DEVIANCE BEYOND GRAMMAR

Karol Janicki

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

As has been stressed by some authors (e.g. James 1971, Marton 1972), contrastive analysis (CA) and error analysis are complementary to each other, i.e., error analysis may be looked at as a procedure verifying pedagogical predictions possibly inferred from data available within CA. The majority of contrastive studies to date have been of non-sociolinguistic orientation, i.e. they have been analyses disregarding the social reality of linguistic behavior. In earlier papers (Janicki 1979a, b) we attempted to set up a general methodological framework within which regular contrastive sociolinguistic studies might evolve. The underlying aim of the *present* paper is to point to the necessity of developing an extension, or a sociolinguistic equivalent, of error analysis. Thus we intend to encourage studies which are complementary to contrastive sociolinguistics.

Graphically the interrelationships among the four fields mentioned above will take the following form:

linguistics contrastive analysis	error analysis
sociolinguistics contrastive sociolinguistic analysis	sociolinguistic deviance analysis (SDA)

One might go on expanding the chart to arrive at:

linguistics contrastive analysis (CA)	error analysis
contrastive sociolinguistic analysis	SDA
contrastive paralinguistic analysis	communicational (socio- interactional) deviance analysis (CDA)

We suggest that the researcher's attention be drawn to communicational behavior in its entirety as:

1. after all, communication does include proxemic, kinesic, etc., along with linguistic behavior,

2. speech communities vary not only with respect to communicational patterns but also with respect to attitude toward these very patterns when not conformed to (Argyle 1975),[1] and

3. preliminary, data empirically collected, indicate extensive occurrence of exolinguistic rule infringement.

Whether the analyst will get involved in SDA or whether he will investigate communicational deviance is his individual choice, although we should strongly encourage studies aiming at the biggest integration feasible.

Sociolinguistic deviance in the foreign language situation has hardly been given any systematic treatment so far. Authors usually limit their sociolinguistic concern to brief remarks and references. In the most recent Polish publication on error analysis (Grucza 1978) there is no single mention of sociolinguistic or communicational rule violation. It must be emphasized that by whatever we say throughout this paper we do not mean to vilify the significance of error analysis, or to suggest that SDA or CDA replace it. What we intend to put forward is the idea of having to increase the range of error analysis, and in this way supplement it by SDA and possibly by CDA.

There are at least two reasons underlying the situation described above:

1. Irrespective of the evident variety of objectives toward which an individual foreign language course may be geared, generally a tendency has been observed recently toward teaching and learning communicative skills.

2. A considerable number of native speakers of English temporarily resident in Poland have not only reported many instances of socio- and paralinguistic rule violation on the part of the Polish student of English, but also stressed that deviant behavior going beyond grammar[2] bothers them much more than errors in syntax, vocabulary or pronunciation. Such behavior willy-nilly does sometimes result in unintended social consequences.

In view of 1 and 2, SDA and CDA emerge as a corollary and as a necessity. The problem now is to state what SDA and CDA actually are, what sort of inquiries they entail, and finally in what way they differ from error analysis. In the remaining part of the paper we try to relate to the questions posed, and elaborate on some ramifications that our standpoint generates.

---

[1] Argyle (1975), among other things stresses that "Arabs like the Japanese are very sensitive to non-verbal communication partly since they too engage in a lot of stereotyped formal behavior which needs to be supplemented verbally" (1975 : 91). We find it relevant to learn how speech communities differ in attitude to communicational rule violations.

[2] Grammar pertains here basically to syntax and phonology.

One might reflect at this point on whether teaching the social use of language, and moreover, teaching the patterns of overall communicational behavior, fall within the scope of what has always been called *teaching a foreign language*. While the question of teaching the social use of language hardly seems to be eligible for defiance, teaching overall socio-interactional behavior is a matter of a more arbitrary decision. It is our contention that CDA is a legitimate endeavor, as *teaching a foreign language* should actually be expanded and thus relabeled to *teaching how to communicate in the foreign culture* whereupon the core of the teaching process would certainly pertain to the foreign language.

ERROR ANALYSIS VS. SDA AND CDA

In our understanding SDA and CDA widely differ from error analysis not only in the scope of research involved but also, and very significantly, in the working procedures that they entail. Below we try to pinpoint the most striking differences that emerge at the present state of research.

1. The linguistic (i.e., pertinent to error analysis) norm against which linguistic behavior is measured is much easier to define, basically because the linguistic code has been scientifically described. The sociolinguistic norm of any kind, let alone the communicational norm, has *not* been described scientifically, and therefore can hardly be stated in an explicit way.

2. Linguistic deviance, as opposed to socio-interactional rule encroachment, is much easier to detect, largely, again, because the linguistic system is much better known in theoretical terms.

3. The areas potential to sociolinguistic, and in particular socio-interactional, rule violation are much easier to avoid than those potential to linguistic mistakes,[3] hence

4. The role of elicitation procedures in SDA and CDA is much more significant than in error analysis.[4] It may actually turn out to be one of the major strategies leading to reliable data collection.

---

[3] Take for instance kinesic patterns. If during a conversation one sits without any noticeable moving of one's arms and legs, communication may be carried out without any impairment. There is no area of potential kinesic deviance in question. Once one starts moving one's arms and legs, however, one has to know how to do it to fit the given social situation. Then potential kinesic deviance emerges. One cannot avoid linguistic behavior in this sense.

[4] Corder (1973) actually contrasts error analysis and elicitation procedures. "Error analysis is applied to what the learner produces, his composition exercises, précis, and so on. It is applied to what the learner chooses to say, or write, that is *his* sampling of what he can do, not *ours*. Elicitation procedures impose *our* sampling on the learner. They aim to 'put him on the spot'. Elicitation procedures are an error-provoking activity, whilst spontaneous speech is an error-avoiding one" (1973 : 367–8).

5. As SDA relates to sociolinguistics in an obvious way, SDA takes over from sociolinguistics some of the basic methodological procedures with regard to data collection. Unlike the analyst working within the error analysis framework, the SDA researcher has to resort to speech communities defined explicitly in sociolinguistic terms. In other words, while workers in error analysis have only implicitly referred to exolinguistic categories correlating with linguistic reality, the SD analyst in the long run is expected to match his findings against sociological indices. Such a procedure is consonant with the fact that sociolinguists, as opposed to linguists, are not only aware of language variation, but also take account of it in a principled manner.

6. Data collection entails data collectors. While within error analysis data can be fairly easily collected by non-native speakers with a good command of the target language, deviant behavior pertinent to the sociolinguistic and socio-interactional systems is hardly detectable by the non-native. Exceptions are instances of drastic violation like *Mr. George (which is inappropriate when used as an equivalent of the Polish "panie Jurku") or sequences like *A. How are you? B. Not too good. Actually I've had a cough for two days, and I've been thinking of visiting a doctor. I've been sneezing for a few days also, ...etc. This fact relates to, again (cf. p. 63), and may be accounted for by, the non-availability of scientific descriptions of sociolinguistic and socio-interactional behavior. Until such descriptions become available, the native speakers' intuitive judgements will prove most helpful in arriving at any data at all. It is the sociolinguists' task to then interpret such data and thus render descriptions in terms of sociolinguistic categories. All in all, the native speaker's function in data collection within SDA is not only to supply information on categories already differentiated (e.g., patterns of interruption), but also to arrive at new categories which the non-native speaker is very much unlikely to be able to arrive at. In the case of the linguistic system, the categories with reference to which potential deviant behavior exists are known; it is only the occurrence, distribution, and interpretation of errors that are of concern.

It seems justifiable to say that studying and trying to eradicate deviant sociolinguistic behavior are activities of utmost importance to sociolinguists and language teachers. We refer here to a hierarchy of significance against which any instance of rule infraction might be measured. It is a well known fact that from the point of view of social consequences and communicative effect, mistakes vary widely. In this respect, sociolinguistic and socio-interactional errors evidently take a central situation. As exolinguistic behavior in the foreign language situation is undoubtedly much less conscious than behavior governed by formation rules, sociolinguistic and socio-interactional rules are much more susceptible to misapplication. It follows that, for instance, the intended function of an utterance may be misinterpreted due to either external or internal interference which precludes unencumbered interaction. Thus insult or acqui-

escence may be aroused unintentionally in situations where the alter has no cues to the effect that the utterances are not labeled as such.

We now intend to raise one of the basic questions within what we have called SDA and CDA, namely, *what to study*? The area of potential research for CDA[5] is enormously vast. It includes any form of social interaction involving the use (or potential use) of language. Although emphasis is put on face-to-face encounters, other forms of interaction (e.g., telephone conversations) also count in. Below we provide an informal and unstructured list of labels which are examples of categories that the sociolinguist investigating deviance will be interested in.

1. sex-specific forms
2. age-specific forms
3. the superimposed social role 'foreigner'
4. social role — e.g., student, friend, porter, bartender
5. social situation (combination of *participants+setting*), e.g., frozen, casual, etc.
6. topic
7. co-occurrence of linguistic forms in a series of utterances temporarily contiguous (pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar)
    a. horizontal — congruence within one component (example of deviance: He's com*in* and look*in* and speak*ing*)
    b. vertical — congruence across components (example of deviance: *Sir*, he's juxtapos*in* and contriv*in*...)
8. alternation rules; choice of forms, e.g., Prof., Dr., Mr., George, Sir, etc.
9. sequencing utterances — e.g., sequence during initiation of conversation
10. directness vs. indirectness — e.g., direct vs. indirect refusal, request, answer, question, etc.
11. turn-taking, duration of turns
12. patterns of interruptions
13. overlappings (last word of the previous speaker overlaps the first word of the following speaker)
14. silence — refraining from speaking
15. alienation from interaction (gaze, posture)
16. choice of topic in a given speech situation
17. posture
18. socio-fugal, sociopetal orientation
19. haptics (touch code)
20. voice loudness

---

[5] As CDA is superordinate to SDA, CDA will be used in the remaining part of the paper to refer to both CDA and SDA.

21. gaze
22. clothing
23. kinethetic code — what people do with their arms, legs, bodies, etc.
24. kissing — patterns of formal and casual kissing, e.g., kissing on the cheek, hand.
25. interactional patterns like announcing visits, postjustifying and pre-negotiating behavior
26. telephone conversations — e.g., patterns of sequencing
27. olfaction as a means of communication.

CDA should not be limited, however, to deviancy data collection, description and interpretation. The range of topics within CDA should also include *attitude to deviance.* In other words, we would like to find out not only what errors are made and how one could possibly account for their occurrence, but also what native speakers think of communicative behavior impaired through some sort of interference. The phenomenon is very likely to turn out to be quite complex. It seems that the native speaker does not show a uniform and constant attitude toward sociolinguistic and communicational rule transgression. His opinion as to the value of a given category of deviance will depend largely on both linguistic and sociological characteristics of context.

It follows that studies of attitude to deviance will have to control a number of variables which very significantly influence obtained results. Central to the studies of attitude is the superimposed role 'foreigner' which allows for or prohibits the use of some forms that the superimposed social role 'native' does not, i.e., our hypothesis is that some linguistic, sociolinguistic, and socio-interactional patterns that will pass[6] in the case of the native speaker, will not in that of the foreigner, and the other way round.

Studies of attitude will also have to relate to the degree of integration (both attempted and achieved) characteristic of a given student, or group of students. Such considerations have to intersect with those mentioned in the preceding paragraph as the degree of integration is one of the tokens to label a speaker as foreigner or not.

Furthermore, the student of attitude to sociolinguistic and socio-interactional deviance will have to undertake analyses of native speakers' attitude toward:

1. sociolinguistic and socio-interactional deviance as opposed to linguistic deviance[7]

---

[6] "Passing" implies here overall appropriateness as dictated by the individual roles (e.g., student, truck driver) in a given social situation.

[7] Some empirical evidence on the attitude to grammar mistakes is available from Triandis, Loh and Levin (1966).

2. individual sociolinguistic and socio-interactional categories, e.g., horizontal co-occurrence rule violation, *as opposed to others*, e.g., violation of interruption patterns[8]

3. one category as disclosed across distinguishable learning stages, i.e., it has to be found out whether attitude to a given label of deviance is an absolute category, or whether it is relative to the co-occurring knowledge of linguistic code

4. one category as detected in speakers with different social characteristics[9]

5. one category as encountered in speech situations which differ markedly with respect to the degree of formality.[10]

Studying attitude to deviance along the lines adumbrated above has at least two advantages. On the one hand, it allows gaining multiaspectual insight into the phenomenon of socio-interactional deviance, and on the other, it may enable a discovery of deviance categories worth studying from the pedagogical point of view.

DATA COLLECTION

One of the major differences between sociolinguistics and autonomous linguistics pertains to the methodological assumptions underlying data collection. Sociolinguistics implies multiform recording of performance in actual speech situations. Such a rigid methodological requirement imposes on the sociolin-

---

[8] The studying of this category of deviance offers an extremely valuable contribution to the results of the whole undertaking. It is our hunch that sociolinguistic and socio-interactional errors form a hierarchy of units which vary as to their significance for unencumbered interaction. When an explicitly stated set of criteria is provided, the hierarchy in question will be of much relevance for example to material gradation in course preparation.

[9] Our another impressionistic judgement that has to be tested empirically is that attitude to deviance differs with regard to such characteristics of the speaker as: age, sex, social status, and possibly others.

[10] Under this heading we might be able to find out whether for example formal forms of some type of behavior are offensive in informal situations to the same extent that informal forms are aberrant in formal speech situations. The common belief is that informal forms in formal situations are much more "dangerous" socially than the other way round. While this actually may be true, empirical evidence is called for to support the claim.

Interesting information on clothing as a means of communication has been obtained informally. In a cross-cultural situation (Anglo-Polish) the wearing of relatively formal clothing in situations which were differently defined by the two cultures in question (one defined the situations as much less formal than the other) was interpreted by one party contrary to the intention of the other, to the effect of outright surprise and subsequent aloofness. The description refers specifically to a situation where a Pole (who wore relatively formal clothing) presided over a meeting with a group of Americans and Englishmen. This is a typical example of socio-interactional deviance, clash, interference, and misunderstanding as a result.

guist a number of restrictions that either hinder or slow down his endeavors. Labov's (1972) "observer's paradox" is the best example to illustrate the problem.[11] Behavior becomes available to the researcher in a wide range of context, but not to the extent that he can make records (other than mental) for subsequent use. Hence it seems that a way to get around this difficulty (in both sociolinguistics and CDA) is to introduce a two stage analysis, which is not only methodologically reasonable but also indispensable for technical and financial reasons.

In such a scheme, stage 1 will result from introspection, intuition, and unstructured observation.[12] At stage 2, findings of stage 1 will be qualified, i.e., statements will be made relative to defined users and uses of language or other types of behavior. Goffman (1971) supports the use of stage 1. In his volume "unsubstantiated assertions are made regarding the occurrence of certain social practices in certain times and among peoples of various kinds. This description by pronouncement is claimed to be a necessary evil. I assume that if a broad attempt is to be made to tie together bits and pieces of contemporary social life in exploratory analysis, then a great number of assertions must be made without solid quantitative evidence" (1971:18). In the sociolinguist's understanding, stage two is indispensable for occurrence and distribution qualification, as studying variation implies the necessity to find out of whom and under what situational circumstances a given finding is true.

In view of the reasoning presented above, CDA undoubtedly remains currently at stage 1. Thus inquiries which we refer to in the foregoing paragraphs have to take on the form of pilot studies and pretests (if we follow Goode and Hatt's (1952) nomenclature)[13] which will prepare grounds for further large-scale investigations, and in this way enable statistical inference and legitimate generalizations.

[11] "The aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain these data by systematic observation" (Labov 1972 : 209).

[12] At this stage the qualification implied or stated informally will take forms like "quite common", "frequent", "routine". The status of the three — introspection, intuition, and unstructured observation — differs significantly in linguistics (basically transformational grammar) and sociolinguistics. Namely, while in the former introspection, intuition and unstructured observation allow for generalizations as to the competence of the 'ideal speaker-hearer' (thus boosting what Fillmore (1973) rightly calls 'armchair linguistics'), in the latter the three are a necessary prerequisite constituting a preliminary stage of the analysis proper.

[13] When discussing the questionnaire, Goode and Hatt distinguish between 'pilot study' and 'pretest'. The former refers to very general activities which precede hypotheses formulation. This is the task that the researcher carries out in a relatively informal way. The latter (pretest) is an attempt at pointing to the weaknesses of the questionnaire, when applied to a very small population.

In sociolinguistics proper numerous ways of collecting data have been distinguished and approved of (cf. Grimshaw (1974) for examples of some overall categories). CDA should certainly make use of these methodological tools. As, however, CDA focuses on instances of behavor that does not conform to rules, it must develop a methodology powerful also to handle such behavior. The problem arises since the foreign language speaker, unlike the native, employs strategies (typical of the foreign language learning process) which make access to his actual knowledge of the language difficult or impossible. One of the strategies in question that is of much interest to CDA is the *avoidance technique*. Roughly defined, 'avoidance technique' refers to the student's tendency to avoid using forms that he either does not know or is not sure of. As exolinguistic patterns of behavior allow for much avoidance, CDA has to, among other things, concentrate on how to arrive at data which would emerge weren't it for the avoidance techniques. [14]

It follows that CDA should strive at discovering not only what deviant structures the foreigner produces in natural interaction, but also what deviant structures he would most probably produce were he in some sense a native speaker, i.e., if he did not use avoidance techniques. [15] Thus the CD analyst has to resort primarily to 'elicitation procedures' (cf. note 4), which enable him to get from the learner what he is not very willing to sell. Also, the CD analyst will rely significantly on behavioral patterns observed in contrived situations, viz., in gatherings convened by the sociolinguist. Obviously, behavior recorded in natural settings is of tremendous value, but as our methodological tools enabling such observation are still much inadequate and ineffective, natural observation has to be extensively supplemented by other techniques.

DEVIANCE, NORM

Throughout this paper we have been using the terms *deviance* and *norm*, which are critical notions for the entire analysis. A deviant form (structure, pattern, instance of behavior, etc.) is one that departs from some norm; this seems to require no further clarification. It is the norm that causes trouble. The question arises: what is the norm that CDA should resort to? If one assumes that standard English is the variety commonly taught in Poland then

---

[14] Avoidance techniques on the part of the foreign language learner yield non-deviant patterns like, e.g., non-address, non-interruption (as the speaker does not know when and how to interrupt, he simply does not interrupt) let alone refraining from speaking whenever such a refraining as such is not deviant, which is a drastic example.

[15] It is true that native speakers of a language also make use of some sort of avoidance techniques, but these are different from the avoidance techniques we deal with, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

standard English should also be the norm against which behavior is to be evaluated. Subsequent problems crop up, namely, if an instance of behavior is to be assessed with respect to standard English, then a representative number of standard English speakers should be the raters in evaluation procedures of that sample of behavior. Such a requirement, though theoretically neat and plausible, is practically untenable. The amount of time, money, and organizational effort necessary for such an endeavor is far beyond any conceivable reach. It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that in view of the facts indicated above CDA cannot function. On the contrary, it is our contention that at least at stage 1 (cf. p. 68) CDA may rely on the norm as defined by the informants currently available, though they do not constitute a remarkably homogeneous speech community, in sociolinguistic terms. After all, the overwhelming majority of native speakers of English available in Poland for consultation *are* speakers of standard English. Native informant variables should be controlled (for example, national identification) to the extent possible, but the fact of having to address a representative (in statistical terms) and homogeneous population of raters should not be overestimated.

When research advances to stage 2, i.e., when attempts are made to obtain data that will permit legitimate generalizations, the controlling of informant variables ought to be more rigid. For a few years yet, such a necessity is very much unlikely to come to the fore.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the rationale underlying the present study refers not only to language learning. A constant feedback between contrastive sociolinguistics and CDA exists, and as new findings within CDA appear, contrastive sociolinguistics incorporates them into its theoretical framework. Thus CDA may be said to also contribute, indirectly, to the elaboration of a theory of language as a social phenomenon. This is possible since contrastive sociolinguistics provides not only a systematic juxtaposition of equivalent and nonequivalent sociolinguistic patterns, but also an analytical framework for the foundation of theories of language use.

APPENDIX[16]

1. "Several students coming to see me in my room didn't know what to do when invited to sit down, e.g., they carried on talking as they sat down, and sat on the edge of the bed".

2. "*Won't you come to the café with us?* Sometimes this or similar questions were put in such a way as to invite a negative response when such an intention was not wanted".

---

[16] In the appendix the reader can find examples of deviance that have been reported by native speakers of British and American English who were temporary residents of Poland and had daily contact with Polish students of English over the period of a few weeks.

3. "To interrupt several students used *please* — then a pause until attention had been gained before speaking".
4. "Use by many students of *rather not* in reply to a question as *Is it big?* Presumably a direct translation from Polish".
5. "Overly friendly — male to male in a tactile way. Touching shoulders, holding arm around waist".
6. "Students introduced me as a friend too quickly, in a very familiar way, making exaggerated impression of acquaintance".
7. "A male may too quickly expect a 'kissing farewell'".
8. "Stands and walks too close".
9. "Tries to adopt the *-in'* ending, which almost never, if ever, sounds appropriate unless student is absolutely fluent".
10. "Replying to *How are you?* with *Thank you*, instead of *Fine. Thank you*, or *Fine. And you?*".
11. "A weakness in the function of 'acceptance' and 'expressing thanks'. Students on the whole were very poor at, for instance, accepting drinks and offering drinks, both in their language and in their socio-physical behavior".
12. "Using English names instead of Polish — *I'm John* instead of *Janek*.
13. "Abuse of *lovely* by male students; *lovely* — female 85%".
14. "Here is Andrzej, on the phone".

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. 1975. *Bodily communication*. London: Methuen.

Bauman, R. and J. Sherzer. (eds). 1974. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corder, S. P. 1973. *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Fillmore, C. 1973. "A grammarian looks to sociolinguistics". In Shuy, R. (ed.). 1973. 273–287.

Goffman, E. 1971. *Relations in public*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goode, W. J. and P. Hatt. 1952. *Methods in social research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Grimshaw, A. 1974. "Data and data use in an analysis of communicative events". In In Bauman, R. and J. Sherzer. (eds). 1974. 419–424.

Grucza, F. (ed.). 1978. *Z problematyki błędów obcojęzycznych*. Warszawa: WSiP.

James, C. 1971. "The exculpation of contrastive linguistics". In Nickel, G. (ed.). 1971. 53–68.

Janicki, K. 1979a. "Toward contrasting styles". *PSiCL 9*. 23–33.

Janicki. K. 1979b. "Contrastive sociolinguistics. Some methodological considerations". *PSiCL 10*. 33–40.

Labov, W. 1972. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Marton, W. 1972. "Pedagogical implications of contrastive studies". *SAP 4*. 115–126.

Nickel, G. (ed.). 1971. *Papers in contrastive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shuy, R. (ed.). 1973. *Monograph series on languages and linguistics*. No. 25. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Triandis, H. C., Loh, W. D. and L. Levin. 1966. "Race, status, quality of spoken English, and opinions about civil rights as determinants of interpersonal attitudes". *Journal of personality and social psychology 3*. 468–472.