



HAL
open science

The design principles of a sociolinguistic typological questionnaire for language contact research

Eri Kashima, Francesca Di Garbo, Ruth Singer, Olesya Khanina

► To cite this version:

Eri Kashima, Francesca Di Garbo, Ruth Singer, Olesya Khanina. The design principles of a sociolinguistic typological questionnaire for language contact research. *Language Dynamics and Change*, 2025, 15 (1), pp.1-103. 10.1163/22105832-bja10035 . hal-04904991

HAL Id: hal-04904991

<https://hal.science/hal-04904991v1>

Submitted on 21 Jan 2025

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License



BRILL



brill.com/ldc

The design principles of a sociolinguistic typological questionnaire for language contact research

Eri Kashima | ORCID: 0000-0002-7534-7047

University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

eri.kashima@helsinki.fi

Francesca Di Garbo | ORCID: 0000-0002-2499-8800

Aix-Marseille University, CNRS LPL, Aix-en-Provence, France

francesca.di-garbo@univ-amu.fr

Ruth Singer | ORCID: 0000-0003-4915-3262

University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

rsinger@unimelb.edu.au

Olesya Khanina | ORCID: 0000-0001-5930-4656

University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

olesya.khanina@helsinki.fi

Received 13 July 2022 | Accepted 7 September 2024 |

Published online 17 January 2025

Abstract

This paper presents the design rationale and pilot demonstration of the GramAdapt Social Contact questionnaire; a research tool developed for collecting global comparative sociolinguistic data on language contact scenarios. The questionnaire is qualitative with quantitative potential, inviting language community experts to provide best-assessment answers to questions about social contact in their communities of expertise. The main purpose is to compare contact scenarios, however the questionnaire can also be a broad survey of any given contact situation as it was designed to target factors associated with language contact and change phenomena at large. Two experts of small-scale multilingual communities answer an abridged version of the questionnaire to qualitatively demonstrate this proof of concept. The experts of Mawng and

Kunbarlang (northern Australia), and Tundra Enets and Nganasan (northern Siberia) were chosen as these communities defy nation-based models of multilingualism. The responses are broadly successful, thus demonstrating the theoretical contribution and methodological potential of this questionnaire.

Keywords

sociolinguistic typology – comparative sociolinguistics – questionnaires – small-scale multilingualism – societal multilingualism – bilingualism – sociology of language – language contact

1 Introduction

Is it possible to compare the social and cultural dimensions of languages across time and place? Questions about what and how to compare across social contexts have become more common within linguistic typology as linguistic comparison alone has been unable to explain the global distributions of linguistic structures. Yet macro-comparative approaches to sociolinguistics have remained nascent over the decades (see, however, Nichols, 1992, and Bickel and Nichols, 2020, as examples of attempts which generated influential ideas), while crosslinguistic comparison has progressed along with the field of linguistic typology.

Typologists have predominantly directed their attention towards readily accessible socio-demographic factors like population size, while sociolinguists have primarily concentrated their research efforts on specific linguistic communities. When sociolinguists address comparison, it typically occurs within tightly circumscribed contexts, such as examining similar grammatical constructions through the establishment of parallel corpora (e.g., Tagliamonte, 2013; Barth et al., 2021; and see de Pietro, 1988, for an early attempt). Global comparison of socio-demographic and cultural factors has not been a central concern in sociolinguistics. Rather, the feasibility of comparing such phenomena across time and place is often met with skepticism, echoing arguments made within social anthropology in the late twentieth century (see Gingrich, 2015).

We argue that large-scale comparisons are crucial for transcending localized observations and gaining a comprehensive understanding of language change broadly construed. The key challenges lie in determining which social, cultural, and demographic factors to compare and devising appropriate methodologies for comparison.

This paper demonstrates the feasibility of a sociolinguistic questionnaire that was designed to collect data for a sociolinguistic typology of language contact. *Sociolinguistic typology*, or comparative sociolinguistics, is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of linguistic diversity where the distribution of language structures is investigated from the perspective of the social history of language communities. Sociolinguistic typological approaches focus on how contact between human populations influences language variation and change, such as in classic studies by Trudgill (2011), Bentz and Winter (2013), Winters et al. (2015), and Wray and Grace (2007). The term “language contact” refers to the linguistic consequences of a situation where “at least some people use more than one language” in the same place at the same time (Thomason, 2001: 1). In this paper language contact is defined as social interaction between speakers/signers that results in bi- or multilingualism at the level of individuals and of groups.¹

The GramAdapt questionnaire (hereafter “the questionnaire”) serves as a tool to describe and compare contact scenarios worldwide. We characterize the contact scenarios in terms of the time frame of contact as well as with respect to a number of factors that are deemed crucial for the assessment of language change dynamics more generally. These factors range from general cognitive abilities and social cognition to historical contingencies pertaining to the structure and nature of social relationships in a given population network.

The questionnaire solicits expert assessments on the sociocultural and demographic (what is sometimes called “sociolinguistic” as a shorthand) aspects of a pair of languages in contact. The experts may be either outside scholars who study a given community or members of the communities in question. Whichever their role, there would ideally be a collaboration between the scholar and the community under study. The goal of the questionnaire is to survey a number of specific sociolinguistic factors that are proposed to affect language contact outcomes for any given contact pair. The questionnaire was designed to compare contact situations across time and place for hypothesis testing, but it can also stand as a broad survey of a single contact situation in the past or present. The questionnaire therefore differs in goal and focus to questionnaires of multilingualism that investigate language choices in a community, or individuals’ repertoires.

1 The terms “bilingualism” and “multilingualism” will be used interchangeably for the remainder of this paper. The terms are understood broadly rather than narrowly to distinguish the use of two vs. more languages.

The questionnaire combines both qualitative and quantitative aspects. It includes questions with predetermined answers that can be quantified, but it also emphasizes qualitative explanations from respondents. This paper presents a qualitative demonstration of the questionnaire, supplemented by a small example of quantification. The quantified responses can later be utilized for statistical analysis if desired.

The first part of the paper describes the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the questionnaire. In Section 2 we discuss the conceptual contributions made by a range of prior studies towards this questionnaire. Section 3 introduces the design principles of the questionnaire, focusing on contact scenarios, explanatory factors of language change in contact situations, and how we understand the historical dimension of contact. The structure of the questionnaire and its implementation are described in Section 4.

The second part of the paper provides the proof of concept of the questionnaire. Ruth Singer and Olesya Khanina responded to an abridged version of the questionnaire as experts of small-scale multilingual communities to demonstrate that the questionnaire can cover types of societal multilingualism that are underrepresented in the literature (Section 5). The case studies consider contact between Mawng (ISO [mph], glottocode [mawn1240]) and Kunbarlang ([wlg], [kunb1251]) from northern Australia, and Tundra Enets ([enh], [tund1254]) and Nganasan ([nio], [ngan1291]) from northern Siberia. The findings related to the questionnaire demonstration are discussed in Section 6. Section 7 concludes the paper with reflections on the strengths and weaknesses of the questionnaire, with comments on the applicability to comparative sociolinguistics, and considerations for future work.

2 Review of sociolinguistic factors

This section is a literature review of earlier work on the characterization of multilingual language ecologies and on the sociolinguistic factors that are proposed to account for the unfolding of language variation and change.

The first subsection, Section 2.1, is devoted to the definition of societal multilingualisms. The following, Section 2.2, is a review of influential factors proposed by sociolinguists as drivers of language variation and change. The third, Section 2.3, surveys recent studies correlating broad socio-demographic factors with the worldwide distribution of specific linguistic structures. We address each of these topics by discussing their relevance to the comparative study of language contact and to the design of our questionnaire.

2.1 *Societal multilingualisms: Nation-based models and small-scale*

Language contact studies, which have their origins in historical linguistics, have tended to focus on grammatical consequences of contact. The publication of Thomason and Kaufman (1988), however, accelerated the research trend towards seriously considering non-linguistic aspects of contact. While Thomason and Kaufman's book was still mostly concerned with the grammatical outcomes of contact, they mention some sociocultural factors that they thought affected the trajectories of language change. These factors are broadly at the level of a community or society, such as "imperfect learning of an additional language [by individuals in the contact area]," "cultural pressures," "sociopolitical dominance," and "prestige economic forces" (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988: 72). In other words, features concerning societal multilingualism are identified as pertinent for explaining language contact and change. Researchers continue to investigate these kinds of factors to this day.

The GramAdapt questionnaire was designed to capture aspects of societal multilingualism. In this paper the term "societal multilingualism" refers to the multilingual language behaviors and practices of a society. By society, we mean a collection of interdependent people linked by mutual interests and shared norms and who can be roughly distinguished from other such groups. The term "society" is used in the sense of "group" and is independent of notions such as the nation-state or hierarchical political structure. Likewise our use of the term "societal multilingualism" is without implication of nationhood or hierarchy and we see it as a general cover term to refer to any type of multilingual setting.

In the broader literature, however, the term "societal multilingualism" is often associated with a particular societal model; that is, a society within a nation with compartmentalized sociolinguistic ecologies, functional specialization of linguistic codes, and a hierarchical semiotic relationship between these codes. The prototype of this model is diglossia² as popularized by Ferguson (1959), though according to Kaye (2001), it was the French Arabist William Marçais who first introduced the term "diglossie" in 1930. Diglossia has been a central theme in much of the literature on multilingualism from a societal perspective. The chapter on societal multilingualism in a recent textbook by Buschfeld et al. (2023) deals almost exclusively with national multilingualisms based on a typology by Stewart (1968), where concepts such as an official language are part of the characterizations. While the idea of diglossia has been

2 Diglossia describes contexts where two languages are used extensively within society, where one is a standardized High variety and the other a vernacular Low variety. Each variety is used for specific kinds of activities and situations.

added to and adapted over the decades (e.g., Platt, 1977; Kaye, 1994, 2001; García, 2013; Saxena, 2014) the fundamentals of what are thought to be relevant factors of a multilingual society are relatively consistent under this model.

In this paper, we refer to these kinds of multilingual settings as “nation-based models of multilingualism.” We use this term to include diglossia and its offshoots such as polyglossia,³ noting that these models hinge on the concept of the nation-state with its “heavy investment of institutionalizing linguistic divisions of labor” (Jaspers, 2016: 180).

Jaspers (2016) suggests that one of the reasons for the popularity of the diglossic model in sociolinguistics and beyond is its relevance to describe colonial and postcolonial language contact contexts. Jaspers notes that Ferguson (1959) demonstrates the notion of diglossia in relation to postcolonial Haiti, making it an attractive and useful term since much of the world has been and continues to be affected by the dynamics of colonialism and its power structures.

As many have pointed out, however, nation-based societal multilingualism is an ineffective model for many other contexts. According to Vaughan and Singer (2018: 88) polyglossia was initially proposed as just one kind of societal multilingualism “but because no other kind of societal multilingualism has ever been elaborated into a fullyfledged model, alternatives are rendered invisible by the ubiquity of Fishman’s model.” In other words, a model of societal multilingualism that stands beyond the nation-state is yet to take hold in linguistics and adjacent subfields.

In more recent years however, research on small-scale multilingualism has offered the basis from which alternative models of multilingualism are emerging. Small-scale multilingualism is not a singular “fullyfledged model” but rather a label that refers to societal multilingualisms that are non-urban (“rural” to use the term from Di Carlo et al., 2019), and are characterized by a small numbers of speakers in societies with modest economic organization (Evans, 2018: 912). In other words, small-scale multilingual societies show varying degrees of independence from the institutions and instruments of the nation-state. Small-scale multilingualism research shifts attention to a number of sociolinguistic factors that challenge the supposed cross-contextual applicability of nation-

3 Fishman’s (1967) notion of polyglossia suggests that the multiple languages and varieties spoken in a nation can be ranked on a continuum between High, Medium, and Low; perhaps akin to Thomason and Kaufman’s “socio-political dominance” and “prestige economic forces.” The criteria for where a language or variety falls on the spectrum include whether it is a language of education, whether there is a corresponding standardized orthography, whether it is prestigious, and whether it is perceived as useful for social mobility.

based models. The findings from small-scale multilingualism research thus help to critically consider sociolinguistic factors presented in nation-based models by describing alternative manifestations of commonly attested phenomena.

For instance, small-scale multilingualism research emphasizes the relational aspects of language use and choices. Examples from Africa illustrate how speakers choose languages based on their relationship with their conversation partner, incorporating local pragmatics into their communication; see Lüpke and Storch (2013: 22–24) with a case study in southern Senegal, and Di Carlo and Good (2020) for Lower Fungom in Cameroon. Proponents of diglossia have suggested that linguistic divisions of labor are “an inevitable feature of social life” (Jaspers, 2016: 180; see also Woolard, 1985), but the focus on relationships challenges the notion that language choice is best understood through compartmentalized spheres of activity. Di Carlo et al. (2019) argue that societies can lack social compartmentalization entirely, having fluid sociolinguistic ecologies instead. For example, rather than home and work being distinct private and public spheres, the family unit may be the central unit by which economic activity is organized. We show that this seems to be the case in the Tundra Enets-Nganasan contact situation presented in this paper. One could construe such cases as home and work domains overlapping, but it is likely more reflective of local perceptions to see an absence of the notion home vs. work; that is, a fluid sociolinguistic ecology.

Non-hierarchical semantic relations between languages and varieties is another observed characteristic in some small-scale multilingual societies. “Egalitarian multilingualism,” a term popularized by François (2012) in reference to northern Vanuatu, attests that there are no hierarchical semantic relations between the languages of the area. The term “reciprocal or balanced multilingualism” (Jourdan, 2007) has a similar meaning. As Schokkin (2021: 294) points out, however, “egalitarian” does not mean that all languages are considered completely equal, or that there are absences of judgment, preference, or conventions around language variation. It is merely that local languages are viewed as functionally equivalent, and there are no local prestige varieties. This lack of a hierarchical semantic relation between local languages is in contrast to nation-based models of multilingualism which presuppose a prestigious High language and a vernacular Low language; though colonial languages are attributed high prestige in some of these egalitarian multilingual communities. There may be asymmetries in language repertoire of the local languages, but as Pakendorf et al. (2021: 847) argue, this is not a function of prestige but of relationality. Speakers are often loyal to their patrillect not because it is prestigious but because of the speaker’s relationship to and identification with their patriline.

The questionnaire was designed to apply to a range of multilingual settings. Insights from small-scale multilingualism assisted in critically assessing various sociolinguistic factors discussed in the broader studies of societal multilingualism. We have incorporated lessons garnered from small-scale multilingualism research, for example, being open about the possible socio-indexical associations and relationship between identified languages in a society (e.g., hierarchical H vs. egalitarian L). Nonetheless the questionnaire still relies on aspects of nation-based models (as elaborated in Section 4.2) owing to the ubiquity and familiarity of these models. The questionnaire can thus capture aspects of diglossic contact scenarios in addition to scenarios outside this prototype.

2.2 *Multicausal sociolinguistic factors*

Sociolinguistic research has proposed a number of general social factors affecting language change broadly construed. Many of these comprise multiple causal factors, whose extent of influence may vary across cultures. In this questionnaire we incorporate some of these classic factors in the attempt to capture the various causal elements related to them.

We use the notion of gender to illustrate our point. Sociolinguists have long acknowledged the impact of gender on language variation and change, beginning with classic studies by Labov (1963, 1966) and Trudgill (1972, 1974). These studies observed a tendency for women to employ more prestigious or standard linguistic variants compared to men, if they are stable variants (as opposed to innovative variants). This pattern has been consistently found across a number of English-speaking communities, such as by Macaulay (1977) for Glasgow English and Gordon (1997) for Pakeha English in New Zealand, as well as in other language communities such as Baghdadi Arabic by Abu-Haidar (1989). The common recurrence of this finding led some scholars to suggest that this is “a strong contender for the status of a sociolinguistic universal tendency” (Holmes, 1998: 473).

Subsequent case studies have challenged this notion of a universal sociolinguistic tendency for gender. For instance, research conducted in outer London found that female speakers from certain ethnic backgrounds tended to use more non-standard forms of the stable *was/were* variant than males (Cheshire and Fox, 2009). Gender may not be a variable explaining language variation, such as for vowels in Hawai'i creoles (Grama, 2015) and h-drop in the Papuan language Nmbo (Kashima, 2020). These examples demonstrate how gender can relate to linguistic variation in different ways across cultures, reiterating the dynamic and contested nature of how gender, as a social factor contributing to language variation, manifests within each community (Okamoto, 2021; Atanga et al., 2012; Meyerhoff and Holmes, 1999).

Ergo it may not be gender as such that leads to women's preference for prestigious linguistic variants, but rather that gender serves as a proxy of power differentials within a society. This position has been articulated from early on in qualitative sociolinguistics, especially in relation to women's speech and politeness by, for example, Lakoff (1975) and Brown and Levinson (1987). The questionnaire also uses the term "gender" across multiple questions to investigate power, and other factors, that manifest as gendered behaviors.

Another factor related to power dynamics is the concept of the "socioeconomic structure" or "sociopolitical structure" of a given society. This factor garners great interest due to its well-known effects on language, such as rapid language shift or the emergence of mixed languages in highly stratified societies resulting from European colonization. Yet, as Yakpo (2020: 132) notes, the connection between socioeconomic and linguistic structures is raised only in "diffuse ways" by linguists due to the complexities that make up this factor. There is a lack of clarity over what other factors constitute socioeconomic-sociopolitical structures, though language ideologies and subsistence patterns are recurrently raised. Language ideologies research argues that ideologies and attitudes are part of social structures, and, simplistically put, describe ideologies as social constructs that create and maintain social realities. In language contact of colonial kinds, ideologies are found creating and sustaining inequalities and states of domination (Woolard, 2020: 5). Subsistence patterns are raised in ways that intuitively feel meaningful, such as "hunter-gatherers," "agrarian," or "industrial." These are, however, closely intertwined with social network structures, where rural communities tend to have networks of familiar people (Milroy and Margrain, 1980: 48). Further examination is needed to better understand the general components of socioeconomic structure and how those relate to language change. All of this is addressed in our questionnaire by directly eliciting a characterization of contact scenarios in terms of social network structures and stated ideologies.

Lastly, we consider the influential ideas proposed by Trudgill (2011) in his work on sociolinguistic typology, which comprise a number of multicausal factors.

Trudgill suggests that two broad types of communities can predict language contact outcomes along the lines of simplification vs. complexification. There are the "societies of intimates" (a term used earlier by Givón and Young, 2002) resulting in language complexification, and "open communities" leading to simplification. These community types vary across five factors related to their composition: the extent of contact versus isolation, social stability, population size, social network structure, and shared common ground. Openness to out-group communication ("the relative degree of contact vs. isolation") has

been a prominent idea in studies of language contact outcomes, and is represented in our questionnaire at various points. This notion has variously been called esoterogeny vs. exoterogeny (Thurston, 1989) or stranger vs. insider talk (Croft, 2021). The contention is that groups who orient towards each other share contexts and communicate with familiar interlocutors, resulting in the development of linguistic complexities. On the other hand, groups who orient towards strangers outside their immediate group would communicate with people who do not share knowledge, resulting in a regularized language with semantic transparency. As Wray and Grace (2007: 557) outline in their paper, *eso-/exoterogeny* itself is a concept that is comprised of multiple factors such as the opportunities for adults to learn languages.

Trudgill highlights three key characteristics of social network structures: openness, density, and multiplexity. Openness is covered in part by the notion of *eso-/exoterogeny* which we just discussed. Density indicates the extent of connections between individuals, reflecting how many people within the network know each other. Multiplexity refers to the number of levels of interactions between individuals. A tie that is based on more than one level of interaction is multiplex, such as your cousin being your business partner as well as your neighbor. Research indicates that speech communities with dense, multiplex networks tend to uphold conservative norms (Bowerman, 2010) with a strong orientation towards the community vernacular (Milroy and Milroy, 1985; Lippi-Green, 1989). Experimental and modeling work have both provided some support for Trudgill's claims, such as Raviv et al. (2019) for the former, and Fagyal et al. (2010) and Clem (2016) for the latter.

Identifying Trudgill's proposed factors is relatively straightforward for the prototypical extremes that he presents, but is challenging for other societies. Furthermore, the majority of communities across the globe lack empirical data on these factors due to the difficulty in operationalizing the data collection. The continued referencing of Milroy and Milroy (1985) and Lippi-Green (1989) as benchmarks for sociolinguistic studies of social networks demonstrates the difficulty in conducting empirical research of this kind. Despite limitations associated with Trudgill's factors, we have incorporated them in our questionnaire due to their significance in contact sociolinguistics literature. Although there is a lack of published empirical data on communities' openness to stranger communication or network structures, fieldworkers often possess intuitive insights about these dimensions in their respective field sites. We will argue later that, currently, this is the best option for approximating data of under-described communities for global comparative research.

2.3 *Sociolinguistic typology and global correlational studies*

Quantitative sociolinguistic typological studies often follow the data collection and presentation styles of linguistic typological studies. This results in the creation and use of databases inspired by the World Atlas of Language Structures (Haspelmath et al., 2008), where “a language” is presented as having certain values for certain linguistic factors. The sociolinguistic variables are treated like the linguistic variables, typically with a single value representing the language. Our questionnaire aligns with these databases in some respects, but innovates along other lines including which sociolinguistic variables are covered.

The Languages of Hunter-Gatherers and Their Neighbors (LHG; Bowerman et al., 2010), and the Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures (APiCS; Michaelis et al., 2013) are the only existing typological databases which we know of that consider social, cultural, and demographic factors alongside linguistic structures for a global sample. Both databases focus on the social and linguistic profile of a highly specific language type from a sociocultural perspective; hunter-gatherer societies for LHG, and pidgin and creoles for APiCS. LHG codes 34 ethnographic features across seven categories at the time of access, while APiCS codes 27 sociolinguistic factors. Naturally, many of the features chosen are those relevant to hunter-gatherers’ communities or creolistics; for example, “sedentism” and “subsistence preference” in LHG, and “the identity of the lexifier language” in APiCS. Domains of language use are also covered in APiCS, with fine-grained categories such as “newspaper editorials,” “radio and TV call-ins/discussions,” and “court.” The relevance of these factors to language contact across time and place needs assessment case by case. For example, some of the sampled languages in APiCS already show the limitation of the chosen sociolinguistic variables. The entries for Yimas-Arafundi Pidgin (a Papuan pidgin; Foley, 2013), for instance, show 18 out of the 27 sociolinguistic variables coded as “not applicable.”

Another relevant database for identifying macro-sociolinguistic variables is the Database of Places, Language, Culture and Environment (Kirby et al., 2016), more commonly known as D-Place. It contains a wealth of ethnographic data stemming from multiple pre-existing datasets, such as the Human Relations Area File (Murdock, 1983), and the Binford Hunter-Gatherer dataset (Binford, 2001). These ethnographic data are also linked to the linguistic phylogenies of Glottolog (Hammarström et al., 2020). Since its publication, however, the D-Place database has been under-utilized for testing hypotheses about the relationship between language structures and sociolinguistic structures. It has rather been used for answering questions related to cultural transmission (Haynie et al., 2021), subsistence practices (Vilela et al., 2020), and population movement (Moravec et al., 2018). Coelho et al. (2019) is the one published study

which uses D-Place for exploring language-related issues, notably the drivers of language diversity in North America.

One reason for the slow uptake of D-Place in linguistic work may be that the linguistic component of the database is limited to linguistic phylogenies (i.e., language family trees). Another reason may be that the languages in D-Place often do not match those languages for which we have sufficient linguistic descriptions. For example, Mawng, which is represented in this paper, has 48 linguistics references listed in Glottolog (Hammarström et al., 2020), but has no corresponding society represented in D-Place. The geographically closest society is identified as “Gidjingali,” speakers of Burrara ([bvr], [bura1267]).

The creation and use of databases reflect typologists’ tendency to use quantitative variables when factoring sociolinguistic variables into the study of linguistic diversity. The most investigated factors are population size and degrees of community bilingualism. Hay and Bauer (2007) present one of the earliest investigations of population size and linguistic variables, showing a positive correlation between population size and phoneme inventory between 216 non-randomly sampled languages. A number of studies have further investigated demographic factors and morphological complexity (Lupyan and Dale, 2010), adding nuance such as proportion of L1 to L2 speakers (Bentz and Winter, 2013; Sinnemäki and Di Garbo, 2018). As Greenhill (2015) points out, however, population appears to be a proxy for some other causal factor, such as population structure and urban vs. rural lifestyle differences. More work is necessary to identify other causal factors.

Another major discussion point in typology has been how one counts population. For instance a study by Sinnemäki and Di Garbo (2018) investigating typological variation in the domain of nominal and verbal complexity found that statistical models combining population size and proportion of L2 speakers have a better fit than models that consider the two variables as independent of one another. Based on these results, the authors suggest that a variety of factors, both language-internal and -external, should be modeled together when testing hypotheses about sociohistorical and sociolinguistic correlates of language variation.

We suggest three related reasons for why global typological studies continue to focus on factors related to population numbers. One is a matter of expertise. Linguists interested in the interaction between social and linguistic structures tend to be experts of specific communities, and, as mentioned earlier, the comparison of communities has not been a major tradition in sociolinguistics. Typologists, on the other hand are experts of comparative analyses of language structures, but may have fewer intuitions about what sociolinguistic factors may be comparable across time and place. Relatedly,

social, cultural, and historical factors are also largely affected by areality and genealogical relatedness (Mace and Pagel, 1995; Jordan and Huber, 2013; Mace and Jordan, 2011), making it all the more challenging for linguists to make judgments about which sociolinguistic variables to compare when, and why. The third reason is that population size can be easily extracted from published census data and existing databases such as Ethnologue (Eberhard et al., 2022), enabling the relatively easy linkage of population data to quantitative studies.

While we believe population counts are valuable to explore the relationship between the social determinants of language change and diversity, in this questionnaire, we aim to integrate a more fine-grained perspective on the lower-level factors that may implicitly correlate to sheer speaker counts. Our questionnaire thus incorporates demographic data both as broad quantitative factors (see Section 4.1), and as fine-grained variables (Section 4.2). Through this solution, we aim at making the dataset comparable with other sociolinguistic typological databases, but also to make the questionnaire data amenable to additional analyses on the characterization of contact profile, where the role of lower-level factors pertaining to population structure can be assessed.

2.4 *Summary*

Prior works featuring the sociolinguistics of language change and contact serve as valuable starting points for developing a new analytical framework for global comparisons of language contact scenarios. Our questionnaire has attempted to incorporate some of the underlying causal factors identified through this review under the term “explanatory factors of language change.” We will discuss these and additional factors in Section 3.3. These explanatory factors form the foundations of the questionnaire as a research tool for sociolinguistic comparisons of contact contexts worldwide. In Section 3, we describe how we incorporate these factors into the questionnaire design.

3 Questionnaire design

Here we outline the various components of the questionnaire. Since this questionnaire was designed to collect data on factors associated with language change in contact situations, it makes a number of common assumptions related to language contact. While being cognizant that questionnaires run the risk of reinforcing worldviews that are implicit in the wording of questions and in the way phenomena are measured (Leeman, 2018; Urla, 1993), we hope our identification of known assumptions will spark discussion and aid future improvements of comparative sociolinguistic research tools.

We start by outlining the procedure of identifying contact scenarios worldwide (Section 3.1). We continue by addressing the question of how to delimit the time frame of contact between the targeted groups (Section 3.2). Finally we introduce four explanatory factors for (contact-induced) language change, which constitute the building blocks of the questionnaire (Section 3.3).

3.1 *Selecting contact scenarios*

Investigating the social dimensions of contact between speakers of different languages requires a systematic approach to selecting the language communities involved. Ideally this process is uniform and enables the selection of contact scenarios between neighboring language communities worldwide. The aim is to collect comparable descriptions of the contact dynamics attested in each scenario.

Any language is likely to be in contact with more than one language at any given time. We established that the sociolinguistic scenarios studied through our questionnaire would consist of pairs of language communities in contact. These pairs of language communities in contact consist of what we call the “Focus Group” and the “Neighbor Group.” As mentioned above, the aim is to elicit descriptions of the relationships and opportunities of contact that exist between these two groups. For manageability’s sake, these descriptions are framed from the perspective of the Focus Group only.

A research design where the contact profiles of both Focus and Neighbor Groups are in full scrutiny would require the involvement of experts equally acquainted with the history of both communities, as well as, more crudely, a longer and more time-consuming questionnaire. Even though limited to the Focus perspective, the selection procedure is flexible enough to be adapted to larger units. For instance, one and the same contact region could be explored through multiple contact pairs, with one and the same group acting as the Focus in one set and the Neighbor in the other. However, given that most of the individual questions in the questionnaire are framed following a pair-wise scheme, applying the questionnaire to contact scenarios consisting of three or more languages would at least require some reformulation of the actual questions (see Section 4).

Focusing on language pairs rather than larger sets of languages in contact reduces the complexities of highly multilingual contact scenarios. This is a trade-off we made in order to get deeper data on specific contact pairs. The greater context of contact is still of interest, hence information is briefly elicited about other language communities involved in contact. These languages may be global majority languages, lingua francas, or other vernacular languages.

3.2 *Approximating the time frame of contact*

The research design also calibrates *when* contact takes place. We call this the “time frame of contact” between Focus and Neighbor Groups. In principle, the questionnaire can be used to document the dynamics of social interaction between Focus and Neighbor Groups at any given point in time. However, given that the time span of contact may vary a great deal across language communities of the world, and that contact dynamics also vary through time, we established that the sociolinguistic descriptions elicited through the questionnaire should identify one relevant time frame of contact between Focus and Neighbor Groups.

More specifically, we operationalize time as “the densest period of contact between Focus and Neighbor Group,” or “the time frame with the greatest opportunities of (linguistic) interactions between the two groups, such that linguistic consequences could have arisen.” For instance, contact between Mexican Spanish (Indo-European, Romance) and Toluca Otomí (Otomanguan, South-Western Otomí) goes back to the eighteenth century, but the period with the greatest opportunities of interactions for the largest number of people goes from the mid-twentieth century until the present (Rosnátaly Avelino, personal communication). In the eyes of this questionnaire, the densest period of contact for this contact pair is this latter time stretch. The questionnaire thus assumes a view of language change where a long period of stable multilingualism is assumed to be necessary for grammatical changes to take effect.

Three cut-off points are used as a way of further systematising the varying time frames of contact relations across pairs:

1. Contact started in the (remote) past and is still ongoing
2. Contact occurred in the (remote) past, but is no longer ongoing
3. Contact has been only recently established over the last two centuries⁴

When paired with linguistic data, these three cut-off points can be used to test proposals made about the relationship between types of contact influences at the linguistic level, and the duration of contact. For instance, is it that strong similarities in language structures of the Focus and Neighbor Group languages always presuppose long-lasting contact relations between the two communities? In addition to duration, these dimensions also capture whether contact

4 This cut-off point is an attempt at capturing recent societal developments connected to urbanization and modernization worldwide. Modernization and urbanization are invariably tied to colonization in some places. However, the time period of colonization differs across the globe. For instance, while European colonization of South America was already taking place in the fifteenth century, colonization of Australia begins later in the seventeenth century.

between the two groups bears any relevance to the present. In this sense, contact scenarios with ongoing contact from the remote past are the most dense, temporally speaking.

The realities of language contact are of course temporally complex. The decision to restrict the representation of a contact situation to one specific time window was motivated by the need to make the questionnaire manageable in terms of time commitment and knowledge, especially given the absence of knowledge in many communities concerning multiple contact points across time. We acknowledge this simplification upfront to the respondents of the questionnaire, and ask about other possible contact groups and time periods that may be consequential. We rely on the expert respondents' knowledge and intuitions of the contact situation under investigation to interpret the responses that we receive.

In some contact situations the densest period of contact by our definition may be the present time. This would be the case in some colonial contexts where traditional speakers of a language may interact more in the present due to colonial policies, for example in the forced consolidation of indigenous peoples onto reservations in North America. In such cases, respondents can only answer about contemporary social contact since the questionnaire definition specifies what the densest period of contact is.

Another assumption related to the operationalization of the time frame of contact is the uniformitarian principle. This principle suggests that processes which we observe today can "help us to gain knowledge about processes in the past" (Bergs, 2012: 83). The principle assumes that fundamental processes related to the functioning of language are the same across time and place, and are unchanging enough that parallels can be drawn between the present and the past. This principle is invoked in historical linguistics, sociolinguistics (historical and contemporary, such as Labov, 1972, and Wray and Grace, 2007), and in sister disciplines such as archaeology.

There are obvious dangers in drawing parallels from the present to the past (Trudgill, 2020, for sociolinguistics; Hodder, 1998, for archaeology). For example, anachronisms are a major issue identified by Bergs (2012). There is, however, some evidence from across the globe that historical patterns of interaction may persevere even despite major historical upheavals. For example, Lindstedt (2016) suggests that some local linguistic situations in the Balkans today reflect the multilingualism of the past despite one hundred years passing since the Balkan Wars. Dickson (2015) shows the maintenance and transmission of cultural knowledge in certain domains are robust among traditional speakers of Marra in Northern Australia. The grandchildren of the oldest Marra speakers are now speaking Kriol, but transmission is still occurring in, for example, the

knowledge domain. A similar observation has been made about Māori in New Zealand (Chrisp, 2005). Sookias et al. (2018) found that deep cultural ancestry can explain contemporary cultural phenomena (although more recent historical events are a better predictor of cultural similarity across groups). Our solution to this difficult issue of invoking the uniformitarian principle is to consider the responses to each questionnaire independently, and assess whether it is appropriate to assume it or not.

3.3 *Explanatory factors of language change as the basis of data collection*

The review of sociolinguistic aspects of language change broadly construed (Section 2) helped develop the theoretical scaffolding of the questionnaire design. Through this review, we identified four groups of factors that are recurrently associated with accounts of language change, including contact-induced change; some of which we have already mentioned in the review. These are: cognitive processes, social cognition, social networks, and macro-contexts of language use. We refer to these four groups of factors as “explanatory factors.”

1. **Cognitive processes:** This label gathers a range of proposals that rely on domain-general cognitive abilities at the level of the individual. These include: memory, categorization, perceptual saliency and how they fare in language learning, production, and perception. Many of the studies in this domain are experimental or corpus-based (see, e.g., Kuhl, 1991; Litcofsky et al., 2016), but case studies and comparative studies also abound (see, e.g., Ross, 2007; Blevins, 2017). Explanations of contact effects appear to rest on the assumption that there is a fundamental divide between native and non-native language learning and processing, which affects the type of changes that we observe in contact situations (Kempe and Brooks, 2018). Studies in this domain tend to focus on L1 transfer effects on patterns and structures of the L2 as well as on differences in parsing preferences between L1 users and adult L2 users (for an overview of both transfer effects and parsing preferences in L1 and L2 processing, see Clahsen et al., 2010). Implicit in the idea of L1 influences on L2 learning and processing (the transfer approach) is the basic human cognitive mechanism of applying familiar patterns, routines, and habits to less familiar ones. Thus, an alternative way to address this family of effects is to talk about the effect of prior learning on bi- and multilingual language use. On the other hand, differences related to varying preferences in parsing between L1 and adult L2 users are to be understood as a physiological correlate of age of acquisition. In our questionnaire, we therefore seek

responses on language production (what we call “output”) and comprehension (based on prior exposure and “input”). The questionnaire asks about both adults and children.

2. **Social cognition:** These are explanatory factors related to individuals in interaction. In this category, we consider domain-general cognitive abilities that pertain to individuals in interaction and, more generally, to humans’ ability to understand and make inferences about the intentions, goals, and communicative resources of their interlocutors (e.g., “theory of mind” by Happé et al., 2017). An illustration of contact-induced patterns of language use, which tend to be explained as a function of human social-cognitive abilities and are thought to have potential repercussions on contact-induced change is “foreigner-directed speech” (see, among others, Ferguson, 1975; Chun et al., 2016; Dale and Lupyan, 2012), which can be broadly described as an instance of audience design (Bell, 2002). This is a behavior where speakers adapt their speech to interlocutors perceived to be non-native. Constructions that are perceived or known to be difficult for learners are avoided in order to facilitate communication. In our questionnaire, we address this interactional component of individual linguistic behavior by asking questions about the occurrence of foreigner-directed speech in Focus-Neighbor interactions, as well as the expectations related to choice of language in a given interactional context.
3. **Social networks:** This group of explanatory factors consider the interaction between individuals and groups, studying how linguistic variants diffuse in social networks, and how network structures may affect trajectories of change in language structures. Traditionally, the data used in these studies stem from (sociolinguistic) fieldwork (e.g., Milroy and Milroy, 1985; Lippi-Green, 1989). Agent-based modeling and experimental work has also gained ground in assessing the impact of social network structure and density on the patterning of linguistic structure (e.g., Raviv et al., 2019, 2020; Fagyal et al., 2010), although there is doubt as to how essential network structures are in trajectories of language change (see Clem, 2016). Broader research on social networks was also consulted (such as Granovetter, 1973; Easley and Kleinberg, 2010). Social networks feature prominently in our questionnaire design through a variety of questions addressing their density and structure.
4. **Macro-contexts of language use:** This heterogeneous group of explanatory factors address the broader contexts of language use, and are united by macro and societal focus. The factors encompass demographic, historical, economic, and political variables like population size and structure,

subsistence practices, language policies, and language vitality. Examples of studies addressing linguistic diversity and change from the perspective of such variables were discussed under global correlational studies in Section 2. Language ideologies and attitudes are also counted in this family of explanatory factors, and interpreted as social constructs that affect trajectories of variation and change (Irvine and Gal, 2000; Lindstedt, 2016). The questionnaire asks about ideologies and attitudes in the communities under study, both in general, and in relation to language.

4 Questionnaire structure and implementation

The questionnaire consists of two sub-questionnaires: the Overview Questionnaire and the Domains Questionnaire. The Overview Questionnaire is a wide look at social, historical, and political features of predominantly the Focus Group. The Domains Questionnaire elicits responses on spaces and modes of interaction between Focus and Neighbor Groups by considering six different social domains. The instructions and content of the entire questionnaire are presented in Appendix A.

4.1 *Overview Questionnaire*

The Overview Questionnaire is designed to gain a macro-perspective of the Focus Group society. There are 34 questions, nine of which ask about data sources and respondent confidence assessments with respect to each social domain (Appendices B–H, questions OE1–3, OC1–6). The Overview Questionnaire follows some of the categorizations found in the Human Relations Area File (Murdock, 1949), such as population density groupings. The unit of investigation is a singular “society” and its characteristic features such as levels of jurisdictional hierarchy (question OS1) and subsistence practices (OS6). While limited in scope, this sub-questionnaire supplements the Domains Questionnaire and links our questionnaire and its factors to those investigated in other global correlation studies (Section 2.3). These variables include population size, and proportions of L1 and L2 speakers. The Overview Questionnaire has unique identifiers always beginning with O, followed by a letter that represents the section associated with the question.

Table 1 shows the different sections of the Overview Questionnaire, their two-letter unique identifiers, and one example question with its unique question identifier. The Overview Questionnaire is presented in Appendix H.

TABLE 1 The Overview Questionnaire: Examples of sections and identifiers.

Section	Section identifier	Example question (with unique identifier)
Demographics	OD	What is the total number of native-like speakers of Focus? (OD ₁)
Language geography	OG	What is the population density within the area where Focus is spoken? (OG ₁)
Language and identity	OI	Is Focus stated as an expression of identity of any of the following? Yes or No answer to each of the following: (OI ₁) Group centered around shared descent, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group [...]
Social structure	OS	Typically, how many levels of jurisdictional hierarchy are there in the Focus speaking society, beyond the local community? (OS ₁)
History	OH	Have there been any natural disasters or major societal upheaval during the densest period of contact between Focus speaking and Neighbor speaking people, such that it impacted people's mobility, and Focus speaking people talk about it? (OH ₁)
Fieldwork experience	OE	How long have you spent working with this community? (OE ₁)
Confidence assessment	OC	How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about each domain? (OC ₁)

4.2 *Domains Questionnaire*

The Domains Questionnaire assesses social interactions between Focus and Neighbor communities in the context of six social domains. These are:

- Local Community (DLC): pertaining to relationships in the private sphere beyond the household
- Trade (DTR): pertaining to transaction of goods
- Social Exchange & Marriage (DEM): pertaining to relationships through marriage and practices of (ceremonial) exchange
- Family & Kin (DFK): pertaining to relationships in the household
- Knowledge (DKN): pertaining to relationships in the sphere of formalized learning
- Labor (DLB): pertaining to relationships in the sphere of production

The notion of domains of language use, popularized by Fishman (1965), has

long been employed to systematically investigate linguistic behavior across varying social contexts. Domains probabilistically circumscribe contexts of activity, role relationships, and topics of communication in various sociocultural situations.

Domains were chosen as a way to organize the questionnaire for several reasons, the critiques of nation-based models notwithstanding (Section 2.1). Firstly, social domains practically divide the questionnaire into manageable components, rather than having one monumental questionnaire for the respondent to tackle. Secondly, domains are a familiar concept to linguists, sociologists, and anthropologists, though our understandings and assumptions around the term may vary. Finally, domains were developed as a concept for the purpose of comparison, therefore they suit the needs of the questionnaire. In its original conception, Schmidt-Rohr (1933) organized German language use into domains of activities to assess language choice across the domains. While our goals differ to Schmidt-Rohr's, the systematicity afforded by the model of domains provides some structure to facilitate comparisons across contact contexts.

We share, up to a point, Fishman's assumptions that some activities increase the probability of certain linguistic behaviors. We suggest, however, that it is not necessarily the domain and activity itself that probabilistically triggers linguistic behaviors, but the fact that certain activities tend to be done with certain people. It is these interlocutors that affect the likelihood of linguistic behaviors, and the activity is one way of narrowing the focus to a manageable size. One of the reasons why the Domains Questionnaire revolves around conventions between Focus and Neighbor Group peoples is because who the interlocutor is matters for language variation.

We take a critical approach to some of the assumptions built into the notion of domains. For example we do not assume that there is a dominant language per domain. Questions about which languages are spoken in the target domain include an answer that is, in essence, a "there is no clear preference" option. We have received feedback that this response option reduces the range of possible phenomena and motivations of language variation. Our response has been to reiterate that the purpose of this questionnaire is to globally compare contact situations, and that fine-grained distinctions at this level of macro-comparison are beyond our scope.

A warning against the use of domains is that it may reinforce the dominance of domains as a model by requiring respondents to consider language variation by domains. A recent paper by Di Carlo (2023) presents a design of a multilingualism survey of speaker's practices, attitudes, and ideologies that charts locally meaningful relationships and affiliations. The survey is geared

towards small-scale multilingual societies, reflecting Di Carlo's concern that the uncritical adoption of nation-based models for surveys may "obliterate the signals of non-diglossic patterns" found in these kinds of communities (2023: 379).

The shortcomings of domains as a model are made clear by small-scale multilingualism research (Section 2.1). We also see this in our demonstration below with some proposed domains showing significant overlap with one another in the northern Siberian context. Typology, however, necessarily requires some model to facilitate comparison. We refer again to Vaughan and Singer (2018), who observe the ubiquity of polyglossia as a model, and that domains are one of the few well-elaborated comparative models available. The notion of domain was therefore chosen primarily for its utility in structuring the questionnaire into manageable components.

In the absence of a well-developed alternative model that facilitates systematic comparison, we have tried to compensate for the blind spots of domains by providing opportunities for respondents to indicate issues posed by the various domains through qualitative comments. We have also attempted to free the notion of domains from some of the assumptions inherent in the Fishmanian sense, such as being neutral about the dominance of a language being spoken when undertaking certain activities. As mentioned in Section 2.1, we have tried to remain neutral about how certain factors may manifest in any given community; for example, that ideologies may not assume a hierarchical semantic relation between languages. Despite the name of this questionnaire subset, to our mind this is a step in deconstructing the dominance of a narrowly construed domains model in questionnaires. The shortcomings of this questionnaire will hopefully provide lessons for the development of an alternative comparative sociolinguistic model.

We identified the six domains listed at the beginning of this section (Local Community, Trade, Social Exchange & Marriage, Family & Kin, Labor, Knowledge) by carrying out a review on the dynamics of social and linguistic interactions in contact situations. Specific research will be cited in Sections 5.3–5.8 where each domain is defined. We formulated our definitions with the goal of maximizing comparability across time and place, and do not, for example, consider the role of modern communication technologies in contact. In addition, many of our definitions are functional in nature, in the sense that they approach a given domain from the activities and societal functions associated with it (e.g., as done by Vincent, 2015). For instance the domain of Family & Kin is characterized as a space associated with child-bearing and -rearing. Some have argued that functional definitions of cultural practices and social institutions are prone to missing the dynamic aspects of practices and insti-

TABLE 2 Domains Questionnaire: Sections and the first letters of the cross-domain identifiers associated with each section.

Section	Cross-domain identifier	Description of section
Preamble	P	Speakers, occurrence, and time frame of contact
Domain-specific	D	Characterization of the domain
Social network	S	Social network comprising Focus and Neighbor Groups
Behavior-affecting biases	B	Ideologies and attitudes in the domain
Output	O	Linguistic production of Focus Group people in a domain
Input	I	Linguistic input that Focus Group people receive
Transmission	T	Language use by children in the domain
End	E	Data sources, other languages/groups featured in the domain, response confidence assessment

tutions (Yanagisako, 1979: 164–165), as they ignore the meanings of cultural practices to their practitioners. Yet, this approach is still useful for identifying similarities across varying societies, especially in the absence of any precedent in the field of comparative (socio)linguistic research (see a similar argument by Goodenough, 1980, with respect to comparative approaches in anthropology).

From here on we will make references to specific questions from the Domains Questionnaire. Each question has a cross-domain identifier and a domain-specific identifier. The cross-domain identifiers refer to the different sections of the Domains Questionnaire which are repeated in the same ordering across each and every domain. The cross-domain identifiers comprise two characters: a letter character representing the specific section of the questionnaire (e.g., P for preamble questions and S for questions pertaining to social networks), and a cardinal number or letter character representing individual questions within a broader section (e.g., P1 is the first question inside the preamble section and BA within the behavior-affecting biases section). The cross-domain identifiers are summarized in Table 2. The wording of individual questions is given in the appendices along with the corresponding identifiers, though some examples can be seen in Table 5.

Domain-specific identifiers are particular to each domain. They comprise five characters, where the first three characters refer to the domain to which the question applies; for example, the three letter abbreviations such as DLC

TABLE 3 Examples of the relationship between cross-domain identifiers and domain-specific identifiers.

Cross-domain identifier	Domain-specific identifier	Question identifier
BA	DTR16	What is the overall attitude that Focus Group people have towards Neighbor Group people in trade?
BA	DLC18	What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbor people in the local community?
S1	DLC16	How often do Focus people interact with Neighbor people in the local community?

TABLE 4 The correspondence between the explanatory factors of language change and the cross-domain identifiers.

Explanatory factor of language change	Sections of the questionnaire	Cross-domain identifiers
Cognitive processes	Opportunities for language learning and use	I, O, T
Social cognition	Accommodation, foreigner-directed speech	I, O, T
Social networks	Social network structure and density	S
Macro-contexts of language use	Linguistic ideologies and attitudes	B

for the domain of Local Community. These will only be referred to when necessary. For this paper, the most crucial identifier is the cross-domain identifier as described above. Table 3 shows concrete examples of the relationship between cross-domain identifiers and domain-specific identifiers. For each question cited, we will use unique identifiers that allow to trace the details of the question in the appendices.

The questions asked for each domain are divided in two categories: those that aim at characterizing the peculiarities of a given domain (and whose formulation may slightly vary across domains), and those that cut across domains (and whose formulation stays the same across domains). These cross-domain questions were designed as implementations of the four groups of explanatory factors identified in Section 3.3, schematized in Table 4.

Questions related to the cognitive processes and social cognition explanatory factors concern patterns of language learning and use at the level of the

TABLE 5 Relationship between explanatory factor type and section identifiers, and examples of questions related to the explanatory factor.

Explanatory factor	Section identifier	Example question (with cross-domain identifier)
Cognitive processes (output)	O	What language do Focus Group people typically speak with Neighbor Group people in domain X? (O ₁)
Cognitive processes (input)	I	What language do Neighbor Group people typically speak with Focus Group people in domain X? (I ₁)
Cognitive processes (transmission)	T	What language do Neighbor Group adults typically speak to Focus Group children? (T ₂)
Social cognition (accommodation)	O	Do Focus Group people typically simplify their language when speaking with Neighbor Group people in domain X? (O ₂)
Social networks (density)	S	How often do Focus Group people interact with Neighbor Group people in domain X? (S ₁)
Social networks (density)	S	How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus Group people and Neighbor Group people in domain X? (S ₃)
Macro-contexts of language use	B	What is the overall attitude that Focus Group people have towards Neighbor Group people in domain X? (BA)
Macro-contexts of language use	B	How do Focus Group people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbor Group people, within the context of domain X? (BH)

individual. The focus is on language input or exposure (the I set of section identifiers) and output or production (O set). These particular questions concern adults, but the questionnaire also tries to get information on opportunities for language transmission and use with children (T set).

Then there are the questions related to the explanatory factor of social networks (S set). These questions try to capture elements of the social network structure involving Focus and Neighbor peoples; for example, the frequency of interactions between the two groups, as well as the proportions of people that are typically involved in these interactions.

Finally the questions relating to the explanatory factor of macro-contexts of language use cover the broader contexts of language use affecting the group. This includes factors of attitudes and ideologies that may sway language behavior, labeled under the umbrella term of behavior-affecting biases (B set).

Table 4 shows the correspondence between the explanatory factors and cross-domain identifiers, and Table 5 shows examples of questions and the explanatory factor that they are related to.

The questions of the Domains Questionnaire follow the same patterns across all six domains. We begin by asking whether the domain in question is relevant for contact (questions P₁). The respondent is then asked to estimate the duration of contact (P₂), and to identify when the densest period of contact may have been (P₃). All subsequent questions for any given domain should be answered using the densest period of contact as the time frame of reference, as discussed in Section 3.2.

The questions related to the occurrence and the time frame of contact are then followed by questions about the particularities of each social domain. In the domain of Labor, for example, we ask “How commonly are Focus Group and Neighbor Group people involved in public modes of production?” (question D₁/DLB₀₂). The majority of the remaining questions are shared across domains and are designed to characterize the dynamics of social and linguistic interaction between Focus and Neighbor. For example, in every social domain there is some iteration of the question “How do Focus Group people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbor Group people, within the context of domain X?” (questions B_H), or “How much do Focus Group children participate in domain X?” (questions T₁). Table 3 introduced earlier shows an example of question B_A (attitudes) asked in the domains of Trade and Local Community.

The Domains Questionnaire ends with a set of final questions addressing data sources, the respondent’s confidence assessment of the answers provided for each domain, as well as any other language that may have played a relevant role during the suggested time frame of contact. These are questions E₁, E₄, E₅, and E₆, where E stands for “Ending questions.”

The Domains Questionnaire is presented in Appendices B–G.

4.3 *Question and answer format*

The wording of the questions attempts to avoid jargon and upfront analysis of the contact situation. Questions are worded in a way that experts can report on the basis of their own knowledge and experience of the Focus Group. For example, we ask “What languages do Focus Group people typically speak with the Neighbor people” in a given domain and vice versa (e.g., the input and output set of questions). These questions give an indication of the type of multilingual mode observable in the domain. Focus people may speak the Neighbor language in one domain, or there may be no clear tendency because both Focus and Neighbor people may frame their choice of language depending on the interactional context. If we had asked whether Focus and Neighbor Group

practice receptive multilingualism, or whether one group shifts to the other group's language, we would have needed the expert to provide a response based on some kind of prior analysis informed by these very notions. By eliciting responses based on observed behaviors, we then interpret the data post hoc, that is building upon the expert's responses in a bottom-up fashion.

Most questions have sets of predetermined answers. The predetermined answers often have specific parameters related to the question, and these are provided to the respondent so they may choose the best answer. For example, the question concerning physical proximity of Focus and Neighbor Group people in a given domain (S4) is specified as follows. The answer "Very proximate" is accompanied by the following explanation: "There is little to no effort in reaching one another, and does not bear considering as effortful." Conversely, the answer "Very far" is accompanied by the note: "There is considerable effort required to reach one another. Logistic considerations and planning must be made. Requires one or more overnight travel." Adding these specifications to the answer types contributes to guiding the respondents in their choice of answers, and to make responses comparable across contexts.

A comment field is available for each question so the respondents may elaborate, nuance, and further qualify their responses. The qualitative comments are crucial for interpreting the predetermined responses, as well as for making judgments on the applicability of the question to the contact pair under investigation; a point we will discuss further below.

The predetermined answer types are either binary (yes vs. no), scalar (Likert scale), or a selection of predetermined types. An example of a scalar response is the one given for question DEM06 (Social Exchange & Marriage), which asks "How much do Focus Group children participate in practices of exchange?" The possible answers are a scale between 1 and 5, where 1 corresponds to "They practically never participate" and 5 to "They practically always participate." An example of predetermined types are the answers to question DTR11 (Trade), "What language do Focus Group people typically speak when trading with Neighbor Group people?" with options of "Focus Group language," "Neighbor Group language," "Some other language," or "This is highly contextual." While all the other possible answers target some form of monolingual interaction (with choice between the Focus, Neighbor, or some other language), the last possible response stands for a mode of interaction that encompasses multilingual practices of various kinds. These may include: code-switching, code-mixing, audience design based on the interactional context, and knowledge of interlocutor's language biography.

Predetermining the possible responses has its merits and demerits. One risk is that it simply forces respondents to choose an answer, hence forcing the data

into a particular format. For example, as one anonymous reviewer pointed out, having a single “this is highly contextual” response for the range of possible response strategies possibly implying the use of multiple languages in a given interactional context means that most small-scale multilingual contexts would fall under this response. This may result in an asymmetry of signals from polyglossic vs. non-polyglossic contexts. While we cannot exclude that this may be the case, it is also possible that this is not the case. As far as the literature on societal multilingualisms is concerned, currently there is no clear knowledge about whether one type of multilingualism is more common than the other. The purpose of this questionnaire is to get some basic facts about contact, and the responses to the questionnaire may help us get some insight into this question about prevalence of multilingualism types. The only way to discern a “real” asymmetry vs. an asymmetry brought about by the questionnaire design is to view the responses in light of the qualitative comments provided by the respondent.

Definitions of the scales are presented in Appendix I.

5 Demonstration

There are two goals to this demonstration. The first is to showcase the utility of the questionnaire for assessing the frequency and tightness of contact relations between Focus and Neighbor Groups across domains of interactions. The second goal is to illustrate how the questionnaire contributes to gain an understanding of the type of bilingualism that is spread in language communities in contact (adult vs. child bilingualism). We qualitatively describe how each domain manifests in each contact pair and present responses about whether the domain in question is one where intergenerational language transmission could take place. We summarize key points from each and every section for readability’s sake, rather than providing a point-by-point illustration of the questionnaire. The entire questionnaire is, however, attached in the appendices.

When referring to the pair of Mawng-Kunbarlang, we will use the abbreviation MK. For Tundra Enets-Nganasan, we use the abbreviation TN.

5.1 *Introducing Mawng-Kunbarlang and Tundra Enets-Nganasan: Who are the speakers?*

The contact contexts under investigation are two small-scale multilingual societies. Ruth Singer tested the questionnaire by answering for Mawng (ISO [mph], glottocode [mawn1240]) and Kunbarlang ([wlg], [kunb1251]) in Arnhem Land,

TABLE 6 Contact pairs from Australia and Siberia

Contact pair	Mawng-Kunbarlang	Tundra Enets-Ngasan
Area	Northern Australia	Northern Siberia
Focus Group	Mawng (Iwaidjan)	Tundra Enets (Samoyedic)
Population	Approximately 300, pre- and post-colonization	For Enets as a whole, 3000 in the 1600s, 500 in the late 1800s, 200 in 2002 (Khanina and Meyerhoff, 2018: 223)
Neighbor Group	Kunbarlang (Gunwinyguan)	Ngasan (Samoyedic)
Densest time	1600–1800 CE	1700–1930 CE

northern Australia. Olesya Khanina responded for Tundra Enets ([enh], [tund₁₂₅₄]) and Nganasan ([nio], [ngan₁₂₉₁]) of the lower Yenisei in Siberia. A notable difference between the two contact pairs is that while the Australian pair features contact between speakers of two genealogically unrelated languages, the Siberian contact pair involves two genealogically related languages of the Samoyedic family. This suggests the questionnaire can consider social contact between neighboring communities regardless of their historical language and group affiliations. The questionnaire took Singer about seven hours to complete. Khanina took less time, as fewer social domains were relevant. Both authors have worked with their respective communities of expertise for a minimum of 19 years.

Both MK and TN have social contact in multiple domains, with European documentation noting social contact for at least the past 200 years. Both respondents, however, estimate that social contact has been ongoing for longer. Table 6 reports population figures and estimated densest time frame of contact as defined by the questionnaire (Section 3.2).

While the focus of this section is the demonstration of the Domains Questionnaire, Table 7 shows some examples of responses to selected questions from the Overview Questionnaire (Section 4.1) for completion's sake.

In the instructions at the beginning of the Domains Questionnaire, the Focus Group speakers are defined and identified (Appendix A). "A speaker of language X" is understood in the questionnaire as a person who is locally viewed as a speaker of the language with some kind of proficiency speaking it. We do not intend to connote ethnolinguistic unity, although the definition allows for the inclusion of such contexts. We assume to an extent that such speakers are the numerical majority when considering a given contact sce-

TABLE 7 Demonstration of select questions and answers from the Overview Questionnaire.

Identifier	Question	Mawng	Tundra Enets
OD1	What is the number of native-like users of Focus Group language?	100–999	100–999
OG1	What is the population density within the territory controlled by the Focus Group community?	Less than 2 persons per 10 sq. km	Less than 2 persons per 10 sq. km
OI1	Is the Focus language stated as an expression of identity of: Group centered around relationships of shared descent, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?	Yes	No
OS1	How many levels of jurisdictional hierarchy* are there in the Focus Group, beyond the local community?	No levels	No levels
OH1	Have there been any natural disasters or major societal upheaval during the densest period of contact between Focus Group and Neighbor Group that the Focus Group people talk about as having impacted people's mobility?	No	Yes
OE1	For how long have you worked with this community?	20 years	19 years
OC1	How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about each domain?	Very certain	Somewhat

*In this questionnaire “jurisdictional hierarchy” refers to a rank with jurisdictional authority, such as the ability to punish transgressors. The term “local community” refers to the closest social circle to the household environment, but outside the realm of family and kin, who typically reside together in face-to-face association.

nario; that is, there may be a numerical minority who speak language X often and well, but they are not locally viewed as speakers of the language. Local ideologies concerning speaker identity have bearings on speaker behaviors, and, therefore, it is crucial to know which people are the focus of the questionnaire response. Who gets considered “a Mawng speaker” or “a Tundra Enets speaker” becomes immediately significant for the questionnaire responses. In Arnhem Land, languages are often associated with clan. Therefore a person belonging to any one of the clans associated with Mawng is considered “a Mawng person.” A person of a different clan may speak Mawng very well, but they are excluded from local definitions as being a Mawng speaker. Singer thus specifies that

the questionnaire responses concern this local perspective of who is a Mawng speaker, thus excluding people who speak the language just as fluently, but who are associated with other clans. For Siberia, the different language groups roughly correspond with ethno-territorial groups. A person identified by a linguist as a Tundra Enets speaker may speak a variety of other languages, and people of other ethno-territorial groups may also speak Tundra Enets proficiently.

In addition to the issues entailed by defining speakerhood, we also acknowledge that groups that speak a particular language can be internally socioculturally diverse. We have tried to account for within-group heterogeneity by providing opportunities for the respondent to indicate this throughout the questionnaire. For example, for each social domain, there is a set of questions that asks the respondent to answer the questionnaire based on the social group where contact between Focus Group and Neighbor Group people is densest (D10). This question was included to recognize that only some speakers of a language may engage in language contact phenomena. Contact experiences may also differ, in part, based on one's social background. The questions of set D3 were included to help interpret the answers of the questionnaire, and to provide a nuanced picture of the sociocultural particularities of a given contact scenario.

5.2 *Sections chosen for demonstration: Intergenerational transmission and language choice*

In what follows, we provide an overview of test responses by social domains. The responses are then summarized in Section 5.9 where we demonstrate how the two contact scenarios can be compared with one another using the questionnaire as a grid. The purpose of this demonstration is to showcase the answerability of the questionnaire through the grid of these test responses, rather than to break new grounds of knowledge about these communities, or to provide a content analysis of individual responses.

Since the Domains Questionnaire in its entirety has 231 questions, we have chosen to present a qualitative analysis of the responses to just a couple of these. Here we will look at opportunities for intergenerational language transmission, and the language choices of adults.

The opportunity for intergenerational language transmission is addressed by asking about children's participation in each domain (specific questions for the six domains: DEM06, DKN22, DLB17, DLC31, DTR18, DFK00). By asking whether children actively participate in the activities typical of a domain, we can infer whether the domain provides an opportunity for children to learn the Neighbor Group language or other linguistic codes. The predetermined responses to the question are scalar, from children "practically always participate" with a value

of 5, through to “they practically never participate,” value 1. In theory, the higher the value, the more likely that children have the opportunity of exposure to the Neighbor language.

The questionnaire is limited to considering children under the age of five years. While language learning and socialization undoubtedly continue throughout life, the choice of this age threshold reflects knowledge from child language research. Bilingual language acquisition studies demonstrate that bilingual children show the ability to tailor their own choice of language to the interlocutors’ language from around their second year of life (Mishina-Mori, 2011: 3122, and references therein). The literature on cognitive and language development suggests that at around age three or four, children start showing the ability to take the perspective of others both in terms of visual perception (Flavell, 2004; Frick et al., 2014) and linguistic behavior. There is evidence showing that children around this age also understand and utilize sociolinguistic variables (e.g., Fischer, 1958; Stanford, 2008), and cultural linguistic norms (e.g., Davidson, 2018, for northern Australia).

For both contact pairs, the language choices of adults are highly variable across all domains. In Australia, one of the many factors that inform language choice is a strong cultural convention of speaking the language of the place one is presently at (see Merlan, 1981), meaning that language choice is highly dependent on context and interlocutor. For the Siberian pair, Khanina reports that speakers engage in receptive bilingual modes of interaction, with contextual power being a strong determinant of language choice. For instance, if there are greater numbers of any given language present, those who can speak that language may choose to speak it. Thus, while the details of variable language choice differ across the two contact pairs, in both cases, the social domains are spaces of (socio)linguistic negotiation, rather than being associated with a single language in some strong polyglossic mode.

5.3 *Local Community*

5.3.1 Definition

Local Community concerns the spaces closest to the household, but extending beyond it. The neighborhood or village are examples of a local community. From a linguistic point of view, it is a space of in-group relationships where unmonitored speech likely occurs. Local communities are considered likely domains of linguistic innovations (see Labov, 1966, 1972, and his particular definition of “vernacular speech”; see also Coupland, 2016) and transmission (Clark and Watson, 2016; Labov, 2007).

Possible local community forms predefined for the questionnaire are “nuclear family,” “band,” “neighborhood or village,” “town or city,” and “other”

(D1/DLC02). We include both sedentary and mobile units to contrast agricultural vs. non-agricultural language communities (following Bower, 2010). While there is diversity of configurations within the categories we have chosen, the intention of this question is to give a rough approximation of group size and mobility on a global level.

5.3.2 Response

The type of local community for both contact pairs was “band”: a collection of families that are connected by some culturally meaningful bond such as shared descent, marriage, and friendship. Both Mawng and Tundra Enets groups have historically been non-sedentary and organized themselves as more-or-less politically autonomous groups centered around kinship relations. In the case of the Australian pair, people were historically nomadic and traveled in groups that constantly varied in composition. Members of this band would have spoken up to 10 western Arnhem Land languages that bordered Mawng territories (e.g., Iwaidja, Kunwinjku, Bininj Kunwok), including the Neighbor Group language of Kunbarlang.

Local Community overlaps functionally with other domains for TN: with Family & Kin, Labor, and Social Exchange & Marriage. The responses to the questions about languages spoken (I and O set) and social networks (S set) are therefore the same across these four domains. Social contact is assessed as occurring predominantly through marriage in the case of Tundra Enets, therefore many activities of daily life revolve around the household of married couples. Local Community for MK also appears to overlap with the domain of Family & Kin, but the social contact in the domains of Labor and Social Exchange & Marriage are more specific.

Children are present in both contact scenarios. Singer chose “children practically always participate” in the local community of the Australian pair. Children are reported as speaking their own Mawng language to both Kunbarlang adults and children, but Singer suggests that Kunbarlang adults would, where possible, speak Mawng to Mawng children. Khanina chose “children participate somewhat” for the Siberian pair. Tundra Enets women are reported as tending to stay at home with children under the age of five, meaning that young children are perhaps partially segregated from public local community spaces. Khanina was unable to assess typical language choices of children in this domain.

5.4 *Trade*

5.4.1 Definition

Trade is often mentioned as a significant domain in language contact studies. From the transmission of loanwords from Arabic into Hausa (Yalwa, 1992) to the emergence of trade jargons such as Chinook (Thomas, 1935) and Tanim Tok (a Yimas-Alamblak trade pidgin; Williams, 2000), a variety of linguistic outcomes have been hypothesized and observed from trade relations.

The operational definition of the Trade domain is the transaction of objects and services by individuals and groups of people. The prototype is a transaction of commodities, by the modes of money, barter, or some mixed form. Trade is operationally characterized by two aspects in this questionnaire. First, that there is a clear understanding by participants of immediate or future gains or returns, and second, that the acquisition of objects, money, or service, is a clear motivator of the exchange. The purpose of this definition is to keep trade as distinct as possible from acts of exchange which build relationships, such as gift exchange addressed, in the domain of Social Exchange & Marriage (Section 5.5).

While it is often impossible to separate transactional trade from relational exchange (see Strathern and Stewart, 2012), there is some evidence that monetary transactions have distinct behavioral characteristics. These characteristics are relevant to concepts such as social network structure, or the larger concept of societies of intimates. For example, currencies have historically been used by groups with multiple levels of jurisdictional hierarchy, having developed out of a specific sociohistorical context of early state taxation (see Smith, 2004: 91). This in turn may suggest exoteric kinds of interactions and linguistic exchanges. An experimental study by Vohs et al. (2006) suggests that the use of cash results in more solitary and individualistic behaviors, which may in turn have consequences for interactions and linguistic norms.

5.4.2 Response

The responses reinforce the difficulty of separating gift exchange and trade in small-scale multilingual societies. Trade is a “no social contact” domain for both MK and TN precisely because exchange is less transactional and more relational. For example, Singer points out anthropological observations which mention gift exchanges between groups via elders as representative gift-givers and receivers. The precise answer here is that transactional trade is not a domain of social contact, but people from both contact pairs most certainly exchanged goods with one another.

Since transactional trade is a “no contact” domain, there are no responses concerning children’s involvement in this domain.

5.5 *Social Exchange & Marriage*

5.5.1 Definition

We broadly define this domain as concerning practices of (semi-)codified exchange that regulate relationships between individuals and movement across groups. The domain therefore covers practices of gift and ceremonial exchange, as well as marriage exchange. All deal with the circulation of goods and people for the purpose of relationship-building. Social Exchange naturally interacts with the domain of Trade, while Marriage with the domain of Family & Kin. Nevertheless, we chose to distinguish these in an attempt at reducing the internal complexity of these domains.

Gift and ceremonial exchange include deliberate ceremonies such as the *po'ò a*, a ceremonial exchange ritual of the northwestern Amazon (Chernela, 2003). Regional systems of exchange such as the *kula* of east-coast New Guinea (Malinowski, [1922] 2013) would also fall in the ceremonial exchange category. Finally, the gifting of Christmas presents in the contemporary USA would be an example of a semi-codified exchange event.

By marriage exchange, we are interested in patterns associated with marriage, such as endogamic and exogamic patterns, polygamy and monogamy, and residency rules surrounding marriage events. This helps characterize marriage-based population movements between Focus and Neighbor Groups at a group level. The dynamics of linguistic interaction within the marriage relationship are part of the Family & Kin domain (Section 5.6). The questions from this conglomerate domain thus focus on goods exchange and marriage exchange, separately. The results of marriage will be analyzed with those of the Family & Kin domain.

While the relationship between marriage patterns and language change is relatively well researched at various scales of investigation,⁵ we could find little on exchange practices outside those commonly labeled as “trade.” Anthropological works have documented and theorized much on various forms of exchange and their social meaning (see, e.g., Strathern and Stewart, 2012), and this is an area that could be of greater research interest for linguists interested in language contact.

5 Research on kinship patterns, populations, and languages suggest that these phenomena affect one another in complex ways. Lansing et al. (2017) find that postmarital residence patterns, which promote movements of individuals between speech communities, also lead to uniparental language transmission. In areas of high linguistic diversity or high levels of multilingualism, fieldworkers have noted a certain propensity to some kind of linguistic exogamy—either as a deliberate ideology (Stenzel, 2005) or as an epiphenomenon of some other exogamy rule (eg. clan exogamy, village exogamy, see Stanford and Pan, 2013).

5.5.2 Response

Both contact pairs reported “yes” for social contact in this domain. For MK, Singer estimates that social exchange has been ongoing for a few hundred years. Khanina expresses certainty about social exchange for the past 100 years, but comments that it also likely occurred in earlier times. Khanina notes that the TN involvement in social exchange is asymmetrical across the populations, in the sense that at least half of the Tundra Enets population would interact in social exchange with Nganasan speakers.

Both contact pairs report social exchange as a highly multilingual affair, with other local languages spoken in addition to the two contact pair languages. Singer responds that most MK people will or will have experienced some form of social exchange, meaning that this is a significant contact domain in terms of opportunities for linguistic interaction. TN, however, have limited opportunities of social exchange as it is only those who occupy adjacent territories that are involved in contact. There are no precise figures available, but the assessment is that at least half the Tundra Enets who border Nganasan people would interact in social exchange, while only a minority of Nganasan people directly interact in social exchange.⁶

Both respondents report the presence of children in exchange, but the degree of involvement in exchange practices varies. Khanina chose “children participate a lot.” Singer comments that children travel with the older members of their families to attend ceremonies, but the amount of participation depends on the ceremony. The Mamurrng ceremony, for example, involves children a lot since it features gifting a toddler who is expected to sit up in front of the audience for most of the ceremony. Other ceremonies, however, do not require children’s participation at all. The response for MK was therefore chosen overall as “children participate a little.” Typicality judgments of children’s language choices in this domain were unavailable.

5.6 *Family & Kin*

5.6.1 Definition

This domain concerns the interaction between family and kin members. For the purposes of this questionnaire, family and kin are characterized as relationships revolving around child-bearing and -rearing, as well as food production and consumption (e.g., following Yanagisako, 1979: 162–163). The goal here is to

6 The questionnaire in its entirety has questions about the proportion of Focus Group and Neighbor Group people involved in this domain (cross-domain identifiers S6 and S7, respectively).

elucidate general information about language use and attitudes within family to compare across a range of situations involving language contact via families.

Family and kin dynamics are significant for language transmission, given the role caregivers play in the language acquisition and socialization of children. For example, the vitality of language use in the family space relates to successful intergenerational language transmission in colonial, and migratory, contexts (Clyne, 2003: 22), especially when coupled with positive parental attitudes towards the family languages (Mbakop and Ndada, 2021; Kircher, 2019). Areas of high multilingualism appear to have exogamic marriage patterns that result in the movement of spouses across language communities (Pakendorf et al., 2021: 843–844). Tolerant attitudes towards multiple language use is observed in such small-scale multilingual communities, and some have suggested that this tolerance allows the acquisition of multiple languages from early childhood (e.g., François, 2012; however see Khachatryan and Konoshenko, 2021, and Stanford, 2009, about language shame).

We focus on familial relationships between spouses and affines (in-laws) in this questionnaire. The importance of affinal relationships on linguistic behavior is observed cross-culturally, seemingly due to strong social obligations between in-laws. This often manifests linguistically in lexical avoidance (Fleming, 2014; Mitchell, 2015; Stasch, 2011), and the use of special address terms and registers (King, 2001; Rushforth, 1981). In this questionnaire we constrain the questions to the issues of whether there are marked linguistic behaviors and attitudes, and rough assessments of language use.

5.6.2 Response

Marriage patterns (see Section 5.5) are reported as mostly virilocal in both MK and TN; that is, a woman will typically relocate to her husband's location of residence. Both contact pairs have reciprocal marriages across groups. For instance, a Mawng woman may live with a Kunbarlang husband in his territory, and a Kunbarlang woman may live with a Mawng husband in his territory. The preferred language of use is stated as the husband's language, but Singer states that children are spoken to by their mother in her own language and that they respond to their mothers in this same language, circumstances permitting. For TN, a Tundra Enets person will typically speak the language of the numerical majority of the area, so a Tundra Enets woman would speak Nganasan in the household if she lives in an area where the Nganasan are a majority. She may speak Tundra Enets to her husband in the early days of the marriage as she is still becoming familiar with Nganasan (see also Khanina, 2021: 1070), but it is also likely that she will have learned some Nganasan from her relatives as a child because of a possible future marriage to a Nganasan speaker.

There are qualitative differences between the Australian and Siberian responses regarding when children could speak their mothers' languages. In the case of Siberia, Khanina states that children were encouraged to speak the language of the majority group present. Multiethnic households are typically monolectal, speaking the language of the numerical majority (Khanina, 2021: 1070), so the children of Tundra Enets mothers would speak Nganasan in the household. However if a child were in a situation surrounded by maternal kin, they would likely speak her language. As for Australia, Singer reports that a Mawng child could speak their mother's language at any time, but the location may sway their decision, that is, a child may prefer to speak their mother's language in territories associated with her language, as per cultural convention.

Regarding interaction between in-laws, both pairs report that the preferred languages of communication are highly dependent on individuals' biographies. For TN, one may find that relatives speak in receptive bilingual modes, or may switch to the interlocutor's language due to context or ability. Singer relays reports of Mawng women learning Kunbarlang so that they may speak to their grandchildren who are Kunbarlang speakers. Because both northern Australia and northern Siberia are traditionally highly multilingual, the range of possible language repertoires in in-law interactions is highly variable (both in terms of languages, and ability). While coarse-grained, these answers suggest an environment where children are exposed to many languages, and are themselves likely to partake in multilingual interactions.

5.7 *Knowledge*

5.7.1 Definition

The knowledge domain is broadly defined as social institutions practicing knowledge transmission through some kind of master-novice relationship. The mode of transmission can be oral or literacy based. The precise details of the nature of knowledge being transferred are of secondary interest at this stage.

This domain prototypically covers practices around education, religion, and ritual knowledge. Knowledge domains often appear to have cultural authority, and are likely to have some kind of coercive power that stems from and forms the basis of their authority and legitimacy. Some concrete examples include historical literary spaces such as those dedicated to the study of theological texts, such as the Sanskrit Dharmasāstra (Indosphere), temple-administered secular education of literacy and arithmetic for children in eighteenth-century Japan. Institutions of non-literary modes of knowledge transmission may also be included, such as Hopi ceremonial sodalities where children receive ritual knowledge over the course of their lives from extended family, and into which they are initiated as adults later in life (Glowacka, 1998: 389).

The definition of this domain is motivated by general research findings on the consequences of standardized national languages and language of religion. For example, codified and standardized national varieties are effectively disseminated over a large population, in conjunction to shaping the attitudes and behaviors of the next generation (see, e.g., Ferguson, 2006: 33–35; Spolsky and Lambert, 2006: 561). Educational and religious institutions both often disseminate literacy (Spolsky, 2003; Sawyer, 2006: 522, for religion). National/colonial and religious languages are often linked to ideologies of purism and notions of “good vs. bad” language (Spolsky and Lambert, 2006: 561–562, for standard languages in education; Fudge, 2006, and Spolsky, 2003, for religious languages). Both often idealize a conformity to a singular form (e.g., as stated by Bamgbose, 1994, in the colonial context of Africa).

5.7.2 Response

The broad definition of the domain of Knowledge appears applicable to a range of societal contexts given that both respondents were able to answer the questionnaire for these small-scale multilingual contexts. Both contact pairs have a “yes” response for this domain. For the purposes of this questionnaire, practices centered around ceremonies and ceremony planning are considered knowledge transmission.

For MK, participation in ceremonies differs depending on one’s age, gender, descent group, land owning group, and place-based identity. Elders and older people are recognized in the community for their spiritual knowledge or leadership skills, and plan ceremonial activities together. Most Mawng and Kunbarlang speakers lived in an area claimed by Mawng speakers during the densest period of contact (1930–1980 CE), so Singer suggests that the common language of choice for both Mawng and Kunbarlang speakers was likely Mawng.

Mawng children are reported as participating “somewhat” in the Knowledge domain. Some knowledge such as sacred knowledge is unsuitable for children, so akin to the social exchange response, children are present only in some knowledge contexts. The language typically spoken by Mawng children is reported as Mawng.

For TN, the domain of Knowledge manifests in involvement in shamanistic rituals. Rituals often involved a shaman and his/her helpers whose main language may be different from the language used in the family where the ritual was performed.⁷ As far as Khanina is aware, shamanistic rituals mostly took

7 Being a shaman was a gift, and the share of gifted individuals was not too high. Therefore if a shaman speaking your language was not in your whereabouts, but one speaking a different Northern Samoyedic language was, the latter was consulted.

place inside a tent. This meant all the family was present, and that children were present also.

5.8 *Labor*

5.8.1 Definition

In this domain we investigate interactions in labor, production, and economic activity. Economic activity is defined as human labor and production where people transform nature into a cultural domain (Seremetakis, 2007: 101). The economic activity may lie anywhere along the domestic-public mode continuum. Domestic economic activities refer to contexts where work activity, production, and consumption all occur in the domestic sphere, while for public modes there is a split between the public and private domains (Seremetakis, 2007: 102). In public modes of economic activity, individuals sell their labor in public (Seremetakis, 2007: 102). These modes roughly overlap with certain kinds of sociopolitical organizations: domestic modes with hunter-gatherers and horticultural societies on one extreme, and public modes with societies of specialized labor and/or economic stratification on the other.

Labor is often a domain of contact. Work places in migration contexts are often multilingual (Gunnarsson, 2013), and use of languages in such a space are greatly affected by greater attitudes and ideologies. For example, second language socialization “often occurs in a relatively hostile environment” (Roberts, 2010: 217), for example in Canada where migrant workers are involved in “unskilled labor” (Li, 2000; Katz, 2000). On the other hand, professionals in cosmopolitan transnational corporate environments tend to have more egalitarian relationships across different strata of staff (e.g., “bilingual professionals” in Day and Wagner, 2008). Like many other domains, the differences in power between different groups appears to be of key interest.

5.8.2 Response

Both MK and TN report Labor as a domain of contact. In both cases, the Focus and Neighbor Groups have worked with one another in different ways over time; the notable shift in labor type occurring around the turn of the twentieth century. Singer reports that Mawng and Kunbarlang worked together between 1916 and the 1970s during the mission era at Warruwi. For Tundra Enets and Nganasan, as mentioned earlier, Khanina reports that the domains of Local Community and Family & Kin overlap significantly with Labor, which is centered around the tent and herding. Comparing these two pairs, it seems that labor is a long-enduring and kin-based domain of social contact for the Siberian pair involving multiple generations and genders, while it is an intense, recent, and socially concentrated domain for the Australian pair.

TABLE 8 Australian and Siberian domains of contact

Domain	Mawng-Kunbarlang	Tundra Enets-Nganasan
Local Community	Yes	Yes*
Trade	**	**
Social Exchange & Marriage	Yes	Yes
Family & Kin	Yes	Yes*
Knowledge	Yes	Yes
Labor	Yes	Yes*

* Family and kin are also the units of labor, and local community

** Exchange of goods as social exchange rather than transactional trade

Both pairs report children as present, and as participating “somewhat” in Labor. The language typically spoken by Mawng children is reported as Mawng, while for Tundra Enets, typicality judgments of children’s language choices in this domain were unavailable.

5.9 *Comparative summary of responses by social domain*

Having presented a qualitative overview of responses by social domain for each of the two example contact pairs, we will now illustrate how these responses can be used to draw comparisons between contact scenarios. Allowing for a broad exploration of the social foundations of language contact in individual contact settings and enabling comparisons across contact settings are precisely the goals of the sociolinguistic questionnaire and the general principles that ultimately guided its design.

We compare the responses for the contact pairs of MK and TN, focusing on three aspects: the number and types of contact domains, the degree of overlap between contact domains, and the participation of children in the contact domains. We chose these three aspects as frames of comparison as each of them contributes to key notions in sociolinguistic typological research on language contact, notably: the intensity of contact, the difference between small- and large-scale contact, and the type of multilingualism (adult- or child-based). Comparing responses through the eyes of these phenomena demonstrates how our questionnaire can collect data for the investigation of factors associated with language contact and change.

Table 8 summarizes the relevance of the six social domains with respect to each of the two contact pairs. Both MK and TN pairs report “yes” for five domains with “no” for transactional trade. These “yes” responses are, however, not completely equivalent across the two contact pairs.

TABLE 9 Participation of children across domains

Domain	Mawng-Kunbarlang	Tundra Enets-Nganasan
Local Community	Children practically always participate 5	Children participate somewhat 3
Trade	** **	** **
Social Exchange	Children participate a little 2	Children participate a lot 4
Family & Kin	Children always present 5	Children always present 5
Knowledge	Children participate somewhat 3	Children participate somewhat 3
Labor	Children participate somewhat 3	Children participate somewhat 3

** Exchange of goods as social exchange rather than transactional

Khanina specifies that the domains of Local Community, Family & Kin, and Labor overlap significantly. Tundra Enets and Nganasan speakers are documented as marrying across language groups (Dolgikh, 1962, cited in Khanina and Meyerhoff, 2018: 233), and form linguistically mixed families, where a family “tent” constitutes a local community. The functions of the tents are to raise families and engage in food production, therefore we have overlap between the three domains of Family & Kin, Labor, and Local Community.

For the Australian pair, Singer also reported “yes” for five of the six social domains. The domains of relevance however appear qualitatively more distinct in their activities as compared to the Siberian pair. For example, the relevant activity in the domain of Labor for Mawng and Kunbarlang speakers involves men working for Macassan traders, while the local community comprises linguistically mixed families. The strategy for how to deal with these differences for the purpose of comparison would depend on the research question. What is relevant here is that, given the questionnaire format, it is possible for respondents to single out the extent of overlap or mutual distinctness of the social domains. The comment function accompanying the questions addressing occurrence of contact in each of the social domains further allows for a better contextualization of individual answer choices.

Table 9 compiles the Australian and Siberian responses to the questions about children’s participation in each domain. By default, children are consid-

ered absent where there is “no contact” reported for the domain. The quantified responses would allow for further numerical explorations of the data (see, e.g., Sinnemäki, 2024).

The responses for the Australian and Siberian pairs show that children tend to be present whenever there also is contact between adult speakers in any given domain. All domains with adult contact report the participation of children to some extent. This ultimately suggests that there is a potential for early language socialization in the Focus and Neighbor Groups’ languages to occur in any of these domains. The responses to the Family & Kin domain show a high degree of child participation, suggesting that both MK and TN bilinguals are not adult learners. Likewise, the Local Community domain shows a high degree of child participation, further supporting the description of both Australian and Siberian pairs as contact situations involving child bilingualism (that is, not adult learner contact).

6 Discussion

We now focus on issues related to the answerability of the questionnaire and its broad applicability to sociolinguistic typological research. The questionnaire was overall considered answerable by both respondents, who have personal experience with communities from the contact pair (in both or either one of the two speech communities in contact). Both contact pairs are relatively self-contained, with most speakers being part of a geographically circumscribed community with low population numbers. This questionnaire is arguably more challenging for large language communities, but can still be useful when considering specific regional or sociolectal varieties. The necessary step would be to delimit the sociocultural context as tightly as possible so that typicality judgments can be made.

In addition, as mentioned throughout the paper, both contact pairs instantiate scenarios of small-scale multilingualism where several languages beyond those singled out as the Focus and Neighbor Groups’ languages are available to the repertoire of the community members. These additional languages may be actively used depending on the interactional context. Both Singer and Khanina respond to the questionnaire when asked to frame these small-scale multilingual settings in terms of pair-wise relations between one Focus Group and one Neighbor Group. This speaks to the applicability of the questionnaire to these types of multilingual language ecologies.

The feedback from Singer and Khanina was that while the questionnaire was answerable, it was challenging in parts. Both Singer and Khanina mentioned

the lack of historical data available for the communities, and Singer specifically mentioned the difficulty in choosing the most relevant time period of contact for each domain. Khanina expressed a degree of uncertainty for the answers provided, and suggested that the very nature of the phenomena (i.e., multi-lingual practices) cannot be categorically captured. Khanina also mentioned, however, that some questions were straightforward to answer and thus kept her engaged with the questionnaire. Despite these reservations, both Singer and Khanina indicated that the questionnaire could be completed, and that the supporting text and answer types were adequate despite the loss of qualitative richness.

A few caveats need to be acknowledged from this demonstration. To begin with, the responses to the questionnaire are a subjective assessment of the contact pairs. Both respondents stress that they can only report what they know from their experience with the communities, meaning that a “no” response to any question may be an “I do not know” rather than a true negative. While there are multiple opportunities for respondents to qualify their responses by using a comment box, by and large, the respondents felt that some things were immeasurable. This “bad data problem” of gaps in knowledge and uncertainties are common in historical (socio)linguistic research (as pointed out by Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg, 2016), and more generally, when eliciting expert assessments based on observational data.

Ideally we would want to know with more certainty about the multiple facets of language communities, such as child socialization, or common expectations on language choices, and how both of these might have evolved through time. The current state of the field is such that this information may be either non-existent for the communities under study, or not accessible to general linguists who do not have training in anthropology, sociology, history, and related fields. This latter point can be addressed in future research where deeper interdisciplinary work can be conducted. We contend, however, that the type of assessment elicited through our questionnaire is still preferable to a black-box approach to the social dimension of language or to cases where these aspects of language contact are ignored entirely.

Another issue is the low granularity of the answers associated with each question. Cross-cultural variation is flattened in the name of comparability, and there is little room to explore nuances or individual speaker choices except through qualitative comments. The loss of sociocultural richness is particularly evident when considering the questions which cross-cut domains and require answer selection from a predetermined set. The low granularity is, however, compensated by the number of data points (207 per contact pair in the Domains Questionnaire, omitting those questions relating to confidence

assessment). This is comparable to existing typological databases of language structures such as 144 features for the World Atlas of Language Structures (Haspelmath et al., 2008) and 195 features for Grambank (Skirgård et al., 2023). All in all, the questionnaire affords the opportunity to compare contact contexts, counterbalancing the shortcomings. Attention should be paid as to what can and cannot be said by the data, and to interpret the data with caution.

Finally, the length of the questionnaire has been identified as a barrier to its wider uptake. On the other hand, a relatively comprehensive investigation of sociolinguistic factors relating to language contact necessarily involves multiple dimensions. We thus view the length of this questionnaire as necessary to collecting data of this kind. A future iteration of the questionnaire should consider a shorter and more accessible format, so a wider range of people may use it, such as, for instance, members of the communities under investigation.

The questionnaire makes two broad contributions to research in comparative sociolinguistics and sociolinguistic typology. Firstly, it provides a qualitative and quantitative tool for estimating the intensity of contact between pairs of neighboring speech communities. This can be done in a number of ways, but one option is by considering just the number of domains where interactions between Focus and Neighbor Groups occur. Another option is to consider the frequency and nature of Focus-Neighbor interactions within each social domain, focusing on social network density and structures, as well as reported expectations on language choice and competence. When applied to a large dataset of language communities of the world, and in combination with actual linguistic data, this questionnaire has the potential as a resource to empirically test the oft-repeated claim that the nature and extent of contact-induced change depend on how much contact there is between speakers of neighboring communities.

Secondly, by eliciting expert assessments on language choice and use in adult-adult interactions, and by including at least some cursory information about adult-child, and child-child interactions between Focus and Neighbor Group members, the questionnaire offers a window into the dynamics of language use and language transmission in a range of contact situations. The responses concerning these topics are undoubtedly coarse due to the design constraints. However, having access to even some data about language use and transmission in contact situations and across different interactional contexts is an unprecedented possibility in comparative contact research; sociolinguistic and linguistic alike. For instance, combining data collected through the questionnaire with linguistic data targeting specific structural features in a large sample of languages of the world would provide a unique testing ground to the

oft-repeated claim that adult bi-/multilingualism and child bi-/multilingualism fundamentally differ with respect to their impact on language variation and change (Kempe and Brooks, 2018).

7 Conclusion

We have presented here the design principles of the GramAdapt Social Contact questionnaire, which is a tool for systematically collecting comparative data on sociolinguistic factors of language contact scenarios from around the world. The theoretical contribution of the questionnaire lies in problematizing comparative approaches to language contact scenarios, and suggesting a different approach. The questionnaire questions are based on a synthesis of explanatory factors suggested by a range of studies including small-scale multilingualism and global typological studies. The questionnaire's methodological contribution to comparative sociolinguistics is the usability of this questionnaire, demonstrated through the case studies of two distinct contact scenarios of Mawng and Kunbarlang contact in Australia and Tundra Enets and Nganasan contact in Siberia.

The questionnaire has the potential to present new sociolinguistic materials, in spite of the caveats to the data obtained through the responses. The potential for the comparative study of contact-induced change is manifested by considering, for example, opportunities for intergenerational transmission in various social contexts. This kind of data has hitherto been lacking in prior comparative studies with a global focus. Such a global comparative approach inevitably coarsens the complexities of individual language ecologies and contact scenarios. Nevertheless, the transparency of the design principles by which the questionnaire is informed provides a new baseline to comparative language contact research.

Division of labor

Eri Kashima and Francesca Di Garbo shared equally in the writing of the manuscript, and the design of the questionnaire. Ruth Singer and Olesya Khanina contributed the responses to the questionnaire, and provided specific details about their communities of expertise for the writing of this paper.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank our colleagues Friederike Lüpke, Maria Khachaturyan, Ksenia Shegal, and Max Wahlström for comments on earlier versions of the questionnaire. We are also grateful for the feedback of our GramAdapt colleagues Kaius Sinnemäki, Ricardo Napoleão De Souza, and Janne Loisa, with special thanks to Oona Raatikainen.

This publication is part of the GramAdapt project, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No. 805371). Olesya Khanina would also like to thank the Kone Foundation for providing funding during the time she worked on the questionnaire responses (2021).

References

- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 1989. Are Iraqi women more prestige conscious than men? Sex differentiation in Baghdadi Arabic. *Language in Society* 18(4): 471–481. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500013865>.
- Atanga, Lilian, Sibonile Edith Ellece, Lia Litosseliti, and Jane Sunderland. 2012. Gender and language in sub-Saharan African contexts: Issues and challenges. *Gender and Language* 6(1): 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.v6i1.1>.
- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1994. Pride and prejudice in multilingualism. In Richard Fardon and Graham Furniss (eds.), *African Languages, Development and the State*, 33–43. London: Routledge.
- Barth, Danielle, Nicholas Evans, I Wayan Arka, Henrik Bergqvist, Diana Forker, Sonja Gipper, Gabrielle Hodge, Eri Kashima, Yuki Kasuga, Carine Kawakami et al. 2021. Language vs. individuals in cross-linguistic corpus typology. In Geoffrey Haig, Stefan Schnell and Frank Seifart (eds.), *Doing Corpus-based Typology with Spoken Language Corpora*, 79–232. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bell, Allan. 2002. Back in style: Reworking audience design. In Penelope Eckert and John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cb09780511613258.010>.
- Bentz, Christian, and Bodo Winter. 2013. Languages with more second language learners tend to lose nominal case. *Language Dynamics and Change* 3(1): 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22105832-13030105>.
- Bergs, Alexander. 2012. The uniformitarian principle and the risk of anachronisms in language and social history. In Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*, 80–98. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118257227.ch5>.

- Bickel, Balthasar, and Johanna Nichols. 2020. Linguistic typology and hunter-gatherer languages. In Tom Güldemann, Patrick McConvell and Richard A. Rhodes (eds.), *The Language of Hunter-Gatherers*, 67–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139026208.004>.
- Binford, Lewis R. 2001. *Constructing Frames of Reference: An Analytical Method for Archaeological Theory Building Using Ethnographic and Environmental Data Sets*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Blevins, Juliette. 2017. Areal sound patterns: From perceptual magnets to stone soup. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics*, 88–121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowern, Claire. 2010. Correlates of language change in hunter-gatherer and other “small” languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(8): 665–679.
- Bowern, Claire, Patience Epps, Jane Hill, and Patrick McConvell. 2010. Hunter-Gatherer Language Database. <https://huntergatherer.la.utexas.edu/>.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buschfeld, Sarah, Patricia Ronan, and Manuela Vida-Mannl. 2023. *Multilingualism: A Sociolinguistic and Acquisitional Approach*. Cham: Springer International. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-28405-2>.
- Chernela, Janet M. 2003. Language ideology and women’s speech: Talking community in the Northwest Amazon. *American Anthropologist* 105(4): 794–806. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2003.105.4.794>.
- Cheshire, Jenny, and Sue Fox. 2009. *Was/were* variation: A perspective from London. *Language Variation and Change* 21(1): 1–38.
- Chrisp, Steven. 2005. Māori intergenerational language transmission. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 172: 149–181.
- Chun, Eunjin, Julia Barrow, and Edith Kaan. 2016. Native English speakers’ structural alignment mediated by foreign-accented speech. *Linguistics Vanguard* 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2016-0027>.
- Clahsen, Harald, Claudia Felser, Kathleen Neubauer, Mikako Sato, and Renita Silva. 2010. Morphological structure in native and nonnative language processing. *Language Learning* 60(1): 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00550.x>.
- Clark, Lynn, and Kevin Watson. 2016. Phonological leveling, diffusion, and divergence: /t/ lenition in Liverpool and its hinterland. *Language Variation and Change* 28(01): 31–62. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954394515000204>.
- Clem, Emily. 2016. Social network structure, accommodation, and language change. *UC Berkeley Phonetics and Phonology Lab Annual Report* 12: 83–102. <https://doi.org/10.5070/P7121040723>.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Coelho, Marco Túlio Pacheco, Elisa Barreto Pereira, Hannah J. Haynie, Thiago F. Rangel, Patrick Kavanagh, Kathryn R. Kirby, Simon J. Greenhill, Claire Bower, Russell D. Gray, Robert K. Colwell, Nicholas Evans, and Michael C. Gavin. 2019. Drivers of geographical patterns of North American language diversity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 286(1899). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.0242>.
- Coupland, Nikolas. 2016. Labov, vernacularity and sociolinguistic change. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 20(4): 409–430. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12191>.
- Croft, William. 2021. A sociolinguistic typology for languages in contact. In Enoch O. Aboh and Cécile B. Vigouroux (eds.), *Variation Rolls the Dice: A Worldwide Col- lage in Honour of Salikoko S. Mufwene*, 23–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dale, Rick, and Gary Lupyan. 2012. Understanding the origins of morphological diver- sity: The linguistic niche hypothesis. *Advances in Complex Systems* 15(03104). <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219525911500172>.
- Davidson, Lucinda. 2018. *Allies and Adversaries: Categories in Murrinhpatha Speaking Children's Talk*. PhD dissertation, University of Melbourne, School of Languages and Linguistics.
- Day, Dennis, and Johannes Wagner. 2008. Bilingual professionals. In Peter Auer and Li Wei (eds.), *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*, 391–404. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110198553>.
- Di Carlo, Pierpaolo. 2023. Reappraising survey tools in the study of multilingualism: Lessons from contexts of small-scale multilingualism. *Journal of Language Contact* 15(2): 376–403. <https://doi.org/10.1163/19552629-15020004>.
- Di Carlo, Pierpaolo, and Jeff Good. 2020. Introduction: Understanding the diversity of multilingualisms in sub-Saharan Africa. In Pierpaolo Di Carlo and Jeff Good (eds.), *African Multilingualisms: Rural Linguistic and Cultural Diversity*, xv–xxxvii. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Di Carlo, Pierpaolo, Jeff Good, and Rachel Ojong Diba. 2019. Multilingualism in rural Africa. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.227>.
- Dickson, Gregory F. 2015. *Marra and Kriol: The Loss and Maintenance of Knowledge across a Language Shift Boundary*. PhD dissertation, Australian National University.
- Dolgikh, Boris O. 1962. Rodovaja ekzogamija u nganasan i èncev [Clan exogamy by Nganasan and Enets]. In *Sibirskij Ètnografičeskij Sbornik iv. Očerki Po Istorii, Xoz'ajstvu i Bytu Narodov Severa [Essays on the History, Economy and Material Culture by Peoples of the North]*, 197–225. Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.
- Easley, David, and Jon Kleinberg. 2010. *Networks, Crowds, and Markets: Reasoning about a Highly Connected World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fenning (eds.). 2022. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Dallas: SIL International 25th edn. <https://www.ethnologue.com>.

- Evans, Nicholas. 2018. Did language evolve in multilingual settings? *Biology & Philosophy* 32(6): 905–933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-018-9609-3>.
- Fagyal, Zsuzsanna, Samarth Swarup, Anna María Escobar, Les Gasser, and Kiran Lakkaraju. 2010. Centers and peripheries: Network roles in language change. *Lingua* 120(8): 2061–2079.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. Diglossia. *Word* 15(2): 325–340.
- Ferguson, Charles A. 1975. Toward a characterization of English foreign talk. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17: 1–14.
- Ferguson, Gibson. 2006. *Language Planning and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fischer, John L. 1958. Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant. *Word* 14(1): 47–56.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1965. Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique* 1(2): 67–88.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1967. Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* 23(2): 29–38.
- Flavell, John H. 2004. Theory-of-mind development: Retrospect and prospect. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 50: 274–290.
- Fleming, Luke. 2014. Australian exceptionalism in the typology of affinal avoidance registers. *Anthropological Linguistics* 56(2): 115–158.
- Foley, William A. 2013. Yimas-Arafundi Pidgin. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath and Magnus Huber (eds.), *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Languages Online*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://apics-online.info/surveys/69>.
- François, Alexandre. 2012. The dynamics of linguistic diversity: Egalitarian multilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 214: 85–110.
- Frick, Andrea, Wenke Möhring, and Nora S. Newcombe. 2014. Picturing perspectives: Development of perspective-taking abilities in 4- to 8-year-olds. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00386>.
- Fudge, E. 2006. Religion: Overview. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd edn., 525–528. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00787-2>.
- García, Ofelia. 2013. From diglossia to transglossia: Bilingual and multilingual classrooms in the 21st century. In Christian Abello-Contesse, Paul M. Chandler, María Dolores López-Jiménez and Rubén Chacón-Beltrán (eds.), *Bilingual and Multilingual Education in the 21st Century*, 155–175. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783090716-012>.
- Gingrich, Andre. 2015. Comparative method in anthropology. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edn., 411–414. Amsterdam: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.12181-6>.

- Givón, Talmy, and Phil Young. 2002. Cooperation and interpersonal manipulation in the society of intimates. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*, 23–56. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Glowacka, Maria Danuta. 1998. Ritual knowledge in Hopi tradition. *American Indian Quarterly* 22(3): 386–392.
- Goodenough, Ward Hunter. 1980. *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Elizabeth. 1997. Sex, speech, and stereotypes: Why women use prestige speech forms more than men. *Language in Society* 26(1): 47–63.
- Grama, James. 2015. *Variation and Change in Hawai'i Creole Vowels*. PhD dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360–1380.
- Greenhill, Simon J. 2015. Demographic correlates of language diversity. In Claire Bowern and Bethwyn Evans (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 557–578. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gunnarsson, Britt Louise. 2013. Multilingualism in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 33: 162–189. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000123>.
- Hammarström, Harald, Robert Forkel, Martin Haspelmath, and Sebastian Bank. 2020. Glottolog Database 4.3. Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3754591>.
- Happé, Francesca, Jennifer L. Cook, and Geoffrey Bird. 2017. The structure of social cognition: In(ter)dependence of sociocognitive processes. *Annual Review of Psychology* 68(1): 243–267. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044046>.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie. 2008. The World Atlas of Language Structures Online. Max Planck Digital Library, Munich. <https://wals.info/>.
- Hay, Jennifer, and Laurie Bauer. 2007. Phoneme inventory size and population size. *Language* 83: 388–400.
- Haynie, Hannah J., Patrick H. Kavanagh, Fiona M. Jordan, Carol R. Ember, Russell D. Gray, Simon J. Greenhill, Kathryn R. Kirby, Geoff Kushnick, Bobbi S. Low, Ty Tuff, Bruno Vilela, Carlos A. Botero, and Michael C. Gavin. 2021. Pathways to social inequality. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 3. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2021.32>.
- Hodder, Ian. 1998. *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Holmes, Janet. 1998. Women's talk: The question of sociolinguistic universals. In Jennifer Coates (ed.), *Language and Gender: A Reader*, 461–483. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Irvine, Judith, and Susan Gal. 2000. Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P.V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*, 35–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jaspers, Jürgen. 2016. *Diglossia and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.013.27>.

- Jordan, Fiona M., and Brad R. Huber. 2013. Evolutionary approaches to cross-cultural anthropology. *Cross-Cultural Research* 47(2): 91–101.
- Jourdan, Christine. 2007. Linguistic paths to urban self in postcolonial Solomon Islands. In Miki Makihara and Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*, 30–48. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kashima, Eri. 2020. Word initial [h]-drop variation in Nmbo: Change-in-progress within an egalitarian multilingual speech community of Papua New Guinea. *Asia-Pacific Language Variation* 6(2): 250–277. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aplv.20002.kas>.
- Katz, Mira-Lisa. 2000. Workplace language teaching and the intercultural construction of ideologies of competence. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(1): 144–172. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.1.144>.
- Kaye, Alan S. 1994. Formal vs. informal in Arabic: Diglossia, triglossia, tetraglossia, etc., polyglossia—Multiglossia viewed as a continuum. *Zeitschrift für Arabische Linguistik* 27: 47–66.
- Kaye, Alan S. 2001. Diglossia: The state of the art. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2001(152). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.051>.
- Kempe, Vera, and Patricia J. Brooks. 2018. Linking adult second language learning and diachronic change: A cautionary note. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9: 480. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00480>.
- Khachatryan, Maria, and Maria Konoshenko. 2021. Assessing (a)symmetry in multilingualism: The case of Mano and Kpelle in Guinea. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25(4): 979–998. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211023142>.
- Khanina, Olesya. 2021. Languages and ideologies at the Lower Yenisei (Siberia): Reconstructing past multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25(4): 1059–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211023157>.
- Khanina, Olesya, and Miriam Meyerhoff. 2018. A case-study in historical sociolinguistics beyond Europe: Reconstructing patterns of multilingualism in a linguistic community in Siberia. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 4(2): 221–251. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jhsl-2017-0016>.
- King, John T. 2001. The affinal kin register in Dhimal. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24(1): 163–182.
- Kirby, Kathryn R., Russell D. Gray, Simon J. Greenhill, Fiona M. Jordan, Stephanie Gomes-Ng, Hans-Jörg Bibiko, Damián E. Blasi, Carlos A. Botero, Claire Bower, Carol R. Ember, Dan Leehr, Bobbi S. Low, Joe McCarter, William Divale, and Michael C. Gavin. 2016. D-PLACE: A global database of cultural, linguistic and environmental diversity. *PLOS ONE* 11(7): e0158391. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158391>.
- Kircher, Ruth. 2019. Intergenerational language transmission in Quebec: Patterns and predictors in the light of provincial language planning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 25(2): 418–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1691499>.

- Kuhl, Patricia K. 1991. Human adults and human infants show a “perceptual magnet effect” for the prototypes of speech categories, monkeys do not. *Perception & Psychophysics* 50(2): 93–107.
- Labov, William. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *Word* 19(3): 273–309.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, William. 2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83(2): 344–387.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. 1975. *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lansing, J. Stephen, Cheryl Abundo, Guy S. Jacobs, Elsa G. Guillot, Stefan Thurner, Sean S. Downey, Lock Yue Chew, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Ning Ning Chung, Herawati Sudoyo, and Murray P. Cox. 2017. Kinship structures create persistent channels for language transmission. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114(49): 12910–12915. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706416114>.
- Leeman, Jennifer. 2018. It's all about English: The interplay of monolingual ideologies, language policies and the U.S. Census Bureau's statistics on multilingualism. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2018(252): 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2018-0013>.
- Li, Duanduan. 2000. The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 57(1): 58–87. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.1.58>.
- Lindstedt, Jouko. 2016. Multilingualism in the Central Balkans in late Ottoman times. In Maxim Makartsev and Max Wahlström (eds.), *In Search of the Center and Periphery: Linguistic Attitudes, Minorities, and Landscapes in the Central Balkans*, 51–67. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, nykykielten laitos.
- Lippi-Green, Rosina L. 1989. Social network integration and language change in progress in a rural alpine village. *Language in Society* 18(2): 213–234.
- Litcofsky, Kaitlyn A., Darren Tanner, and Janet G. van Hell. 2016. Effects of language experience, use, and cognitive functioning on bilingual word production and comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 20(6): 666–683.
- Lüpke, Friederike, and Anne Storch. 2013. *Repertoires and Choices in African Languages*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lupyan, Gary, and Rick Dale. 2010. Language structure is partly determined by social structure. *PLOS ONE* 5(1): 1–10.
- Macaulay, Ronald K.S. 1977. *Language, Social Class and Education*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Mace, Ruth, and Fiona M. Jordan. 2011. Macro-evolutionary studies of cultural diversity: A review of empirical studies of cultural transmission and cultural adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 366(1563): 402–411.

- Mace, Ruth, and Mark Pagel. 1995. A latitudinal gradient in the density of human languages in North America. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences* 261(1360): 117–121.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. [1922] 2013. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315014463>.
- Mbakop, Antonie Willy Ndzotom, and Alex Kamgang Ndada. 2021. Multilingualism, beliefs about language, and language use in the family. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 18(1): 128–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1678625>.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1981. Land, language and social identity in Aboriginal Australia. *Mankind* 13(2): 133–148.
- Meyerhoff, Miriam, and Janet Holmes. 1999. The community of practice: Theories and methodologies in language and gender research. *Language in Society* 28(2): 173–183.
- Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath, and Magnus Huber (eds.). 2013. *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <https://apics-online.info/>.
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1985. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation. *Journal of Linguistics* 21(2): 339–384. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002222670010306>.
- Milroy, Lesley, and Sue Margrain. 1980. Vernacular language loyalty and social network. *Language in Society* 9(1): 43–70.
- Mishina-Mori, Satomi. 2011. A longitudinal analysis of language choice in bilingual children: The role of parental input and interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(13): 3122–3138.
- Mitchell, Alice. 2015. Words that smell like father-in-law: A linguistic description of the Datooga avoidance register. *Anthropological Linguistics* 57(2): 195–217.
- Moravec, Jiří C., Quentin Atkinson, Claire Bowern, Simon J. Greenhill, Fiona M. Jordan, Robert M. Ross, Russell Gray, Stephen Marsland, and Murray P. Cox. 2018. Post-marital residence patterns show lineage-specific evolution. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 39(6): 594–601.
- Murdock, George P. 1983. *Outline of World Cultures*, vol. 6. New Haven, CT: Human Relations Area Files.
- Murdock, George Peter. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Nevalainen, Terttu, and Helena Raumolin-Brunberg. 2016. *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315475172>.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Okamoto, Shigeko. 2021. Japanese language and gender research: The last thirty years and beyond. *Gender and Language* 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1558/genl.20316>.
- Pakendorf, Brigitte, Nina Dobrushina, and Olesya Khanina. 2021. A typology of small-

- scale multilingualism. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 25(4): 835–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211023137>.
- de Pietro, Jean-François. 1988. Vers une typologie des situations de contacts linguistiques. *Langage & société* 43(1): 65–89.
- Platt, John T. 1977. A model for polyglossia and multilingualism (with special reference to Singapore and Malaysia). *Language in Society* 6(3): 361–378. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500005066>.
- Raviv, Limor, Antje Meyer, and Shiri Lev-Ari. 2019. Larger communities create more systematic languages. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 286(1907): 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.1262>.
- Raviv, Limor, Antje Meyer, and Shiri Lev-Ari. 2020. The role of social network structure in the emergence of linguistic structure. *Cognitive Science* 44(8). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074015611745>.
- Roberts, Celia. 2010. Language socialization in the workplace. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 30: 211–227. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000127>.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2007. Calquing and metatypy. *Journal of Language Contact* 1(1): 116–143.
- Rushforth, Scott. 1981. Speaking to ‘relatives-through-marriage’: Aspects of communication among the Bear Lake Athapaskans. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37(1): 28–45.
- Sawyer, J.F.A. 2006. Religion and Literacy. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, 2nd edn., 522–525. Amsterdam: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00673-8>.
- Saxena, Mukul. 2014. “Critical diglossia” and “lifestyle diglossia”: Development and the interaction between multilingualism, cultural diversity and English. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 2014(225). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2013-0067>.
- Schmidt-Rohrer, Georg. 1933. *Mutter Sprache: Vom Amt der Sprache bei der Volkswerdung*. Jena: Diederichs.
- Schokkin, Dineke. 2021. The integration of languages and society: A view from multilingual Southern New Guinea. In Alexandra S. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon and Nerida Jarkey (eds.), *The Integration of Language and Society*, 288–311. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192845924.003.0009>.
- Seremetakis, C. Nadia. 2007. *An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Sinnemäki, Kaius. 2024. On the “socio” in sociolinguistic typology: A review. Unpublished manuscript.
- Sinnemäki, Kaius, and Francesca Di Garbo. 2018. Language structures may adapt to the sociolinguistic environment, but it matters what and how you count: A typological study of verbal and nominal complexity. *Frontiers in Psychology* 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01141>.
- Skirgård, Hedvig, Hannah J. Haynie, Damián E. Blasi, Harald Hammarström, Jeremy

- Collins, Jay J. Latache, Jakob Lesage, Tobias Weber, Alena Witzlack-Makarevich, Sam Passmore, Angela Chira, Luke Maurits, Russell Dinnage, Michael Dunn, Ger Reesink, Ruth Singer, Claire Bowern, Patience Epps, Jane Hill, Outi Vesakoski, Martine Robbeets, Noor Karolin Abbas, Daniel Auer, Nancy A. Bakker, Giulia Barbos, Robert D. Borges, Swintha Danielsen, Luise Dorenbusch, Ella Dorn, John Elliott, Giada Falcone, Jana Fischer, Yustinus Ghanggo Ate, Hannah Gibson, Hans-Philipp Göbel, Jemima A. Goodall, Victoria Gruner, Andrew Harvey, Rebekah Hayes, Leonard Heer, Roberto E. Herrera Miranda, Nataliia Hübler, Biu Huntington-Rainey, Jessica K. Ivani, Marilen Johns, Erika Just, Eri Kashima, Carolina Kipf, Janina V. Klingenberg, Nikita König, Aikaterina Koti, Richard G.A. Kowalik, Olga Krasnoukhova, Nora L.M. Lindvall, Mandy Lorenzen, Hannah Lutzenberger, Tânia R.A. Martins, Celia Mata German, Suzanne Van Der Meer, Jaime Montoya Samamé, Michael Müller, Salih Muradoglu, Kelsey Neely, Johanna Nickel, Miina Norvik, Cheryl Akinyi Oluoch, Jesse Peacock, India O.C. Pearey, Naomi Peck, Stephanie Petit, Sören Pieper, Mariana Poblete, Daniel Prestipino, Linda Raabe, Amna Raja, Janis Reimringer, Sydney C. Rey, Julia Rizaew, Eloisa Ruppert, Kim K. Salmon, Jill Sammet, Rhiannon Schembri, Lars Schlabach, Frederick W.P. Schmidt, Amalia Skilton, Wikaliler Daniel Smith, Hilário De Sousa, Kristin Sverredal, Daniel Valle, Javier Vera, Judith Voß, Tim Witte, Henry Wu, Stephanie Yam, Jingting Ye, Maisie Yong, Tessa Yuditha, Roberto Zariquiey, Robert Forkel, Nicholas Evans, Stephen C. Levinson, Martin Haspelmath, Simon J. Greenhill, Quentin D. Atkinson, and Russell D. Gray. 2023. Grambank reveals the importance of genealogical constraints on linguistic diversity and highlights the impact of language loss. *Science Advances* 9(16): eadg6175. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adg6175>.
- Smith, Michael E. 2004. The archaeology of ancient state economies. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 33(1): 73–102. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.33.070203.144016>.
- Sookias, Roland B., Samuel Passmore, and Quentin D. Atkinson. 2018. Deep cultural ancestry and human development indicators across nation states. *Royal Society Open Science* 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.171411>.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2003. Religion as a site of language contact. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 23: 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190503000242>.
- Spolsky, Bernard, and Richard D. Lambert. 2006. Language planning and policy: Models. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, 2nd edn., 561–575. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Stanford, James N. 2008. Child dialect acquisition: New perspectives on parent/peer influence. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 12(5): 567–596. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00383.x>.
- Stanford, James N. 2009. “Eating the food of our place”: Sociolinguistic loyalties in multidialectal Sui villages. *Language in Society* 38(3): 287–287.
- Stanford, James N., and Yanhong Pan. 2013. The sociolinguistics of exogamy: Dialect

- acquisition in a Zhuang village. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 17(5): 573–607. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12052>.
- Stasch, Rupert. 2011. Word avoidance as a relation-making act: A paradigm for analysis of name utterance taboos. *Anthropological Quarterly* 84(1): 101–120.
- Stenzel, Kristine. 2005. Multilingualism in the northwest Amazon, revisited. In *Memoirs del Congreso de Idiomas Indígenas de Latinoamérica-11 27–29 de octubre de 2005*, Austin: University of Texas.
- Stewart, William A. 1968. A sociolinguistic typology for describing national multilingualisms. In Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, 531–545. Berlin: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110805376.531>.
- Strathern, Andrew, and Pamela J. Stewart. 2012. Ceremonial exchange: Debates and comparisons. In James G. Carrier (ed.), *A Handbook of Economic Anthropology, Second Edition*, 239–256. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849809290.00023>.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. 2013. Comparative sociolinguistics. In J.K. Chambers and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 2nd edn., 729–763. Hoboken, N.J.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Thomas, E.H. 1935. *Chinook: A History and Dictionary of the Northwest Coast Trade Jargon*. Portland, OR: Metropolitan Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G., and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Thurston, William R. 1989. How exoteric languages build a lexicon: Esoterogeny in West New Britain. In R. Harlow and R. Hooper (eds.), *VICAL 1: Oceanic Languages; Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 555–579. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1972. Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society* 1(2): 179–195.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1974. *The Social Differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic typology: Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2020. Sociolinguistic typology and the uniformitarian hypothesis. In Mily Crevels and Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Language Dispersal, Diversification, and Contact*, 44–57. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/os0/9780198723813.003.0003>.
- Urla, Jacqueline. 1993. Cultural politics in an age of statistics: Numbers, nations, and the making of Basque identity. *American Ethnologist* 20(4): 818–843. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1993.20.4.02a00080>.

- Vaughan, Jill, and Ruth Singer. 2018. Indigenous multilingualisms past and present. *Language and Communication* 62: 83–90.
- Vilela, Bruno, Trevor Fristoe, Ty Tuff, Patrick H. Kavanagh, Hannah J. Haynie, Russell D. Gray, Michael C. Gavin, and Carlos A. Botero. 2020. Cultural transmission and ecological opportunity jointly shaped global patterns of reliance on agriculture. *Evolutionary Human Sciences* 2. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2020.55>.
- Vincent, Joan. 2015. Functionalism in anthropology. In James D. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edn., 532–535. Amsterdam: Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.12077-X>.
- Vohs, Kathleen D., Nicole L. Mead, and Miranda R. Goode. 2006. The psychological consequences of money. *Science* 314(5802): 1154–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1132491>.
- Williams, Jeffrey P. 2000. Yimas-Alamblak Tanim Tok: An indigenous trade pidgin of New Guinea. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 15(1): 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jpcl.15.1.03wil>.
- Winters, J., S. Kirby, and K. Smith. 2015. Languages adapt to their contextual niche. *Language and Cognition* 7(3): 415–449. <https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.35>.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 1985. Language variation and cultural hegemony: Toward an integration of sociolinguistic and social theory. *American Ethnologist* 12(4): 738–748.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. 2020. Language ideology. In *International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology*, Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217>.
- Wray, Alison, and George W. Grace. 2007. The consequences of talking to strangers: Evolutionary corollaries of socio-cultural influences on linguistic form. *Lingua* 117(3): 543–578.
- Yakpo, Kofi. 2020. Social factors. In Evangelina Amadou and Yaron Matras (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language Contact*, 129–148. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Yalwa, Lawan Danladi. 1992. Arabic loan words in Hausa. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies* 20(3). <https://doi.org/10.5070/F7203016759>.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia Junko. 1979. Family and household: The analysis of domestic groups. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8: 161–205.

A Appendices

The following appendices include the wording of the questionnaire and the possible answer selections. The wording and style used here reflects the state at which the questionnaire was administered to our collaborators, including any errors in punctuation and particularities of question numbering.

In the interest of space the full set of supplementary information concerning each question and answer type is excluded. The supplementary information is available in the relevant “Rationale” page (searchable by domain-specific identifier) at <https://gramadapt.cldd.org>. Each question is accompanied by its five-character domain-specific identifier and its two-character cross-domain identifier (see Section 4.2).

Appendix I provides further detail on how the scalar responses are defined.

A.1 *Appendix A: Instructions*

Prior to the commencement of the questionnaire the nature and details of the questionnaire are discussed so respondents understand that the questionnaire seeks an assessment of social contact to the best of the respondent’s knowledge.

During the pre-commencement phase, respondents are asked to provide their expert opinion on the choice of Focus and Neighbor languages. The criteria for deciding the Focus and Neighbor group are discussed with the respondent, highlighting the following:

- Sampling criteria (Section 3.1), including the choice of which Neighbor Group language;
- Community internal criteria (Section 5.1): Defining the a speaker of the Focus or Neighbor language as a person who is locally viewed as a speaker of the language, and has some kind of proficiency speaking it.

Once the language/community choices are made the responses to the questionnaire begin.

The domains questionnaires are answered first (Section 4.2). The domains can be answered in any order, however some domains are more straightforward to understand than others. Respondents read the goal of the domain and the rationale as an introduction to what kind of activities and situations would fall under the domain purview. In all domains we ask whether the domain is a domain of contact. If not, the respondent will skip the questionnaires for that domain. If yes, they begin answering the questions for that domain.

Once the domain is established as a contact domain, an approximate time frames is sought (Section 3.2), as well as information on other languages that are relevant for contact in this domain.

After the completion of all six domains the respondent will begin the Overview Questionnaire (Section 4.1). This is the final stage.

Once the questionnaire is completed, the responses are checked by investigators to identify any possible misunderstandings or clarifications. If any issues are identified, the investigator would clarify with the respondent.

A.2 *Appendix B: Domain of Trade (DTR)*

Goal

Trade is a domain of interest where there is a clear case of contact, where groups come together for exchange. Put another way, trade situations are fruitful for investigating the relationship between groups.

Definitions

For this questionnaire, trade is characterized by two aspects. The first is that there is a clear understanding by participants that there will be immediate gains or returns. If not immediate, there is an explicit understanding of future returns. “Explicit” here includes strong cultural norms, such that violating the norm of expected return would result in a predictable and clear penalty.

The second characteristic of trade in this questionnaire is that the acquisition of objects, money, or service, is a clear motivator of the exchange. This domain thus excludes acts of exchange whose purposes can be characterized more-so as building relationships, such as gift-giving. Exchanges that are simultaneously a transaction and relationship building are considered trade transactions for this questionnaire. The key point of interest is that there is some transaction involved.

QID:DTROO CID:P1

1. Has trade ever been a relevant domain of contact between Focus Group and Neighbour Group?
 - Yes
 - No

DTROaB P2Begin

2. How long have Focus Group and Neighbour Group people traded for?
[Free response]

DTRObB P3Begin

3. What is the time frame when the largest number of people had the most opportunities for interaction in trade?
[Free response]

DTRO1 P4

4. What other languages, if any, are spoken in trade?
[Free response]

DTR02 D1

5. Traded good types. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Do Focus Group people trade raw materials and primary produce to Neighbour Group people?
- Do Focus Group people trade luxury items to Neighbour Group people?
- Do Focus Group people trade manufactured goods to Neighbour Group people?
- Do Neighbour Group people trade raw material and primary produce to Focus Group people?
- Do Neighbour Group people trade luxury items to Focus Group people?
- Do Neighbour Group people trade manufactured goods to Focus Group people?

DTR24 D4

6. Typically when trading with Neighbour Group people, the Focus Group people will:

- Use money
- Exchange objects
- This is contextual

DTR06 D6

7. Where does trade between Focus Group and Neighbour Group people typically take place?

- At places which belong to the Focus Group
- At places which belong to the Neighbour Group
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DTR17 D11

8. How much influence can the Focus Group exert over the Neighbour Group in terms of trade?

- Influence is practically always exerted
- Influence is often exerted
- Influence is somewhat exerted
- Influence is exerted very little
- Influence is practically never exerted

DTR28 D9

9. Are there any speech styles used in trade?

- Yes
- No

DTR35 D12

10. How often are these speech styles typically used in trade, in comparison with unmonitored speech?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DTR03 D3

11. Involvement in trade. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Does involvement in trade differ based on hierarchies associated to profession or wealth, such as a person's class or caste?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on whether a person belongs to some magico-religiously sanctioned group, such as religious denomination?

- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's descent group, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's group of land ownership, such as tribe, clan, territorial group?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's age or life stage?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's place identity and affiliation?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on a person's sex or gender?
- Does involvement in trade differ based on any other communities of practice?

DTR32 D10

12. Do Focus Group people experience trade differently depending on social group?

- Yes
- No

DTR14 S1

13. How often do Focus Group people trade with Neighbour Group people?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DTR22 S3

14. How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus Group people and Neighbour Group people when trading? Practically always under 5 people

- Practically always under 5 people: e.g., up to 90
- Often under 5 people: e.g up to 70
- Sometimes under 5 people: up to 50
- Rarely under 5 people: up to 30
- Practically never under 5 people: up to 10

DTR36 S4

15. How physically proximate to each other are people involved in trade?

- Very proximate
- Proximate
- Somewhat proximate to each other
- Far from each other
- Very far

DTR23 S5

16. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus Group and Neighbour Group people in trade?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DTR33 S6

17. What is the proportion of total Focus Group people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour Group people in trade?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DTR34 S7

18. What is the proportion of total Neighbour Group people who have opportunities for contact with Focus Group people in trade?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DTR16 BA

19. What is the overall attitude that Focus Group people have towards Neighbour Group people in trade?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DTR29 BH

20. How do Focus Group people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour Group people, within the context of trade?

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DTR08 BI

21. What language do Focus Group

people expect to be used when trading with Neighbour Group people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR11 O1

22. What language do Focus Group people typically speak when trading with Neighbour Group people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR12 O2

23. Do Focus Group people typically simplify their language when speaking with Neighbour Group people during trade?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DTR13 O3

24. Typically in trade, how fluently do Focus Group people speak the Neighbour Group language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DTR09 I1

25. What language do Neighbour Group people typically speak when trading with the Focus Group?

- The Focus Group language

- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR10 I2

26. Typically in trade, how well do Focus Group people understand the Neighbour Group language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DTR18 T1

27. How much do Focus Group children participate in trade?

- They practically always participate
- They participate a lot
- They participate somewhat
- They participate a little
- They practically never participate

DTR27 T6

28. Looking after children during trade. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically, do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age during trade?
- Typically, do parents look after children up to five year of age during trade?
- Typically, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age during trade?
- Typically, do children up to five year of age look after each other as part of the same peer group during trade?

DTR31 T11

29. Typically, how much supervision do adults provide to children in trade?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision
- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DTR19 T2

30. What language do Neighbour Group adults typically speak to a Focus Group children in trade?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR20 T4

31. Typically, what language do Focus Group children from four/five year of age prefer to speak with Neighbour Group adults?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR37 T5

32. Typically, what language would a Focus Group child speak to Neighbour Group children in trade?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DTR96 E1

33. List any other groups that the Focus Group traded with in the past,

in so far as you believe this had linguistic consequences for the Focus Group language. Where possible, please also give an indication of when this happened.

[Free response]

DTR97 E4

34. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of trade, overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants
- Published or ongoing research project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
- Published material by linguists

- Published materials by researchers in other fields
- Other

DTR98 E5

35. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of local community?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

DTR99 E6

36. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.

[Free response]

A.3 Appendix C: Domain of Local Community (DLC)

Goal

Here we wish to understand what kind of interactions occur between Focus Group and Neighbour Group people in the contexts closest to the household environment, but outside the realm of family and kin. Within this space, we are interested in capturing face-to-face interactions between both individuals and groups where so-called “unmonitored speech” is likely to occur.

For some societies, the domains of local community and labor will overlap significantly. If local community and domain of labor are one and the same, please answer for both domains.

Definitions

Local Community: Domain concerning the surroundings closest to the household environment, but outside the realm of family and kin. A space of interaction that may extend beyond a bounded geographical place (this is done in order to capture mobile groups (e.g., nomads) and other communities of practice.

Unmonitored speech: Ways of speaking where speakers are paying less attention to the forms they produce, compared to situations where they do (such as formal situations). Overlaps somewhat with notions of “vernacular speech”.

QID = DLC00, CID = P1

1. Has the local community ever been a relevant domain of contact between Focus and Neighbour?

- Yes
- No

DLC0aB P2Begin

2. How long have Focus and Neighbour people been in contact in the local community?

[Free Response]

DLC0bB P3Begin

3. What's the time frame of densest contact between Focus and Neighbour as far as family formation is concerned?

[Free Response]

DLC01 P4

4. What other languages, if any, are spoken in the local community?

[Free Response]

DLC02 D1

5. Choose one of the following where Focus people are most likely to speak in an unmonitored way.

- Nuclear Family
- Band
- Neighbourhood or village
- Town or city
- Other

DLC28 D6

6. Where do Focus and Neighbour people typically meet up in the local community?

- At places which belong to the Focus

- At places which belong to the Neighbour
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DLC27 D11

7. How much influence can the Focus exert over Neighbour in the activities of the local community?

- Influence is practically always exerted
- Influence is often exerted
- Influence is somewhat exerted
- Influence is exerted very little
- Influence is practically never exerted

DLC25 D3

8. Involvement in the Local Community. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Does involvement in the local community differ based on hierarchies associated to profession or wealth, such as a person's class and caste?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on whether a person belongs to some magically-sanctioned group, such as religious denomination?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's descent group, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's group of land ownership, such as tribe, clan, territorial group?

- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's age or life stage?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's place identity and affiliation?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on a person's sex or gender?
- Does involvement in the local community differ based on any other communities of practice?

DLC29 D10

9. Do Focus people experience the local community differently depending on social group?

- Yes
- No

DLC16 S1

10. How often do Focus people interact with Neighbour people in the local community?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DLC15 S3

11. How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus people and Neighbour people in the local community?

- Practically always under 5 people: e.g., up to 90
- Often under 5 people: e.g up to 70
- Sometimes under 5 people: up to 50
- Rarely under 5 people: up to 30
- Practically never under 5 people: up to 10

DLC05 S4

12. How physically proximate to each other are people in the local community?

- Very proximate
- Proximate
- Somewhat proximate to each other
- Far from each other
- Very far

DLC14 S5

13. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus and Neighbour people in the local community?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DLC32 S6

14. What is the proportion of total Focus people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour people, in the form of local communities?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DLC33 S7

15. What is the proportion of total Neighbour people who have opportunities for contact with Focus people, in the form of local communities?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DLC18 BA

16. What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbour people in the local community?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DLC19 BH

17. How do Focus people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour people, in the context of the local community?

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DLC04 BI

18. What language do Focus people expect to be used with Neighbour people in the local community?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC11 O1

19. What language do Focus people typically speak with Neighbour people in the local community?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC12 O2

20. Do Focus people typically simplify their language when speaking with Neighbour people in the local community?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DLC13 O3

21. Typically in the local community, how fluently do Focus people speak the Neighbour language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DLC09 I1

22. What language do Neighbour people typically speak with Focus people in the local community?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC10 I2

23. Typically in the local community, how well do Focus people understand the Neighbour language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DLC31 T1

24. How much do Focus children participate in the activities of the local community?

- They practically always participate
- They participate a lot
- They participate somewhat
- They participate a little
- They practically never participate

DLC03 T6

25. Looking after children in the local community. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically, do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age in the local community?
- Typically, do parents look after children up to five year of age in the local community?
- Typically, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age in local community?
- Typically, do children up to five year of age look after each other as part of the same peer group in the local community? (Peer group = children from the same age cohort and not necessarily related by kin. Sibling-kin group = children from different age cohorts who are also related by kin.)

DLC20 T11

26. Typically in the local community, how much supervision do adults provide to children's own activities, such as playing?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision
- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DLC21 T2

27. What language do Neighbour adults typically speak to a Focus children?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC22 T4

28. Typically, what language do Focus children from four/five year of age prefer to speak with Neighbour adults?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC23 T5

29. Typically, what language would a Focus child speak to Neighbour children in the local community?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLC96 E1

30. List any other groups that the

Focus formed local communities with in the past, in so far as you believe this had linguistic consequences for the Focus language. Where possible, please also give an indication of when this happened.

[Free Response]

DLC97 E4

31. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of local community, overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants
- Published or ongoing research project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
- Published material by linguists

- Published materials by researchers in other fields
- Other

DLC98 E5

32. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of local community?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

DLC99 E6

33. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.

[Free Response]

A.4 Appendix D: Domain of labor (DLB)

Goal

In this domain we wish to get some insight into interaction as it pertains to labor, production, and economic activity. Here we consider both domestic and public modes of economic activity. We will exclude economic activities that primarily concern trade, or overlap with labor. These activities can be addressed in the relevant domains of this questionnaire.

For some societies, the domains of local community and labor will overlap significantly. If local community and domain of labor are one and the same, please answer for both domains.

Definitions

Work. Activities that pertain to production and consumption, which transform the natural world into the cultural domain.

Examples:

- Subsistence work such as agricultural labor, fishing, animal husbandry.
- Production of cultural matter, such as physical structures, crafts, tools, other kinds of material culture.
- Exclude activities that primarily concern trade, or overlap with labor.

QID = DLB00, CID = P1

1. Has work ever been a relevant domain of contact between Focus and Neighbour?

- Yes
- No

DLB0aB P2 2. How long have Focus people and Neighbour people worked together for?

[Free Response]

DLB0bB P3

3. What is the time frame when the largest number of people had the most opportunities for interaction in the labor domain?

[Free Response]

DLB01 P4

4. What other languages, if any, are spoken in the labor domain?

[Free Response]

DLB02 D1

5. How commonly are Focus people and Neighbour people involved in public modes of production?

- Very commonly
- Commonly
- Somewhat commonly
- Uncommonly
- Very uncommonly

DLB04 D4

6. Is there hierarchy involved in work?

- Yes
- No

DLB05 D6

7. Where do Focus people and Neighbour people typically work together?

- At places which belong to the Focus
- At places which belong to the Neighbour
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DLB29 D11

8. How much influence can the Focus exert over the terms of work?

- Influence is practically always exerted
- Influence is often exerted
- Influence is somewhat exerted
- Influence is exerted very little
- Influence is practically never exerted

DLB06 D9

9. Are there any speech styles used during work?

- Yes
- No

DLB31 D12

10. How often are these speech styles typically used during work, in comparison with unmonitored speech?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DLB03 D3

11. Involvement in work. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Does involvement in work differ based on hierarchies associated to

- profession or wealth, such as a person's class and caste?
- Does involvement in work differ based on whether a person belongs to some magico-religiously sanctioned group, such as religious denomination?
 - Does involvement in work domain differ based on a person's descent group, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?
 - Does involvement in work domain differ based on a person's group of land ownership, such as tribe, clan, territorial group?
 - Does involvement in work differ based on a person's race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping?
 - Does involvement in work differ based on a person's age or life stage?
 - Does involvement in work differ based on a person's place identity and affiliation?
 - Does involvement in work differ based on a person's sex or gender?
 - Does involvement in work differ based on any other communities of practice?

DLB30 D10

12. Do Focus people experience work differently depending on social group?
- Yes
 - No

DLB07 S1

13. How often do Focus people work with Neighbour people?
- Very often

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DLB09 S3

14. How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus people and Neighbour people when working?
- Practically always under 5 people: e.g., up to 90
 - Often under 5 people: e.g up to 70
 - Sometimes under 5 people: up to 50
 - Rarely under 5 people: up to 30
 - Practically never under 5 people: up to 10

DLB10 S4

15. How physically proximate to each other are people when working?
- Very proximate
 - Proximate
 - Somewhat proximate to each other
 - Far from each other
 - Very far

DLB11 S5

16. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus and Neighbour people involved in work?
- Friendly
 - Somewhat friendly
 - Neutral
 - Somewhat hostile
 - Hostile

DLB27 S6

17. What is the proportion of total

Focus people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour people, in work?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DLB28 S7

18. What is the proportion of total Neighbour people who have opportunities for contact with Focus people, in work?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DLB22 BA

19. What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbour people in work?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DLB23 BH

20. How do Focus people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour people, within the context of work?

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DLB25 B1

21. What language do Focus people expect to be used when working with Neighbour people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLB32 O1

22. What language do Focus people typically speak when working with Neighbour people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLB13 O2

23. Do Focus people typically simplify their language when working with Neighbour people?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DLB14 O3

24. Typically in work, how fluently do Focus people speak the Neighbour language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DLB15 I1

25. What language do Neighbour people typically speak when working with Focus people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLB16 I2

26. Typically in work, how well do Focus people understand the Neighbour language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DLB17 T1

27. How much do Focus children participate in work?

- They practically always participate
- They participate a lot
- They participate somewhat
- They participate a little
- They practically never participate

DLB21 T6

28. Looking after children during work. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically, do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age during work?
- Typically, do parents look after children up to five year of age during work
- Typically, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age during work?
- Typically, do children up to five year of age look after each other as part of the same peer group dur-

ing work? (Peer group = children from the same age cohort and not necessarily related by kin. Sibling-kin group = children from different age cohorts who are also related by kin.)

DLB26 T11

29. Typically, how much supervision do adults provide to children in work?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision
- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DLB18 T2

30. What language do Neighbour adults typically speak to a Focus children in work?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLB19 T4

31. Typically, what language do Focus children from four/five year of age prefer to speak with Neighbour adults in work?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DLB20 T5

32. Typically, what language would a Focus child speak to Neighbour children in work?

- The Focus Group language

- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

- project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
- Published material by linguists
 - Published materials by researchers in other fields
 - Other

DLB96 E1

33. List any other groups that the Focus people worked with in the past. List any other group in so far as you believe they had linguistic consequences for the Focus language. Where possible, please also give an indication of when this interaction happened.
[Free Response]

DLB98 E5

35. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of labor?
- Very certain
 - Certain
 - Somewhat certain
 - Uncertain
 - Very uncertain

DLB97 E4

34. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of labor, overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants
- Published or ongoing research

DLB99 E6

36. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.
[Free Response]

A.5 *Appendix E: Domain of Knowledge (DKN)*

Goal

The aim is to gain some insight into social contact in a domain that focuses on formalized learning. We are interested in teasing apart the relationships between Focus Group and Neighbour Group along the lines of masters and novices, peers of novices, and peers of masters.

We are also interested in getting some sense of the mechanisms that support the instruction that takes place. The prototypical forms of the knowledge domain, such as formal education and/or magico-religious learning, often seem to have specialized oral and graphic-symbolic techniques used to aid and transmit the knowledge. This domain also appear to have cultural authority.

While we have some interest in the nature of the knowledge that is being transmitted (see below under definitions), the precise details are of secondary interest. The main concerns about knowledge in the domains questionnaire are 1) the relationship between the Focus Group and Neighbour Group peoples, and 2) that the domain is recognized by people within the community as having some authority and/or legitimacy.

Definition

We use the general terms master to mean the knowledge bearer, and novice to mean the one that is receiving the knowledge. By formalized we mean loosely two things: the situation is recognized by people within it as a circumscribed one where knowledge holders are transmitting that knowledge; there is some kind of understood protocol of instruction and learning; knowledge transmission occurs in cohorts or groups, rather than between individual master & novice pairs. The protocol of may be rigidly defined in the form of a curriculum, or it may be loosely understood as, for example, age-sensitive and learnt at various points throughout one's life. The knowledge learnt should emphasize recognition of things rather than physical skill; that is, the learner is required to memorize and recognize names of things, stretches of text, and abstract knowledge pertaining to the world (natural, supernatural or otherwise). Thus we include knowledge pertaining to the environment (e.g., botanical knowledge, navigational knowledge). In addition, the knowledge learnt should have a linguistic component, such as the knowledge of narratives, specialized lexicon, oral/orthographic texts, and learning of orthographies.

QID = DKN00, CID = P1

1. Have Focus and Neighbour people occupied the same spaces of knowledge transfer together?
[Free Response]

DKN0aB P2

2. How long have Focus and Neighbour people been involved in the knowledge domain together for?
[Free Response]

DKN0bB P3

3. What is the time frame when the largest number of people had the most opportunities for interaction in the knowledge domain?
[Free Response]

DKN01 P4

4. What other languages, if any, are spoken in the knowledge domain?
[Free Response]

DKN02 D1

5. The most influential form of knowledge in this contact scenario is:
– Global
– Local

DKN04 D4

6. The relationship between Focus people and Neighbour people in the knowledge domain can typically be characterized as:
– Focus people are masters, Neighbour are novices
– Neighbour people are masters, Focus are novices
– None of the above

DKN05 D6

7. Where does knowledge transmission between Focus people and Neighbour people typically take place?

- At places which belong to the Focus
- At places which belong to the Neighbour
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DKN28 D11

8. How much influence can the Focus people exert over the decision of what constitutes legitimate knowledge in this domain?

- Influence is practically always exerted
- Influence is often exerted
- Influence is somewhat exerted
- Influence is exerted very little
- Influence is practically never exerted

DKN06 D9

9. Are there any speech styles used in the knowledge domain?

- Yes
- No

DKN31 D12

10. How often are these speech styles typically used in knowledge transmission, in comparison with unmonitored speech?

- Always
- Often
- As much as unmonitored speech
- Rarely
- Never

DKN03 D3

11. Involvement in the knowledge

domain. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on hierarchies associated to profession or wealth, such as a person's class and caste?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on whether a person belongs to some magico-religiously sanctioned group, such as religious denomination?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's descent group, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's group of land ownership, such as tribe, clan, territorial group?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's age or life stage?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's place identity and affiliation?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on a person's sex or gender?
- Does involvement in the knowledge domain differ based on any other communities of practice?

DKN07 D10

12. Do Focus people experience the

knowledge domain differently depending on social group?

- Yes
- No

DKN08 S1

13. How often do Focus people interact with Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DKN10 S3

14. How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus people and Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- Practically always under 5 people
- Often under 5 people
- Sometimes under 5 people
- Rarely under 5 people
- Practically never under 5 people

DKN11 S4

15. How physically proximate to each other are people in the knowledge domain?

- Very proximate
- Proximate
- Somewhat proximate to each other
- Far from each other
- Very far

DKN12 S5

16. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus and

Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DKN29 S6

17. What is the proportion of total Focus people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour people, in the knowledge domain?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DKN30 S7

18. What is the proportion of total Neighbour people who have opportunities for contact with Focus people, in the knowledge domain?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DKN13 BA

19. What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DKN14 BH

20. How do Focus people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour people, in the context of the knowledge domain?

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DKN16 BI

21. What language do Focus people expect to be used with Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN17 O1

22. What language do Focus people typically speak with Neighbour people when in the knowledge domain?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN18 O2

23. Do Focus people typically simplify their language when speaking with Neighbour people in the knowledge domain?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DKN19 O3

24. Typically in the knowledge domain, how fluently do Focus people speak the Neighbour language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DKN20 I1

25. What language do Neighbour people typically speak with Focus people in the knowledge domain?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN21 I2

26. Typically in the knowledge domain, how well do Focus people understand the Neighbour language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DKN22 T1

27. How much do Focus children participate in the activities of the knowledge domain?

- They practically always participate
- They participate a lot
- They participate somewhat
- They participate a little
- They practically never participate

DKN23 T6

28. Looking after children in the knowledge domain. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically, do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age in the knowledge domain?
- Typically, do parents look after children up to five year of age in the knowledge domain?
- Typically, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age in the knowledge domain?
- Typically, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age in the knowledge domain? (Peer group = children from the same age cohort and not necessarily related by kin. Sibling-kin group = children from different age cohorts who are also related by kin.)

DKN27 T11

29. Typically, how much structured instruction do adults provide to children in the knowledge domain?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision
- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DKN24 T2

30. What language do Neighbour adults typically speak to a Focus children in the knowledge domain?

- The Focus Group language

- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN25 T4

31. Typically, what language do Focus children from four/five year of age prefer to speak with Neighbour adults?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN26 T5

32. Typically, what language would a Focus child speak to Neighbour children in the knowledge domain?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DKN96 E1

33. List any other groups that the Focus people interacted with in the past, in the knowledge domain. List any other group in so far as you believe they had linguistic consequences for the Focus language. Where possible, please also give an indication of when this interaction happened.

[Free Response]

DKN97 E4

34. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of knowledge, overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants

- Published or ongoing research project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
 - Published material by linguists
 - Published materials by researchers in other fields
 - Other
- Very certain
 - Certain
 - Somewhat certain
 - Uncertain
 - Very uncertain

DKN98 E5

35. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of knowledge?

DKN99 E6

36. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.

[Free Response]

A.6 Appendix F: Domain of Social Exchange & Marriage, and Family & Kin: Social Exchange & Marriage (DEM)

The Domain of Social Exchange & Marriage (DEM) and the Domain of Family & Kin (DFK) are administered together due to the close conceptual relationship between marriage as social exchange and kinship.

Goal

We wish to understand the repercussions of exchange on linguistic behavior in contact situations. For exchange, we are interested in things such as norms and ideologies surrounding language and ways of speaking around gift exchange, and spaces with ceremonial speech styles.

Definitions

Exchange: (semi-)codified practices of exchange that regulate relationships between individuals and groups as a result. For the purposes of this questionnaire we consider exchange to be characterisable more-so in terms of relationship-building rather than transaction. The motivations for forming the relationships may be various. Our definition of exchange encompasses gift exchange and ceremonial exchange.

For the purposes of the questionnaire, exchange should be treated as distinct from trade. The operational definition of trade is “the explicit promise of immediate gains or returns, and concerns the acquisition of object, money, or service. Acquisition and transaction of such things is a primary motivator of trade.” The emphasis is on the transactional element of interaction. For exchange, then, the transactional characteristic is either absent or ambiguous. In traditional societies, gift and ceremonial exchange tend to occur between people that are related by kin or other types of close relationships, while trade tends to occur

between people and groups that are not intimately connected with each other. Gift and ceremonial exchanges can also occur between rival groups, as a form of negotiation and a sign of mutual recognition.

Gift exchange: The exchanging of gifts. Gift exchange can occur at the individual and group-level, between people of similar social status (horizontal exchange) or across social ranks (vertical exchange), and can be more-or-less ritualized. Gift giving entails expectations of return (reciprocal gift giving) but can also function as a mere statement of prestige (of the donor over the recipient, and the other way around) without necessarily implying reciprocity.

DEMO0 P1

1. Has exchange ever been a relevant domain of contact between Focus and Neighbour?

[Free Response]

DFK00 P1

2. Do Focus people and Neighbour people marry each other, or have they done so in the past?

[Free Response]

DEMOaB P2

3. How long have Focus and Neighbour people been involved in the knowledge domain together for?

[Free Response]

DEMObb P3

4. What is the time frame when the largest number of people had the most opportunities for interaction in the knowledge domain?

[Free Response]

DEMOI P4

5. What other languages, if any, are spoken in this domain?

[Free Response]

DEMO2 D1

6. Characteristic of the domain of Exchange. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Is Exchange between Focus and Neighbour the individual's initiative?
- Is Exchange between Focus and Neighbour an institutionalized procedure?
- Is Exchange between Focus and Neighbour part of a ceremonial event to which both communities participate?

DEMO4 D6

7. Where does exchange between Focus and Neighbour people typically take place?

- At places which belong to the Focus
- At places which belong to the Neighbour
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DEMI9 D11

8. How much influence can the Focus exert over exchange?

- Influence is practically always exerted
- Influence is often exerted
- Influence is somewhat exerted
- Influence is exerted very little
- Influence is practically never exerted

DEM38 D9

9. Are there any speech styles used during practices of exchange?

- Yes
- No

DEM45 D12

How often are these speech styles typically used during practices of exchange, in comparison with unmonitored speech?

- Always
- Often
- As much as unmonitored speech
- Rarely
- Never

DEMO3 D3

11. Social categories. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on hierarchies associated to profession or wealth, such as a person's class or caste?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on whether a person belongs to some magico-religiously sanctioned group, such as religious denomination?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's

descent group, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group?

- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's group of land ownership, such as tribe, clan, territorial group?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's age or life stage?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's place identity and affiliation?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on a person's sex or gender?
- Does involvement in Exchange practices differ based on any other communities of practice?

DEM41 D10

12. Do Focus people experience exchange differently depending on social group?

- Yes
- No

DEMO8 S1

13. How often do Focus people exchange with Neighbour people?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DEM11 S3

14. How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus and Neighbour in the context of exchange?

- Practically always under 5 people
- Often under 5 people
- Sometimes under 5 people
- Rarely under 5 people
- Practically never under 5 people

DEM10 S5

15. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus and Neighbour people in the domain of exchange?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DEM40 S6

16. What is the proportion of total Focus people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour people in the context of exchange?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DEM44 S7

17. What is the proportion of total Neighbour people who have opportunities for contact with Focus people in the context of exchange?

- Almost everyone
- Many people

- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DEM17 BA

18. What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbour people in the context of exchange?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DEM18 BH

19. How do Focus people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour people in the context of exchange?

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DEM05 BI

20. What language do Focus people expect to be used when interacting with Neighbour people through practices of exchange?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM14 O1

21. What language do Focus people typically speak during practices of exchange with Neighbour people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language

- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM15 O2

22. Do Focus people typically simplify their Focus language when speaking with Neighbour people during practices of Exchange?

- Yes
- No

DEM16 O3

23. Typically in the context of exchange practices, how fluently do Focus people speak the Neighbour language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DEM12 I1

24. What language do Neighbour people typically speak to Focus people during practices of exchange?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM13 I2

25. Typically in contexts of exchange practices, how well do Focus people understand the Neighbour language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DEMO6 T1

26. How much do Focus children participate in practices of exchange?

- They practically always participate
- They participate a lot
- They participate somewhat
- They participate a little
- They practically never participate

DEM39 T6

27. Child socialization. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically during practices of exchange, do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age?
- Typically during practices of exchange, do parents look after children up to five year of age?
- Typically during practices of exchange, do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age?
- Typically during practices of exchange, do children up to five year of age look after each other as part of the same peer group? (Peer group = children from the same age cohort and not necessarily related by kin. Sibling-kin group = children from different age cohorts who are also related by kin.)

DEM20 T11

28. Typically, how much supervision do adults provide to children during practices of exchange?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision

- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DEM21 T2

29. What language do Neighbour adults typically speak to Focus children during practices of exchange?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM22 T4

30. Typically, what language do Focus children prefer to speak with Neighbour adults in the context of exchange?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM25 T5

31. Typically, what language do Focus children speak to Neighbour children during practices of exchange?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM26 D1

32. Marrying out: When marrying each other, should Focus people and Neighbour people marry somebody:

- Outside their village or other kind of local community?
- Outside their descent group or clan?

- Outside their designated marriage group such as a moiety?
- Outside their hierarchical social group such as class or caste?
- Outside their linguistic group?

DEM27 D1

33. Marrying within: When marrying each other, should Focus people and Neighbour people marry somebody from:

- The same village or other kind of local community?
- The same descent group or clan?
- The same designated marriage group such as a moiety?
- The same hierarchical social group such as class or caste?
- The same linguistic group?

DEM28 D1

34. Polygyny.

Is polygyny possible for Focus men?

- Yes
- No

DEM29 D1

35. Polyandry. Is polyandry possible for Focus women?

- Yes
- No

DEM37 D1

36. What type of marriage payments and transfers are expected when Focus and Neighbour marry?

- Bride wealth
- Dowry
- Other

DEM31 D3

37. Inter-marriage. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Is it typical for Focus men to marry Neighbour women?
- Is it typical for Focus women to marry Neighbour men?

DEM32 D6

38. Where do marriage ceremonies between Focus and Neighbour take place?

- At places which belong to the Focus
- At places which belong to the Neighbour
- At places which belong to some other group
- This is highly contextual

DEM34 S5

39. How would you rate the overall relationship between Focus and Neighbour people in practices of marriage exchanges?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DEM42 S6

40. What is the proportion of total Focus people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour people in the context of marriage exchanges?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people

- A few people
- Almost no one

DEM43 S7

41. What is the proportion of total Neighbour people who have opportunities for contact with Focus people in the context of marriage exchanges?

- Almost everyone
- Many people
- Some people
- A few people
- Almost no one

DEM35 BA

42. What is the overall attitude that Focus people have towards Neighbour people in practices of marriage exchanges?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DEM36 BH

43. How do Focus people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour people, within the context of marriage

- Very superior
- Superior
- Neither superior or inferior
- Inferior
- Very inferior

DEM33 BI

44. What language do Focus people expect to be used in marriage ceremonies with Neighbour people?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DEM30 T6

45. Yes or No answer to each of the following: Does marriage impose any child rearing obligations for:

- Both parents and grandparents on both sides?
- One parent, and grandparents on both sides?
- One parent, and grandparents on that side?
- One parent, and grandparents from the other side?

DEM96 E1

46. List any other groups that the Focus practiced Social Exchange with in the past, in so far as you believe this had linguistic consequences for the Focus language. Where possible, please also give an indication of when this contact through Social Exchange practices happened.

[Free Response]

DEM97 E4

47. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of social exchange overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants
- Published or ongoing research project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
- Published material by linguists
- Published materials by researchers in other fields
- Other

DEM98 E5

48. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of social exchange?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

DEM99 E6

49. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.

[Free Response]

A.7 Appendix G: Domain of Social Exchange & Marriage, and Family & Kin: Family & Kin (DKN)

The Domain of Social Exchange & Marriage (DEM) and the Domain of Family & Kin (DFK) are administered together due to the close conceptual relationship between marriage as social exchange and kinship.

Goal

This section asks about the relationships between family members. Unlike the questions about marriage in the domain of exchange and marriage, this section

will ask about interactions between individuals within a family. The domain of exchange and marriage is concerned with macro characterisations of the social institution of marriage, such as patterns of exogamy. Here we are looking at micro elements.

Definitions

Family: At a minimum, a woman and her dependent child. This definition of family can also include a man who is culturally recognized as “the husband” (i.e. a man who is in some culturally recognized relationship analogous to the English word “marriage”). Note that so-called fictive kin (e.g., adoptive father) are also included in this definition of family.

In-law: refers to ego’s spouse’s relatives. The spouse’s relatives of interest are their parents, and siblings. For example for the purposes of this questionnaire, if you are a married man, your in-laws are your wife’s parents, and your wife’s siblings.

Coresidential group: a group of people who share a space where matters of child-bearing and rearing, food production, and/or food consumption take place. The coresidential group is identified as a separate group from the family as defined above, since 1) the family may not necessarily reside with one another, and 2) an individual may have multiple coresidential groups at any given time. Examples of coresidential units include “single men’s houses”.

The parameters included under the term kinship for this questionnaire are the following: residency rules (e.g., matrilocal, ambilocal), marriage patterns (e.g., exogamy, endogamy), and relationships with one’s in-laws (i.e. affines).

DFK00, CID: P1

1. Do Focus Group people and Neighbour Group people marry each other, or have they done so in the past?

QID:

DFK0aB P2Begin

2. How long have Focus and Neighbour peoples been forming families with each other for?

[Free Response]

DFK0bB P3Begin

3. What’s the time frame of densest contact between Focus and Neigh-

bour as far as family formation is concerned?

[Free Response]

DFK01 P4

4. What other languages, if any, are spoken between family members?

[Free Response]

DFK35 D6

5. What is the typical pattern of relocation for Focus women when starting a new family?

– Focus women practically always relocate to Neighbour locations

- Focus women often relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women sometimes relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women rarely relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women practically never relocate to Neighbour locations

DFK39 D6

6. What is the typical pattern of relocation for Neighbour women when starting a new family?

- Focus women practically always relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women often relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women sometimes relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women rarely relocate to Neighbour locations
- Focus women practically never relocate to Neighbour locations

DFK02 D1

7. Co-residential units. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Do mothers (and their children) live with their husbands as part of a co-residential unit?
- Do mothers (and their children) live with their mothers?
- Do mothers (and their children) live with their mothers-in-law?

DFK40 D10

8. Do Focus people experience family life differently depending on social group?

[Free Response]

DFK03 S1

9. Typically, how much of their lives do spouses spend with each other during the course of their lifetime?

- Practically all their lives: e.g., cohabitation starting from childhood.
- Much of their lives: e.g., cohabitation starts around puberty
- Some of their lives: e.g., cohabitation starts from marriage which is later in life than puberty
- A little of their lives: e.g., characterisable as “for some parts of the year”, frequent enough cohabitation that it is difficult to characterize as “very rarely”
- Practically none of their lives: e.g., the marriage is consummated, but then the husband and wife do not live together

DFK37 S4

10. How physically proximate to each other are the households of the husband and wife?

- Very proximate
- Proximate
- Somewhat proximate to each other
- Far from each other
- Very far

DFK16 BA

11. What is the overall level of affection that the Focus person has towards their Neighbour spouse?

- Very affectionate
- Affectionate
- Neutral
- Unaffectionate
- Very unaffectionate

DFK06 O1

12. What language do Focus people typically speak with their Neighbour spouse?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK07 O2

13. Do Focus people typically simplify their Focus language when speaking with their Neighbour spouse?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DFK08 O3

14. Typically in the domain of family, how fluently to Focus people speak the Neighbour language?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DFK09 I1

15. What language do Neighbour people typically speak with their Focus spouse?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK10 I2

16. Typically in the domain of family, how well do Focus people understand the Neighbour language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DFK04 T6

17. Looking after children. Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Typically, do fathers look after children up to five year of age?
- Typically, do mothers primarily look after children up to five year of age?
- Do adults other than the parents look after children up to five year of age?
- Do children from sibling-kin groups look after children up to five year of age?
- Do children up to five year of age look after each other as part of the same peer group? (Peer group = children from the same age cohort and not necessarily related by kin. Sibling-kin group = children from different age cohorts who are also related by kin.)

DFK24 T11

18. Typically, how much supervision do grandparents provide to children?

- Constant supervision
- A lot of supervision
- Some supervision
- Little supervision
- No supervision at all

DFK05 B1

19. What language are children

expected to speak to their Neighbour parent?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK20 T7

20. What language do Focus parents typically speak with their children?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK21 T8

21. What language do Neighbour parents typically speak with their children?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK22 T9

22. What language do children typically speak with their Focus parent?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK23 T10

23. What language do children typically speak with their Neighbour parent?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK25 T2

24. What language do Neighbour grandparent/aunts/uncles typically speak to the children?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK26 T4

25. Typically, what language do Focus children speak with their Neighbour grandparents/aunts/uncles?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK38 D9

26. Are any of the following features characteristic when speaking to one's Neighbour in-laws?

- Lexical avoidance
- The use of certain morphosyntactic forms
- The use of certain pronominal forms

DFK12 S1

27. Thinking about the Focus person and their Neighbour in-laws, how often would they typically meet?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Very rarely

DFK15 S3

28. How many people are typically

involved in interactions between a Focus person and their Neighbour in-laws?

- Practically always under 5 people
- Often under 5 people
- Sometimes under 5 people
- Rarely under 5 people
- Practically never under 5 people

DFK11 S4

29. How physically proximate to each other are a Focus person and their Neighbour in-laws?

- Very proximate
- Proximate
- Somewhat proximate to each other
- Far from each other
- Very far

DFK14 S5

30. How would you rate the overall relationship between a Focus person and their Neighbour in-laws?

- Friendly
- Somewhat friendly
- Neutral
- Somewhat hostile
- Hostile

DFK33 BA

31. What is the overall attitude that a Focus person has towards their Neighbour in-laws?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

DFK30 O1

32. Your child has married a Neighbour person. What language do you typically speak when speaking with your Neighbour son/daughter-in-law?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK31 O2

33. Typically, does a Focus person simplify their Focus language when speaking to their Neighbour in-laws?

- Yes
- No
- This is highly contextual

DFK32 O3

34. Typically, how fluently does a Focus person speak the Neighbour language when speaking to their Neighbour in-laws?

- Very fluently
- Fluently
- Somewhat fluently
- A little fluently
- Not fluently at all

DFK28 I1

35. Your child has married a Neighbour person. What language does your child's spouse typically speak to you, a Focus person?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFK29 I2

36. Typically, how well does a Focus person understand the Neighbour in-law's language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DFK34 I1

37. You have married a Neighbour person. What language do you typically speak to your Neighbour in-laws (your spouse's parents and siblings)?

- The Focus Group language
- The Neighbour Group language
- Some other language
- This is highly contextual

DFKXX I2

37b. Typically, how well does a Focus person understand the Neighbour in-law's language?

- Very well
- Well
- Somewhat
- Poorly
- Very poorly

DFK96 E1

38. Who do Focus people typically form families with besides Neighbour

people?

[Free Response]

DFK97 E4

39. What type of data informed your answers to the questions in the domain of family and kin, overall?

- Impressions from my own fieldwork with a related community
- Reports from language consultants
- Published or ongoing research project of my own on topics covered in this questionnaire
- Published material by linguists
- Published materials by researchers in other fields
- Other

DFK98 E5

40. How certain are you in your responses for the domain of family and kin?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

DFK99 E6

41. List any comments or notes that you feel are relevant to this section of the questionnaire.

[Free Response]

A.8 *Appendix H: Overview Questionnaire (ov)*

Goal

The Overview Questionnaire is designed to gain a macro-perspective of the Focus Group society. The questions in this questionnaire were chosen to capture variables that could not be captured in the Domains Questionnaire. The vari-

ables in this questionnaire were also chosen so that answers could be matched to prior studies investigating correlations between linguistic and macro socio-cultural factors.

Some of the questions, particularly those pertaining to demographics, may be difficult to answer without conducting specific research. If this is the case, please answer to the best of your knowledge, and provide details on sources which we can consult to gather more accurate data.

OT1

1. How long have Focus and Neighbour people been in contact overall?

[Free Response]

OT2

2. What is the overall time frame when the largest number of people had the most opportunities for interaction?

[Free Response]

OD1

1. What is the total number of native-like speakers of Focus?¹⁰–99 speakers

- 100–999 speakers
- 1,000–9,999 speakers
- 10,000–99,999 speakers
- 100,000–999,999 speakers
- 1,000,000–9,999,999 speakers
- 10,000,000–99,999,999 speakers
- 100,000,000–999,999,999 speakers

OD3

2. What is the total number of native-like speakers of Neighbour?¹⁰–99 speakers

- 100–999 speakers
- 1,000–9,999 speakers
- 10,000–99,999 speakers
- 100,000–999,999 speakers
- 1,000,000–9,999,999 speakers

– 10,000,000–99,999,999 speakers

– 100,000,000–999,999,999 speakers

OD4

3. What is the approximate proportion of native-like speakers in the total population of all speakers of Focus?

- High proportion: an overwhelming majority (roughly 80% or higher) of speakers are native-like speakers
- Fairly high proportion: the majority of speakers (roughly 60–80%) are native like speakers
- Intermediate proportion: roughly half of all speakers (roughly 40–60%) are native-like speakers.
- Fairly low proportion: a minority of all speakers (roughly 20–40%) are native-like speakers.
- Low proportion: a small minority (roughly 20% or less) of all speakers are native-like speakers

OD5

4. What is the approximate proportion of native-like speakers in the total population of all speakers of the Neighbour Group language?

- High proportion: an overwhelming majority (roughly 80% or higher) of speakers are native-like speakers

- Fairly high proportion: the majority of speakers (roughly 60–80%) are native like speakers
- Intermediate proportion: roughly half of all speakers (roughly 40–60%) are native-like speakers.
- Fairly low proportion: a minority of all speakers (roughly 20–40%) are native-like speakers.
- Low proportion: a small minority (roughly 20% or less) of all speakers are native-like speakers

OG1

5. What is the population density within the area where Focus is spoken?

- Less than 2 persons per 10sq. km
- 2–4 persons per 10sq. km
- 5–19 persons per 10sq. km
- 20–99 persons per 10sq. km
- 100–399 persons per 10sq. km

OS7

6. What is the mean size of the Focus speaking communities at the local level?

- Fewer than 50 persons
- From 50 to 99 persons
- From 100 to 199 persons
- From 200 to 399 persons
- From 400 to 1,000 persons
- More than 1,000 persons in the absence of indigenous urban aggregations
- One or more indigenous towns of more than 5,000 inhabitants but none of more than 50,000

OS9

7. How frequently do Focus people generally interact with out-group people?

- Very Frequently
- Frequently
- Neither frequently nor infrequently
- Infrequently
- Very infrequently

O11

8. Is Focus stated as an expression of identity of any of the following? Yes or No answer to each of the following:

- Group centered around shared descent, such as clan, house, lineage group, kinship group
- Race, ethnicity, or some other similar grouping
- Micro-level (politico-)territorial group, including regional or areal groups, clans, bands, tribes
- Formal or informal relationships between non-kin, such as alliances, sodality membership, ad-hoc relationships between families or individuals

O13

9. Is there a codified standard variety for Focus?

- Yes
- No

O16

10. What are the Focus speakers' attitudes towards linguistic transfers from Neighbour, such as lexical or grammatical borrowing?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

O17

11. What are the Focus speakers' general attitudes towards linguistic transfer, such as lexical or grammatical borrowing, from any other language than Neighbour?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

O19

12. What are the Focus speakers' attitudes towards lectal differences within Focus?

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

O18

13. How significant is language as part of group identity for the speakers of Focus?

- Very significant
- Significant
- Neither significant nor insignificant
- Insignificant
- Very insignificant

OBI

14. There is an emic conception of

Focus as “a language” or some other categorical or objective thing?

- Yes
- No

OL3

15. Do the Focus speaking people use some orthography in writing their language?

- Yes, in a non-standardized way
- Yes, in a standardized way
- No, the Focus Group language is not written

OL1

16. What is the approximate rate of formal literacy in the Focus speaking community?

- High
- Fairly high
- Intermediate
- Fairly low
- Low

OL2

17. Restrictions in access to literacy in terms of social categories. Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to people of certain hierarchy groups associated with profession or wealth (such as class and caste)? Answer yes or no for the following.

- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to people of certain magico-religiously sanctioned groups (such as religious denomination)?
- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to people of certain descent groups, such as

clan, house, lineage group, kinship group)?

- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to people of certain races, ethnicities, or some other similar grouping?
- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to people of certain age cohorts or life stages?
- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to a certain sex or genders?
- Is the ability to read and write restricted, in practice, to other communities of practice not mentioned above?

OS1

18. Typically, how many levels of jurisdictional hierarchy are there in the Focus speaking society, beyond the local community?

- Four levels: for example, described as large states. Often has some centralised structures.
- Three levels: for example, described as states. Often has some centralised structures.
- Two levels: for example, described as large chiefdoms. Often has some centralised structures.
- One level: for example, described as petty chiefdoms.
- No levels: no political authority beyond community.

OS2

19. Typically, how many levels of jurisdictional hierarchy are there in

Neighbour society, beyond the local community?

- Four levels: for example, described as large states. Often has some centralised structures.
- Three levels: for example, described as states. Often has some centralised structures.
- Two levels: for example, described as large chiefdoms. Often has some centralised structures.
- One level: for example, described as petty chiefdoms.
- No levels: no political authority beyond community.

OS4

20. Which of the following best characterizes the dominant form of the Focus speaking group's mobility and sedentism, in regards to subsistence?

- Sedentary: A group is completely sedentary or group moves into and out of a central location that is maintained for more than one year.
- Mobile: A group is mobile and moves the entire population from camp to camp as they go about the subsistence round.
- Mixed: Group is mobile for at least half the year, and are otherwise sedentary at designated locations.

OS5

21. Which of the following best characterizes the dominant form of Neighbour Group mobility & sedentism, in regards to subsistence: sedentary, mobile, or mixed?

- Sedentary: A group is completely

- sedentary or group moves into and out of a central location that is maintained for more than one year.
- Mobile: A group is mobile and moves the entire population from camp to camp as they go about the subsistence round.
 - Mixed: Group is mobile for at least half the year, and are otherwise sedentary at designated locations.

OS6

22. The Focus speaking society's subsistence pattern can be broadly characterized as:

- Hunter-gatherer
- Fishing
- Animal Husbandry
- Agricultural, casual
- Agricultural, shifting
- Agricultural, Permanent
- Highly Mixed

OH1

23. Have there been any natural disasters or major societal upheaval during the densest period of contact between the Focus speaking and Neighbour speaking people, such it impacted people's mobility, and Focus speaking people talk about it?

- Yes
- No

OE1

24. How long time have you spent working with this community?

[Free Response]

OE2

25. Whom did you mostly interact with during your stay and through community-based research?

[Free Response]

OE3

26. Was your interaction with members of the community typically mediated by one/a few person(s)? Who were they?

[Free Response]

OC1

27. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about each domain?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

OC2

28. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about social networks (The S-Set of questions)?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

OC3

29. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about attitudes and ideologies (The B-Set of questions)?

- Very certain

- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

OC4

30. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about language production (The O-Set of questions)?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

OC5

31. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions

about the languages spoken to the Focus people (The I-Set of questions)?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

OC6

32. How certain are you in your responses to the set of questions about children (The T-Set of questions)?

- Very certain
- Certain
- Somewhat certain
- Uncertain
- Very uncertain

A.9 *Appendix I: Scale definitions*

The standard scales used for the questions identified by their double digit identification codes (the Correspondence IDs, or CIDs). Further details can be found at <https://gramadapt.clld.org>.

S1: How often do Focus Group people interact with Neighbour Group?

- Very often: Characterisable as “consistently throughout the year”. Other possibilities: frequently recurring but short interactions (e.g., a few days every week), or prolonged interaction for limited periods of time (e.g., once a year for several weeks).
- Often: Characterisable as “some parts of the year”, or an aggregate of approximately 4–5 weeks/28–35 days of interaction in a year. Often enough, but not enough to characterize as “very often”.
- Sometimes: Characterisable as “some parts of the year”. Neither often nor rarely.
- Rarely: Characterisable as “rarely in a year”, or an aggregate of 2–3 weeks/14–21 days of interaction in a year. Rarely enough that it is difficult to characterize as “very rarely”
- Very rarely: Characterisable as “almost never”, or less than 5 days maximum in a year. Other possibilities: once year for a couple of

days, or interactions occur based on incidental opportunities.

S3: How many people are typically involved in interactions between Focus Group and Neighbour Group when interacting in domain X?

- Practically always under 5 people: e.g., up to 90% of the time up
- Often under 5 people: e.g up to 70% of the time
- Sometimes under 5 people: up to 50% of the time up
- Rarely under 5 people: up to 30% of the time
- Practically never under 5 people: up to 10% of the time

S4: How physically proximate to each other are people involved in domain X?

- Very proximate: There is little to no effort in reaching one another, and does not bear considering as effortful.
- Proximate: There is some effort in reaching one another, but no real planning is necessary.
- Somewhat proximate to each other: There is some effort required to reach one another, and some planning may be necessary. The effort required is not so large as to dissuade travel if there is an imperative. Less than a days worth of travel.
- Far from each other: There is effort required to reach one another, and some degree of planning is

required, with some physical discomfort expected. Maximum, a days worth of travel.

- Very far: There is considerable effort required to reach one another. Logistic considerations and planning must be made. Requires one or more overnight travel.

S6 and S7: What is the proportion of total Focus/Neighbour Group people who have opportunities for contact with Neighbour/Focus Group people in domain X?

- Almost everyone: A very high proportion, estimating roughly 90% or more of the total population
- Many people: A fairly high proportion, the majority of the Focus Group people, estimating around 66% of the total population
- Some people: An intermediate proportion, roughly 50% of the Focus Group total population have opportunities for contact with Neighbour Group people.
- A few people: A fairly low proportion, a minority of the people in the Focus Group, estimating around 33% of the total population
- Almost no one: A very low proportion, estimating 10

BH: How do Focus Group people view themselves overall in relation to Neighbour Group people, within the context of domain X?

- Very superior: Clearly stated beliefs that the Focus Group are better than the Neighbour Group in some way.
- Superior: Some stated beliefs that Focus Group are better than the Neighbour Group in some way.
- Neither superior nor inferior: e.g., there are no clear or obvious stated beliefs that Focus Group are better than the Neighbour Group in some way.
- Inferior: Some stated beliefs that Focus Group are not as good as the Neighbour Group in some way.
- Very inferior: Clearly stated beliefs that Focus Group are not as good as the Neighbour Group in some way.

B1, O1, I1, T2, T4, T5, T7, T8, T9, T10

- The Focus Group language/The Neighbour Group language/Some other language: So-called monolingual modes of interaction. These options are mutually exclusive, that is, if more than one language is used in interaction, please select the fourth option, “This is highly contextual”.
- This is highly contextual: encompasses interaction in which more than one language is used, including but not limited to phenomena that come under the umbrella terms “code-switching” and/or “code-mixing”.

O3: Typically in domain X, how fluently do Focus Group people speak the Neighbour Group language?

- Very fluently: Almost a complete absence of linguistic markers that differentiate the speech of a Focus Group person from a Neighbour Group person, e.g., or use of features that fall entirely beneath the level of speaker/interlocutor consciousness,
- Fluently: High level of production, but a few linguistic markers of “late acquisition”, such as having an accent. A non-native linguist would not necessarily be able to ascertain level of fluency from a textual transcription without audio.
- Somewhat fluently: Many markers of late acquisition, but does not impede communication and comprehension. A non-native linguist would likely be able to ascertain level of fluency from a textual transcription without audio.
- A little fluently: Many markers of late acquisition. It hampers communication and comprehension.
- Not fluently at all: Usage limited to lexical items, and rote learned set phrases.

I2: Typically in domain X, how well do Focus Group people understand the Neighbour Group language?

- Very well: Focus Group people have high comprehension skills of Neighbour Group language & understand

- the contextual situation very well
- Well: Focus Group people have low comprehension skills of Neighbour Group language but understand the contextual situation very well.
 - Somewhat: Focus Group people have low comprehension skills of Neighbour Group language but understand the contextual situation to some extent.
 - Poorly: Focus Group people have low comprehension skills of Neighbour Group language and do not understand the contextual situation too well either
 - Very poorly: Focus Group people have almost no comprehension of the Neighbour Group language and do not understand the contextual situation.

T_I: How much do Focus Group children participate in domain X?

- They practically always participate: children are actively involved in the activities and verbal interactions of this social domain.
- A lot: Not as much as the adults, but still participate in some activities and verbal interactions of this social domain.
- Somewhat: They participate in the

activities and verbal interactions of this social domain., but are less involved than adults.

- A little: i.e. just being present in the space of this social domain, but uninvolved in interactions
- They practically never participate: children are not involved in this social domain.

T_{II}: Typically, how much supervision do adults provide to children in domain X?

- Constant supervision: if participating in activities, children always do that in the presence of adults and under their explicit and constant guidance.
- A lot of supervision: if participating in activities, children mostly do that in the presence of adults and under explicit guidance.
- Some supervision: if participating in activities, children partially do that in the presence of adults and under explicit guidance, and partially on their own.
- Little supervision: if participating in activities, children mostly do that on their own, with little input and guidance from the adults.
- No supervision at all: children are left alone in activities.