DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 803 FL 006 108

AUTHOR Shuy, Roger W.
TITLE Breaking Into and Out of Linguistics.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at Georgetown University, 25th Annual Round Table (Washington, D. C., March 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes; *Curriculum Development; *Employment Problems; Goal Orientation; Information Centers; Job Market; *Linguistics; Professional Services; Professional Training; *Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

As a result of its isolative pattern of development, linguistics is now beginning to suffer from not having a natural apprenticeship domain, making it difficult for new graduates to find work. The field has been lacking in entrepreneurial tendencies and unimaginative in developing either a potential clientele or a repertoire of uses. Linguistics can be developed within the university by infiltrating other disciplines such as English, education, and speech, where with careful management (e.g., small pilot programs initially) and a cooperative attitude on the part of the linguist, all the disciplines involved linguistics outside the university, the linguist must also overcome his attitude of elitism and discover methods of breaking into such areas as information processing and retrieval, medicine, psychiatry, lexicography, publishing, the communications industry, and educational consulting. Finally, if linguists are to expand territorial imperative, several commitments are necessary: (1) a dramatic change in attitudes, (2) the development of an active information office and placement service, and (3) the orientation of training programs to develop new perspectives. (LG)

Breaking Into and Out of Linguistics

Roger W. Shuy
School of Languages and Linguistics
Georgetown University
25th Annual Round Table
March 1974

Breaking Into and Out of Linguistics

A recent article on the changing role of the contemporary university portrays American higher education as the inheritor of a rich and complex development (Knepper 1974). The early religiously affiliated liberal arts schools were joined by engineering and vocationally oriented, land-grant and public service universities in the latter part of the nineteenth century, bringing with them a wave of applied research in contradistinction to the earlier theoretical purism. After World War II, a further development in education saw some universities becoming instruments of social utility and we began to look to higher education to help solve some contemporary social problems (especially those raised by industry and the military). The fifties and sixties witnessed still another developmental phase, the existentialist stage of the university, in which faculty and students alike tried to make higher education an instrument of self-expression, free from traditional restraints and patterns. Today higher education seems to have no such clear-cut or definable role, for it is always difficult to be aware of the movement of which one is a part (who in the late eighteenth century would have described himself, for example, as in the midst of the industrial revolution?).

The future of linguistics in this country has been, in many ways, closely linked to the future of the university. More than one observer of the recent changes in university structure has seen this transformation in a negative light. Ronnie Dugger (1974b), for example, observes that American universities are becoming more and more like big business, a process which he compares to the butterfly changing back into a grub. As a result of their following Clark Kerr's definition of the multiversity's role as facilitator for servicing the needs of government and business, Dugger sees universities as ceasing to be free and stimulating places of learning conducted for the student's culture and development. The president of The Ohio State University, Harold L. Enarson, argues against this development, citing the current trend in university development as "the triumph of technique

over purpose" (Dugger 1974b:70). Thorstein Veblen's prophecy, made over fifty years ago, that universities will eventually become business places operated by business people for business reasons has certainly begun to come true in some universities. At one prominent university, for example, the president was advised by a member of his board (who was also the president of a large oil company) to train specialists to conduct fundamental research into the problems of the natural resources industry and to avoid encouraging education which might lead to dissatisfaction and unrest (Dugger 1974a:30ff).

The Changing Role of Linguistics

Linguistics, today, faces a set of paradoxically opposite goals. While the very institutions in which we work are being drawn into the big business matrix, we have assiduously avoided being relevant to those aims. On the surface, this might seem virtuous. But no virtue can be deduced from this act, however, for it is in no way apparent that our action was deliberate. Chances are, indeed, that we were unaware of the problem altogether. There is, today, very little in linguistics that would tempt the financing of an oil magnate board member but, on the other hand, we have also done relatively little within our field which might be said to lead to institutional dissatisfaction or unrest. Linguistics has been neither the sort of profit raising, corporation pleasing, business-oriented enterprise that engineering, education, psychology and some of the hard sciences have been, nor has it rocked the boat in the manner of the fine arts and humanities people. In short, we have been a rather blah discipline.[1] As such, we are faced with the need to approach the future in two directions at the same time. On the one hand, we need to help strengthen the institutions in which we operate by advocating their abandonment of the idea that the university if primarily a business operation where the boat is not to be rocked. On the other hand, we need to develop a strong sense of entrepreneurship among our students and colleagues to preserve our field from being canabalized by scholars from other disciplines and from being ignored by representatives of enterprises which could use our expertise. This paper will focus on the paradox of these two apparently contradictory goals.

The development of linguistics to date may appear to be a hap-hazzard

and willy-nilly affair. Although it is always difficult to recognize the period or movement of which one is a part, hindsight generally clarifies certain patterns. What is generally invisible to the initiates of a given field, however, is the fantastic rapidity of change within any field that we try to freeze long enough to examine. It may be well for us to stop and remind ourselves that the influence of structuralism in linguistics was not felt very strongly in this country until after World War II had ended; that despite the appearance of the date, 1957, on Chomsky's Syntactic Structures, his influence was not strongly imprinted until the mid sixties; and that the study of Vernacular Black English in this country is not yet a decade old. This rapidity of change has led to many disadvantages. Heroes not only fall quickly, but they are consequently assigned to utter oblivion if not disgrace. One essential ingredient of the game in linguistics seems to be to kill the King, whoever he might be. A second disadvantage, directly related to this rapidity of change, is that the linguistics teachers almost invariably have been trained in an out-moded theory or approach. These two disadvantages ultimately lead to a third: that a student in linguistics will be given an education which is out-of-date the very moment he graduates and which grows increasingly irrelevant year after year.

Nevertheless, these very disadvantages in studying linguistics can also be seen to be its strengths. In the field of economics, revolutions occur approximately every forty years. In literary criticism, the time span between revolutions is less predictable but certainly longer than that of linguistics. For a theory to dominate for ten years seems to be an event unique to linguistics, making our field one of the truly credible academic enterprises, if we accept Ronald Berman's observation that the true measure of the intellectual life is expressed by the low incidence of internal tranquillity and inertia (1974, 14ff). The field is in almost constant turmoil and growth, a fact which opens the door to exciting possibilities and speculative development, however hard this might be on the reputations of its individual members.

What this rapidity of change means for us as a field, however, is that there is, at present (without much possibility for improvement in the immediate future), little hope for an established orthodoxy. The field is simply too broad and too unstable, partaking as it does of almost every other discipline as part of its own. I take this to be a positive characteristic in that any field with an orthodoxy has gone

about as far as it can go. Its next stages will involve vocational training programs rather than education for its initiates.

Perhaps a greater handicap brought on by the seemingly willy-nilly development of linguistics is one which also grown out of its recency: that, until very recently, our graduates have been able to move directly from their PhD programs into graduate teaching positions. The grim findings of the Manpower Survey Report clearly indicate that we have reached the saturation point of program and departmental expansion and that the time has come to think creatively about the job market for our graduates (Manpower Survey Report 1973:1-4). Elsewhere I have argued against the suggestion that we reduce the number of initiates to the field of linguistics, offering, instead, that we broaden our training programs and determine strategies for expanding employment possibilities (Shuy, in press). The following suggestions along these lines are meant to initiate further discussion and thought. One set of suggestions relates to linguistic entrepreneurship within the university setting and the other set is meant to apply outside the university proper.

Developing Linguistics Within the University

One obvious method of increasing the users of one's product is to move the product into new territories. Traditionally linguistics is a graduate program. Very few undergraduate programs exist and those which do exist continue to be plagued by questions of their own function. We have no really good answer to the question, "What do I do with an undergraduate major in linguistics?". In some ways we prefer that our linguistics graduate students major in some other field, such as mathematics, philosophy, language or psychology, so that their education can develop from more than one perspective. Very little can be said in defense of the encouragement of the undergraduate linguistics major, as least as it is now conceived and defined. On the other hand, a great deal might be said for the usefulness of linguistics at the undergraduate level. Although a good case might be made for expanding our efforts to many other majors, such an anthropology, sociology and psychology, where linguistics has been clearly recognized in the past as a relevant component, I will focus my attention on three fields which contain, in my opinion, better prospects for the infiltration of the linguistics job market. These departments are English,

education and speech. Each of the three poses a somewhat different problem and a slightly different training program. It is my thesis, however, that all three fields can be infiltrated with proper and careful management, a little time and change in attitude both on their part and on ours.

1. English. Before World War II much of what was taught at the college level in linguistics was found in English departments. Most large departments still have at least one house-linguist but years of bad stewardship have tended to erode the effectiveness of the position. Typically the English department linguist today is either a philologist whose main interest is Beowulf or a recently trained generative grammarian who is trying desperately to get out of the English department and into a linguistics department as fast as he can. Very few English departments have assessed their needs for a house linguist but those which have done so have generally determined that linguistics departments are not training people to be useful to them. One early step, therefore, would be for linguists to discuss these matters with English department chairmen or their representatives to try to determine how our services might either be developed or improved. Meanwhile, we might also take a hard look at the extant freshman composition program. Freshman composition is taught by literature majors who are ill-prepared to teach it, typically not interested in it and generally ineffective at it. They do it only as part of their graduate assistantship or as the necessary post-PhD apprenticeship, a condition to be endured until an opening occurs for them to teach what they have been trained for. In this regard it must be noted that English, like most other fields, has an apprenticeship area. While new foreign language professors teach introductory language courses and new biologists teach new freshman required courses in science, new linguists have, historically, moved directly to their specialty, by-passing the apprenticeship stage entirely.

Unless things have changed drastically since the days when I taught freshman composition, there is still large-scale insecurity in the field. Each year brings out a new spate of approaches: writing about poetry, writing about social concerns, writing about novels--even a few texts in writing about language. Many of the topics for study in a freshman English course are subjects about which well-trained lin-

guists would be more likely to have knowledge and resources than do the literature scholars. We might view college composition, for example, as the lect of educated people who survive four years of college. As such, the subject could be described and analyzed and a kind of bilingual (bi-stylistic?) program could be instigated. One topic often dealt with in freshman composition relates to diction (geographical, social, educational, occupational, age, etc.). This topic would certainly seem to be within the domain of linguistics. In freshman composition one also is concerned with the concept of appropriateness (sometimes called "writing with a purpose" or "talking the language of the audience"), a focus requiring some understanding of code-switching, cultural relativism and other topics less appreciated by estheticians than by social scientists. Literature scholars know how to be critical of some kinds of jargon (read "wordiness", "stock words", "overworked nouns", "overused passive", "technical language", etc.) but generally have no appreciation for its potential appropriateness and, far more damaging, no skill in diagnosing it beyond the level of the terms used above. In short, the English teacher sees the surface of the problem but has little expertise in what underlies it all. Occasionally the freshman English course deals with topics of circumlocution, euphemism, clichés, newspaperese, governmentese and, with particular scorn, social-science-ese. Little is done with it, however, other than to ridicule it and to rise above it. The opportunity for linguists here should be immediately apparent. Here is language variability which can be diagnosed, described with reasonable accuracy and prescribed for specific literary effect. The literature major may know what he likes when he sees it, but the linguist is in a far better position to describe what it is and devise a teaching strategy to relate to it. If I had to choose between the knowledge of the linguist and the knowledge of the literature specialist, I'd choose the former any time as a prerequisite for freshman composition.

What is more, freshman composition also deals with semantics, particularly the connotation of words, metaphors, symbols and irony. The potential of this area for linguistics majors should be obvious. And when it comes to discussing matters of sentence length, sentence arrangement, syntactic complexity or sentence rhythm, one would think that a linguist would be clearly in a position to offer more advice than a specialist in Thomas Hardy or George Orwell.

Nor would we need to confine our potential usefulness for English departments to the freshman English course. Recent developments in the ethnography of communication and, in particular, to the verbal arts, suggest that linguists (at least one type of linguist) may even have something to say about ways of analyzing literature that the literature specialists have no way of handling by themselves.

Naturally, these are only suggestions about how linguists might expand its horizons into the presumed territory of another discipline. As a former member of an English department I feel that the issues have been presented accurately enough. What remains to be done is for us to determine an avenue of access. It is highly unlikely that graduate English programs will want to relinquish their freshman English teaching apprenticeships or assistantships to linguistics majors or new PhD's. The obvious strategy is one which requires an active, promotional program, not a passive "sit-back-until-they-ask-us" approach. The timing must be right, the circumstances should be favorable and, most of all, the first attempt must be an unqualified success. (It is unlikely that we will get several chances.) Any in-roads developed in this manner will naturally need to be done in conjunction with English department people who have not yet been turned-off by years of arrogance perpetrated by linguists.

2. Education. It will not be my task to go into much detail here about how linguistics can interface with education. Elsewhere I have expounded at some length on this topic as has Bruce Fraser in his paper at this symposium (Shuy, in press; Fraser, in press). My point for education is similar to that which I made for English: linguists have been poor entrepreneurs in the past, for whatever reasons, and we are now reaping the results of our neglect. Very little of what happens to children in the first three grades of school is unrelated to the knowledge which linguists should have. Likewise, very little of what elementary teachers are trained in relates in any way to this knowledge. The situation is as dire as one could expect it to be. Children come to school speaking a relatively well-developed dialect of their native language. Little advantage is taken of this, regardless of the socio-economic status or race of the child. He is then taught to read by methods which should, but for the magnificent patience and perseverence of children, turn the

learner completely off. The human brain being what it is, many children learn anyway, muddling through a generally hostile environment which is shrouded by linguistic and cultural ignorance. The study of language arts, English, spelling, reading and composition (all strangely separated in most schools) suffers from essentially the same problems as the college freshman composition course, as noted earlier. Foreign language instruction is carried on, in most cases, without the foggiest notions of linguistics while bilingual education programs, in most parts of this country, are potential disaster areas. If ever there was a subject which could use sympathetic assistance of linguistics, it is education. What it most certainly does not need, at this point, is the kind of scorn proffered by linguists in the past. Again, step one is clearly that of self-assessment by linguists. We need to get our own attitudes in order before we venture forth at all. Next, we need to devise a strategy of gradual infiltration by the best people in such a way that our initial ventures can be seen as friendly, helpful and as unthreatening as possible. Then, perhaps we can begin to devise ways of either working in education as a kind of apprenticeship or, in some cases, as a full-fledged field of fulfillment.

If we do not consider ways of infiltrating education we stand to lose a great deal more than a potential job market. A recent incident leads me to believe that our avoidance of this opportunity can lead to further serious problems. A few months ago after I helped instruct a recent three-week intensive workshop for reading teachers (elementary, secondary and college level), I received an excited telephone call from one of the participants who exclaimed with job that, having had my course, she was now going to teach a course in linguistics to be offered in the education department of her university. During World War II certain hurry-up officer training programs produced what was then referred to as "ninety-day wonders". It will give me pause to offer any more 21-day institutes for teachers if they lead to such refinements on this war-time innovation.

3. Speech. A third area of potential infiltration and entrepreneurship for linguistics is the field of speech. Like educationists, speech clinicians and teachers are usually supplied a basically deficit model of training. Children either conform to the norm or they are declared to have a pathology of some sort. To the

credit of the discipline, several years ago it began to realize the weakness of this sort of thinking and began to gear up for some understanding of the dimensions of language variation. To that point the major overlap of linguistics to the field of speech had been largely through phonetics, language acquisition study and language pathology. Despite these obvious first steps toward broader understanding, it is generally perceived that speech teachers and clinicians are still inadequately trained in linguistics. To repair their weakness of background in language variation, several series of workshops have been conducted across the country. Such workshops frequently contain the germs of good ideas but their brevity precludes anything more than band-aid treatment, where surgery is indicated.

As things now stand, the field may be just as well off for not requiring more linguistics courses as part of the undergraduate major. The speech departments of the country have not yet geared-up their faculties to handle such matters. One danger in deciding that new data or courses are needed is that self-declared specialists suddenly arise to fill the needs, witness the previously mentioned three-week workshop for reading teachers. Miraculously enough, three weeks of training is enough, apparently, to cause one to declare oneself a linguist. This laying-on-of-hands syndrome is also a constant danger for the interrelationship of linguistics and speech. If the accrediting agencies should suddenly declare that all speech departments must offer certification requirements in sociolinguistics or generative semantics, we must face the sobering possibility that, overnight, professors of theatre arts, debate, acoustics or even phonetics will suddenly receive the mantle.

We can look upon this situation either as a threat or as an opportunity. My contention, of course, is that it is the latter. If we view it as a threat, we can take the ludicrous position of trying to close the door to speech specialists ever understanding our field. If we consider it an opportunity, we can try to devise ways of infiltrating speech departments with well-trained linguists who will serve as watchpersons against a sudden laying-on-of-hands.

Suggestions for Extended Relationships Within the University

If linguistics as a field feels obligated to or even interested in expanding its options in the undergraduate university program, such an entrepreneureal ven-

ture must avoid the willy-nilly nature of development in the past. It is time that a certain amount of planning be done.

For one thing, as mentioned in each of the preceding cases, linguists will need to divorce themselves from the sense of superiority so characteristic of our field in the past. This time it will be up to us to get ourselves accepted by the fields of English, education and speech and by any other discipline deemed desireable. Our time in the catbird seat has expired. Linguistics is no longer the magic word in these departments. When they needed our help most, we were too busy doing other things so they developed their own breed of linguist who, in each field, has not proved adequate. Such homegrown linguistics will seldom pass the muster over time and the enchantment period has passed. Now if we want to repair past atrocities and patch up a strained relationship we will have to knock on their doors. But this can be a good thing for us for it will force us to do what we should have done in the first place--ask them how we can be helpful.

Secondly, we will need to start small, preferably with low-keyed pilot projects in reasonably friendly settings. It is imperative that we not peddle snake oil this time for their minds are still fresh with memories of how structuralists claimed that the study of intonation would aid in punctuation or that the study of Paul Roberts' version of generative syntax would aid in composition. We taught their students all about plus juncture but, not surprisingly, they still spelled badly. We had their students learn the basic syntax strings along with Neg transformations but the students still couldn't write well. This time we will need to be able to prove that we are useful. Not many universities are going to be willing to let us try, however, until we can offer the sort of evidence that a pilot-project can provide.

As a first step, then, it would seem wise to bring together a small cadre of English department chairmen (and, separately speech departments and education departments) along with other opinion leaders to meet with an equally small contingent of linguists who want to try such a venture. It would be presumptious to plan beyond such a step at this time. In such a meeting the potential of linguistics for each field should be clearly presented by linguists who have clearly done their homework in the matter. Such a step seems obvious and elementary. But to take it would be history-making in our field.

Developing Linguistics Outside the University

However obvious it may be that linguists have not adequately explored the possibilities for expanding their work domain with the university world, it is even more obvious that we have scarcely thought about expanding this domain outside of the academic environment. This same need to find an area of reasonable apprenticeship might be looked for in a number of places. But if we should ask ourselves to list all the linguists we know who are working as linguists in non-academic jobs (that is, excluding universities, research centers, government and professional organizations such as The Center for Applied Linguistics), we would likely come up with a very short list. Our field has been neither creative nor entrepreneureal.

One has to be perplexed about how linguists have grown to consider themselves to be suitable only for teaching positions on college, usually graduate level, faculties. On one hand, it seems to be a result of an amazing oversight, perhaps related to our vaunted pride in loving our work. On the other hand, we can be criticized for the sort of elitism which has vision only for oneself. What sort of field is it that is so ego-centered that it actually believes that the pursuit of itself is all that really matters? The word elitist usually applies.

Whatever the reason for our conditioning, we must ask ourselves what new job markets might be opened up if linguistics were to turn ourward rather than inward. Several come to mind.

1. Information processing and retrieval is a field in which some infiltration by linguists has already occurred. It has become clear to IBM and a few other computer corporations that language is heavily involved in much of their input and that it would be a good thing to have a linguist or two around to provide guidance and to do relevant research. It would seem, however, that more than a handful of linguists could be active in this industry and that we have not presented ourselves to the question of how to make maximum use of this opportunity.

2. The field of medicine has been almost completely overlooked by linguistics as a potential area in which to expand our work domain. To be sure it is not easy to convince the profession which has perhaps the greatest status in America

that it needs help from anyone, much less from linguistics, but there are signs that the armor is beginning to crack. Part of our lack of success in convincing medical doctors that we have anything to say to them stems from the strategy we have taken. Typically we have begun with the assumption that doctors want to know about linguistics. Not only is this a poor approach, but it is also probably wrong. What the medical profession is usually interested in are solutions to their problems. Most perceived problems relate to medical technology. These we probably can't help much with. Others relate to their relationships with their patients. Such relationships are invariably carried out in language, either spoken or written. The medical history is the first and usually the longest verbal interaction in which doctors and patients participate. This event is of critical importance for the patient, since all future treatment hinges on its accuracy and breadth.[2] Yet little or no training is given the medical student in the "field methods" of his profession, in the "ethnography of interrogation", in the language of minorities, in foreign language or in any sort of cross-cultural understandings. No mention is made of the need for the medical student to develop at least a receptive competence for the many varieties of language which a non-suburban practice might produce and no teaching packages have been developed to help accommodate this possibility.

Only a few linguists in this country are in dialogue with the medical profession on these matters but there is reason to be optimistic about its future development, provided that the focus of the relationship has integrity. That is, there needs to be genuine promise of help in solving a real problem and there cannot be evidence of the overpromise of applied linguistics which characterized the overzealous blunders of our earlier history. The most optimistic result one can visualize is a linguist in every medical school.

3. The field of psychiatry will be perhaps the hardest one of all for linguists to crack because it is so protective against outside influence. Nevertheless, even the most hardened antagonist to linguistics will have to admit that without language the psychiatrist has little to work with. Among the great tasks of the profession is to sharpen up its terminology (exactly what is a language disorder, for example), to improve methods of diagnosing particular illnesses (schizophrenia is

at best vaguely defined) and to develop methods of reaching non-middle class patients (few successes are reported for working class patients). Recent work in conversational analysis and generative semantics offers possibilities of assistance to psychiatrists who are willing to listen, for, in many illnesses, it appears that it is not the language form which is distorted but, rather, the language function which lacks adjustment. It may be, for example, that schizophrenic patients make good use of the inventory of potential hedges, but do not use them in the expected or proper functional slots. The following interchange from a real interview is illustrative:

Doctor: Does anybody else live with you?

Patient: Well, there may be someone else living with me.

The patient's syntax is perfectly normal but the sentence is still slightly bizzare. Likewise, recent work on openings, closings, interruptions and other conversational units relating to language functions present promising ways for linguists to be helpful to psychiatrists in analyzing their data.

Even more than the rest of the medical profession, psychiatrists need to learn how to talk with patients from other cultures or dialects. As things now stand, precious few working class patients are even seen by psychiatrists, much less helped by them. Part of this problem stems from the pure elitism of the profession but part of it is because the field is unaware that it has a problem. The pathological model here, as in education and in medicine, puts the blame for failure on the patient rather than on the professional. Here, as in education and in physical medicine, one might expect the healthy to adjust to the sick. How this is to be done, of course, is not clear. But there can be no doubt about the need. And a need is a potential opportunity for expanding the work domain of linguistics. More importantly here, as elsewhere, the most crucial fact is not the need for a job market for linguists as much as it is for helping solve a problem of human need.

4. Lexicography is a field which has been and ought to continue to be thought of as characteristically linguistic. Still, precious few active lexicographers can be found at the meetings of The Linguistic Society of America, The Chicago

Linguistic Society or The Georgetown Round Tables or New Wave Conferences. A quick glance through the list of lexicographers connected with the major dictionaries on the market today will yield an almost mutually exclusive list of names from the people considered to be the leaders in the field of linguistics. But those of us who have recently wrestled with questions involving the lexical properties of even the commonest nouns will attest to the potential linguistic sophistication of the field. If linguists would present themselves as interested in the problems involved in lexicography (and, of course, if they were genuinely interested in such problems), they might find themselves in a position to be useful in a vastly neglected field. For example, please try to determine the principles by which words are syllabified in dictionary preface pages. You may be surprized to learn that better contains two syllables, bet- and -ter. Then try to say it that way: bet-ter. You will soon discover that the word syllable means something other than you thought it meant. I have yet to see the dictionary that comes to grips with the fact that what it calls syllables sometimes relates to sounds and sometimes to end-of-line word-splitting. Or please explain why father is divided fa+ther while mother is split differently, moth+er.

Once again, the field of lexicography would seem to be a natural non-university point of employability. Perhaps the job market here is not immense but it is real and it is time that some attention be given to exploring it.

5. Related to lexicography is the broader area of publishing, especially educational publishing. Every year, dozens of new educational books, kits and programs are designed to capture public tax money in American schools. Every publication which is geared to teaching children to read, to spell, to write, to talk better or to speak a foreign language could benefit by having a linguist on the staff. Publishers who realize this respond in a number of ways. Some hire a linguist-consultant and parade his name on the title page but do little to utilize his ideas. Others send him manuscripts or ideas to critique and pay him by the job. Occasionally a publisher will actually hire a linguist to work in the editorial offices but this is thought to be a radical approach since linguists are sometimes considered to be of little usefulness other than about their own field. Here, as

in the broader field of education, linguistics is losing the job market by default. On more than one occasion I have observed a publisher hiring a consultant to more or less educate an intelligent editor in what he needs to know about linguistics in order to be a good editor. After a certain level of success is achieved, the editor is awarded the title "linguist" or "editorial linguist" or some such name and the consultant is released.

The assumption here, as in every other of the potential job markets noted above, is that the generalist can learn enough of the specialized field of linguistics to get by. In not one instance has there been the assumption that the linguist, with his special knowledge and skills, can learn enough of the generalist's world to transfer knowledge in the other direction. In the case of publishing, it may well be true that linguists should take at least a few courses relevant to editorial work along with their linguistic specialization. It might also be political to take some of the curriculum offered by the departments of reading, mathematics, social science or whatever field in which one hopes to be employed. It appears that the burden is on us to prove that we can adjust to their world. This is partly due to the sins of our ancestors and, as such, we will simply have to allow for windage and learn to live with it.

6. The communication industry is still another area in which linguistics has played a minor role despite its high potential for relevance. I was once asked by Twentieth Century Fox (as a consultant, of course) to check over the movie script of "The Great White Hope" to make sure that James Earl Jones did not speak an imperfect or impure Black Vernacular English. This was a minor, though interesting, job which would be difficult to parlay into a profession. But it certainly is suggestive of a number of possibilities. What do the Sarah Lee people really think is understood by the phrase "Nobody doesn't like Sarah Lee"? Or how do listeners respond to the claim "Every refrigerator is not a Frigidaire"? Cross cultural communication is certainly a problem to be faced by television, radio, magazines and other members of the communication industry. A few years ago psychologists began to cash in on their profession by carrying their salient principles to business and industry, giving rise to the creation of

the concept, industrial psychology. To be sure, a great deal of their product was a kind of modern snake oil, and such practices are not to be condoned. What is crucial here, however, is that the field of psychology did not sit back and simply wait for industry to come to it. Entrepreneureal psychologists took their theory, looked for problems in the real world and went after them with an application. In the process, they may have done some harm but they also did some good and they most certainly can serve as a model to the field of linguistics, which seems to have chosen not to play the game at all.

7. Educational consulting is a field which has blossomed in recent years, partly as a result of President Nixon's policy of revenue sharing. Once again, linguistics can be seen to be slow to respond to the exigencies of the real world. When it became apparent that the grand days of research money were past, education entrepreneurs did not dispair; they simply adjusted their tactics. Instead of going for large research grants, they retooled for the market by presenting themselves as consultants (in management, evaluation, in-service training, grantsmanship, etc.) to the organizations to which the educationmonies were directed, state and local school systems. The schools became a sort of middle man through whom the money flowed but the sharper educationists never really suffered from the change. In contrast, when linguistic research funds began to dry up, linguists who had been on grant support beat a hasty retreat back to the relative safety of university teaching, thus crowding the already diminishing job market for newly graduated linguists. Paradoxically, linguists who stood the best chance of going it alone as grantsmen-consultant-researchers, usurped the teaching positions of initiates-apprentices whose only hope for a professional position was through teaching. This left the role of linguist-consultant to the newcomer who had little marketability in this area. Needless to day, the situation is totally askew. We are now in the absurd position of suggesting to recent graduates that their best hope of self-support is to apply for a grant or that they offer themselves to a local school system as a consultant expert. In reality, it is the established linguist who should be in a position to assume the consultant role but, unfortunately, he usually has not prepared himself for such work.

Once again the past elitism of the field has blocked expansion into a potential job market. We have trained ourselves and our students so narrowly that, in time of crisis, we have few if any alternative employment possibilities. It is not difficult to conceive of linguistic educational consulting firms. Most certainly they are needed for the honest and creative development of bilingual education programs across the country. They could be instrumental in helping already funded adult basic education programs develop concepts and materials. Such concerns are natural ones for linguists and, with a little broader training, we could also get involved in the many evaluation projects which are flooding today's education scene. I, for one, would feel more comfortable if a linguist with evaluation expertise, for example, would assess a state Right to Read program than I would for an evaluation expert with no linguistic background to do so. Elsewhere I have urged linguists to take a good, long look at the test instruments used in such evaluations (Shuy MS). On first blush, it would seem that we have little to say on such subjects. But even a cursory examination of such standardized tests of reading, aptitude, achievement (about half of which involves the use of standard English) and even intelligence will reveal that linguists have been lax in their protection of the public from misinterpretations which could have been avoided.

These are only several of a possible number of outside-the-university possibilities for job market expansion. Mere identification of such areas, however, is only a first step. The more difficult questions involve ways of breaking into such fields.

Comparing the Plight of Linguistics to That of Other Fields

The situation in linguistics today, then, can be characterized by a number of features. We have concluded that it just grew naturally to where it is today with little conscious control or exercised planning. It has done little to sell itself to the public, however that may be defined. It has gone through various surges of attempted practicality (to language learning, to English teaching and to reading, to mention only a few) but the field has never endeared itself to its clients nor has it come close to fulfilling its potential for impact on education, the field which would seem most amenable to its ministration.

Linguistics has adhered to its advantage as a growing and developing discipline, clinging to the benefits which only temporary orthodoxy will permit. As a discipline in flux, it has remained open to change and reasonably academic in orientation.

On the other hand, linguistics is now beginning to suffer from not having a natural apprenticeship domain, making it difficult for new graduates to find work. The field has been lacking in entrepreneureal tendencies and unimaginative in developing either a potential clientele or a repertoire of uses. But not only has linguists not been forward thinking, it has also been negligent in protecting its rear flank. While we have been preoccupied with other things, other disciplines (education, speech and English, in particular) have been developing their own brand of linguist, training them in aspects of the field and with degrees of accuracy and quality which would curl our hair if we would bother to take a close look. For a while we could afford to ignore such behavior and scorn the end products, heaping insult upon them by gracing such people with the most scornful of all in-group insults: "He's not really a linguist anyway". Now it appears that we might be sorry that we let the training in linguistics by such departments get away from us. Now we must look on such positions as potential job markets for our students. Likewise we have neglected to protect our flanks outside the academic walls, letting specialists in psychiatry, lexicography, publishing and communication (and probably many others) make language claims with which we might disagree and use language in ways which we might not appreciate.

In an effort to determine whether or not these current predicaments are unique to linguistics I have tried to ascertain what other disciplines are doing in terms of employment, public understanding and generally expanding the potential of their fields. The American Psychological Association, The American Anthropological Association and The American Sociological Association were contacted for a comparison of their current condition with that of linguistics. Employment was described as not a problem among sociologists and psychologists. On the other hand, the job market situation is critical in anthropology.

In the case of APA, the problems seem fewest. Like linguistics, psycho-

logy got its real growth after World War II, before which time it was a research- and theory-oriented baby science. The advent of psychological testing caused a dramatic spurt in the development of clinical psychology and psychological testing. This more or less natural development of the field was soon parlayed into a number of relationships with other fields of human behavior, including alcoholism, business, industry, the military and many others. The APA Department of External Information, made up of a staff of 11 people, claims that it makes no effort to sell the field of psychology for there is no need to. It has a membership of 36,000, about half of all the psychologists in the country. About 20,000 of these are directly involved in serving people in some way, usually as industrial psychologists or as counsellors. Of psychologists who are university professors, about 40% are at the same time also counselling or seeing patients on a part-time basis. The point here is that psychologists have been service oriented and entrepreneureal for many years. As a field, psychology seems to have followed the trend of universities to service industry rather than to maintain theoretical purity, much as Clark Kerr advised in the sixties. In all, however, there has been little or no need to beat the bushes for new uses to which psychology can be put. This sort of thinking seems to come naturally as part of the training in the field.

The American Sociological Association operates its public information office on a much smaller scale, with only one clerk who puts in only about eight hours a week on the job market in sociology. The field is said to service the university community almost exclusively, with only a few non-academic opportunities, usually from government. Nevertheless, employment is not a problem and there is little or no thought of dreaming up new uses for sociology in today's world.

The field of anthropology shares a great many of the problems faced by linguistics today. Like linguistics, anthropology is characterized by a large graduate component and a small undergraduate clientele. It also seems to have completed a cycle of development to the extent that it has all its university positions filled or nearly filled while a large surplus of graduate students are waiting right outside the door. The American Anthropological Association has taken official cognizance of the problem by hiring a full-time public information director who is currently planning to increase the size of his office in order to expand his effort to develop

job market possibilities in anthropology. Similar to the lines suggested for linguistics in this paper, anthropology is exploring the possibility of non-university careers in areas such as urban planning, recreation, drug abuse, media work, poverty programs, public health and psychiatric services. Although some anthropologists have addressed themselves to questions of the application of their field to industry, especially to multi-national corporations, such effort has led to heated debate related to ethical issues. There is apparent agreement about the need for cross-cultural understandings about attitudes, reward systems and needs, but there is considerable disagreement about the extent to which industrial imperialism should be served.

Each of the disciplines surveyed here have at least one thing in common: they have a public information office. Although there is no professed effort to display the virtues of psychology, the APA does offer press releases which get picked up by various professional journals. A press release about the psychology of police protection, for example, was recently picked up by Crime Control Digest, yielding requests to APA for further information from 150 readers. The AAA office is currently surveying the non-university membership about how adequate this alternate career has proven to be and what further or different training in anthropology might have been useful. For 13 years, AAA has also operated a visiting lecturer program which has focussed on small colleges with few or no offerings in anthropology. By providing a day or so of consultant-lecturing it is hoped that such colleges will expand or develop their offerings in anthropology. Approximately 15 colleges have done so, presumably as a direct result of such efforts. Perhaps more interesting from our perspective, the AAA visiting lecturer program has also begun to service civic clubs, to provide the general membership with a broader perception of anthropology and what it can offer. One can only speculate at the success most linguists might have if encountered by a similar assignment today.

Suggestions for Extended Relationships Outside the University

It is apparent that any real concern on the part of linguists to expand our territorial imperative will involve a number of commitments, both personal and as a profession. The following suggestions may be an indication of such activity:

1. Linguists will have to engage in a rather dramatic shift in their personal attitudes. In the past decade or so it has been popular for linguists to delimit that which and only that which they, as linguists, are qualified to say. This probably was a natural reaction against the overpromise of linguists of the previous decades. It is likely that such an attitude developed as a by-product of the attempt by linguists to establish the boundaries of their own territory. Linguistics in the fifties was difficult to pin-down for the field seemed to partake of many other fields, and had little identity of its own. With the development of a more sophisticated theory came a natural abstractness which placed a gulf between linguistics and other fields as well as between practical concerns within linguistics. Wherever it came from, this tendency of linguists to disqualify themselves from having anything to say but that which directly relates to their field tended to widen the gulf between linguistics and other fields. Thus, linguistics courses were set up for linguistics majors only, while psychology, sociology or education majors would either have to make do or go hang.

In this, linguistics departments could be accused of following a kind of compensatory education model in which the learner is told that he must adjust to linguistics rather than having linguistics adjust to his beginning point. Linguists often accuse educators of dealing with children from minority cultures as deficient rather than different. Yet a linguistics which perceives of the beginning points of other fields as deficient rather than different is surely guilty of the same perversion. The point here is that linguists will need to develop a new posture and a new attitude, setting aside old biases against non-linguists and accepting the vulnerabilities and insecurities involved in operating out of their own depth. For too long we have been isolative, sitting in judgment of other fields but not reaching out to them with what linguistics has to offer.

2. Linguists will have to make a physical commitment to develop an active information office and placement service. It simply will not be enough to maintain a passive job list to be made available to the unemployed at annual conventions and in quarterly newsletters. All of the sister organizations surveyed here have shown at least some evidence of such a commitment. Specifically, one can visualize a

full-time staff member whose task it is to call together outreach-oriented linguists to exercise their creativity along these lines of development:

a. First, we must define what it is that we can do, preferably in terms which can be understood by a layman. A small brochure would be a desirable first step.

b. Next, we should thoroughly assess the targeted non-university organizations which we feel that linguistics can serve. We must develop a convincing rationale about how our specific knowledge relates usefully to those fields.

c. Then, we should approach the non-university organizations or fields, describing what we think we can do for them and working actively with them to help solve their problems with our resources.

Such an exercise would be an active step toward reaching out both in service to and in opportunity for our initiates. Obviously we will want to be concerned about the same ethical questions which bother many anthropologists about their involvement in multi-national affairs. We will also want to keep in perspective Veblen's prophecy that universities will someday turn into mere agents of business and industry.

The commitment involved in such a strategy will include a funded position, logically in the LSA, but also a commitment of time on the parts of a number of the more entrepreneureal and public relations-sensitive members. One can visualize special meetings of linguists with the targeted organizations or fields in which the task of the linguists, having first done their homework about the field, is to take the position of helping that field solve a pressing problem.

3. Linguists will have to orient training programs to a focus which will permit and prepare for the development of such a perspective. This suggestion is not an admonition to include applied linguistics courses in the theoretical curriculum, however useful this might prove, for applied linguistics suffers from some of the same myopia. It has, in fact, become synonymous, in many circles, with English as a Second Language. What I have in mind is a much wider sense of relationship, to many academic and non-academic fields, and a relationship in which linguists go to the target field, see its problems and relate our expertise to them. This sort of posture will require that we work hard to know the target fields well enough to begin to see their areas of need. This may mean that our students will

take courses in such fields, or that they take advantage of their and our experiences with such fields, or that we get one of our own kind well placed in such a field so that he can work for the development of linguistics from a position of internal security.

One example of the latter approach is the one which is currently being exercised in the federal government where at least two linguists are currently working for the expanded development of the field. One is looking out for our cause in the area of research grants. The other is operating out of the office of planning and evaluation of a newer agency, helping to guide program development along lines in which linguistics can be useful. Such efforts are being carried out, in both cases, at great personal expense to the scholars involved. To a certain extent, they are currently inactivated to the field in which they have been trained. They run the risk of losing ground in the publication and promotion races that linguists all run against each other. Their work may be considered a sacrifice along the order of the sacrifices made by all explorers of new terraines.

Another current example of an attempt by linguistics to benevoltently infiltrate another discipline can be seen in the field of reading. At the 1974 meeting of The International Reading Association a two-day workshop in Linguistics and Reading was conducted for participants (reading teachers, professors and administrators) who were willing to pay to attend. The field of reading has recognized the importance of linguistics for several years, but the focus has been primarily on psycholinguistics. In an effort to open up the possibility of the usefulness of linguistics along other lines, a group of a dozen linguists and a dozen classroom teachers presented a series of six three-hour performances in the fields of grammatical theory, phonological theory, language acquisition, sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication and pragmatics. In each series there was a description of what the field does by a linguist, an interpretation of what this field can do for reading by a person who knows both linguistics and reading, followed by a workshop conducted by teachers of reading who have been trained at least partially in linguistics and who worked together with the theoreticians and interpreters to develop a series of "what-to-do-on-Tuesday" experiences to present to the teachers. These workshops were intended to avoid both the typical pronounce-

ments-by-linguists approach and the typical what-do-we-do-in-the-classroom demands of teachers by guiding the discussions carefully from theory to interpretation to practice. The entire effort was intended to be a door-opener both to the reading prople involved and to the linguists who stand to benefit even more by this exposure to real-life situations.

Conclusion

A field such as linguistics, with virtually no current undergraduate clientele and no area of apprenticeship in which to place its initiates, is faced with a problem quite unlike that of either psychology or sociology but rather similar to that of anthropology. Anthropology is working to develop a clientele outside the university world, much as I am advocating here. Their approach inside the university is simply to develop a larger undergraduate major. Linguists may wish to follow such an example but, from my perspective, this would not be the wisest approach. Many serious questions must be asked about how the graduate program differs from the undergraduate program and how wise it would be to usurp the breadth of an undergraduate education with our specialization. One strength of our field seems to stem from the broad backgrounds of our initiates when they come to linguistics. The problem we face today is not that our majors come from psychology, French or mathematics; it is rather that we have not capitalized on this fact.

Unlike psychology, linguistics has not, through an accident of history, discovered a gold mine of natural uses and development. It appears that the world is not waiting for us with open arms and that we will have to engage in a type of market research for our products and services. Our problem is not a unique one. It surfaced much earlier in some of the humanities which, in the main, have chosen to ignore the problem, hoping that it will go away. One prominent historian is said to have observed that his field really had no uses to which other fields could put it and that historians would simply have to be satisfied with the fact that they had a PhD, even if they never got a job. "At the very least", he observed, "we will have more interesting conversations with cab drivers." Linguists might be satisfied to answer similarly, for it is a noble response which smacks of martyrdom. But it is also a noble cop-out, at least until an effort is made to find out whether or not it is true that there is no other avenue to pursue.

It is growing popular in meetings which I have attended recently to make statements such as, "What is really important in education is process." or "If I had to choose between a manager who does not know a field and an academician who does not know management, I'd take a manager every time." Perhaps it is our own fault but governments, offices, school systems and businesses are being run by managers who may know something about process but little about the content they are managing. "Delivery services" was a hot term in the federal government during recent years but, at NIH at least, it is now also becoming apparent again that it is necessary to have something to deliver. I would rather see a person trained in a content area of some sort learn what is necessary about management than to continue to rely on managers to get occasional consultant help from us as they manage our affairs. Perhaps this can be called being entrepreneureal. It seems to me to be more accurately identified as defending one's own interests. The thesis of this paper, of course, is that we should do both. It is time for linguistics to break out of its self-perceived straight jackets and time for it to figure out ways of breaking into a number of other pursuits.

NOTES:

[1] This is not to say that individual linguists have not been successful in aiding in unrest, but it is well attested that such activity has generally been done outside the realm of linguistics (e.g. anti-war demonstrations) rather than from within.

[2] For one examination of this problem, see Roger W. Shuy, Sociolinguistics and the medical history. Paper presented at The American Sociological Association, August 1973 (Mimeo).

REFERENCES:

Berman, Ronald. 1974. Section 6: New York Times Magazine (February 10).

Dugger, Ronnie. 1974a. The politics of knowledge. Change (February).

_____. 1974b. The counting house of academe. Harpers (March).

Fraser, Bruce. In press. Linguistics in education. In F. P. Dinneen (ed.), Proceedings of the 25th Annual Georgetown Round Table. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Knepper, George W. 1974. The changing role of the contemporary university. From the Hilltop 22, 5.

Manpower survey report. 1973. Linguistic Reporter 15, 6:1-4.

Shuy, Roger W. MS. Sociolinguistics and educational planning in the U. S. To be published in the Proceedings of The American Association for the Advancement of Science Seminar on Science and Man. Mexico City, July 1973.

_____. 1973. Sociolinguistics and the medical history. Paper presented at The American Sociological Association, August (Mimeo).

_____. In press. What is the study of variation useful for?. In R. Shuy and R. Fasold (eds.), New Ways of Analyzing Variation II. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.