SPEAKING "LIKE A MAN" IN TEAMSTERVILLE: CULTURE PATTERNS OF ROLE ENACTMENT IN AN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD

Gerry Philipsen

TALK is not everywhere valued equally; nor is it anywhere valued equally in all social contexts. Speaking is an object of a high degree of interest, elaboration, and positive evaluation in some cultures, such as those of the Barundi[1] and St. Vincentians[2] but is relatively deemphasized in other cultures, such as those of the Paliyans[3] and La Have Islanders.[4] Cultures are not only varied but are also internally diverse in the emphasis they place on the value of talk; in all communities there are some situations in which "silence is golden" and some in which talk is the most valued mode of social behavior.[5] Each community has its own cultural values about speaking and these are linked to judgments of situational appropriateness.

"Teamsterville," which is located on the near south side of Chicago, is a neighborhood of blue-collar, low-income whites who share a cultural outlook on communication.[6] Teamsterville's cultural (i.e., shared, tacit) understandings about the value of speaking are sharply defined and susceptible of discovery, although they are not written down in native treatises on effective communication, nor can native informants necessarily verbalize them. One manifestation of cultural outlook is the local view of the appropriateness of speaking versus other actional strategies (such as silence, violence, or non-verbal threats) in male role enactment or self-presentation. Whether and how well a man performs in a manly way is a principal criterion in Teamsterville for judging whether his behavior is appropriate and proper to

Mr. Philipsen is Assistant Professor of Communication Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. *This paper is based in part on the author's Ph.D. dissertation research completed at Northwestern University under the supervision of Ethel M. Albert. Acknowledgment is made of the helpful comments of Rollin W. Quimby on an earlier version of the paper.*

[1] Ethel M. Albert, "Culture Patterning of Speech Behavior in Burundi," in *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication,* eds. John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972), pp. 72-105.

[2] Roger Abrahams and Richard Bauman, "Sense and Nonsense in St. Vincent: Speech Behavior and Decorum in a Caribbean Community," *American Anthropologist,* 73 (1971), 762-772.

[3] Peter Gardner, "Symmetric Respect and Memorate Knowledge: The Structure and Ecology of Individualistic Culture," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology,* 22 (1966), 389-415.

[4] Richard Bauman, "The La Have Island General Store: Sociability and Verbal Art in a Nova Scotia Community," *Journal of American Folklore,* 85 (1972), 330-343.

[5] Two ethnographies of communication which verify and illustrate the culture patterning of silence behavior are Keith H. Basso, "'To Give up on Words': Silence in Western Apache Culture," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology,* 26 (1970), 213-230: Susan U. Phillips, "Acquisition of Rules for Appropriate Speech Usage," *Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics,* 21 (1970), 77-94.

[6] "Teamsterville" is a fictitious name. Description of the physical setting and the economic and political characteristics of the neighborhood are presented in Gerry Frank Philipsen, *Communication in Teamsterville: A Sociolinguistic Study of Speech Behavior in an Urban Neighborhood,* Diss. Northwestern University, 1972, 102-114.

the social identity, "male." Manliness is a theme of much neighborhood talk about self and others and a Teamsterville man is aware that his social performances will be judged frequently as to their manliness. To know how to perform, or present oneself, "like a man" in Teamsterville as elsewhere is to be privy to implicit understandings shared by members of the speech community, i.e., it is to have access to the culture. It is because the male role is highly important in the culture that description of the place of speaking in male role enactment reveals much in general about the community's valuation of talk, and cultural interpretations of the value of speaking in male role enactment are the special concern of this report.

Collection and Analysis of Data

I had two periods of contact with Teamsterville. The first was a twenty-one month period during 1969 and 1970 spent as a social group worker in the neighborhood. The second, which began after a twelve month absence from the neighborhood, was for nine months in 1971 and 1972 devoted exclusively to field work research.

Participant observation and interviewing were used as techniques of data collection and data were analyzed using an ethnography of communication model.[7] All available data, including field records of speech behavior, informants' statements (spontaneous and elicited), and tape-recorded verbal interaction provided the evidence from which the culture pattern was inferred, and against which it was tested. Thus, multiple sources of data were used in constructing descriptions and verifying hypotheses relevant to the inferred culture pattern.[8]

One research technique was particularly useful in constructing the culture pattern. The two episodes analyzed in this paper draw attention to role enactments which were judged ineffective by Teamsterville residents. Native reactions to out-of-role behavior are instructive because they bring into sharp focus role expectations which have been violated.[9] While exclusive use of this technique could produce a distorted view of the culture pattern,[10] it is useful as one source of clues to discovery of a pattern. The episodes reported below were clues to discovery and provide concrete instances of a pattern which was verified systematically through ethnographic research.

The Culture Pattern

A Teamsterville native shares tacit understandings about the situational appropriateness of speech behavior—specifically, that in some situations speech is appropriate in male role enactment, but that in others it is not and its use casts doubt on the speaker's manliness. Three classes of situation can be discerned: those which are marked in the culture for a relatively great amount of talk by men, those marked for minimal

[7] My use of the term "situation" and my reference to "an ethnography of communication model" are based on the programmatic essays of Dell Hymes, particularly "The Ethnography of Speaking," in *Anthropology and Human Behavior,* eds. T. Gladwin and W. C. Sturtevant (Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1962), pp. 15-53.

[8] This is an adaptation of a procedural technique suggested in Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest, *Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966), pp. 1-5.

[9] Cf. Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor 1959), chapter five.

[10] Raoul Naroll cautions against selecting field data which are conspicuous because exotic, thereby overlooking other field data which are inconspicuous because familiar to the ethnographer. "Data Quality Control in Cross-Cultural Surveys," in *A Handbook of Method in Cultural Anthropology,* eds. Raoul Naroll and Ronald Cohen (Garden City, New York: The Natural History Press 1970), p. 928.

talk by men, and those in which an emphasis of the verbal channel is proscribed for effective male self-presentation and for which other means of expression are required. Following are brief analyses of the first two of these classes of situation and a more extensive analysis of the third.

When the social identity relationship of the participants in a situation is symmetrical, the situation can appropriately realize a great amount of talking by a Teamsterville man. Specifically, the participants in a speaking situation should be matched on such identity attributes as age, sex, ethnicity, occupational status, and location of residence and the participants should be long-time friends. Speaking is a dominant focus of all-male social interaction in corner groups and corner bars. For boys the street corner and for men the corner bar is the principal setting for sociability, and speaking is a dominant activity in these settings. Typically, small groups of boys "hang" on their own corner and groups of men have their own corner bar, a public drinking establishment which has been claimed by them as their "turf," a territory to which outsiders are not invited or welcomed. Teamsterville men seek out other men of like identity, in well-established locations, and these are the situations in which it is most appropriate and proper for a man to produce a great quantity of talk.

A high quantity of speaking is considered inappropriate in situations in which the participants' identity relationship is asymmetrical. Such relationships are, for the adult man in Teamsterville, those with a wife, child, boss, outsider to the neighborhood, or a man of different ethnicity. Certainly, Teamsterville men do speak to their wives, girlfriends, children, and employers but these are not contexts of relationship which call for a high quantity of speaking nor are these the "natural" situations in which to engage others in a state of talk. Thus one criterion in Teamsterville for marking a "speech situation" for men is the variable, the social identity relationship of the interlocutors; in speech situations the relationship is symmetrical on relevant identity attributes, in non-speech situations the relationship is asymmetrical.

For some situations the question is not so much whether there should be a great quantity or frequency of talk but rather what mode of action is to be emphasized in male self-presentation, and it is this kind of situation which I have selected for more detailed analysis. Specifically, an analysis of the Teamsterville data produces the generalization that when a man must assert power over or influence another person, speaking is disapproved as a dominant means of self-presentation and in such situations other means of expression are preferred, sometimes required, if the actor's male role enactment is to be credible to those who witness it. Three instances of this class of sitution have particular relevance for a Teamsterville man: when he responds to insult, an insult directed either at him or at his female relative or girlfriend, when he seeks to influence the behavior of a status inferior, such as a child, and when he asserts himself in politics or economics. These instances of the class of situation are analyzed and illustrated below.

It is not uncommon that a Teamsterville man must respond to insults directed at him or at the reputation of a woman relative or girlfriend. An episode illustrates the Teamsterville view that an emphasis of the verbal channel is not appropriate for men in such situations. A settlement house group worker took a group of Teamsterville boys (thirteen and fourteen years of age) on a trip to Old Town, an entertainment area in

Chicago. On the drive from Teamsterville to Old Town, conversation turned to the topic of defending the honor of women. The question was put to the group worker, who was not a native of Teamsterville: "What would you do if a guy insulted your wife?" The group worker responded that he did not know, that it would depend on the situation. The answer did not satisfy the boys, who pressed the question by asking, "But you'd hit him, wouldn't you?" The worker answered that he did not know, that he probably would not hit him, or fight, but would instead probably try to talk to him, or persuade him to leave. The boys, however, pressed the point, and became increasingly nervous and upset, to the point that their moving vehicle was shaking from the activity. They were, as I recorded it at the time, visibly agitated. As the group drove off Lake Shore Drive, a main highway in Chicago, into the Old Town area, all of the boys, who were usually enthusiastic about Old Town visits, clamored to go home, saying they did not want to go to Old Town after all.

How can the Teamsterville boys' apparently sudden decision to go home be explained? In spite of their fondness for Old Town, the boys were—on this and previous occasions—uneasy about many of the people they expected to meet there, and they freely verbalized their apprehensions of blacks, "hippies," and "pot-smokers." On a typical walk with the boys on Wells Street—Old Town's main street—some of the boys would always be close to the side of their adult group worker. At the start of the trip in question, the boys apparently assumed they would be in the company of a normal man who protects those in his care in their culturally prescribed way, for example, by fighting for them as he would for the honor of female relatives. When the boys learned, through the discussion in the car, that their adult companion of the evening was not the kind of man who protects those dependent upon him in what is for Teamsterville the culturally prescribed way they became frightened. The boys' definition of the situation had been radically altered by the conversation in the car. The closer they got to Old Town (where, they would reason, they might need an adult for security), the uneasier they became. To the boys, given their assumptions, the situation was threatening. The boys faced a problem of trying to deal with an alien situation, created by a man who said he would choose silence or talk when fighting is, to the boys, the proper and appropriate response.

A second episode is about the Teamsterville reaction to a man who did not know—or who for some other reason did not act in conformity to—a local conception of appropriate role enactment. Again, the outsider's out-of-role behavior was the choice of speech over fighting as the preferred mode of self-presentation in an exigent situation, one which required a man to influence the behavior of his status inferiors. The episode, which took place over a period of days, was prompted by the trouble a Teamsterville settlement house had with teenage boys in its youth program—the boys were undisciplined, rude, and defiant of authority. The director of the program approached the problem in what he thought was a constructive and sympathetic way, by trying to reason with the boys, to involve them in decision-making, to understand their feelings, etc. These were techniques which had, in other settings, proved effective for the director. The strategy was not effective in Teamsterville; the boys became more rebellious and increasingly verbally abusive and disrespectful of adult staff members.

John, a long-time resident of the

neighborhood, embodied the local norms of the strong, physically aggressive male. John, who witnessed much of what went on during teen program hours, had to face, as I now interpret it, a dilemma. On the one hand, the director of the program had a position of high status in the community and he was a married, adult man. On the other hand, the director did not physically subdue the boys, as John thought he should. John's dilemma can be phrased as the resolution of conflicting information: either the director was not a normal male or the role expectation of corporal punishment and the speech proscription for men in such situations was not applicable.

John dealt with the dilemma in three stages. He apparently ruled out the possibility that the director belonged in the non-normal category.[11] At first he hinted, and eventually stated outright, that the director ought to "beat the hell out of these kids." He even expressed his willingness to help and reassured the adult that he could obtain the boys' parents' permission for such action. John's suggestion was reinforced by his explanation to the non-native that Teamsterville boys interpreted the verbal strategies as a sign of homosexuality, a point which I verified repeatedly in other observations and through elicitation of role expectations from informants.

Having failed to change his interlocutor's behavior to conform to Teamsterville expectations, John adopted a second strategy, shifting from persuasion to an attempt at rationalizing the behavior. Since the director failed to live up to the social-moral code, John sought to interpret the behavior in light of another code—it was illegal, he reasoned, for someone in the position of director to hit minors: "I know you'd like to hit these kids, but someone in your job can't do it, it's against the law, but I know that you'd like to hit them." It appears that John was beginning actively to re-evaluate the alien behavior. However, recourse to "higher authority" as an explanation apparently did not satisfy him for long.

John's third and final strategy can also be described from a moral perspective. The director was not immoral (homosexual), or guided by an extra-local morality (legally bound not to hit minors), but was now, in John's eyes, so proper that he was able to transcend the expectations which apply to mere mortals; John said to the director: "You know what you are, all the trouble you get from these kids, I don't know how you can keep from belting em' one; you're a saint, that's what you are." The director's speaking strategy had been interpreted and rationalized. John applied several levels of the Teamsterville moral code to account for the alien behavior, to preserve the director's role enactment as appropriate, proper, and convincing. The preference of a verbal to a physical role enactment was itself a message in the community, but John had to search for a meaning to that message with which he could comfortably live, a meaning that was at each stage of his interpretation a moral one.

In both of the above situations—an insult by a stranger and rude behavior by boys—the Teamsterville man discerns a threat to the credibility of his role enactment as male. The challenge requires a response, a self-presentation which answers the challenge. What resources for self-presentation are appro-

[11] One reason why it would be hard for John to assign the director to the category, non-normal, is that the director was married and in Teamsterville marriage is automatically accepted as proof that a man is not a homosexual. An illustration of this is that in a group discussion at the Teamsterville settlement house someone interpreted my wearing of colored socks as a sign that I was a homosexual; the assertion was quickly disputed when someone else said, "He can't be a queer, he's married."

priately available to him? Speech is the currency of social interaction when participants have similar social identities, including membership in a close-knit friendship group; speech purchases an expression of solidarity or assertion of status symmetry. Therefore a response in which speaking is the dominant mode of self-presentation has little value as a counter to the threat—indeed, the threat itself might be an inappropriate assertion of status symmetry. A speech surrogate as the dominant means of self-presentation purchases an assertion of distance, difference, or status asymmetry, and may therefore appropriately be used to counter the threat. The man must respond in such situations and the sanctioned resource for responding is something other than talk.

In Teamsterville speech is judged appropriate for male self-presentation in assertions of solidarity but not in assertions of power over another person. "Responding to insults" provides a neat illustration of this two-point theme. First, when an outsider to his group insults a boy's girlfriend or mother, to take a speaking "part" is to run the risk of having one's performance judged to be ineffective. By not defending his girlfriend physically the boy invites further attacks on himself, inferiority feelings for himself, and possible future attacks on the girl. After all, the Teamsterville boy would reason, who will protect her if her boyfriend is not "man enough" to defend her? I am here describing, as a construction from relevant data, the Teamsterville boys' own conceptualization. As in any study of norms, so in this, rules do not necessarily predict behavior. Speech, at least as a dominant mode of response, is *judged* ineffective as role enactment when dealing with an insult to a woman under a man's protection when the offender is an outsider. However, if a boy insults a peer's mother or girlfriend (e.g., the mother or girlfriend of a member of his own corner group), speech is judged an effective, appropriate means for neutralizing the attack. Preferred is a verbal put-down which in effect humiliates or defeats the attacker, but a simple appeal to stop is also appropriate. Speech is, in the situation defined, a sanctioned resource for acting to respond to the exigence of the situation. It should be emphasized that speech is efficatious for an expression of power only in the context of a previously established, continuing relationship which is based primarily on a solidarity tie. The strength of the tie supports the verbal appeal, and a verbal strategy but serves to activate the solidarity ties which are themselves persuasive resources.

Teamsterville residents not only believe that speech is inappropriate and improper in dealing with a threat from an outsider, but that its use will bring negative consequences to the boy such as future attacks on himself and his friends. So too, when a Teamsterville adult man wants to affirm or assert power over or influence the behavior of a child, the use of speech is not only ineffective but may also entail damaging consequences for the man's reputation. The operation of the principle is seen in the failure of a man to respond to verbal abuse from a child by a show of physical power. For the child to challenge the man with speech, particularly brash speech, is an initiation of status symmetry, a challenge which, if met only with talk by the adult, is not met at all. The use of speech by the child signals to the other a comment about the relationship, an implicit announcement that the speaker is in a solidarity relationship to the hearer. And in Teamsterville, as elsewhere, assertions of solidarity are judged to be the prerogative of the high-power

member of a pair.[12] For the man to restore the relationship to its properly asymmetrical state requires the use of an effective cultural resource for that situation, and such an effective resource is physical fighting or nonverbal threat, not talk. One informant summarized the Teamsterville view when he responded to my question of how a man would be judged if he *talked* to an erring child before spanking him: "I don't know of that ever happening. That just wouldn't be natural for a man to do."

In Teamsterville, speech is proper and functional in asserting male solidarity, but not in asserting power and influence in interpersonal situations. In critical symbolic ways, as protector and as master of a house, the Teamsterville man disvalues speech as a resource for male role enactment. In another critical way, as breadwinner, speech is not an integral part of earning a living or of other aspects of economic life. A list of Teamsterville occupations, prepared from my survey data and corroborated by government census figures,[13] suggests that the Teamsterville man requires relatively little verbal interaction in connection with his employment. And yet, when the Teamsterville man needs a job, or must deal with the civil authorities, or must plead a case, what means of persuasion are properly available to him? I would coin the phrase a "rhetoric of connections" as the answer to the question, meaning that connections with a political leader, a prospective employer, or other kinds of officials, are personal resources which may be morally and effectively marshalled in times of personal need. Whereas speech is not a resource critical to male role enactment in exigent situations, connections have a very real value. When I raised the subject of connections with my male informants, each of them smiled broadly. Apparently they were pleased by mention of the subject and enjoyed discussing it. Each emphasized the personal importance of connections and told how he himself had used connections successfully in some situations requiring effective action. "The more connections a man has, the more he is a man," is how one informant explained it.

For the Teamsterville man, minimal emphasis of talk in work settings is one part of a pattern of minimal talk with outsiders to the neighborhood, with persons in positions of authority who are not long-time associates, and with white-collar persons, with whom there is a perceived status difference. Most of the Teamsterville man's necessary contacts with "outsiders" are mediated through a local precinct captain, Catholic parish priest, or union steward. The politician —a precinct captain or his block assistant —serves as an intermediary in matters of employment, law, politics, and social welfare, and various other matters, thus minimizing the resident's direct dealings with the outside world. This is an extension of a widespread European pattern that extends from minor secular situations to religion. In the European countries of origin of Teamsterville residents, not only in politics are dealings with authority normally conducted by means of an intermediary, but also in the sacred realm, where the resident does not directly address the deity but relies upon such intermediaries as ministers, priests, or holy figures to whom he prays.

[12] Roger Brown and A. Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity" in *Style in Language*, ed. T. A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1960) pp. 253-276. Brown and Gilman state: "The suggestion that solidarity be recognized comes more gracefully from the elder than from the younger, from the richer than from the poorer, from the employer than from the employee, from the noble than from the commoner, from the female than from the male."

[13] Evelyn Kitagawa and Karl Taeuber, *Local Community Fact Book, 1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1963).

It should be noted that the intermediary principal redefines situations requiring assertion of influence from the use of speech by the suppliant to the use of solidarity or locality ties with the intermediary, who is eventually to state the case for the resident. Speaking is easy and appropriate for the intermediary in virtue of his higher social status and his demands for convincing role enactment as an intermediary.

The concept of the intermediary was confirmed in conversations with informants, who verified the "rule" of access to outsiders through an intermediary. In addition, the concept proved useful in explicating what I had, previous to formulation of the principle, viewed as inexplicable behavior. Throughout my years as employee-participant and as ethnographer-participant observer at a Teamsterville settlement house, I had occasion to observe on numerous occasions the following illustration of the intermediary principle in action. The settlement house required that any teenage boy wishing to join the group work program in the middle of the school year come to the office to register and speak to the director. Whenever a teenage boy came to register, however, he always brought a friend, someone who was already a member of the program, who stated the newcomer's case, while the applicant stood by as if mute, although he might later prove to be capable of loud and frequent talk. My uninformed response, borne of being socialized to a very different culture, was skepticism about a teenage boy who could not come on his own and speak "as a man." In Teamsterville, however, I discovered that many of these applicants were speechless only in situations of their choosing. To speak "like a man" in Teamsterville required knowing when and under what circumstances to speak at all.

Teamsterville residents do not think in terms of organized action for community improvement, nor do they think in terms of using a verbal strategy for self-assertion. I asked one block politician, who praised the connections system for satisfying the needs of individuals and families, whether a community group would be able to secure some needed improvement through a persuasive campaign. I tried phrasing the question in several different ways, but my interlocutor would or could answer my question only by pointing to the ways in which individuals secured personal favors through the effectiveness of an intermediary in the social or political system. The connections system—and the local conceptualization of its efficacy—is based on personal ties to intermediaries. My interviews of long-time residents and my own experience produced only two instances of a community group that organized a persuasive campaign for community improvement. Both instances were described by respondents as following this pattern: first, the groups tried to promote a cause through a group-organized persuasive campaign, including appeals through news media, but the groups did not have connections and the campaigns failed; then, someone in the neighborhood who had connections noticed the campaign and acted to secure the needed action. The importance is not the actual, but the reported, result of using personal connections in attaining the desired end. In Teamsterville, speech and group action are not regarded as effective methods for attaining difficult goals, and sometimes speech is thought to be counter-productive.

In summary, speech in Teamsterville is not an effective means for the display of a manly role before one who is not a peer. If an assertion of power is necessary, custom sanctions other means of expression. Naturally, the means vary

with the nature of the situation. If one's addressee is of lower status—a child, a woman, a member of another Teamsterville ethnic group—the power assertion may rely on nonverbal threat or physical combat. When one's addressee is of higher status—a boss, an outsider from a more prosperous neighborhood, a government official—male power assertion may properly employ personal connections with an intermediary who states the resident's case for him. When speech is used in asserting influence among peers or in securing the services of an intermediary, the role enactment is effective because of the strength provided by the established solidarity tie rather than the style or content of the verbal message. Just as the woman who has learned her roles in the speech community knows her place is in the home, so a man who has learned his roles in Teamsterville knows his "place" when it comes to speech behavior. He asserts himself in civil or economic affairs through an intermediary, and is neither so bold as to engage in talk with those far above him on the social scale nor so lacking in self-esteem that he must use speech to deal with those below him. To be able systematically to render a convincing performance of the male role in Teamsterville requires control of the culture, particularly that part of the culture which specifies the efficacy of speaking in appropriate, proper, and convincing role enactment.

Conclusions

The statement that talk is not everywhere valued equally is well established by ethnographic research. There is now a small but growing list of empirical studies which, taken together, verify Dell Hymes' statement that ". . . speaking may carry different functional loads within the communicative economies of different societies."[14] The Teamsterville study, as a descriptive datum, is further verification of that statement and also prompts me to speculate about cultural diversity of communication patterns in America. In Teamsterville, talk is negatively valued in many of the very situations for which other American communities most highly prize speaking strategies. Speaking is a culturally prized resource for male role enactment by black Americans in urban ghettos; the black man who *speaks* as a strategy for dealing with outsiders or females is enacting the male role appropriately according to the standards of his speech community.[15] The white collar man who can "talk things through" with his wife, child, or boss is using speech in culturally sanctioned ways.

The statement that talk is not anywhere valued equally in all social contexts suggests a research strategy for discovering and describing cultural or subcultural differences in the value of speaking. Speaking is one among other symbolic resources which are allocated and distributed in social situations according to distinctive culture patterns. In Teamsterville, for example, talk is negatively valued in some situations, positively valued in others, and where it is negatively valued other modes of action are prescribed. To describe Teamsterville men as linguistically deprived, taciturn, or uncommunicative (all of which they are, by the standards of the black ghetto or of middle class suburbia) would be to obscure the nature of the subcultural differences. What should be described, and eventually compared, is the subcultural allocation and distribu-

14 "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Setting" *Journal of Social Issues* 22 (1967), 10.

15 Cf. Ulf Hannerz "Streetcorner Mythmaking," *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1969), pp. 105-117.

tion of communicative resources. What such a perspective implies is not only that communities value speaking differently, but that speaking is a different part, albeit an important one, of the total culture pattern of communication. Fundamental to analysis of the place of speech in communication and social life is the discovery of where and when speech is used, and for what ends it is sanctioned.

Teamsterville is one of many American communities whose members share a distinctive cultural outlook on the value of speaking. If America is the home of diverse views about the value of speaking, then when Americans from diverse communities—or with diverse regional, class, or ethnic backgrounds—try to communicate with each other they bring to the communication encounter different underlying values about what is appropriate and proper communicative conduct. This suggests the importance of understanding the diversity of cultural outlooks on speaking in contemporary America. We have barely any information on what groups in the United States view speaking as an effective means of social influence and what alternatives they envision. Such a deficit in the fund of information should be remedied by descriptive and comparative studies of American speech communities. This study is intended as one contribution to the fund.