

Artículo de investigación

Extralinguistic conditions of language variability in national languages

Recibido: 12 de agosto del 2019

Aceptado: 16 de octubre del 2019

Written by:

Lyudmila I. Antropova⁹⁸<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0496-139X>**Tatiana Yu. Zalavina**⁹⁹<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0210-7963>**Liliya S. Polyakova**¹⁰⁰<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9990-7694>**Yuliya V. Yuzhakova**¹⁰¹<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6790-044X>**Abstract**

The article is aimed at studying the concept of the existence of socially motivated language variants. They are explained by sociolinguistic differentiation and specific use of language in different situations of communication. The dialectical connection of the objective world, the society and a language gives the latter a special dynamic character. It is manifested in active language processes at all linguistic levels and in language usual innovations. Sociolinguistic variants do not only show different images of the world, but also reflect the changes of the world depending on the culture, which, in turn, is reflected in the specifics of linguistic phenomena. Language norms, in this case, correlate not only with communicative attitudes, but also with the cultural ones. In the context of linguistic variability, the speakers of codified standard language, who can switch from one sociocultural language to another one, in the official or informal communication can choose and use various sociolinguistic language variants in their everyday life. It explains the novelty of the research, which is closely related to the typological study of the paradigm of national language situations, determined by the presence of various social strata and groups in the United States, Germany, France, the Czech Republic, Russia and other countries. The authors view the language situation as a socially-motivated model of speech behavior of a native speaker in the social language space.

Keywords: Sociolinguistic differentiation, linguistic variability, sociolinguistic subsystems, speakers of codified standard language, language situation.

Introduction

Scientific development of the issue of socio-cultural variability of national languages in American, European and Russian Sociolinguistics is directly related to the study of the language social differentiation problem, based on the socio-cultural-communicative concept. According to this concept national language forms are considered to be relatively autonomous languages obtaining their own elements, norms and speakers. Language variability although having been sufficiently

studied in linguistics, still arouses interest among researchers. It is closely associated with the language social motivation specificity related to the changes taking place in the society, i.e. depending on extralinguistic factors (Antropova et al., 2017, pp. 33-38; Yuzhakova & Polyakova, 2018, pp. 199-202; Yuzhakova et al., 2018, pp. 464 - 472). Constantly changing extralinguistic factors stipulate various language forms manifestation and functioning, each form can be chosen and used by standard language speakers

⁹⁸ Ph. D. (Philology), Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Education in the Humanities Institute, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia.

⁹⁹ Ph. D. (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Education in the Humanities Institute, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia.

¹⁰⁰ PhD (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages for Engineering, Institute of Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia.

¹⁰¹ PhD (Philology), Assoc. Prof. of Foreign Languages in Engineering Department, Institute for the Humanities, Nosov Magnitogorsk State Technical University, Magnitogorsk, Russia.

in their everyday life. The forms of language functioning are relatively autonomous, sociocultural languages used in different types of communication (Antropova, 2005; Zalavina & Antropova 2018; Dyorina et al., 2017).

The combination of expression means used by a group of people within a separate linguistic zone is characteristic of one or another community reflecting the cognitive way of thinking. This is typical for communication of people with higher education and people living in rural areas. Studying language functioning in different communicative situations in a certain region, scientists consider a language as a system that includes, on the one hand, an official standard-written form, and colloquial one, on the other. A regional colloquial language is a part of the national colloquial language that characterizes a certain linguacultural space in which the first type of language is used under normal conditions.

Methodology

The following scientific and theoretical approaches and general scientific methods developed by the leading foreign and domestic researchers were used to achieve the aforementioned aims. First of all, the method of language territorial differentiation should be noted. It allows studying language forms functioning in the territorial space conditions. Other useful methods are the classification method (the typology method), the interpretation method, the dynamically systemic method, the descriptive method and a new sociocultural-communicative approach to the stratification of the unilingual language situations. This approach is used in explication of the linguistic situation paradigm, in the description of the language functioning forms and characterization of their internal structure; in the processes of developing the social roles concept; identifying the codified standard language speakers; characterizing the communicative competence of a codified standard language speakers; describing patterns of switching from one code to another (from one language functioning form to another one).

In the course of our study we set the following research tasks:

1. To analyze the general theoretical prerequisites of a sociocultural-communicative approach that provides interpretation and modeling of the language situation constituted by a set of different language functioning forms.

2. To determine the chronological periodization of the language functioning forms genesis.
3. To define results of the codified standard language speaker's switching from one language form to another one, taking into account the socio-cultural communicative situations.

Theoretical Framework

Dialectographers (Ammon, 1986, pp. 1-64; Jaberg, 1928) have formulated the basic principles of the territorial linguistic space division into certain language functioning forms which have been called specific-local dialects. The most important is the linguo-geographical principle of the language territorial division into territorial dialects. The contrastive method has been chosen to be the leading method of language territorial differentiation study. By means of this method the vowel and consonant sounds of different dialects have been compared and language maps with clear boundaries of phonetic laws impact have been produced.

The second approach is based on the concept of the supradialectal Koine functioning (Gumperz, 1962; Labov, 2002; Lodge, 2011). The advent of this concept was an impulse to distinguish the language functioning forms of different rank: a codified standard language, a standard-colloquial language, region-wide colloquial and urban colloquial languages which, as language systems of higher rank, dominate specific local territorial dialects.

The third approach is based on the concept of the systemic nature of the language as a whole, of its functioning forms and of the levels of the aforementioned structures. This concept has come into being due to the recognition of the language to be "the system of systems" and understanding that all language levels are also systems, including language stylistic varieties. According to the linguists of the twentieth century systemacity and functionality are the fundamental properties of the language. In many works devoted to the study of the language as a system, scientists focus on the dynamic systemic character of the language, its mobile, evolving nature (Kachru, 1985; Labov, 2002).

Several periods characterized by various social traditions can be distinguished in the development of views on the language functioning forms problem. The first period (the end of the XIX-th - the beginning of the XX-th century) includes two stages. Stage 1 is

associated with the formation and development of territorial and social overseas (Tagliamonte, 2013) and domestic dialectology. The second stage is based on the study of functional differences between language functioning forms, producing oppositions of two strata: a dialect and another language functioning form which has differential features in comparison to the dialect (Reed, 1973). This approach appeared in the nineteenth century during the formation of the standard language, however it became a leading one only at the beginning of the twentieth century. It was based on the linguistic opposition method widely used in linguistic practice of that time, which allowed scholars to carry out an intralanguage comparison, establish opposition series like “a dialect – a standard language”, “a dialect – a regional colloquial language” and identify language differences between the selected language functioning forms.

The second period, which lasted throughout the twentieth century, also consists of two stages. Stage 1 is associated with the attempt of scientists to identify the language functioning forms based on social models of the society. This stage was accompanied by the study of language and speech differences among representatives of different social strata and groups (Preston & Shuy, 1988), the study of “language conflicts” and advancing the theory of the “language barrier” (Wells, 1986). It is characteristic for the 2nd stage, to use the proper linguistic approach to the language functioning forms study. All changes occurring in the language are studied in connection with the internal processes of interaction of linguistic elements in the process of speech. The overwhelming majority of works devoted to the study of multilevel language means are based on the data of a specific language functioning form (mainly a codified standard language), and the structural similarities and differences among the language functioning forms presented at all levels are stated (Wardhaugh, 2006, pp. 25-57).

The third period covers the end of the XX-th - the beginning of the XXI-st century. At this stage in sociolinguistic studies, the importance of including the communicative aspect into the theory of social differentiation, the content of which is determined by the communicative behavior of the members of society, is recognized. In connection with the aforementioned formulation of the problem, concepts based on the theory of “social roles” (Chomsky, 1975) and “linguistic competence” (Trudgill, 2000) are being developed.

We may find the issues related to the nature of the use of this or that language functioning form in other linguistic works, the main objective of which is traditionally the study of the national language situation and a closely related problem of a language social differentiation, determined by the presence of various social strata and groups (Dittmar, 2001, pp. 971-973).

In this paper language situation is understood as socially motivated model of a native speaker’s speech behaviour in socio-linguistic space. From this perspective, the concept of linguistic situation is defined as the interaction of extralinguistic and intratextual, basic changes. Colloquial forms of languages vary in individual linguistic levels: phonetics, grammar, vocabulary. Since any language exists because of a society, these levels depend on socio-communicative situations and social conditions, where native speakers are situated.

Nowadays there is no unified definition in linguistics for such terms as “sociolinguistic variants”, “sociolinguistic subsystem”, “social linguistic variants”, “language variation”, “variant”. Some scholars, like (Eckert, 2000, Trudgill 2000) and others, use the terms “variance” and “variability” as synonyms, and other scientists consider them as separate terms. As we are interested in the social nature of linguistic changes, we adhere to the definition of sociolinguistic subsystems of a language as the continuum forms of its existence. We refer to the forms of existence of a language (Language Variety, Existenzformen der Sprache, Formes de l’existence du langage) as socially and communicatively differentiated, relatively autonomous language systems with their own set of linguistic signs and with their specific features of functioning in modern communication. First of all, we are talking here about social variance of any national language, which is determined by linguistic stratification, social status of speakers and their social-speaking roles in given speech situations. As it is known, in formal situations a coded language is used, e.g.: American English (Standard American English), Standard language in the UK; deutsche Literatursprache or Standarddeutsch (standard German) in Germany; the official standard-written language of France (le français littéraire) or standard general French language (la langue française standardisée générale), le français littéraire, etc.

In general, the study of the language social conditionality is aimed at developing issues related to 1) the territorial distribution of language functioning forms, 2) the social

structure of society, 3) studying the influence of social and cultural changes on the development and functioning of language, 4) periodization of the language functioning forms development based on socio-cultural conditions, 5) the development of a paradigmatic view on the linguistic situation social stratification and 6) a representation of the internal structure of the language functioning forms (Chambers et al., 2004).

Discussion

Having abstracted from the differences in terminological apparatuses and taking into account modern sociolinguists' views it can be stated that different language functioning forms are characteristic of any linguistic situation, and their number and content are determined by the social conditions of communication and the communicative intentions of the speakers. According to the data available in the special literature on the language functioning forms dynamics, the language situation is characterized by a complex structure. On the one hand, it is constituted by languages, the system of which is fixed by various dictionaries and reference books, on the other hand, languages used in the society in verbal communication at different historical moments are also systems. In modern sociolinguistic studies, one of the fundamental concepts is the notion of a language situation, which is understood as an organized set of languages. Organization of the language situation is explained by the fact that languages are interrelated not only due to close contacts among linguistic communities made up of people belonging to certain political and territorial associations, but also by people's attitude to the communication continuum of the given society and to one another (Bell, 1984).

Typological overview of modern language situations in America, Germany, France, and Russia allowed us identify standard, as well as extra standard national language functioning forms.

With regard to the functioning of the dialects in Western European countries, they are considered to be reasonably well investigated. However, linguists' interest to the study of different types of dialects, which had equal historical conditions for their development, still remains rather high, both in terms of identifying language similarities and differences, and building the typology of the forms of existence of European languages, including English, French, German and Czech.

However, foreign and Russian sociolinguists, dealing with the problem of social differentiation in languages, rather note different forms of existence of languages than describe them in detail. Moreover, their primary attention is paid to the use of language by different social groups regardless of the "social role" of the same speaker. A number of sociolinguistic studies give scientists the opportunity to present language as a set of various differential forms and to assert that the existence of different forms of any national language is rather a rule than an exception, and they (forms) are determined by social conditions and the objectives of native speakers (Dittmar et al., 1988).

The concept of sociolinguistic differentiation is related to the functioning of the national language in different socio-communicative and territorial conditions. That is why languages have been explored in different regions of Germany, France, the Czech Republic, Russia. Comparative studies, however, were mostly done on small fragments of language material and on separate linguistic levels. In special literature on linguistics there is still no systematic comparative study of European and Russian languages in terms of their linguistic conformity by forms of linguistic entities. Moreover, in sociolinguistic studies, so far, the mechanism of affecting social factors on language has been little investigated, and the system and the peculiarities of targeted influence of a society on a language remain unexplored. In this respect, when building the typology of forms of existence of the language, promising proved to be the method proposed by Brown and Levinson (Brown & Levinson, 1979) when researching sociolinguistic subsystems of Russian language. It is this approach that allows you to identify communication situations, where the speakers of coded standard language may occur during the day, and which may be used for building a typology of forms of existence of other national languages.

One of the main issues in the phenomenon of the forms of existence of national language remains the question what level is appropriate in regard to these differentiations. As we see it, they may be found in speakers' various socio-linguistic behaviours, as the speech of every native speaker does not only reflect his/her public relations, but also the conceptual and linguistic picture of the world.

The analysis of the current linguistic situation in different countries allowed us to distinguish literary forms and extraliterary sub-systems of

national languages, or the forms of their existence. The paradigm of socio-linguistic space constitute the coded standard language, standard-colloquial, regional colloquial language, urban and regional dialects. It should be noted that, although territorial dialects have undergone significant changes as compared to the period of their development, they still continue to play a significant role in the process of oral communication both among the villagers, or educated and intelligent people.

Let us consider local dialects, which being the variants of national languages, function within a limited region. They also remain a favourite topic for the researchers of modern languages. A number of researchers continue to explore modern dialects, their speakers, and the role of dialects in the paradigm of unilingual linguistic situations. They compare the linguistic characteristics of dialects and a coded standard language (CSL), explore the use of dialects in different communicative situations. The speakers of the coded language continue to find in the dialects "trust, intimacy with colleagues". Among the scientists, the terms *Dialekt/Mundart* are used as synonyms (Schönfeld, 1985, pp. 207-208).

New data on the changing social role of dialects in everyday life of various Western European countries, maintaining dialects' independence, have enabled scientists to consider dialects one of the ways of leaning the national language picture. Indeed, any native speaker's true natural life is reflected in language colloquial forms. No wonder that dialects, reconstructed in connection with the revival of connotative concepts of "folk", "folk song", "folk wisdom", "folk tales", "folk customs", "folk language", reflect the national consciousness and the language original nature (Radden, 2001). The unifying aspect of the considered U.S., French and German dialects is the fact that they have been preserved at the present stage, both in individual use and in the public media. According to linguists, information extracted from the traditional rural dialect is often more valuable than that obtained on the basis of the literary version. A dialect speaker can express such feelings that the normative abstract standard language can hardly convey.

It is verified by data obtained due to the comparative analysis of modern language situations in America, France, and Germany. They point to the fact that territorial dialects are still an important means of informal communication, as they are motivated by social

situations and are determined by the changes going in today's national society.

Therefore, in modern linguistics, the largest group of French dialects is noted:

la langue d'oïl (northern and central parts of the territory) normand > parlocher (parler avec affectation) piedsente (sentier); gallo > avoir (avoir), dret (droit); poitevin-saintongeais > monde (monde), prsoune (personne); berrichon > bouille (marais), coursière (raccourci), fluber (souffler); picard > canter (chanter), gambe (jambe); wallon > av'vuve (avenue), pendée (rue); champenois > badorer (barbouiller), goulaffe (goinfre); lorrain > burre (beurre), chauchoir (pressoir); bourguignon > treige (trage ou traige) (passage couvert traversant les maisons); bourbonnais > à bouchon (à plat ventre), mouret (visage); franc-comtois treige (trage ou traige) (passage couvert traversant les maisons); jurassien > biaude (robe), gna (niais(e)); orléanais > cacouet (nuque), peineux (ouvrier agricole) (Zalavina & Dyorina, 2017, pp.10-13). In this case the codified standard language speaker can move from one form of language to another: from CSL to dialect and vice versa. The socio-cultural and sociolinguistic status of an idiom (a language subsystem) depends on a general social and linguistic differentiation. The following examples demonstrate the specific features of territorial dialects in the Baden-Frankish region, used in an informal situation (Bräutigam & Lehr, 1986).

All the territorial dialects are contrasted with the standard language in different options and characteristics. For example, according to lexical-morphological markers we can identify: a) Plattdeutsch and the coded standard language (De kinnern maket em hus klamauk, Die Kinder machen im Haus Krach 'The kids are being noisy at home'; Guten Tag / Grüß Got 'Good afternoon', Brotchen / Schrippe 'a bun'; the pronunciation of [g] as [h]); b) Russian regional colloquial language Ruhrdeutsch (Aus'n Konsum/ anne Ecke// Aus dem Konsum / an der Ecke 'From the shop / at the corner; assimilation of verbs with personal pronouns: Was frachse?, Was fragst du? What are you asking about?) (Bausinger, 1979, p. 170; Bräutigam & Lehr, 1986).

In fact, each of the aforementioned approaches to the sociolinguistic problems of the existence and functioning of the national language sociolinguistic subsystems has different theoretical and practical significance for creating any language functioning forms typology. The

method allows establishing the difference in linguistic and communicative norms of a codified standard language and colloquial languages operating in different territorial and social conditions. The aforementioned facts give grounds to conclude that colloquial languages, due to the change of communicative situations, have their own communicative norms, both in the region and within cities. In this regard, it is possible to study various socially structured situations relating to various unofficial unprepared spheres of communication. The sociolinguistic basis of such everyday private conversations with codified standard language speakers are, for example: discussing musical and literary novelties, receiving guests, celebrating the birthday and anniversary of a company, a firm or a city, sharing impressions about vacations and purchases. The situation having changed, the CL speaker starts using common regional colloquial language: "bank", "savings banks", "canteens and cafes", "visit to the doctor", "traffic accident", "traffic police" "purchasing in a strange city", "rent of living space" etc.. The sociolinguistic factor of transition to urban colloquial language urban dialect is both a situation change, and a change of social and communicative roles of codified standard language speakers. The basis of such speech situations is the speakers' communicative experience, their common communicative horizon. Therefore, due to their common communicative culture, CSL speakers can switch from one language to another. They form their utterances using a speech guess and conversational vocabulary and syntax according to specific situations. Within the framework of a new sociocultural-communicative approach to the study of the language functioning forms, the concept of *a dynamic communicative competence* is introduced. This mental communicative presupposition means the presence of a special communication matrix in the CSL speaker's mind (in the terminology of J. Gamperts) (Gumperz, 1962). It is formed with the help of certain language functioning forms and a proper set of linguistic means, as well as language and usage norms, which ensure the possibility of transition from one language functioning form to another.

The language reflects innovative processes in the scientific, technical, cultural and consumer spheres. The following lexical items have been introduced and are widely used: *Internet, Handy, mobile phone, laptop, roaming, fax, xerox, brand, supermarket, player, ATM, glamor*, etc. The computer technology advent has led to the

coining of many new words in the standard language and jargon.

The scientific and technological revolution and the associated emergence of new professions and new professional fields entail not only the creation of new terminological systems, but also the emergence of new professional jargons. Space science is one of such modern spheres of activity, its professional jargon as one of the forms of intra-group social communication has already been formed. For example, such specific jargon lexical items as *glitch* meaning '*any technical defect, malfunction, accident*' and *go* meaning '*ready to launch, ready, in order*'. . . *it appeared that for two of them at least the gradual slowdown was punctuated by jerks, sudden speedups, after which the slowdown resumed. These were called sudden events, or glitches, a word borrowed from the jargon of the astronauts* ; *After conferring with launching crews, flight controllers and the weatherman, William C Schneider, the mission director, said, "Everything at this time is go"* (Schneider, 2010). The antonym of the gargonism *go* is *no go* meaning '*faulty, unprepared for launch, in unsatisfactory technical condition*'. The jargon equivalent of the official term *lunar roving vehicle* is the gargonism *bug*: *From this vehicle, a small two-man lunar excursion vehicle commonly known as the 'bug' would be detached from the mother craft* (Launius & Howard, 2008).

The BBC company has its own professional jargon as well. The newcomers of the British Information Corporation are often forced to ask again the meaning of certain words and abbreviations that are directly related to work and are firmly embedded in the everyday speech of more experienced colleagues. Here are some of the words and abbreviations that can often be heard in the studios and offices of the BBC around the world: *board*, i.e. an interview that a commission of several people holds with a candidate for a particular position; *BoG* (abbr. from *Board of Governors*), i.e. the BBC Board of Trustees (It consists of 12 members appointed by the Queen. It supervises the activities of the corporation on behalf of the public. The Trustees are responsible for BBC's accountability to parliament, taxpayers and the public in general, in order the BBC programs are of high quality. The Council ensures the editorial independence of the corporation and has the authority to investigate complaints from viewers and listeners.). *Bush* - abbr. from *Bush House* (the main residence of the BBC World Service, located in London), *casual* is the name given to

freelancers of the corporation, *Cue* is the text for a television and radio program, *CPS* is an abbreviation from *Content Production System*, it is a computer program designed to create Internet content, *DVC* is an abbreviation from *Digital Video Camera*, *DG* is an abbreviation from Director General, *ELVIS* - constantly updated electronic archive of photographs (used by producers of "BBC" Internet services for the preparation of online content), *ENPS* is an abbreviation from *Electronic News Production System* which is a computer program providing employees with access to information resources and the ability to prepare television and radio programs, *GAL* is an abbreviation from *Global Address List*, i.e. a list of corporate email addresses of employees and BBC divisions ", *Gateway* is the name of the BBC intranet, *SM* is an abbreviation from *Studio Manager* meaning *sound producer*, *Two-way* is- a television or radio interview.

Conclusion

The considered interpretation of communicative competence is the essence of the sociocultural-communicative approach that explains the choice of a certain language functioning form made by a codified standard language speaker and the corresponding transition from one form to another in a changing situation of communication. Within this approach, communicative competence includes language competence, and usage of the language functioning form as a sociocultural language. This language becomes an autonomous and socially shared means of communication in the process of the speaker's individual and social interaction experience, because it is characterized by the development of its own usage rules.

The analysis does not aim at being exhaustive to make a complete typology of forms of existence of a language and to describe the mechanisms of social and situation-dependent use of this or that language. The paper considers the main sociolinguistic criterion of functioning of different languages: the type of one speaker of coded standard language, who, depending on various communicative contexts, is able to switch from one language to another one. This criterion is one of the main cross-lingual universals of national languages.

In conclusion, it should be noted that each of these approaches to scientific problems of forms of existence and functioning of different sociolinguistic variants (subsystems) of national

languages has a different value for the creation a typology of forms of existence of national languages. The opposition comparison method allows identifying the differences in linguistic and communicative rules of coded standard (CSL) and colloquial languages, operating in different territorial and social conditions. This enables us to conclude that spoken languages, due to the change of communicative situations, have their own linguistic and communicative norms, both in the regions, and within the cities.

References

- Ammon, U. (1986). Explikation der Begriffe 'Standardvarietät' und 'Standardsprache' auf normtheoretischer Grundlage . Sprachlicher Substandard. (Hrsg.), von Günter Holtus und Edgar Radtke. Tübingen: Niemeyer. S. 1 - 64.
- Antropova, L.I. (2005). The Forms of Existence of Language: Sociocultural and Communicative Approach (Thesis of Doctor in Philology). Chelyabinsk State University, Chelyabinsk.
- Antropova, L.I., Zalavina T.Y., Polyakova L.S. (2017). Linguistic and Cultural Space of Serbia and Russia: General and Characteristic National and Cultural Aspects. *Наслеђе. Journal of Language, Literature, Arts and Culture*, 14 (37), pp. 33-38.
- Bausinger, H. (1979). *Deutsch für Deutsche: Dialekte, Sprachbarrieren, Sondersprachen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society*, 13(02), pp.145-204.
- Bräutigam, K., Lehr, R. (1986). *Daheim: Ortspolische Mundarten zwischen Rhein und Tauber, Main und Murg*. Karlsruhe: Baudenia.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1979). Social structure, groups and interaction. In K.R. Scherer and H. Giles (Eds.), *Social Markers in Speech* (pp 291 – 342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, J.K., Trudgill, P., and Schilling-Estes, N. (2004). *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon.
- Dyorina, N., Savinova, T., Zalavina, T., Zerkina, N., Kisel, O., et al. (2017). Polydiscursive Space: TheWord, the Text, the Communication. Magnitogorsk. NMSTU
- Dittmar, N., Schlobinski, P., & Wachs, I. (1988). The social significance of the Berlin urban vernacular. In N. Dittmar & P. Schlobinski (1988). pp.19-43
- Dittmar, N. (2001). Text- and Gesprächslinguistic: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung. In:

- Linguistics of Text and Conversation. Berlin; N.Y.: de Gruyter. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft. Bd.16. Halbbd.2. S. 971-973
- Eckert, P. (2000). Linguistic variation as social practice. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. (1962). Types of Linguistic Communities, *Anthropological Linguistics*, 4, 1, pp. 28-40.
- Jaberg, K., und Jud, J. (1928). Der Sprachatlas als Forschungsinstrument. Kritische Grundlegung und Einführung in den Sprach- und Sachatlas Italiens und der Süd-Schweiz. Halle (Saale): M. Niemeyer.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism. The English language in the outer circle. In Randolph Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp.11-30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Labov W. (2002). *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press. <https://www.upenn.edu/pennpress/book/1082.htm>
- Launius, Roger D, McCurdy, Howard E. (2008). *Robots in space: technology, evolution, and interplanetary travel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins university press.
- Lodge, R. Anthony (2011). La question de la "langue commune" en français. In Sonia Branca-Rosof, Jean-Marie Fournier, Yana Grinshpun, Anne Régent-Susini (eds.), *Langue commune et changements de norms* (pp. 77 - 91). Paris: Honoré Champion, Champion.
- Preston, D., Shuy, R. (1988). *Varieties of American English*. Washington: United States Department of State: English Language Programs Division.
- Radden, Günter (2001). The folk model of language. *metaphorik*. https://www.metaphorik.de/sites/www.metaphorik.de/files/journal-pdf/01_2001_radden.pdf
- Reed, C.E. (1973). *Dialects of American English*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Schneider, Edgar W. (2010). *English around the world: an introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schönfeld, H. (1977). *Zur Rolle der sprachlichen Existenzformen in der sprachlichen Kommunikation*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Schönfeld, H. (1985). Varianten, Varietäten und Sprachvariation. In: *Zeitschrift für Phonetik* und Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung, №1 (38). S. 207-208.
- Tagliamonte, Sali A. (2013). *Roots of English: Exploring the history of dialects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: an Introduction to Language and Society*. London: New York: Penguin.
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Blackwell textbooks in linguistics.
- Wells, W.H.G. (1986). An Experimental Approach to the Interpretation of Focus in Spoken English. In Catherine Johns-Lewis (ed.) *Intonation Discourse* (pp. 53 - 75). London, Sydney: Croom Helm.
- Yuzhakova, Yu., & Polyakova, L. (2018). Ethnic stereotypes in English political discourse. *Philological Science. Questions of theory and practice*, 7 (85), pp. 199-202.
- Yuzhakova, Yu., Polyakova L., Derina N., Zalavina T. (2018). Peculiarities of Ethnic Stereotypes Usage in English Political Discourse. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (4), pp. 464 - 472.
- Zalavina, T. Y., Antropova, L. I. (2018). Variability of Verbal Phraseology-Representatives of the Concept "Censure" in National Languages. *Humanities and pedagogical research*, vol. 2, n. 2, pp.54-61.
- Zalavina T.Y., Dyorina N.V. (2017). National-Cultural Semantics Reflection of French Proverbs. *Proceedings of the 14th International conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*. «East West» Association for Advanced Studies and Higher Education, GmbH. Vienna. pp. 10-13.