Sociolinguistics

Revolution or Interdiscipline?

WOLFGANG WÖLCK
State University of New York, Buffalo

INTRODUCTION

A VAST FIELD

This introductory paragraph could better be entitled "limitations," because the space for each contributor makes it impossible to give even a condensed survey of sociolinguistics. Over the past ten years it has not only been the most representative new area of research in the discipline of linguistics, it has, in addition, become a solid part of many other social sciences, notably of anthropology, sociology, and social psychology; and many other fields of knowledge, e.g., education and the language arts, have contributed their share to this interdisciplinary field called sociolinguistics. Fortunately, there have been so many assessments and reviews of our field or parts of it in the recent and not

so recent past (e.g., Luckmann, 1969; Mathiot, 1969; Ornstein and Murphy, 1974; Grimshaw, 1974), including review-like introductions to proceedings and collections (e.g., Kjolseth, 1971), that the reader who is looking for some particular kind of information will be able to find it in someone else's account if not here.

Besides being inappropriate, even a selective bibliography would be impossible within this space. One highly selective bibliography of sociolinguistics five years ago contained 45 two-column fine-print large pages of items (Kjolseth and Sack, 1971: 349-393). A more recent one is book-length (Simon, 1974). Special bibliographies on particular research topics within our field are often of book-length, e.g., on American Black English (Brasch and Brasch, 1974, 2,100 entries), pidgins and creoles (Reinecke et al., 1975), or bilingual education (Anderson and Boyer, 1970, 2: 151-243). After the first series of anthologies and collections, there appeared several textbooks of our field, starting with Fishman's (1970).

I mention these facts not so much as an excuse or justification for the selection of topics which I am going to touch upon, but rather as a brief documentation of the vast dimensions of this still growing field of study.

SUBJECT MATTER AND GOALS

Therefore, a quick and ready definition of sociolinguistics is equally difficult, partly because of its interdisciplinary character. Some of the statements in Bright's (1966: 11f.) first collection under the title of this article have still not lost their validity through frequent repetition. The subject matter of sociolinguistics is linguistic diversity, and its goal is the description of the relationship or mutual influence between linguistic behavior and other societal or social psychological factors—and, ultimately, the development of a multiaspectual model (Fishman, 1972b) for the treatment of language as a mode of human social interaction.

This clearly empirical, or rather empiricist, basis distinguishes sociolinguistic research from the more strictly rationalist foundations of transformational-generative linguistics in its standard and revised standard form (Chomsky, 1957, 1965), with its main analytical and explanatory focus on the grammatical competence of a somewhat idealized speaker-listener unit (Chomsky, 1965: 3). The concern with

linguistic diversity brought sociolinguistic research necessarily to the task of dealing mostly with so-called surface phenomena, i.e., with linguistic performance. While it gave up the cold comfort of the abstract homogeneity of a grammar of a language imputed to be within the knowledge or intuition of "the native speaker," it established an alternative model of "communicative competence" and linguistic "repertoires" (Gumperz, 1964, 1972; Habermas, 1971) whose locus of patterning is the "speech community" and not the individual (Labov, 1966a: 103f.; Gumperz, 1968). Transformational-generative linguistics has been accused of providing at best a theory of grammar and not a theory of language as it has claimed (Fillmore, 1972). Perhaps it would be fairer to say that it has tried to establish a theory of linguistic competence. Sociolinguistics might, therefore, claim to be developing a theory of linguistic performance or, better, one of communicative competence. There is no doubt that this is one of its theoretical goals, but, on the one hand, the usefulness of the competence-performance distinction has become rather questionable (Labov, 1971a: 468), and, on the other hand, sociolinguistics has not yet developed a clear and unified enough theoretical basis to claim disciplinary independence. Its main advances are of a methodological nature and, perhaps, good enough to be called theoretical in the American tradition—which often includes methodology in theoretical categories.

Rather than continue along dubious theoretical lines, I admit and confess my personal biases in favor of certain linguistic and social psychological aspects of sociolinguistic research; and I add that as a linguist who has had some training and practice in the study of dialectology and bilingualism, I believe that I can do no better than select for this brief review some fields of scientific research and development which are not only representative of the field of sociolinguistics but also close to my personal knowledge and current activity. Besides, as early as 1971, Hymes, as one anthropologist, declared "sociolinguistics as linguistics" (title of a lecture at the Buffalo Linguistic Institute, July 1971).

THE GROWTH OF SOCIOLINGUISTICS

TWO DEVELOPMENTAL MODELS
IN COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

The fundamentally comparative character of sociolinguistics brings it into close relationship with the traditionally most comparative field

of linguistic research, namely that of dialectology (cf. Malkiel, 1976). Dialectology is, however, only one of the two principal branches of comparative linguistics—i.e., the one dealing with the comparison of genetically related varieties. The other branch, which concerns itself with the comparison of varieties whose genetic relationship is not a definitional prerequisite for the analytical process—including, e.g., studies of bilingualism and contrastive linguistics—has made equally important contributions to the development of sociolinguistics. It has, however, and perhaps unfortunately, not yet developed a methodology independent from the other branch, though its similar goals make this close dependency on the former quite justifiable. I shall return to this branch and some of its problems later.

The clarification of the complex process of linguistic change has been the ultimate goal of comparative linguistics, probably since long before neogrammarian days. Historical (comparative) linguistics and dialectology, in particular historical dialectology, are so inseparable as to be almost indistinguishable. The genealogical or "family tree" schema, in which at least the Indo-European languages are still presented in every introductory linguistics text, assumes not only pure ontogeny (or phylogeny; cf. Hockett, 1948: 353 ff.), but even *monogenesis* in the development of new languages through dialectalization at earlier stages. Some awkward cases, such as the development of the (classical) Greek koiné or the amalgamation of Norman French and Anglo-Saxon into Middle English, had to be accommodated by making some branches grow together again, as in the former case, or by having a couple of twigs cross between two branches.

This neat, though rather aseptic, schema of language development has had a competitor since as early as the mid-nineteenth century. Suggesting an analogy from physics through its label, Schmidt's "Wellentheorie" (1872), called in English "wave theory," saw linguistic change originating at specific points, spreading concentrically or centrifugally and losing force through gradual attrition unless met by counteracting forces emanating from other points of origin or stopped by other barriers, physical or social. This model does not stand alone in what since have been called the social sciences. Christhaller's "Zentral-ortstheorie" (1931; central place theory; cf. Berry and Pred, 1961) tried to account for settlement processes in much the same way; and modern spatial diffusion theory (Brown, 1968; Hagerstrand, 1967), with its detailed specification of sources, carriers, and barriers divided into penetrable, absorbing, and reflecting, in close relation with human

geography, proceeds along very much the same lines as the social and cultural diffusion models of contemporary sociology and anthropology (Rogers, 1962).

Early dialectologists developed a schematic map of linguistic diversity within the wave theory, or diffusionist model, divided into three representative areas of linguistic distribution: urban "focal" areas—i.e., centers of linguistic innovation and great comunication density from which new trends radiated out into the hinterland; rural or "relic" areas so remote from the focal areas as to be left practically untouched by their influence; and "transition" areas at the overlap between the radiations of competing centers.

TRADITIONAL DIALECTOLOGY

Since the process of linguistic change occurs most actively in the "focal" centers, we would have expected our predecessors in the profession to concentrate their attention on these areas—the cultural centers or cities. They must have intended to do so. Why else the elaborate schema with its obvious "focus"? We do know, nevertheless, that they went in the opposite, most unlikely direction—namely, mostly to the relic areas—for their dialectological investigations. We can only read between the lines and speculate with hindsight why this happened: the factors to be considered in urban centers were too numerous and too unmanageable for that stage in the development of the social sciences. Our predecessors did not have the methodological tools needed for the treatment of complex and heterogeneous communication networks. In remote rural areas the social stratification of the population has a much narrower range, and linguistic behavior approaches homogeneity there, particularly if younger population groups are excluded. The withdrawal into relic areas, therefore, justified their concentration on regional, geographic distribution of linguistic variables. The new tradition at the turn of the century, of mapping this distribution into linguistic atlases, on the one hand, and the established predilection for conserving historically older forms of the language on the other, provided further reasons for this combination of linguistic geography and "linguistic archeology"[1] which has characterized the bulk of dialectological studies all over the world ever since.

This does not mean, however, that dialectologists paid absolutely no attention to social variables other than geographic space. The

German Romanist tradition known as "Wörter und Sachen" (words and things), which combined linguistic geography with a kind of cultural ethnography, began in the 1930s and continues into the present, particularly in the Romance language area, including Latin America (cf. Malkiel, 1976). From the earliest days of organized linguistic atlas work on North American English, a few social factors such as age, education, and social contacts were included among the listed informant characteristics, even though rather informally (Kurath et al., 1939: 44f.; Kurath and McDavid, 1961: 11f.). A more notable exception to the rule is Gauchat's (1905) study of the behavior of a number of vowels across three generations in a Swiss village at the beginning of the century; it was followed up about a generation later by Hermann (1929), the famous Indo-Europeanist. Another early example of the inclusion of social factors in dialect analysis is the work of McDavid (1948), who still coordinates regional linguistic atlas work on U.S. and Canadian English.

**MULTIDISCIPLINARY READINESS
AND SOME POLITICAL HELP**

Unlike what is sometimes claimed for certain scientific innovations—as, for example, the introduction of transformational-generative theory—the development of sociolinguistics cannot properly be called revolutionary. More appropriately, it should be seen as the honest product of the maturation process in several social sciences—not just of linguistics, but also of sociology (cf. Luckmann, 1969), anthropology, and social psychology. The mathematical philosophical formalism developed by linguistics, particularly of the transformational-generative school, added systematic rigor and theoretical independence to the preceding structuralist efforts and cemented the reputation and acceptance of linguistics as a discipline, to the extent that it became a model for other sciences.

In the vanguard of scholars who preceded and helped initiate the new movement was Weinreich. His classic study of bilingualism (1953) was an extension of his active concern with the systematization of dialect differentiation (1954) and an effort toward the clarification of linguistic change. From a rather different base, but with similar goals, came the contributions to an understanding of processes of language contact by Haugen (1950, 1956). The first rigorous study, which tried to show the

systematic covariance of social factors and linguistic behavior, however, was undertaken by Weinreich's master disciple, Labov (1963)—who has since exerted a guiding influence on sociolinguistics. His and his former teacher's thoughts on linguistic change were summarized a few years later in a challenging article (Weinreich et al., 1968). This new interdisciplinary target area would probably have developed further at a regular rate, had it not been for certain political constellations of the early and mid-sixties in the United States; suddenly this budding research area became prominent. It is no coincidence that this boom of interest, research, and publication in our field followed soon upon the violent demonstrations of racial conflict in several large U.S. cities in the summer of 1963, leading to new civil rights legislation in 1964. The well-known dependency triad of language communication-education-social mobility (cf. Delgado, 1971: 72f.) was a factor in persuading governmental agencies to seek possible solutions to the problems of racial discrimination and poverty through remedial language and education programs; and considerable funds were made available to sociolinguists for diagnosing the malady (cf. Dittmar, 1975). Dialectologists seemed to be among the best qualified to attack the problem (Shuy, 1965), but were now obliged to direct their attention to cities or, more specifically, to ghettos of the "inner city," where socially "disadvantaged" were concentrated. Fairly comprehensive surveys were conducted in Chicago by the McDavids, Davis, Austin and Pedersen; and in Detroit (Shuy et al., 1968) with urban blacks as the main target population (Wolfram, 1969). We should not forget to point out that the McDavids warned of the problems inherent in the black/white speech differential long before the open conflict and the ensuing Black English boom (McDavid and McDavid, 1951). Urban or, more generally, social dialectology become the preferred—if not prescribed, though at least funded—task of modern dialectologists.

THE "BOOM"

Fortunately, the advances in the social sciences and, particularly, the coming of age of linguistics, as pointed out earlier, provided a climate of professional security in each discipline conducive to productive interdisciplinary collaboration; this climate helped our colleagues tackle somewhat more successfully the problem of multivariant analysis which they now faced in the city and which had driven their predecessors

"back into the woods." The milestone in the development of the survey methodology necessary for urban language studies was marked by Labov's (1966b) doctoral dissertation and by the journal articles which accompanied it. In the same year the proceedings of the first meeting organized under the new general theme "sociolinguistics" (Bright, 1966) were published, shortly after Hymes' classic anthology, *Language in Culture and Society* (1964a), an excellent collection of "pre-boom" studies relevant to our field. Concerns with Black English led to renewed interest in the phenomenon of language creolization (Hymes, 1971). The inclusion of other linguistic and ethnic minorities—beginning with Spanish-Americans—as problem target poulations reactivated the study of language and dialect contact processes (cf. Macnamara, 1967). Barker's (1947, 1958) famous study of the social function of Mexican-American Pachuco in Tucson preceded the "boom." While it was mostly individual bilingualism which had attracted the attention of some linguists and psychologists before then, it now became obvious that societal bilingualism characterizes large portions of the world's population. In the United States, Fishman's work became an orientation and guide (1964, 1965; Fishman et al., 1966). Particularly for the postcolonial Third World countries, the social importance of their multilingual composition now was obvious to outsiders; it was made the object of study in Asia and the Middle East, where Ferguson's and Gumperz' work had preceded the new trend (Ferguson and Gumperz, 1960; Ferguson, 1959; Gumperz, 1962, 1964), in Africa (Whiteley, 1971), and in Latin America (Albo, 1970; Escobar, 1972; LePage, 1972; Rubin, 1968; Wolck, 1972), providing a flood of new interesting data.

Though they are relevant at least at educational levels in any community—because of always existing dialect variation and possible diglossia (Ferguson, 1959)—questions of language policy are more obviously important in traditionally multilingual societies; these questions became the target of sociolinguistic research, from both a sociopolitical (Das Gupta, 1970; Heath, 1972) and a more anthropological linguistic point of view, directed at language standardization processes (Garvin and Mathiot, 1960; Garvin, 1959). They have since been recognized as constituting a separate field of interest within general sociolinguistics, called language planning (Rubin and Jernudd, 1971; Haugen, 1966; Fishman et al., 1968).

ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROBLEMS

TWO PRINCIPAL INNOVATIONS

Survey methodology. For most people it appears obvious that any endeavor in the social sciences must concern itself with the description and explanation of naturally occurring behavior before any generalizations or abstractions can be attempted; or, if that sounds too atheoretical, that any theoretical assumptions or claims must be clearly documented through representative data. This social-data orientation and the requirement of what I would like to call "representational adequacy" made it impossible for sociolinguistic research to bear results and gain insights by mere theoretical speculation and intuition or by practicing what Fillmore (1972) aptly calls "armchair" linguistics. From its very beginning, research in the social context of language has obliged investigators to establish a solid reliable data base for their analyses and conclusions. This task goes far beyond the traditional principles of linguistic fieldwork, with its stress on *how* to get data and how to arrange and catalog them later (Samarin, 1967); however, the first is very important if we are interested in natural, casual—and not only in formally "elicited"—behavior. Of much greater importance for the sociolinguist, however, is the decision about *what* kind of data to get and *from whom.* The latter task forces the sociolinguist into direct contact with live speakers in natural communicative situations and, thus, makes sociolinguistics into "people's linguistics" or field linguistics of a special kind.

The methodological task of survey research design, together with experimental design, has necessarily occupied us ever since Labov (1966a, 1966b, 1971b, 1972b) clearly demonstrated its need and showed us the way. In addition, we have since learned much from the rich literature of sociology, social psychology, and anthropology (Blalock, 1960, 1970; Oppenheim, 1966; Naroll, 1970; Fishman et al., 1971), particularly in the two important areas of sampling and interview techniques. The question of the measurability of the relevance or significance of our results had to be raised in the same context, and has by now made it at least embarrassing for a sociolinguist to admit total ignorance of statistics.

Functionalism. The other fundamental innovation is of a rather different kind and is more axiomatic. It is the renewed and more

specified concern with the determination and description of the functions of language, most convincingly represented by Hymes (1964b) in his work on the ethnography of speaking. The study of the functions of language has had a long history ever since Bühler and the early Prague School days. Hymes' early work on language functions could still be seen as a continuation of this tradition. In his 1972 article, however, Hymes is clearly taking the full consequence of what had only been implicit in his earlier position; here he insists on a study of language functions first, to precede that of linguistic forms and structures which should then be categorized and interpreted according to the way in which they serve the previously determined functions. This insistence would be a revolutionary change if sociolinguistics could take credit for it—one that could lead to the development of a theory of its own and make it into a separate, independent discipline. As fascinating and attractive as this goal is, we are far from even an operational definition of functions or the elaboration of methods to get to them (cf. Mathiot, 1971).

SOCIOLINGUISTIC DIAGNOSTICS

Social variables. It is fortunate that our new interdiscipline apparently placed a high priority on the determination of the social factors which stand in a relation of covariance with linguistic behavior. Bright's (1966) introduction to the proceedings of the 1964 conference attempts to establish a list of the dimensions of the new field of research. Hymes' effort in cataloging factors and functions which characterize speech events (1964b) further complements the set. Whatever could not be categorized more specifically under a more concrete rubric, however, ended up under the cover term "situation" or "setting," with an occasional attempt to distinguish between the two. Into this catchall category Ervin (1964) introduced some order by distinguishing locality and time factors as well as social roles of participants, with a scale of the stability of such roles. Goffman put his finger on this weak point in our research by addressing an article to "the neglected situation" (1964) in which he suggested further analysis of multiple "gatherings" and face-to-face encounters" according to participant behavior. Ethnographic analysis of communication seems to be the key to this problem; and it is certainly an important improvement over the mere transfer into our research designs of some simple demographic categories, like age and

sex, or of some more complex ones, like socioeconomic class or status, with its various weightings of the conventional constituents of occupation, education, income, and housing. This is not to deny that these factors might not intervene as possibly important correlates or determinants of linguistic behavior (cf. Key, 1975), but it is naive to assume that their relative importance or diagnostic value is the same in all so-called situations. Our special research tasks need special methods, sampling being just one example, and traditional demographic statistical methods are not fully adequate to the task of finding the community-specific significance of social factors in correlation with linguistic ones, nor can they show their hierarchies or Guttman-scale values (Wölck, 1976). At least for retrospection, multivariable analysis programs have become available to measure and possibly eliminate certain factors post factum (Nie et al., 1970); and we have long known about qualitative data analysis in distinction from mere quantification (Maxwell, 1961). Nevertheless, since the early thrust in the mid-sixties, too little attention has been paid to finding the social factors that are diagnostic of linguistic behavior, and we are in constant danger of falling back into early dialectology or of merely repeating some demographic exercises.

Linguistic variables. Of equal or, more correctly, parallel importance is the determination of socially significant or "diagnostic" linguistic variables and of the degree of their diagnosticity. Again, we are indebted to Labov (1964, 1965, 1966a, 1966b). With very few exceptions (Labov, 1969, 1970), however, the available studies use phonological variables— not because they are the most significant, but rather because comparative linguists have generally been better trained in phonological analysis and because phonological phenomena are more easily detectable and quantifiable.

With the aim of formalizing linguistic variability and incorporating this obvious, though formally cumbersome, phenomenon in a basically monosystemic grammar, Labov (1969) developed a new rule format which was able to accommodate inherent phonotactic variability, social variability according to a few known social factors, and a frequency probability quotient of the occurrence of the particular phenomenon in a "variable rule." This model was further developed (Fasold, 1970) into proposals of "polylectal" (Bickerton, 1972) or "pan-dialectical" (Bailey, 1973) grammars. In addition, it gave some important insights into the complexity of creolization processes—and

the so-called creole continuum—and, therefore, into the process of language change and development, at least in a unilinear direction.

On the question of the social diagnosticity of linguistic variables, however, social psychologists have made more progress than linguists in the use of attitude studies. Until we have a diagnostic scale or some other criterion for selection, our inclusion or exclusion of particular forms or structures in a grammar is rather arbitrary.

LANGUAGE ATTITUDE STUDIES

The study of language in its social context finally convinced linguists—who had so far used "informants" as somewhat bloodless sources of data for "objective" analysis—that much could be learned from a speech community's or its members' subjective associations with certain linguistic utterances, both their own and other people's. Again, in his dissertation, Labov (1966b) was one of the first linguists to use subjective reaction measures. Social psychologists, however, both in Europe and in North America, had been developing a rich literature on attitude measurement since the forties (cf. Oppenheim, 1966). In the field of language attitude studies, the work of Lambert and his Canadian associates has assumed a leading role (Lambert et al., 1960, 1966; see also Agheytsi and Fishman, 1970, for an early summary of these and other studies). Most of this work is concerned with the assessment of the differential values associated with particular varieties of language in bidialectal and bilingual situations.

It will be useful here to make a distinction between studies in which reactions to language stimuli are elicited for the analysis of these very stimuli—i.e., for purposes of a linguistic diagnostic of the kind advocated in the preceding section—and those in which language stimuli are used to elicit associations along certain scales of social evaluation. Only the latter should properly be called attitude studies in the true sense, while for the former we had better reverse the label "subjective reaction tests." One problem with the recent proliferation of attitude studies, particularly with those trying to establish attitude profiles along formal evaluative scales, is the often unreflected use of values or evaluative labels from Osgood's semantic differential technique (Osgood et al., 1957). The intended universal use of these terms makes it highly unlikely that they adequately represent the unique social-cultural values of a specific community (cf. Wölck, 1973: 135f.).

Much more attention will have to be paid to a careful selection of these terms if we want them to serve as a reliable measure against which to check attitudinal responses to language. The field of ethnosemantics can help here (Mathiot, 1968), and the reward of discovering community social values in the process may well be worth the trouble.

POLYSYSTEMIC REPERTOIRES

Typology of bilingualism. In the wake of the "discovery" of the ethnic and linguistic minorities in the United States, bilingual education programs were established in most large cities with traditional Spanish-American and/or oriental inmigrant populations, and occasionally even with European ones. This new institution stimulated research in second-language acquisition and cognitive processes (see Burt and Dulay, 1975) and brought the fields of sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics very close together. Foreign language teaching and, particularly, the field of teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL), the two traditional areas of applied linguistics, quickly reorganized to participate in the new endeavor (Paulston, forthcoming). TEFL became TESL, the teaching of English as a second language, and TESOL, teaching English to speakers of other languages—and there was even "the teaching of Standard English to speakers of other dialects," with some new acronym. Without going into further discussion of this enormous field, it is important and sufficient to note that through the need for establishing a sociocultural and social psychological base in its new endeavors, a large amount of traditional applied linguistics became applied sociolinguistics and, thus, a part of sociolinguistics. The annual Georgetown University Round Table, which through its choice of topics usually serves as a representative index for the relevance or popularity of particular trends in linguistics, put bilingualism on its agenda for 1970—and almost half of the contributions dealt with educational aspects (Alatis, 1970).

Here, however, I focus on the assessment of kinds and degrees of bilingualism as a prerequisite not only for any effective bilingual education, but, at a higher level, for any language policy or planning effort. There exist a number of attempts to establish criteria for profiles or typologies of multilingual nations and communities, with varying amounts of detail and thoroughness of organization (Stewart, 1962; Ferguson, 1966; Kloss, 1966). Kloss, who began work on this topic in the

twenties (Kloss, 1927), has since devoted most of his time to this task. A solution to this problem requires first that we make an honest attempt to differentiate between types of linguistic varieties along social dimensions rather than continue in our comfortable linguistic egalitarianism (Hymes, 1972: 313-333)—although Bernstein's many efforts (e.g., 1966, 1964) at distinguishing between "elaborated" and "restricted" codes have been too easily confused with certain elitist suggestions of verbal and cognitive deficiencies of certain classes of speakers. Language attitude studies have helped to show the prestige differential between different languages and dialects. In assessing the linguistic behavior of bilingual individuals, however, we have not come much farther than the very limited and idealized model proposed by Osgood and Ervin (1964), who tried to distinguish between what we might now consider as processes of coordinating and compounding two lexical semantic systems. Rona (forthcoming) has added some interesting thoughts on this problem, which still needs work.

Grammatical models. Ever since Weinreich's early attempts at characterized bilingual interference (1953) and dialectal variation in "diasystems" (1954; cf. also Pulgram, 1964; Wölck, 1965), the systematization of linguistic variation within some overall structural pattern (cf. Smith's "morphophone," 1967) or the accommodation of constituent systems in "supersystems" has been attempted by scholars of every grammatical persuasion, from generative phonology (cf. Keyser, 1963) to the latest variation theory models mentioned earlier. The problem has never been satisfactorily resolved, not even for genetically related varieties (dialects), partly because of the comparative incompatibility between physical, observable features and their abstractions in structural systemic constructs. The question is obviously much more serious in the comparative analysis of unrelated varieties or different languages, where phenomena attributable to what I have called linguistic "fusion," distinct from interference, have produced bilingual dialects (Escobar, 1976) for whose grammatical formalization the available models of phonological rules are apparently inadequate. Most previous models of grammatical description have been monosystematic and unilinear or, at least, unidirectional. This characteristic is most pronounced in the structuralist and transformational-generative models. Variable rules, therefore, might serve well to accommodate what was appropriately called "inherent" linguistic variation and are, perhaps, able to capture

the "continuum" of creolization (but see Alleyne, 1971). The complex phenomena of actual bilingual behavior cannot, however, be accurately captured in these monosystematic models. Something closer to the old diasystemic approach is needed. A new development in the contrastive analysis of language—called "error analysis"—though still dependent on a simple interference model of foreign language learning (cf. Corder, 1967; Nickel, 1971), could be made into a useful tool for predicting and diagnosing actual bilingual (linguistic) conflict areas. We might also have to abandon the idea that the "supersystem" is just a more comprehensive version of its various constituent systems. So far we know very little about the formal structure of bilingual grammars, although some interesting beginnings have been made (Gumperz, 1967; Haugen, 1970; Burt et al., 1976).

THE ESTABLISHMENT

When the theme of the 1972 Georgetown Round Table was announced as sociolinguistics (Shuy, 1972), some of us feared that this might be its swan song. The beginning of the economic crisis partly may have prompted this fear. Obviously, we were mistaken. Maybe the fact that it does not owe its existence to a revolutionary change but rather to a more or less natural development has been an advantage. Transformational-generative grammar has long ceased to be big news, and many of its earlier proponents are modifying their views along more sociolinguistic lines (Ross, 1972; Fillmore, 1972; Fraser, 1972). The abandoning of the strict sentence model, the discussion of discourse grammars (Longacre, 1970; Longacre et al., 1971) and of speech acts by philosophers and linguists (Searle, 1969; Sadock, 1974), and the beginnings of conversational analysis (Sacks et al., 1974) are due to the recognition of the social context of language as a constituent framework. Sociolinguistics has remained the most actively pursued target area, at least within linguistics, where the generativist search for universals has been modified into a preference for typological studies; such studies can be considered the only other mainstream trend in present-day linguistics.

Meetings and publications on sociolinguistic topics proliferate. The contribution of linguistics to the 1973 Congress of the American Association for the Advancement of Science was a symposium on sociolinguistics and language planning, with an emphasis on Latin

America (Wölck and Lastra, forthcoming). Language planning will be the focus of the 1977 Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America and has been the theme of a new collection (Fishman, 1974). Variation theory is treated at a new series of annual meetings which started under the title "New Ways of Analysing Variation in English" (Bailey and Shuy, 1973; Fasold and Shuy, 1975), abbreviated as "NewWAVE";[2] and the closely related creolization studies have shown new results (DeCamp and Hancock, 1974; Bickerton, 1975). Social dialectology has changed its focus from urban American English (Wolfram and Fasold, 1974) to rural American English (Wolfram and Christian, 1976) and to more general concerns (Rona and Wölck, 1976). Language attitude studies have been presented in three new collections (Shuy and Fasold, 1973; Cooper, 1974, 1975) and one excellent research digest (Giles and Powesland, 1975). My German compatriots, whom Fishman (1971: 34) found rather inactive, have since produced both general works (Hartig and Kurt, 1971; Luckmann, 1975) and research reports, the latter mostly on the language problems of foreign migrant workers in their country (Klein and Dittmar, 1975). Two sociolinguistic journals were started in 1972: *Language in Society* (D. Hymes, editor), with, perhaps, a slightly more anthropological linguistic focus; and the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (J.A. Fishman, editor), with a more sociological, social-psychological tendency, although these lines are by no means rigid. The Research Committee on Sociolinguistics of the International Sociological Association has been publishing *Sociolinguistics Newsletter* (J. Driessen, current editor), which contains information on teaching, research, and publication in the field. Whoever missed some of the earlier publications of the "great names" in the field has been able to buy each one's collected articles in a single volume in the Stanford series (Ferguson, 1971; Greenberg, 1971; Gumperz, 1971; Haugen, 1972; Lambert, 1972; Fishman, 1972a). Labov's (1972a) and Hymes' (1974) research digests appeared in the Pennsylvania series.

Our interdiscipline is still growing and expanding and has not yet found or taken the time to consider its consolidation as a separate discipline; in this day of the destruction of the rigid boundaries of traditional disciplines in favor of interdisciplinary expansion, it is perhaps just as well.

NOTES

1. Sometimes ironically called "one-foot-in-the-grave" dialectology, because the majority of informants were so old that the investigators were in constant danger of losing them through natural death.

2. The acronym might be an allusion to the "wave theory" model discussed in the "Developmental Models in Comparative Linguistics" section. The fact that the 1977 International Congress of Linguists in Vienna has scheduled an entire plenary session on wave theory in Indo-European studies is an interesting reorientation.

REFERENCES

AGHEYTSI, R. and J. A. FISHMAN (1970) "Language attitude studies: a brief survey of methodological approaches." Anthropological Linguistics 12: 137-157.

ALATIS, J. W. [ed.] (1970) Bilingualism and Language Contact. Georgetown University Round Table, 1970. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

ALBO, J. (1970) Social Constraints on Cochabamba Quechua. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Latin American Studies.

ALLEYNE, M. C. (1971) "Acculturation and the cultural matrix of creolization," pp. 169-186 in D. H. Hymes (ed.) Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

ANDERSON, T. and M. BOYER [eds.] (1970) Bilingual Schooling in the United States. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

BAILEY, C.J.N. (1973) Variation and Linguistic Theory. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

———— and R. W. SHUY [eds.] (1973) New Ways of Analysing Variation in English. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

BARKER, G. C. (1958) Pachuco: An American Spanish Argot and its Social Functions in Tucson, Ariz. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona.

———— (1947) "Social functions of language in a Mexican-American community." Acta Americana 5: 185-202.

BERNSTEIN, B. (1966) "Elaborated and restricted codes: an outline." Soc. Inquiry 36: 254-261.

———— (1964) "Elaborated and restricted codes: their social origins and some consequences," pp. 55-69 in J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (eds.) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

BERRY, B.J.C. and A. PRED (1961) Central Place Studies: A Bibliography of Theory and Application. Bibliographical Series 1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Science Research Institute.

BICKERTON, D. (1975) Dynamics of a Creole System. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

———— (1972) "The structure of polylectal grammars," pp. 17ff. in R. W. Shuy (ed.) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

BLALOCK, H. M. (1970) Introduction to Social Research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

————— (1960) Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

BRASCH, I. W. and W. M. BRASCH (1974) A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography of American Black English. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press.

BRIGHT, W. (1966) "Introduction: dimensions of sociolinguistics," pp. 11-15 in W. Bright (ed.) Sociolinguistics. Proceedings of the 1964 UCLA Conference. The Hague: Mouton.

BROWN, L. A. (1968) Diffusion Dynamics: a review and revision of the quantitative theory of the Spatial Diffusion of Innovation. Lund Studies in Geography 29. Series B.: Human Geography. Lund: Gleerup.

BURT, M. K. and H. C. DULAY [eds.] (1975) New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education: selected papers from the ninth annual TESOL convention, Los Angeles, California, March 4-9, 1975. Washington: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

————— and E. HERNANDEZ (1976) Bilingual Syntax Measure Technical Handbook. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

CHOMSKY, N. (1965) Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

————— (1957) Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

CHRISTHALLER, W. (1931) Die Zentralen Orte in Suddeutschland. Jena [translated as Central Places in Southern Germany, by C. W. Baskin; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966].

COOPER, R. L. [ed.] (1974-1975) "Language attitudes I and II." Int. J. of the Sociology of Language 3 and 6. The Hague: Mouton.

CORDER, S. P. (1971) "Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis." Int. Rev. of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 9: 147-160.

————— (1967) "The significance of learners' errors." Int. Rev. of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching 5: 161-170.

DAS GUPTA, J. (1970) Language Conflict and National Development: Group Politics and National Language Policy in India. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

DeCAMP, D. and I. F. HANCOCK [eds.] (1974) Pidgins and Creoles: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

DELGADO, C. (1971) Problemas Sociales en el Peru Contemporaneo. Serie Peru Problema 6. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

DITTMAR, N. (1975) "Sociolinguistics: a neutral or a politically engaged discipline?" Foundations of Language 13: 251-265.

ERVIN, S. (1964) "An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener," pp. 102-132 in Gumperz and Hymes (eds.) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

ESCOBAR, A. (1976) "Bilingualism and dialectology in Peru," in J. P. Rona and W. Wölck (eds.) Int. J. of the Sociology of Language 9. The Hague: Mouton.

————— [ed.] (1972) El Reto del multilinguismo en el Peru. Peru Problema 9. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

FASOLD, R. W. (1970) "Two models of socially significant linguistic variation." Language 46: 551-563.

————— and R. W. SHUY [eds.] (1975) Analysing Variation in Language. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

FERGUSON, C. A. (1971) Language Structure and Language Use. A. S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and National Development Series 1. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

——— (1966) "National sociolinguistic profile formulas," pp. 309-324 in W. Bright (ed.) Sociolinguistics. Proceedings of the 1964 UCLA Conference. The Hague: Mouton.

——— (1959) "Diglossia." Word 15: 325-340.

——— and J. J. GUMPERZ (1960) "Linguistic diversity in south Asia." Int. J. of Amer. Linguistics 26. Bloomington, IN: Research Center for Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics.

FILLMORE, C. F. (1972) "A grammarian looks to sociolinguistics," pp. 273-287 in R. W. Shuy (ed.) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

FISHMAN, J. A. [ed.] (1974) Advances in Language Planning. The Hague: Mouton.

——— (1972a) Language in Sociocultural Change. A. S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and national Development Series 6. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

——— (1972b) "The sociology of language: an interdisciplinary social science approach to sociolinguistics," in T. A. Sebeok (ed.) Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 12. The Hague: Mouton. (Also in J. A. Fishman (ed.) Advances in the Sociology of Language. 2 vols. The Hague: Mouton.)

——— (1971) "Zur Soziologie der Sprache auf dem 7. Weltkongress für Sociologie," pp. 33-35 in R. Kjolseth and F. Sack (eds.) Zur Soziologie der Sprache. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, special issue 15. Opladen: Wistdeutscher Verlag.

——— (1970) Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

——— (1965) Yiddish in America: Sociolinguistic Description and Analysis. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center for Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics.

——— (1964) "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry." Linguistics 9: 32-70.

———, F. L. COOPER, and R. MA (1971) Bilingualism in the Barrio. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

FISHMAN, J. A., C. A. FERGUSON, and J. DAS GUPTA [eds.] (1968) Language Problems of Developing Nations. New York: John Wiley.

FISHMAN, J. A. et al. with the assistance of M. WARSHAUER et al. (1966) Language Loyalty in the United States (introduction by E. Haugen). The Hague: Mouton.

FRASER, B. (1972) "Optional rules in grammar," pp. 1-16 in R. Shuy (ed.) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

GARVIN, P. L. (1959) "The standard language problem: concepts and methods." Anthropological Linguistics 1: 28-31.

——— and M. MATHIOT (1960) "The urbanization of the Guarani language," pp. 783-790 in A.F.C. Wallace (ed.) Men and Cultures: Selected Papers of the 5th International Congress of Anthropology and Ethnology Sciences. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

GAUCHAT, L. (1905) L'Unité Phonetique dans le Patois d'une Commune. Halle.

GILES, H. and P. F. POWESLAND (1975) Speech Style and Social Evaluation. New York: Academic Press.

GOFFMAN, E. (1964) "The neglected situation," pp. 133-136 in J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (ed.) The Ethnography of Communications. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

GREENBERG, J. H. (1971) Language, Culture and Communication. A.S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and National Development Series 2. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

GRIMSHAW, A. D. (1974) "Sociolinguistics," pp. 49-92 in I. de Sola Pool and W. Schramm (eds.) Handbook of Communication. Skokie, IL: Rand McNally.

GUMPERZ, J. J. (1972) "On the communicative competence of bilinguals: some hypotheses and suggestions for further research." Language in Society 1: 143-154.

————— (1971) Language in Social Groups. A. S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and National Development Series 3. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

————— (1967) "On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication," pp. 48-57 in J. Macnamara (ed.) Problems of Bilingualism. J. of Social Issues 23.

————— (1964) "Linguistic and social interaction in two communities," pp. 137-153 in J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (eds.) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

————— (1962) "Types of linguistic communities." Anthropological Linguistics 4: 28-40.

————— and D. H. HYMES [eds.] (1964) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

HABERMAS, J. (1971) "Vorbereitende Bemerkungen zu einer Theorie der kommunikativen Kompertenz," pp. 101-142 in J. Habermas and N. Luhmann (eds.) Theorie der Gesellschaft oder Sozialtechnologie-Was leistet die Systemforschung? Frankfurt a.M.

HAGERSTRAND, T. (1967) Innovation Diffusion as a Spatial Process. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

HARTIG, M. and U. KURZ (1971) Sprache als soziale Kontrolle. Frankfort.

HAUGEN, E. (1972) The Ecology of Language. A. S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and National Development Series 4. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

————— (1970) "On the meaning of bilingual competence." pp. 221-229 in R. Jakobson and S. Kawamoto (eds.) Studies for S. Hattori. Tokyo.

————— (1966) Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

————— (1956) Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. University of Alabama American Dialect Society.

————— (1950) "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." Language 26: 210-231.

HEATH, S. B. (1972) Telling Tongues: Language Policy in Mexico—Colony to Nation. New York: Teachers College Press.

HERMANN, E. (1929) "Lautveränderungen in der Individualsprache einer Mundart." Nachrichten der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 9: 195-214.

HOCKETT, C. F. (1948) A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan.

HYMES, D. H. (1974) Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

————— (1972) "The scope of sociolinguistics," pp. 313-333 in R. Shuy (ed.) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Georgetown University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

————— [ed.] (1971) Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

————— [ed.] (1964a) Language in Culture and Society. New York: Harper & Row.

————— (1964b) "Introduction: towards ethnographies of communication," pp. 1-34 in J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (eds.) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

KEY, M. R. (1975) Male/Female Language. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

KEYSER, S. J. (1963) "Review of McDavid and Kurath, The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States." Language 39: 303-316.

KJOLSETH, R. (1971) "Die Entwicklung der Sprachsoziologie und ihre sozialen Implikationen," pp. 9-32 in R. Kjolseth and F. Sack (eds.) Zur Soziologie der Sprache. Kölner Zeitschrift fur Sociologie und Sozialpsychologie, special issue 15. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

——— and F. SACK [eds.] (1971) Zur Soziologie der Sprache. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozial psychologie, special issue 15. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

KLEIN, W. and N. DITTMAR (1975) Sprache und Kommunikation äuslandischer Arbeitnehmer. Kronberg.

KLOSS, H. (1966) "Types of multi-lingual communities," pp. 7-17 in S. Lieberson (ed.) Explorations in Sociolinguistics. Soc. Inquiry 36.

——— (1927) "Spracherhaltung." Archiv für Politik und Geschichte 8: 456-462.

KURATH, H. and R. I. McDAVID (1961) The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.

KURATH, H., B. BLOCH, and M. L. HANSEN (1939) Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England. Providence, RI: Brown University.

LABOV, W. (1972a) Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

——— (1972b) "Some principles of linguistic methodology." Language in Society 1: 97-120.

——— (1971a) "The notion 'system' in creole languages," pp. 447-472 in D. H. Hymes (ed.) Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

——— (1971b) "Methodology," pp. 412-497 in W. R. Dingwall (ed.) A Survey of Linguistic Science. College Park: University of Maryland.

——— (1970) "The study of language in its social context." Studium Generale 23: 30-87.

——— (1969) "Contraction, deletion and inherent variability of the English copula." Language 45: 715-762.

——— (1966a) "Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic change," pp. 84-113 in W. Bright (ed.) Sociolinguistics. Proceedings of the 1964 UCLA Conference. The Hague: Mouton.

——— (1966b) The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

——— (1965) "Stages in the acquisition of standard English," pp. 77-104 in R. Shuy (ed.) Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

——— (1964) "Phonological correlates of social stratification," pp. 164-176 in J. J. Gumperz and D. H. Hymes (eds.) The Ethnography of Communication. Amer. Anthropologist 66.

——— (1963) "The social motivation of a sound change." Word 19: 273-309.

LAMBERT, W. E. (1972) Language, Psychology and Culture. A. S. Dil (ed.) Language Science and National Development Series 5. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

———, H. FRANKEL, and R. A. TUCKER (1966) "Judging personality through speech: a French-Canadian example." J. of Communication 16: 304-321.

LAMBERT, W. E., R. C. HODGSON, R. C. GARDNER, and S. FILLENBAUM (1960) "Evaluational reactions to spoken language." J. of Abnormal and Social Psychology 60: 44-51.

LEHMANN, W. P. and Y. MALKIEL [eds.] (1968) Directions for Historical Linguistics. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

LePAGE, R. (1972) "Preliminary report on the sociolinguistic survey of multilingual communities, Part I: Survey of the Cayo District, British Honduras." Language in Society 1.

LONGACRE, R. (1970) Philippine Languages: Discourse, Paragraph and Sentence Structure. Santa Ana, CA: Summer Institute of Linguistics Pub. 2, 2 vols.

————, L. BALLARD, and R. J. CONRAD (1971) "Deep and surface grammar of inter-causal relations." Foundations of Language 7: 70-118.

LUCKMANN, T. (1975) Sociology of Language. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

———— (1969) "Soziologie der Sprache," pp. 1050-1101 in R. König (ed.) Handbuch der Empirischen Sozialforschung, Vol. 2. Stuttgart.

MACNAMARA, J. [ed.] (1967) Problems of Bilingualism. J. of Social Issues 23.

McDAVID, R. I. (1948) "Post-vocalic 'r' in South Carolina: a social analysis." Amer. Speech 23: 194-203.

———— and V. G. McDAVID (1951) "The relationship of the speech of American negroes to the speech of whites." Amer. Speech 26: 3-17.

MALKIEL, Y. (1976) "From romance philology through dialect geography to socio-linguistics," pp. 59-84 in J. P. Rona and W. Wölck (eds.) Int. J. of the Sociology of Language 9. The Hague: Mouton.

MATHIOT, M. (1971) "Sociolinguistics and the functions of language." Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague 5.

———— (1969) "El Estado actual de la sociolinguistica norteamericana," pp. 3-11 in M. Alleyne (ed.) Boletin de Sociolinguistica 1. Mona: University of the West Indies.

———— (1968) "An approach to the cognitive study of language." Int. J. of Amer. Linguistics 34.

MAXWELL, A. E. (1961) Analysing Qualitative Data. London: Methuen.

NAROLL, R. (1970) "Cross-cultural sampling," pp. 889-926 in R. Naroll and R. Cohen (eds.) A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology. Garden City, NY: Natural History Press. (Reprinted 1973, New York: Columbia Univ. Press.)

NICKEL, G. [ed.] (1971) Papers in Contrastive Linguistics. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

NIE, N. H., D. H. BENT, and C. H. HULL [eds.] (1970) Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

ORNSTEIN, J. and R. P. MURPHY (1974) "Models and approaches in sociolinguistic research on language diversity." Anthropological Linguistics 16: 141-176.

OPPENHEIM, A. N. (1966) Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. London: Heinemann.

OSGOOD, C. E. and S. ERVIN (1964) "Diachronic paycholinguistics," pp. 126-146 in C. E. Osgood and T. A. Sebeok (eds.) Psycholinguistics. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

OSGOOD, C. E., G. J. SUCI, and P. H. TANNENBAUM (1957) The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

PAULSTON, C. B. (forthcoming) "Implicaciones de la teoria del aprendizaje de lenguas para la planeacion linguistica," in W. Wölck and Y. Lastra (eds.) Sociolinguistica y Planeamiento de Linguas. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonoma.

PULGRAM, E. (1964) "Structural comparison, diasystems, and dialectology." Linguistics 4: 66-82.

REINECKE, J. W. et al. (1975) A Bibliography of Pidgin and Creole Languages. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 14. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.

ROGERS, E. M. (1962) Diffusion of Innovation. New York: Free Press.

RONA, J. P. (forthcoming) "La relatividad del bilinguismo y su realizacion social," in W. Wölck and Y. Lastra (eds.) Sociolinguistica y Planeamiento de Linguas. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonoma.

——— and W. WÖLCK [eds.] (1976) "The social dimension of dialectology." Int. J. of the Sociology of Language 9. The Hague: Mouton.

RUBIN, J. (1968) National Bilingualism in Paraguay. The Hague: Mouton.

——— and B. H. JERNUDD [eds.] (1971) Can Language be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.

ROSS, J. R. (1972) "The category squish," pp. 316-328 in Papers of the 8th Regional Meeting. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

SACKS, H., E. SCHEGLOFF, and G. JEFFERSON (1974) "Conversational analysis." Language 50.

SADOCK, J. (1974) Speech Arts. New York: Academic Press.

SAMARIN, W. J. (1967) Field Linguistics: A Guide to Linguistic Field Work. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

SCHMIDT, J. (1872) Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen. Weimar.

SEARLE, J. (1969) Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. London: Cambridge Univ. Press.

SHUY, R. W. [ed.] (1972) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Georgetown: University Round Table. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

——— [ed.] (1965) Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

——— and R. W. FASOLD [eds.] (1973) Language Attitude Studies: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

SHUY, R. W., A. WOLFRAM, and W. K. RILEY (1968) Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

SIMON, G. (1974) Bibliographie zur Soziolinguistik. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

SMITH, H. L., Jr. (1967) "The concept of the morphophone." Language 43: 306-334.

STEWART, W. A. (1962) "An outline of a linguistic typology for describing multilingualism," pp. 15-25 in F. A. Rice (ed.) Study of the Role of Second Languages in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

WEINREICH, U. (1963) "Four riddles in bilingual dialectology," pp. 335-358 in American Contributions to the 5th International Congress of Slavists. Sofia.

——— (1954) "Is a structural dialectology possible?" Word 10: 388-400.

——— (1953) Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.

———, W. LABOV, and M. HERZOG (1968) "Empirical foundations for a theory of language change," pp. 95-188 in W. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.) Directions for Historical Linguistics. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

WHITELEY, W. N. [ed.] (1971) Language Use and Social Change: Problems of Multilingualism with Special Reference to Africa. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

WÖLCK, W. (1976) "Community profiles: an alternative to linguistic informant selection," pp. 43-57 in J. P. Rona and W. Wölck (eds.) Int. J. of the Sociology of Language 9. The Hague: Mouton.

————— (1973) "Attitudes towards Spanish and Quechua in bilingual Peru," pp. 129-147 in R. W. Shuy and R. W. Fasold (eds.) Language Attitude Studies: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press.

———— (1972) "Las Lenguas mayores del Peru," pp. 185-216 in A. Escobar (ed.) El Reto del Multilinguismo en el Peru. Peru Problema 9. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

———— (1965) Phonematische Analyse der Sprache von Buchan (Scotland). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

———— and Y. LASTRA [eds.] (forthcoming) Sociolinguistica y Planeamiento de Lenguas. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autonoma.

WOLFRAM, W. (1969) A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

———— and D. CHRISTIAN (1976) Appalachian Speech. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

WOLFRAM, W. and P. W. FASOLD (1974) The Study of Social Dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.