Małgorzata Martyńska

The typology of bilinguism

2006

Małgorzata Martyńska

Instytut Językoznawstwa

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

The typology of bilinguism

1. Introduction

Bilinguism is a very complex phenomenon, because it occurs as both an individual and social (collective) process. As it depends not only on linguistic, but also sociological, psychological and pedagogical aspects, bilinguism is an area of research undertaken by e.g. linguists, sociologists, psychologists. In many previous scholarly works on bilinguism, however, this notion is very narrowly defined and its interdisciplinary character is usually missed out. Interestingly, it is yet the definition of bilinguism which creates considerable difficulties because researchers are unable to arrive at an agreement on setting the boundaries which mark the level of linguistic and communicative competence. It is these competences that determine whether a person is bilingual or not. In addition, almost every researcher exploring bilinguism either creates his or her own terminology or uses the already existing terms to name different phenomena. Hence there is a plethora of definitions of bilinguism, which differ in line with the adopted criteria.

In this paper the notion of bilinguism is described in a general way and Grucza's definition is the base for the typology of bilinguism presented here: 'bilinguism is an ability to use two natural languages' or ' an ability to communicate using two languages' (see Grucza 1981: 10–11). Other, more specific aspects of this phenomenon, are not included in this definition but form different categories of bilinguism. The languages which are involved in an individual occurrence of bilinguism are defined as follows:

- language A – is the first (native) language, that is the first language acquired by an individual

- language B – is the second (foreign) language, which was acquired after the process of the language A acquisition was completed or during this acquisition

In order to determine which type of bilinguism we are dealing with in a specific case, it is crucial to distinguish between the processes of language *acquisition* (in German *Erwerben*) and language *learning* (in German *Lernen*) (see House and Edmondson 1993). This distinction was first introduced by Graf (1987: 22) who based his views on Krashen's theory (1981). What those two processes have in common, however, is the continual instability of bilinguism: a language that has already been learned can be further mastered (e.g. thanks to regular private or business contacts with the native speakers of the language) or neglected (e.g. the writing skill falls into decay when only spoken language is used in the community where the learner lives).

This paper aims to characterize a typology of bilinguism which will be used in later works to characterize the bilingual family who is an area of my research. A starting point for this is a set of criteria adopted by various researchers to describe diverse types of bilinguism.

1.2. The typology presented in this paper is based on the following ten criteria: the level of fluency, the functions of languages A and B, the way language systems are stored, the sequence of acquisition, the range of bilinguism, the territory, the circumstances of acquisition, the status of languages, the knowledge of culture developed by the language groups, the attitude to the languages.

1.3. The level of fluency criterion

This criterion is also known as the criterion of global linguistic ability (in German *globale Sprachfertigkeit*) understood as an individually reached level of linguistic skills (see Bausch 2003: 439–445). This criterion forms a continuum, which starts from *minimal* bilinguism, through *semi-bilinguism* and *nearly-bilinguism* and ends with *maximal* bilinguism. What is problematic and disputable in this case is defining and setting limits of the highest language proficiency, which is needed to compare the levels of fluency in languages A and B. The highest or 'full' language proficiency may not denote the same language level as the level characteristic of native speakers (in German *Muttersprachler*), who by the way should be defined as 'socially equivalent, monolingual language users' (see Grucza 1981: 17–19). The full range of language competences is only typical of an ideal language user (see Komorowska 1999). In reality even a native speaker can achieve only a certain level of those competences and various native speakers can vary in terms of the level of

language competence, because monolinguals never reach the limit of their linguistic development. This is proved by the fact that even a proficient language user can come across some words that he or she does not understand. Therefore, there can be a huge gap between 'full' language proficiency, which poses an ideal and long-term goal, and the language fluency of an ordinary native speaker.

Those who can be described as *minimal* bilinguals are also called incipient bilinguals (Bausch 2003: 440). In terms of language fluency they are beginners who mostly have contextual knowledge of one or both languages, e.g. they learned or acquired fixed phrases and basic expressions such as politeness formulae or greetings, etc.

Maximal bilinguism (see Bausch 2003: 440), also called *ambilinguism* (see Grucza 1981: 17–18) lies at the opposite end of the continuum and is characteristic of individuals who in both languages achieved a level of proficiency comparable to that of native speakers (which does not have to equal 'full' proficiency). Such bilinguals, who are fully monolingual both in language A and B and use both languages as their native languages, are also called *completely bilingual* (see Skutabb-Kangas 1981: 36). This situation, however, occurs rather seldom, so this type of bilinguism is considered an ideal form which is strived for (*near nativeness*) (see Bausch 2003: 440).

In the center of the continuum there are two more types of bilinguism: *nearly bilinguism* and *semilinguism*. Nearly bilinguals developed a native-speakerlike competence in one of the languages, and in the other one – their competence is temporarily at a lower level (see Skutabb-Kangas 1981: 36).

Semilinguals show in both languages quality and quantity deficiencies and that is why they are only able to communicate at the elementary level, usually in everyday conversations. Those deficiencies may affect not only all aspects of a language (inter alia the lexis and morphosyntax), but also psycholinguistic processes. Consequently, semilinguals do not display in either language a full competence (see Bausch 2003: 439–445). Semilinguism is also called *półjęzyczność* (see Lipińska 2003: 123–124) or *double semilinguism* (see Skutabb-Kangas 1981: 36). 'It refers to bilingual children, who in neither of the two languages are as proficient as native speakers. Semilingual children usually show serious language deficiency (eg. in vocabulary) in comparison with their monolingual peers of the same social background and from the same kind of school.' (Olpińska 2004: 60) Semilinguism is considered to be a transitory phenomenon heading towards bilinguism. Double semilinguals in neither of the languages have become as proficient as native speakers yet (see Skutabb-Kangas 1981). Being vague and not easily discernible, semilinguism is an area of very little research and often identified with *subtractive* bilingualism, which is defined later.

If a definition of 'full' proficiency was to be given, certainly it would have to include all forms of a language, that is oral (phonic) and written (graphic) (see Grucza 1981: 18–19). Consequently, in order to compare the acquisition of two languages it is necessary to contrast the levels of individual language skills such as the active ones (writing, speaking) and the passive ones (reading, listening). Additionally, a bilingual can develop an ability to translate between the two languages. Therefore, this criterion also includes *productive (active, full)* bilinguism, in which a bilingual proves full competence in both languages and *receptive (passive, partial)* bilinguism in the case when the bilingual has not achieved full competence in one of the languages e.g. he or she can understand the language but not speak it or write in it. This distinction, however, is very general and rigid.

To make the presented typology complete and more precise, the following six different kinds of acquisition of each language were taken into account (Grucza 1981: 18–20):
1. an active and passive speaking skill and an ability to translate were acquired
2. an active and passive writing skill and an ability to translate were acquired
3. an active and passive speaking skill was acquired
4. an active and passive writing skill was acquired
5. a passive speaking skill was acquired
6. a passive writing skill was acquired
   which makes up 36 different types of bilinguism.

Still within the same criterion we can distinguish between *balanced (symmetrical)* bilinguism and its opposite, *dominant (asymmetrical)* bilinguism (see Bausch 2003: 440). The terms *ambilingual* or *equilingual* are sometimes used as synonymous with *balanced* bilinguism (Bausch 2003: 440) or *proportionate (równorzędny)* bilinguism (see Grucza 1981: 22–23), which refers to more or less equal proficiency (not necessarily as high as that one of native speakers) acquired by a bilingual in both languages (in German *gleichgewichtiger Sprachstand*) and can be maintained at the same level. This case is true mostly for children of mixed-nationality parents, who acquired both languages as their mother tongues (see Bausch 2003). Some consider this type of bilinguism to be unattainable or very rare, even if a bilingual devotes more or less the same amount of time to acquiring each language (see Kubiak 2003, Olpińska 2004). It happens more often that individual skills in each language are developed at various levels, which depends on numerous factors such as the type, the intensity and the time of the first contact with each language, educational background, emotional attitude, personal motivation and others (see Larsen-Freeman and Long 1991: 172).

Dominant (asymmetrical) bilinguism, also called *subordinate* (see Grucza 1981) is typical of bilinguals whose communicative range in one language is wider or narrower than in the other. Which of the languages becomes dominant depends on social factors, e.g. emigrants usually acquire one language and learn another simultaneously (see Bausch 2003). 'Equality is possible only between equal varieties of languages, that is between two standard languages or between two dialects. The relation between different varieties of languages is usually of subordinate/dominant character' (see Grucza 1981: 22–23).

1.4. The function of languages criterion

Languages A and B in an individual case of bilinguism can perform diverse functions in communication acts and it is not insignificant which language fulfils which function (see Grucza 1981). Their specialization is socially conditioned and determines the stability of a bilingual group. Functions carried out by languages that come into bilingual contact are shared between them while in monolingual societies they perform their functions separately. Which language performs which functions is not an arbitrary decision of a bilingual but depends on numerous social factors, e.g.:

A. people taking part in the communication, their age and gender (With whom?). This factor is most frequently governed by the following two rules (see Kubiak 2003: 39–49):
   - the OPOL rule (One Parent One Language), under which each parent speaks a different language to the child, e.g. the mother speaks Polish, the father – German
   - the BPBL rule (Both Parents Both Languages), under which both parents use both languages when speaking to their children. This rule is the reverse of the previous one. Both rules allocate specific functions to the languages used, depending on the child's interlocutors;

B. circumstances, in which a communication act occurs, including the current mood of the bilingual, his or her emotional attitude towards the interlocutor (In what situation?);

C. location of the communication act (Where?). Depending on this location, the functions of the languages change according to the ML@H rule (Minority Language at Home), which says that among family members or at home a different language is used than outside (see Kubiak 2003);

D. topic of the communication act (About what?), e.g. a language of serious conversation – a language of games, fairytales and mealtime etc.

E. aim which the bilingual wants to achieve, and simultaneously the communications channel (oral or written) which the bilingual chooses (With what aim?)

Different communication acts are characterized by different sets of such factors, which determines the probability of choosing one or the other language (Woźniakowski 1982). Bilinguals very often make such decisions unconsciously. A phenomenon in which a bilingual uses each of the two languages in separate contexts, e.g. language A at home and language B in formal situations is called *functional* bilinguism (see Bausch 2003, Baker 1993, Graf 1987, Lambeck 1984, Aleemi 1991) or *systematic* bilinguism dependent on communication partner (type A), on topic (type D) and on style (type B) (see Grucza 1981). In other situations we can talk about *mixed* bilinguism.

A very special case of this functional diversification of languages and very narrow specialization is *diglossia*, a phenomenon first described by Ferguson (1959), in which one language is used in everyday situations, and another – in very rare, precisely specified contexts, e.g. for religious cult. A functional diversification, which is less rigorous and less clear, and involves using two languages alternately, is called *code switching*. This term was coined by Haugen (1956) (see Shaffer 1978).

1.5. The criterion of the way language systems are stored

On the basis of this criterion we can define *bilinguism of mental representation*, which is divided into three categories: *compound* bilinguism, *coordinate* bilinguism and *subordinate* bilinguism (see Weinreich 1953). Polish linguists name those categories *złożony*, *współrzędny* and *podrzędny* (see Woźniakowski 1982, Lipińska 2004), *koordynacyjny* and *kompozycyjny* (see Michalewska 1991) or *mieszany* and *czysty* (see Kurcz) accordingly. Some divide bilinguism of mental representation only into the first two categories, treating subordinate bilinguism as a kind of compound bilinguism (see Erwin and Osgood in Kurcz 1992: 183).

In *compound* bilinguism two different systems of language coding are recorded in mind on the same compound level. The two language systems are partially mixed (a word and its equivalent in the other language refer to the same semanteme) (see Woźniakowski 1982). One of the most illustrative examples of this bilinguism is learning a foreign language at school, on the basis of a native language. According to some authors, however, (see Klein 1986) this category also includes simultaneous acquisition of two native languages by children. Every two language systems have some elements in common, and

consequently, a child acquiring two languages simultaneously is likely to develop one universal system whose elements will be interchangeable.

In *coordinate* bilinguism two different systems of language coding are recorded in mind as complete but separate systems called coordinate systems. This type of bilinguism is characterised by the language systems that are completely separately stored: a given word and its equivalent in the other language refer to two different semantemes, so they will have different meaning' Woźniakowski (1982: 45–46). From this category originated the concept of a bilingual who uses one language in the communication with e.g. his or her parents, and the other one in functionally separate contexts, e.g. in professional life. Such a bilingual is called a *true bilingual* (see Bausch 2003). In coordinate bilinguism two languages encode and decode the message independently and a coordinate bilingual is unable to translate word for word, although they have acquired great fluency in both languages (see Lipińska 2004). This type is sometimes also related to consecutive bilinguism, in which a bilingual first develops one system, which later, as the acquisition of a foreign language starts, is accompanied by the second, completely separate system. Using either one or the other language, a bilingual alternates between the first and the second system, instead of operating one universal system (see Klein 1986).

Subordinate bilinguism occurs when two language systems are completely inseparable: 'In this case a given word in one language does not refer at all to the corresponding fragment of extralinguistic reality, but to the corresponding word (its equivalent) in the other language' Woźniakowski (1982: 45–46). This type of bilinguism often results from learning a language at school, where explanations are given in the children's native language via translation. (see Lipińska 2004).

1.6. The sequence of acquisition criterion

Bilinguism can also be divided into different types according to the age of bilinguals and, consequently, to the sequence of acquisition. The acquisition of two first (native) languages in infancy via parents and people who accompany the child in everyday life, e.g. a nanny or a group of peers is called *infant* bilinguism (see Bausch 2003), *bilingual first language acquisition (bilingual FLA)* (see Klein 1986), *parallel* bilinguism (see Grucza 1981, Kubiak 2003) or *simultaneous* bilinguism (see Siguàn and Mackey 1987). The pace of such acquisition of two languages is, however, hardly ever even; one of them usually gains dominance over the other, which is unavoidable.

The other type resulting from the given criterion is *consecutive* or *successive* bilinguism (see Bausch 2003, Siguàn and Mackey 1987, Baker 1993), also called *second language acquisition (SLA)* (see Klein 1986), *succeeding* bilinguism (see Grucza 1981) or *sequential* bilinguism (see Kubiak 2003). It occurs when the second language is acquired later, in childhood starting from the age of three or in adulthood, after the acquisition of the native language has already started or has even been completed, no matter if it happens spontaneously or at school. What is crucial in this type of bilinguism is the fact that the acquisition of the second language is delayed in relation to the acquisition of the first one. Simultaneous acquisition is usually typical of infants while successive acquisition corresponds more often to school pupils, youngsters and adults. In the latter case the dominance of one language over the other and functional specializations of both languages tend to occur more often than in simultaneous bilinguism, which is proved by numerous interferences from the dominant language (see Klein 1986).

1.7. The range of bilinguism criterion

Bilinguism can cover different range. If only one person in a given community is bilingual, then we can talk about *individual* bilinguism. Its opposite is *group (social)* bilinguism is which occurs when all the members of a community, who belong to the same language group, can use the same two languages (see Grucza 1981). Group (social) and individual bilinguism depend on each other during the process of acquisition, because the bilinguism of each member of a community is indispensable for the existence and functioning of this bilingual community. In consequence, individual bilinguism seems to be superior to social bilinguism. On the other hand, without individual bilinguism a member of a community could not efficiently communicate with other members of the community (Woźniakowski 1982).

Group bilinguism can be divided into *permanent* bilinguism and *coincidental (temporary)* bilinguism, which results from tourism, business trips etc. Additionally, permanent bilinguism can be called *historical*, if it already existed within a given community before a prospective bilingual member of this community was born, or *migrant* – if it is a result of migration of a given community (see Grucza 1981). Group bilinguism is also subdivided into:
– *unilateral* bilinguism, which is true in a situation when all members of a language group, whose native language is language A are able to use also the language of group B, which does not speak language A. Consequently, members of group A will use language B to communicate with group

B, and languages A or B when communicating with each other. Members of such language groups can use languages A and B:
- in a mixed way when languages A and B are used in the same communicative situations alternately
- in a systematic way when language A is used in different contexts than language B, e.g. one language is used among family members, the other – in formal situations;
– *bilateral* bilinguism – when all members of language group A know language B and vice versa. Then the members of such language groups themselves can choose in which language they want to communicate
– third category, in which only one person speaks both languages A and B, and the other members of language groups A and B are monolingual, so to communicate with group A this person will use language A, and with group B – language B.

1.8. The territory criterion

There are four categories of acquisition depending on the territory, where a language has been acquired (Grucza 1981):
– both languages were acquired in the territory of the language A group
– both languages were acquired in the territory of the language B group
– language A was acquired in the territory of the language A group and language B – in the territory of the language B group
– languages A and B were acquired in the historically bilingual territory A,B

1.9. The circumstances of acquisition criterion

Bilingualism also depends on the circumstances in which acquisition took place and on the means of acquisition. If a language was acquired by staying or living within a community using this language (e.g. a whole nation or just a family), then such bilinguism is called *naturalistic* (see Grucza 1981, Bausch 2003, Weinert 1987), *spontaneous* or *untutored (unguided)* (see Klein 1986). Some authors (see Schönpflug 1977, Fthenakis and others 1985, Graf 1987, Aleemi 1991) do not restrict this type only to the acquisition within a language group, but claim that everyday contact with a person using the language e.g. a nanny is enough to acquire the language in a naturalistic way. In other words, such a language does not have to be a native language of the whole community. Others (see Jonekeit and Kielhöfer 1995, Blocher 1982) treat this type of bilinguism as an artificial one.

Artificial bilinguism, also known as *classroom* bilinguism (see Grucza 1981, Weinert 1987), *academic* bilinguism (Lipińska 2004), *guided/tutored* bilinguism (Bausch 2003, Klein 1986), *rational* bilinguism (Woźniakowski 1982) or *cultivated* bilinguism (Olpińska 2004, Blocher 1982) is the result of lessons, courses or private lessons at home given by a native speaker such as e.g. a nanny, an au pair or a tutor. This type is also called individual bilinguism without group bilinguism, because at school (unlike in a language group) all students as a class do not form simultaneously a language group (Woźniakowski 1982).

Those two ways of acquisition very often blend with each other, which leads to a situation when naturalistic acquisition precedes artificial one and vice versa (Grucza 1981, Lipińska 2004). That is why what occurs more frequently is a variant of those two types of bilinguism, in which acquisition is bolstered by learning and vice versa. Pure acquisition is a very rare phenomenon starting from school-age children who receive formal education. In this case the processes of acquisition and learning influence each other. Adults usually learn a foreign language via academic, formal and conscious education; even if it happens abroad in natural circumstances, they don't learn as fast and unnoticed as children and what acquisition of a language does is only assist the process of learning. Even if spontaneity appears in adult SLA, it is to some extent restricted by the knowledge of the first language (Lipińska 2004).

Main differences between naturalistic and artificial bilinguism are presented in the table below:

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
Linguistic input (Woźniakowski 1982, Klein 1986)	a lot of linguistic input, that is data to process, unlimited access to it, good base for drawing conclusions and forming hypotheses, authentic input which results from everyday communication and situational contexts	little linguistic input, limited access, little base for drawing conclusions and forming hypotheses, linguistic input is not very authentic

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
The sequence of learning the input (Klein 1986)	spontaneous, natural	not very natural, imposed by e.g. by the curriculum or a teacher
Time spent on studying/acquiring (Woźniakowski 1982)	a great deal	Little
Motivation for studying/acquiring (Woźniakowski 1982, Klein 1986)	great, because efficient communication is aimed at, without which it's not possible to coexist in a bilingual community	little, because the main focus is placed on the language itself and metalinguistics connected with it
Awareness of acquisition/learning (Krashen i Terrell 1985)	lack of awareness, in natural circumstances, like in the circumstances when the first language is acquired, a person acquiring a language is not aware of this process. They do not realize language rules that they acquired (implicite), but usually they have a feeling for linguistic correctness	complete; learners have formal linguistic knowledge (explicite), so also full awareness of their actions
Spontaneity of learning (Woźniakowski 1982).	complete	lack of spontaneity
Forming bilingual community (Woźniakowski 1982)	yes	No

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
Using the language that is being acquired in practice (Weinert 1987, Klein 1986)	from the very beginning, it happens in line with learning/acquisition via social interaction and communication attempts with other members of the language group, which means even more opportunities to verify the learner's own language production. A partial paradox appears here: a person has to acquire/learn a language in order to be able to communicate with other members of the language community, and on the other hand, the same person acquires a language via communication. The more we communicate, the better access we have to the linguistic input, the more opportunities we have to verify our linguistic production, and the greater chance to master the language, and simultaneously, to achieve communication success	first the linguistic input is presented, and only then exercises are done as practice

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
Systematic and intentional intervention (Klein 1986)	free from systematic and intentional intervention, but not from any intervention at all, acquisition via everyday communication	systematic and intentional intervention
Rules that govern the language (Klein 1986)	deduced from the linguistic input	usually presented by the teacher
Communicative partnership (Komorowska 1999)	full; interlocutors in an individual conversation usually enjoy the same linguistic and communicative rights	lack of communicative partnership, unequal rights, the teacher controls communication, monitors a group of students who are subordinate to him/her
The time proportions of discourse (Komorowska 1999)	more or less equal time proportions of discourse by each interlocutor in everyday conversations	in the classroom – as research shows – the teacher's discourse amounts to 2/3 of the whole time, students' discourse – only 1/3
The opportunity to initiate communication (Komorowska 1999)	each interlocutor has an equal opportunity to initiate conversation	it is the teacher who most often initiates communication
Unpredictability of what the communication partner is going to say (Komorowska 1999)	complete; discourse is of creative character	lack of unpredictability, classroom discourse is fully predictable
Redundancy (Komorowska 1999)	yes; natural language is rich in various forms of expression, so even if we do not know all the elements of a text we can reproduce it, e.g. abbreviated or incomplete texts	lack of redundancy; students are usually required to know the meaning of every single word in a text

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
Non-verbal communication (Komorowska 1999)	great; gestures, facial expressions, posture, voice pitch, look	poor; without gestures and facial expressions, which leads to unnatural communication
Information gap (Komorowska 1999)	occurs; interlocutors differ in the amount of information, that is why they initiate communication	very often does not occur; the teacher asks questions to which he/she well knows the answer; the teacher cares more about the form of the students' utterances than their content
Integration of all language skills (Komorowska 1999)	complete; a few language skills are used simultaneously	most often language skills are not integrated; language is practised according to the previously determined curriculum, so skills are practised separately
Style diversification (Komorowska 1999)	complete; the discourse is flexible in terms of style because it depends on the interlocutor and the setting; conversation with a friend is different in terms of vocabulary than with a clerk	lack of style diversification

TYPE OF FACTOR	NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM CONTRA ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM	ARTIFICIAL BILINGUISM CONTRA NATURALISTIC BILINGUISM
The kind of communicative situation (Szczodrowski 2004:21)	'greater frequency of direct receptive and productive participating of an individual in communicative interactions'	lack of direct receptive and productive participation of an individual in communicative interactions", because a foreign language is learned in institutionalized circumstances (at school or on courses), when the subject of study is a modern, classical or artificial language (e.g. esperanto, ido, novial etc.)
Three main factors forming the base of the process of learning (Szczodrowski 2004:41)	1. lack of curriculum determined in advance 2. lack of glottodidactically arranged linguistic input 3. lack of lesson units	'1.a fixed curriculum of teaching and learning a foreign language 2. glottodidactically arranged linguistic input in course books and other teaching materials 3. strategically arranged lesson units with highlighted glottodidactic goals to be achieved'

1.10. The status of languages criterion

Languages that come into direct bilingual contact can have a different sta-tus. That is why we have to differentiate between acquiring the standard va-rieties of both languages and acquiring dialectal varieties of those languages. The standard language is here understood as 'a non-dialectal and non-soci-olectal standard variety of a language' (Grucza 1981: 20–21). The acquisition of two different dialects of the same language or of a dialect and the standard variety of a language can also be called bilinguism.

In this paper one more category was added to the aforementioned typolo-gy, namely, the acquisition of a standard variety of one language (in the case of the family under investigation it is Standard German) and a dialect of the other language (in this case it is Silesian (*śląski*) – a dialect used in Silesia, a region in southwestern Poland). This category falls into *diversified* bilin-guism, which is opposite to *balanced* bilinguism, 'concerning two correspon-ding varieties of the languages' (see Woźniakowski 1982: 31–37).

1.11. The criterion of the knowledge of culture developed by the language communities.

This criterion implies that bilinguism and *biculturism* are intertwined (Grucza 1989: 9–49). It is supported by the fact that lexical, syntactic and morphological systems as well as phonemic and graphemic systems of a lan-guage are the products of a culture typical of a group using this language. Consequently, if a human language is part of culture, then we can conclude that if a person is bilingual, he or she is also bicultural to a certain degree.

What is included in *biculturism* is the knowledge which a blingual has about the material and spiritual products of two different language groups and practical ability to acquire the ways of thinking and the ways of assess-ing different fragments of reality typical of those two language groups (Grucza 1989). In other words, biculturism implies knowing the common so-cial code of the two language groups, which includes their values and norms as well as the ways and rules of using the language and the principles of their interpretation (see Woźniakowski 1982). In consequence, communicative competence consists not only of language competence but also cultural com-petence, that is the knowledge about the culture that the other language group represents. Like language competence, cultural competence can be achieved at a lower or higher level; it can be passive or active. As a result, maximal bilinguism is likely to occur only when a bilingual has full language

competence and full cultural competence in both languages. This situation is, however, very rare. The following two categories can be discerned:
– when a bilingual has achieved language competence and cultural competence in both languages A and B (*bilinguism with biculturism*)
– when a bilingual has achieved language competence in both languages A and B, but cultural competence in only one of the languages (*bilinguism with monoculturism*)

Together with other competences 'the knowledge of basic elements of a foreign culture and the ability to use the language fluently and adequately' (see Pfeiffer, 2001: 148–149) are indispensable for a language user to communicate efficiently in a foreign language.

1.12. The attitude to the language criterion

If a positive quality is attributed to a language, then such a bilinguism is called *additive* or *enriching*. Such category is also called *elite* bilinguism, in contrast to *subtractive* or *impoverishing* bilinguism, also called *folk* bilinguism (Lambert 1982, Lipińska 2004, Olpińska 2004). Additive bilinguism occurs when the dominant language in a language group is the native language of bilingual children. Then they gain a broader cognitive perspective thanks to acquiring a new language and a new culture. Their native language continues developing and in this aspect those bilingual children do not differ from monolingual children (Olpińska 2004). In the opposite situation a negative quality is attributed to a language, which is illustrated by restricting the number of minority languages. The native languages of minorities are finally replaced by the language of majority and this process very often results from necessity or compulsion and poses a threat to the minority languages. Consequently, children acquire a new language at the expense of their native language, which becomes neglected. Elite bilinguism can characterize a majority group which acquires/learns the minority language or an individual who voluntarily learns foreign languages without any threat to the native language.

1.13. Conclusions

All in all, bilinguism turns out to be a very heterogeneous and hardly definable phenomenon. This is proved right by the fact that there is a multitude of more or less overlapping definitions of bilinguism depending on the

established criterion. In particular the trouble with forming the right definition result from the difficulties in forming the definition of 'full' proficiency in a language. Superficially, bilinguism may appear to imply 'full' proficiency in two languages that one person demonstrates. It is, however, only one of many criteria (and what is more, not a very precise one), laid down to study bilinguism. We can conclude that the definition of bilinguism should include all the possible criteria, and the resultant inner taxonomy should be part of it. As the typology of bilinguism, which has been presented in this paper, shows, although the list of types is very long, it is still incomplete. Taking into consideration the fact that the phenomenon of bilinguism has been investigated from various angles, this list can still be gradually completed.

References

Aleemi, J. (1991): *Zur sozialen und psychischen Situation von Bilingualen*. (= Sprachwelten Bd. 6). Peter Lang Verlag. Frankfurt am Main.

Baker, C. (1993): *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. Clevedon.

Bausch, K.-R., Christ, H., Krumm, H.-J. (ed.) (2003): Zwei- und Mehrsprachigkeit: Überblick. In: *Handbuch Fremdsprachenunterricht*. Francke: Tübingen und Basel. 439–445.

Blocher, E. (1982): Zeisprachigkeit: Vorteile und Nachteile. In: Swift, J. (ed.): *Bilinguale und Multikulturelle Erziehung*. Verlag Königshausen und Neumann. Würzburg. 17–25.

Fthenakis, W.-E. et al. (1985): *Bilingual-bikulturelle Entwicklung des Kindes. Ein Handbuch für Psychologen, Pädagogen und Linguisten*. Staatsinstitut für Frühpädagogik. Max Hueber Verlag. München.

Graf, P. (1987): *Frühe Zeisprachigkeit und Schule. Empirische Grundlagen zur Erziehung von Migrantenkinder*. Münchner Universitätsschriften. Max Hueber Verlag. München.

Grucza, F. (1981): Glottodydaktyczne implikacje bilingwizmu. In: Grucza, F. (ed.): *Bilingwizm a glottodydaktyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UW. 9–39.

Grucza, F. 1989. Język a kultura, bilingwizm a bikulturyzm: lingwistyczne i glottodydaktyczne aspekty interlingwalnych i interkulturowych różnic oraz zbieżności. In: Grucza, F. (ed.): *Bilingwizm, bikulturyzm, implikacje glottodydaktyczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UW. 9–49.

Ferguson, Ch.-A. 1959. Diglossia. In: *Word* 15. 325–340.

House, J., Edmondson, W. (1993): *Einführung in die Sprachlehrforschung*. Tübingen: Francke. 8–12.

Jonekeit, S., Kielhöfer, B. (1995): *Zweisprachige Kindererziehung*. Stauffenburg Verlag. Tübingen.

Klein, W. (1986): *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Komorowska, H. (1999): *Metodyka nauczania języków obcych*.

Krashen, S.-D. (1981): *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.-D., Terrell, T.-D. (1985): *The Natural Approach. Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Pergamon Press & Alemany Press. Oxford.

Kubiak, B. (2003): Dwu- i wielojęzyczność dzieci. In: *Języki Obce w Szkole*. Nr specjalny 6 „My w Europie".

Kurcz, I. (1992): *Język a psychologia*. WSiP. Warszawa.

Lambeck, K. (1984): *Kritische Anmerkungen zur Bilingualismusforschung*. Gunter Narr Verlag. Tübingen.

Lambert, W. (1982): Die zwei Gesichter zweisprachiger Erziehung. In: Swift, J. (ed.) *Bilinguale und Multikulturelle Erziehung*. Verlag Königshausen und Neumann. Würzburg. 44–50.

Larsen-Freeman, D., Long, M. (1991): *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. Longman. London–New York.

Lipińska, E. (2003): *Język ojczysty, język obcy, język drugi. Wstęp do badań dwujęzyczności*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, Kraków.

Olpińska, M. (2004): *Wychowanie dwujęzyczne*. Wydawnictwo UW. Warszawa.

Pfeiffer, W. (2001): *Nauka języka obcego. Od praktyki do praktyki*. Poznań: Wagros.

Schönpflug, U. (1977): *Psychologie des Erst- und Zweitspracherwerbs. Eine Einführung*. Kohlhammer Verlag. Stuttgart.

Shaffer, D. (1978): The Place of Code-Switching in Linguistic Contacts. In: Paradis, M. (ed.): *Aspects of Bilingualism*. Hornbeam Press. Columbia.

Siguàn, M., Mackey, W. (1987): *Education and bilingualism*. Kogan Page in association with UNESCO, London.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1981): *Bilingualism or not. The Education of Minorities*. Multilingual Mattera. London

Szczodrowski, M. (2004): *Glottokodematyka a nauka języków obcych*. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego. Gdańsk.

Weinert, R. (1987): Processes in Classroom Second Language Development: the Acquisition of negation in German. Ellis, R. (ed.): *Second Language Acquisition in Context*. Pretince-Hall English Language Teaching.

Weinreich, U. (1953):. *Languages in contact*. Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York. No.1. New York.

Woźniakowski, W. (1982): *Glottodydaktyka w świetle zjawiska bilingwizmu naturalnego*. Ossolineum, Wrocław.