Macnamera, John (1971). Successes and failures in the movement for the restoration of Irish. In *Can Language Be Planned? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*, Joan Rubin and Björn H. Jernudd (eds.). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Milan, William G. and Munoz-Hernandez, Shirley (1977). The New York City Consent Decree: a mechanism for social change. *Bilingual Review* 43, 169–179.
Paulston, Christina Bratt (1980). *Bilingual Education: Theories and Issues*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Santiago, Isaura (1978). *A Community's Struggle for Equal Educational Opportunity: Aspira v. Board of Education*. Princeton: Office for Minority Education, Educational Testing Service.
Schermerhorn, R. A. (1978[1970]). *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Schneider, Susan Gilbert (1976). *Revolution, Reaction, or Reform: The 1974 Bilingual Education Act*. New York: Los Americas.
Spolsky, Bernard and Cooper, Robert (eds.) (1978). *Case Studies in Bilingual Education*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
Steinberg, Lois S. (1979). Can federal laws protect the educational interests of language minorities? Implementation of the Bilingual Education Act and the Aspira Consent Decree in New York City. ERIC.
Swing, Elizabeth Sherman (1980). *Bilingualism and Linguistic Segregation in the Schools of Brussels*. Publication B-95. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.
Teitelbaum, Herbert and Hiller, Richard J. (1977). *The Legal Perspective. Bilingual Education Current Perspectives: Law*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Traviesco, Lourdes (1975). Puerto Ricans and Education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 26(2).
Verheyen, J. E. (1929). Le bilinguisme en Belgique. In *Le bilinguisme et l'éducation*, travaux de la conférence international tenue à Luxembourg du 2 au avril 1928. Genève: Bureau International d'Education.
Wirt, Frederick (1979). The stranger within the gate: ethnic minorities and school policies in Europe. *Comparative Education Review* 23, 17–40.

# Sociolinguistics and language planning in bilingual education for Hispanics in the United States*

S. OFELIA GARCÍA

The legislative and judicial actions that have made bilingual education possible in the United States have all been based on the rights of individuals under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution or under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.[1] The student's native language is accepted only as a remedial tool when the child cannot benefit from instruction in English. The Bilingual Education Act promotes the use of the non-English language in the classroom only for what Heinz Kloss calls 'expediency'.[2] That is, the law is designed to promote the linguistic assimilation of minorities, and thus it serves the interests of the majority. However, the law in no way recognizes or promotes the language rights of ethnolinguistic minorities as a social group. The concept of sociolinguistic language planning for the benefit of the ethnic minority has been largely ignored in the United States. A discussion of bilingual education for the benefit of Hispanics in the United States must address the following three sociolinguistic topics:

1. The social organization of Hispanics as an ethnolinguistic group in the United States.
2. The Spanish-mother-tongue school as a social institution.
3. The prescriptive planning of the majority and minority languages within the Spanish-mother-tongue school.

## 1. The social organization of Hispanics as an ethnolinguistic group in the United States

Following the pattern of former European immigrants to the United States, Hispanics have attempted to assimilate by shifting to English.[3] However, second- and third-generation Hispanics are becoming aware that even when linguistic assimilation has occurred, structural and economic incorporation into the mainstream has not. The majority has continued to categorize Hispanics as a separate group along racial and social lines. This process of categorization is analogous to that of Blacks in the United States. Although Blacks have

0165–2516/83/0044–0043 $2.00
*Int'l J. Soc. Lang.* 44 (1983), pp. 43–54
© Mouton Publishers, Amsterdam

undergone relinguification, complete reethnification has never occurred (Fishman 1972a). The segregation of Blacks by the majority deprived them of social and economic mobility and prevented them from developing instrumental attachments to the system. This in turn discouraged sentimental attachments to any new United States ethnicity.[4] When Blacks in the early 1960s became aware that segregation was a process of categorization by the majority, they demanded integration and eventual recognition of their distinct ethnicity.

This struggle of an ethnic group for recognition as a distinct yet equal social group has been described at length by Eric Allardt (1979) in his study of linguistic minorities in Western Europe. Basing his theories on the views of the Norwegian anthropologist Fredrik Barth, Allardt emphasizes that ethnic boundaries are what define an ethnic group. These boundaries are maintained by either of two processes: categorization by others or self-categorization.

In the case of Hispanics, racial and social boundaries set up by the majority have prevented them from assimilating. This process of categorization by others must be superseded by an internal process of self-categorization by Hispanics themselves in their struggle for recognition. Michael Banton (1977) has demonstrated that borders between ethnic groups are drawn in order to gain advantages. In the case of Hispanics, the majority-language group has drawn up borders which contain them in order to benefit themselves. Only if Hispanics take control of their borders by the institutionalization of cultural and social autonomy will there be any hope of future changes in those borders. As the situation exists now there are no incentives for the majority to change the borders, and it would be naive to assume that they will do so. Thus, what is proposed is a movement among Hispanics in the United States to self-categorize as a distinct ethnolinguistic group.

## 2. The Spanish-mother-tongue school as a social institution

According to Allardt, the only way to preserve ethnolinguistic borders in today's industrialized society is to develop formal institutions for the separate use by the members of the minority only. Hispanics have been unwilling to self-categorize and they have not established many sociocultural institutions of their own. They depend on those controlled by the majority and of benefit to the mainstream (Fishman and Milán 1980). The present data from the Language Resources Project (Yeshiva University) supports the contention that Hispanics are underserved by ethnic institutions when compared with other non-English-language use claimants in the United States. Although Spanish accounts for approximately 50% of all non-English-language use claimants today, it is served by some 41% of all non-English-language broadcasts, 19% of all non-English-language periodicals, 12% of ethnic local religious units, and 6% of ethnic community schools.[5]



The fact that Hispanics are served by only 6% of ethnic-mother-tongue schools in the United States is extremely significant. The low percentage reveals an ethnolinguistic group with little economic, political, and social power. Furthermore, it demonstrates the unwillingness of the present Hispanic community to compartmentalize its behavior so as to restrict the open and unlimited interaction between themselves and the majority. Hispanics must draw advantages from their identity as an ethnolinguistic group by carefully compartmentalizing their home and community arrangements from those of the majority.

Fishman (1980b: 167–171) indicated that the ethnic-mother-tongue school is only part of a secondary reward system that cannot 'save the community from itself'. It is important to emphasize that the Spanish-mother-tongue school cannot be solely responsible for the acceptance of Hispanics into the structural and economic mainstream of the United States. It is precisely only after Hispanics have self-categorized and have obtained some economic, political, and social power of their own, that the role of the Spanish-mother-tongue school becomes important. Formal schooling, with its emphasis on the developmental maintenance of the minority language, is essential in the self-categorization social scheme being proposed.[6] The Spanish-mother-tongue school – supported, organized and controlled by the ethnic community – is essential in order to control the ethnolinguistic borders of a self-categorized Hispanic community.

## 3. The prescriptive planning of the majority and minority languages within the Spanish-mother-tongue school

Even when the dire need for Spanish-mother-tongue schools supported and controlled by Hispanics is recognized, decisions about the prescriptive planning of the majority and the minority languages within the school must be made. It is at this point that ethnic leaders and educators must join the sociolinguists and the language planners.

Sociolinguists following the descriptive model proposed by Joshua Fishman and summarized by his now famous question, 'Who speaks (or writes) what language (or what language variety) to whom and when and to what end?', have attempted to look at the relationship between the linguistic structure of the Hispanic community and its social organization. The past decade has provided us with many studies of language use in different Hispanic communities.[7] However, the Spanish-mother-tongue school must go beyond reflecting the linguistic and social structure of the community. Tollefson

(1981: 1) proposed an evaluative model of the sociology of language which attempts to determine 'how language resources can be allocated to fulfill communicative needs and to assure language rights of groups within social organizations'. The Spanish-mother-tongue school must fulfill the language rights of the Hispanic minority and must become a mechanism for deliberately altering the present relationship between linguistic structure and social organization.

Bilingual education in the United States has been plagued with disagreements over the following language planning issues:

a. code selection; that is, the use of Spanish and/or English in instruction;

b. regional and social linguistic variability; that is, the use of the standard vs. the local vernacular in instruction;

c. the efficient expansion of new functions for a code; that is, expanding the use of Spanish which had previously been used only in the home (L domain) to the school (H domain).[8]

In an effort to resolve the three language-planning problems of bilingual education identified in (a) through (c) above, we will examine the three rights of Hispanics as an ethnolinguistic social group identified by Tollefson, namely (1) to have access to information, (2) to form language-based associations and (3) to use efficiently a particular variety in a particular domain. It is important to remember that we are referring only to the language needs of a self-categorized Hispanic ethnic group capable of supporting and controlling its own schools as is done, for instance, by the Old Order Amish.

## a. *The issue of code selection in the ethnic school*

The Spanish-mother-tongue school would have a choice of using either English or Spanish or both. Let us evaluate the three possibilities according to the three criteria for effective prescription of language rights for the ethnolinguistic minority established by Tollefson.

If monolingual instruction in English were adopted, the importance of the Spanish language to the ethnic community as a resource with social, economic, and political value would be lost. The intragroup flow of information would be severely hampered, since the continuous mass immigration of Hispanics supports a monolingual Hispanic community of great proportions. Furthermore, their language-based associations and, as a result, their distinctive Hispanic ethnicity, would be severely weakened. Thus, without any strong language-based associations, the process of self-categorization would be highly improbable. The present diglossic use of English in the public domain (H) and Spanish in the home domain (L) would be further shaken. Encouraging literacy only in the majority language could only lead to language shift, with English eventually displacing Spanish in the home. The resulting monolingual English-speaking Hispanic community would be unable to communicate effectively with the large number of newcomers who speak only Spanish and would lack the cohesiveness that results from the language and ethnicity link. Furthermore, this solution would not alter in any way the failure of the majority to accept Hispanics into the structural and economic mainstream.



On the other hand, monolingual instruction in Spanish, as some have advocated (Castro 1976), would likewise work against all the three criteria for ethnolinguistic rights established by Tollefson. It would not give the whole group access to information, since the mainstream language will continue to be English. Thus, extensive mass media, important printed material, and sophisticated technological information would not reach many in a monolingual Spanish-speaking community. Even though the selection of Spanish as the sole code of instruction would indeed strengthen the emotional bond among Hispanics, it would severely weaken its ties with an Anglo-Saxon majority that would continuously assail it as being anti-United States. The assignment of only Spanish to the school domain will isolate Hispanics and will eventually encourage confrontation with the majority along linguistic lines.

Thus, we support a compartmentalized and therefore diglossic bilingual policy for these community-controlled schools that would give Hispanics unlimited access to information both within and outside of the community and at the same time would develop strong self-categorization bonds based on the Spanish language.

Once we have established the need to use both Spanish and English as media of instruction, then we must determine how and when each language will be used within the classroom. Although many frameworks have been presented (Fishman and Lovas 1972; Mackey 1976), most community-controlled schools have insisted on a full-maintenance bilingual program where students are expected to develop all skills in both languages in all domains. Fishman and Lovas (1972: 89) pointed out that this type of program was 'a theoretical impossibility because balanced competence implies languages that are functionally equivalent and no society can be motivated to maintain two languages if they are really functionally redundant'. The loss in instructional quality is obvious when the teacher continuously mixes languages, addresses children in different languages, teaches the same subject matter in an inconsistent and haphazard shifting and alternation of language codes. Although the goal of these programs is to develop both languages simultaneously and with equal proficiency, the bilingualism that they encourage is subtractive (less than nativelike levels in both languages) rather than additive (Lambert 1975). González (1977) and Kaminsky (1976) have argued that bilingual children coming to school after having been exposed to both lan-

guages in an unsystematic way are not fully proficient in either language. James Cummins (1979), based on his 'threshold' and 'developmental interdependence' hypothesis, has advocated the separate and full development of the native language before attempting the introduction of the second language. However, little thought has been given to what happens when the two codes finally coexist within the classroom. It is obvious that unless we separate them, the continuous interference between them will eventually result in an administrative and technical mismatch, in poor-quality education for Hispanic children, and in the further weakening of an already suffering diglossic relationship between the two languages.

Language selection within the classroom domain must, in some way, reflect the sociolinguistic structure of the speech community. The school, as a microcosm of society, must effectively reproduce the functional allocation of languages within the community itself. Thus the best solution might be to support a partial maintenance program (Fishman and Lovas 1972), also called a dual developmental maintenance program (Mackey 1976), that would support the functional bilingualism of the speech community, rather than institutionalized bilingualism without societal value. Perhaps the curriculum adopted in the Philippines, with Pilipino used for the ethnic encumbered subjects (social sciences, literature, and arts) and English used for the ethnically unencumbered domains of math and science (Pascasio 1977), would be a proper solution to the allocation of the two languages in a bilingual Hispanic ethnic school in the United States. A quality bilingual program must be domain-sensitive (Jacobson 1975) and must carefully and rigidly compartmentalize the language uses in the classroom. Only then, after we realize what the societal limitations on bilingual education are, will we be able to develop quality developmental maintenance programs.

### b. *The issue of regional and social linguistic variability in the ethnic school*

One of the most vehement discussions in bilingual-education circles today is whether the standard or the local vernacular should be used in instruction. The issue of the vernacular is further complicated by the existence of the different regional varieties – each with its own standard – of the three major Spanish-speaking groups in the United States (the Cubans, the Mexican-Americans and the Puerto Ricans.) Aside from these regional varieties, English has also affected each regional group to different degrees. Finally, the sociolects within each group have also added to the confusion.

Cooper (1979) points out that when this problem of standardization exists at a national level, two routes have traditionally been followed by language planners:



1. elevating one variety among several competing varieties;
2. creating a composite of the main dialects.

Option 1, that is, elevating one variety among several competing varieties, would not be in agreement with the three criteria for effective language planning under the evaluative model of Tollefson. Using any of the three national standards would restrict access to information among Hispanics who have been in the United States for generations and who are unfamiliar with that standard. Also, it would severely cut off language-based associations, since most members of the speech community would find themselves alienated from this rhetorical Spanish norm. Furthermore, it would not reflect present language use by the Hispanic speech community in the United States.

Selecting one variety over the other would also have the effect of dividing the Hispanics as a linguistic group and might, therefore, encourage swift language shift to English among the groups whose variety was not respected. Thus, although the favored group would have better access to information, better language-based associations among themselves, and more effective use of their variety within the school domain, the remaining speech groups would be estranged. This divisiveness would lead to the disappearance of the ethnic group and would prevent self-categorization.

Cooper's option 2 (creating a composite of the main dialects) would be an effort to standardize a 'supravariety.' Attempts along these lines are being made daily by commercial publishing companies that want to appeal to a universal market. However, given the dominance of English as the majority language, and the lack of a language policy to promote a non-English language in the United States, it would be difficult for this new composite to spread, and its use in instruction would be artificial.

Joshua Fishman (1977) pointed out that the United States has never adopted a single standard of English, and yet this has not caused any problems in monolingual instruction. The issue of Black English has come up only because the Black ethnic group has not been in control of the schools that Black children attend. However, if the ethnic group were in control of its own schools, the variety used by the ethnolinguistic community would be respected and would not be looked down upon. The Spanish ethnic-mother-tongue school can be conducted without a single supraregional standard.

The Spanish ethnic school in the United States must adopt a bilingual communicative norm (Haugen 1977) rather than a strict rhetorical norm. If Hispanics want to benefit from the only resource that they possess to their advantage, their language, they must then give up what Haugen has called 'a rigid backbone'. As he has so eloquently stated: 'It may be better to bend than to break' (1977: 101).

Spanish-mother-tongue schools, in an effort to give the Hispanic community access to information, language-based associations, and efficient use of par-

ticular languages and varieties in particular domains, could take the German positive approach to dialects (Fishman and Lueder 1972). In Germany, local dialects are often used by the community school for younger students and for the informal, as well as for most spoken, functions. However, mastery of the standard is particularly pursued in connection with older students, as well as for more formal and written or read functions. Thus, although the Spanish-language school would respect the variety used by the speech community, it would not exclude the standard rhetorical norm for older students at the formal and written level.

c. *The issue of adding new functions to the ethnic mother tongue in the ethnic school*

The value of adding new functions to Spanish in the United States has been questioned. Up to the time that the Bilingual Education Act was passed, Spanish for Hispanics had existed only within the home and in community domains. According to Fishman (1980b), the introduction of the vernacular into the school domain, if not carefully controlled and compartmentalized, could be devastating to Spanish language-maintenance efforts by increasing its exposure to English.

It is obvious that only a self-categorized community-controlled school with an integrated primary system of rewards can successfully spread an L into H functions. Joshua Fishman states, '. . . for an L to spread into H functions, more concrete considerations (jobs, funds, influence, status control, power) are involved' (1980a: 43).

It has been hypothesized that when H moves to the L domain, vernacular language shift occurs (Fishman 1972a). However, in an advanced modern nation, the spread of L into H by a self-categorized ethnolinguistic group might indeed be the only way to stabilize an eroding diglossic situation. Thus, introducing Spanish into the school domain (formerly an H domain) could prevent shift. Therefore,

$\frac{H}{L}\downarrow$ cancels L *but*

$\frac{H}{L}\uparrow$ reinforces L as long as compartmentalization is retained.

Successful bilingual education managed by a self-categorized Hispanic community would have the obligation to spread L (Spanish), and at the same time to be able to control the functions of H (English). The Hispanic bilingual school would support and stabilize a diglossic relationship of the $\frac{A/B}{a/b}$ type; that is, of the type in which each language is used in its written and spoken varieties and each is functionally compartmentalized from the other. The expanding use of Spanish in function and domain would definitely increase the Hispanic's access to information by promoting literacy in Spanish as well as in English. This stronger diglossic relationship and compartmentalization of two languages would also promote language-based associations. Thus, we conclude that the Spanish-mother-tongue school must carefully elaborate the functions of Spanish while at the same time effectively compartmentalizing the use of the two languages.



## Conclusion

Let us briefly summarize the sociolinguistic theoretical issues that will be important to Hispanics in the future:

1. Hispanics must embark on a process of self-categorization and must struggle for recognition as an ethnolinguistic minority.
2. Hispanics must establish, control, and use their own ethnic community schools.
3. These ethnic community schools must use the Spanish language as a resource of social and political, as well as communicative, value. In order to assure the rights of Hispanics to
   a. have access to information,
   b. form language-based associations,
   c. efficiently use a particular language variety for a particular purpose,

the ethnic community school must do the following:

1. compartmentalize its use of Spanish and English by instituting a program of partial bilingual maintenance with a domain sensitive curriculum;
2. adopt a bilingual communicative norm that would accept the local vernacular, especially with younger students and in informal functions, as well as pursue the standard in connection with older students and formal functions;
3. elaborate the functions of Spanish by using it efficiently and distinctly in the H domain. Thus a diglossic $\frac{A/B}{a/b}$ would be maintained as long as compartmentalization is retained.

During the decades of the 1960s and the 1970s, many legislative and judicial efforts attempted to end discrimination against Hispanics. Hispanics in the 1980s must begin to struggle for recognition as an ethnolinguistic minority by restricting the unlimited interaction between themselves and the majority. Only through a process of self-categorization supported by sociocultural

institutions with a clear language policy will Hispanics have any hope of structural acceptance by the mainstream as a distinct ethnolinguistic group.

*The City College of New York*
*School of Education*

## Notes

* This paper was originally prepared for an NEH Summer Seminar on Language Maintenance and Language Shift, 1981.

1. For a review of the legal aspects of bilingual education, see especially Teitelbaum and Hiller (1977).
2. Heinz Kloss (1977) gives an account of the different kinds of minority linguistic rights.
3. The language shift by Hispanics has been documented by López (1976) and Skrabanek (1970), among others.
4. For a discussion of instrumental and sentimental attachments see Herbert Kelman (1971).
5. These percentages are taken from the latest figures of the Language Resources Project conducted by Fishman, Gertner, Lowy and Milán (Yeshiva University).
6. The term 'developmental maintenance' is used in opposition to 'static maintenance' as proposed by Otheguy and Otto (1980).
7. Studies of language use in Hispanic communities have been conducted by Aguirre (1981), Floyd (1981), Hudson-Edwards and Bills (1980), and Language Policy Task Force of Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1980), among others.
8. These are three of four types of language problems identified by Fishman (1972a) following Neustupny and elaborated and explained by Robert Cooper (1979).

## References

Aguirre, Adalberto (1981). A sociolinguistic survey of a bilingual community: implications for bilingual education. *Bilingual Education Paper Series* 4(9) (April).

Allardt, Eric (1979). Implications of the ethnic revival in modern industrialized society: a comparative study of the linguistic minorities in Western Europe. *Commentationes Scientiarum Socialium* (Helsinki) 12.

Banton, Michael (1977). Rational choice. A theory of racial and ethnic relations. *Working Papers on Ethnic Relations* 8, S.S.R.C. Research Unit on Ethnic Relations, University of Bristol, 1–9.

Castro, Ray (1976). Shifting the burden of bilingualism. The case for monolingual communities. *The Bilingual Review* 3(1), 3–28.

Cooper, Robert L. (1979). Language planning, language spread, and language change. *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics* 32, 23–50.

Cummins, James (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Bilingual Education Paper Series* 3(2) (September).

Fishman, Joshua A. (1966). *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

– (1972a). *Language in Sociocultural Change*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

– (1972b). *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

– (1977). 'Standard' versus 'dialect' in bilingual education: an old problem in a new context. *Modern Language Journal* 61, 167–171.

– (1980a). Attracting a following to high-culture functions for a language of everyday life: the role of the Tshernovits Language Conference in the 'rise of Yiddish'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 24, 43–73.

– (1980b). Minority language maintenance and the ethnic mother tongue school. *Modern Language Journal* 64, 167–173.

– and Lovas, John (1972). Bilingual education in a sociolinguistic perspective. In *The Language Education of Minority Children*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

– and Lueder, Erika (1972). What has the sociology of language to say to the teacher? In *Language in Sociocultural Change*, 340–355. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

– and Milán, William (1980). Spanish language resources of the United States: some preliminary findings. Paper presented at conference on Spanish in the U.S. Setting: Beyond the Southwest, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, October 10–11.

Floyd, Mary Beth (1981). Bilingualism, language maintenance, and Spanish in the Southwest. Paper presented at El Español en los Estados Unidos: An Interdisciplinary Conference, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, October 2.

González, Gustavo (1977). Teaching bilingual children. In *Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives. Linguistics*, 53–59. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Haugen, Einar (1977). Norm and deviation in bilingual communities. In *Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implications*, Peter A. Hornby (ed.), 91–102. New York: Academic Press.

Hudson-Edwards, Alan and Bills, Garland D. (1980). Intergenerational language shift in an Albuquerque barrio. In *A Festschrift for Jacob Ornstein*. Edward L. Blansitt, Jr. and Richard V. Teschner (eds.), 139–158. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Jacobson, Rodolfo (1975). The dilemma of bilingual education models: duplication or compartmentalization. In *New Directions In Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education*, Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay (eds.), 123–138. Washington, D.C.: T.E.S.O.L.

Kaminsky, Sally (1976). Bilingualism and learning to read. In *The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes*, Antonio Simoes (ed.), 155–171. New York: Academic Press.

Kelman, Herbert C. (1971). Language as an aid and barrier to involvement in the national system. In *Can Language Be Planned?* Joan Rubin (ed.), 21–52. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Kloss, Heinz (1977). *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Lambert, Wallace E. (1975). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In *Education of Immigrant Students*, A. Wolfgang (ed.). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Language Policy Task Force, Centro de Estudios Puertorriqueños (1980). Centro Working Papers 7, April.

López, David E. (1976). Chicano language loyalty in an urban setting. *Sociology and Social Research* 62, 267–278.

Lovas, John (1975). Language planning in a multilingual community in the United States. In *New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education*, Marina K. Burt and Heidi C. Dulay (eds.), 113–122. Washington, D.C.: T.E.S.O.L.

Mackey, William F. (1976). A typology of bilingual education. In *Bilingual Schooling in the United States*, Francesco Cordasco (ed.), 73–89. New York: McGraw Hill.

Otheguy, Ricardo and Otto, Ruth (1980). The myth of static maintenance in bilingual education. *Modern Language Journal* 64, 350–357.
Pascasio, Emy (1977). Bilingual education research and its directions. In *The Filipino Bilingual*, E. M. Pascasio (ed.), 117–125. Quezon City: Ateneo University Press.
Skrabanek, R. L. (1970). Language maintenance among Mexican-Americans. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 11, 272–282.
Teitelbaum, Herbert and Hiller, Richard J. (1977). Bilingual education: the legal mandate. *Harvard Educational Review* 47(2), 138–170.
Tollefson, James (1981). Alternative paradigms in the sociology of language. Paper read at the University of California at Santa Cruz, January.

# Linguistic theory and sociolinguistics in Yugoslavia[1]

MILORAD RADOVANOVIĆ

## 1. Linguistic theory: sociolinguistics

In the 1950s linguistic theory, linguistic methodology, and even the practical study of language were marked by a variety of prominent and dominating structuralist 'schools' and trends. Since then, despite the continued vitality of structuralism, transformational-generative grammar has become dominant, and it has affected the shape of linguistic theory, its methods, and the practical study of language. During this course of events in the science of language, the past 30 years, and the last ten particularly, have also seen the gradual introduction, advancement, proliferation, and popularization of interdisciplinary approaches to language, between linguistics and other, related sciences, deriving, frequently, from a reaction, whether direct or indirect, to either structuralism or transformational-generative grammar and also from the need to transcend the essentially 'isolationist' positions and methods of structuralist and transformational-generative theory. For language, society, and culture, and even for mankind, our time is one when new horizons are opening up for sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, text linguistics, the ethnography of communication, the philosophy of language, general semantics, semiotics, and many other related disciplines. If some of the latest 'functionalist' and 'contextually situated' orientations of the structuralists and the various semantic and pragmatic orientations of the transformational-generative grammarians are added to the above list, it becomes a fairly representative outline of most of the present (and even some of the future) notions of linguistic theory and linguistic studies – deriving from corresponding notions and definitions of language.

### 1.2. *(Socio)linguistics in Yugoslavia*

In the 1950s language studies in Yugoslavia (particularly Slavic studies and even those of Serbocroatian) were still deeply involved with elements of

0165–2516/83/0044–0055 $2.00
© Mouton Publishers, Amsterdam