

THE
KANSAS
JOURNAL
OF

Sociology

Vol.9 No.2

Fall 1973

IN THIS SPECIAL ISSUE:
STUDIES IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

James W. Hartman
A PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Reid Luhman
ON LANGUAGE USE AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Joshua A. Fishman
THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC PILGRIMAGE OF YIDDISH

Raven I. McDavid, Jr., Raymond K. O'Cain
SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY

J.L. Dillard
THE AMERICAN KOINÉ—ORIGIN, RISE, AND PLATEAU STAGE

James C. Woodward, Jr.
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON SOCIOLINGUISTIC VARIATION AND AMERICAN
SIGN LANGUAGE

Gerald L. Denning
HISTORICAL, PROCEDURAL, AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Robert Hopper
IS DEPRIVATION LINGUISTIC? Suggested Changes for Teacher Training Programs
Concerned with Black English

Glendon F. Drake
BLACK ENGLISH AND THE AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEM

General Editor
Issue Editors

Editorial Consultant
Managing Editor
Faculty Consultant
Cover Design

Gary M. Schemm
James W. Hartman
Reid Luhman
Janet P. Barber
Melvin W. Barber
César X. Hernández-Cela
Stephen D. Hansen

In this special issue . . .

STUDIES IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

James W. Hartman

A PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIOLINGUISTICS / 93

Reid Luhman

ON LANGUAGE USE AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE / 97

Joshua A. Fishman

THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL AND LINGUISTIC PILGRIMAGE OF YIDDISH / 127

Raven I. McDavid, Jr., Raymond K. O'Cain

SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND LINGUISTIC GEOGRAPHY / 137

J. L. Dillard

THE AMERICAN KOINÉ—ORIGIN, RISE, AND PLATEAU STAGE / 157

James C. Woodward, Jr.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON SOCIOLINGUISTIC VARIATION AND AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE / 191

Gerald L. Denning

HISTORICAL, PROCEDURAL, AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS / 201

Robert Hopper

IS DEPRIVATION LINGUISTIC? Suggested Changes for Teacher Training Programs
Concerned with Black English / 209

Glendon F. Drake

BLACK ENGLISH AND THE AMERICAN VALUE SYSTEM / 217

CORRIGENDA / 229

The Kansas Journal of Sociology is a biannual published by the Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. All articles appearing in *The Kansas Journal of Sociology* are indexed in *Sociological Abstracts*. The *Journal* is available on microfilm to regular subscribers to the paper edition. Inquiries should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 N. First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

THE KANSAS JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY
STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL POLICY

The KANSAS JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY offers a means of communication for students in the various disciplines of inquiry concerned with human society. Students, in our view, are not defined by age, rank, or academic degree. As members of the scientific community, they wish to construe a universe that is above all truthfully conceived, while knowing that no truth-claim is ever more than tentative, that no understanding ever more than a temporary approximation, and that the question is the mark of science. As "youthful" members of that community, they are less anxious to be among the many that know the answers than they are intent to be among the few who discover the questions. Since boldness is an old test of youth, and hard-nosed curiosity the students' sport, they often venture into unmapped fields, experiment with rustic or forgotten tools of thought, and probe the bite of concepts in the recalcitrant, abstruse, but, for them, always fascinating material worlds construed by men.

In other words, the journal opens for all serious students a way to contribute more to the spirit of their discipline than to the ritual of the profession.

The article is welcome. Particularly invited is the creative, thought-provoking paper of broad sociological interest. If reports are submitted, let the theoretical problem be clear, the assumptions recognized, the strategy of research discussed and, most important, let the meaning of the particular investigation for further thought and research be evident. But the hard and terse prose is not the only source for insight or stimulation. The short essay, the querulous statement, the searching comment, the informative book review, the considered rejoinder—these and other expressions of the inquisitive mind have their place. Even the report of a flagrant failure may be more enlightening than the confession of a confirmed hypothesis. The journal's envoi goes to imagination in the sociological discipline and discipline in the sociological imagination. Its motto is "from the students to the students," for in the end, the creative students themselves will decide that the spirit of this journal shall live.

The KANSAS JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY endeavors to further scholarly inquiry into social phenomena. The journal welcomes research reports, theoretical contributions, essays on issues of present concern to the discipline, and suggestions for improving current theory and methodology, from graduate students, as well as established scholars, in the social sciences.

Manuscripts submitted should be double-spaced, less than thirty typed pages, footnotes and references appended, and accompanied by an abstract. Preparation of copy and reference format should follow that used in publications of the American Sociological Association. If published, the author receives ten free reprints.

NOTES ON OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Gerald L. Denning, presently a Ph.D. candidate in linguistics at the University of Kansas, did his undergraduate work in Spanish pedagogy at the University of Kansas and subsequently received his Master's degree in Spanish language and literature from Wichita State University. During that time, he spent several summers studying Spanish in Mexico and one at an Institute in Illinois. His academic interests include current linguistic theory and its application to Spanish as well as to pedagogy in general, and sociolinguistics. In addition to teaching English as a foreign language at the Kansas University Intensive English Center, he is working on a social psychology project investigating linguistic cues that lead to changes of speakers in conversation. An article in progress involves preparation of a sociolinguistic questionnaire for studying Kansas Chicano Grammatical Constructions.

J. L. Dillard received his doctorate in 1956 from the University of Texas. A noted linguistics teacher, researcher, and writer, he has held teaching positions at several universities, including Texas A & I; Universidad Central, Quito, Ecuador (Fulbright); Inter-American University, San German, Puerto Rico; University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico (and Institute of Caribbean Studies); Universite Officielle de Bujumbura, Burundi (Fulbright); University of Southern California; and Ferkauf Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York City. His primary areas of scholarly interest are sociolinguistics and pidgin and creole languages. Publications include *Black English: Its History and Usage in the United States* (Random House, 1972); "On the Beginnings of Black English in the New World," (*Orbis*, 1973); "Creole English and Creole Portuguese: The Early Records," (*Journal of African Languages*, 1973). Books in preparation are *Perspectives on Black English* (Mouton, Sociolinguistics Series, galley proof stage) and *A History of American English* (Random House, in preparation).

Glendon F. Drake holds a Ph.D. in American culture from the University of Michigan. He has done advanced study in socio- and psycholinguistics at Indiana University and Michigan State University. His scholarly interests are sociolinguistics and American culture. He has recently completed a book on American linguistic attitudes now being considered for publication. He has held teaching positions at Wayne State University (Linguistics), 1960-1966, and at San Diego State University (Linguistics, American Studies, English), 1966-present.

Joshua A. Fishman received his Ph.D. in social psychology from Columbia University in 1953. Having taught and researched in almost all areas of the sociology of language, he considers "language maintenance and language shift" and "language and nationalism" his areas of special interest and concern. He has authored, co-authored or edited *Language Loyalty in the United States* (1966), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (1968), *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (1968), *Sociolinguistics* (1970), *Bilingualism in the Barrio* (1971), *Language and Nationalism* (1972), *The Sociology of Language* (1972), *Advances in the Sociology of Language* (Vol. I, 1971; Vol. II, 1972), and *Language in Sociocultural Change* (1972). He has held positions as Director of Research for the College Entrance Examination Board (1955-1958), Associate Professor of Human Relations and Psychology, University of Pennsylvania (1958-1960), Professor of Psychology and Sociology, Yeshiva University (1960-1966), and University Research Professor of Social Sciences, Yeshiva University (1966-present).

James W. Hartman is Associate Professor of English and Linguistics at the University of Kansas; his specialty is the English language, particularly social and regional variation. He received his B.A. from Ohio University, M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. He is Associate Editor of *American Speech* and of the *Dictionary of American Regional English* which is being compiled at the University of Wisconsin, F. G. Cassidy, Editor. He has worked previously at the University of Wisconsin and Ohio University.

Robert Hopper is presently Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Texas at Austin. Having received the doctorate in Communication Arts in 1970 from the University of Wisconsin, his interests now center on the communication development of normal children, with emphasis on educational processes. Secondary interests include educational communication, educational change, language and social stratification, and sociolinguistics. He has had articles published in *Speech Teacher*, *Speech Monographs*, *Children's Speech* and the *Southern Speech Communication Journal*.

Reid Luhman is presently a graduate student in sociology at the University of Kansas. He received his B.A. in sociology in 1970 from the University of California at Davis and his M.A. from the University of Kansas in 1973. He is currently working on research in bilingual education on a grant from the National Institute of Education, focusing on language use in children and styles of conceptualization. Now a faculty member of Highlands University of Las Vegas, New Mexico, his major interests include the sociology of language, the sociology of knowledge, occupations, and social psychology.

Raven I. McDavid, Jr.'s scholarly interests have included linguistic geography, sociolinguistics, lexicography, and Early Modern English. He received his doctorate from Duke University in 1935 and the Litt.D. from the same school in 1972. He has had articles published in numerous journals, including *Social Forces*, *American Speech*, and the *Journal of English Linguistics*. Books include *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States* (with Hans Kurath, 1961); and editorship of H. L. Mencken's *The American Language* (one-volume abridged edition, 1963). Professor McDavid has served as Instructor of English, The Citadel, 1935-38; Michigan State, 1938-39; Assistant Professor, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, 1940-42; Western Reserve University, 1952-57; Associate Professor, University of Chicago, 1957-64; Professor of English and Linguistics, 1964-present. He has served as Editor-in-Chief of the *Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States*, 1964-present, and as President, American Dialect Society, 1967-68.

Raymond K. O'Cain received the Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1972. His interests include linguistic geography, sociolinguistics, and onomastics. He is the author of several papers on the social dialects of Charleston, South Carolina, presented at regional and national meetings, and of several forthcoming reviews of works in dialectology. He has served as Instructor of English, University of South Carolina, 1970-71; Assistant Professor, 1972-present; field worker, *Dictionary of American Regional English*, 1966-67; Associate Contributing Editor, *Names in South Carolina*, 1971-present; and Assistant Editor, *Linguistic Atlas of the Middle and South Atlantic States*, 1973-present.

James C. Woodward, Jr., is currently Assistant Professor of Linguistics and English at Gallaudet College, Washington, D. C. He received his doctorate from Georgetown University in 1973. Among his interests are sociolinguistics, sign languages, and Chinese. Published papers include "A Transformational Approach to the Syntax of American Sign Language" and "Implications for Sociolinguistic Research Among the Deaf."

Editorial Introduction:

A PERSPECTIVE ON SOCIOLINGUISTICS

This special issue of the *Kansas Journal of Sociology: Studies in Sociolinguistics* is intended to introduce sociologists to a relatively new field which has drawn on and owes much to the related field of sociology proper. Sociolinguistics treats the social and linguistic implications of variable language behavior. Language use varies across time, space, social groups (as defined by class, age, sex, culture, etc.), situations and elsewhere. Systematic, empirically-based research into language variation and its implications promises to yield insights into man as a social creature and as an individual. An interesting example of the insight possible through sociolinguistic study is William Labov's early (1963) work in Martha's Vineyard. In his "Social Motivation of a Sound Change" (*Word*, 19: 273-309) Labov demonstrates that an individual's choice between two pronunciations of the diphthong in a word like "might" indicates whether he desires to belong to the local community or to reject it. Thus, language change can be seen operating through social processes of group identification, with the behavior of the individual highly correlated to the use of a linguistic feature he himself may not be aware of. Although young, sociolinguistics has an extensive bibliography which demonstrates a wide range of thought. Practical limitations of time and space prevent this issue from being "representative." It is, however, indicative.

Speculation about the relationship between language use and social structure is no recent phenomenon. That this is so should not be surprising—for whenever modern man becomes urbanized, varying forms are brought from the countryside and into contact, leading to the development of spoken and written standard forms which their adherents see as being superior both to rural dialects and to non-standard varieties in the cities. For the most part, until the present century, speculation about intra-language variation was quite often moralistically-based self-justification for those who considered themselves standard speakers and writers. Or, in the reverse mood of self-abnegation, dialects were considered the more worthy forms of the language, uncorrupted by the artificiality of urban life. Thus, when historical linguists of the nineteenth century encountered problems in tracing the development of language forms from earlier times to their current standards, they sought to obtain forms from rural dialects thinking that the countryside would yield more "pure" data. What they found, of course, were even more complications. The dichotomy between the standard languages (of London, Paris, Rome, etc.) and dialects was (and to a great extent is) considered to be a definite one, linked to a superior-inferior judgment.

As indicated above, rural dialects were not the only variant forms of a language which came under scrutiny. In eighteenth-century England much attention was focused on the notions of good English versus bad English, standard versus non-standard. All of us who have ever had to cope with the slippery matters of usage—"hadn't ought," "shall or will," double negatives, etc.—are heirs to dicta laid down by the Bishop Lowth's, the Dr. Johnson's and other writers involved in the attempt to standardize and fix the English language. London, of course, had been in the process of developing and becoming a standard for close to four hundred years, doing so by drawing together and fusing forms from a wide variety of geographical

dialects brought from all over England, raising the resulting amalgamation to a written standard followed in time by a spoken standard. But in the eighteenth century (and of course to the present) there were still many variant forms to be heard among people of various social classes. Naturally (or so it seemed), some forms were better than others, and it happened that the better forms were those of the best people, including the writers themselves. Popular opinion today reflects the more scholarly opinion of one and two centuries ago.

During the present century, scholars known as linguistic geographers (or dialectologists) began to examine speech variation in a more systematic manner. Equipped with research into population movements and cultural change, especially-prepared questionnaires, and field workers trained in both linguistics and dialectology, they went into the field to collect geographically varying forms of a language. Not only did they find geographical variations, which they interpreted culturally as well as linguistically, but they also found much variation within an area, even within a community. Thus, when in the 1920's American linguists turned their attention to American English variations through a project known as the *Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada*, directed initially by Hans Kurath, they altered the European models of such studies by specifying that informants be grouped into one of three social types. With a continuing interest in social variation existing within geographical speech areas, this project continues today under the direction of Raven I. McDavid, a contributor to this issue.

During the 1940's and 1950's, anthropology, a field with close connections to American linguistic study, turned its attention to social variation in language. Cultural anthropologists such as William Bright reported on such matters as linguistic variation as a function of caste status in a village in India. Sociology, too, was contributing to the developing study of the interaction of speech and social structure through studies in the sociology of language as well as the study of social structure itself.

But it has been the last ten years which have witnessed a rapid expansion, intensification and integration of the systematic explanations of the linguistic implications of social structure (and to a certain extent, the social implications of linguistic variation). This rapidly developing field, which goes under the cover term of *sociolinguistics*, receives contributions from a number of older disciplines—principally anthropology, sociology, linguistics—but also from psychology, speech and others. Although each has had its own goals and methods, at least partial fusion appears to be inevitable.

During this past decade the above-mentioned approaches operated on the assumption that speakers who belong to a given culture learn not only the grammar of their native language but also rules of speech usage which are to be applied by differing sub-groups (defined by social status, age, sex, etc.) in appropriate situations. Much of the work in the field has been directed at the implications of this assumption. Thus, Basil Bernstein, a sociologist working in London in the early 1960's, studied lower-class and middle-class informants, formulating the concept of elaborated versus restricted code in which lower-class speakers were seen as having a restricted code which allowed fewer syntactic and conceptual complications and integrations than the middle-class elaborated code. This controversial view was adopted in modified form by a number of American educational psychologists who introduced the concept, often labeled deficit theory, into many Headstart programs.

In this country sociolinguists turned their attention to urban settings where social markings of speech behavior are usually quite salient. William Labov in New York City and Walt Wolfram, Ralph Fasold and Roger Shuy in Detroit used

standard sociometric techniques and devices to study language variation and its correlation to social status. Out of these and similar studies came an interest in the speech of a specific sub-group—Blacks. Work in Black English (the speech of lower-class, usually young Blacks) has been the most concentrated study of any social group. Black speech studies in New York City, Detroit, Washington, D. C., Memphis and elsewhere have yielded controversies of their own. Most notable is the disagreement between those who believe that the speech of Blacks is historically derivable in most part the same way all other American dialects are, that is, as a result of poly-dialectical English colonization, and those who hold that Black speech is derived from a creole language (a nativized *lingua franca* resulting from the fusion of two languages) brought from Africa, a base which is held to be still apparent in the speech of many Blacks. (One of the leading exponents of this position, J. L. Dillard, is a contributor to this issue.) A pedagogical consequence of the latter view is that Black English speakers should be treated, to a limited extent, as speakers of a foreign language, with special texts, drills, etc., to initiate them into written language skills and, perhaps, into spoken standard. Out of these and other urban language studies (such as Lee Pederson's in Chicago) have come an array of methodological tools forged from existing techniques of sociology, linguistic geography and the experience of the researchers themselves.

American cultural and social anthropologists have given us another strain of sociolinguistics, one referred to as ethnography of communication or ethnolinguistics, the study of the competence of intuitive knowledge of the members of a culture. John Gumperz, Dell Hymes and Joshua Fishman (a contributor to this issue) have published prolifically in this area, with some of the most powerful insights coming from studies of bilingualism, such as that of Puerto Ricans in New York City. A somewhat related issue is that of the study of creole languages (which in turn is related to the study of Black English, as indicated above). The work of David DeCamp, Derek Bickerton, Beryl Bailey and others in the somewhat special problems of creole languages has presented useful research tools (such as the implicational series techniques of arranging variable data used by James C. Woodward in this issue) and valuable insights into more conventional language situations.

And finally there is sociolinguistic research which seeks as one of its primary goals to develop insights into the linguistic process itself through the advancement of linguistic theory. This is not to say that work in the above areas is not conducive to such use—it is more a matter of emphasis on a socio-to-linguistic scale. Research in this area by such linguists as William Labov, Walt Wolfram, Ralph Fasold and C. N. J. Bailey uses variable linguistic data to help explain mechanics of historical language change and to refine standard generative linguistic theory by introducing variable rules to replace optional rules. The concept of variable rule is a controversial one as it not only introduces extra-linguistic (social) parameters into the notion of linguistic competence (the set of internalized rules every native speaker has which allows him to produce and comprehend his language) but also because it is based on statistical data, whereas in standard theory linguistic rules do or do not operate, without reference to statistical fluctuations of observed data. Linguistically-oriented sociolinguistics, moreover, like all other areas of sociolinguistics, is very firmly empirically based, whereas standard generative work is intuitive in practice as well as in theory. Recent work in this area of sociolinguistics has departed from earlier and other sociolinguistic research by asserting the primacy of linguistic data in determining social categories rather than using standard sociological breakdowns as the frame onto which linguistic data is attached.

The articles in this issue, of course, speak for themselves. They are arranged with more general articles interspersed among the more specific articles; also, when possible, articles have been arranged so that those dealing with similar topics or taking contrasting views are adjacent. Neither in fact nor intent is this special issue comprehensive or integrated; it is a sampling of the kind of work that is done under the rubric "sociolinguistics." Reid Luhman's "On Language Use and Social Structure" draws on Piaget's studies in the cognitive development of children as well as studies of bilingualism to suggest a view of social structure in which it is both marked by and defined by varying uses of linguistic structures. A more specific sociologically-oriented study is Joshua Fishman's interpretation of varieties of Yiddish as being in part a result of a creolization process in his "The Phenomenological and Linguistic Pilgrimage of Yiddish."

Raven I. McDavid and Raymond O'Cain in "Sociolinguistics and Linguistic Geography" comprehensively comment on the growing pains of the multifaceted new field of study and in the process illumine the overlapping nature and purposes of both approaches indicated in their title. J. L. Dillard's "The American Koine-Origin, Rise, and Plateau Stage" approaches the problem of the historical development of American English varieties from the perspective of a creolist, developing a *koine* theory of rapid early homogenization of English in America as opposed to the view which holds that a mixture of English dialects results in present standard and dialectal American English. James C. Woodward applies the concept of *diglossia* (different languages coexisting but used for different purposes) and the technical tool of implicational analysis to variations in the use of sign languages among the deaf. Similarly, Gerald Denning, within a context of characterizing recent sociolinguistic research, examines some linguistic consequences of Spanish-English bilingualism in Kansas.

The final two articles deal with sociolinguistics as applied to the study of Black English. From slightly different perspectives the authors reach some of the same conclusions but with important differences. Robert Hopper, arguing against earlier deficit and bi-dialectal approaches to pedagogical problems of Black English speakers, redefines the problem and suggests an alternative approach. Glendon Drake argues forcefully for social attitudes as the basic operator in the Black English situation and suggests that any approach, linguistic or otherwise, which does not take this into account will fail.

The above brief outline is intended to orient the reader of this issue who may be totally new to the field of sociolinguistics. The categories will dissolve under informed scrutiny. Goals, emphasis, and techniques vary almost directly with the individual researcher. Many more names of leading researchers could have been cited. Further areas of research that could be termed "sociolinguistic" certainly exist. Sociolinguistics is a young, developing field, where the process of sifting, winnowing, mixing and blending of goals and techniques is really just beginning. Through reading this issue, pursuing the bibliographical references in it and seeking out references to the above-cited researchers, the interested reader could quickly make himself a knowledgeable observer of a fascinating and increasingly important field of study.

James W. Hartman
University of Kansas
December, 1973