Are Bilinguals Bicultural People?
Original and Originated Bilinguals

ZEGHAR Ahmed
Univresity of Oran2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed

Abstract

This paper aims to discuss the question regarding bilinguals and bicultural people, and the relationship between bilingualism and biculturalism. The investigation seeks out whether a bilingual is bicultural, thus the arrangements of its anthropological circumstances. The paper also scrutinizes definite intended terminologies as ethnolinguistics and ethnomethodology. Then, it illustrates, through several examples, how meanings and their various accountabilities change across cultures. The former which pursues how illocutionary forces vary from one local culture to another and how bilinguals generate responses according to cultures by using their repertoires. The argument about bilinguals and their cultures has led to two new concepts: original bilinguals and originated bilinguals. Upon the two new concepts, it is heavily difficult to assert whether if a bilingual is or can be a bicultural. Henceforth, the difficulty in figuring out so stands in knowing the sufficient ethnolinguistic knowledge itself of both languages' cultures that the bilingual masters.

Keywords: Ethnolinguistics, Bilingualism, Biculturalism, Original bilinguals, Originated bilinguals.

1. Introduction

The main argument of this paper is the question of how bilingual people can be considered as bicultural. The concepts or approaches discussed are selective key notions of particular sociolinguistic theories. The field classifications of the concepts and approaches will include ethnicity, linguistics, ethnomethodology and other sub-concepts that may elucidate the main argument. Our discussion supports that languages are developed off cultures; henceforth, both linguistics and culture are highlighted to stress the need to understand about bilinguals. In addition, the link between the main arguments with ethnomethodology is presented to illustrate why meanings and concepts are set up by cultures, and how they are distinctly generated by people.

To clarify the intended distinctions suggested above, we projected that it is important to illustrate primarily some symbols that are well integrated and spread in the Arabic culture in contrast to other external cultures. The choice of comparison between the Arabic culture and the Western culture is selected due to the diverse differences and

lifestyle of the people. We will also demonstrate how the behavior and language uses of the people of both cultures are activated and shifted from a culture to another depending on their settings. We will then exemplify some cases of bilingual people raised in Algeria such as Arabic and Tamazight (Kabyle variety) speakers, and those who emigrated and was raised outside their countries within distinct cultures. The cultural background of a bilingual obscures the assertion of whether a bilingual is bicultural. It is excessive to consider any bilingual as bicultural, we therefore, conclude that by differentiating the two concepts of originated bilinguals and original bilinguals would clarify the argument on whether a given person is a bicultural.

2. Ethnolinguistics

Ethnolinguistics is a fundamental field to both sociolinguistic and sociology of language, which combines the concepts of ethnology and linguistics, also known as cultural linguistics. It is the study of the relationship between language and culture and how do the ethnic groups perceive the world. For example, winds, mountains, moons, stars, birds and dances may have different meanings and references between two groups of peoples. The question, which is asked, is "Do the same symbols reveal or transmit the same feelings?" As such, one of the enquiries that we coincide while reaching ethnolinguistics researches is how does each person perceive the world?

The question itself may explicate why people of the past could not come to agreements. When Muslim missionaries reached India, they figured out numerous characteristic changes. For instance, they used to eat beef, while it was out of the question for an Indian to kill a cow, for example. Today, most Muslim countries import cows from India with good costs, since the Indians do not eat their meats. Complex and opposing situations such as these may go back to simple point of views considered for X people as normal, but untreatable matters for Y people, or otherwise. It may explain why the ethnic groups of North America (Red Indians) could not exchange goods or at least made contacts in the seventeenth century with the discoverers, immigrants, invaders, missionaries or colonizers as some historians see. Thus, other plentiful cases around the world and through eras illustrate how people molded their own anthropological tendencies to mark their ways of life. Today, linguistically speaking, we still live on bases and backgrounds that were kept by the ancestors. Moreover, despite that, the world is becoming a smaller place; each group of people has shaped its own linguistic of perceptions and linguistic repertoires. In brief, two peoples may share the same language; however, they do not share the same words in

referring to particular matters. Therefore, it becomes difficult to guess the cultural value of the speaker, since he uses both languages fluently.

In another word, if a beard person whose clothes reflect the Islamic significance shouts 'ALLAH Akbar' (God is the greatest) in any public place in Europe or in any other non-Muslim country. Hereafter, citizens may demonstrate fear expressions; because, they decode and relate the phrase through an integrated image without an understanding to terrorism. In addition, the image that they had accumulated via media or previous experiences such as bombs and terror is now held and crusted in their minds. Henceforth, it tells them that the shouting person is a major public danger, though Islam is innocent from those acts and only few people around the world succeed to know the reality. Now, if we take the same man, but with a shaved chin and classical suit, and it happens that he does the same act by shouting 'ALLAH Akbar' (God is the greatest). Now the question is; are they going to run and leave the place or at least show fear expressions? The probability to react might be feebler, but once they drop the physical accommodation theory of the Western suit (elegance), thus their linguistic repertoires will be activated and the reaction might increase gradually by indicating that they are threatened.

Another pertinent example maybe realized in the different translations that both the oriental and occidental world work on about particular matters. For instance, in the Arab world, the gull is the symbol of intelligence. Therefore, most Arabic novels and cartoons for young children include that the facing problem animals rush constantly to appeal to the gull, for clever solutions. On the other hand, the gull in the Western world is referred as the symbols of fear and darkness, which are symbolized by the raven in the Arabic culture. Away from other visible effects of the gull, we depict that there are two types of audiences. The first are those who fear or at least got caught by the illocutionary force of the show, and the second are those who will not respond negatively with the gull presence or even its sound. Moreover, adult audience of both cultures so far react differently; because, the patterns and the haphazard social paths they were raised on were distinct to other cultures, thus they were raised separately inside two different ethnic groups and living styles. The emphasis is that even small details can grow unconsciously with children to be finally set up in their brains. Consequently, when the adult audience shifts from a language to another in their speeches, they accordingly shift from one culture to another. The second language is activated by the help of the Broca and Wernicke; however, the second culture is not activated, for the process perception of particular matters will still depend on culture one's background only. The former may be explained by the fact that

530

those audiences did not exist in both cultures at the same time except for some oddities.

3. Ethnomethodology

Another aspect of the relationship between language and meaning with regard to sociolinguistics will be based on the conversational analysis of interlocutors, and its impact on forms of accountabilities bilingually and culturally. Ethnomethodology can be defined as an original mode of a given ethnicity in interpreting and producing social interactions. On the other hand, accountability is both what people finally produce on the bases of what we use to interact with, and it is at the same time the responsibility of what we say or use to communicate with (Goffman, 1981).

No normal person can accesses to others' minds and see what they construct, think about us, or learn particular matters. Nevertheless, we can formulate assumptions or hypotheses by the support of other linguistic mechanisms. Apart from ethnolinguistics, behaviorism persists to be another fundamental corpus to figure out peoples' intentions. Indeed, behaviorism is a complicated mechanism that shakes hormones of different reactions in the human brain. Gestures, gazes, proxemics, postures, glances and so on are important non-verbal communication skills that largely depict feelings, attitudes and other various emotions.

However, before going on more details, we shall highlight that current studies of conversation are central by the elaborations of conversational analysts. Then, we may intuitively foresee that the conversational linguistic phenomena of a given people might not seem the same before others' responses. Nevertheless, if we evade the anthropological traditions of peoples' ethnicities that comprise specific ethnomethodology and ethnographical sources, then our linguistic deciphering of theories and methods of conversational analyses will be hazy, incomplete, thus misleading. Certainly, ethnomethodology tackles 'the set of techniques that the members of a society themselves utilize to interact and act within their own social world' (Levinson, 1983, p. 295).

We may scrutinize ethnomethodology in relation to the rational analysis of the structures, measures and strategies that participants themselves utilize in order to make senses and set their daily illocutionary forces. Beattie (1983) notes that the ethnomethodology conversation is ordinary set up, thus it does not need to be advanced by hypotheses. Moreover, Levinson (1983) shortly sums up this outlook:

> Out of [ethnomethodology] comes a healthy suspicion
> of premature theorizing and ad hoc analytical

categories: as far as possible the categories of analysis should be those that participants themselves utilize in making sense of interaction; unmotivated theoretical constructs and unsubstantiated intuitions are all to be avoided. (p. 295)

For example, a manager addresses his new office assistant in the morning and the first thing he does is to shake her hand with a large smile. If these two persons do not share the same culture, is it going to be an obstacle? If the assistant was a conservative Muslim, and her superior leans his hand to shake hers, yet she does not shake it back by excusing that she is sorry. Upon this, there are two interrogations: if he was a bicultural, would he present his hand at the early stage, since she dresses a veil? If he gets mad at what she did, is he then a bicultural? If he did not get mad, but explained to her that he cannot let her work anymore, for her work is based on welcoming businesspersons of different nationalities, and that he cannot miss strong business relationships because of her principles. Another example concerns the Saudi Arabian people. When they meet someone they respect, they do not shake hands, but rather noses. To the general public, this way of showing greetings is rather weird. Now, is an adult Saudi Arabian bilingual, who emigrated since his childhood, does not practice this type of salutations and finds it weird, is considered a bicultural, though shaking noses behavior is part of his original culture?

These examples assert that being bilingual and bicultural at the same time has no symbiosis. The examples show how biculturalism is important in shaping bilingualism. Cultures deal with senses and emotions, but linguistics deal rather with lexica. Henceforth, it is heavily challenging to find someone who holds two different senses to both languages. If possible, we are then required to check his biculturalism from different unstructured angles. Thus, ethnomethodology is compulsory and only one among several, since it is the sociological study of rules and rituals underlying ordinary social activities and interactions.

4. Meaning and Culture versus Bilingualism and Biculturalism
In this passage, we may reach some answers for the main argument: the distinction between bilingual and bicultural people. We will talk particularly in focus about how the culture shapes the language (meaning) and not the contrary. The "*meaning as culture*" approach entails how much linguistic meaning is entirely determined by the "cultural context" in which the language arises. Languages and cultures are tidily related as indicated by Wittgenstein's proverb (1922) 'The limits of my world are the limits of my language'. By other words, if you want to learn a language, you would better learn its culture.

Languages and cultures cannot be studied separately. DeBernardi (1994), for example, highlights that the mastership of a language is not the self-assured decoding of a linguistic cryptogram only. Henceforth, this internalization strengthens also the "how" for position and role in suitable social influence and the keys perception via different windows of the "same world", which might be on the other hand seen via different windows by other both culture and language holders as well. Indeed, many other proponents supported that languages are interdependent with their cultures practices. In addition, Whorf (1956) asserts that language shapes the worldview. Whorf assertion's is supported by Farwley (1992), who claims that 'Language, culture and thought are all mirrors of each other . . . so it is possible to read thought off language, and language off culture because linguistic distinctions reflect cultural distinctions, which in turn generate distinctions in thought'.(p. 46)

From a different point of view, we may ask primarily why in a given culture, we may find many names for a particular thing, whereas few names for other things. Undoubtedly, the most often cited example about linguistic relativism is the observation that Greenland Eskimos as Fortescue (1984) notes have approximately fifty words to describe snow, whereas people in Britain may only have five or six (e.g., slush, snow, sleet, hailstones and snowdrift). Differences are numerous when it comes to different names that the culture sets up. We may realize that differences are made off the needs of cultures through ages. We do not realize it oddly, why the Eskimos gave fifty words for the word snow since the basis of their life is built on the harsh freezing nature of snow. The requirements for the natural type of living are the central motivators for people and how they construct their languages, yet nature is also an immense shaper of cultures.

Culture itself is a decoding key of others if they mean more than what they say in odd interpretations. Overall, cultures and languages are associates in a constructive mixture in terms of meanings (performance). Moreover, if we keep the same language and apply it in another context of a different culture, the combination will not be the same, thus it turns out to be rather another window to another worldview. We may see how much is demanded to be apt in both languages. Sometimes, second or foreign language speakers speak better than the natives. Because, when simple ordinary people, or even ignorant ones, are suddenly emigrated to other lands, thus integrated, it is compulsory to them to learn so many things about their new culture. On the other hand, academic learners are bilinguals, but their lexica are still introductory, thus uttered without emotional changes. That is why so many bilinguals fail in terms of precising terminologies.

5. Are bilingual people bicultural?

Another question about bilinguals is whether they are double edged personality holders or they are just biculturals? The subject matter of whether bilinguals are double personality holders, biculturals or multiculturals was a corpus investigation of so many linguists. Numerous similar works were done in collaborations with different universities such as California, Texas and Cambridge. Groups of sociolinguists of different cultures did sociolinguistic researches as such, which delved to figure out whether bilinguals have two personalities.

By some estimates, half of the world's population is bilingual and many others are multilingual (Grosjean, 1982). Ralston, Cunniff and Gustafson (1995) supported this view. It is remarkable that sometimes bilinguals use different personality's leanings while shifting from a language to another. That is to say, they give to each language a special self-molding depending on the cultures' languages. For example, in the Algerian administration, especially in North-central and North-western cities, when a citizen feels rejected by an administrator, he then starts shouting and speaking in French language. The French is considered in the Algerian society as a successful societal level of education and style of living, for after the Algerian revolution against the French colonization, only few citizens had the chance to access to school, likewise, most of the teachers were French people, thus all buildings were Franchised. Ramírez-Esparzaa, Goslinga, Benet-Martínez, Potter and Pennebakera (2006) worked on Cultural Frame Switching method (CSF). Their research enlightens that bicultural persons shift both values and attributions in the occurrence of cultural motivators (signifier). Bicultural people are those who have two adopted cultures that mold their feelings, thoughts, emotions, and actions (Hong, Morris, Chin & Benet-Martínez, 2000; La Fromboise, Coleman, &Gerton, 1993). For instance, one CSF mentions that Chinese Americans exhibit diverse cultural emotional responses when they are exposed to the "Superman'' story, and then to "the Great Wall" (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Hong et al., 2000). Likewise, both Hong Kong Chinese and Chinese Americans shaped spontaneously unified collective self-descriptions when their Chinese identity was activated than did the North Americans. On the other hand, North Americans and Chinese Americans shaped spontaneously more individual self-descriptions when their American identity was activated than did Hong Kong Chinese (Hong, Ip, Chiu, Morris, &Menon, 2001).

Indeed, bilinguals tend to be bicultural. Emotions and believes that they generate at home are not the same when they are abroad. The previous is the trend which says that language can prime bilinguals' responses.

The next survey was provided and supported by Bond and Yang (1982), Bond and Yang (1980) and Ralston et al., (1995). The study has shown that Chinese bilingual speakers hold norms and habits that fit the English world speaking only whenever they are given a question written in English language. On the other hand, when they are provided with the same question written in Chinese, then the answers noticed changes unlike the one of the English language; the answers fitted rather to the Chinese culture.

The problem that obstructed the researchers often is that participants were not giving pure answers due to so many social and historical events across cultures. That is to say, the results depend on the two cultures; whether if they hold already common rites and costumes or other historical backgrounds. As Bond and Yang (1982) study revealed; a plausible explanation to this case is referred as "*cultural accommodation*". They figured out that participants completed the questionnaire according to the norms that these two distinct cultures share similarities in: believes, values and norms. In other words, participants completed the questionnaires in manners that satisfy, accommodate and favor the culture related to the language they are communicating with (Ervin, 1964).

Therefore, to link the discussion to meaning and culture, we can define language due to different aspects, but still in relation to "meaning" since the fundamental role of a language is the original transmission of different forms of perceptions, meanings, beliefs, emotions and norms or messages at least. The investigation on both poles: language versus culture in relation to bilingualism leads also to the haziness of the question matter of which platform can we consider a bilingual, a double edged personality speaker or simply a pure bicultural.

Since we continually define personality as a micro complex accumulation of beliefs, attitudes, emotions, feelings and norms of any person who derives from a monoculture, it will be then unstable to comprehend whether if bicultural bilinguals do have two personalities or not? Then, if a bicultural speaks, is he then pointing at two meanings in different contexts of the same word? The conclusion made off by the CSF affirmed that the phenomenon reflects the predispositions of bicultural individuals to change their perceptions according to the settings around them. They added that CSF can be primed with something as sophisticated as the language and can as well affect both their attributions and morals, yet this what causes the affections of their personalities.

Overall, our point from mentioning the query of whether bilinguals are double-edged personality persons is envisioned to show

the problematic and confusing issues between bicultural people and various personalities holders. Biculturalism is a social phenomenon, whereas activating and deactivating a personality without being a bilingual is an abnormality. Accordingly, if a bilingual speaker seems modifying his presence while speaking to two different persons, who may descend from different cultures, he may be then considered as a real bicultural.

5Discussions

According to the studies conducted by some sociolinguists on the different methods of deciphering the relationship between bilingual speakers and bicultural speakers, we introduce two terms: originated bilinguals and original bilinguals. Table 1 shows the differences between the two terms.

Table 1	
Original bilingual	Originated bilingual
- The speaker speaks both languages spontaneously. - The speaker speaks both languages according to their accents with no difficulties or diversions. - The speaker reacts to symbols of both cultures equally and feels them deeply.	- One language is spoken spontaneously; whereas, the second one may record late speech combinations which may not even be felt by the listeners. - The speaker speaks one language by the first language accent; whereas, the second one is just an imitation of the second language accent.
- The speaker makes no efforts on the level of the brain (Broca and Wernicke)	The speaker can react to symbols mono-culturally, but he can never hold both emotional sensations to both cultures.
-The speaker can think in both languages he likes depending on the context. - The speaker cannot be figured out easily during odd moments like being driven crazy (boiling points). He can be activated in	-Huge efforts are made on the level of the brain (efforts of accent imitation, efforts of grammar and speech combination) - The speaker can think by his first language than utters in the second

both cultures modes.	language. He cannot think in both languages.
	- The speaker can be figured out easily, and whenever he is at a boiling point he may then use bad words in his first language, though he is in a context of the second language. Thus, he may react by saying "ouch" instead of "ay", or otherwise.

If a bilingual is simply defined as a speaker who has the competency of two languages, then what might be the difference between these two in relation to biculturalism and double personality holders?

An "original bilingual" is a person who, by a major force or circumstances, has learnt two languages or varieties during his childhood (1-12 years old) at the same time. Now, can we judge that this person is a bicultural? Does he hold two personalities? Does he hold the same emotions in his brain/heart for the same word of a cultural reference or a symbol?

An "originated bilingual" is a person who speaks two languages; however, during the course of acquisition, one language was learntbefore another; one is the mother tongue, and the second is the incoming language, thus he has learnt it by his own voluntary; otherwise, he has learnt it after the L1 was completely set up. Once more, can we assert that this person is a bicultural? Does he hold two personalities? Does his brain/heart generate the same emotions for the same word: a reference or a symbol?

As an answer to the previous questions, it is worthy to refer to concrete references. In the Northeast of Algeria, lives a group Kabyles broadly spread on two or three main cities: Tizzy ouzo or Bejaya and Bordjboariridj. These people speak a minority language: Tamazight, but at the same time speak Arabic in parallel. The Arabic culture is completely different from the Kabyles, to the extent that blood ties are few and sometimes unacceptable. Despite of the fact that these two peoples have two different cultures, yet they became through the course of time bicultural speakers. They can feel both: the symbolic Arabic cultural references and the symbolic Kabyles cultural references. If we link the former to the early passage of ethnolinguistics, we may understand that the internalization of a language or any given language

in the world must be spilt in its own jar, that is to say, it must be set up according to the present norms of the culture.

Now, we come back to the Kabyle minority. Kabylians learnt both Arabic and Tephinaq (Berbers' language variety) side by side in one country (Algeria, Morocco or Tunisia), but widely spread on central north of Algeria. Learning both languages was compulsory; because, they firstly are just a minority speakers and secondly because the first and the only official language in the country is the classical Arabic language. In addition, both Arab and the Kabyle pupils go to the same school, and shared the same syllabus. That is to say, the young Kabyle are raised in the Arabic culture, though they have their own culture. Linguistically speaking, what we want to refer to from the brief explanations, is that a real bicultural 'feels' emotionally or sensitively two distinct symbols sculpted by different cultures nearly/entirely by the same frequency of sensations. If these conditions match, then we categorize this category as 'original bilinguals'.

On the other hand, an originated bilingual cannot be a bicultural, although he alternates both languages fluently, since culture is something else regarding to language. Language leans to linguistics and culture leans to sociology. Culture is deeper than it seems. It has relation to identities, flags, rites and proverbs. Sometimes, a single word, or a combined noun may refer to a whole history, thus it can be understood and learnt linguistically by an originated bicultural, but it will never be felt emotionally. If this oddity occurs, then the sense generator must be an original bilingual and must know its meaning, the roots, etymology, the history of existence of the phrase or the word, the old use and the new use and so on and so forth, or feels it at least.

The former might be explained in the flowing example. During the French colonization against Algeria, many words and proverbs were born to make the local resistance works, for the martyrs (known as the Brothers) avoid to be caught as well. One of the common phrases is "the bitumen road". This might be explained primarily as a road made by bitumen. However, the history tells something else. The summary of this phrase explains that when an Algerian citizen, a student, a doctor or any individual, who holds the Algerian blood, and wants to catch the brothers' rows in the mountains for the resistance, he must be presented firstly by a trustful dealer. When the brothers collect trusted information about him, he is then welcomed. Then, he must address them in his own clothes to avoid suspicions. Once he reaches the group of brothers through the dealer, he ought to fight against the French regime. In this case, the brothers required him first to bring his own overalls and weapon on his own, and that could be possible on the 'bitumen road' only as all those who joined the brothers' rows did. The

only way to bring his new belongings is when the brothers make a circled trap in the high forests. The French Army has no track for its tanks, lorries full of soldiers plus other war equipment, but the bitumen road which leads either to French barracks or other cities. Once both rivals get into spark, the newcomer must move immediately during the fire wall to check the newly dead French soldiers' bodies, hereafter, he takes off the body equipment such as weapons and grenades, takes off his boot and flees to join the fire wall to shoot. Once the aftermath settles down, he is required to check attentively in a new military cloth that suits his morphotype among the gory dead bodies. It depends on the skills of the new brother to do all this. Occasionally, some die immediately during the cross fire, some collect swiftly all the needs at once; the weapon with the boot, and some will catch after in the next battle.

The most important thing to ask regarding to this matter is that, does an Arab, a Kabyle or any Algerian citizen nowadays, who was raised abroad since his childhood, feels the phrase of 'the bitumen road' the way other Algerian Kabylians or Arabs who fought side by side against the French colonization do? Moreover, does any other non-Arab and a non-Algerian citizen feel what 'The bitumen Road' means the way other local Algerians feel it, although he is an excellent translator?

It seems that we have three main stereotypes of bilinguals as provoked implicitly in the three previous questions. Nevertheless, before mentioning the three options, we remind intentionally of the concise definition of a bilingual. A bilingual is a person who speaks two different languages either in its standard form or dialectlogically, yet one language (i.e. the first language) might be standard and the second language (i.e. L2) might be a distinct variety, and vice versa. Now, the option stands in the following: a Kabyle who speaks both Arabic and Tephinaq, but was raised in Algeria, a Kabyle who speaks both Arabic and Tephinaq, but was not raised in Algeria, and an intruder to the Algerian culture or a translator who masters the Arabic language.

Currently, we may combine the two first options into focus, and we let the third one for the next lines. A bilingual Kabyle (Arabic and Tephinaq) who was raised abroad is not sensitively a quick responder though he may understand linguistically what does 'the bitumen road' mean, but he will never feel its real tentacular emotional sense. He was not raised since his childhood in the Algerian local culture; hence, he has a weak cultural sensitivity. Additionally, he may explain what the 'the bitumen road' means, but he cannot go further to other abstract explanations. The synonymy of the citation leans to several descriptions and tendencies. It may explain; honor, blood, martyr, suffer, hanger,

gory clothes, sacrifice, leaving studies, leaving parents and friends, leaving youth, a message to the next generations. On the other hand, a local Algerian citizen may explain easily the saying even though he cannot find the words, but the sensation is still there generated in his brain/heart. Moreover, if he did not live the war, his parents or grand-parents will transmit him the story, thus transmit emotions.

We come back now to the third option; a bilingual who was neither raised inside the core frames of the Algerian culture nor is he a Kabyle; however, he immigrated to the Algerian lands since his childhood. His own original culture and language are still there, his new culture (Algerian Arabic one) will be set up through time. Later on, he will understand referential words better than an Algerian who emigrated since his childhood to another land. We do not find it weird why there is a maxim which says that 'A translator is deceiver'. Hundreds of books are being translated and printed around the world in different registers and languages. Hundreds of handbooks, and literal books were being used unknowingly incorrectly because of hazy or non-sensational translations diverted from the real sense. One of the challenging hesitations that the translators fear to delve into are the mid sudden hesitations between the use of word for word translation or sense for sense.

We may now make the link between the three options above to the two terms that we presented previously: 'the original bilingual' and the 'originated bilingual'. Two options follow the originated bilingual and only one option follows the original one. Reasonably, since we have explained that a real bilingual must be generated in both cultures mutually. These categories are the first and the third, thus likely assembles few bilinguals (Kabyles and the intruder), and that is why we favor to call them 'original bilinguals'. They had been formed bilingually due to the random acquisitions of two different languages cultures; however, mutually affected by the two of them. On the other axe, the second option intends 'the originated bilinguals'. This category of bilinguals was generated away from the context, although they descend from it. They either alternate them both away from the motherland due to different occasions as parents' language management at home.

Overall, what we pointed at is that there are two types of bilinguals (see the previous table 1). The two types (original and originated) hold two languages, but there are alternative differences on the level of cultural sensations between the first category's response and the second category's response. Original bilinguals are those linguistically 'actual speakers', and sociolinguistically "actual sense generators". Originated bilinguals are those linguistically "actual

speakers" or at least "communicators" in both languages, but sociolinguistically "weak sense generators".

6.0 Conclusion

To sum up to the main argument; meaning between the alternatives of multiculturalism and biculturalism or whether bilinguals are biculturals. As explained in the early passages above, linguistically, we come to probe that it is a harsh responsibility to assert that a given bilingual person is a bicultural. Any person raised on the basis of his own culture either linguistically, psychologically, theologically, sociologically, anthropologically etc... then thanks to Ethnolinguistics and ethnomethodology, the main parts that may scrutinize sociolinguistically, the correlation of his culture and language. Up till now, on this basis, we move to link and investigate on the other hand, the relationship to bilingualism. To simplify, we may say that a mono-lingual has its own Ethnolinguistic field of study. Now, do we have the right to say that a bilingual case study necessitates a single Ethnolinguistics study only? The former may lead to subjectivity and hazy adaptations; because, if the Ethnolinguistic case study delves into only one language investigation singly, then biculturalism must delve into a duo-ethnolinguistic case studies so that we can judge either X person is a bicultural or not. Moreover, the degrees of differences of whether a person succeeds or not in generating and keeping the real meaning in both languages, must be checked in a 'duo-ethnolinguistic' way (the two languages), etymologically, culturally, linguistically, ritually, ethnographically, anthropologically etc..., upon this scale: the differences degrees of sensations towards language use, we may then judge the extent of the correlation between biculturalism and bilingualism in relation to persons.

References

Beattie, G. (1 983).*Talk: An analysis of speech and non-verbal behavior in conversation.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Benet-Martinez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002).Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities.*Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33,* 492–516.

Bond, M. H., & Yang, K. S. (1982). Ethnic affirmation versus cross-cultural accommodation: The variable impact of questionnaire language on Chinese bilinguals from Hong Kong. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13(2), 169-185.

DeBernardi, 1.(1994). Social aspects of language use.In T.In gold (Ed.), *Companion encyclopedia of anthropology.* London: Routledge.

Ervin, S. M. (1964). Language and TAT content in bilinguals. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68*, 500–507.

Fortescue, M. (1984).Learning to speak Greenlandic: a case study of a two-year-old's morphology in a polysynthetic language. First Language, 5(14), 101-112.

Frawley, W. (1992).*Linguistic semantics*. Hillsdale, NJ: Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Grosjean, F. (1982).Life with two languages. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hong, Y. Y., Ip, G., Chiu, C. Y., Morris, M. W., &Menon, T. (2001). Cultural identity and dynamic construction of the self: Collective duties and individual rights in Chinese and American cultures. Social Cognition, 19(3: Special issue), 251-268.

Hong, Y.-Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*, 709–720.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., &Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: evidence and theory. Psychological bulletin, 114(3), 395.Levinson, S.C. (1983).Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ralston, D. A., Cunniff, M. K., & Gustafson, D. J. (1995). Cultural accommodation: The effect of language on the responses of bilingual Hong Kong Chinese Managers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural* Psychology, 26, 714–727.

Ramirez-Esparzaa, N., Goslinga, S. D., Benet-Martinez, V., Potter, J. &Pennebakera, J. W. (2006). Do bilinguals have two personalities? A special case of cultural frame switching. Journal of Research in Personality, 40, 99–120.

Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought and reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1922). 1984. Tractatuslogico-philosophicus, 7-86.

Yang, K., & Bond, M. H. (1980).Ethnic affirmation by Chinese bilinguals. Journal of Cross-*Cultural Psychology, 11*, 411–425.

Ahmed ZEGHAR

English Section
Sociolinguistics/ Language Management
PhD Student
Univresity of Oran2 Mohamed BEN AHMED
E-mail: travail.oran.tr@gmail.com