represents one's conscious and most refined efforts to say to other people who he is in relation to what he knows. Such skill is viewed as being progressively developed in the framework of actively engaging in discourse, always exhibiting human value and human relationships.

Part III has three essays: (a) Edward P.J. Corbett, "A Literal View of Literacy", (b) Frank J. D'Angelo, "Luria on Literacy: The Cognitive Consequences of Reading and Writing," and (c) Walter J. Ong, S.J., "Reading, Technology, and Human Consciousness." While the first makes no pretense about the simplicity of its content, it provides some practical questions relative to literacy as literally defined as well as its desirability. It outlines certain developments that have contributed to the growing sophistication of teachers of writing.

The last two papers share the similar concern pertaining to the relationship between an individual's literacy and his corresponding perceptual and cognitive abilities. It is shown in D'Angelo's review of Luria's psychological work that cognitive processes change qualitatively as a result of literacy, thus radically altering one's perception of reality. In the last and longest article, Ong discourses on the way various media alter perceptual and cognitive styles of people who use them. He delves into an elaborate discussion of reading and the reader, writing and the writer as growing out of or alongside phenomenology and psychoanalysis, bearing upon consciousness and its substructures as well as on human interiority. Finally, he talks about the technology of words and its impact on human consciousness.

By and large, this collection of papers profits the reader not only in confirming the need for pursuing the "traditional" goals of literacy - reading with understanding and writing intelligibly in proper form. Not one would disclaim these admirable goals as long as the learner's worth as a human being, as well as his rights to his own dialect or language are recognized and respected; that in the effort of promoting literacy, the human element in the learner is kept paramount over the trivia and contradictions that oftentimes muddle the goals which the teachers are trying so hard to attain. This book, in effect, sums up the "human-ness" that is inextricably linked with the goals of developing literacy. Thus, the title is after all most appropriate.

V.P. De Guzman
The University of Calgary

Gordon, J.C.B. *Verbal Deficit.* Totowa, New Jersey: Croom Helm Ltd., 1981. 181 pp. $25.00.

The present work is a succinct survey of various theories and hypotheses generally subsumed under the label "verbal deficit". Its professed aim is to serve the needs of linguists and educationalists and to make a contribution to the history of education. Given its broad topical compass and short length, however, it is difficult to demonstrate that it attains all these goals or, at least, that it attains them equally well. This reviewer, writing from the perspective of sociolinguistics, indeed finds little new (apart from a few bibliographical references) that is not available in the exhaustively researched, carefully reasoned and convincingly argued critique of "the deficit hypothesis" by Dittmar (1976). Readers of Gordon's brief survey are referred to the latter for the definitive (negative) evaluation of work in this area.

As one of Gordon's aims is to place verbal deficit in the wider context of educational theory, his first chapter surveys the rise and fall of "psychometric intelligence theory" and the second treats "classical verbal deficit theory". Since all these theories have been advanced to explain "differential educational attainment", their inclusion in this short volume is appropriate despite the fact that the former is based on assumptions about the heredibility of intelligence and the latter is associated with views which treat "environment" as the primary causal factor. Nevertheless, as Gordon points out later in the work (p. 121) "on closer scrutiny it is apparent that there is no clear-cut antithesis between these two theories. Both are essentially deterministic and hold that when children embark on their statutory schooling they already differ markedly in terms of educability." Chapters One and Two (and to an almost equal extent Chapter Five) may be of the greatest interest to students (or historians) of educational theory.

The heart of the volume (Chapters Three and Four) deals with the most well-known advocate of a verbal theory, Basil Bernstein, his principal critics and the variability (or difference) theory which Gordon sees as supplanting verbal deficit theories. One can quarrel with Gordon's choice of words in the title of Chapter Three: "Bernstein's *sociolinguistic* theory" (my italics). Berstein's "theory" is not in fact sociolinguistic because it has never been advocated by sociolinguists and indeed would appear with all its a priori, prejudicial and (as Gordon points out) untestable assertions to be counter to the basic tenets of all theoretical orientations within sociolinguistics. As Gordon demonstrates, Berstein's assertions are, by virtue of their inconsistency and unsupportability, hardly a theory either. Chapter Three constitutes overall a very effective and damning critique of Berstein's work. It concludes with a highly pessimistic view of the value and utility of the latter in either education or sociolinguistics. One of Gordon's few lapses in the volume (excusable, perhaps, in view of the plethora of conflicting jargonistic neologisms employed by Berstein) is his assertion in this Chapter (p. 79) that: "open and closed role systems create open and closed communication systems and the latter in turn foster the development of restricted and elaborated code respectively. [Bernstein] associates positional families with closed communication systems (and hence restricted code) and open . . . with person-oriented families (and hence elaborated code)."

Gordon shows that Bernstein's theory is without verifiable content, is full of inconsistencies and has been little by little modified and apparently abandoned by its developer. An important point made in the course of this discrediting of Bernstein's work is that very little actual linguistic evidence is adduced to support the theory. Assertions have been made about the relative use of pronouns and nouns by speakers of restricted or elaborated codes, the use of *we* as opposed to *I*, the amount of talk in working class or middle class households, and on and on. No really hard evidence is ever advanced to support these assertions. Evidence which is cited is frequently suspect. Gordon points out (p. 85) for example, that Hawkins' (1969) well-known two (restricted and elaborated) versions of children's descriptions of a sidewalk soccer game (which were actually idealized renderings by the author) are mentioned by Bernstein elsewhere as examples of actual children's performances in his "codes". The failures of Bernstein's work, amply treated by Gordon, are too numerous to discuss further.

Gordon is decidedly opposed to simplistic, deterministic theories (concerning unequal social distribution of educational attainment). He looks sympathetically at the views which have been subsumed under the heading "variability hypothesis" (he prefers "difference hypothesis"). Such views have been associated chiefly with the work of William Labov. Indeed Labov (1969) is often cited (also by Gordon) as one of the principal and most damning critiques of verbal deficit. Gordon's view of Labov's work is, however, not altogether charitable. He is interested in sociolinguistic theories as they are applicable to education. The difference hypothesis serves very well to give the coup de grace to verbal deficit but its immediate relevance for the classroom is unclear. Gordon draws a set of four "axioms" (p. 98) from Labov's work, which he sees as offering the beginnings of a guideline for teachers. These can be summarized as follows:

(1) Teachers must *understand* the dialects spoken by their pupils.

(2) Teachers must be alert to ways in which pupils' dialects may interfere with acquisition of the standard.

(3) Given the linguistic equality of all dialects, pupils should not be forced to *speak* the standard.

(4) Teachers must be alert to the different mismatches between speech and writings which will vary with a pupils' dialect or accent. There will be no "standard" mismatch apparent in all pupils' work.

Trudgill (1975) offers Gordon the most suitable model (or at least inspiration) for "what to do" after the demise of verbal deficit. Trudgill is a British sociolinguist, very much in the Labovian mold. His perspective is a bit different from Labov's, however, in that he works in a society with a standard much more "fixed" and dialects much more diverse than is the case in North America. Gordon (p. 105) sees

Trudgill as pleading for "the toleration of linguistic diversity in schools and in society at large." The benefits of such tolerance, in schools at least, would in Gordon's view be multifold:

(1) Savings in time now spent on linguistic trivia.

(2) Enhancement of the self-respect of pupils with nonstandard dialects and regional accents.

(3) Exposure ("demystification") of the widespread evaluation of (and discrimination against) people based upon superficial linguistic criteria.

(4) The challenging of people who make such judgments.

(5) Open discussion in the school of attitudes toward linguistic diversity linked with a discussion of other stereotyped attitudes and of mechanisms of stereotyping in general.

On balance the present work is a useful contribution to the literature on verbal deficit, its historical antecedents and successors. Its greatest value, perhaps, is that it makes available in a readable, concise format cogent arguments which should lay to rest verbal deficit "theories" (especially that of Basil Bernstein). Gordon points out (p. 110) that of a small group of teachers surveyed by him in 1977 only those exhibiting "a 'casual' degree of acquaintance with [Bernstein's] theory" were "in sympathy with it." It is to be hoped that this work and others like it will serve to enhance the "degree of acquaintance" of such "sympathizers" with the failings of verbal deficit and will eventually consign these "theories" to their proper place in the footnotes of the history of educational theory.

References

Dittmar, Norbert. 1976. *Sociolinguistics: A Critical Survey of Theory and Application.* London: Arnold.

Hawkins, P.R. 1969. Social class, the nominal group and reference, in Bernstein, Basil, (ed.) 1973. *Class, Codes and Control, II.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Pp. 81-92.

Labov, William. 1969. The logic of non-standard English, in Alatis, J.E. (ed.) *Report of the Twentieth Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies.* Washington: Georgetown University Press. Pp. 1-39.

Trudgill, Peter. 1975. *Accent, Dialect and the School.* London: Arnold.

Ronald H. Southerland
The University of Calgary