

# Standard English:

the language of equal opportunities and national unity or discrimination and inclusion/exclusion?

Kate Torkington  
ESGHT

*Most languages have a variety of dialects, both in geographical and socio-cultural terms. At the same time, there is a standard form of the language which is recognised, if not necessarily spoken (and/or written) by the majority of users of that language.*

*This article aims to provide a critical analysis of the concept of standard English in the discourse of language policy in British education, with particular reference to Bourdieu's framework of symbolic power.*

*I want every young person in the country to understand that language is a source of power.*

*To be able to speak and write good, clear English gives you a head start in the job market and helps you reach your goals in other ways, too.<sup>1</sup>*

These comments, made by the British television newscaster Trevor MacDonald after his appointment as the chairman of the 'Better English Campaign', reflect an argument which is difficult to question in British society; the fact that language is a source of power is undeniable as is the fact that this power is linked to a certain *kind* of language, that is, the ability to speak and write fluent standard English (SE). However, the idea that 'good' English is *necessarily* associated with SE is a contentious point - and it is precisely this point that has generated such intense public and academic debate since the mid 1980's. The 'Better English Campaign', announced by Gillian Shepherd, the (then) Education and Unemployment Secretary in the autumn of 1995, was the latest move by the Conservative Party in their relentless struggle to highlight the status of both SE and the 'related' (in their view) concept of 'traditional' Latinate grammar teaching in Brit-

ish schools in retaliation against the 'liberal' language policies in education which had been prominent since the 1960's.

We shall return to the 'Better English Campaign' and the issues which preceded it in due course. Firstly, though, in the light of so much discussion based around the concept of SE, we need to consider what Standard English actually is.

The entry for 'Standard English' in the *Oxford Companion to the English Language* (McArthur 1992) begins:

*a widely used term that resists easy definition but is used as if most educated people nonetheless know precisely what it refers to....*

In fact, most 'educated' people usually have a fairly strong opinion as to what SE means, and their opinion is generally centred upon what the term 'standard' refers to. There is a central ambiguity in the word standard; it can refer to the notion of uniformity or to the notion of excellence (Perera 1994:81). Although most linguists are now in general agreement that SE has nothing whatsoever to do with concepts such as 'good' or 'bad' language, this idea has, it seems, yet to be widely accepted in British society, as we shall see.

However, the dissemination of the idea that there is nothing inherently superior about a standard or indeed any other form of a language has clearly begun, as can be seen in the lively debates on the subject in some quarters of the press and it is no longer an idea entirely restricted to linguistic (predominantly sociolinguistic) circles. According to the entry in the *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, (Crystal 1995) which is presumably a fairly accessible work, there are five essential characteristics of SE:

I) it is a variety of English; a dialect like any other dialect, although it no longer has any geographical base;

II) it is widely understood, but not widely used;

III) its linguistic features include grammar, vocabulary and orthography but not pronunciation;

IV) it is the dialect which carries the most social prestige as it is used by the powerful;

V) the prestige attached to it means that it is generally recommended by adults as a desirable educational target.

The first point is based on the recent linguistic emphasis on the descriptive rather than prescriptive view of language and the subsequent realisation that all languages and dialects are equally adequate, well-formed and rule-governed. The second point reflects the fact that although SE is used in public, formal contexts<sup>2</sup>, most people in Britain speak another dialect<sup>3</sup> or even another language (both hereafter referred to as the home language) before they learn SE. As for the third point, we should refer to the fact that it is now widely (albeit very recently) accepted that SE can be spoken in any accent - particularly in education<sup>4</sup> and the media - although for many people this still remains a source of contention.

However, it is the final two points that are the most crucial to this discussion. Even in the face of proven theories of the linguistic equality of all languages and dialects, the standard form, in Britain as elsewhere, remains firmly ensconced in social prestige; it is the language of the powerful and therefore the chosen language of education.

Although sociolinguists have recognised and described the facts, they have mostly paid little attention to social theories which might explain why and how this situation arises and is maintained. Accounts of this are often limited to rather vague and woolly descriptions: Trudgill (1995), for example, claims that

*English, of course, developed a standard variety by relatively 'natural' means, over the centuries, out of a sort of consensus, due to various social factors.*

At this point we shall turn to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, whose account of the process of the standardisation of a language (Bourdieu 1991) is far more explicit in social and political terms. A standard language, he claims, becomes necessary with the making of a nation—which for him is “an entirely abstract group based on law”. A nation requires an impersonal, anonymous language to fit the impersonal, anonymous uses it has to serve. Thus, as the ‘official’ language becomes bound up so inextricably with the State—it is ‘obligatory’ on official occasions and in official places—the conditions are created for the constitution of a ‘unified linguistic market’ and so the official State language becomes the norm against which to measure all linguistic practices. It is therefore imposed upon the whole population of the nation as the *only* legitimate language.

In order for it to remain the only legitimate (and therefore dominant) lan-

guage, any other modes of expression in use have to be devalued. In industrialised nations, this process was greatly helped by the growth of the education system in the nineteenth century, and by the work of grammarians and lexicographers and their notions of ‘correct’ and ‘incorrect’ usage. However, for Bourdieu, the most decisive factor in this devaluation process was the linking of the education system to the labour market. As soon as success in the education system (which is arguably only possible by a fluent command of the language of education, this being invariably the legitimate (standard) form of the language) is equated with entry into the ‘better’ end of the labour market, those who speak dominated, devalued forms of language are induced to “collaborate in the destruction of their instruments of expression”.

This notion of collaboration, or complicity, is crucial to Bourdieu’s framework of symbolic power (Thompson 1991), for although the political will for linguistic unification must be there, in order for the legitimacy of this language to be maintained without resorting to physical force or constraints, it is necessary for the dominant *and* the dominated groups to believe in, and accept, its legitimacy. Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic power describes a power that is invisible but which is exercised in all areas of everyday life and is maintained and reproduced through active collaboration rather than passive submission or free adherence to values.

Before continuing with the discussion of Bourdieu’s theory of language and symbolic power, it is helpful to see how this fits into his broader framework of practice, based upon the key notions of *habitus*, *capital* and *field* (or *market*), which I shall attempt to outline as briefly as possible.

A key concept in his theory is *habitus*,

which acts as a kind of medium between the external context and the immediate situational circumstances of any social encounter. The habitus is a set of dispositions, accumulated throughout life experience, which 'mould' an individual's behaviour. Although we are not generally aware of the influence of our habitus, as it is almost second nature, it inclines us to act and react in certain ways.

Practice, however, is not the product of the habitus as such, but of the relation between the habitus and a particular field (or market), which in simple terms is the social setting or context. One important feature of a field is the way in which it allows for the conversion of different forms of capital. Bourdieu cites three major types of capital: economic (or material); cultural; and symbolic (accumulated prestige). A typical example of how different forms of capital can be converted is that educational qualifications (cultural capital) can lead to a lucrative job (material capital), which in turn leads to social status and prestige (symbolic capital).

Within the field of education, we can see the workings of the symbolic economy. Mainstream education nurtures a middle-class habitus and at the same time legitimizes the sort of discursive practices associated with this kind of habitus, leading to cultural and linguistic reproduction. Those who are most likely to succeed in the educational system are those who legitimize the symbolic power of their 'educators' by complying with the rules of the game, because they believe that this will lead to profit for themselves in the way of cultural (and so implicitly material and symbolic) capital. Of course this naturally creates a process of inclusion and exclusion which leads to the maintenance of social inequality, without resorting to the use of physical force. So the field of education has the

monopoly in reproducing the linguistic market (Roberts and Sarangi 1995:365), which relies on an unequal distribution of linguistic capital. In other words, in order to maintain the balance of power, everyone must believe in the value of the legitimate language, although not everyone can have a share in this particular form of capital.

Until the 1960's, the myth of the inherent superiority of SE was relatively easily upheld. Although the 1944 Education Act meant free education for all, it could be argued that the education offered at this time merely served to reinforce a system of meritocracy based not on true abilities, but on social background. It was taken for granted that "chil-

within the field of education,  
we can see the workings of the  
symbolic economy

dren of every social background.... should ideally speak and write an English which conformed with the best speech and writing of the educated upper classes" (Cox 1994:29) - the operative word here being *ideally*, as those children who entered school without the beginnings of the necessary linguistic capital - in other words children from working class backgrounds - were immediately at a disadvantage; according to Bourdieu, the mismatch between the language of the home and school is an important cause of educational failure (Collins 1993). Yet at the same time these children were inculcated with a sense of the superiority of the legitimate language and even a sense of shame of their own mode of expression.

This is clearly spelled out in the following extract from a newspaper article<sup>5</sup>:

*The working-class generation that was first able to take advantage of the 1944 Education Act..... would later remember their sense of shame when they were humiliated by teachers for their use of regional dialect and non-standard spoken sentences.*

*It rendered them, one told me, literally speechless in class, too ashamed to put their hand up when they knew the answer to a question. They knew how to write in a way that would get them through exams, they had formal language. But when they opened their gobs they talked as everyone around them at home did. It was habit.*

In this way, the children whose linguistic habitus did not coincide with the dominant language collaborated in its legitimisation by excluding themselves from classroom activities. The sense of shame in one's home language was further reinforced by the fact that post-1918 educational policy emphasised the potential of language as a source of national unity, based on a fear of social unrest and the escalation of class war in Russia (Cameron and Bourne 1988). This is illustrated in the Newbolt Report of 1921 (quoted in Cameron and Bourne 1988:158):

*The English people might learn as a whole to regard their own language, first*

*with respect and then with a genuine feeling of pride and affection.... it is a part of England; to maltreat it or deliberately to debase it would be seen as an outrage.....Such a feeling for our native language would be a bond of union between classes and would beget the right kind of national pride.*

It is obvious that the language referred to is SE, as is made perfectly clear in a further extract of the same report (quoted in Edwards 1983:70):

*It is emphatically the business of the Elementary School to teach all its pupils who either speak a definite dialect or whose speech is disfigured by vulgarisms, to speak standard English, and to speak it clearly, and with expression.*

In this way, the predominant features of the discourse of language policy in education at that time were not only a reinforcement of the value of SE as linguistic capital and the parallel devaluation of any deviations from it by asserting the idea of language deficiency, but also an appeal to national unity and pride. These two features are obviously deeply conflicting - on the one hand seeking through language policy to reproduce a society with a strong class divide, whilst on the other hand trying to create a bond between classes through the very same language.

By the 1960's, however, British society was no longer divided merely by social class, but also by race. The arrival of large numbers of non-English speaking children and speakers of English dialects from overseas<sup>6</sup> meant that language policies in education had to account for this. In the 1960's, separate ESL provision was made for non-English speaking children, adhering to the dominant assimilation perspective of educationalist policy makers which sought ways of helping these

children to learn English as quickly as possible in order for them to become fully integrated into the education system (Gillborn 1990:173). However, by the mid 1970's it was widely accepted that this policy might have adverse effects on the educational opportunities of pupils who were being excluded from the normal classroom (*ibid.*). The publication of the Bullock report (DES 1975), which seriously addressed the issues of multi-ethnic education, was met with enthusiasm by English teachers and generally considered to be a humane and progressive document (Stubbs 1989:236). The fact that children who did not have English as a first language were presumed to be better off in the normal classroom was presented as an argument for equal opportunities—which was to become a key concept in the discourse of language policies—and this was reiterated in the Swann report (DES 1985) which again discussed the separate ESL provision and argued that it was an example of 'institutional racism', which although not discriminatory in *intent* was clearly discriminatory in *effect* in denying the individual child access to the 'full range of educational opportunities available'.

However, the concept of equal opportunities can be understood in different ways, as Gillborn (1990) points out. Drawing on the work of Halsey *et al* (1980) he suggests that there are three approaches to the interpretation of equal opportunities in education:

- 1) the idea of opportunities for access and participation;
- 2) a focus on the inequalities of circumstance, despite *formal* opportunities;
- 3) a focus upon the equality of outcome, ie. the equality of success rates in education of different groups, based on social class, gender, ethnicity etc. It appears that the discourse of educational policy tends to focus on the first ap-

proach, without consideration of the second, which then almost inevitably leads to inequality of outcome.

Following the line of this argument, which seems to fit in with Bourdieu's framework of the symbolic economy, we can see how children of multilingual backgrounds, now finding themselves in the mainstream classrooms, have equality of access to the curriculum, but, along with those children who speak a non-standard dialect of English, find that their linguistic habitus leads to an inequality of circumstances and thus to a potential inequality in terms of academic success. The fact that their home language was devalued, either explicitly or simply by non-recognition of it, frequently led to collaboration rather than resistance, for collaboration (often on the part of the parents as much as the children) was seen as the only way to achieve some measure of academic success, as the following testimony illustrates<sup>7</sup>:

*Throughout my schooling in England no-one took the slightest interest in the fact that I spoke another language ..... Of course my parents wanted me to learn English but they were never given the opportunity to decline the offer of Greek lessons at my mainstream schools. So I and many others like me learnt early on that the best way to get by was to be like everybody else. We craved assimilation.*

Not all children were so willing to collaborate with school language policies, however. Many resisted by holding on to, and reinforcing, their linguistic (and thus socio-cultural) identities. Although it is beyond the scope of this discussion to study this resistance in any detail, Edwards (1979, 1983), for example, documents the case of West Indian children and Willis (1977) describes the resistance and counter-culture of British-born

working class boys. However, Bourdieu would argue that resistance of this sort is merely another example of collusion. In the same way as he rejects the notion of striving to appropriate what would allow assimilation into the dominant culture as being a form of submission, he equally does not accept that stigmatised groups who claim the very stigma by which they are dominated as the basis of their identity to be a form of resistance (Bourdieu 1991: 94-5). In terms of the symbolic economy, once a particular form of language has been devalued in a particular market, it has no capital for investment and so to use it brings no profit.

Despite the fact that through the 1970's and early 1980's there was no official recognition of other languages or non-standard forms of English in the education system, there was a growing feeling that a new orthodoxy had taken hold in British schools concerning the teaching of English, which seemed to reflect the latest linguistic ideas focusing on ideas such as descriptive rather than prescriptive grammar, the importance of distinguishing spoken forms of language from written forms, and particularly the 'revolutionary' idea that no language or dialect is inherently superior to any other. Among certain quarters, especially those of extreme right-wing Conservatives, there was increasing alarm about the move away from the teaching of traditional, prescriptive grammar embodied in SE. In 1983, a pamphlet called *The Language Trap*, written by a Professor of Education, John Honey, appeared.<sup>8</sup> The pamphlet was a direct challenge to the notion of 'linguistic equality' and therefore attributed to linguists who endorse this claim a certain responsibility for the falling standards, both educational and moral, in schools. The basic argument was that to encourage the vernacular at the expense of SE was a 'cruel trick' as it

resulted in working-class and ethnic minority children being denied the language of social improvement (Graddol and Swann 1988).

Four years later, The Centre for Policy Studies published a pamphlet entitled *English Our English* (Marenbon 1987) which was also an attempt to defend the superiority of SE. One of the most telling fears, seen in relation to our discussion, was that "at the centre of the new orthodoxy is its devaluation of Standard English" (Marenbon 1994:22). This, in terms of Bourdieu's framework of symbolic power, would mean that the dominant group in British society was in danger of suffering a devastating blow through the decrease in value of their linguistic capital in the lin-

guistic market. It could therefore be argued that this fear played an important role in the subsequent predominance of the language issue in the discourse of political ideology in the late 1980's and 1990's. Simon Jenkins, writing in the *Sunday Times* in late 1988 claimed that "grammar is the fastest rising topic in the Tory policy firmament, now almost on a par with hanging and dole fraud" (quoted in Cameron and Bourne 1988:148).

As this fear could not be spelled out, however, it was necessary to link language to wider ideological issues, such as morality and equal opportunities, in order to appeal to the nation to collaborate in the maintenance of SE as the dominant mode of expression. Thus the apparent

decline in English language teaching standards was blatantly linked to the rise in crime, for example, as illustrated by the comments of Norman Tebbit, Conservative Party Chairman at the time, on a national radio programme in late 1984:

*I'm sure that if people are not at work they've got more time for getting into trouble - that's absolutely true.....[but] there is a moral dimension to this as well as any other. And I think that's because we've allowed so many standards to slip. I must say I was interested this morning to notice that Mr Waterhouse in the Daily Mirror had noticed how educational standards had slipped - not through lack of money but because teachers weren't*

## until the 1960's, the myth of the inherent superiority of SE was relatively easily upheld

*bothering to teach kids how to spell and to punctuate properly.....*

*One's standards have fallen. Crime is not thought of as a terribly serious matter these days - a little bit of drug pushing here and there.....*

*If you allow standards to slip to the stage where good English is no better than bad English, where people can turn up filthy and nobody takes any notice of them at school..... all those things tend to cause people to have no standards at all, and once you lose standards then there's no imperative to stay out of crime.<sup>9</sup>*

It is interesting that the concept of 'bad' English being directly linked to petty crime, personal hygiene and the broader

issue of 'falling standards' is given apparent credibility by referring to the tabloid press<sup>10</sup>, widely accredited with influencing popular opinion, and therefore inculcating attitudes that will lead to complicity in the relationship between language use and symbolic power.

In 1987, a committee was appointed by Kenneth Baker, Secretary of State for Education and Science, in order to develop a model of the English language for use as a basis for the teaching of English in schools. The expectations of the Government were clear - they wanted a return to the traditional teaching of a standard grammar which, under the rather thin disguise of an appeal for equal opportunities (access for all children to

used in the ideological discourse of the Conservative party by insisting on the euphemism 'knowledge about language' and rejecting the teaching of Latinate grammar in favour of a more modern approach to English teaching outlined in the model of language developed by the Committee, its focusing on the indispensability of SE as a means of access into 'the wider community' as opposed to the 'family and immediate circle' (DES 1988:7) is playing straight into the hands of the government. SE is seen as "a great social bank, on which we all draw and to which we all contribute" (DES 1988:14). But as Cameron and Bourne (1988) point out:

once a particular form of language has been devalued in a particular market, it has no capital for investment and so to use it brings no profit

the language of power), was designed to bring the education system firmly back to the traditional system of inclusion and exclusion. The issues surrounding the eventual publication of this committee's report, which became known as the Kingman Report (DES 1988) and the subsequent publication of the Cox report (DES 1989) are complex. The scope of this discussion, however, will be limited to a brief overview of how the reports handled the question of SE and the ensuing reactions.

One reading of the Kingman report (eg Cameron and Bourne 1988) is that, although it distances itself to some extent from the key concept of 'grammar' as

*what is not addressed is the issue of who put up the capital, who controls the means of linguistic exchange. We might well ask why it is that some people are forced to borrow at exorbitant rates of interest while their own currency lies valueless in a sock beneath the mattress!*

The Cox Report makes even more explicit the notion that SE is the language of opportunity, stating that without access to SE, pupils will find many future doors closed to them in terms of further education, the job market and even cultural activities (DES 1989: 4.5).

It is also noteworthy that the Cox Report draws attention to the "essential" role of SE as an "international lan-

guage"; in other words as desirable *international* linguistic capital. The symbolic economy is no longer played out solely within national boundaries but on a world-wide scale.

However, the aspect of the Cox report that most attracted government and media attention was the fact that (despite recommending the explicit teaching of SE), it emphasised the 'linguistic equality' principle, leading to tabloid headlines such as the following (quoted in Cox 1991):

*Thatcher furious with trendy Experts - a report telling schools to ignore English teaching in favour of trendy methods has infuriated Mrs Thatcher (Mail on Sunday 13.11.89)*

*Baker in row over basic English - Bad grammar is acceptable for schoolchildren an official report recommended yesterday (Daily Mail 16.11.89)*

*The Professor what don't know nothing - is correct English just a dialect or a tool for a youngster in search of a job? (London Standard 17.11.89)*

The examples above demonstrate the fact that the Press, in carrying reports of this type is displaying its typical propensity to distort one form of discourse into another, so that professionals have little control over the meaning given to their discourse in the public domain (Graddol and Swann 1988) - thus academic insistence on linguistic equality is distorted into meaning that 'trendy' (implying left-wing and therefore anti-establishment as well as the idea that it is only a passing fashion) theories claim 'bad' grammar as acceptable, and that 'correct' English is being devalued (cf. the *Language Trap* argument discussed above).

Yet it cannot be denied that the Cox

report was instrumental in the reassessment of the value given to other languages and dialects in the educational field. The report explicitly states that SE should not be confused with 'good' English (DES 1989:4.10) and that:

*Teachers should never treat non-standard dialect as sub-standard dialect but should recognise the intimate links between dialect and identity and the damage to self-esteem and motivation which can be caused by indiscriminate 'correction' of dialect forms (ibid. 15.15)*

Whether or not an eventual bolstering of socio-cultural (including linguistic) identity really can contribute to a redistribution of the symbolic power within the field of education is a complex issue, but it is possible that the Government's plan to reassert the importance of SE backfired quite dramatically - for the recommendations of the Cox report indicate that the teaching of SE should be based on a much more realistic premise of equality of opportunity than in the past and that other languages, as well as non-standard forms of English, should be 'valued' as an 'enormous resource'. Furthermore, it emphasised that schools should develop their own language policies 'which are sensitive to their local circumstances' (DES 1989: 2.12). This effectively means that schools can develop policies which are designed to give all children access to the 'language of power' whilst enhancing the recognition of their home languages, not as a stigma, but as a useful form of linguistic capital in its own right. Admittedly this would be a long and complex process, but the implications for this sort of educational policy in the framework of the symbolic economy are potentially far reaching. If the education system is no longer seen by the dominant group in society as reproducing and maintaining

social inequalities and the dominated groups are no longer forced to collude in the devaluation of their own forms of capital on the symbolic market, then the whole basis of symbolic power relations is seen to be weakening.

Although it is difficult to imagine non-standard forms of English becoming legitimate languages in education in Britain, the fact that official reports such as the Cox report even suggest that SE is not the only form of language that can be valued is obviously infuriating to those who wish to maintain their symbolic power in the linguistic market.

This perhaps explains why the Government, in the late 1980's and 1990's, made such an effort in its campaigns to promote the myth of 'good' and 'bad' English. Collins (1993:128) points out that "educational systems in capitalist democracies face a basic dilemma: they must profess egalitarian ideals while rationing class privilege". However, if the education system itself is seen to be leaning even a little too far on the side of egalitarian ideals, the government might see fit to intervene from outside the education system. Thus we return to the 'Better English Campaign', widely publicised in all forms of the media. The message intended to be inferred from this campaign is clear: it is in the best interests of all children to acquire SE. However, the underlying force of the campaign can be seen to be discriminatory and a backlash against educational policies which attempt to deny the traditional system of inclusion and exclusion. It is significant that Trevor MacDonald was chosen as the chairman of the campaign - as a black immigrant (arriving from Trinidad in the 1960's) he symbolises the message that collaboration in the linguistic market can ultimately lead to success.<sup>11</sup>

In the late 1990's, under the New Labour government<sup>12</sup>, educational policy

is (debatably) more concerned with the concept of equal opportunities. David Blunkett, the education secretary, recently commented:

*There is a big divide between the haves and the have-nots in education. As secretary of state, I am acting to overcome it.*<sup>13</sup>

In early September of 1999, the education secretary announced revisions to the National Curriculum in England, to be implemented in 2000. One of the main changes is a 'stronger emphasis on inclusion', with a view to providing 'effective learning opportunities for all pupils' (QCA undated). One of the key principles for inclusion is the 'overcoming of potential barriers to learning and assessment'; the fact that there is a large number of children in school in England who are learning English as an additional language is recognised as one such barrier.

Meanwhile, standard English continues to be the only legitimate language of education and although the National Curriculum now makes explicit the entitlement of all pupils to full access to opportunities for developing competence in SE, and even acknowledges the 'richness' of other dialects and languages (albeit in terms of making an important contribution to pupils' knowledge and understanding of standard English!), the underlying call for collusion in legitimising the dominant language form remains the same:

*In order to participate confidently in public, cultural and working life, pupils need to be able to speak, write and read standard English fluently and accurately (DFEE undated).*

**d'a**

Notas

- 1 Quoted in the *Sunday Times*, 21.04.96
- 2 For example, in parliament, law courts, church services, TV and radio broadcasting, the press, and particularly in education
- 3 A dialect is any variety of a language, regional or social, and can be different in some words, grammar and/or pronunciation from other varieties of the same language
- 4 In the current National Curriculum for education in England, the general requirements for English state that pupils should recognise that spoken standard English is not the same as Received Pronunciation and can be spoken in a variety of accents
- 5 From an article by Linda Grant, 'You want for us to stay cool, already?' which appeared in the *Guardian*, 23.12.96
- 6 Particularly from the former Asian and Caribbean colonies
- 7 Savva (1990:249)
- 8 Graddol and Swann (1988:97) note that the National Council for Educational Standards, who published the pamphlet, was referred to at the time by the *Times Educational Supplement* as being an 'influential group of right-wing lobbyists'
- 9 Quoted in Graddol and Swann (1988) and Stubbs (1989)
- 10 The *Daily Mirror*, referred to in the comments by Tebbit, is one of the most widely read British tabloid newspapers
- 11 Trevor MacDonald is a high-profile (and presumably very highly paid!) television news-reader whose English is undoubtedly what most people would think of as standard and indeed 'highly educated'; he has no trace of an Afro-Caribbean dialect
- 12 Elected in 1997
- 13 David Blunkett, writing in the *Guardian*, 16.09.99

Bibliografia

- BOURDIEU, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited and introduced by J.B. THOMPSON; Translated by G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge, MA.: Polity Press
- CAMERON, D. and J. Bourne (1988) No common ground: Kingman, Grammar and the Nation. *Language and Education* 2/3: 147-160
- COLLINS, J. (1993) Determination and contradiction: an appreciation and critique of the work of Pierre Bourdieu on language and education. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma and M. Postone (eds) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Oxford: Polity Press
- COX, B. (1991) *Cox on Cox: An English Curriculum for the 1990's*. London: Hodder & Stoughton
- COX, B. (1994) The National Curriculum in English. In S. Brindley (ed) *Teaching English*. London: Routledge
- CRYSTAL, D. (1995) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DFEE (Department for Education and Employment) (undated) *The National Curriculum: General Requirements For English*. Published on the Internet ([www.dfes.gov.uk](http://www.dfes.gov.uk))
- DES (Department of Education and Science) (1975) *A Language for Life*. (the Bullock report) London: HMSO
- DES (1985) *Education for All* (the Swann report) London: HMSO
- DES (1988) *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Teaching of English Language* (The Kingman Report) London: HMSO
- DES (1989) *English for Ages 5-16* (the Cox report) London: DES and Welsh Office
- EDWARDS, V. (1979) *The West Indian Language Issue in British Schools: Challenges and Responses*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- EDWARDS, V. (1983) *Language in Multicultural Classrooms*. London: Batsford 'Academic Press
- HALSEY, A.H., A.F. Heath and J.M. Ridge (1980) *Origins and Destinations: Family, Class and Education in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- HONEY, J. (1983) *The Language Trap: Race, Class and the Standard English Issue in British Schools*. London: National Council for Educational Standards
- GILLBORN, D. (1990) *'Race', Ethnicity and Education*. London: Unwin Hyman
- GRADDOL, D. and J. Swann (1988) Trapping Linguists: An analysis of linguists' responses to John Honey's pamphlet 'The Language Trap'. *Language and Education* 2/2: 95- 111
- MARENBNON, J. (1987) *English Our English*. London: Centre for Policy Studies
- MARENBNON, J. (1994) The new orthodoxy examined (taken from Marenbon 1987) In S. Brindley (ed) *Teaching English*. London: Routledge
- MCARTHUR, T. (1992) *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- NEWBOLT, H. (1921) *The Teaching of English in England*. London: HMSO
- PERERA, K. (1994) Standard English: the debate. In S. Brindley (ed.) *Teaching English*. London: Routledge
- QCA (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) (undated) *Revised National Curriculum for 2000. What has changed?* Published on the internet ([www.qca.org.uk](http://www.qca.org.uk))
- ROBERTS, C. and S. Sarangi (1995) 'But are they one of us?': Managing and evaluating identities in work related contexts. *Multilingua* 14/4:363-390
- SAVVA, H. (1990) The rights of bilingual children. In R. Carter (ed.) *Knowledge about Language and the Curriculum*:248-268 London: Hodder & Stoughton
- STUBBS, M. (1989) The state of English and the English State: reflections on the Cox Report. *Language and Education* 3/4: 235-250
- THOMPSON, J.B. (1991) Editor's introduction. In P. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* Cambridge MA: Polity Press
- TRUDGILL, P. (1995) *Sociolinguistics* (revised edn.) London: Penguin
- WILLIS, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Colombia University Press