

NATIVE SPEAKERHOOD SOCIO- AND ETHNOLINGUISTIC COMPETENCE IN CO-ORDINATE AND COMPOUND BILINGUALISM¹

J.A.G. ARDILA
Jane NEVILLE

1. Introduction

Bilingualism and the many linguistic issues that relate to it have recently become of great interest to both society and linguists. To the non-linguist, native speakerhood and bilingualism are labels of social distinction and academic connotations: bilingual societies, such as the Spanish-Catalan of Catalunya, take pride of their regional identities' being safeguarded by the use of their regional languages; immigrants boast of their children's hypothetical dual native speakerhood; and others deem their knowledge of a foreign language an academic and social distinction. These three groups have grown significantly in the 90s, when, for instance, the Spanish and the British governments conferred upon their former kingdoms linguistic attributions (which result from political ones), migration has been facilitated by the EU open market, and foreign language learning has become a must -be it curricular or pragmatic- at all educational levels. The terms native speaker and bilingual have generally been used randomly; yet linguists have also endeavoured to discuss their implicatures. The aim of this paper is to examine bilingualism and native speakerhood (focusing on the English-Spanish example) in the light of proficiency implications in order to determine to what extent the balanced bilingual may be regarded a native speaker and a model in academic situations. Further to other issues, I shall argue that natural translation, i.e. "the translation done in everyday circumstances by people who have no special training for it" (Harris 1977: 97), is seldom satisfactory in superposed, or standard versions of a language, and that in a context-related standard sociolects cannot fit the bill (Giles et al 1975: 16).

2. Defining Bilingualism: Cultural Realizations and Linguistic Domain

Linguists have concluded that being bilingual implies speaking two languages. The question arises when one needs to measure second language competence. In his study *Bilingual Children*, George Saunders quoted Haugen, who claimed that "bilingualism begins at the point where a speaker of one language can produce complete, meaningful utterances in the other language". However, Saunders also referred to Diebold, for whom "a type of bilingualism has even commenced when a person begins to understand utterances in a second language without being able to utter anything him- or herself". In order to simplify the definition, Saunders (1983: 9) concluded: "Bilingualism, therefore, simply means having two languages". The question lies in the degree of competence the bilingual has in the two languages they speak, which concerns both cultural realisations and linguistic domain.

Bernard Spolsky emphasises the differences between compound bilinguals and co-ordinate bilinguals on the grounds of culture. Compound bilinguals are those who acquire a first language and afterward learn an additional one. Co-ordinate bilinguals are

¹ All English translations from Spanish are ours.

those who acquire two languages at the same time. "Over-simplifying", Spolsky (1998: 48) points out, "co-ordinate bilinguals were assumed to have two meaning systems each with its own set of words, while compound had a single system with two sets of words"; i.e. whereas Spanish-English co-ordinate bilinguals would have a signified for the signifier *coche*, and another signified for the signifier *car*, Spanish-English compound bilinguals would only have one signified for the two signifiers *coche* and *car*. Indeed, linguistic competence has been claimed to be amenable to culture. Some linguists argue that language belongs to a determined cultural identity, e.g. Charles Taylor (1994: 38) maintains that: *With the politics of equal dignity, what is established is meant to be universally the same, an identical basket of rights and immunities; with the politics of indifference, what we are asked to recognise is the unique identity of this individual or group, their distinctness from everyone else. The idea is that it is precisely this distinctness that has been ignored, glossed over, assimilated to a dominant or majority identity.*

Helen Leckie-Tarry (1995: 159) has further argued that culture is, alongside situation and context, one of the "three levels of a context involved in the meaning-making process", and consequently indispensable to understand any message. Accordingly, only coordinate bilinguals should claim a thorough command of the two languages they speak, since they alone possess a dual meaning system. All the above considerations imply that in general, compound bilinguals possess a biased and flawed command of their second language, because they are not as knowledgeable about the cultural identity of their second language as co-ordinate bilinguals are. This, allegedly, would cause co-ordinate bilinguals to be the most skilful translators.

Domain is a significant variable to allow for. The more domains a speaker is capable of mastering, the stronger their command of a language will be. Domain comprises location, role-relationships, and topics. *Home* and *school* are common domains. In the domain *home*, location is domestic environment; role-relationships are immediate family; and topics are predominantly domestic and personal. In the domain *school*, location is the educational centre; role-relationships are teacher, fellow-students, etc.; and topics are social and educational. Domains are important factors because the vast majority of co-ordinate bilinguals have seldom experienced all relevant domains in their two languages. Fishman, Cooper and Ma's pioneering study of Puerto Rican bilingualism in Brooklin was first to note that co-ordinate bilinguals only mastered specific domains in each one of their languages: in short, they use their parents' mother tongue in such domains as home and church, and never in domains such as school or work. Admittedly, these Brooklin Puerto Ricans were incapable of successfully assuming many role-relationships (e.g. client, employer, colleague, teacher or student), and topics (e.g. business or education) in Spanish. The corollary is that whereas co-ordinate bilinguals' cultural realisations may be accurate in their two languages, their competence is decidedly restricted to certain domains depending on whether they are speaking their parental or their adopting language.

Co-ordinate bilinguals are believed to have a similar linguistic competence in their two languages; this, however, is true only if one considers their incompetence in a significant number of domains. In order to elaborate we shall refer to a number of cases which we have observed. Our first case is a person of Spanish origin who moved to

France with his parents when he was only five, whom we shall call Michel². Michel learned French at school and Spanish with his parents at home, who were, according to Chambers sociolinguistic classification (1996: 36), lower lower-class. Although he is not a university graduate, his French is fairly educated, especially when at work as a sales manager for a well-known department store. However, he is extremely hesitant when he speaks Spanish. Although he can write and read Spanish, Michel's utterance in his parental language denotes illiteracy in sentences like "cuando voy *en ca* mis padres" [when I go *into* my parents' *'ome*], his mannerist overuse fixed sentences like "¿entiendes lo que te digo?" ["you know I mean?"] implies impoliteness. This is because his Spanish is only competent in the domain *home*, and he will consequently fail to produce an appropriate utterance in the other domains.

Our second case is a Spanish person who moved to England in her early infancy, whom we shall call Patricia. Although Patricia works in the City and is a graduate from a prestigious red-brick university, her competence of the Spanish language is restricted to informal domains. In a conversation in Spanish that included Patricia and two other persons, Patricia said to one of them referring to the other: "no discutamos con éste" [let's not argue with this one], employing a demonstrative pronoun, which in Spanish denotes impoliteness. This example we believe certainly relevant, for in English Patricia would have said "let's not argue with [e.g.] John", instead of the more informal "let's not argue with him". Here, the co-ordinate bilingual was incapable of relying on her English knowledge of terms of address in order to reproduce English politeness in Spanish; instead, she automatically assumed a casual, domestic domain in Spanish.

William Nagy and Patricia Herman (1987: 32) noticed that "For many children the speech of their parents and peers may be the single most significant source of vocabulary growth. However, this source is not under a teacher's control". For immigrants' children, like Michel and Patricia, vocabulary acquisition is fully untutored, and, perhaps, exemplifies the worst of all possible linguistic environments.

3. Co-ordinate Bilinguals' Domain Competence--Receiving Oral Bilinguals

The belief that co-ordinate bilinguals' competence in both languages is stronger than that of compound bilinguals therefore appears, we believe, extremely controversial. The question lies in linguistic competence, and being a co-ordinate bilingual does not always implies optimal competence in two languages. As Diebold suggests, bilingualism begins when a person understands two languages. Therefore, co-ordinate bilinguals are those who may possess the four linguistic skills in one language but only the skill of listening in another: these have been termed receiving oral bilinguals. In the US, receiving oral bilinguals were easy to find in the 1960s where many children had grandparents who spoke to them in a foreign language. These children were co-ordinate bilinguals since they learned both languages at the same time, albeit their competence in one of the languages was extremely weak. As the cases below suggest, receiving oral bilingualism is an intriguing issue for it casts a doubt upon co-ordinate bilinguals' mythical status in society.

² False names are used throughout.

We have recently observed a Cuban-American family of East Lansing (Michigan). The three living generations of the family attended, thus presenting us with the chance to observe their linguistic habits. The immigrants -i.e. the grandparents- were compound bilinguals with a high competence of Spanish and English -to a fairly educated degree- although strong foreign accents in the latter. The first generation -the parents- were co-ordinate bilinguals with a high command of both languages. Being married to English-speaking monolingual Americans, the first generation spoke in English to their children. The grandparents encouraged their grandchildren to speak Spanish; however, the second generation only had the chance to speak Spanish when they visited their grandparents. We attempted to talk to the grandchildren in Spanish but they persisted in responding in English. Although they could hardly speak Spanish, the second generation of this family were indeed, and according to Diebold, co-ordinate bilinguals.

We have observed a second family in Glenview (Metropolitan Chicago). The father was first generation of Spanish and Chilean immigrants and the mother was a Spanish immigrant herself. The mother was a teacher of Spanish at a primary school in the Chicago area; she spoke in Spanish with her husband, yet she decided to bring up her children speaking English alone. (This, she explained, helped her meliorate her English; but the chief reason she had to do so was not to cause her children to feel alienated and foreign in their own country.) Although all her five children could understand Spanish, only two of them could actually speak it and write it; all of the children were co-ordinate bilinguals, but with different degrees of competence in their parental language.

4. Native Speakerhood and Bilingualism

On the basis of domain competence, the general belief that co-ordinate balanced bilinguals are native speakers of two languages is questionable. Native speakerhood has been largely analysed in the past decade, especially with regard to the exemplar linguistic competence often conferred upon native speakers (bibliographical details are provided subsequently). One of the chief issues linguists have discussed concerning native speakerhood is its validity as a norm. The Spanish language, for instance, has its linguistic norms regulated by the Real Academia. English, on the other hand, does not have a language academy to be measured against, and purists have looked for other paradigmatic institutions, such as the BBC or the monarchy. Conversely, many have advocated the sole linguistic authority of the speaking community. This is particularly true of the Creole versions of Spanish, since, according to the Real Academia's linguistic rules, the utterances of many Hispanic-Americans would certainly be irregular in terms of linguistic validity, since their irregularities result from their original pidgin. In Hispanic-America, Andrés Bello's claim that the people alone have the right to regulate their own linguistic patterns encouraged some to believe the native speaker to be the only linguistic model.

As far as bilinguals are concerned, equilingualism does not always imply, as we have argued, proficiency. That equilinguals should be regarded native speakers of their two languages has been contested by a number of sociolinguists. Claire Kramsch claims that: "The native speaker is, moreover, a monolingual, monocultural abstraction;

he/she is one who speaks only his/her (standardized) native tongue and lives by one (standardized) national culture. In reality most people partake of various languages or language varieties and live by various cultures and subcultures" (1998: 80). In short, many balanced co-ordinate bilinguals should be regarded native speakers in only one language. Their incapability to cope in a number of domains limit their proficiency in both languages; this is to say that whereas co-ordinate bilinguals may possess accurate cultural realisations in their adopting language they may, conversely, possess very few in their parental language. Hence, cultural realisations in co-ordinate bilinguals are rarely balanced, because they have grown up and lived in a cultural environment. Likewise, compound bilinguals are also knowledgeable about one culture. Indeed immigrants are better acquainted with their two cultures than the first generation, since the time the immigrants have spent in both cultures is much more balanced. There are, nonetheless, multifarious exceptions to allege: the above argument concerns immigrants and their children but it does not apply to bilingual societies, e.g. the Welsh, the Catalan, or the Galician, where bilinguals experience both cultures. (Bilinguals in Welsh and English who study at the University of Wales in Aberystwyth, for example, can live in Welsh-speaking halls, socialise in Welsh both on campus and in town, attend classes taught in Welsh, and even listen to Welsh radio stations, whereas, at the same time, they can attend classes in English, and socialise in English with their English monolingual fellow-students.) Experiencing two languages in both their cultural settings, on a very regular basis, and, if possible, in learned environments, is the most appropriate means to achieve educated balanced bilingualism.

Native speakerhood becomes a rather vague notion in the realms of *lingue franche*. In as much as the discussion focuses on the English language, one is also to take into consideration Braj Kachru's (1985) so-called Outer Circle, i.e. countries where English is employed in administrative activity. Braj Kachru (1984: 190) poses the question: "Is English really a non-native language for India, for Africa, and for Southeast Asia?" F. Niyi Akinnaso also points out that English is widely spoken and written in Nigeria.

5. Measuring Native Speakerhood

A number of linguists have attempted to determine native speakerhood. The first extensive study of native speakerhood was edited by Coulmas in 1981. More profound examinations appeared in subsequent years, amid which are those by Tay and Paikeday before Alan Davis's. Tay maintained a number of common criteria which were needed in order to identify native speakerhood, overall, Tay discards priority of learning, and unbroken oral tradition. Paikeday proclaims that native speakerhood depends on mother tongue acquisition and proficiency.

Alan Davis's profound study *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics* shed much light on the issue. Davis (1995: 154) analysed the problem in a later essay and reproduced his six ways in which he believes a native speaker is commonly characterised:

- 1.- The native speaker acquires the first language (L1) of which he or she is a native speaker in childhood.

- 2.- The native speaker has intuitions (in terms of acceptability and productiveness) about his or her grammar.

3.- The native speaker has intuitions about those features of the grammar of the common (or standard) language which are distinct from his or her idiolectal grammar.

4.- The native speaker has a unique capacity to produce fluent spontaneous discourse, which is facilitated by a huge memory stock of partly or completely lexicalised units.

5.- The native speaker has a unique creative capacity which enables him or her to write or speak creatively. This includes, of course, literature at all levels from jokes to epics, metaphors to novels. Speaking creatively probably belongs here too as does linguistic creativity and inventiveness.

6.- The native speaker has a unique capacity to interpret and translate into the L1 of which she or he is a native speaker.

After concluding that all six ways but no. 1 can be attained by a compound bilingual, Davis suggested (1995: 156): "Our conclusion might therefore be that it is indeed possible -though difficult- for a post-pubertal second language learner to become a native speaker of English". Consequently, second language learners who can master Alan's ways 2 to 6 would have the same linguistic competence as a native-speaker, and thus claim native speakerhood, since Davis's way 1, i.e. age of acquisition, is purely anecdotal, provided the compound bilingual can master the phonetic system, which is certainly a *tour de force*. In comparing co-ordinate balanced bilinguals to compound balanced bilinguals, for whom Davis claims native speakerhood, one is confronted by the notion of linguistic competence. This essay has already denounced the co-ordinate balanced bilingual's flaws, since these bilinguals lack competence in some domains; moreover, it must be noted that co-ordinate bilinguals are commonly non-proficient in the general employment of their vernacular language, particularly where literacy is concerned. Many co-ordinate bilinguals do not meet the concept of functional complementariness, i.e. that "written and spoken language are complementary to each other by being used, by and large, for different purposes in different situations" (Stubbs 1980: 17), and their written outcome is not liable to succeed in a number of linguistic functions (Vachek 1973), most especially academic or literary, since they want linguistic appropriateness.

Notwithstanding the practical endeavours from many institutions to measure proficiency, with exams such as the TOEFL, Cambridge Proficiency, etc., these have been widely criticised (Brindley 1989; Bachman 1990); Davis's ways, however, may help to measure general linguistic competence. Davis maintains that a compound bilingual can achieve all ways but birth, i.e. they can attain intuitions about the idiolect and the standard language, and they can create fluent spontaneous discourse, demonstrate linguistic creativity and interpret and translate.

6. Academic Instruction and Linguistic Interference

The difficulties that Michel and Beatriz encounter when they speak their parental language in formal domains result from their lack of instruction. Bialystok (1994: 166-167) refers to domain as the *circumstances* in which a language is learned, and denounces: *Language learned for different purposes, in different situations, starting with a*

different first language, under favourable or unfavourable conditions, and so on, are critical factors in the processes of outcomes... the real mechanism for learning lies in the processes of analysis and control. Instruction is one example of an important factor in second language acquisition that determines outcomes without overriding the central mechanism of analysis and control. Language instruction is primarily a means of altering the rate of language acquisition.

Indeed optimal proficiency is amenable to instruction. This is true of bilinguals and also of monolinguals. Most co-ordinate bilinguals, even equilinguals, may fail to produce a translation or to create a grammatically-correct text in their parental language. In this sense, Michel and Patricia are certainly close to illiteracy, since their written outcome will hardly measure up to literacy.

With regard to academic domains, and allowing for Alan Davis's six ways, the examples of co-ordinate bilingualism we have provided above do not meet the ways necessary to claim proficiency and, native speakerhood: they cannot have intuitions about idiolects since they know very few versions of their parental language; they cannot have intuitions about the standard language because their standard is largely their parents' colloquial utterances; they will hardly be capable of creating a text; and, finally, they are not educated to interpret and translate. This is to say that Michel and Patricia cannot be regarded native speakers of their parental language -Spanish.

At this point, Kramsch's and Davis's arguments -which had seemed so disparate- coincide to sustain our point: that, co-ordinate bilinguals can be regarded native speakers of only one language: their adopting language, i.e. the language in which they have been educated. It is therefore evident that natural translation, although certainly convenient in casual conversation, is not always an academically-correct translation (cf. Campbell 1998).

However, even equilinguals -be it co-ordinate or compound- who are sufficiently educated in both languages may fail to produce an academically acceptable outcome in one or both of their languages because of the inevitable linguistic interference. Interference may be avoided by intensive dedicated instruction, with varying results depending, predominantly, on the learner's linguistic abilities, i.e. Aristotle's *natura* component in all speakers. Phonetic interference, or foreign accent, is seldom a problem for co-ordinate bilinguals. Grammatical interference, however, is likely to affect compound and co-ordinate bilinguals alike. We suggest that four chief types of grammatical interference may be discerned: codemixing; semantic interference; morphologic interference; and syntactic interference (cf. Harris et al 1978: 155).

A number of studies on bilingualism have focused on codemixing, e.g. Carol Myers-Scotton's *Social Motivations for Codeswitching* (1993: 2) acknowledges by means of introduction that: "*Codeswitching* is the term used to identify alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation... The linguistic varieties that participate in codeswitching may be different languages, or dialects or styles of the same language". Myers-Scotton critiques linguists who employ codemixing rather than codeswitching. Indeed these are two differing phenomena: codemixing is -generally but not always- the result of codeswitching. Codeswitching occurs when there is a switch from one language to another. Conversely, word is always the linguistic unit in codemixing, which consists of interspersing words of one language into the syntax of the other language, e.g. the so-called Spanglish slang. Linguists have often attributed codemixing to

idleness: a claim strongly contested by Myers-Scotton. Whatever the reasons for such a phenomenon, codemixing is sometimes a glowing evidence of some co-ordinate bilinguals' lack of confidence in one of their languages: commonly their parental language. This type of interference is triggered off by a want of vocabulary, since it seems obvious that those balanced bilinguals who have a high proficiency of one language need not reverse to the other language to find a word that matches the context.

Semantic interference has, likewise, baffled investigators. This particular kind of interference is especially noticeable in *faux amis*. (Amongst the general treatments on the issue, Joan Matthews [1983] is to be recalled; as to the specific approaches one may want to consult, for example, Ardila's studies [1998; Ardila 1999].) Semantic interference might be understood as a form of codemixing. Here, the bilingual fails to find the appropriate word in the language they are speaking and, instead, borrows the closest phonetic term from the other language believing it a cognate word. This we shall illustrate with a simple example. *Cafeteria* in English is a place where all types of meals are self-served, from hot meals to refreshments and beverages. In Spanish, *cafetería* means (in English) *café*. A componential analysis would show that an English *cafeteria* is a Spanish *comedor* and a Spanish *cafetería* can only be an English *café*. However, many balanced bilinguals would say "Vamos a comer a la cafetería" to mean "Let's go eat at the cafeteria". Not only have we noticed this example in casual conversation amongst balanced bilinguals in an English-speaking environment, but also on dubbed films and television shows, supposedly dubbed by professional translators. What the linguist must be concerned about is the obvious interference which causes the utterance to be decidedly flawed.

Morphologic interference has enjoyed less scholarly attention. A first type of morphologic interference occurs when the speaker borrows a term from the language they are not speaking with the particularity that only the lexeme is borrowed, and morphemes -especially suffixes- from the language they are speaking are added. This is a common practice, for instance, for those who employ the so-called Spanglish slang. Authentic examples which we can recall include: "los copos no dejan que *parqueemos* el carro" [the cops won't let us park the car]; "no logro *fitear* el carro en este *lote*" [I can't get to fit my car in this lot].

Less noticeable interference arises when the balanced bilingual is aware of morphologic conventions in one language but not in the other, e.g. we have recently come across a scholarly article entitled "El intelectual mexicano frente a las crisis sociales en dos novelas de los noventas"³ [The Mexican Intellectual and the Social Crise in Two Novels from the 90s]. The author is aware that in English decades an `s` is added to the cardinal number, yet ignores that in Spanish they do not; the correct Spanish form can only be "los noventa". Another colleague wrote to us in Spanish and asked us to pass her greetings on to the 'Ardilas'; this person obviously knows that, in English, surnames have plural forms when referring to a family, e.g. the Smiths. Yet the Spanish language does not add a suffix, e.g. one greets "los González", not "los Gonzálezes". These balanced bilinguals are academically proficient in the English language but they are not in Spanish-English being, surprisingly, their second language, and Spanish their mother tongue. A striking case we encountered in a

³ Appeared in the September 1999 issue of *Hispanófila*, 127: 81-91. As mentioned above, I omit the author's name.

scholarly volume, where one author pointed out that “El profesor ayuda a la creación de currículums”⁴ [The instructor helps to create curriculums]. Beside the fact surnames have plural forms, that curricula are not *creados* but *redactados*, the author ignored the correct plural form of *curriculum* in Spanish.

Other specimens of morphologic interference concern verb conjugation, e.g. we once heard one of our English-speaking Spanish-learning students telling another “si quieres ir, ir” [if you want to go, to go], meaning “if you wanna go, go”. Syntactic interference, on the other hand, is rarer than the above, since balanced bilinguals usually know syntactic structures in both languages. However, sometimes the coordinate bilingual sometimes borrows a syntactic structure, generally idioms. In addition to idioms, we are well acquainted with the personal experience of a coordinate bilingual in Spanish and English with English dominant who introduces himself in his parental language, Spanish, as “soy Javier González” [I am Javier González] instead of “me llamo...” [my name is...], which is an interference from the English “I am...” In Spanish, employing the verb *ser* [to be] in the first person implies that the person who is introducing him- or herself is known by the addressee, e.g. “soy el presidente del gobierno” [I am the Prime Minister] or “soy Camilo José Cela” [I am Camilo José Cela]. In introducing himself as “soy Javier González”, this person sounded so arrogant that one of his addressees said to us giggling: “¿Pero quién se cree este tío que es?” [who does this bloke think he is?]

7. Conclusions.

Valentín García Yebra (1984: I, 354-359) offers a list of 100 selected examples of interference of English into Spanish. García Yebra’s was, in fact, approached by two American scholars who had written a monograph in Spanish and wanted him to proof-read it. One of the academics was an American-born balanced compound bilingual in English and Spanish; the other was a Hispanic-American balanced compound bilingual in the same languages. García Yebra devotes a number of pages to comment on the examples he provides and classifies into⁵: *mal uso de las preposiciones; colocaciones impropias; impropiedades léxicas; mal uso de conjunciones; uso inadecuado de quien; abuso de la voz pasiva; mala ordenación de las palabras; redundancia; concisión excesiva; impropiedad en el uso de tiempos y modos; verbos desnaturalizados; uso impropio de los deícticos; impropiedades morfológicas* [misuse of prepositions; inaccurate collocation; misuse of lexis; misuse of conjunctions; misuse of who; overuse of the passive voice; wrong lexical order; redundancy; overconcise formulae; misuse of tenses; alteration of the meaning of verbs; misuse of deictics; inaccurate morphology].

His observations demonstrate that, as Rozenčvejk (1936: I, 64) pointed out, although bilingualism commonly implies interference, yet some bilinguals may indeed

⁴ “La lengua practicando entra: relevancia de la experiencia en el extranjero para estudiantes de español de negocios” [Language Learning through Practice: The Relevance of the Year Abroad to Students of Spanish for Business], in A. Bocanegra et al (eds) (1999), *Enfoques teóricos y prácticos de las lenguas aplicadas a las ciencias y las tecnologías*, Salamaca: Tesitex. 110. This is really conference proceedings that the organisers present as a book.

⁵ Cf. Harris and Sherwood (1978: 155) propose the following chief types of interference: idiomatic translation, syntactic translation, lexical approximation, elaborated translation and reduced translation. Baker (1992: 65) also discusses the problems that arise from translating fixed expressions and idioms: “The main problems that idiomatic and fixed expressions pose in translation relate to two main areas: the ability to recognise and interpret an idiom correctly; and the difficulties involved in rendering the various aspects of meaning that an idiom or a fixed expressions conveys into the target language”.

avoid interference by acquiring the appropriate instruction. Spolsky's claims in favour of the co-ordinate bilingual's cultural realisations are certainly irrelevant in the light of their competence restraints in some particular domains. Rather than a dual meaning system, many co-ordinate bilinguals do often have a meaning system of two signified's, e.g. "place to have meals" and "lugar donde comer" [place to have meals], and one signifier, i.e. *cafeteria*. This is to say that where compound bilinguals may have meaning system consisting of one signified and two signifiers, co-ordinate bilinguals may, conversely, have a system of two signified's and one signifier. This linguistic malfunction may not matter in natural translation, yet it can seriously harm semantic accuracy in translation and interpretation.

In addition to making *tabula rasa* of Spolsky's theory, our above argument also shows that compound bilinguals' restraints are as serious as those of co-ordinate bilinguals. Instruction is the only means to achieve an acceptable proficiency in all domains and, particularly, in any academic field. Michel's and Patricia's restraints in their parental language is their evident lack of education; the academics who requested García Yebra's advice were obviously short of a thorough instruction in the Spanish language, which was mother tongue to one of them and second language to the other; and so are those who write *noventas*, *Ardilas* or *curriculums*. These scholars have undoubtedly been instructed in a long burdensome educational process which was accomplished when they earned their higher degrees, yet their proficiency in academic realms is not always optimal. Allegedly, one must adroitly question the assumption that native speakerhood implies optimal proficiency. Often co-ordinate bilinguals are not proficient in one of the languages they speak, commonly their domestic or parental language, according to Davis's six ways.

Ronjat (1913) and Leopold (1949) declared, on the basis of their experimental observation, that co-ordinate bilinguals can translate more accurately than compound bilinguals. Their claims are, undoubtedly, not to be contested in a discussion on natural translation, because co-ordinate bilinguals are commonly more fluent in their two languages than most compound bilinguals (save, predominantly, professional interpreters, linguists, and immigrants). However, an ability to do well in natural translation does not guarantee an appropriate interpretation or a correct written translation. In their study "Why Albanian-Greeks are Not Albanians", Trudgill and Tzavaras (1977), reached the conclusion that co-ordinate bilinguals cannot be regarded native speakers of two languages. After evaluating a consistent corpus of data compiled by parents and investigators, Harris and Sherwood (1978: 168) declared that there is no evidence "to suggest that natural translation hinders successful acquisition of a second language or language development in general. Nor is there anything to suggest that it improves it. It just seems to be a concomitant". Indeed the ability to perform socially-functional translations -for which co-ordinate bilinguals are very likely to be better equipped than compound bilinguals- cannot by any means imply an expertise in written translation, which demands a very high level of literacy. Co-ordinate bilingualism is indeed an advantage for those who seek academic literacy; however, if, as Edwards (1977: 278) put it, "Ethnic identity can be reinforced by bilingual education", there is no doubt, we believe, that education is also a must for bilinguals to secure a linguistic competence in the languages they speak.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akinnaso, F. Niyi (1996) 'Vernacular literacy in modern Nigeria', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 119: 44-52.
- Ardila, John G. (1998) 'Semantic Accuracy in the Spanish Political Lexicon', *Actas de las II Jornadas de Lenguas para Fines Específicos*, Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.
- Ardila, John G. (1999) 'Hermenéutica y pragmática en la traducción cinematográfica' [Hermeneutics and Pragmatics in Film Dubbing], *Livius*, 13: 47-60.
- Bachman, L.F. (1990) *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mona (1992) *In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bialystok, E. (1994) 'Analysis and Control in the Development of a Second Language Proficiency', *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16 (2): 157-168.
- Brindley, G. (1989) *Assessing Achievement in the Learned-centered Curriculum*, Sidney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Campbell, Stuart (1998) *Translation into the Second Language*, London, Longman.
- Chambers, J.K. (1996) *Sociolinguistic Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coulmas, F. (ed) (1981) *A Festschrift for Native Speaker*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Davis, Alan (1991) *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davis, Alan (1995) 'Proficiency or the Native Speaker: What Are We Trying to Achieve in ELT?', in G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds) *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, J.R. (1977) 'Ethnic Identity and Bilingual Education', in H. Giles (ed) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroups Relations*, London: Academic Press.
- Fishman, Joshua A., Robert L. Cooper and Roxanna Ma (1971) *Bilingualism and the Barrio*, Columbus: Research Center for the Language Sciences, Indiana University.
- García Yebra, Valentín (1984) *Teoría y práctica de la traducción* [Theory and Practice in Translation], Madrid: Gredos.
- Giles, Howard and Peter F. Powesland (1975) *Speech Style and Social Evaluation*, London: Academic Press.
- Harris, Brian (1977) 'The Importance of Natural Translation', *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 12: 96-114.
- Harris, Brian and Bianca Sherwood (1978) 'Translating as an Innate Skill', in D. Gerver and H.W. Sinaiko (eds) *Language Interpretation and Communication*, New York and London: Plenum Press.

- Kachru, Braj B. (1984) 'The Alchemy of English. Social and Functional Power of Non-native Varieties', in C. Kramarae, M. Schultz and W.M. O'Barr (eds) *Language and Power*, London: Sage.
- Kachru, Braj B (1985) 'Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle', in R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds), *English in the World: Teaching and Learning the Language and Literatures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, for the British Council.
- Kramsch, Claire (1998) *Language and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leckie-Tarry, Helen (1995) *Language and Context: A Functional Linguistic Theory of Register*, London and New York: Pinter.
- Leopold, W.F. (1949) *Speech Development of a Bilingual Child. A Linguistic Record*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Matthews, Joan (1983) 'Relations between Languages', in Catriona Picken (ed) *The Translator's Handbook*, London: Aslib and Co.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993) *Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nagy, William E. and Patricia A. Herman (1987) 'Breath and Depth of Vocabulary Knowledge: Implications for Acquisition and Instruction', in M.G. McKeown and M.E. Curtis (eds) *The Nature of Vocabulary Acquisition*, Hillsdale and London: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Paikeday, T.M. (1985) *The Native Speaker is Dead!*, Toronto: Paikeday Publishing Inc.
- Ronjat, J. (1913) *Le développement du langage observé chez un enfant bilingue* [The Development of Language as Observed in a Bilingual Child], Paris: H. Champion.
- Rozencvejk, V. Ju. (1936) *O jazykovyx kontaktax* [On Linguistic Contacts], Moscow.
- Saunders, George (1983) *Bilingual Children: Guidance for the Family*, New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Spolsky, Bernard (1998) *Sociolinguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stubbs, Michael (1980) *Language and Literacy. The Sociolinguistics of Reading and Writing*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Tay, M.W. (1982) 'The Uses, Users and Features of English in Singapore', in J.B. Pride (ed) *New Englishes*, Rowley: Newbury House.
- Taylor, Charles (1994) *Multiculturalism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Trudgill, P. and G.A. Tzavaras (1977) 'Why Albanians-Greeks are Not Albanians: Language Shift in Attica and Biotia', in H. Giles (ed) *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroups Relations*, London: Academic Press.
- Vachek, Josef (1973) *Written Language: General Problems and Problems of English*, The Hague: Mouton.