DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 832 FL 003 855

AUTHOR Regan, John
TITLE Co-lingualism, Anthropological Linguistics and Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE Jan 67
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented to the Language Seminar, Claremont Graduate School and University Center, Claremont, California, January 1967

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; Anthropology; Compensatory Education Programs; *Educational Problems; *Language Development; *Language Instruction; Language Patterns; Language Styles; Language Usage; Linguistics; *Nonstandard Dialects; Personality; Self Concept; Social Change; Social Dialects; Sociolinguistics; Speech Habits; Standard Spoken Usage; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Noting the close relationship among language, thought, culture, personality, and self awareness, anthropological linguistics acknowledges the powerful and real function language styles play in human life, the close attachment between the individual and his natural manner of speech, and the sensitivity that surrounds an individual's attachment to his language style. In the classroom, the teacher dealing with varieties of language dialects and styles among his pupils must be aware that all children's languages are equally sacred to them, that dialects are expressions of "in" and "out" groups, that some dialects are more useful for the operation of individuals in their wider society, and that dialects and styles have assets and liabilities, elaborations and deficits. Co-lingualism designates the attitude of the teacher who is aware of these points and who devises a teaching method and course to deal with them. Compensatory language programs should acknowledge the principle of the non-violation of linguistic emotions through understanding the social, cultural, and personal role of language as expressed in anthrolinguistics. (VM)

Co-lingualism

Anthropological Linguistics and Compensatory Education

from three presentations to Language Seminar, January 1967

CLAREMONT GRADUATE SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY CENTER

John Regan

> "Such a science would provide a basis for detailed analysis of the differing systems of speech activity which meet in an educational situation, and such analysis would make it possible to predict or at least to anticipate more effectively the interference which a program of literary, bilingual education, and so forth, would encounter."
>
> Del Hymes

I would like to launch into a confrontation with some rarely considered aspects of linguistic deprivation--and thus a confrontation with a topic that is directly related to the evaluation of compensatory education programs. Such programs we need not remind ourselves are consuming considerable human and economic resources of our society.

Let me approach the major theme through a consideration of a principle of non-violation of linguistic emotions. This principle springs from the anthro-linguistic premise related to the interaction among culture, language, thought, and personality. We will follow a circuitous path that starts with a quotation from an article by a California educator.

> . . . If enough kids in a given school class say "I ain't got no book," kindly Miss Mentor should wince momentarily, forget it and concentrate on something important, like togetherness and on-going forward-lookingness.
>
> There's a rapidly growing snowball of this kind of guff presently rolling down the educational hill toward the little red schoolhouse snuggled in the valley. And the name of that snowball is 'relativism.'
>
> It can be defined as 'the view that ethical truths depend upon the individuals or groups holding them.'
>
> Educationally applied, this means that it's okay for the school kids to say 'ain't' or indeed anything else just so long as everybody's doing it.
>
> Similarly, the term 'literary classic' is meaningless because the only thing worth reading is what's cool with the current 'in' group.
>
> What relativism really implies is the assassination of all absolutes, the strangling of all standards, the vanquishing of all values--except, of course, relative ones. So, if Johnny uses hair-raising English, don't substitute the

teacher's 'middle-middle class' speech patterns for Johnny's 'middle-lower class' habits. After all, how can we be sure teacher is right? Can't Johnny be just as right?

'No, friends, Johnny can't. English operates under set rules which have little of nothing to do with social stratification or whether Johnny lives on Park Ave. or under a bridge somewhere. In the semantic battle between 'Enry 'Iggins and Eliza Doolittle, Prof. Higgins was right. Obviously.

"So spare me the anguished protests that Johnny needs to learn more important things, that English grammar is really Latinized syntax and that it doesn't matter just so Johnny can make himself understood.

"It matters a lot. Correct English just has to be taught to the next generation unless we want a replay of the Tower of Babel bit around 1984. And it does matter profoundly if Johnny is being encouraged in school to express himself in the latest disk jockeyese instead of in the best of an admittedly evolving Queen's English." [1]

Now strangely enough, there is considerable wisdom as well as what we might call un-wisdom in this statement.

English, it is suggested, operates under set rules. This is a wise statement. The purest linguist would agree. So would we for we know that all "normal" children by about four years of age in all cultures have received enough data from their linguistic environment that they are unconsciously aware of and bound by the set of rules which govern their language. Without such set rules I can't imagine that a language could exist as we understand language. Lennenberg[2] has said that these set rules are imbedded in our very biology. We, like the chickens he discussed, come into the world with these patterns and tendencies to perceive built into us so that all we need receive from our linguistic environment is the barest of data to permit these rules to take shape in our ability to speak and understand.

Even if we move a step away from such a basic set of rules to the area where cultural choice operates, we will still agree that English operates upon set rules as does all its linguistic kin. On all levels within the basic phonological, morphological, tactical patterns, English operates within very narrow and rigid rules. Thus we know,

for example, that English has narrowed its attention to a very few phonemes, forty odd. English does not utilize sounds outside of these arbitrarily selected sounds. These set phonological rules are beyond the, as it were, conscious awareness of a speaker who has not encountered other phonological possibilities. Such a person is likely to look at the word Paris and then, tying to be French, will sound out Paree, a sound likely to shock the most dense of Frenchmen. The phonemes which 'R' attempts to represent are quite different in the French and the English languages.

Even less obvious to the untrained observer are the set rules concerning order in which phonemes may be placed when constructing English words. Some sounds are reserved only for initial position, others only for a terminal location. Still others may be terminal, medial or initial. So we could continue; nevertheless the point need not be laboured. English, we will certainly agree, operates upon certain definite rules and these have, we will also agree, nothing to do with social stratification and opinion. This type of fundamental rule has nothing to do with people's opinions. As far as the linguistic community is concerned there is nothing relative about them. But these rules are absolutes because the unitiated do not know they exist.

I do not believe that the article quoted above is directing its attention to such a foundational level of rules as we have discussed. What the article considers, is the violation of less basic speech habits. These are the habits of which we are aware and which can be changed by fiat and time. The less basic a rule the more open it is to change. Such speech habits are indeed the stuff out of which much social stratification is made. They evidence certain historical accidents which have brought one style of pronounciation etc. into prestigious use. However, the rules which govern the acceptance or non-acceptance of the example used in the article, i.e., "I ain't got no book", are totally social.

Such mixing of conclusions that apply to one level but not to another cannot be ridiculed. We are all the prisoners of our own enculturation. We are all the products of the culture whose basic rules we breathe in from birth without questioning or reflecting upon them. The process of enculturation ensures that we are unaware of the basic rules of our language. We, therefore, have a method of determining whether a rule is worth dying over. If there is a dispute as to the rightness or wrongness of a way of speaking, we know that the rule governing this situation is a social rule.

On another count the article's writer is on the right side of the fence; he is reacting to encroachments that are being made into language; he is reacting to encroachments that are being made into the norms of his standards of speech. Perhaps linguists may persuade people that standards of language are just the result of the vicissitudes of history and that if things had turned out differently the English they prize could have been a rejected dialect spoken by a remnant of the population. However, the point is that things <u>are</u> as they are and not as they could have been. The English we value is indeed a means of being valued in the society. A linguist who would not acknowledge this would be suffering from looking too long at the test tube situation - the situation which certainly correctly tells us language styles are relative. But, as Machiavelli wisely said,

> "...he who studies what ought to be done rather than what is done will learn the way to his own downfall..." [3]

Although "the scientific value of a language is independent of its political importance..." [4] the political value, the social value, which after all is the real value of a language, is independent of its scientific values. The writer regards English as it is spoken by educated Americans as a standard which ought not to be tampered with; he apparently regards this standard as related to something else that

is important to him. And he is right.

He regards the standard as associated with other standards in our society, with the general mores, and he feels that the loosening of linguistic standards and the acceptance of deviations in language are associated, maybe indeed even cause, other loosenings in our way of life.

Before we smile too broadly at such a notion, we must remember that language is an intimate, special aspect of culture. It is not merely a part but a reflection of the culture; it is as I have said in the paper "Anthropology and Linguistics" among the first fruits of changes in the culture: (language) "thus gets itself mixed or involved with all the other goings on; it assists in the maintenance of things as they are, becomes among the sensitive first fruits of change."

Thus the person who looks in discomfort on the signs of the times that show up in the changes in language, perhaps is not as old fashioned and pedantic as he seems. Lexical level changes are evidence of cultural changes; they are indications that things are not as they were. Indeed, our very attitude to changes in language in any aspect of the speech package,* including print, is itself evidence of pervasive changes in the general culture.

I am personally not concerned about first cuases but am suggesting that regardless of what complexity of factors were involved in the changes in the language and the attitude to language, once operating they have an impetus and influence of their own. Once operating, these changes within a language contribute to the other forces which are exerting pressure on the society. If we, for example, have been

*The verbal and non-verbal elements operating when individuals carry on a face to face conversation.

brought up in an environment which favors the acceptance of absolutes across the range of our thinking, a breach is made in our resistance to relativity once we accept changes in language and expect change. In his reaction, the writer is being a sensitive expression of most of us. He is speaking for all those who look askance at the tumbling of linguistic habits and traditions. He and such people are not without some support from anthropology, or should we say anthrolinguistics.

Such people have some cause to be disturbed; they have some cause to be discomforted by the bandwagon of linguistics for in that bandwagon something of the image of a tumbril can be seen. At the end of such a vehicle's path lies the beheading and dethroning of many a blue-blooded social tradition.

The bandwagon of linguistics does indeed have a shadow of such an image. Linguistics does suggest that relativity is, as far as any of the rules over which we have control are concerned, the all pervasive concept. When he gives his entire attention to English as it is spoken, the linguist does hold up a moving model. The print world is an imitation of a reality that is forever changing. The kingdom of the print world has been the chief victim of the linguist's revolution. The dictionary, for example, is supposed, they say, to describe the actual language of a linguistic community. Thus if this linguistic community uses highly charged four letter words (though interestingly they have only three phonemes), if it employs new words to say old things-- or shifts meanings here and there, then the linguist would say a dictionary should record this actual state of act--at least after a suitable degree of permanence has been evidenced.

Of course advocating that a dictionary be a record of what is, rather than what was, is always a highly dangerous occupation for anyone.

When the linguist makes attacks upon the print culture and upon the speech habits of his community, he speaks calmly of language as the substance of his investigation. He speaks only of the relative merits of the particular circumstances within the confines of a language test tube. He is not a sociologist; he speaks of the way things ought to be only without risk to his social comfort. As Machiavelli might say, the linguist does less well when he begins to comment upon the way things ought to be rather than to tell us exactly the way things are. If the articles writer felt that linguists were advocating that no one should care about styles of speaking, he would be right for feeling the linguist is misled.

Perhaps interpretations of anthrolinguists are at fault. Certainly the changes that have been accepted in language as well as our attitudes to changes in language are part of a larger process going on. There is some justification for all this is somehow tied up with free speech movements, rather extreme and descriptive literature and ultimately rather blue films. Which is cause and which is effect is another matter.

As an expression of the discomfort and uncertainty of a large body of "pure" speakers, the writer is being sensitive to something significant. The linguist who will deny the emotional attachment involved in the writer's own personal association with language would be denying a fundamental principle of anthropological linguistics. A linguist with any background in anthropology would be most cautious about violating people's sensitivities (unless for special heuristic purposes). All we know about the interaction among language, thought, personality, tells us that to suggest languages and styles of languages are equal, even in a test tube sense, will rouse emotions.

II If our opinions about language* are tightly interwoven with our feelings, self

*We will have to include all levels of the speech package and include the print world with its rules of spelling, writing, analyzing, composing and even include handwriting.

image, view of the world, then the teacher attempting to change our linguistic or other behavior should be very cautious not to look askance at our style of language. A teacher must avoid with all the subtlety he can muster the divisive effects that come from violating linguistic emotions. Quite apart from any pedagogical considerations about commencing where a student is, the teacher must avoid suggesting that his student is a poor human being, which is exactly what disapproval of his language habits would suggest.

We should remember that disdain or disapproval of language deviations is not limited to our society and not associated necessarily with a highly developed society. 'High standards' of linguistic purity have nothing to do with level of civilization or development. Some primitive tribes are far more pedantic than are the worst English teachers. The Ngoni of Africa and the Washo and Paiute of North America are three of these. Among the latter group a word mispronounced by the child becomes his nickname and is a continual reminder of his linguistic slip.

The anthrolinguist acknowledges the powerful and real function language styles play in human life. He acknowledges that linguistic codes or dialects are cohesive and divisive forces. (Although this is a simplification and will require elaboration later.) Language preferences and values provide clear evidence of the lines that demark vested interests; they mark off social groups, keep people in their place, and thus provide an external, easily recognized indication of a speaker's background and position in society.

A linguist would indeed be a strange student of language if he did not recognize that in the way language, thought, culture and personality and self awareness interplay, all languages are equally close to the heart and soul. In this respect all languages are certainly equal; in this respect, too, the language styleswithin which children grow are all equally sacred. The emotions that generated the article above are the same

emotions that are attached to the linguistic styles of all the speakers of English. We are all using the same obligatory set of rules, however, we are violated when the more changeable rules of our language are criticized and condemned.

The teacher would be wise to build his program on the following principles: -

1. All children's languages are equally sacred to them.
2. All dialects are expressions of 'in' and 'out' groups, and merely alternatives valued because of the vicissitudes of history.
3. Some dialects are more useful for the operation of individuals in their wider society.
4. Dialects and styles have assets and liabilities--elaborations and deficits.

I believe we could seek a new term to describe the attitude of a teacher who had internalized the above principles. Such a term would need to suggest that compensatory language programs acknowledge the principle of non-violation of linguistic emotions. It would need to remind us also that we must seek out the child's linguistic elaborations and deficiencies.

When dealing with an English dialect that is only tenuously related to "standard" English, should the teacher operate as though he were teaching a second language to foreigners, teching for bi-lingualism? The British are presently wrestling with the problem of whether the similarity between extreme non-standard dialects of English - phonologically, lexically and syntactically is sufficient to make a process of elaboration worthwhile.

We can appreciate the feeling that the British and other educators have when confronted with languages which sound to have no meaning. In most of our work we would be well advised to look at the problems we have in compensatory education programs as though we were seeking, we could say, a 'co-linguistic' device and method.

'Co-lingualism' might indeed be the term I am seeking. Such a term might assist us in attending to the elaborations built into the child's code--elaborations which possibly are far more significant than anyone has considered. (Such compensations, absent from our standard dialect, would exist on any level of the speech package.) This word could stand to designate the attitude of the teacher who would be aware and sensitive to the additional elements, elaborations, exclusions within a child's code and who would then devise a consistent teaching method and content.

Such a teacher would then have at his command -

1. clues to a student's way of perceiving
2. a foundation upon which to begin a compensatory program
3. a sensitivity to what parts could be added to and elaborated upon.
4. a starting point for the necessary, positive regard he must show for the pupil's emotional starting base, i.e., his language.

II To gain even a dim impression of a gulf which opens between individuals when linguistic emotions are violated, we do not need to delve beyond our own immediate experience. We have all encountered, in perhaps a very restricted form, what we might call 'linguistic alienation'. How disruptive it is to the warmth of involvement and our eagerness to discuss when our pronounciation is corrected or our usage frowned

techniques is evidence of function of language controlling the human environment. A malicious individual could utilize the alienation effects to create status distances between himself and another speaker.

Even though the teacher is aware of the sensitivity that surrounds a child's attachment to his language style will find it difficult to avoid giving evidence of the linguistic gap that separates his speech habits and his pupil's. He will indicate his attitude through all the multitude of pores that exist on each level of the speech package. The teacher's lack of awareness of the complexity of his own language reduces hisability to control indications of his lack of regard for pupils' language style. Even the most positive teacher would typically be unable to control a disapproving impression seeping through the pores of his speech package.

It is easy to resist correcting the isolated mistakes of students and friends, but it is difficult to control the global impression of disapproval we give to the pupil. As with any aspect of culture, the matters over which we have conscious control are typically the most superficial. The general attitude of disapproval that shows up in the angry tap of the finger or the wiggle of the foot betrays an otherwise controlled politeness. When dealing with children our camouflages are often less carefully placed. Yet the impact of the violation on the self image of the youngster will be nonetheless severe. Perhaps during the greener years the child is more sensitive to linguistic alienation. Perhaps with the young child, the effect is to drive a wedge between himself and his ideal self. With the older child the effect may be merely to separate himself more from the teacher's world and to cause him therefore to draw closer to his own kind. We cannot estimate the effects of linguistic alienation on either child by recalling the twinges of annoyance that we have felt when we have

been corrected in a specific situation. We have to imagine what would be the effect on us of a negative attitude to all we said. The difficulties involved in controlling linguistic alienation tendencies should, however, motivate us to multiply our efforts to become sensitive to the ways a problem can arise. We should be motivated to seek the attitude which I am designating co-linguistic.

Perhaps I am placing too much emphasis upon the dire effects of linguistic alienation. The way culture and personality work together, our typical lack of awareness of the connection, suggest we should suspect that linguistic alienation is fraught with possibilities of expensive failure.

It is difficult to avoid being confronted by the uncomfortable impression that the way our world is set up, the way schooling operates, failures are insured by such built-in devices as linguistic alienation. The certainty of failure for a portion of the population suggests that causes reside in schooling itself. Perhaps the significant causes of failure fall into the penultimate area of the spectrum. My interests in language would lead me to suggest that one of these hidden, though effective devices involve language and alienation.

In cases where the difficulties of linguistic alienation are not handled, no doubt a proportion of compensatory education's expenditures of human and economic resources would be better not spent at all. Apart from disbursement of valuable resources, apart from the actual negative results that occur from poorly based compensatory linguistic programs, there is an undesirable effect on the teachers themselves, the educational establishment and ultimately on the society itself. This is the belief that adequate measures of remediation or compensation are under way. Such a belief discourages thinking beyond the type of work being done. Considering the present state of knowledge concerning language, culture, thought,

learning, etc., there seems little cause for comfort. In a paper concerned with the topic of education as a device by which the culture initiates its future generation, I have written a section that has relevance here. It discusses the "failure" devices of our school system. Some of these devices are common knowledge. A section of them are called middle class values, the prizing of sitting up, being clean and on time, achieving, etc. etc. Another type of device would include ' linguistic alienation'. There would have to be included a large X factor which would include those devices which are beyond our own awareness but which insure the failure of particular populations. The selection quoted below argues that, as the school performs the initiating task for the general culture, such failure factors can be viewed as the successful achievement of a school induced negative training program.

> Occupation membership thus influences what for primitive societies is the stuff out of which all other memberships are made. In this sense occupation membership is crucial. And, as also in the primitive society, the process of preparation for that group is of vital concern to the individual and the culture; efficient handling of that process becomes linked to the welfare not only of the individual but also to the welfare of the culture of which he is the carrier.
>
> Within the crucial membership slot of 'Occupational Membership' two sub groups could be separated; namely, 'Employed' and 'Unemployed'. In a general sense, a person's 'cultural occupation'can be considered as membership in one of these categories. Membership in one of these sub groups is the prime factor, to paraphrase Linton's words, in deducing the bulk of the individual's social participation. Membership in the broad category of chronic unemployed determines just as membership in the employed group, the nature of the individual's participation in his society.
>
> Schools have become the single channel of preparation for and initiation into the critical membership. Schools have thus the responsibility of imagining a curriculum and then deciding on the standards of passing or failing that curriculum. Considering education in the role of initiator and preparer for participation in the culture suggests that the built in failure devices of the schools are, in fact, preparations for unemployed group membership.
>
> The implication of the recent process that has placed into the hands of unprepared functionaries the sole right of initiation is cause enough for

speculation. The resultant division of the population into permanent employed and unemployed groups is perhaps even more interesting. Restricted opportunities for employment are considered to derive from an individual's qualifications as judged by the schools.

Linked as it is [illegible] to crucial occupational group membership, education has become an institution of significance that is charged with emotion. Popular education's influences on and association with self image and the making of decisions affecting the bulk of the individual's participation, suggests that members of the teaching occupation are themselves in a most sensitive cultural location.

An outside investigator of our way of life who held the extreme metaphysical conception of culture, i.e., the view that culture is an autonomous, omnipotent manipulator of men, might suggest an uncomfortable notion. He might propose that our culture, structured as it seems to be to maintain an unemployed consumer class which like 'lilies of the field' reap but do not sow, has initiated procedures to create an increasing membership in the unemployed-employeable occupation group. Evidence for such an opinion might appear to be the contents, methods, procedures that insure school failures. In terms of the school's functioning as a device of the culture, these failures could be considered as preparatory and initiating methods. Elaboration of the topic of education as an initiating device is made in the paper Initiation and Preparation into Unemployment. [5]

IV Earlier I suggested that an anthropological linguist would be ignoring all he knew concerning the relationship between man and his language if he did not recognize that the individual has more social advantages if he can speak like the Joneses. At that time, comment was made concerning the cohesive and divisive characteristics of linguistic habits. This was, as mentioned, a simple picture of affairs. Matters are rarely so simple that they may be categorized as either one thing or another. I will elaborate upon the point that language is a cohesive and therefore divisive force and then proceed to complicate matters by some exceptions.

To focus on the bind/unbind characteristic of language, I will save time by referring to a section from "Words After Dinner," a paper which considered the jargon, metaphors and shorthand that develop around any interest groups.

> Such shorthand arises when members of a group are mutually concerned about the same circumstances for a length of time. It is a predictable process, a process that continues automatically as long as that group is interested in and converses about this experience. People in hockey or golf or art or medicine will do the same. A special language will evolve to express events or ideas that are peculiar and significant to the group.
>
> This special language is, however, a two-faced Janus. While it unifies the persons mutually interested in the same world by allowing them to converse without indulging in circumlocutions, it excludes those outside the group. We need no linguistic anthropologist to tell us how disruptive to personal association is the inability to understand and be understood. How annoyed we become when a foreign language gets in our way.
>
> There is a great deal more involved in the 'inside and outside' feeling created by special words. Not only can we misunderstand each other but also we feel we don't want to. As the scholar Cassirer has said of art and myth, words have the power to 'bind' or 'unbind'--to unite or separate. If we have ever taken a course in psychology or sociology, we will know that we often become involved in conversations where reference is made to 'psych' or 'soc'. Also in high school we had shorthand for other subjects and, I confess, also for the teachers. Those who have taken the courses may use these short words and no one minds. But how out of place it seems when an 'outsider' does the same. We notice the same feelings when someone uses the Christian name of a prominent person with whom he has barely nodding acquaintance. We feel somewhat cross when this sort of thing occurs as we do when, again, an 'outsider' uses a family nickname or pun before he has been given the 'right' to do so.
>
> Words do bind and unbind. They take on a kind of magic. The words become containers for the meaning and feeling we put into them, and the effect is a weaving of a unifying circle around us. Groups of human beings build up a special language to unite and separate themselves as they build up a shorthand for conversation. They can give a secure feeling to those 'inside' but quite the contrary for those on the 'outside'.

Secret societies, prison groups, vested interest groups, professions, gangs, adolescents, ghetto members, use esoteric language to draw a cloak around themselves to protect themselves and to secure their own self image as well as to facilitate whatever language is supposed to do. Because language is one of the games we play as well as the means by which we play all our other games, we could expect that if by breaking the code the outsider could encroach on the created privacy, the 'in' group would generate new linguistic forms for ambushing and outwitting. Perhaps

there is some reason here for the generation of jargons.

Del Hymes points out that by maintaining their loyalty to their own language the Mequital Otomi of Mexico and the Eastern Cherokee contribute to their feeling of inferiority. The relatively prosperous, urban, industrial society within which they are imbedded is more prestigious in their eyes. Thus in terms of the Spanish for the Otomi and the English for the Cherokee, linguistic loyalty diminishes the speakers self image. The Otomi and Cherokee adhere to a language they know to be of no value in the world that could supply them with what they would like to have.

Loyalty to their own languages has been a factor in reducing their opportunities. For example, education would have been unavailable to the Otomi had it not been for the use of a compromise. Their loyalty to their own tongue made education in Spanish unacceptable, yet education in their own language was not acceptable because this tongue was perceived as being inferior and only Spanish was considered prestigious enough to be used as a medium for schooling.

Some linguistic codes, some styles, some languages are indeed functionally inferior to others. This social inequality does not ignore the basic equality of all languages in terms of other linguistic principles and indeed, in terms of immediate functionality, i.e., the use to which a language or dialect is put in its immediate environment.

The danger, of course, is that we may imagine that we are confirmed in our previous impression expressed in the article quoted earlier. For this reason it would be unwise to throw the idea of cultural inferiority into a discussion with those who have not examined the problems of linguistic alienation. 'Functionally inferior' sounds

too much like a confirmation of what we have always believed. Like so many other issues in learning, 'functional inferiority' is only meaningful after all the qualifications have been investigated. The end result of the process of qualification should be a radar-like sensitivity which scans the linguistic situation in the schools and which causes us to multiply our efforts to discover adequate compensations and elaboration devices.

Thus the simple bind/unbind function does not adequately suggest the way things are in a larger environment of speakers; however, we cannot assume linguistic loyalties all have negative effects. Perhaps the groups with whom some of us work in language programs do not fall into such a category as the Cherokee and Otomi. They may indeed be members of a group which is not only highly loyal to its language style but also thoroughly proud thereof. How complex are the possibilities!

I realize that speaking of the problems of the Otomi of Mexico and the Cherokee is a far cry from discussing, as the writer of the article might say, the slang infected jargon of a ghetto youngster. In one case we are considering a foreign language, in the other a frowned upon style. However, the connection between the exotic example and the homespun problems of compensatory education is not hard to find. The need for a face-saving device as was found for the Otomi is not difficult to imagine.

Consider the school as one social system, the child's immediate home environment another, and we have something like the Spanish/Otomi, English/Cherokee situation. Independant of the students' loyalty to own language habits, the students are emotionally involved in these habits. The language they see attached to

life beyond them on the freeways and before them in the dreams of television is foreign.

Surely the child finds himself in a dilemma in a school situation where a style of English is the only prestigious language. If there is any connection between the pupil's self image and his group's language habits, the school risks dangerous violations when it disapproves of a pupil's language habits. Were it successful, the school would risk even more: namely, the maladjustment of the child to his own immediate environment. The school, however, as it is so often saved from the responsibilities of its action by the quantity of its failure. At most, the school's attempt to build its compensatory linguistic program on mono-lingualism, that is, actual erasure of the child's speech style, fails. Much expensive human energy is deployed, however, in doing it.

Were it to succeed, the school would risk responsibility for creating a particular type of misfits, for language is a means of dealing with the environment and the most significant aspect of that environment is people. As people are very close emotionally and intellectually to their language, their emotions are easily aroused by encroachments on what they expect is right.

In this characteristic of being a device for handling the environment, language styles are once again all equal. Even the most restricted code is an excellent device for dealing with the immediate environmental matrix of that code. Although its area of utility is narrower than that provided by the alternatives embodied in an elaborated code, a restricted code provides for its speakers excellent means for doing what it is there to do. By the same token, appropriate social small talk is functionally perfect although it would be functionally inferior in another situation.

As thus all styles of our language are devices for dealing with a particular style of life, we can imagine that the individual's psychological, indeed in extreme cases, even his physical survival is associated with maintenance of his speech habits. A compensatory linguistic education program should not, even if it could, seek to create immediate linguistic alienation. The attitude and methods of co-lingualism rather than mono- or bi-lingualism in the programs that aim to do something with English speakers' devious dialects might assist us in establishing effective linguistic programs in compensatory education curricula.

V In discussing the Otomi problem, i.e., the dilemma arising from a clash between loyalty to one's language and the feeling of inferiority that derives from the speaker's valuing the outside, Spanish world more than he does his own, Del Hymes wrote, "The obstacle of mono-lingualism in such a case can best be overcome with the help of an adequate analysis of the functions of speech in the situation." Elsewhere, he said, ". . . Success in such an education venture will be enhanced by an understanding of this existing structure because the innovators' efforts will be perceived and judged in terms of it and innovations which mesh with it will have greater success than those which cross its grain."

The notion of additions and omissions, utilization of other channels, etc. in restricted and elaborated codes is central to the idea of co-lingualism, i.e., the view that compensatory education's content and method should build upon the information derived from "an adequate analysis of the function of speech in the situation" and of the pupil's existing language structure.

Two sub topics need to be pursued in the discussion of the major theme; these are, firstly, the difficulties and methods of locating those additions and deletions, and secondly, the explanation of the apparent contradiction between the

limitations of restricted code and the possibility of elaborations of such a code suggested in the co-linguistic notion.

In an article by John M. Brewer, principal of a ghetto school, is listed some examples of the ghetto children's colorful style (see appendix). He then states: -

> "This is the colorful, private speech of the children of America's ghettos, a 'hidden language' of haunted phrases of striking subtlety. It is a language little known in the world outside. But for many it is more meaningful, more facile, and more developed than the language of standard English." 7

Toward the end of his article, he expresses the attitude that I have tried to symbolize in the term co-lingualism.

> "If one looks for substance instead of smut, meaning instead of obfuscation, it is possible to harness some of the positive features that lie behind the crust of degradation and depravation explicit in the hidden language." 8

Mr. Brewer, who grew up in an environment similar to that which surrounds his school, is suggesting that teachers first get to know the restricted code. Secondly, he suggests teachers harness the positive features. Such harnessing is achieved by first making an sssumption, i.e. that there is substance, value and meaning in the students' language.

I believe that one of the most significant insights that linguistics can give educators is that language is forever a patterning of patterns. So pervasive is the patterning of linguistic phenomena that we can assume an order even when we encounter what seem to be 'noise' errors or omissions on any level of the speech package. There is patterning, for example, in what R. Brown calls the 'tip of the tongue' phenomena, there is patterning in the smallest and largest item of our linguistic behavior. Not to assume that there is meaning, patterning, and order in any utterance is to miss one of the most valuable bits of information the study of

linguistics provides for us.

The whole idea underlying co-linguistic approach, of course, is the harnessing of the positive features of the pupil's language. It is basic to avoiding linguistic alienation (and all the effects that may spring therefrom). However, my neglect of his first point, i.e. the use by a teacher of a restricted code, cannot go unmentioned.

No doubt many would feel Mr. Brewer's use of the students' language was degrading and, even worse, that it contributed to all that linguistic relativity is heir to-the general loosening of standards. Mr. Brewer might reply that he merely stoops to conquer, that he refuses to be outwitted or ambushed by students' linguistic manipulations. He would also, no doubt, declare that he is more in control of the teaching situation if he knows the students' dialect. Nevertheless, though he would claim that his actions are based on expediency, he would not escape the malediction of most standard dialect speakers.

My inclination would be to agree with the principal. The question is whether we can learn the dialects sufficiently to appear to be an insider (Mr. Brewer at least grew up in a ghetto environment). Are we capable of performing the necessary linguistic acrobatics, and would it be worth our while? If we were able to learn a student's dialect, no doubt we would be in a better position to handle certain situations. After all, education is devoted to the principle that the more knowledge a person has, the more capable he is in handling his environment.

The question seems to be not whether we would be better to know the child's dialect, but whether firstly, we would ever indeed become skilled enough to use it and secondly whether we would be able to control our own

linguistic emotions sufficiently when using the dialect. Is it possible to persuade people to acquire and use another code?

Del Hymes would agree with Mr. Brewer's second recommendation, i.e. the harnessing of the positive features, that is, the becoming aware of them and their utilization. So do I; the locating of the assets, elaborations, compensations in a code is central to the idea of co-lingualism. When Hymes speaks of "adequate analysis" and "understanding the existing structure", he is talking of locating positive features. This is nothing more than a re-statement of our old pedagogical rule of thumb, which is the basis of diagnostic tests; namely, that we should locate the assets and liabilities of the student in each facet of the skill area and build a teaching program thereupon. It is curious that we are convinced of the virtues of diagnostic methods in all the superficial aspects of remediation. We consider such methods basic to any new program in spelling, reading, arithmetic etc. We are, however, not committed to the principle where it is most essential. We need to seek out the points of linguistic muscle and atrophy.

The closeness of language to ourselves and the resultant unawareness of its significant role makes me pessimistic concerning the degree to which we can step out of our own linguistic ensnarement in order to find these linguistic strengths and weaknesses. Like the juggler, culture and language forever seem to be tricking us into looking in the wrong direction. Even when we have given close attention to the development of language, thought and personality, we find that we still operate as though our speech habits were sacred and all others profane. Considering other dialects somewhat untouchable causes us to regard them as unworthy of attention. Indeed, is it possible for us ever to be objective about such a subjective thing as our own dialect?

Apparently we do not apply the same wisdom that we bring to bear upon other areas when diagnostic attitudes and devices are needed. We are the products of our

enculturation. The restrictions that this state places upon us is evidenced every time we approach the problems of language. If we look at the examples of the rich metaphor as used by Mr. Brewer's students, we are again in a situation where our own habits are likely to befool us. Looking at the typed evidence (see appendix), we note that word for word translation seems to have been made. However, we cannot assume that two word-like sounds are the two words we recognize as being part of our dialect. Mr. Brewer himself has gone through a process of writing the metaphors in a fashion we can understand. A number of filtering processes have operated upon his students' original utterances: we wonder what indeed is the possibility of seeking true meaning and accurately analyzing the speech situation when we must look through the lenses of our own experience.

What are the steps we need to follow in analyzing our students' dialects? Firstly, we need to remind ourselves that we are considering the speech package and that each of its levels is teeming with items. Many of these do not show up in print but they are all meaning carriers and reinforcers. Secondly, we must recognize that an item from any one of the above levels; that is, a word, a kine, a juncture, a stress, a pitch, a syntactical selection could, for a restricted code, be either equal to, differ from, an elaboration upon or a reduced form of an item in that elaborated code. There are, thus, four basic relationships that might exist between an item on any one of the speech package levels. The item may have a) an equivalent function; b) an elaborated function; c) a reduced function; d) a neutral (or different) function. Such differences can cause misunderstanding. As Del Hymes mentioned in discussing teachers and Puerto Rican students, "A teacher may misinterpret an ornate or elusive style in an examination as an attempt to conceal ignorance of the answer, not realizing that Puerto Rican students may deem it the only style appropriate to such an occasion.

Thirdly, after locating one of the items in either of these four groups, we must decide whether the function is carried by either a change in a) the quality of meaning, or b) the quantity of words or kines or paras, or c) the favoring of a syntactic style, or d) the favoring of a part of speech, etc. If we can clear the lenses through which we look at the child's language so that we can note its function, we may then ask what is added or lost when an elaborated or restricted code child attempts to handle a similar situation by use of his speech package. Thus after deciding on the four categories of function, the third step in the analysis of the speech is to ask how the function is carried. Either one of the above general functions could be carried by a change in meaning or quality of words, movements of items from the paralinguistic level. It could be also carried by a favoring of the syntactical type of a part of the language usage spectrum, e.g. parts of speech.

Thus, in attempting to follow the recommendations of the co-linguistic approach, and the recommendation of Del Hymes and Mr. Brewer, we need to perform an elaboration process upon ourselves. We must first establish the basis of language in terms of the wider concept of the speech package, then firmly attach to that a corollary expectation: namely, that every aspect of an individual's speech is part of a pattern. We are then in a position to look for the patterns and to categorize these according to the principles suggested above, i.e. 1) locate the utterance being analyzed or its parts in one of the function groups and 2) locate the way in which this function is performed (through changes in quantity, items, changes in the type of selection of items, etc.). This type of analysis may be beyond our capabilities and might indeed be not worth the expenditure of effort--though that does seem unlikely.

It is necessary to return to the second of the sub topics, i.e. the contradictions

inherent in the limitations and elaborations of a restricted code. We have acknowledged that English in all its various forms and styles operates within a set of fixed rules. These are deep structural elements that Lennenberg says are related to structure and tendencies with which we are born.

If we were depicting the differences in the language repertoire of an elaborated and a restricted code speaker, we could imagine the set rules being indicated by, let us pretend, five red beads. For each speaker of English the number of beads would be equal. These rules are represented in speech by lexical items composed of sounds and shapes and accompanied by stresses and pitches, junctures as well of course, as body movements. Thus we are considering the three levels of the speech package, each of which is capable of carrying and intensifying certain meanings and must, therefore, be considered in analyzing the differences that exist between the two individuals from even the most widely differing English backgrounds. If we continue to use beads to depict the way in which the five central rules took on real linguistic existence, we could use blue, green, yellow to depict the elaborations of the separate levels. If we had such a bead diagram of a restricted and elaborated code speaker before us, we would already notice that in one of the speakers there was a tendency towards greater use of one of the levels. However, if we focused on the language level, i.e. use of lexis and syntax using black to show the number of lexical items and white favored syntactical styles, et., the difference between the speakers would show very clearly.

When all the work would be done, when we had before us a picture of the elaborated and restricted speaker's habitual way of using language, we would notice that deriving from some rules were a multitude of items while from others there

were very few. The total picture would indicate marked tendencies toward the favoring of certain parts of speech, certain words, certain syntactical variations from the elaborated code. However, this would not deny the greater use of other items from either of the three levels of the speech package by the restricted code speaker.

I realize this example is fraught with weaknesses and may serve only to confuse. Perhaps, however, you can attempt some diagram of yourself if you find the idea of restriction and elaboration contradictory.

VI

I am concerned that in these terminating comments I may slip into giving the impression of a divine summation, of suggesting a panacea. I have considerable questions about our ability to break through the web in which our enculturation has enmeshed us. Even if we could break through our enculturated web and become thoroughly aware of the positive features of our students' code, I cannot be sure that we would, in fact, operate in any significantly different fashion with this understanding. Even if we could operate upon such knowledge, I am unable to offer any conclusive salvation for compensatory education programs. However, I do believe that if we accept the principles of analysis and focus upon 'positive features', this single, slight shift in our way of thinking would bear significant classroom curricular results.

Such a single change could cause a reorientation of our belief and behaviour about language and learning. A reorganization that results from new theory is disruptive, but it provides for new attitudes and new knowledge. We are desperately in need of devices to force alternatives to reveal themselves. After all, I suppose, the simple reorienting of the conception of the universe that resulted from shifting the earth and the sun's central position profoundly affected art and religion, literature,

as well as astronomy. One of our problems, however, is that because we have a rush towards practicality, we are often barred from the awareness of the alternatives which new insights provide. We do not allow the deep implications of a new way of seeing our tasks to become a part of our being and to shift the basis of our opinions and actions. When we want to force our immediate insight to application in exactly what we are doing today, we force the bud and often never see the complete bloom.

Such considerations tend to make me very hesitant about discussing practical issues. I therefore hesitate to make the connections between a linguistic insight and the implications for the classroom. The whole center of the universe about language and learning has been gently shifted just a degree, but this degree should alter everyaction and decision we make in the classroom. A new theory, like a well written play, is inexhaustible of application. The major effects on things as they are in the schools will be partly observable immediately, but the significant changes will be beyond our present awareness. This all the more should encourage us to resist looking for the detail of application and focus upon the general attitude and intellectual change--a change that must precede all significant innovations.

Conceiving of language in the expanded fashion that linguistics, or better, anthrolinguistics, suggests opens up possibilities for research much beyond most of our previous dreams. When we place print in the outer reaches of reality and move towards the expanded view of the speech package and the function of language, we have more opportunities from which to work; we have more explanations available for a wide range of learning problems.

APPENDIX

Excerpts from "Hidden Language" by John M. Brewer

Broken homes are "trees without roots."
Meat markets are " great flesh parlors."
Outsiders looking for thrills are "toys on a fairy lake."

About 9:45 A.M. one day, Junebug--a small, wiry, shabbily dressed boy with large brown eyes--came into my office. As I looked up, it was obvious that he was hosed down and deep in the mud (embarrassed and had a problem). Very quickly I got up and asked, "Why are you stretched so thin by joy? Are you flying backwards?" (Why are you so sad? Are you in trouble?")

Junebug took a cool view (looked up), cracked up (smiled) and answered, "My special pinetop (favorite teacher) is smoking (angry) and wants to eyeball (see) you fast." I said to him, "I'm stalled (puzzled). What is this all about?"

He answered, "I wasted (punched) one of the studs (boys) for capping (insulting) me. Teach blasted (yelled) at me and told me to fade away (go) to the hub (office) and fetch you."

Poor Tiny Tim (the teacher), her nerve ends are humming (she is overwhelmed), her fleas (nice children) and bust-heads (smart children) have twisted the knob (lost respect for her). The tomcat doesn't have to waste any more hip bullets on her (continue the harassment)--after all, a cat can't tell a dog what to do (he is the new leader). He will keep his shoe laces tied (control everything). Hail the Stinking King !