DOCUMENT RESUME

ABSTRACT
        For research purposes, an individual's education and
educational attainment, and his or her ethnic identity, are usually
taken to represent static and independent characteristics of the
person. However, the processes which lead to categorizations of
educational attainment and ethnic identity are not static and are
probably not independent. In this paper a research approach to ethnic
identity is proposed. It is oriented specifically to classroom
settings in the Philippines. The rationale for undertaking research
of this kind, including a review of the literature on ethnicity and
linguistics, is presented in the context of Philippine education. The
approach proposed utilizes methods taken from recent sociolinguistic
work in conversational analysis. Insights into native assumptions
that a sociolinguistic approach can yield are suggested. The
incorporation of a conceptual approach, in which the meaning of
elements of a person's social identity is subject to negotiation and
interpretation in specific cases of interaction, is also suggested.
Possible implications of such an investigation for Philippine
education and sociolinguistics are discussed. A bibliography is
included. (Author/GC)

"DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION"

AND ITS SOCIOLINGUISTIC DIMENSION:

A PROPOSAL FOR STUDYING ETHNIC IDENTITY

IN A PHILIPPINE CLASSROOM*

Thomas S. Goodrich

Stanford University

An individual's education and his ethnic identity are usually taken to represent static charactistics of the person which, while they may be correlated, are the results of essentially independent processes. The assumptions that underlie this position are, I believe, open to question as to their empirical validity, their theoretical adequacy, as well as to the effectiveness of policy derived from them. The type of research proposed here would investigate the processes of social interaction, especially in the school setting, through which conceptions of ethnic identity are, as a matter of ordinary, everyday activity, produced and maintained in a Philippine community.

In this paper, I will present the rationale for undertaking research of this kind, particularly in the context of Philippine education. I will suggest the sort of insight which a sociolinguistic approach could yield into native assumptions about ethnicity that help to regulate everyday interaction in this setting. Finally, I will discuss possible implications of such an investigation for Philippine education and sociolinguistics in general.

---

* This is a substantially revised version of a paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Meetings in San Francisco, California, on December 4, 1975.

Rationale for Research

Like the governments of other Southeast Asian nations, the Philippine
government faces what it considers to be a great challenge in its attempt
to arrive at a national consensus on development goals and priorities.
It must fashion such a consensus out of a population characterized by great
cultural and especially linguistic heterogeneity (Thompson and Adloff 1955;
Enloe 1974). Part of the response to this challenge has been to formulate
as an explicit policy goal the fostering of the notion of a 'Filipino
national identity', with special emphasis placed upon the propagation of
the national language, Pilipino (Parale 1970). The instrument which is
seen to have perhaps the greatest potential for attaining this goal is the
educational system (Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education
1970), particularly through its use of the national language as medium of
instruction (Azanza 1973). The attempt to implement this policy, however,
has been far from free of problems -- from the level of language problems
faced by classroom teachers (Bernardino 1974) to the level of central,
long-debated policy questions such as the extent to which a national iden-
tity should be expected to <u>supplant</u> identification with a more restricted
cultural-linguistic group, as opposed to merely <u>supplementing</u> it (c.f.
Tamano 1968). Lacking the foundations for a clear conceptions of what
such identifications consist of, those engaged in such debates must fall
back on differing sets of assumptions about how people conceptualize and
use the 'identities' on a day-to-day basis.

One of the difficulties with the attempt to implement this policy
objective, then, is the lack of a clear understanding of what an ethnic

identity is, or how it should be conceptualized for the purpose of affec-
ting it through the schooling experience. As will be discussed in more
detail subsequently, most current conceptions of 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic
group' are neither etically well-formulated nor responsive to the needs of
those (e.g., teachers) in practical situations who must deal with such
matters as a part of their everyday affairs. What is called for is not so
much the study of more particular situations (either as instances where
traditional notions are problematic or where they are not). Rather, the
need appears to be for research utilizing different approaches -- carried
out, necessarily, in concrete situations -- which may provide the basis
on which an adequate understanding can be built. The primary goal of the
type of research proposed here, then, would be an empirically-derived con-
ception of the ways whereby ethnic identity is established and made to
function as a device for structuring social situations, i.e., of the nature
of developing 'grounded theory' (Glaser and Strauss 1967), rather than
testing hypotheses derived from existing theory.

The approach to studying ethnicity to be taken here relies heavily
on assumptions about the importance of verbal interaction in the context
to be investigated. That is, ethnicity is both communicated and communica-
ted about. One may engage in behavior that is intended (or interpreted,
i.e., taken as intended) to indicate, on the one hand, that ethnic identity
is to be understood as relevant (or not relevant) to the situation-at-
hand; on the other hand, one may indicate what one's own ethnic identity
(vis-a-vis some larger scheme, e.g., a 'folk taxonomy' of ethnic identities
-- c.f. Frake 1962, 1964) is or should be taken to be in that situation.
One may also communicate about ethnicity, such as by means of providing

4

an explanation for one's own or another's behavior on a specific occasion
-- or, through 'stereotypes', in generalized situations -- and also as a
way of providing instruction about how one should behave and what behavior
to expect from others, as a teacher or parent instructs a child, or an
informant 'explains things' to an ethnographer. Communication, either
of or about ethnic identity, relies of course heavily, though by no means
entirely, on verbal interaction. More specifically, such communication
relies on the common possession of a set of rules for the appropriate
use of speech in a given range of social settings, or 'communicative com-
petence', to use Hymes' (1971) terms. The methods which have been devel-
oped in sociolinguistics to study this aspect of the use of speech fall
under the general rubric of the 'ethnography of communication' (Slobin
et al. 1966; Gumperz and Hymes 1964, 1972). Thus, it would also be impor-
tant for the kind of research proposed here to develop a limited ethno-
graphy of communication -- that is, with special concentration on home and
school settings -- for the community to be studied.

To summarize, the research project outlined here would investigate
the broad patterns of speech use in a limited range of settings in one
community. It would seek to find the ways people in this community use
these patterns as means to establish their ethnic identities and to talk
about ethnic identity. All of these ways, it is assumed, are available
to children -- in many cases in school and at home, of course, they are
directed at or even produced for children -- as part of the process of
socialization. However, to investigate socialization relevant to ethnic
identity in this way requires a different theoretical approach to the
notion of ethnicity than anthropological or other social science literature

has generally provided (c.f. MacKay 1972).

Traditional Approaches to Ethnicity

The concepts of 'ethnicity', 'ethnic group' and so on have, of

course, been central to the concerns of anthropology at least since the

time when Boas, Malinowski and others made it a study of real people

living in real societies. Arising out of the very way that Malinowski

and his followers went about studying 'primitive' societies, there has

developed a conventionally acceptable mode of treating ethnic groups,

i.e., as if they were discrete and even isolable entities. LeVine and

Campbell have attempted to make explicit the assumptions on which this

conventional treatment was based. They enumerate these assumptions as

follows:

> (1) There exist named units which are readily perceived as
> units by their members, their neighbors, and anthropological
> observers alike. (2) Such a unit, called a society or
> culture, is in its typical concrete embodiment a population
> with territorial boundaries that represent discontinuities
> in breeding, language, economy, sociopolitical structure,
> and culture. (3) In a unit so distinguished from its
> neighbors, each of the institutionalized aspects of social
> action has the properties of an organized entity, like a
> biological system, with interdependent parts and a normally
> high degree of stability.
> (LeVine and Campbell 1972: 83)

LeVine and Campbell go on to discuss the ways in which this set of

assumptions about societies and cultures has become so crucial to the

way ethnographers have viewed their tasks, that it often is allowed to

serve as "the primary criteria for noticing, recording, and (later)

emphasizing data" (1972: 84). With such a set of assumptions in opera-

tion, it is not difficult to see why, for the most part, the questions anthropologists have tended to ask have not revealed the assumptions to be problematic.

That they have become problematic in recent years, however, is unquestionable. One reason for this has arisen from the attempt to carry out large-scale, cross-cultural comparative studies using materials such as those in the Human Relations Area Files. This sort of attempt has provoked debate over the basic comparability of the groups that constitute the units of analysis; one example is the article by Raoul Naroll and the commentaries on it published in Current Anthropology (see Naroll 1964). Naroll's proposal for locating the basic culture-bearing unit (which he calls the 'cult-unit') suggests using primarily linguistic and sociopolitical criteria, with other characteristics such as the common use of a distinctive label as secondary features for re-solving ambiguous cases. Some of the problems inherent in the attempt to use such criteria are discussed by Hymes (1968); he concentrates on the difficulties in applying linguistic standards unambiguously. Other work -- e.g.,that of Moerman(1968, 1969) on Northern Thailand, the col-lection of articles edited by Barth (1969) on African, Scandinavian, Mexican and Middle Eastern cases, and perhaps most convincingly, Leach's classic study of Highland Burma (1954) -- clearly demonstrate the vir-tual impossibility of assigning non-problematic ethnic labels to social and political structures. The point is that the ethnographic facts do not fit tidily into any set of pre-established categories so far proposed; it is becoming more and more questioned whether any such set exists.

The problem is not confined, however, to a debate over whether the people who call themselves X 'really' belong to one group or three. There is,beyond that, the crucial issue of the 'unit of analysis' that anthropologists claim to be studying, whether through participant-observation or through multiple regression runs on the computer. If the definition of the unit turns out to depend (as Levine and Campbell suggest) on the preconceptions of the observer as to the nature of such groups, then the advantage claimed for the anthropologist's method seems to have disappeared through his very lack of method.

More rigorous method tends to be associated with the work of socio-logists rather than anthropologists, and ethnicity has, at least since 1950, been accorded a good deal of attention here. While anthropologists have largely taken ethnicity as a resource -- to be used as the implicit basis for "noticing, recording and ... emphasizing data" -- sociologists have attempted to take 'ethnicity' (van den Berghe 1970), 'ethnic relations' (Schermerhorn 1970), 'ethnic stratification' (Shibutani and Kwan 1965), etc., as topics. Yet there are problems with the usability of this literature for the type of study proposed here, some of which are similar to problems mentioned earlier. This can be seen in the kinds of definitions of 'ethnicity' and 'ethnic group' offered in these works. As Simpson and Yinger point out (1972: 12-13), many current works rely heavily on conceptions similar to that proposed for 'minorities' by Wagley and Harris (1958). This is basically a list of features -- subordinate political status, low social esteem, self-conscious iden-tification with the minority group, affiliation based on a rule of descent, group endogamy -- presumably characteristic of ethnic (or

8

minority) groups in general, often with little or no specification of
degree. Since Wagley and Harris, there has been a gradual recognition
of the variation in situations of interaction between groups, and a
consequent relaxation of the terms of the definition, as in the following:

> An ethnic group consists of people who conceive of themselves
> as being of a kind. They are united by emotional bonds and
> concerned with the preservation of their type. With very
> few exceptions, they speak the same language or their speech
> is at least intelligible to each other, and they share a
> common cultural heritage. Since those who form such groups
> are usually endogamous, they tend to look alike. Far more
> important, however, is their belief that they are of common
> descent, a belief usually supported by myths or a partly
> fictitious history.
> (Shibutani and Kwan 1965: 40-41)

The most recent literature -- interestingly enough, often a colla-
borative effort between anthropologists and sociologists, as in the case
of LeVine and Campbell -- takes a more restrained view as to the defi-
niteness with which any general assertions can be made. De Vos finds
that there are "no essential characteristics common to all groups usually
so designated [i.e., as 'ethnic'] " (1975: 9); however, he does proceed
to offer his own suggestions for such a list (with "the word 'usually'
... understood as preceding any generalization"). LeVine and Campbell,
who undertake perhaps the most complete examination of the definitional
problem, agree that no single list of characteristics is adequate to
the task. Instead, they formulate a solution in terms of different kinds
of boundaries -- linguistic, economic, political, etc. -- which tend
(with wide variation) to coincide through the 'principle of least effort':
"people who speak the same language are more likely to interact, and
their interaction is likely to lead to marriage and reproduction and thus
an increase in genetic and cultural homogeneity" (1972: 108).

9

The problem with this literature for the approach proposed here is clearly not that there really exists a set of defining features which are necessary and/or sufficient for a group to have the label 'ethnic', but that no one has found it yet. The problem is that, in terms of consequences for the research, the definitions offered by these authors serve much the same function as the assumptions of Malinowskian ethnography. What anthropologists tended to assume away, sociologists have defined away with very similar results. With very few exceptions, the validity of these definitions is not investigated once the research is underway. In most cases, in fact, the work of proposing the definition appears to be undertaken largely for its own sake, since the terms of the definition are not really involved in the questions under investigation. That is, a great deal of the literature is concerned with relations between racial groups, where in some cases (e.g., Lieberson 1961) 'racial' and 'ethnic' are explicitly taken as synonymous. This tendency is borne out by the observation of van den Berghe that over eighty per cent of the articles published by the American Sociological Review over a thirty-four-year span concerned the continental United States and dealt primarily with White-Black relations (van den Berghe 1970). In such studies, the question of assigning ethnic labels to individuals is taken as completely non-problematic, since (it is assumed) the relevant criteria are 'manifest' physical features such as skin color; in the case of Mexican-Americans or Puerto Ricans, the criterion is often the (only slightly more problematic) possession of a 'Spanish surname'. By resort to such 'obvious' criteria for assignment to ethnic groups, the researcher avoids having to deal with the ways in which these assignments -- and whatever expectations

for behavior may be associated with them -- are brought into social
interaction, and thus made available, on a day-to-day basis in ordinary
affairs, as a means for generating social structure.

A Sociolinguistic Approach to Ethnic Identity

Theory more adequate to the complexity of everyday interaction in
field situations will need to draw upon an information base in many
respects 'richer' in detail than is now available (Hymes 1971), but also
one that is gathered and produced with a different approach and different
goals than has usually been the case. In the development of this infor-
mation base as well as the theory that is developed from it, primary
emphasis will have to go to the study of the use of language in social
contexts, since language, as pointed out earlier, aside from being one
of the most common badges or tokens of identity, is also the most important
means of conveying information, hence teaching, about ethnicity.

The use of language in social contexts is, in broad terms, the
central concern of the field of sociolinguistics (Labov 1970; Fishman
1972b, 1972c; Pride and Holmes 1972). Within this field, a good deal of
work has been done in recent years on the relatively small-scale processes
and dynamics that are involved in ordinary interpersonal interaction
(Ervin-Tripp 1964, 1973; Giglioli 1972), including bilingual (Alatis 1970)
and other types of cross-cultural contexts (Smith and Shuy 1972). The
methods used especially in this latter body of research have been adopted
basically from the participant-observation techniques employed by ethno-
graphers for many years; in recognition of the use of these methods to
study the phenomena of verbal interaction, a sub-field has emerged within

11

sociolinguistics with the label 'ethnography of communication' (Gumperz and Hymes 1964, 1972). It is within this area that the empirical work has been (and is being) done which will form the basis for a more broadly-based understanding of the "interaction between language and social life" (Hymes 1972).

One of the central notions being investigated in this field is that of 'communicative competence', usually characterized as a set of rules for using language in socially and culturally acceptable ways. An important goal here is the development of theory which would "account for the fact that a normal child acquires a knowledge both of proper sentences and of their appropriate use. He or she develops abilities to judge when to speak, when not, and what to talk about with whom, in what way, and when and where" (Hymes 1971: 55). One could add to this list "in what language" (c.f. Fishman 1971), especially in a context such as the Philippines; here the 'linguistic repertoire' (Gumperz 1972) of most of the population can be expected to include different languages -- Tagalog, perhaps English, plus one or more regional languages -- as well as varieties appropriate for showing different levels of respect, etc.

It is one of the operating assumptions of the study proposed here that individuals' linguistic repertoires and the 'communicative choices' (Ervin-Tripp 1973) they make will form a prevalent feature in people's accounts of 'ethnic' behavior. This assumption rests in turn on another: that in the community to be studied, there will be widely-shared tacit knowledge of the 'rules' for the appropriate use of language. This knowledge would not necessarily include an ability to communicate in all the languages spoken in the community on the part of all members, or even any one member -- though it would imply that all members can communicate

12

in one language, e.g., Tagalog. Rather, it means that members share an understanding of the 'communicative strategies' that anyone may use, and thus what is meant by the choice of a particular strategy on a particular occasion, e.g., a teacher speaking Tagalog to a child in class and a local language to the same child after school. This shared understanding forms the basis for what Gumperz (1968) calls a 'speech community', and it is expected (though this expectation will be open to empirical check) that the research site will conform roughly to this idea.

The notions of an individual's 'linguistic repertoire', 'shared knowledge of rules for appropriate behavior', and 'speech community' are suggestive of the terms used by Goodenough to describe his view of the interrelationships of culture, language and society (Goodenough 1971). Culture, in this view, can be examined at many levels, the most basic of which is an individual's 'propriospect' -- his "private, subjective view of the world and its contents ... embrac[ing] both his cognitive and his affective orderings of his experience" (Ibid.: 36). The propriospect is largely shaped by one's view of social objects and events, that is, "the various standards for perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing that he attributes to other persons as a result of his experience of their actions and admonitions" (Ibid.). Goodenough's notion of propriospect is consistent with, indeed, is built out of his conception of culture:

> Culture, then, consists of standards for deciding what is, standards for deciding what can be, standards for deciding how one feels about it, standards for deciding what to do about it, and standards for deciding how to go about doing it.
>
> (Ibid.: 22)

13

Goodenough's model of culture is largely and explicitly a linguistic model.[2] For the most part, one takes a language to have the sound and shape others give it, as the standards by which effective communication can take place. Yet, just as one's linguistic repertoire can include several languages and varieties, so the propriospect may include a number of cultures -- as sets of standards the individual attributes to corresponding sets of others. Moreover, just as a person makes communicative choices regarding language use, so he chooses "from the several cultures in his repertory the one he regards as most suitable for his purposes on any given occasion" (Ibid.: 37). Indeed, because of the close association of a language with the culture of its speakers, these two choices are in most cases the same. The choice, in Goodenough's terms, becomes his 'operating culture' on that occasion. By choosing the appropriate operating culture for the various situations a person enters in his daily affairs, he has the opportunity to demonstrate to groups of others that he shares with them competence in that culture. This "provides a basis for people to identify one another mutually as being the same kind of persons. It promotes a sense of common ethnicity" (Ibid.: 38).

Goodenough's model of culture (or the aspects of it relevant here) has been presented in some detail partly because of the similarities already noted to other bodies of theory to be used, but also because the differences between his position and the approach proposed here are illuminating. This model relies rather heavily on (only partially

_____

[2]Though, in its emphasis on one's perceptions of other persons, it bears a strong resemblance, also noted by Goodenough(Ibid.: 37n.), to Mead's concept of the 'generalized other' (Mead 1934: 152-163).

examined) notions of an individual 'choosing an operating culture' and 'demonstrating competence' in it. Both of these issues will, for the purposes of this research, be taken as matters open to negotiation in social interaction (Garretson 1967; Dreitzel 1970). Such 'negotiations' are not separate from ordinary verbal interaction, but are an integral part of it; it is through verbal interaction that the sense of a stable and ongoing social structure is accomplished and maintained (Cicourel 1974; Berger and Luckmann 1967). Specifically, an individual's choice of operating culture, or ethnic identity -- a choice, incidentally, almost certainly as conscious and calculated as Goodenough's discussion suggests only on rare occasions -- must be made in terms of purposes and made on specific occasions. Yet both the purposes-at-hand (what is to be achieved, even what is achievable in the interaction), and especially the characterization of the occasion (the 'definition of the situation') are matters which must be, and routinely are, accomplished in the course of the interaction (McHugh 1968). The demonstration of 'competence', likewise (perhaps moreso) is a matter for negotiation and accomplishment. This is partly a matter of a performance being an acceptable demonstration on one occasion, but not on another, or for some purposes but not others, thus involving the same problems of negotiating purpose and definition of the situation mentioned above (c.f. Nagata 1974; Moerman 1969). More crucial, though, is the fact that the demonstration is judged as competent or not on the basis of the standards which make up the culture. Yet such standards -- which would be extremely difficult to formulate in any case, even for a limited domain of behavior -- have the characteristic, like all such sets

15

of rules, of 'essential incompleteness' (Mehan and Wood 1975; Garfinkel
and Sacks 1970). That is, the applicability of any standard is deter-
mined in ways that are not (and perhaps cannot be) specified prior to
the occasion in which they are applied, where the 'circumstances' can be
'taken into account' -- i.e., where what the 'circumstances' are can be
negotiated. In short, as McDermott concludes (from a study of Black
and White schoolchildren), ethnic identity should be seen "almost as
much achieved as ascribed," acheived through "much social work on the
part of the interactants" (1974: 85). The attempt to locate and elicit
accounts of this social work forms the basis of the research strategy
recommended here.

Possible Implications of the Research

Given the theoretical framework and research strategy outlined
above, what sort of revelations can one reasonably hope this type of
approach toyield? There is, of course, a good deal of value in relative-
ly 'basic' research -- especially in a field as new as sociolinguistics
(c.f. Hymes 1971, 1972a) -- in simply providing a broader base of in-
formation about how verbal interaction is actually structured in a wide
range of cultural contexts and social settings, and thus a better under-
standing of what communicative competence really entails. The possibi-
lity of making such a contribution is increased given a cultural setting
such as lowland Philippines where a substantial body of ethnography
of the more traditional sort already exists (see, e.g., Saito 1972).

Of great concern to the researcher, however, should be whatever benefits may result from his or her research for the people whose cooperation and tolerance make it possible. Implications for the educational system of the kind of research suggested here fall into three main categories: language policy, curriculum development and teacher training.

Language Policy. Although the Philippines currently has a fairly explicit policy of promoting the national language, Pilipino, as medium of instruction, the difficulties of enforcement have left an unstable and rather confused state of affairs (Bernardino 1974). The utility of a given choice of language of instruction and its implications for other parts of the educational process (e.g., testing) may be better understood when they are related to a community's beliefs about and attitudes toward ethnicity. Suggestions for the development of bilingual programs are a possible concrete outcome of the research in this area.

Curriculum Development. Prerequisite to any intervention strategy is a much clearer understanding of how what is currently being taught about ethnic groups relates to the general process of ethnic identity formation as revealed by the research. Once this relationship is established, the explicit message of the school, as expressed in the curriculum materials, can be directed so as to deal with that process more effectively.

Teacher Training. This may well be the area most amenable to changes in policy and the one where policy changes may be most fruitful. It is reasonable to assume that teachers' own notions about and expectations related to ethnicity have a substantial impact in the classroom. They affect not only the process of learning ethnic identities, but possibly (through the teachers' expectations of children's abilities) many aspects

17

of children's performance in school. If an increase can be achieved in teachers' understandings of the nature of ethnic identities and the process by which they are established, this awareness should enable them to manage this part of their educational task with more effectiveness, more consistency and more empathy.

Conclusion

Perhaps it would be appropriate to end this paper by noting the kinds of things the sort of approach suggested here cannot be expected to deal with satisfactorily. As the sociologist Hans Peter Dreitzel puts it, "... studies of communicative behavior should be open to the fact that the rules of interpretation are not invariant essences of the social life world, but are themselves subject to other social processes" (1970: xvi). These processes include class and occupational structures and power relations within the society. The structure of the social world is provided by language, but modes of production and power relationships also provide forms of structure. These various forms of structure, moreover, are doubtless interrelated in ways that are anything but simple. Certainly any study of the complex phenomena that comprise development ignores any one aspect at the risk of misunderstanding the whole. What is called for, in the end, is an approach to development, including the more limited area of development education that is truly interdisciplinary, not merely multi-disciplinary, that does not sacrifice the complexity of the real world for the comfortable simplicity of a theoretical one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alatis, James E. (ed.) 1970. Bilingualism and Language Contact. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Azanza, Rudolfo. 1973. "Education and the Social Context." Philippine Journal of Education 52: 394-396, 493-440.

Barth, Fredrik. 1969. "Introduction." In Barth, F. (ed.), 1969. Pp. 7-38.

_____. (ed.) 1969. Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Differences. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Bell, Wendell and Freeman, Walter E. (eds.) 1974. Ethnicity and Nation-Building: Comparative, International and Historical Perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Berger, Peter and Luckmann, Thomas. 1967. The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Doubleday and Co.

Bernardino, Vitaliano. 1974. "Our Unstable School Language Situation." Philippine Journal of Education 52: 518-519.

Berreman, Gerald. 1975. "Bazaar Behavior: Social Identity and Social Interaction in Urban India." In De Vos and Romanucci-Ross (eds.), 1975. Pp. 71-105.

Birdwhistell, Ray. 1970. Kinesis and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. New York: Ballantine Books.

Blount, Ben G. 1975. "Agreeing to Agree on Geneology: A Luo Sociology of Knowledge." In Sanchez and Blount (eds.), 1975. Pp. 117-136.

Blumer, Herbe t. 1967. "Society as Symbolic Interaction." In Manis and Meltzer (eds.), 1967. Pp. 139-148.

Cazden, Courtney B.; John, Vera P.; and Hymes, Dell (eds.) 1972. Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cicourel, Aaron. 1964. Method and Measurement in Sociology. New York: The Free Press.

_____. 1974. Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press.

Cicourel, Aaron et al. 1974. Language Use and School Performance. New York: The Free Press.

Collier, George A. 1975. Fields of the Tzotzil: The Ecological Bases of Tradition in Highland Chiapas. Austin: Univesity of Texas Press.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny. 1975. "The Child as Practical Reasoner." In Sanchez and Blount (eds.), 1975. Pp. 137-162.

Davis, William G. 1973. Social Relations in a Philippine Market: Self-Interest and Subjectivity. Berkeley: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California.

de la Cruz, Leonardo and de la Cruz, Luz Samonte. 1974. The 'New' Social Studies for Philippine Schools. Manila: Social Studies Publications, Inc.

De Vos, George. 1975. "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accomodation." In De Vos and Romanucci-Ross (eds.), 1975. Pp. 5- 41.

De Vos, George and Romanucci-Ross, Lola (eds.) 1975. Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Dreitzel, Hans Peter (ed.) 1970. Recent Sociology No. 2: Patterns of Communicative Behavior. London: The MacMillan Co.

Edelstein, Joël. 1974. "Pluralist and Marxist Perspectives on Ethnicity and Nation-Building." In Bell and Freeman (eds.), 1974. Pp. 45-58.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1974. "Foreign Policy and Ethnicity in 'Soft States': Prospects for Southeast Asia." In Bell and Freeman (eds.), 1974. Pp. 223-232.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan. 1964. "An Analysis of the Interaction of Language, Topic and Listener." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1964. Pp. 86-102.

_____. 1973. Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice. Essays by Susan M. Ervin-Tripp. Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1965. "Varieties of Ethnicity and Varieties of Language Consciousness." In Report of the Sixteenth Annual Round Table on Linguistics and Language Study. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

_____. 1971. "The Relationship between Micro- and Macro-Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When." In Fishman, Joshua; Cooper, Robert; Ma, Roxana; et al. Bilingualism in the Barrio. Bloomington: Research Center for Language Sciences, Indiana University.

_____. 1972a. "Domains and the Relationship between Micro- and Macro-Sociolinguistics." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1972. Pp. 435-453.

_____. 1972b. Language in Sociocultural Change. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

_____. 1972c. The Sociology of Language. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Fishman, Joshua and Lueders-Salmon, Erika. 1972. "What Has the Sociology
of Language to Say to the Teacher? On Teaching the Standard Variety
to Speakers of Dialectical or Sociolectical Varieties." In Cazden
et al. (eds.), 1972. Pp. 67-83.

Frake, Charles O. 1962. "The Ethnographic Study of Cognitive Systems." In
Gladwin, Thomas (ed.) Anthropology and Human Behavior. Washington, D.C.:
Anthropological Society of Washington. Pp. 72-93.

_____. 1964. "How to Ask for a Drink in Subanon." In Gumperz and
Hymes (eds.), 1964. Pp. 127-132.

_____. 1972. "Struck by Speech: The Yakan Concept of Litigation."
In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1972. Pp. 106-129.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1972. "Remarks on Ethnomethodology." In Gumperz and
Hymes (eds.), 1972. Pp. 301-324.

Garfinkel, Harold and Sacks, Harvey. 1970. "On Formal Structures of
Practical Actions." In McKinney and Tiryakian (eds.), 1970. Pp. 337-
366.

Garretson, Wynona Smutz. 1967. "The Consensual Definition od Social Objects."
In Manis and Meltzer (eds.), 1967. Pp. 337-342.

Giglioli, Pier Paolo (ed.) 1972. Language and Social Context. Harmonds-
worth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

Glaser, Barney and Strauss, Anselm. 1967. The Discovery of Grounded Theory:
Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York:
Doubleday and Co.

_____. 1967. Interaction Ritual. New York: Doubleday and Co.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1969. "Rethinking 'Status' and 'Role': Toward a
General Model of the Cultural Organization of Social Relationships."
In Tyler (ed.), 1969. Pp. 311-329.

_____. 1971. Culture, Language and Society. Addison-Wesley Modular
Publications.

Gumperz, John J. 1964. "Linguistic and Social Interaction in Two Communi-
ties." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1964. Pp. 137-153.

_____. 1968. "The Speech Community." International Encyclopedia
of the Social Sciences. Vol VII.

_____. 1969. "Communication in Multilingual Societies." In Tyler
(ed.), 1969. Pp. 435-448.

_____. 1972. "Introduction." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1972.
Pp. 1-25.

Gumperz, John and Herasimchuk, Eleanor. 1973. "The Conversational Analysis of Social Meaning: A Study of Classroom Interaction" In Shuy (ed.), 1973. Pp. 99-134.

Gumperz, John J. and Hymes, Dell (eds.) 1964. The Ethnography of Communication. Special Publication. American Anthropologist 66, No. 6, Part 2.

_____. 1972. Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Haaland, Gunnar. 1969. "Economic Determinants in Ethnic Processes." In Barth (ed.), 1969. Pp. 58-73.

Hollnsteiner, Mary R. 1964. "Reciprocity in the Lowland Philippines." In Lynch, Frank (comp.) Four Readings on Philippine Values. second revised edition. IPC Papers No. 2. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Univesity Press. Pp. 22-49.

Hubbell, Linda J. 1969. "Methods for Studying the Child's Acquisition of Sociolinguistic Competence." In Rainey et al., 1969.

Hymes, Dell. 1964. "Introduction: Toward Ethnographies of Communication." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1964. Pp. 1- 34.

_____. 1968. "Linguistic Problems in Defining the Concept of Tribe." In Helm, June (ed.) Essays on the Problem of Tribe. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

_____. 1971. "On Linguistic Theory, Communicative Competence and the Education of Disadvantaged Children." In Wax, Murray; Diamond, Stanley and Gearing, Fred (eds.). Anthroplogical Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books. Pp. 51-66.

_____. 1972a. "Introduction." In Cazden et al. (eds.), 1972. Pp. xi - lvii.

_____. 1972b. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1972. Pp. 35-71.

John, Vera P. 1972. "Styles of Learning -- Styles of Teaching: Reflections on the Education of Navajo Children." In Cazden et al. (eds.), 1972. Pp. 331-343.

_____. 1973. "Sociolinguistic Perspectives and Education." In Shuy (ed.), 1973. Pp. 223-236.

Labov, William A. 1970. "The Study of Language in Its Social Context." Studium Generale 23: 30-87.

Leach, Edmund. 1954. Political Systems of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure. London: G. Ball.

LeVine, Robert A. and Campbell, Donald T. 1972. Ethnocentrism: Theories
of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior. New York: John
Wiley and Sons.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1972. (orig. 1961). "A Societal Theory of Race and
Ethnic Relations." In van den Berghe (ed.), 1972. Pp. 38-51.

MacKay, Robert. 1973. "Conceptions of Children and Models of Socialization."
In Dreitzel, Hans Peter (ed.) Recent Sociology No. 5: Childhood and
Socialization. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

McDermott, R.P. 1974. "Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach
to Illiteracy and Social Stratification." In Spindler, George D. (ed.)
Education and Cultural Process: Toward An Anthropology of Education.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McHugh, Peter. 1968. Defining the Situation: The Organization of Meaning
in Social Interaction. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co.

McKinney, John C. and Tiryakian, Edward A. (eds.) 1970. Theoretical Socio-
logy: Perspectives and Developments. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Manis, Jerome G. and Meltzer, Bernard N. (eds.) 1967. Symbolic Interaction :
A Reader in Social Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University
of Chicago Press.

Mehan, Hugh and Wood, Houston. 1975. The Reality of Ethnomethodology.
New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Mills, C. Wright. 1967. "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive."
In Manis and Meltzer (eds.), 1967. Pp. 355- 366.

Mishler, Elliot G. 1972. "Implications of Teacher Strategies of Language
and Cognition: Observations in First-Grade Classrooms." In Cazden
et al. (eds.), 1972. Pp. 267-298.

Moerman, Michael. 1968. Analysis of Lue Conversation: Providing Accounts,
Finding Breaches and Taking Sides. Working Paper No. 12. Berkeley:
University of California Language-Behavior Research Laboratory.

_____. 1969. "A Little Knowledge." In Tyler (ed), 1969. Pp. 449-469.

Nagata, Judith A. 1974. "What is a Malay? Situational Selection of Ethnic
Identity in a Plural Society." American Ethnologist 1, No.2 (May):
331-350.

Naroll, Raoul. 1964. "On Ethnic Unit Classification." Current Anthropology
5: 283-312.

Philips, Susan U. 1972. "Participant Structures and Communicative Competence:
Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom." In Cazden et al.
(eds.), 1972. Pp. 370-394.

Presidential Commission to Survey Philippine Education. 1970. Education for
    National Development: New Patterns, New Directions. Manila: Government
    Printing Office.

Pride, J.B. and Holmes, Janet (eds.) 1972. Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth,
    Middlesex, England: Penguin Education.

Rainey, Mary. 1969. "Style Switching in a Head Start Class." In Rainey et
    al., 1969.

Rainey, Mary et al. 1969. Studies of Interaction. Working Paper No. 16.
    Berkeley: University of California Language-Behavior Research Laboratory.

Saito, Shiro. 1972. Philippine Ethnography: A Critically Annotated and
    Selected Bibliography. Honolulu: Univesity of Hawaii Press.

Sanchez, Mary and Blount, Ben G. (eds.) 1975. Sociocultural Dimensions of
    Language Use. New York: Academic Press.

Scheflen, Albert E. 1972. Body Language and the Social Order: Communication
    as Behavioral Control. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Schermerhorn, R.A. 1970. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for
    Theory and Research. New York: Random House.

Selby, Henry A. 1975. "Semantics and Causality in the Study of Deviance."
    In Sanchez and Blount (eds.), 1975. Pp. 11-24.

Sherzer, Joel and Darnell, Regna. 1972. "Appendix 2: Outline Guide for the
    Ethnographic Study of Speech Use." In Gumperz and Hymes (eds.), 1972.
    Pp. 548-554.

Shibutani, Tamatsu and Kwan, Kian. 1965. Ethnic Stratification. New York:
    MacMillan and Co.

Shuy, Robert W. (ed.) 1973. Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects.
    Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics
    and Language Studies. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Simpson, George Eaton and Yinger, J. Milton. 1972. Racial and Cultural
    Minorities: An Analysis of Prejudice and Discrimination. 4th ed.
    New York: Harper and Row.

Slobin, Dan (ed.) 1967. A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the
    Acquisition of Communiative Competence. 2nd draft, Berkeley: Univ.
    of California Press.

Smith, David M. and Shuy, Robert (eds.) 1972. Sociolinguistics in Cross-
    Cultural Analysis. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Tamano, Mamintal. 1968. Needed: A Total Commitment. Manila: Bureau of
    Printing.

Thompson, Virginia and Adloff, Richard. 1955. Minority Problems in South-
    east Asia. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tyler, Stephen A. (ed.) 1969. Cognitive Anthropology. New York: Holt,
    Rinehart and Winston.

van den Berghe, Pierre. 1970. Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative
    Sociology. New York: Basic Books.

_____. 1972. "Introduction." In van den Berghe (ed.), 1972. Pp. 1-14.

van den Berghe, Pierre (ed.) 1972. Intergroup Relations: Sociological
    Perspectives. New York: Basic Books.

Wagley, Charles and Harris, Marvin. 1958. Minorities in the New World.
    Columbia University Press.

Wieder, D. Lawrence. 1975. Language and Social Reality: The Case of
    Telling the Convict Code. The Hague: Mouton.

Wolcott, Harry (ed.) 1975. Ethnography of Schooling. Special Issue of
    Human Organization 34: 107-216.