of their Japanese interlocutors, while the Japanese speakers maintained their level. In any case, it would be useful to see if status of speech communities had any bearing on the likelihood of asymmetrical convergence. One could predict, for instance, that "colonizers" or "conquerers" would be less likely to converge, a fact that history seems to confirm.

Convergence or divergence can also be perceptual, so that speakers may perceive their own or other's convergence, for instance, where none exists. Larsen/Martin/Giles (1977) found that the greater one's desire for specified other's approval, the more similar the other's voice sounded subjectively to their own. In addition, Bourhis/Giles/Lambert (1975) found that speakers were more likely to perceive an upward shift where none exists. This leads directly to the notion of objective versus subjective accommodation. Speakers usually shift in accord with objective sociolinguistic reality. However, even when speakers are actually "on target", they may be not seen subjectively as doing so. Giles/Bourhis (1976) showed that black West Indian immigrants in a British city thought they were converging toward white local speech norms, and while they did sound in fact indistinguishable from the local whites, they had, in actuality, converged toward the very same working class variety the local whites were attempting to diverge from. Thus the whites did not see the blacks as converging toward themselves, but rather toward the undesirable speech variety. Beebe (1991) found that Chinese-Thai bilingual children subjectively converged toward what they thought was a Chinese speaker, but who was in fact an (objectively) standard Thai speaker — their subjective convergence was based on the
fact that the Thai speaker looked ethnically Chinese. Cohen/Cooper (1986) found that
sojourners in foreign countries often conver
ged towards the convergent attempts of
host country individuals converging towards
them.

A final aspect of convergence is the notion
of hyperconvergence versus underaccom-
modation. Speakers can “overshoot”, or overac-
commodate, a speech variety of an interlocu-
tor while others might not be perceived to ap-
proximate it adequately enough.

4. Additional applications

4.1. Dialect continuum

Coupland (1984) showed explicitly the ac-
commodation of one speaker as she worked
as a travel agent in Cardiff, Wales. He found
her accommodated speech varieties to be as
good a reflection of the socioeconomic class
and educational background of her clients as
the percentages of nonstandard forms were
for the latter themselves. As mentioned
earlier, work by Trudgill in 1986 confirmed
that accommodation theory applied to con-
vergence at a group level. Trudgill applied
CAT to his own research in Norwich, but
also examined work from researchers in
other countries as well. For instance, he cites
(25) Nordenstamm (1979) as revealing that
Norwegian speakers moving to Sweden fol-
low “regular and common routes” in their ac-
commodation to Swedish morphology, as did
two children observed by Trudgill (1982) that
had moved from Great Britain to Australia.
He also reports work by Payne (1976, 1980)
that shows that the age a child is when relo-
cated to a new language community has a di-
rect bearing on the degree to which they will
accommodate their speech, with younger
children accommodating more rapidly than
older children. Thus, Trudgill sees geographi-
cal diffusion as speakers from language area
A accommodating speakers from language
area B “often enough and on a large enough
scale for area B features to become estab-
lished in area A” (Rickford 1989, 270). If
Trudgill is right, and we believe he is, then
accommodation theory should be one of the
major frameworks to which researchers in
language change should turn.

4.2. Pidgins and creoles

Broch (1927) states that another name for the
Russian pidgin Russenorsk was moja pa tvoja
Russenorsk for “I speak your way”. He fur-
ther reported that ethnic Russian speakers
think they are speaking Norwegian when
they use this variety, while ethnic Norwegian
speakers think they are speaking Russian.
This is compelling evidence for pidgins repre-
senting prototypical accommodation situ-
tions, although to date there have been very
few researchers in either field who have made
this connection (see exceptions above). An
additional compelling hypothesis in CAT is
the notion that collectivistic cultures, such as
those in the East, are more likely to ac-
commodate than individualistic cultures like
those of the West (cf. Yum 1988). Pidgin situ-
ations, then, are ideal places to look for max-
imum cultural differences in accommodation
since, by and large, pidgin situations that
have been studies in creolist literature (e.g.
Hawaii, Malaysia, West Africa, Hong Kong,
etc.) involve Western colonizers and Eastern
colonized.

Thomason/Kaufman (1988) makes the distinc-
tion between “abrupt creolization”
whereby the new contact language must im-
mediately serve all of the communicative
functions of the speakers, and pidginization,
where the “process of compromise can be
more leisurely” (174). They suggest that the
structures of abrupt creoles look different
from the structure of pidgins, and they in-
clude several hypotheses for why this might
be, including what may mean more mutual
accommodation in the case of pidginization.
CAT could contribute to the discussion as a
theory best equipped to deal with the differ-
ing social situations in which each of these
situations would be found.

4.3. Bilingualism

There has been much work in both the field
of contact linguistics and the field of accom-
modation theory on bilingualism. However,
there has been relatively little dialogue be-
tween these two fields (see exceptions above).
Thomason/Kaufman (1988), for instance,
discuss “interference” in terms of the shifters
and the target language, stating that substra-
tum interference, or “imperfect language
learning”, can be the result of “attitudinal
factors, but do not provide for what those
factors might be. There also is reference to
the fact that substratum versus superstratum
borrowing is related to the amount of pres-
tige that the languages possess, and they pro-
vide a borrowing scale (1988, 50) that in-
cludes ideas such as “casual contact” or “in-
tensive contact,” but little specific reference
30. Linguistic accommodation

to what other social factors attribute to the degree of bilingualism.

And yet, Giles (1979) categorizes various types of bilingual languages situations (i.e. language choice situations, accommodation situations, assimilation situations), and provides attitudinal justification for each. Giles/Coupland (1991) as well devote an entire chapter just to such "attitudinal" factors which include the amount of ethnonlinguistic vitality that speakers perceive their language to possess (Harwood/Giles/Bourris in press), and the attitudes each group in contact has towards the respective languages. This area in particular, then, is an ideal place for the work from the two fields to inform each other, especially given the amount of work on bilingualism that has been done in both.

4.4. Maintenance

In the case of complete nonconvergence or divergence, language maintenance can result (Bourris 1979). Thomason/Kaufman (1988) here appeal to the aforementioned intensity of contact (length of time, more source language speakers than borrowing language speakers, amount of bilingualism) as a means of predicting whether a language will have success at maintenance. This does not seem to be the entire answer, however, if one considers cases such as Romani and Faroese, both cases in which there was intensive contact of the type Thomason/Kaufman describe. Rather, what seems to be operating in these situations is that social pressure from "outgroup members" leads to "communicative group distinctiveness". To that end, Giles/Leets/Coupland (1990) have argued that, just as Trudgill (1986) proposes that accommodation forces are an integral element in long-term language and dialect shifts, intergroup processes similar to those that lead to group divergence are part of the psychological processes that lead to language maintenance and survival.

4.5. Language death

Thomason/Kaufman (1988) posit three possible outcomes for situations involving immediate learning of a contact language: sudden death of the language (i.e., full and immediate convergence), a slow "death" that takes several generations (that may result in "semi-speakers" — those speakers who have no language that they are fluent in), and "stubborn" retention of whatever speakers possibly can retain, albeit with heavy borrowing from the dominant language. They concentrate on the last possibility, calling it "language mixture." It is exemplified by Anglo-Romani, a language consisting of Romani lexicon and English syntax. Thomason/Kaufman suggest that Anglo-Romani is not learned as a first language by anyone, but rather kept "as a secret code" (103). Anglo-Romani is unique in that the original language of its speakers — Romani — was not completely lost. Thomason/Kaufman suggest that the reason for this is that it "continued to serve important communicative functions" (104), but they cannot explain why this was the case for the Romani and not for the myriad other fully bilingual speech communities that lose their language completely. Perhaps, if the need for a "secret code" was great enough, the need for ingroup-outgroup distinctions were as well. It is just such questions that CAT could begin to answer.

4.6. Sprachbund

In these types of contact situations, whereby several languages with apparently equal status are in contact, CAT may be used as a tool to explore the types of language shift and language borrowing one finds. These cases are especially interesting since there is usually no asymmetrical dominance and multilateral rather than unilateral bilingualism, and yet there is moderate to heavy structural borrowing — to the point of isomorphism in form (Thomason/Kaufman 1988). In addition, there may be also widespread phonological features across several languages. Linguists have posited internal structures of the languages in contact to account for which features spread, but, as Thomason/Kaufman point out, these do not account for all cases. Again, perhaps research using a CAT framework could provide some clues.

5. Conclusion

Researchers in both the field of contact linguistics and the field of communication accommodation theory have set goals for their field. Giles/Coupland (1991, 51) express the hope that "sociolinguistics [...] incorporates and articulates social psychological premises in its considerations of the practices and contexts of talk", Thomason/Kaufman (1988, 213) ends with the following goal for the field of language contact (quoted from Paul Kroskrity): "[what is needed is] a particular
type of scholarship that attends to both the linguistic details of diffusion and to the social circumstances in which it occurs.” CAT seems uniquely prepared to answer the call.
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1. Identifying autochthonous groups

Autochthonous is a rare word. It is hardly ever used in publications in sociolinguistics and the sociology of language. It is seldom presented in English dictionaries of ordinary, book-length size. It is mostly found in large, unabridged dictionaries for desk use. Webster’s Unabridged Third New International Dictionary (1986, 147) lists autochthonous “indigenous, native, aboriginal, used esp. of floras and faunas”. In the Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology (1986, 28) an autochthon is defined as one “sprung from the soil”; the plural form of the word indicates original inhabitants. In the Revised Edition of the Random House College Dictionary (1988, 91) it is said that autochthonous is an attribute pertaining to autochthons that are equal to indigenous, aboriginal inhabitants. Autochthonous implies clearly being the first in place from the very beginning. Taken literally the concept autochthonous is almost useless. It is only in rare cases possible to say with a reasonable degree of certainty who were the first ones in a place or, in other words, the real aborigines. The time span over which we can reconstruct the historical roots of existing languages covers 10,000 or 20,000 years at most. This is, however, a very small fraction of the period during which language has been spoken by man (P. Kiparsky 1976, 97). – Even if the use of the word autochthonous is restricted to historical periods for which there is historical and archeological evidence or to which linguistic comparative methods can take us back, there are obvious difficulties in establishing autochthonousness. The settlement of Europe by its present dominant populations occurred fairly late in history, starting in the early Iron Age. Europe has been layered with people by numerous waves of migration and conquests. Rokkan/Urwin (1983, 22) identify seven such waves when listing only the most important ones in chronological order: (1) the Celtic expansion, (2) the series of Roman conquests, (3) the invasions of Germanic tribes into the Western Roman empire during the fourth and fifth centuries, (4) the eight century wave of Arab conquests, (5) the succession of Viking raids and conquests, (6) the westward