



Socio-spatial Networks, Multilingualism, and Language Use in a Rural African Context

Pierpaolo Di Carlo, Jeff Good, Ling Bian, Yujia Pan and Penghang Liu

Abstract A GIS spatial perspective can provide important insights into many poorly understood sociolinguistic phenomena such as multilingualism in rural Africa. By relying on ethnographic and individual-based sociolinguistic information as well as on high spatial-temporal resolution data, our interdisciplinary team composed of linguists and geographers aims to (i) make original contributions to the cartographic representation of multilingualism and (ii) develop spatial-analytical models able to capture a complex array of linguistic, cultural, and spatial variables for a compact rural area of Cameroon.

Keywords ■■■■

1 Multilingualism, Space, and GIS

The existing literature on the application of GISystems to the study of multilingualism represents the distribution of languages in specific areas—mostly urbanized regions of Western countries—where many languages are spoken by residents (Williams and Van der Merwe 1996; Veselinova and Booza 2009). What has yet to see attention is the spatial analysis of individual patterns of multilingualism, i.e., the ability of a given individual to use multiple languages. Individual multilingualism is a pervasive social feature in many parts of the world, including Sub-Saharan Africa, which is where our area of focus is located. Such an individual-based cognitive phenomenon lacks immediate cartographic representations (Luebbing et al. 2013: 386). In addition, sociolinguistic scholarship on multilingualism has mostly focused on the behaviors of urban migrants, whose multilingual repertoires are characterized

P. Di Carlo (✉) · J. Good
Department of Linguistics, University at Buffalo, 613 Baldy Hall,
Buffalo, NY 14260, USA
e-mail: pierpaol@buffalo.edu

L. Bian · Y. Pan · P. Liu
Department of Geography, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, USA

by the addition of one or more languages of wider communication—such as, e.g., ex-colonial languages and pidgins—to more localized “heritage” languages. Both limits have made it thus far impossible—in fact, inconceivable—to attempt analyses of how multilingual repertoires pattern in space.

Following a theoretical shift from single languages to communicative practices, some recent language documentation projects have focused on small languages spoken in linguistically highly diverse areas and are now offering novel and more complex views of multilingual behaviors in non-urban regions of the world (see Lüpke 2016 for a review; Woodbury 2011 provides an overview of the practice of language documentation more generally). The multidisciplinary data collected in such projects and the localized nature of the languages documented provide new grounds for the application of GISystems for the study of multilingualism in both geographic and socially-constructed space (Low 2017), and we report on the application of GISystems to a project documenting rural patterns of multilingualism in Sub-Saharan Africa here.¹

2 The Target Area: Lower Fungom

Our target area, Lower Fungom, lies at the northern edge of the Cameroonian Grassfields, one among the most linguistically dense parts of the world (Stallcup 1980). Many of the region’s languages are endangered, and there is increasing consensus that multilingualism in local languages, likely to be an ancient phenomenon, plays a key role in the maintenance of such a diverse linguistic ecology. Within this exceptionally diverse region, Lower Fungom shows the highest degree of language density: in an area of around 200 sq km, one finds eight distinct languages associated with its thirteen villages and roughly 12,000 inhabitants (Good et al. 2011). Moreover, the Cameroonian Grassfields are known to be a “singularity area”, i.e., one in which local language ideologies tend to identify a one-to-one relationship between language varieties and traditional political units (i.e., chiefdoms). In other words, locals conceptualize each chiefdom—which in Lower Fungom coincides with a single village—as being the center of a distinct language.

3 The Database

Multidisciplinary field research aimed at developing a holistic documentation of the languages of Lower Fungom has resulted in the collection of linguistic, ethnographic, archaeological, and geographic data. In particular, surveys have been

¹This paper is based upon data collected during research projects supported by the U.S. NSF under grants BCS#0853981 (2009–2013), BCS#1360763 (2014–2017), and by the Endangered Languages Archive Programme (IPF0180 2012). Interdisciplinary research is funded by the University at Buffalo under IMPACT grant #077.

61 collected that provide detailed information on the self-reported multilingual
62 repertoires of 206 individuals (ca. 2% of the area population), in addition to
63 information on their social ties and family background. On this basis, Ešene
64 Agwara (2013) established that there are essentially no adult monolinguals in
65 Lower Fungom and that the average individual speaks around six languages.

66 The spatial data at hand include a 1:50,000 topographic map, a high-resolution
67 QuickBird image, aerial photos, DEM, and the locations of streams, roads, and
68 footpaths. Such a wealth of information—linguistic, cultural, historical, and spatial
69 —is highly unusual for rural African contexts.

70 4 Working Hypotheses

71 Di Carlo (2016) and Di Carlo et al. (forthc.) have proposed (i) that individuals in
72 Lower Fungom acquire multiple languages primarily in order to gain access to the
73 resources associated with different villages and (ii) that language use is not tied to a
74 deep cultural notion such as ethnicity but, rather, is used to index an individual's
75 participation in different kinds of personal relationships, in particular kinship (cf.
76 Brubaker and Cooper 2000). This is different from what is known from Western
77 societies (see, e.g., Fishman 1967, 1977; Irvine and Gal 2000) where languages are
78 seen to be associated with cultural “essences”.

79 5 Expected Outcomes

80 Ongoing research in the context of an interdisciplinary collaboration including
81 linguists and geographers has three different, but tightly interrelated, goals:
82 (i) transform qualitative data—in particular ethnographic data—into formats that
83 can be effectively used for spatial analysis; (ii) adapt existing cartographic repre-
84 sentation techniques to a new domain in order to represent multilingual repertoires
85 and behaviors in space; and (iii) attempt spatial analyses of both individual-based
86 and aggregate data concerning the size and nature of multilingual repertoires (see
87 Sect. 3).

88 We have created a fine-grained spatial model that can support the exploration of
89 the relationship between individual-based sociolinguistic and ethnographic infor-
90 mation and the locations in which individuals reside and have lived in the past. In
91 parallel to this work, we have also developed models for quantifying qualitative
92 data that can minimize the loss of information via a system of weighted variables.
93 This has allowed us to carry out socio-spatial analyses using a range of methods and
94 to create visualizations of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and cultural information in
95 geographic space, building on work representing epidemics in space (see, e.g.,
96 Zhong and Bian 2016) as well as economic patterns (Buys et al. 2006).

Preliminary results of this work have allowed for consideration of socio-spatial patterns of language “on the ground” and provide new insights into how the behavior of individuals patterns with observed linguistic-spatial patterns. These results suggest that geographical proximity plays a key role in shaping an individual’s multilingual repertoire, with kinship networks also playing an important role. However, neither factor seems to account for the overwhelming majority of the individuals examined, thus suggesting the need to explore additional factors to understand multilingual patterns (see Sect. 4).

The high spatial-temporal resolution available to us, along with individual-level data, is playing a crucial role in uncovering precolonial, *longue durée* sociolinguistic and spatial patterns still at work in rural Africa that might be significant for the maintenance of local languages and that would be otherwise impossible to retrieve. In addition, this work is able to inform our goals for future fieldwork, directing us, in particular, towards the identification of new kinds of sociocultural and economic information to collect which will support the development of more adequate analytical models.

References

- Brubaker R, Cooper F (2000) Beyond “identity”. *Theory Soc* 29(1):1–47
- Buyts P, Deichmann U, Wheeler D (2006) Road network upgrading and overland trade expansion in Sub-Saharan Africa. Policy Research Working Paper. World Bank. doi:[10.1596/1813-9450-4097](https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-4097)
- Di Carlo P (2016) Multilingualism, affiliation and spiritual insecurity: from phenomena to processes in language documentation. In Seyfeddinipur M (ed) African language documentation: new data, methods and approaches, pp 71–104. Language Documentation and Conservation special publication no. 10. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24649>. Accessed 31 May 2017
- Di Carlo P, Good J, Ojong RA (forthcoming) Multilingualism in Rural Africa. In: Aronoff M (ed). Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics
- Esene Agwara AD (2013) Rural multilingualism in the North West Region of Cameroon: the case of Lower Fungom. Buea, Cameroon: University of Buea MA thesis. <http://buffalo.edu/~jgood/EseneAgwara-2013-RuralMultilingualism.pdf>. Accessed 31 May 2017
- Fishman J (1967) Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *J Soc Issues* 23(2):29–38
- Fishman J (1977) Language and ethnicity. In: Giles H (ed) Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations. Academic Press, New York, pp 15–58
- Good J, Lovegren J, Mve JP, Tchiemouo CN, Voll R, Di Carlo P (2011) The languages of the Lower Fungom region of Cameroon: Grammatical overview. *Africana Linguistica* 17:101–164
- Irvine JT, Gal S (2000) Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Kroskrity PV (ed) Regimes of language. Ideologies, politics, and identities. SAR Press/ James Currey, Santa Fe/ Oxford, pp 35–84
- Low S (2017) Spatializing culture. The ethnography of space and place. Routledge, London and New York
- Luebbering CR, Kolivras KN, Prisley SP (2013) The lay of language: surveying the cartographic characteristics of language maps. *Cartogr Geogr Inf Sci* 40(3):383–400
- Lüpke F (2016) Uncovering small-scale multilingualism. *Crit Multilingualism Stud* 4(2):35–74

- 142 Stallcup K (1980) La géographie linguistique des Grassfields. In Hyman L, Voorhoeve J
143 (eds) L'expansion Bantoue: Actes du Colloque International du CNRS, Viviers (France) 4–16
144 avril 1977. Volume I: Les Classes Nominaux dans le Bantou des Grassfields. SELAF, Paris,
145 pp 43–57
- 146 Veselinova L, Booza J (2009) Studying the multilingual city: a GIS-based approach. *J Multilingual*
147 *Multicult Dev* 30(2):145–165
- 148 Williams CH, Van der Merwe I (1996) Mapping the multilingual city: a research agenda for urban
149 geolinguistics. *J Multilingual Multicult Dev* 17(1):49–66
- 150 Woodbury AC (2011) Language documentation. In: Austin PK, Sallabank J (eds) *The Cambridge*
151 *handbook of endangered languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 159–186
- 152 Zhong S, Bian L (2016) A location-centric network approach to analyzing epidemic dynamics.
153 *Ann Am Assoc Geogr* 106(2):480–488. doi:[10.1080/00045608.2015.1113113](https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2015.1113113)

Author Query Form

Book ID : 440507_1_En

Chapter No : 9



Springer

the language of science

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections.

Dear Author,

During the process of typesetting your chapter, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided below

Query Refs.	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ1	As keywords are mandatory for this chapter, please provide 3–6 keywords.	

MARKED PROOF

Please correct and return this set

Please use the proof correction marks shown below for all alterations and corrections. If you wish to return your proof by fax you should ensure that all amendments are written clearly in dark ink and are made well within the page margins.

<i>Instruction to printer</i>	<i>Textual mark</i>	<i>Marginal mark</i>
Leave unchanged	... under matter to remain	Ⓟ
Insert in text the matter indicated in the margin	∧	New matter followed by ∧ or ∧ [Ⓢ]
Delete	/ through single character, rule or underline or ┌───┐ through all characters to be deleted	Ⓞ or Ⓞ [Ⓢ]
Substitute character or substitute part of one or more word(s)	/ through letter or ┌───┐ through characters	new character / or new characters /
Change to italics	— under matter to be changed	↙
Change to capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to small capitals	≡ under matter to be changed	≡
Change to bold type	~ under matter to be changed	~
Change to bold italic	≈ under matter to be changed	≈
Change to lower case	Encircle matter to be changed	≡
Change italic to upright type	(As above)	⊕
Change bold to non-bold type	(As above)	⊖
Insert 'superior' character	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ or Υ under character e.g. Υ or Υ
Insert 'inferior' character	(As above)	∧ over character e.g. ∧
Insert full stop	(As above)	⊙
Insert comma	(As above)	,
Insert single quotation marks	(As above)	ʹ or ʸ and/or ʹ or ʸ
Insert double quotation marks	(As above)	“ or ” and/or ” or ”
Insert hyphen	(As above)	⊥
Start new paragraph	┌	┌
No new paragraph	┐	┐
Transpose	└┘	└┘
Close up	linking ○ characters	Ⓞ
Insert or substitute space between characters or words	/ through character or ∧ where required	Υ
Reduce space between characters or words		↑