A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF BEGINNING READING MATERIAL AND A SELECTED NONSTANDARD DIALECT

by

Garbette A. M. Garraway

Diploma (Journalism), Vancouver City College, 1972

B. F. A., University of British Columbia, 1974

Diploma (Media Resources), Capilano College, 1979

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)

in the Faculty

of

Education

Garbette A. M. Garraway 1988

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

November, 1988

© All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Garbette A. M. Garraway

Degree: Master of Arts (Education)

Title of Project: A Contrastive Analysis of Beginning Reading Material and a Selected Nonstandard Dialect

Examining Committee:

Chair: Stuart Richmond

Kelleen Toohey
Senior Supervisor

Mary Sakari
Assistant Professor

Meguido Zola
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B. C.
V5A 1S6
External Examiner

Date Approved November 9/88

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

A Contrastive Analysis of Beginning Reading Material and a Selected Nonstandard Dialect

Author: _____
(signature)

Garbette A. M. Garraway
(name)

November 9th 1988
(date)

ABSTRACT

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the linguistic differences between Black nonstandard dialect and standard English became the focus of much attention as the probable cause of reading difficulties among Black nonstandard dialect speakers. The research in this area has traditionally compared children's comprehension of texts which differed in certain dialect features. This research study focusses instead on the content of (standard English) beginning reading material and the approximation of such materials to a Black nonstandard dialect.

Three texts, each from a different country but of the same grade level, were analysed and contrasted with Jamaican Basilect (JB) to determine whether one of them relates more closely than the others to the phonological, syntactic, and semantic background of JB children. The results of the contrastive analyses conducted for this study do not support the assumption that the country in which children's books originate is related to the extent to which they approximate JB.

However, the analyses provide valuable insights concerning the relationship between texts written for children and certain nonstandard dialects. They indicate that children's standard English texts approximate JB most closely at the semantic level while the most problems for JB children in these texts may be at the syntactic level. The

analyses also indicate that children's texts follow the strongest pattern of similarity among themselves at the graphophonological level. Moreover, the differences that the analyses revealed between standard English and JB indicates a need for literature differentiating the differences between Black American English and standard texts and JB and standard texts.

DEDICATION

To my family:

Gloria,

Asha, and

Shawn

whose understanding, support, and patience

ensured the completion of this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Kelleen Toohey for her patience and advice in supervising this thesis and for her guidance in the program of studies that led up to it. During the preparation and writing of this thesis, I received much valuable advice and insight from Dr. Mary Sakari and would like to thank her as well. I also offer my sincere thanks to my friends who encouraged me during my schooling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

CHAPTER 1 - PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

INTRODUCTION TO THE AREA OF STUDY

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the language of nonstandard dialect speakers and their underachievemet in the school system became the focus of much attention in the United States of America, Britain, and the English Caribbean. Of particular concern was the linguistic differences between nonstandard dialects and the standard dialect, and the way(s) in which those differences might be the cause of the nonstandard dialect speakers' academic failure. Being a fundamental measure of success in the school, as Baratz and Baratz (1969) pointed out, reading was widely hypothesized to be involved in the educational underachievement of nonstandard dialect speakers. As Black students have been traditionally least successful in school, the focus of attention was on them and their 'language' (Fasold & Shuy, 1970; Dillard, 1972).

The subsequent discussion and research resulted in 1) a body of literature dealing with the phonological and grammatical differences between Black nonstandard dialect and standard English and 2) a hypothesis postulating that the lack of a match between the nonstandard dialect of Blacks and the language of the school's reading instruction material was a cause (if not the major cause) of their reading difficultites (Baratz & Shuy, 1969). In the search

for ways to eliminate the 'language mismatch' problem and facilitate learning to read standard English, certain pedagogical approaches were proposed - especially teaching standard English as a second dialect and using dialect material for reading instruction. Those strategies no longer seem to bear the promise, as they once did, of solving or alleviating the problem. In fact, since the 1970s, no new approach - pedagogical or research - has been advanced to deal with a situation in which Black students speak a nonstandard dialect which differs to a greater or lesser extent from the standard English found in school readers.

This is not to say that approaches in other areas of the learning/teaching process have not been suggested and tried as solutions to the educational underachievement problem. Indeed, many experts have attested to the complex of social, economic, cultural, political, psychological, and institutional factors that may all be contributing to the reading difficulties of nonstandard dialect speakers (Adler, 1979; Burmeister, 1983; Downing & Leong, 1982; Goodman & Burke, 1973; Hall, 1981; Horn, 1970), and investigation of some of these variables point to strategies that may help to alleviate the educational underachievement of nonstandard dialect speakers. Heath's (1983) ethnographic study of language socialization and the investigation by Shuy and Stanton (1982) into the role of "sociolinguistic competence" in the classroom are examples of such research. Studies in

such areas should be encouraged. However, inasmuch as such studies do not deal directly with nonstandard dialect and reading, the lack of recent research on that issue needs to be addressed.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

In his survey of research on the language mismatch hypothesis, Simons (1979) identified two types of activities involved in learning to read in school: 1) the teacher verbally interacting with the child during the reading activity and 2) the student interacting with the written text. Simons suggested that the second activity could provide "important information" that bears on the reading underachievement of Black children who speak a nonstandard dialect (p. 121). However, this activity has been the focus of only one published research study (Piestrup, 1973). The scant research attention to this activity is due perhaps to the sensitive nature of such classroom investigations.

The first activity is the one on which the body of research on the language mismatch hypothesis has focussed. There were by the 1970s many studies on the ways in which nonstandard dialects spoken by Blacks in the United States, the English Caribbean, and Britain differed from standard English, and that information was utilized extensively in investigations of the language mismatch hypothesis. As the literature review will show, the phonological and

grammatical differences between standard English and the nonstandard dialect of Blacks became the instrument used to determine if standard English text caused reading difficulties for nonstandard dialect speaking Black students. The literature review will show further that the typical research approach was to test for difference in comprehension when students read one text written in standard English and another written in Black nonstandard dialect. However, the extent to which dialect differences between standard English and Black nonstandard dialect occur in beginning reading materials has not received research attention.

Therefore, while Simons (1979) has called for investigations on teacher/child verbal interaction during reading, and investigations into the relationship between nonstandard dialect and reading have focussed largely on comparing the comprehension of texts which differed in certain dialect features, this study will focus on the content of (standard English) beginning reading material and the approximation of such materials to a Black nonstandard dialect at the graphophonological (grapheme-phoneme), syntactic, and semantic levels.

Inasmuch as the literature indicates that nonstandard dialects differ from standard English to a greater and lesser degree, some linguistic differences that exist between standard English and one nonstandard dialect may not

exist between standard English and another nonstandard dialect. This state of affairs requires the identification of a nonstandard dialect whose features will be used as the basis for determining whether or to what extent dialect differences appear in beginning reading material.

Also, since the language features in a story may be influenced by the writer's origin, this study will involve an analysis of different texts from three different countries to determine how they compare semantically, syntactically, and graphophonologically with the selected nonstandard dialect.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Specifically, the purpose of this study is to determine whether one text originating from a particular geographic polity relates more closely than others to the phonological, syntactic, and semantic background of children who speak the selected nonstandard dialect.

The completion of this study, will be guided by the following three questions:

1. What is the status of the graphophonological, syntactic, and semantic content of the three different reading texts selected for examination?
2. How does each text compare with the selected nonstandard dialect at the graphophonological, syntactic, and semantic levels?

3. Which text has the possibility of relating most closely to the phonological and syntactic system of the selected nonstandard dialect and to the semantic background of children coming from the environment where the nonstandard dialect is spoken?

The answers to these questions will be sought within the parameters of certain linguistic features which the relevant literature indicates constitute differences between the selected nonstandard dialect and standard English. The extent to which these linguistic differences exist in the individual texts will determine which one might relate most closely to the selected nonstandard dialect.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

That beginning reading material is under consideration in this study is in itself significant as far as the research dealing nonstandard dialect and reading is concerned. Baratz (1973) pointed out the lack of research dealing specifically with beginning reading and nonstandard dialect speakers. Pflaum-Connor (1979) concurred with Baratz and noted that such research is needed before the curtain could be drawn on the language mismatch issue. There is no indication from the literature that this challenge has been taken up. With the graphophonological, syntactic, and semantic features of beginning reading material being

analyzed, the results of this study may have some bearing on issues relating to beginning reading.

More specifically, the traditional focus on certain linguistic differences as a cause of reading problems has left undetermined the extent to which these differences appear in reading instruction material. The absence of certain contrastive features in reading instruction materials would give educators the confidence to eliminate them as sources of reading problems and concentrate on those features that do appear in the materials. Inasmuch as beginning reading materials may not contain certain words and structures that may appear in later reading materials, this point is particularly relevant to beginning reading instruction and the language mismatch hypothesis.

Finally, the study will indicate to teachers of children who speak the nonstandard dialect being used in this study whether the texts from a particular geographical polity may be more suited to the linguistic background of their students. Such an indication will be particularly relevant for teachers of immigrant nonstandard dialect speakers where texts of the host country are most likely to be used.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 has been concerned with the purpose and scope of the study. Chapter 2 will deal with relevant issues

arising from the literature. First, it will define such pertinent concepts as reading, graphophonology, syntax, and semantics, and discuss the assumption, which underlies this study, that a relationship exists between oral language and reading. Inasmuch as reading instruction approaches have received much research attention with regard to their influence on children's reading ability, chapter 2 will also include a summary of the debate and current thinking on that issue.

The focus of chapter 2 will then narrow to the issue of nonstandard dialect and reading by discussing the assumption underlying the language mismatch hypothesis. This discussion will involve outlining the structural and theoretical differences between standard and nonstandard English dialects as well as identifying the differences between oral and written language that led to the hypothesis.

Since the pedagogical strategies that developed in response to the language mismatch hypothesis generated much debate which influenced research, a review of the debate will be conducted to determine how its influence may affect current and future research in this field. Finally, a review of research studies concerned with nonstandard dialect and reading will be undertaken. Such a review will help to determine the current status of this area of research, and to reveal the gap in the research body that this study is directed at filling.

In the third chapter, the standard and nonstandard dialects and the text used in the study will be identified and their selection rationalized. That having been done, the basis for using contrastive analysis as a methodological tool in this study will be established. Chapter 4 will describe and explicate the results from the text analyses and the comparative analyses of the texts and the selected nonstandard dialect. The concluding chapter will consist of a discussion relating to the question of which text, if any, relates most closely to the selected nonstandard dialect.

SUMMARY

This chapter has served as an introduction to the study. It oulines the background to the area of study and notes the need for renewed research. The lack of research on the content of beginning reading texts in this area of study is viewed as a particularly significant reason for renewed research and is pinpointed as the issue that this study will address. Also, the research questions that were used to achieve that purpose are listed and the organizational structure of the study described.

CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Inasmuch as this thesis is concerned with nonstandard dialect, reading, and beginning reading material, it encompasses diverse concepts and assumptions, some of which underpin the study and need to be clarified and substantiated. The purpose of this chapter is to provide such clarifications and substantiations and to review the research literature concerned with the language mismatch hypothesis and with the role of reading instruction approaches in reading achievement. Inasmuch as the pedagogical strategies that were developed to eliminate the language mismatch problem generated much debate which influenced research (and may still be doing so), this chapter will also include a review of that debate. These reviews will help to determine the current status of research and thinking in those areas relevant to this study.

A DEFINITION OF READING

Perhaps most crucial to any discussion dealing with reading is an understanding of what 'reading' itself means. Of the four elementary school language arts components, reading receives the most attention from educators as well as researchers (Mackay & Thompson, 1968; Kirkwood & Wolfe, 1980). In spite of this attention, there is still no

commonly accepted definition that satisfactorily describes what reading is. The lack of such a definition follows in part from the wide variety of purposes for which reading is used (Gibson & Levin, 1975) as well as from the lack of a comprehensive theory of the reading process (Carroll & Walton, 1979). This does not mean, however, that no progress is being made. Carroll and Walton (1979) have noted that reading is no longer narrowly defined as the conversion of graphic symbols to sound symbols and nothing else - as Elkonin (1973) has argued. Moreover, they noted that the contributors to a review volume edited by Resnick and Weaver (1979) reflected a consensus on the statement that reading is obtaining meaning from written language (Carroll & Walton, 1979). Johns' (1984) definition that "reading occurs when meaning is reconstructed from written symbols" (p. 72) goes further than the consensus found in Resnick and Weaver (1979); the word "reconstruct" carries a stronger implication that the reader is interacting with the written symbols to obtain meaning that may differ in form from the form in which the meaning was encoded by the writer.

Although this concept of reading is the one that will be used in this study, it does not answer some of the crucial questions about the reading process. It does not, for example, address the issue of the nature and sequence of the psychological process that occurs when readers reconstruct meaning from written language. This question has

not been answered adequately even by models of the reading process. Rumelhart's (1977) model made a beginning in that direction, but he himself remarked that, although such models suggest that various components of written language interact in the reading process, "it is quite another ±thingH to specify a psychologically plausible hypothesis about how they interact" (1977, p. 588). More recently, Anderson and Pearson (1984) noted that, inasmuch as gaps exist in the understanding of the reading process and some reading phenomena solicit alternative explanations which the available evidence does not resolve, "there is still much work to be done in order to build THE definitive model of basic processes in reading comprehension" (p. 285).

The investigation being undertaken in this study does not require addressing the question of how components of written language interact in an internal mental process during reading. However, since the study will be analysing the graphic, syntactic, and semantic components inherent in written language as well as the corresponding components in oral language, it is instructive to make some comments on these components in order to define the connotation they will carry in this study.

CUE SYSTEMS IN READING

The graphic, syntactic, and semantic information inherent in written language have been identified by Goodman

(1970; 1973; 1986), Rumelhart (1977), and Smith (1978) as cues available to the reader for use in the reading process. While the reference to the 'semantic' and 'syntactic' sources do not raise any disagreement among these writers, their discussion of the graphic component does and therefore requires explication. Out of this discussion will come a definition of the term 'graphophonology' as applies to this study. Comments on semantics and syntax will be concerned with limiting and defining these terms as far as the scope of the study is concerned.

The Graphic Component

The level of the graphic information on which each writer focussed differed. Rumelhart started from the level of letter features and called this information graphemic; Smith viewed spelling patterns as crucial and alluded to this information as orthographic; while Goodman (1973; 1986) referred to this level of information as graphophonic, admitting of a relation between oral and written language at the level of "spelling patterns" and "sound sequences" (1973, p. 25).

The difference is merely one of emphasis, however, since all three adhere to an interactive process of low-level and high-level perceptions occurring simultaneously in reading. Rumelhart's model (1977) took into consideration the effect that orthographic structure

has on facilitating the perception of letters in letter strings. On the other hand, Goodman (1973) stated - and Smith (1978) implied - that when other contexual clues in the text are scarce, the amount of graphic input utilized by the reader increases. Furthermore, Goodman (1968; 1970) has pointed out that the beginning reader needs more graphic information than the proficient reader.

The basis for consensus among these writers lies in the agreement that there is visual input in the reading process occuring at the graphemic or at the letter combination level depending on the proficiency of the reader and other contextual clues in the text. Inasmuch as beginning reading is the concern in this study and the level of contextual clues in the text to be used is unknown, the analysis in this study will focus on the unit of the graphic input that distinguishes one word from another in written language. To signify this unit, the term 'graphemic' will be used with the understanding that it applies to graphemes as well as to digraphs.

Graphophonology

While the terms 'semantic' and 'syntactic' are applicable to corresponding components in both oral and written language, the term 'graphemic' applies to the written language and 'phonological' to the oral language. Phonology relates to the study of sound units that are

capable of distinguishing one word from another (Tomori, 1977; Traugott & Pratt, 1980). These sound units are called phonemes. Consequently, in dealing with oral language, the focus will be on the phoneme - the unit that corresponds to the grapheme unit in written language. When reference is being made to the correspondence that exists between the written system and the sound system at this level, the term 'graphophonology' will be used.

It should be noted that while Goodman's use of the term 'graphophonic' refers to a "morpho-phonemic" relationship between written and oral language, in this study 'graphophonological' implies a relationship between phonemes and graphemes.

Syntax

No discrepancy arises among Goodman, Rumelhart, and Smith with regard to the syntactic information available to the reader from written language. However, it must be pointed out that while the term 'syntax' is traditionally associated with the study of phrase structure (Fowler, 1971; Tomori, 1977; Traugott & Pratt, 1980), Goodman, Rumelhart, and Smith have employed it to refer to the term 'grammar', which traditionally includes morphology - the study of word change (Tomori, 1977; Traugott & Pratt, 1980). This particular use of the term 'syntax' by Goodman, Rumelhart, and Smith means that they are not referring only to cues

gained from the expected order of words in written text. Goodman (1973) in particular stated that he is referring as well to such cues as inflectional suffixes. That connotation for the term 'syntax', in embracing some aspects of morphology, applies as well in this study. While Goodman did not specify whether other aspects of morphology besides suffixal inflection are included in his concept of syntax, this study will limit itself to that aspect of morphology.

Semantics

Inasmuch as semantics is the study of meaning (Milne, 1977; Traugott & Pratt, 1980), it can be discussed and studied from the point of view of word meaning and sentence meaning (Traugott & Pratt, 1980), where the word or sentence is explicated by meaning the reader has already extracted from the text. It was on this aspect of semantics that Rumelhart focussed in discussing the role of semantics in reading. The approach of Goodman and Smith is focussed more on the knowledge the reader brings to the reading activity. Goodman (1973) pointed out:

> This is not simply a question of ±providing± meaning for words but the much larger question of the reader having sufficient experience and conceptual background to feed into the reading process so that he can make sense out of what he is reading. (p. 26).

It is from this point of view that the text will be analyzed with respect to speakers of the nonstandard dialect selected for used in the study.

ORAL LANGUAGE AND THE READING PROCESS

Any study that investigates the relationship between oral language - nonstandard or standard - and the written text, with an aim of shedding light on reading comprehension or underachievement, is in effect assuming that oral language plays some role in the reading process. Although all studies that investigate oral language and reading are in effect acknowledging this fundamental assumption, the assumption is not customarily acknowledged explicitly. However, since an opposing view exists that reading can occur without the interplay of the reader's oral language, the validity of the fundamental assumption that underlies this thesis, and other studies concerned with the same issue, must be established.

Smith (1971, 1975, 1983) is the chief opponent of the traditional view that a dependent relationship exists between oral language and the extraction of meaning from written language. He has argued (1975, p. 180) that "writing and speech are parallel and independent aspects of language" and that "writing does not require speech to be understood." In Smith's opinion, reading is an 'inside-out' process which begins with the intentions and purposes that the reader brings to the reading activity and proceeds by the reader hypothesizing "among a certain range of meaningful likely alternatives" and searching "among the featural information available in the print only to the extent necessary to

resolve their remaining uncertainty" (1983, p. 61). In such a process, readers are looking for "the featural information that they need and ±theyH ignore information that is irrelevant or redundant to their purposes." Smith has argued that with such a view of reading, one "does not require recourse to spoken language for the comprehension of print. Meaning is directly accessible through print." It is instructive to note that while Goodman's (1970; 1973; 1986) concept of reading is similar to Smith's in terms of its emphasis on the reader sampling and predicting information in the text, Goodman (1973) writes that readers make use of the correspondence that exists at the morpheme-sound level.

Smith (1983) notes that his view of the reading process is vague, but argues that it is no more so than opposing theories which suggest that meaning is obtained from print by first being mediated through some form of speech, whether overt or internal. A discussion by Massaro (1984) throws much light on understanding this issue from the phonological point of view.

According to Massaro, the question of phonological mediation in reading is "a very old one ... probably as old as reading itself" and can be viewed in terms of two models of reading (p. 136). The model that assumes a phonological mediation postulates that when the letters in a word have been identified by comparing their features against letter features in long term memory, the letters are translated

into some manner of sound by the letter-sound correspondences known by the reader. This sound is then used to get the meaning of the word from the internal lexicon. One example of such a process would be in reading the word "civic" where the spelling-to-sound rule that 'c' before 'i' is pronounced /s/, and not /k/, would give /sɪvɪk/ and not /kɪvɪk/. Meaning would result from the sound /sɪvɪk/ having correlations in the internal lexicon.

In the other model, once the letters in a word have been identified, in the same manner as in the first model, meaning is directly obtained from the internal lexicon. This model assumes a relationship between the visual composition of the word and the reader's internal lexicon. To employ once more the example used above, the visual perception of the letter sequence in the word "civic" is sufficient to access its meaning.

Massaro (1984) noted that although it may seem relatively easy to determine empirically which of these models is more likely to be correct, no method has been found as yet to avoid confounding the variables involved. He pointed out, for example, that some words are more difficult to pronounce once they have been recognized, so response time in pronouncing words is a variable that could be confounded with lexicon access time. Also, since some words are made up of more common letters and consonant clusters than others (Zettersten cited in Gibson & Levin, 1975),

letter recognition would be faster for those words than others. In those cases, letter identification time becomes a confounding variable (Massaro, 1984). Furthermore, the reader's past experience with a phonics-emphasis or a sight word-emphasis method of reading can also confound the results (Carroll & Walton, 1979).

The argument that meaning can be accessed directly from print is supported to an extent by the fact that severely deaf children (who don't have speech capabilities) learn to read without access to a speech code (Carroll & Walton, 1979; Gibson & Levin, 1975; Sticht & James, 1984). However, inasmuch as deaf children do not achieve high levels of reading skills (Gibson & Levin, 1975; Sticht & James, 1984), and are limited in their reading to sight words and words of concreteness (Gibson & Levin, 1975), it seems that the presence of a speech code is helpful in the teaching of reading.

The point of view taken by Carroll and Walton (1979) is that the question is not whether the mediation of the speech code is essential or not, but whether children who are not disabled 'should' be taught to read via the phonological mediation method. They argued (p. 328) that they should on these bases:

1) There is no evidence that translating written language to sound in order to access meaning during beginning reading impedes improvement in reading skills.

2) It is probably pointless to try to avoid a sight-sound correspondence since most children will tend to form those correspondences anyway "as they appear to do naturally even in silent reading."

3) It seems that teaching children to decode written language into some form of speech helps them to use those language skills that have been learnt in oral comprehension.

The last reason given by Carrol and Walton is supported by an earlier statement by Smith (1971) that "almost all children have acquired a good deal of verbal fluency before they face the task of learning to read" and that this experience in oral language provides a basis "that is obviously relevant to the process of learning to read" (p. 45).

It is on those bases that this writer accepts the traditional view that a relationship exists between oral language and reading. The relationship is that the translation of written language into sound facilitates the extraction of meaning from text.

In establishing the assumption for a relationship between oral language and reading, this discussion has focussed on the translation of written language into sound. It must be pointed out, however, that the argument for a relationship between oral language and the reading process also exists in terms of the linguistic knowledge that the reader brings to the reading activity through his experience

with the oral language. It is this oral language experience that makes the syntactic and semantic cue systems in written language operational.

Studies by Clay (1968) and Weber (1970) found that when beginning readers made 'errors' in their reading, the 'errors' were syntactically appropriate. That is, children substituted verbs for verbs and nouns for nouns so that in a sentence such as "The boy caught the ball", "ball" may be replaced by "bird" but not by "bake" - although "ball" and "bake" have more graphemes in common. Allington (1984) notes that such syntactic congruity occurred in at least 70% of the errors studied in these investigations.

To what extent the 'errors' in those studies concurred semantically with the context of the preceding text cannot be reported here, since Allington did not discuss that subject and the stated percentage of syntactic congruity does not mean that the same percentage of semantic congruity occurred. The lack of a direct relation between syntactic and semantic congruity can be illustrated by using the sentence employed in the last paragraph. While "bird" may be syntactically appropriate, it may not be semantically appropriate in terms of the preceding text. Moreover, the word "bike" is also syntactically appropriate in the place of "ball", but it may be even less semantically appropriate than "bird", since bikes are not usually caught. It is in this respect that reading necessitates more than syntactic

knowledge gained through oral language experience. The reader's knowledge gained from preceding passages in the text or from experiencial knowledge gained through his/her world of oracy is also important.

The reading process, then, is facilitated not only by the translation of written words to sound but also by syntactic and semantic knowledge gained through oral language interaction. However, even when one takes the position that getting meaning from written texts is facilitated by translating the written symbols into the speech code and utilizing oral language skills, educators of beginning reading are still faced with such issues as whether instruction should be focussed on the relationship that exists between grapheme and phoneme; whether the focus should be on the written word as a whole unit and its corresponding sound in the learner's vocabulary; and whether the syntax and vocabulary in reading texts should be controlled.

Those are some of the issues that have been advanced by publishers and writers of educational materials as crucial in the reading process for beginning readers (see Aukerman, 1981; Chall, 1967; 1983). Some commentators argue, however, that there is a lack of evidence to support that position (Barr, 1984; Bond & Dykstra, 1967). Inasmuch as this writer agrees with the argument of those commentators, the influence of the differences among reading instruction

approaches is not taken into consideration in this study. To substantiate this decision, the literature relating to reading instruction approaches is reviewed next.

READING INSTRUCTION APPROACHES

As Mathews (1966) pointed out, the question of which approach is best is an old one in the field of reading instruction. The differences among approaches that allowed research on relative effectiveness can be illustrated by a brief survey of the reading instruction approaches involved.

In differentiating reading instruction approaches, it may be best to view them as overlapping along a continuum at the extreme ends of which contrastive and opposing approaches may be clearly identified. This view of reading instruction approaches is best exemplified by Chall (1967), who organized the continuum from one extreme to the other as follows: systematic phonics, linguistic, alphabet reforms, intrinsic phonics, and look-say.

The systematic phonics or phonics-first approach includes all those reading programs that focus, at the beginning of reading instruction, on teaching letter-sound correspondence first, systematically and separated from connected reading, and usually before sight words are learnt (Aukerman, 1981; Chall, 1967; 1983; Flesch, 1955; 1981).

Linguistics programs differ little from systematic phonics programs, so that some reading programs may be

classified as either systematic phonics or linguistics (Aukerman, 1981; Chall, 1983). One difference remaining is the use by linguistic programs of phonetically consistent spelling patterns to avoid the many irregularities in letter-sound correspondences. For example, certain consonants and one vowel sound may be presented in a sequence to form words that differ minimally - such as Dan, can, fan, Nan.

The most widely known artificial orthography is the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ita) which was first introduced in Britain in the 1960s (Aukerman, 1981; Chall, 1967; 1983; Spodek, 1978; Wilson & Hall, 1972). It was not designed originally as a particular approach to reading instruction; it was a change in the traditional printed symbols to be used with other approaches (Chall, 1967; 1983; Wilson & Hall, 1972). From that point of view, like other artificial orthographies, ita is actually a 'medium', not even a 'method' of teaching (Wilson & Hall, 1972), and its effect on learning to read will in turn be affected by the reading instruction approach with which it is being used.

Intrinsic phonics programs differ from systematic phonics and linguistic programs mainly in that letter-sound association is usually not emphasized as the initial step in learning to read (Chall, 1967; 1983; Wilson & Hall, 1972). In fact, in the intrinsic programs, it is the meaning component of reading that is empahsized, with phonics being

taught after whole units such as words, sentences, and stories are understood. Furthermore, when phonics is taught, it is done so in an analytic instead of synthetic manner and in association with other means of identifying words, such as context and picture clues.

After intrinsic phonics, Chall placed on the continuum the look-say programs which are those programs that teach no phonics at all and emphasize "visual recognition of the whole word, 'getting the thought', and reading whole sentences" (p. 102).

The language experience and basal approaches, although included in research on the effectiveness of reading programs, have not been placed by Chall on her continuum. Perhaps her failure to do so is a result of those two approaches being susceptible to extensive variation which makes it difficult to place them in a specific slot on the continuum.

In discussing basal programs, Chall listed certain "principles" that were "incorporated in the most widely used" basal readers and teachers' guides up to the time of her study. Her description of these principles reveals a strong similarity to intrinsic phonics (Chall, pp. 14-15). However, Aukerman (1981) put the basal approach under the heading of Whole-word, since it "is most frequently identified as a whole-word, 'look-say' method of learning to

read," with some basal reading programs having "a phonics strand attached as an ongoing component" (p. 319).

With regard to the language experience approach, Chall noted that it "shares one essential feature with the linguistic and phonic innovations - early acquisition of the code" (p. 42). On the other hand, Spodek (1978) remarked that "of all the possible approaches to reading" the language experience approach puts the least emphasis on learning letter sound correspondence in a systematic fashion. She stated further that "word attack skills are often taught to individuals and small groups as the need arises" (p. 106). The conflicting assessment of the language experience approach indicates that in practice, programs using this approach may, like the basal programs, be distributed over a wide area of the continuum. The distinction of language experience programs seem to lie not so much in the use or avoidance of phonics as in the use of the beginning readers' dictated sentences and stories as reading instruction material.

There are new approaches that have not received the research attention given to the approaches discussed above (Barr, 1984; Resnick, 1979). These new approaches rose mainly out of the psycholinguistics theory of reading (Goodman, 1968; 1970; 1973; Smith, 1971; 1975; 1983) and are called "Natural reading approaches" by Aukerman (1981) and whole-language by others (Goodman, 1986; Newman, 1985). As

with the basal and language experience approaches, the programs in this category vary greatly from each other. However, two characteristics make them distinctive as a group: 1) the reading of whole texts to or with children as a primary activity and 2) the avoidance of a systematic, synthetic approach to teaching phonics in beginning reading (Aukerman, 1981; Chall, 1983; Goodman, 1986; Holdaway, 1979; Waterland, 1985). The lack of research attention to these new approaches is very likely due to their lack of systematic, structured methodologies (Resnick, 1979) - compared with the phonics methodologies, for example. Nonetheless, by the 1970s, the body of existing research was already providing some conclusions about the relative effectiveness of reading instruction approaches.

Economic prosperity and the concern for social equality during the 1960s made that decade one of the most productive of research studies on reading (Barr, 1984). On the basis of her wide-ranging survey of research studies conducted before the 196os, Chall (1967) concluded that in terms of the phonics-meaning dichotomy that could be drawn among programs, a phonics emphasis tended to produce "better overall reading achievement by the beginning of the fourth grade" (p. 137). However, in their review of research studies, Bond and Dykstra (1967) concluded that "the superiority of a single method of reading instruction is yet to be determined" (p. 26). They pointed out that the

comparability of research findings was limited by such factors as the variation among studies in research design, statistical analysis, instruments used for tests, the length of treatment periods, and the extent to which such variables as class size were controlled or assessed. It was such difficulties that the Cooperative Research Studies in First-Grade Reading Instruction were designed to overcome.

One of the most extensive investigations of the relative effectiveness of reading instruction approaches undertaken during the 1960s, the First Grade studies were funded by the U. S. Office of Education (USOE). The studies centered on the first grade and consisted of 27 different studies, 19 of which compared different reading approaches. Despite the extensive nature of the investigation and the increased compatability among studies, this body of research failed to determine if a specific reading instruction approach was the most effective one. Bond and Dykstra (1967) reported that "no method was especially effective or ineffective for pupils of high or low readiness" for reading (p. 5). Two decades later, Barr (1984) summed up her review of studies up to the 1970s thus:

> From this vast amount of research conducted on reading methods ... we have learnt that no single method or approach is consistently more effective in developing general reading skill than any other." (p. 553).

Since the consensus has developed that difference in reading instructional approach is not a crucial variable in

learning to read, other variables have been suggested for experimentation: differential student aptitude and teaching effectiveness (Barr, 1984), teacher and learning situation characteristics (Bond & Dykstra, 1967), and degree of structure in instruction (Resnick, 1979). However, a variable that is directly related to the reading process and children's oral language is the content of their reading material. It is this variable that will be examined as a factor that may influence reading ability. The rationale for examining texts as a factor in the reading difficulties of nonstandard dialect speakers is based on the language mismatch hypothesis. The arguments underlying this hypothesis is taken up in the next section.

LANGUAGE MISMATCH HYPOTHESIS

The observance of oral/aural misunderstanding between speakers of different dialects may easily satisfy the assumption that oral language differences may affect verbal interaction. On the other hand, the assumption that differences between a nonstandard dialect and written standard English may affect reading is not as easily satisfied. Indeed, with their focus on Blacks in the United States, some investigators have denied that such a mismatch causes nonstandard dialect speaking children any greater disadvantage in learning to read than that experienced by those children who speak the standard dialect (Goodman &

Buck, 1973; Pflaum-Connor, 1979; Simons, 1979; Venezky & Chapman, 1973). In light of this, some time must be devoted to discussing the basis of the assumption that reading may be affected adversely by an oral/written language mismatch. This assumption is discussed first from the perspective of the general oral and written language differences that may affect learning to read, then specifically from the perspective of those differences between standard English and nonstandard dialects that may make learning to read more difficult.

Oral and Written Language Differences

Unless they are physically or mentally handicapped, by the time most children enter the school system, they have control over much of the structures of their native language (Lindfors, 1980; Wood, 1981); they have a vocabulary consisting of sound-meaning associations, a phonological system, morphological rules, syntactic rules, and guidelines for discourse structure and sociolinguistic competence. This array of oral language skills and behaviors, while serving its purpose in an environment and stage of oracy, can become a problem or a benefit as children begin formal instruction in reading. While benefit may accrue from the similarities that exist between oral and written language, such as the basic syntactic structure of the language, problems may rise from the differences between the language systems. These two

modes of human communication have different functions, different rules for discourse organization, different syntactic structures, different symbols to represent knowledge of the world, and different units comprising those symbols. (For further discussion, see Cambourne, 1981; Kress, 1982; Schafer, 1981). It is these differences that lead to the assumption that all beginning readers encounter difficulties in learning to read. It is instructive from that point of view to examine some of these differences in terms of syntactic structure and grapheme-phoneme relationship. We will look first at the graphophonological relationship.

In languages that are written with an alphabetic system, graphemes (or letters) are meant to have a one-to-one relation with the phonemes (or minimal sounds) of the oral language. While the letter-sound correspondence is very regular in some alphabetic languages such as Finnish and Spanish (Bloomfield, 1942), it is much less so in English. This is especially the case with English written vowels, each of which represents more than one sound, and the same sound may be represented by different written vowels.

The lack of a one-to-one correspondence between graphemes and phonemes in the English language and the implication this has for children learning to read have received much research attention. The evidence from studies

suggests that the lack of correspondence is an impediment in the learning-to-read process. Evidence on learning to read in other languages suggests that children learn to translate graphic symbols to phonic symbols earlier when there is a close match between grapheme and phoneme (Downing, 1973; Gibson & Levin, 1975). If such decoding is a necessary and primary step in learning to read, then beginning readers of English may have to, as a first step, become familiar with the general principles regulating the sounds that are accorded to graphemes in different positions in words.

The beginning reader may not be familiar also with written language rules at the syntactic level. Although oral and written language are similar in that they can both be used to transfer information, the purposes for which they are naturally suitable - for example, conversation versus novels - lead to the difference in the frequency of the syntactic structures found in them (Goodman & Goodman, 1979; Perera, 1984). It had been suspected for a long time that the relationship between the syntactic structures of oral and written language had an effect on reading (Flesch, 1948; Lorge, 1948) but that relationship was not tested until the early 1960s.

In a seminal research study, Ruddell (1965), tested this suspicion from the aspect of language structure. He compared 131 grade four children's comprehension of material written with high frequency versus low frequency patterns of

grade four children's oral language structures. He concluded that "reading comprehension is a function of the similarity of patterns of langage structures in the reading material to oral patterns of language structure used by children" (p.273). Tatham (1975) replicated Ruddell's study, using an additional group of children from grade two and a different instrument for scoring comprehension, and supported the previous findings.

In a differently designed study, Leu (1982) had 28 second grade students read and retell two stories, one with high frequency oral and the other with high frequency written language structures. The treatment conditions were set up so that the children read both of the stories and both language versions but did not read the same story twice. The findings from his analysis suggested that the stories with the written language structures were more difficult to understand.

While differences between oral and written language at the syntactic and graphophonological levels may affect all beginning readers, variability in oral language - most often discussed with regard to differences across regions, social classes, and ethnic groups - may amplify the oral and written language differences discussed above. This greater 'mismatch' and the influence it may have on reading became an important factor in the language mismatch hypothesis that was developed in the United States. This greater mismatch

will be better understood by first looking at the relationship between nonstandard and standard dialects and the written language, then demonstrating some differences between standard and nonstandard dialects that create this greater mismatch.

Nonstandard, Standard, and the Written Language

In discussing this subject, it may be best to start with the concept of 'dialect'. In spite of their individual differences, a group of speakers may differ less among themselves linguistically than they do from another group that speaks the same language. When groups that speak the same language differ in grammar, lexicon, and phonology, they are said to be speaking different 'dialects' of the same language (Chambers & Trudgill, 1980; Davis, 1983; Petyt, 1980). When these differences between groups occur geographically, as one moves from one village, city, or region to another, the dialects are referred to as regional dialects; when the differences occur between groups as a result of social stratification, social class dialects is the result (Davis, 1983; Pflaum-Connor, 1979; Traugott & Pratt, 1980).

In discussing the concept of dialect, a digression must be made to note that a distinction may be made between 'dialect' (the result of grammatical and lexical differences) and 'accent' (the result of phonological

differences). With such a distinction, it can be said that two persons are speaking the same dialect (that is, making the same grammatical and lexical choices) but with a different accent. However, Hughes and Trudgill (1979), who made this distinction in the case of Britain, on account of the existence there of a 'model' dialect as well as a 'model' accent, have also pointed out that such a distinction may not be applicable universally. Moreover, Petyt (1980) has pointed out further that speakers whose pronunciation diverges greatly from the norm in the society "would almost certainly have some differences in vocabulary and grammar" (p. 20). In light of these remarks, no distinction is made in this discussion between accent and dialect; the latter term covers both concepts.

While no one dialect of a language is linguistically superior to another in any manner, one of them nonetheless becomes regarded as 'purer' and more 'correct' than the other dialects (Langacker, 1967/68; Traugott & Pratt, 1980). As a result, it becomes the model to which people who are enjoying or wish to enjoy high social status try to conform (Petyt, 1980; Pyles & Algeo, 1982). It is this prescriptive attitude of regarding one dialect as the 'correct' dialect that raises it to the status of being regarded as the 'standard' against which other dialects are measured and, as a result, termed 'nonstandard' (Chambers & Trudgill, 1980; Davis, 1983; Petyt, 1980; Traugott & Pratt, 1980).

In the case of the English language, it was the social dialect of the upper class of London that eventually became the standard dialect (Davis, 1983; Traugott & Pratt, 1980) as London rose to cultural, political, and economic prominence between the ninth and fifteenth centuries (Davis, 1983; Pyles & Algeo, 1982). By the end of the eighteenth century, prescriptive 'grammar books' began to appear in which the dialect of the upper class of London was codified as the model for those of less social status to strive after (Traugott & Pratt, 1980). This dialect continued to dominate the thinking if not the practice of oral language, and certainly the practice of written language well into this century in all regions of the New World to which English-speaking people immigrated (Davis, 1983; Pyles & Algeo, 1982; Traugott & Pratt, 1980). From this historical perspective, it may be said that there is a symbiotic relationship between standard English and the written English language which ensures a greater grammatical 'sameness' between them than between the written language and nonstandard dialects. It is this state of affairs that may amplify the oral and written language differences in the case of nonstandard dialect speakers.

Nonstandard Dialect Features

Before looking at some common differences between nonstandard dialects and standard English, it is instructive

to note that dialects are not monolithic. Linguistic features of a particular dialect may vary according to the influence of factors such as listener, topic, and setting (Berko-Gleason, 1973; Cazden, 1972; Labov, 1972; Sachs & Devlin, 1976; Shatz and Gelman, 1973). Using standard English as an example, Edwards (1983) has pointed out how this kind of variation in speech may occur in pronunciation ("e.g. '-in' for '-ing' in words like 'walking'"); in vocabulary ("e.g. 'bloke' for 'man'"); and in grammar ("e.g. 'We decided to finish' for 'It was decided that we should finish'").

Also, there is the linguistic phenomenon in which some speakers may habitually use linguistic features that are closer to standard English than other speakers belonging to the same region, ethnic group, or social class. This situation is more common in areas where a nonstandard dialect is in the process of becoming more like a target language (DeCamp, 1971). Studies by Craig (1971; 1977) and Bickerson (1975) have investigated this phenomenon with regard to oral language in the English Caribbean and have revealed that varieties of speech may vary from those that diverge greatly from the standard dialect of the target language to those that vary very little, with many intervening speech varieties. Keeping in mind then that a particular expression in a dialect may change with context and that speakers from the same dialect group may employ

different linguistic features to express the same meaning, we can now look at some common nonstandard dialect features.

Although nonstandard dialects differ among themselves in their divergence from standard English, there are some basic grammatical features that can be readily identified and used to draw the difference between standard English and nonstandard dialects. An examination of work on nonstandard dialects in Britain (Cheshire, 1982; Edwards, 1986; Hughes & Trudgill, 1979; Sutcliff, 1982), America (Dillard, 1972; Fasold & Wolfram, 1975; Labov, 1969; Smithermann, 1977), and the English Caribbean (Bailey, 1966; Bickerson, 1975; Cassidy, 1971; Chin Pang, 1981) reveals some of the most common nonstandard features to be:

1) Absence of third person singular marker: e.g. He want it.

2) Present tense verb form used for past tense: e.g. I meet him there last month.

3) Multiple negation: e.g. He can't beat nobody.

4) Variable use of personal pronoun forms as possessive and demonstrative pronouns and for formation of reflexive pronouns: e.g. They book; Them boys; Meself.

5) No plural marker on nouns of measurement and quantity: e.g. Three cup.

Some nonstandard dialects, though, when studied alone display features that diverge much more than others from

standard English. Certain Black American dialect features, discussed by Smitherman (1977), serve as examples.

1. 'Be' forms are used mainly to indicate a condition that

   a) occurs habitually,

      e.g. They be slow all the time.

           She be late every day.

   b) is future

      e.g. The boy be here soon.

           The family be gone Friday.

2. 'Be' is omitted when referring to stative conditions and non-recurring events and realities.

      e.g. He sick today.

           He a hippie now.

           The men playing baseball and the women cooking today.

3. 'Been' is used to express past states and actions.

      e.g. She been tardy twice this semester.

           She been gone a year.

4. 'Done' is also used to express the past but when used in conjunction with another verb it expresses the past with the notion of completed action.

      e.g. I done finish my work today.

5. Some personal pronouns are used more variably than in standard English.

e.g. Him cool.

(Smitherman, passim, pp. 16-34).

As discussed under the relevant section above, oral and written language differences may be expected to create difficulty for beginning readers in general. However, it was the kinds of dialect differences listed immediately above that led some investigators during the 1960s and 1970s (see Baratz & Shuy, 1969; Laffey & Shuy, 1973) to suggest that the greater divergence from standard written language of various Black nonstandard dialects will present a greater degree of difficulty in learning to read. As Pflaum-Connor (1979) explained, this did not mean that the nonstandard dialect speakers could not learn to read, but it could account for their underachievement in reading. This in essence is the language mismatch hypothesis.

This hypothesis not only became the basis of many research studies, but also resulted in several pedagogical strategies aimed at eliminating the 'mismatch problem'. These strategies in turn generated much debate which greatly affected research efforts and may still be doing so.

THE DEBATE ON PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES TO LANGUAGE MISMATCH

The pedagogical strategies for solving the 'language mismatch problem' can be grouped as follows: teaching standard English to nonstandard dialect speakers; developing special reading materials for the nonstandard dialect speaker; educating teachers so they accept children's rendering of standard English texts in nonstandard dialect during reading; and utilizing the language experience approach. The first two received the most discussion in the literature. That is not surprising since they dealt with two controversial issues, changing or adding to children's oral language and altering the language structures in reading instruction materials. The third alternative, on the other hand, focused on an aspect of teachers' verbal behaviour while the language experience approach seems to be a late addition to the list of pedagogical responses.

The debate and public reaction to those first two approaches has much to do with the scarcity of research on nonstandard dialect and reading since the mid-1970s (Baratz, 1973; Shuy, 1979; Simons, 1979; Simons & Johnson, 1974). Indeed, it was the debate that influenced some researchers to turn to other areas of the learning and teaching process for answers. In noting that more valid results than theirs would be produced by longitudinal studies that involved

children just being introduced to texts, Simons and Johnson (1974) remarked:

> The political, emotional, and cultural controversies surrounding the issue of using materials written in dialect in the schools are so great that an objective unbiased scale study of the question appears highly improbable at this time. (p. 356).

Simons and Johnson's (1974) conclusion was that an answer to the reading underachievement of Black children should be sought "beyond dialect 'per se'" (p. 356). The debate generated by the pedagogical responses to the language mismatch hypothesis is surveyed here to ascertain the nature of the controversies that affected research and to assess whether and to what extent those controversies may influence new research on the issue of nonstandard dialect and reading.

Teaching Standard English

There were two facets to teaching nonstandard dialect speakers to speak standard English: teaching standard English without consideration for the retention of students' native dialect and adding standard English as a second dialect. Some reviewers have made little attempt to clarify this difference (for example, Pflaum-Connor, 1979; Shuy, 1979) but the clarification is important. Inasmuch as the two approaches to teaching standard English resulted from different conceptualizations of nonstandard dialects, the basis of the objections to the approaches differed.

Understanding these objections will be enhanced by looking at the two facets of teaching standard English as a move from one pedagogical response to another.

Referred to in the literature as the eradication approach, the practice of teaching standard English to nonstandard dialect speakers in an attempt to change, correct, or eradicate their native dialect has been with us for a long time (Edwards, 1983; O'Neil, 1973; Trudgill, 1975). However, it did not gain the trappings of scientific support until publication in Britain (beginning in 1958) of Basil Bernstein's papers on social class language.

In associating working class children with a 'restricted code' which differed in vocabulary, grammar, and explicitness from the 'elaborated code' of middle class children, Bernstein's class-code theory (see Bernstein, 1971) provided an appealing explanation for why some children, typically disadvantaged nonstandard dialect speakers, don't do as well as others in school. While in the past the reason to eradicate students' nonstandard dialect might have been based on the notion that it was bad or ungrammatical, the notion of restrictedness encouraged the view that nonstandard dialects were "a basically non-logical mode of expressive behavior which lacks the formal properties for organization of thought" (Bereiter et al., quoted in Edwards, 1983, p. 73). Furthermore, this lack or deficiency was attributed to working class parents verbally

depriving their children by not speaking to them often enough in their early years (see Edwards, 1983, p. 73; Stubbs, 1983, p. 49). Based on this semblance of theoretical justification, the eradication approach was accepted enough by the middle of the 1960's for pre-school programs to contain question-and-answer drills aimed at teaching standard English to nonstandard dialect speaking children (for example, Bereiter & Englemann, 1966).

Because of the premise on which 'eradication' was based, however, it never found favor among linguists and sociolinguists. In America, Fasold and Shuy (1970) remarked:

> It will become obvious that the authors of the articles in this volume have little sympathy with the eradication approach. The premise that standard English is intrinsically better than nonstandard dialect is explicitly rejected. (p. xiii).

In Britain, Trudgill (1975) took the case against 'eradication' further, arguing not only that it was "impractical because it does not and will not work" but also that it was dangerous because 1) it involves making it plain to a child whether overtly or indirectly that his language is wrong or inferior; 2) it alienates children from school or, if the child adopts the school language, from family and friends; and 3) it produces linguistically insecure children who then become reluctant to use their language.

The current, widespread rejection of the notion that nonstandard dialects are linguistically deficient precludes

the eradication approach from consideration in research efforts to find solutions for the reading underachievement of nonstandard dialect speaking children.

One of the strongest and most systematic attacks on the premise underlying the eradication strategy came in 1969. It came from Labov (1969) in an article entitled "The logic of non-standard English." That article is noteworthy not only for the attack on the concepts of verbal deprivation and linguistic deficiency, but also because it epitomized an emergent concept of Black English that ushered in a new pedagogical strategy called 'biloquialism', or 'bidialectalism'.

In the article, Labov argued that although Black English was different, it was as viable a linguistic system as standard English. He pointed out that such as expression as "They mine" - cited by Bereiter as an example of the deficiency in Black nonstandard dialect in America - is no different from similar constructions in many languages of the world. He noted that Russian, Hungarian, and Arabic also lack a present copula and use subject and predicate complement without a verb. He drew reference also to the occurence of the double negative - a commonly discussed feature of Black nonstandard dialects - in Russian, Spanish, French, and Hungarian. Since no one can seriouly claim that those languages are deficient or illogical, Labov argued, the claim should not be made with regard to Black

nonstandard dialects. Furthermore, he took the position that divergent features of Black nonstandard dialects were logical and grammatical in their own right. It was views such as Labov's and the increasing acceptance that one's dialect is part of one's culture (Baratz & Baratz, 1969) that served as the theoretical basis of bidialectalism.

In this approach to dealing with the academic problem of nonstandard dialect speaking children, the student was to be taught to speak standard English but encouraged at the same time to maintain the use of his nonstandard dialect. The rationale was that the student's nonstandard dialect was a viable linguistic system, serving cultural and social purposes for its speaker and therefore should be maintained for those purposes. On the other hand, since it was stigmatized and standard English was the school language as well as the acceptable dialect for socioeconomic advancement in the mainstream society, then the nonstandard dialect speaker should become proficient in standard English as well (Baratz, 1969).

Kochman (1969) challenged bidialectalism on that rationale. He argued that learning standard English as a second dialect for social advancement was a waste of time since Blacks believed that it was the color of their skin and not their nonstandard dialect that prevented them from getting white collar jobs. He argued further that the input in time and effort required for the acquisition of "even a

mediocre of restrictive performance in standard dialect ... is prodigious and the results negligible" (1969, p. 87).

Sledd (1973) saw bidialectalism as doing much more damage than wasting time. He wrote:

> When schooldays were over, the young double-speaker ±bidialectalF could not really choose between his vernacular and his imperfectly mastered standard English. In every serious transaction of any upwardly mobile life, the use of standard English would be enforced by the giving or withholding of the social and economic goodies which define upward mobility. The upward mobile doublespeaker would be expected to eradicate his vernacular except in some darkly secret areas of his private life, of which eventually he would learn to be ashamed. (p. 207).

In other words, he saw bidialectalism as being little different in the long term from eradication.

In discussing the question of nonstandard dialect speaking children in Britain needing to learn to speak standard English, Trudgill (1975) concluded that although schoolchildren had to learn to read standard English, that did not mean that "we also have to teach it to them or require them to use it actively" (p. 76). When he turned his attention to English Caribbean children in Britain, however, he conceded that "some West Indian children, in fact, may be faced with what can best be called a semi-foreign language problem" - not only with regards to reading but to listening and speaking as well (pp. 84-7).

Although teaching standard English with various versions of English as a Second Language (ESL) techniques

gained much positive attention in the English Caribbean at one time (Bailey, 1963; Craig, 1966; 1971; Gray, 1963), that approach was not a pedagogical strategy in Britain (Edwards, 1986) for two reasons. First, since English Caribbean children varied greatly among themselves in the degree of nonstandard dialect features they used in their speech, an obstacle to the use of ESL techniques was the lack of criteria for determining the level of nonstandard dialect that should be used to decide which children would benefit from the kind of ESL programs recommended by Caribbean writers (Edwards, 1986; Trudgill, 1975). Second, inasmuch as Black speech was becoming a symbol of group identity, the probability existed that teaching Black children to speak standard English might be considered "another act of oppression" (Edwards, 1986, p. 5). Those two obstacles, one sociolinguistic and the other sociocultural, probably still exist today.

It is ironic that although the policy of maintaining the child's home language rendered bidialectalism more linguistically and morally defensible than the eradication approach, bidialectalism proved to be much more controversial. Perhaps community consciousness with regards to language use in education was not, during the height of interest in the eradication approach, at the level it reached by the time bidialectalism gained attention. Nonetheless, while it was the emergent principle of the

linguistic equality of dialects that put the eradication approach to rest (at least at official levels), it was objections based on sociopolitical, sociocultural, and sociolinguistic considerations that prevented bidialectalism from being given serious attention as a solution to the reading problems of nonstandard dialect speaking children.

'Dialect Material'

While the eradication and bidialectal approaches were concerned with oral language alteration, another response to the dialect-reading issue took the form of a proposal to alter standard English texts. Baratz and Baratz (1969) remarked that "reading ability is the important measure of success in our educational establishment" and that "the Negro ghetto child has a ... non-standard dialect which is part of his culture and which interferes with his learning to read" (p. 13). On that basis, they argued that

> Unless and until this variable is considered, and specific educational innovation based upon it, the majority of the inner-city Negro children will continue to fail despite the introduction of all sorts of social improvements to the educational setting. (Baratz & Baratz, 1969, p. 13)

The "educational innovation" that they proposed to deal with the reading problems was the use of Black American English as the basis for reading material for Black children who speak that nonstandard dialect.

> Because of the mismatch between the child's system and that of the standard

> English textbook ... it appears imperative that we teach the inner-city Negro child to read using his own language as the basis for the initial readers. In other words, first teach the child to read in the vernacular, and then teach him to read in standard English. (Baratz, 1973, p. 169).

Sledd (1973) saw this approach as a sign of failure of bidialectalism in its initial aim. The antagonism that surrounded the language mismatch issue is eminently evident in this quotation.

> If the shift from doublespeak ±bidialectalismÆ to interdisciplinary assults on reading does hint at some sense of failure among the disunited sloganeers of overambitious biloquialism, their choice of a second front will not redeem their reputation as skillful strategists. The familiar tactic of concealing the failure to keep one promise by making another is unlikely to succeed if the second promise is less plausible than the first; and promises to give everyone "the right to read" are notoriously hard to make good on, even for the linguist in his favorite role of universal expert. (p. 199).

But opposition to the use of Black American English in the school did not come only from anti-bidialectalists like Sledd. Those Blacks who saw the teaching of the 'standard' dialect to Black children as paramount were especially opposed to this approach to dealing with the reading problems of Black students. Di Pietro (1973) recounted an incident in which the school use of Black American English was interpreted by William Raspberry, a columnist for the Washington Post, as an attempt to "institutionalize the very

inequities ... that a democratic society and a democratic education should attempt to neutralize" (p. 38).

The objection to Black English in the school, even for activities less controversial than reading, was not unique to America. In Britain, Edwards (1983) wrote that

> The ILEA ±Inner London Educational AuthorityH statement encouraging the use of Creole in poetry and drama drove one head teacher to announce that he would allow Creole in his school only 'over his dead body'. (p. 59).

Even in the Caribbean nation of Trinidad and Tobago, where the use of creole and nonstandard dialect is predominant (Chin Pang, 1981), objection to the official use of 'nonstandard English' in the school was "vehement" (Rosen & Burgess, 1980, p. 132).

Only two attempts have been made to test the effectiveness of dialect texts in the United States. One involved one classroom only (Leaverton, 1973) and the other aroused such negative reaction from the Black community that the project had to be abandoned (Baratz, 1973; Shuy, 1979). Simons (1979) remarked that he had little hope of that adverse attitude changing. Current literature does not reveal any evidence either that attitudes have now changed to the extent that dialect reading materials would be accepted as a solution to the reading underachievement of Black children.

Teacher Acceptance of Dialect Rendition

In suggesting an alternative to deal with the language mismatch problem, Goodman (1969) proposed the acceptance by teachers of nonstandard dialect speaking children's rendition of the standard text in their native dialect during reading. This proposal is based on the assumption that children's dialect becomes a problem during reading only when and because the teacher mistakenly assumes that children's dialect pronunciations and grammatical renditions of the written text are errors and intervenes in the reading activity to correct the child (Goodman, 1969).

So far, only one published study (Piestrup, 1973) has tested that assumption and the assumption was substantiated to some degree. For example, in one episode recorded in Piestrup's report, when one child read "Dey call, What is it? What is it?" the teacher stopped the child with the question "What's this word," pointing to the word "They." Having been stopped and quizzed on a word which the child thought had been read correctly, she/he automatically thought that the teacher's oblique request for a standard English pronunciation meant that the word had been incorrectly read and offered /dæt/ as a substitute for "they".

While such investigations could provide valuable information, the observation of classes to collect data could be highly influenced by the sensitivities of teachers,

children, and parents. Those factors may be responsible in part for the dearth of research like Piestrup's.

Nevertheless, Goodman's proposal of accepting nonstandard dialect rendition of standard texts aroused little debate compared to that created by the other pedagogical proposals. That it did not deal with the contentious issues of language change as the others did perhaps explains why it aroused little debate.

Language Experience Approach

Unlike the foregoing pedagogical responses to the language mismatch problem, the language experience approach was not developed particularly to reduce a mismatch between nonstandard dialects and standard English texts; it is seen to be appropriate for all children. However, being a method in which reading instruction is based on materials created by writing down children's spoken language (Hall, 1978), it has been seen as "particularly appropriate" for nonstandard dialect speakers such as Blacks (Adler, 1979; Hall, 1981). It seems to be a late alternative in the language mismatch issue, however, although it traces its beginnings to the middle of the nineteenth century (Hall, 1981). It appeared in Mitchell (1972) and was included among the alternative solutions listed by Pflaum-Connor (1979) and Shuy (1979) in their review of the mismatch issue. The language experience

approach seems to have created little if any debate with regards to the language mismatch issue.

Conclusion To Discussion Of Debate

Some pedagogical responses to the language mismatch hypothesis have received more attention than others. Nonetheless, the heated debate they generated seems to have delivered a clear message: designing reading materials with nonstandard features and teaching Black nonstandard dialect speaking children to speak standard English without regard for the retention of their dialect were not alternatives that the Black community, on the whole, was willing to accept.

In the 1980s, the use of English is still facing rejection in some quarters of the Black community - even in circumstances where its use is not intended as an application of the eradication or bidialectal approach. Discussing language attitudes that influence education in the English Caribbean, Carrington (1983) noted that as nonstandard dialects rapidly become "symbolic of nationhood, cultural identity and progressive social and political ideals", English is seen as "a power that oppresses, alienates and distances the user from his national reality" (p. 21). The attitude is similar to that described by Edwards (1986) as existing in Britain during the 1960s and 1970s.

There seems to be opposing forces at work among Blacks: the fear of losing a part of their culture - their language, and the desire to have their children educated in the dialect that offers full participation in society. These opposing social forces seem to be still influencing pedagogical strategies and the direction of research studies concerned directly with those strategies and the language mismatch hypothesis that generated them.

RESEARCH ON NONSTANDARD DIALECT AND READING

The research into the language mismatch hypothesis has focussed on the interaction of nonstandard dialect speaking children and the written symbols in texts, from a grammatical as well as a phonological point of view. The review that follows is intended to assess the current status of the research so that the contribution this study is intended to make can become clearer. The review will in particular indicate the inconclusive status of results from research on the language mismatch hypothesis.

Studies investigating the comprehension of texts written in standard English as opposed to those written in nonstandard dialect have been conducted by Nolan (1972), Hochman (1973), Leaverton (1973), Simons and Johnson (1974), and Marwit and Newman (1974). They focused on grammatical features that might interfere with reading and involved Black nonstandard dialect speaking children ranging from

grade two through four. In none of the studies were the nonstandard texts read better. But they all share a common and fundamental methodological problem: their subjects had prior exposure to texts written in standard English for years before the experiment in which texts in nonstandard dialect was introduced. This bias skews the results of the studies in the direction of the children comprehending the standard English material better. The general admission of this limitation by the researchers and the inconclusiveness in which the studies are placed is summed up in Simons and Johnson's (1974) statement:

> One might expect the subjects to do better on the standard texts in this study because of their exclusive exposure to standard texts throughout their years in school ... If subjects had learned to read with dialect texts, they might read them better than standard texts. (p. 355-56).

These studies have also been criticised on account of the nature of their sample of subjects and the dialect material used (Baratz, 1973; Shuy, 1979; Simons, 1979). Inasmuch as they lacked rigorous criteria for verifying the extent to which the dialect texts used in the studies approximated the spoken language of the subjects, the studies might have been comparing children's ability to read standard English and a nonstandard dialect that was not their own.

Furthermore, except for Simons and Johnson's, the studies do not address the question of the extent to which

the subjects were nonstandard dialect speakers. Yet, the extent to which the subjects' nonstandard dialect approximated standard English may have been positively related to their ability to read standard English. As Nolen (1972) pointed out in her study, when the underlying structure of the sentence has not been disrupted, subjects would still get meaning from both dialect texts. For example, although "The boy carrying two book" contains two nonstandard features (no auxiliary verb and no plural morpheme affixed to "book"), it may not differ enough in its surface structure from "The boy is carrying two books" to prevent subjects from reading them equally well.

Another criticism of research on the language mismatch hypothesis is concerned with the brevity of the treatment period. This criticism was overcome by Leaverton (1973) by testing nonstandard dialect texts in one classroom over a two year period. He found positive results for the use of nonstandard dialect texts, but Baratz (1973) is critical of this study on account of the same class and the same teacher being used for the duration of the two years. She reported that the teacher was such a committed individual that she began giving extra lessons to the control group, forcing Leaverton to ask her to give additional help also to the experimental group.

In contrast with the number of studies dealing with grammatical interference, Melmed (1973) and Simons (1974)

dealt with interference due to phonological differences between nonstandard dialect and standard English texts. Simons focussed on individual words and was concerned with whether homophones whose spelling is close to Black American English (BAE) phonology (such as "coal" and "miss") would be read more easily by Black nonstandard dialect speaking children than other homophones whose spelling is not as close (such as "cold" and "missed"). Melmed, on the other hand, used continuous standard English texts to determine whether the use of BAE homophones in those texts would affect reading comprehension. Both studies resulted in negative findings with respect to their concerns.

The methodological problem of controlling for experience with standard English text is inherent in these studies as in the other related studies already discussed. Because children use the same pronunciation for 'jar' and 'jaw', it does not at all mean that they would not recognize the words as being different and therefore having different meanings when they see them in print - especially after years of exposure to standard English texts. As Shuy (1979) has pointed out, for urban Black children to make the generalization that 'jus' in speech appears as 'just' in print should not be any more difficult than for other children to realize that 'thum' in speech is realized as 'thumb' in print.

With particular reference to Melmed's study, Baratz (1973) has reported that in a personal communication, Melmed stated that the subjects he used in his study were reading at or above grade level. She argued that all he had done was test a group of atypical disadvantaged children who could read and demonstrated that they could read. It should be noted as well that the status of the subjects as nonstandard dialect speakers and the approximation of the dialect features used in the studies to the actual dialect features used by the subjects are uncontrolled variables - as pointed out above - that weaken the findings of this group of studies.

Rystrom's (1970) study is different from the others. In addition to investigating the ability of Black nonstandard dialect speaking children to read standard English, it dealt with their ability to learn standard English structures. Furthermore, with one experimental group and one control group using a traditional basal reading program and the other two corresponding groups using a linguistic basal reading program, Rystrom was testing as well for any influence the difference in the reading material being used by children might have on word reading scores.

Rystrom's experimental subjects failed to use, in oral language, standard English features that had been taught to them as part of the experiment. An instrument designed by Rystrom himself (The Rystrom Dialect Test) was used to

evaluate dialect change attributable to the standard English training. It should be pointed out as well that the standard English treatment lasted 20 minutes per day for 80 days. A longer period might have produced positive findings.

With regard to the comparison of basal readers, there was no difference between the pre- and post-tests on word reading scores for either of the two groups using different reading material. Perhaps the lack of an increase was a result of a limitation Rystrom noted with regard to his study. While the stated purpose of the study was to determine if Black nonstandard dialect speaking children could be taught to produce the third person singular marker, terminal consonants, terminal clusters, the modal "will", the copula, and the past tense marker, Rystrom stated that the semester-long experiment allowed only the first three of the linguistic features to be taught to the children. He failed to mention whether the post-experiment test included those features not taught. This study, the only one that it can be said tested the strategy of teaching standard English to facilitate reading, failed to give empirical support to that approach.

Hall (1977) reported an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Cachie that studied reading instruction approach as a variable in the issue of nonstandard dialect and reading. The dissertation investigated whether nonstandard dialect speaking kindergarteners instructed with

one language experience approach would perform better in reading comprehension than those instructed with a different language experience approach. The comparison between the approaches involved utilizing the children's dictated story verbatim as reading material versus using versions that had been translated into standard English. The findings of the study showed no difference between groups, and Hall pointed out that the short treatment period of two months was probably one reason for those findings.

It should be pointed out as well that since the comparison in the study was based on the children's verbatim stories versus translated stories, the study was, in fact, another investigation dealing with difference in comprehension resulting from reading texts that differed in dialect features.

The review of research studies focussing on the language mismatch hypothesis has shown that no consideration has been given to the linguistic features actually occurring in reading texts. Rystrom's use of a basal reading program and a linguistic basal reading program in his study came the closest to doing so, except that he focussed on difference in comprehension due to different standard English texts and not on the linguistic features in the texts.

Although this review of research studies has focused on investigations conducted in the United States, Edwards' (1986) critical comments on the much smaller body of British

research on this issue do not contradict the conclusion reached regarding the lack of attention to text content. She noted that while earlier studies showed the influence of Patois (a variety of Caribbean nonstandard dialect) on children's oral language, reading comprehension, and writing, later studies resulted in conflicting findings, particularly with regard to reading. She further noted that Anderson's unpublished thesis corraborated her earlier findings (Edwards, 1975) that Patois had an influence on Caribbean children's reading comprehension, but that Smolins' unpublished thesis, and published studies by Phillips (1978), and Pumfrem and Lee (1982) did not produce any evidence of such an influence.

It is instructive to note that in the writings of Edwards (1983; 1986), Sutcliffe (1982), and Trudgill (1975), where the issue of nonstandard dialect and reading in Britain is discussed, the issue of the linguistic content of beginning reading material has not been raised. This omission reflects a similar lack of consideration for that variable in the language mismatch issue in Britain as well.

With regard to the English Caribbean, a published body of research on the issue seems to be nonexistent. Very likely, that state of affairs resulted from a lack of financial resources as well as the much smaller number of investigators in the Caribbean - especially during the 1960s and early 1970s. Again, as with the case of the United

States and Britain, the linguistic content of beginning reading material fails to be a consideration in literature on the issue originating in the English Caribbean (c.f. Craig, 1971; 1977; 1980; Carrington, 1983).

Conclusion To Review Of Research Studies

The review of the relevant research studies dealing with nonstandard dialect and reading shows the failure of those studies to invalidate or confirm the hypothesis that a mismatch between nonstandard dialect and written language is directly related to reading problems of the nonstandard dialect speaker. This is the conclusion also drawn by Gibson and Levin (1975), Pflaum-Connor (1979), and Shuy (1979). The conclusion supports renewed investigation of the issue. The review also shows the methodological obstacles that hinder research in this area and need to be resolved before full scale research can be resumed. Most importantly, the review reveals the lack of investigation of the extent to which the contrastive features of written language and nonstandard dialect appear in reading instruction materials.

SUMMARY

This chapter has been concerned with concepts and assumptions that underlie this thesis, with related research, and with ideological factors influencing that research. Two assumptions were identified and discussed. One

was related to the role of oral language in the reading process; the other dealt with oral/written language differences that may make the learning-to-read process difficult, especially for nonstandard dialect speakers.

With regards to concepts, the term 'reading' was discussed with the aim of identifying a definition that represents the most current and scientific view and would serve as the meaning implied when it is used in this study. Other concepts dealt with were the cue systems in written language and 'standard and nonstandard dialect'. The term 'dialect' itself was discussed as a background to establishing a relationship between standard, nonstandard, and written language, and to describing some common features that may serve to distinguish nonstandad and standard dialects.

In this chapter, reviews were also conducted in three areas of literature pertinent to this study: reading instruction approaches and the research concerned with their relative effectiveness; research studies concerned with nonstandard dialect and reading; and ideological issues that have affected and may still affect this latter area of research. Through these reviews, areas in the body of knowledge on this issue that need to be address were identified. The reviews also served the purpose of identifying specifically the gap in the body of research that this study is intended to fill.

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is concerned with identifying, and establishing the rationale for selecting the nonstandard dialect, the written texts and the research methodology used in this study. The discussion on the research methodology will provide the basis for outlining the specific procedure used in extracting data from the source material for analysis.

SELECTION OF THE DIALECT

This study developed out of interest in the issues related to the reading underachievement of Black children in the United States, Britain, and the English Caribbean. Of these three areas, the English Caribbean seemed to have the greatest research potential. First, the literature reveals that the relationship between reading and language differences has not received as much research attention in the Caribbean as it has in the United States and Britain.

Second, studies that have analysed the dialects of Blacks in these three geographic areas indicate that in general the dialect in the English Caribbean (Bailey, 1966; Bickerton, 1975; Cassidy, 1971; Chin Pang, 1981) and its transplanted variety in Britain (Edwards, 1986; Sutcliffe, 1982; Wells, 1973) diverge more from standard English

features than Black American English - the Black dialect that has received the most research attention. The lower degree of divergence of Black American English in general from the standard dialect probably accounts, in part, for the inconclusive findings of American studies that were based on the hypothesis that dialect differences is a factor in reading difficulties. In light of the hypothesis that the more divergent the oral language, the more likely there is to be an oral/written language mismatch affecting reading, Caribbean English was selected for use in this study.

So, greater divergence and limited research attention were the factors determining the selection of Caribbean English for use in this study. It was necessary, however, to take the selection process further.

English in the Caribbean consists of various dialects distinctive enough for them to be classified into 'basilect' (those whose features diverge the most from standard English), 'acrolect' (those diverging the least), and 'mesolect' (those in-between). This state of affairs, extensively studied by Bickerton (1975), necessitated determining which of these dialects should be used in the study. In making that decision, the principle of greater divergence was applied once more and the basilect was selected.

Since Jamaica has been the focus of most of the published research on the dialects of the English Caribbean,

it was decided that the basilect of that island would be the dialect relied on most in this study. As Craig (1971) has pointed out, the difference between the basilect of Jamaica and the basilect of other English Caribbean nations "are minor" (p. 371). He further noted that the summary Bailey (1966) made of the principal differences between Jamaican basilect and standard English can apply as well to the differences between standard English and most English Caribbean basilects.

It should be noted that no original oral language samples were collected. It was felt that a large enough and definitive enough corpus on the selected basilect existed to forego the time and expense to duplicate that corpus. Furthermore, the analyses in the literature provide a more general perspective of the basilect than would have been possible if the investigator had collected his own samples from one, two or even three localities. Therefore, the study of Jamaican basilect by Bailey (1966) and by Cassidy (1971) were the chief sources of data, with data from other sources being provided by Bickerton's (1975) investigation of the dialect continuum in Guyana, Chin Pang's (1981) study of Trinidadian basilect, and Edwards' (1986), Sutcliffe's (1982), and Wells' (1973) studies of the Jamaican basilect in Britain.

SELECTION OF THE BEGINNING READING MATERIAL

Inasmuch as Britain, Canada, and the United States are the countries to which English Caribbean students immigrate most and in which many children of English Caribbean parents are born, written texts from these countries were used in the study. Although no rigorous sampling methodology was used in selecting a text from each of those countries, in order to limit the scope of the search for the texts and to ensure that the purpose of the study was not compromised, certain limitations were placed on the selection process.

1) To limit the scope of the search among the children's literature of these countries, the search was restricted to those books published for the first time after 1980.

2) To control the size of the study, a limit was placed on the length of the texts to be considered for selection. Texts with approximately 250 to 450 words were considered with the intention of selecting texts that were most comparable in length within this range.

3) Since the study required an analysis of texts for features that would indicate which text has the possibility of relating most closely to the JB child's phonological, syntactic, and semantic background, it was necessary that the texts selected should not be controlled through deliberate limitations on vocabulary and grammar (as is done with most basal reading programs), or on phonemic diversity

(as is done with some phonics-based reading programs). Control of either grammar or phonemes in any of the texts, for example, could affect the validity of the conclusion reached with regard to whether one text relates to JB more closely than others at those linguistic levels. Consequently, texts that formed a part of a basal or phonic reading program were excluded from the search.

4) Since poetry depends for cohesion on devices - such as rhyming, alliteration, metrical patterns, and refrains - which may render the structures used in various forms of poetry dissimilar to those found in non-literary texts and in every-day spoken language (Traugott & Pratt, 1980), texts written as poetry were omitted from the search.

5) A translation of a text may be word-for-word (corresponding at the word level), literal (at the phrase or clause level), or free (at the sentence or paragraph level), depending on the translator's degree of competence in the two languages and familiarity with the conventions governing interlingual switching (Hartmann, 1980). It follows that depending on the type of translation achieved or aimed at, the original words and structures in the foreign language could influence the words and structures used in translated versions of children's books, thereby lessening the comparability of the text with those originating in English. As a result of this assumption, texts that were translations were omitted from the search.

6) To maintain the validity of the question of linguistic difference between the texts from the three selected countries, texts that were published simultaneously in two or all three of the countries were excluded from the selection process. This decision was taken to eliminate the issue of whether the author employed structures in such a text to satisfy readers from more than one country while the structures in another text, published originally only in one country, was written with the readers of only that country in mind.

7) To ensure that the texts selected did not differ from each other in their linguistic structures on account of the structures of each text being geared for children at a different reading level, the Harris-Jacobson Readability Formula 1 (Harris & Spiray, 1980) was employed to ascertain the readability level of the texts considered for selection. Texts that measured at the grade two and grade three levels were considered, with the intention of selecting three texts that were at the same readability level.

To select the texts, a search was undertaken of the children's literature collection at the Simon Fraser University Library, the Main Branch of the Vancouver Public Library, and the Lincoln Branch of the Coquitlam Public Library. In terms of similarity regarding readability level, recency of publication, length, and theme, the three texts that resulted from this search are as follows.

Simon's Surprise was the Canadian selection. It consisted of 363 words, was written by Ted Staunton and published in 1986.

Little Nino's Pizzeria, consisting of 327 words, was the American selection. It was written by Karen Barbour and published in 1987.

Gorilla, the British selection, consisted of 469 words, was written by Anthony Browne and published in 1983.

The three texts selected are comparable at the low third grade level, as determined by the Harris-Jacobson Readability Formula 1, which uses average sentence length and percentage of unfamiliar words to tabulate readability levels (see Appendix 1 for tabulation). At the thematic level, all three texts deal with a youngster's feeling of not being appreciated.

The search was facilitated by bibliographic information which identify Browne as a British author (see Commire, 1979) and Barbour as an American author (see Barbour, 1987). Inasmuch as Canadian authors of children's books were not identified in the bibliographic literature as readily as American and British authors, a Book Evaluation List of Recent Canadian Picture Books (Bridgman & Iannacone, 1987) was used as the basis for beginning the selection of a text from Canada. Simon's Surprise is on that list.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology used to carry out this study was contrastive analysis (CA). It provided the mechanisms for completing the activities required in comparing oral language and written material. In addition, it allowed the oral and written languages under consideration to be treated, not merely as different modes of communication within one linguistic system, but as two different linguistic systems. The benefit of these characteristics of CA will become clear as the process necessary for completing the investigation is spelled out.

Methodological Approach To Investigation

In chapter 1, it was stated that this study seeks answers to three questions:

1. what is the status of the graphophonological, syntactic, and semantic content of the three different reading texts selected for examination;
2. how does each text compare with the selected nonstandard dialect at the graphophonological, syntactic, and semantic levels; and
3. which text has the possibility of relating most closely to the phonological and syntactic system of the selected nonstandard dialect and to the semantic background of children coming from the environment where the nonstandard dialect is spoken?

Answering the first question calls for a content analysis of the selected texts. Content analysis is used as a research methodology in many disciplines of social science for examining written as well oral language (Berelson, 1952; Borg & Gall, 1983; Carney, 1972; and Krippendorff, 1980). With this methodology, units within the texts - such as letters, words, sentences, propositions, and themes - are analysed to describe the text on these bases. With specific reference to the field of education, it has been used for example to analyse curriculae, teacher/student interaction in the classroom, and reading materials (Borg & Gall, 1983). Within the structure of this study, conducting a content analysis is preparatory to addressing the second question.

The second question, the answer to which yields the information for answering the third question, requires that the data resulting from the content analyses be compared with corresponding data from the nonstandard dialect. Such comparisons between oral and written language have been conducted in many studies - for examples, Strickland's (1962) comparison of the syntactic structures children used most frequently and the structures in their reading texts, Hart's (1977) comparison of 2- and 3-word strings used by children and those in their reading texts, and Doubtfire's (1983) study of cohesion in children's oral language and that in their reading texts. Although it is never acknowledged, the research technique used in these studies

is clearly content analysis of two (or more) sets of source material followed by comparison of the resulting data.

It is to that body of studies that this investigation is related in terms of examining the relationship between oral and written language. However, two points of difference render use of the same research methodology inadvisable. First, while the procedure for conducting content analysis has been well developed and explicated (see Berelson, 1952; Borg & Gall, 1983; Carney, 1972; and Krippendorff, 1980), the literature dealing with the relationship between oral and written language reveals a lack of similarly well-developed guidelines for carrying out the analytic component that compares the data. Indeed, content analysis is discussed extensively by Borg as a technique for use in education research, but comparative analysis, in which data from content analyses are compared, is neither discussed or mentioned.

Second, while investigators such as Strickland, Hart, and Doubtfire dealt with standard dialect speakers, this study is concerned with a nonstandard dialect - a nonstandard dialect, moreover, that is quite divergent from standard English and merits comparison with the written texts at levels (such as the graphophonological level) not studied by investigators dealing with standard dialect speakers and written texts. The lack of a well-defined procedure for comparative analyses, compounded by the need

for a more detailed comparison than that done when oral and written standard language are compared, led to contrastive analysis being viewed as the most appropriate methodology for use in this study.

Contrastive Analysis As Methodology

Contrastive analysis (CA), as Hartmann (1980), James (1980), and Wode (1984) have noted, is generally concerned with comparing languages or language systems. However, the term has become commonly associated, in an applied manner in the educational field, with the analysis of languages for facilitating second language learning (Hartmann, 1980; James, 1980; Long & Sato, 1984; Schachter, 1974; Wardhaugh, 1983). CA is used to describe and compare the native and target languages in order to predict the areas of difficulty in the target language that learners may encounter. Or if these areas have been identified already in the learner's oral production of the target language, CA may be used to explain why the areas of difficulty exist. Although this study is not dealing with second language learning, the discussion in this paragraph reveals the reasons for using CA in this study.

1) CA entails a descriptive as well as a comparative component. This means that the two methodological procedures required for answering the research questions of this study - content analysis and comparative analysis - can be

accomplished through CA. Moreover, procedures for both the descriptive and comparative components of CA are clearly explicated in the literature (Di Pietro, 1971; James, 1980; Lado, 1957).

2) This study is not only dealing with oral versus written language but with two different linguistic systems - standard English and JB. Viewing these two dialects as two different languages allows comparison to be based on different subsystems of language than those used in analyses dealing with standard dialect speakers. For example, graphophonology is one aspect of the oral/written language relationship that has received no consideration in studies of standard dialect speakers and their texts.

3) In dealing with those subsystems of language that have been addressed by studies comparing oral and written standard language, CA allows comparison to be conducted on a more detailed basis. For example, instead of looking at differences in the frequency of sentence type used in oral versus written language as Strickland (1962), Garman (1978), and others have done, this study will note the different surface structures used by the two languages to realize a common meaning or ideation.

The foregoing factors make CA a comprehensive and vigorous analytical tool for conducting the investigation at hand. However, it is argued that the comprehensiveness and vigour of CA depend on two factors: 1) the linguistic

framework within which the description and comparison is conducted (James, 1980; Lipinska, 1980) and 2) whether the description and comparison is being undertaken 'a priori' to predict areas of difficulty or 'a posteriori' to explain the existence of those areas of difficulty (James, 1980; Long & Sato, 1984; Wardhaugh, 1983; Wode, 1984). Since these two factors relate to the degree of detail with which CA need be conducted, their relevance to this investigation must be addressed. The second factor will be taken up first, inasmuch as it deals with the less complex matter of specifying which of CA a priori or CA a posteriori is relevant for this study.

CA a priori is employed to describe and compare in order to identify areas of similarities and differences and predict difficulties while the description and comparison in CA a posteriori are used to explain the existence of identified areas of difficulty. The purpose of this study is to determine whether one of three texts relates more closely than the others to the linguistic background of children who speak JB. Inasmuch as realizing this purpose will consist of describing the texts and comparing them with JB for similarities and differences, this study is being conducted within the framework of CA a priori. However, while CA a priori of two languages is customarily conducted on as global a basis as possible (Di Pietro, 1971; James, 1980; Lado, 1957), this study will be limited first to three

specific texts (which may not contain all the linguistic features in written or spoken standard English) and second, all the graphophonological and syntactic features that may be present in the texts will not be examined. Limiting the size of the study was one consideration. Another consideration was that some standard English features have been identified already by other investigators as not being problematic for the nonstandard dialect speaker. At the graphophonological level, for example, all consonant graphemes are not considered, inasmuch as they are quite numerous and do not comprise an area of extensive differences between standard English and JB (Cassidy, 1961; Edwards, 1986; Wells, 1973). It is only at the semantic level that an attempt has been made in this study to contrast all the relevant features in the texts with JB.

Admittedly, the focus on features already identified as problematic gives the study the appearance of CA *a posteriori* - at least at the graphophonological and syntactic levels. Therefore, inasmuch as it has been stated that this study will be conducted within the framework of CA *a priori*, two points must be emphasized. First, there is no prior identification of areas of differences at the semantic level between standard English texts and JB. CA *a priori* allows exploration for such areas of differences. Second, it bears reiterating that the study is not concerned with explaining the differences between standard English and JB

features (which is what CA a posteriori is concerned with). Rather, the study is concerned with confirming the existence of suspected areas of differences and investigating whether other areas, as yet undetected, exist. It is for such confirmation and discovery that CA a priori is the more suitable approach. The use of CA a priori offers another advantage in studies such as this one; the differences identified in this study can be used to draw inferences about expected reading difficulties.

The predictive ability of CA a priori can be useful in drawing inferences about the linguistic features in reading material that may impede reading comprehension. The results of comparative studies by such investigators as Doubtfire (1983), Garman (1978), and Strickland (1962) have been put to such a use. Indeed, it was the findings from Strickland's (1962) investigation that provided the hypothesis for Ruddell's (1965) seminal study that comprehension of text written with high-frequency oral language structures will be greater than comprehension of text written with low-frequency oral language structures. The predictive ability of CA may prove valuable in this study in terms of drawing inferences from the differences that may be found between JB and the selected texts.

It must be pointed out, however, that the inability of CA to predict the errors likely to be made by language learners is one of the most commonly cited causes of

criticism against CA. It has turned out that some predicted errors do not materialize and other unpredicted errors are observed (James, 1980; Long & Sato, 1984; Schachter, 1974; Wardhaugh, 1983; Wode, 1984). This weakness may be a drawback in some studies, according to the extent to which the goal of the study is to be attained by using the differences observed between oral and written language to draw inferences about difficulties in reading. Insofar as the purpose of this study will be attained by describing and comparing the features of written texts and JB, this weakness in CA is not detrimental.

The second factor relating to the comprehensiveness and vigor of CA has to do with the level of analysis necessary for completing the study. Basically, the description and comparison of languages can be carried out on surface structures or on underlying (deep) structures (Celce-Murcia, 1983; Di Pietro, 1971; James, 1980; Lipinska, 1980). In the former case the overt forms and arrangements which are used in the languages under consideration are described, then those forms and arrangements that are intertranslatable are compared. Thus, comparing a French structure and its English translation such as:

"Le garcon joue avec la chat maintenant"

"The boy plays with the cat now"

provides instances of similarity regarding such factors as word order, the use of definite articles before nouns, and

even the amount of words needed to convey the ideation. A point of difference can be observed in the variation of the form of the definite article in French but not in English.

However, depending on the context, the same French sentence may signify a continuous instead of a habitual action, thereby requiring a different English structure:

"Le garcon joue avec la chat maintenant"

"The boy is playing with the cat now"

Now when the comparison is made, the use of an auxiliary verb and a morphological change to the verb in the English sentence have increased the instances of difference between the two languages.

In other words, a surface structure of one language may have more than one underlaying or deep structure, making the significance of the comaprison with an equivalent structure in another language dependent on which deep structure is intended. It is the breakdown in the one-to-one translation equivalence of sentences, when the surface structures of different languages are compared without consideration for context, that led analysts to consider the deep structure of languages as a starting point for contrastive analyses (James, 1980; Hartmann, 1980).

This different approach led to language systems being compared in terms of transformational rules and the intermediate structures between surface structure and deep structure (Di Pietro, 1971; James, 1980). With deep

structure as the starting point for comparison, CA was based on the assumption that if the ideation to be expressed is the same at the deep structure level in each language but is manifested differently, then the rules of each language that determine the difference in surface structure can be compared. Not only was it possible consequently to express the differences between two languages in terms of the different rules that transform the deep structure ideation to surface structure, but the divergence taken by the languages from that original deep structure ideation could be traced.

Thus if an ideation that focusses around a book, a boy, the narrator, a teacher, and the act of giving, results in the English sentence and its French equivalent:

"The boy gave me the teacher's book"

"Le garcon me donna le livre de la professeuse"

the analyst working with the framework of the deep structure approach is concerned with describing and comparing the transformational rules that led to the difference in such areas as word order and possessive marker. The analyst will be further concerned with comparing the intermediate structures of the languages as the rules transform them from common deep structure to dissimilar surface structure.

In determining the relevance of either approach for conducting this investigation, Lipinska's (1980) discussion is helpful. She argued that if the CA is being conducted to

provide help in second language learning and teaching then a surface structure analysis is sufficient. On the other hand, if the CA is aimed at making a contribution to the general theory of how language works then the analysis should be conducted within the deep structure framework. It should be quite clear that this study is related more to language learning and teaching than to the formulation of general theories of language.

However, Lipinska's comment notwithstanding, there seems to be no consensus on the application of one or the other approach to CA in the area of language learning and teaching. In her discussion of the issue, Celce-Murcia (1983) argued that the deep structure approach is useful in terms of writing materials for learning a second language and in terms of determining degree of difficulty, since surface level differences may result in difficulties that are less serious that those existing at underlying levels. On the other hand, James (1980) has pointed out that surface structure CA may be more appropriate. Inasmuch as the surface structure approach focuses on the overt structures of languages, its strength lies in its ability to list similarities and differences of surface features in a very systematic and detailed manner. This is an advantage pedagogically, James argued, insofar as it is surface structures that learners of a second language are confronted with and have to master in order to communicate.

Again, it should be clear that this study is concerned not with the construction of teaching materials or with degrees of difficulty but with the similarities and differences in the surface structures of two linguistic systems. Indeed, although it has been conceded that prior knowledge and context are important variables in reading, it is differences in surface features (such as grapheme combinations, affixes, and word order) that are the concern of this study.

In summary, CA a priori will be used in this study within the framework of a surface structure analysis. It will not be global but limited by the linguistic features in the texts selected for analysis. However, inasmuch as continuous texts are used, context and prior knowledge will provide access to the underlaying meaning of phrasal structures in the texts. This means that although the surface structure approach is being used in this study, it possesses one of the merits of the deep structure approach; it takes the pragmatics of the languages into consideration.

PROCEDURE

The procedure for comparing languages or the subsystems of languages through CA has been described by Di Pietro (1971), James (1980), and Lado (1957). Lado's model is the one chosen for use as a guide in conducting this investigation. While James and Di Pietro described the

procedure within the framework of an eclectic approach which includes consideration of deep structure features, Lado's procedure is based entirely on surface structure analysis. Furthermore, he alone discussed the comparison of cultures, and he did so in a manner which makes it feasible to analyse the written texts in terms of their similarities or dissimilarities to the background of JB children at the semantic level, as defined in chapter 2.

Despite being viewed as the most appropriate for use in this study, Lado's (or any other contrastive analyst's) methodology cannot be applied in toto in this study. The reasons why and the adaptations that were made to Lado's methodology will be explicated under each of the sections outlining the steps taken in describing and comparing the language subsystems being addressed.

Graphophonological Level

In the phase of Lado's methodology dealing with the comparison of sound systems, the phonemes of both languages are listed, then compared on three bases: 1) whether the languages have similar phonemes; 2) whether the variation of a common phoneme is treated as an allophone in one language but as a separate phoneme in the other language; and 3) whether the common phonemes appear in similar locations of words in both languages. Graphemes do not enter the picture. However, inasmuch as this study is contrasting oral and

written language at the graphophonological level, graphemes will have to be dealt with.

In this investigation, the graphemes in the texts will be translated into their phonemic representations, the American text according to the General American phonological system as described by Kenyon (1964) and Thomas (1958) and the British text according to the Received Pronunciation phonological system as described by Gimson (1980) and Jones (1964).[1] A pronunciation dictionary for American English (Kenyon & Knott, 1953)[2] and one for British English (Jones, 1956) were consulted during the transcription of the texts. Inasmuch as there is no comparable Canadian standard for pronunciation and the Canadian phonological system is, generally, more closely related to the American than British system (see Chambers, 1975; Leon & Martin, 1979), the Canadian text will be translated using the American phonological system.

The translation of graphemes to phonemes is necessary because, to start with, one cannot begin to discuss a written text at the grapheme level unless sounds are designated to letters and letter combinations in order to distinguishing them. For example, what makes the grapheme "ea" in "lead" (the metal) and "lead" (to be ahead of someone) distinctive is the knowledge that the words are pronounced differently because of the different sound designated to the digraph in each of those words.

Consequently, if those two words appear in a text, the use of "ea" can be noted twice - representing the appropriate high front vowel and mid front vowel. Second, translating the graphemes to phonemes allows each text to be described within the context of the sound system of the region where the text originated. Third, once graphemes have been translated into phonemes, the texts can be compared to the phonological system of JB (thus fulfilling Lado's first basis of comparison) with the graphemes still being a factor in the comparison.

Not all graphemes appearing in the texts will be considered, however. The literature on American English, British English, and Caribbean English indicates that with regard to consonant graphemes, the "th" digraph is the only one with its phonemes in JB differing from its phonemes in standard English in all graphic environments (Cassidy, 1961; Chin Pang, 1981; Edwards, 1986; Gimson, 1980; Jones, 1964; Pyles & Algeo, 1982; Sutcliffe, 1980; Thomas, 1958; Wells, 1973). A few of the other consonant graphemes vary in pronunciation from JB to standard English depending on preceeding and/or subsequent letters. Thus, from the outset, the analysis of the texts can focus on the "th" grapheme and these variable consonant graphemes. These consonants will be properly identified in the appropriate procedural step that deals with tabulating their utilization in the text. Inasmuch as most of the vowel graphemes vary in

pronunciation from JB to standard English and furthermore vary in the phonemes they represent within both dialects, all vowel graphemes will be considered.

Step 1: Using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), make a phonemic transcription of each text.

Step 2: Attending to individual graphemes first, list all the vowel letters and digraphs and the "th" digraph occurring in the texts and assign them their phonemic counterpart (so that there is a separate list for each text).

Lado pointed out that contrastive analyses may also include comparing "syllable structure and any other sequence or distributional unit that may be significant in the languages involved" (p. 17). The literature on regional English pertinent to this study indicates that pronunciation in Caribbean basilect is different from standard English with regard to 1) initial consonant clusters in which the first two or more letters represent voiceless consonant sounds, 2) final consonant clusters in which, at the least, the last two letters both represent either voiceless or voiced consonant sounds, 3) "ow" and "ou" representing a diphthong before a nasal sound and 4) vowel plus "r" when final or followed by a consonant or silent "e". (Henceforth, for the sake of convenience only, the specified vowel plus "r" unit is referred to simply as vowel plus "r"). Therefore:

Step 3: From the texts, add to the list the relevant vowel plus "r" units, all initial and final cluster of consonant letters, and the diphthongal "ow" and "ou" before a nasal sound, then assign them their phonemic representation(s).

Step 4: Describe each text in terms of:

a) the occurence of vowel graphemes, the "th" grapheme, vowel plus "r" units, the initial and final consonant clusters, and diphthongal "ow" and "ou" before a nasal.

b) the utilization of these graphic units to represent various phonemes and sound clusters.

The results of this analysis will comprise the descriptive or content analysis component of the study.

Step 5: Using the IPA phonemic notation, transcribe each text into JB.

Step 6: On the lists containing the graphemes and letter combinations and their phonemic representations, add the corresponding JB phonemic representations.

Step 7: For each text, analyse the utilization of the graphic features selected for investigation, in terms of their phonological representation(s) in standard English and their corresponding representation in JB.

Steps 5, 6, and 7, will complete the contrastive analysis necessary for answering research questions 2.

Step 8: Compare the results of the contrastive analysis of the three texts and JB. This step will provide the answer

to research question 3 with regard to the graphophonological level.

The methodology at this level involved the first and third of Lado's basis for comparison, but not the second since it was not applicable. Lado also included comparing the two sound systems on the level of stress, rhythm, and intonation but these levels of comparison are not applicable either in this study.

Syntactic Level

At the syntactic level, Lado's methodology can be applied quite straightforwardly in this study. Only in terms of extent will there be a difference. While Lado's procedure calls for as exhaustive as possible an analysis of the two languages concerned, the analysis in this study will be limited, not only to features that appear in the texts, but also to inflectional suffixes, auxilary verbs and copulas, the pronominal system, questions, negative structures, and structures involving the expletive "there". This limitation was entertained to curtail the scope of the investigation. The selection of features for investigation was based on what the literature indicated may be the greatest points of difference between JB and standard English.

Step 1: List the patterns of questions, negative structures, and structures with expletive "there" that are

in the text. For example, there may be questions with or without reversal of word order.

Step 2: List auxilary verbs such as "is", "have", "does", "can", "may", "will", etc., noting where forms of "be" and "have" are used as copula and main verb.

Step 3: List all verbal and nominal suffixes used for forming aspect, tense, participles, the possessive case, plural in nouns, and third person singular in verbs.

Step 4: List all strong verbs in the simple past and past participle form.

Step 5: List all personal and demonstrative pronouns used.

Steps 1 through 5 will complete the descriptive component necessary for answering research question 1 at the syntactic level.

Step 6: Write a version of each text in JB, translating the text sentence for sentence and ignoring phonological differences.

Step 7: Compare the two versions, noting differences and similarities with respect to all the features listed in steps 2 through 5.

Steps 6 and 7 will provide the contrastive analysis for answering research questions 2 with regard to syntax.

Step 8: Compare the results of the contrastive analysis of JB and the three texts, noting which text contain the least number of instances of difference between JB and text.

This step will provide the answer to research question 3 with regard to syntactic approximation of text to JB.

Semantic Level

As it has been discussed earlier, the oral language and experiential knowledge that readers bring to the reading activity impedes or facilitates the extraction of meaning from a text. As the oral language knowledge brought to the text is a result of the linguistic features to which readers are exposed, the experiential knowledge brought to the text may be a result of the concepts to which they were exposed in their culture or geographic region. In his discussion of the comparison of cultures, Lado divided these concepts into three classes: 1) 'items', such as boy, lady, teacher, family, cow, tree, house, ghost, and idea; 2) 'processes', which includes such items as to run, to read, to rest, to skate, to sleep, to think, to die; and 3) 'qualities', such as slow, hot, large, happily, and bravely. It is these concepts, Lado pointed out, that comprise culture which, according to Kluckhohn and Kelly, is:

> All those historically created designs for living explicit and implicit, rational, irrational, and non-irrational, which exist at any given time as potential guides for the behaviour of men. (Quoted in Lado, 1953, p. 554).

The extent to which these concepts occur among different peoples, differ in their form, what they mean, and how they are distributed, contributes to cultural differences. For

example, the concept "teacher" may have the same meaning in two cultures, but how teachers customarily dress (their form) and where they may be found (distribution) may not be similar in both cultures. Similarly, "to skate" may have a different form, meaning, and distribution in two different cultures.

It should be pointed out that although Lado noted that form, meaning, and distribution "probably do not exist independently of each other in a culture" (pp. 111-112), he found it useful to treat them as if they were separate. In this contrast of concepts in the texts and concepts in the background of children who come from a JB area, they will be treated also as if they were separate.

Step 1: List all the 'items', 'processes', and 'qualities' in each text.

Step 2: Describe the texts in terms of these concepts.

Step 3: Analyse those concepts that are absent from the JB context or have a different form, meaning, or distribution in the JB culture.

Step 4: Compare the results of Step 3, noting which text contains the least instances of difference. These four steps address the research questions at the semantic level.

Statistical Treatment Of The Data

If the purpose of this study had been only to identify areas of difference between JB and standard English, no

statistical analysis would have been employed. However, since this study goes beyond the contrastive process in an endeavor to determine which text has the possibility of relating most closely to JB, some numerical computations will be employed.

The extent to which statistical analysis can be used is greatly curtailed by the lack of a numerical weighting system that establishes a heirarchical order for the dialect differences that may be found across language levels and within language levels. For example, the grapheme "a" represents the RP phonemes /æ,ɒ,ɔ/ in "tap", "top", and "tall" respectively. In JB, the phoneme in those three words is /a/. The question is whether JB /a/ is closer to RP /æ/ than to RP /ɒ/ and /ɔ/ and if so how can that closer proximity be stated numerically.

This state of affairs has been resolved in this study by assigning a one-point value to each dialect difference within each language level and across language levels. Therefore, one point will be recorded when a negative phrase is different in JB and the text as well as when the grapheme "a" represents JB /a/ and the corresponding RP /æ/, /ɒ/ and /ɔ/. This allowed the results for the third research question to be stated in descriptive statistics of gross aggregates and percentages.

SUMMARY

This chapter has outlined the methodology involved in conducting the study. The dialect and the beginning reading material used in the study were identified and their selection substantiated. How the study was conceptualized in order to answer the research questions was then discussed. This entailed outlining the basic methodological approach to the investigation and specifying CA as the methodology selected. A particular version of CA was further identified - CA *a priori* at the surface structure level. Finally, the procedural steps employed in conducting the necessary analyses were described in detail.

CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will report the results of the descriptive analyses of the texts, the analyses that contrasted the texts and JB (JB linguistic features at the syntactic and graphophonological levels and JB children's expected experiential knowledge at the semantic level), and the comparison of the comparative analyses of the three texts. The findings from the descriptive analyses will be reported first with the three language levels of one text being presented before attention is turned to the second then third text. The results of all contrastive analyses will then be reported, leaving the outcome of the comparison of the contrastive analyses of the three texts to be reported last.

Inasmuch as an analysis at the semantic level will provide a larger overview of the texts than analyses at the other two levels, the semantic level is dealt with first, the syntactic level second, and the graphophonological level last. Before reporting the findings, however, some remarks must be made with regard to the classification of the features for the respective levels of language analysed.

Classification Of The Features

In the semantic analysis, only those words that are items, processes, or qualities (as described in the preceding chapter) have been considered. Furthermore, since it is concepts that are being analysed at this level, the various inflected forms of a word have not been considered as different. Thus, "make", "makes", "made", and "making" are not considered individually but as one concept.

At the syntactic and graphophonological levels, however, such a distinction is made. In the case of analysing syntax, it is the differential use between JB and the texts of such forms as "come" versus "came", "home" versus "homes" that is being considered. Therefore, the various inflected forms of words must be considered separately. At the graphophonological level, the distinction between words and their inflected forms is just as important. For example, the failure to include "making", when "make" has already been noted, means the loss of the opportunity to count the grapheme "i" in the "-ing" ending. At some stages of the descriptive analyses, identical words are considered only once; that is, only the first appearance of a word is tabulated. Thus, when reference is being made to the one-time tabulation of words, the terms "different word" and "new word" have been used interchangeably to convey this fact (as in the sentence: "The grapheme "i"

occurs in a total of 100 words but only in 35 different words").

At each level of language, the size of the language unit varied. In most cases, one word represented a concept at the semantic level but in some cases two words such as "slip away" or "fast asleep" are necessary to convey the concept. So in some circumstances, one-word units are the focus of analysis and in other circumstances two-word units are the focus. Similarly, at the syntactic level, the third person singular form "makes" or the pronoun "I" is analysed as a one -word unit. However, such verbal structures as the the infinitive "to be" and the auxilary "would be" are also analysed as one unit. Letters and digraphs also result in natural units of different size at the graphological level. Some units have been made longer by the examination of vowel plus consonants.

It should be pointed out at this juncture that inasmuch as it has been established that the particular vowel plus "r" unit under consideration at the graphophonological level is final, followed by another consonant, or by a 'silent "e"', the distinction between these graphic representations is not shown in the Tables. As a result, "er", "ere", and "ert", for example, are placed in one group as "er". Also, when diphthongal "ow" (or "ou") occurs before "n", the digraph is not considered twice in the analysis - as "ow" and well as "ow" + "n" - but only as "ow" + "n".

The features considered in the graphophonological analysis are grouped in 4 categories: 1) graphemes, which includes the vowel letters and digraphs, the "th" digraph, and "y"; 2) vowel plus consonant, which consists of vowel plus "r" and the diphthongal "ow" and "ou" plus "n"; 3) initial consonant clusters; and 4) final consonant clusters. As it has been noted in the last chapter, "y" is considered in this study only when it functions as a vowel. It should be noted that for the purposes of this study only, when the term "vowels" is used in the upcoming discussion, it includes "y" with the traditional vowels "a", "e", "i", "o", and "u".

Little Nino's Pizzeria

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

Little Nino's Pizzeria is a child's first person account of proudly helping his father in his pizza restaurant until he lost the privilege when his father closed the restaurant and opened a more sophisticated one. The actions and concerns of the characters in the story are centered around the pizza restaurant and even when the action moves to the boy's home, the concern of the characters remains on the restaurant and activities carried out in the restaurant business.

This story is told in 327 words (including "a"), of which 129 are items, processes, and qualities as described in the last chapter. When repeated and inflected words are discounted from this smaller group of 129 words, there are 88 different words. This group of different words (Table 1) are the ones under consideration in this semantic analysis.

As Table 1 shows through the asterisked words, 22 of the 88 concepts (25%) can be directly associated with the restaurant business, even when they are considered outside the context of the story as isolated words. Other concepts such as "money", "busy", "paperwork", "money talk", and "in charge" may not be directly associated with the restaurant business, they are nonetheless directly associated with

Table 1 - A List Of The Items, Processes, and Qualities In Little Nino's Pizzeria

mak-e,es,ing (4)	lots/a lot
best (4)	more
*pizza (8)	money
world (2)	next (2)
helper (2)	day (2)
help (8)	locked (up)
*knead-ing (2)	opened
*dough (2)	big
*stir	fancy
*sauce	expensive
*grate	called
*cheese	tried (3)
*customers	*dining room
finished	*waiters
know	tripped
pick (up)	spilled
*plates	*food
carry (out)	*kitchen
dirty	*chef
*dishes	pushed (away)
give	asked
extra	busy
*hungry	notice
people (2)	helpful
alley	way
have	miss-ed (2)
home-s (3)	extra-tired
*serve	said
*pies	cutting
come/came (3)	*tomatoes
town	chopping
*eat	*onions
wait	tired
name	paperwork
long	money talk
told	shouted
lines	looked
*restaurant	went (2)
small	reopened
one	got
night	new
man	person
see	in charge
last	changed
want	

business. The preponderence of "help" in the text is explained by the fact that when his father opened the bigger and more sophisticated restaurant, the boy made several unsuccessful attempts to help in it.

The foregoing analysis shows Little Nino's Pizzeria to be a narrowly focussed story at the semantic level, with much of its vocabulary directly associated with the setting of the story - the restaurant business.

Syntactic Level

The following list describes Little Nino's Pizzeria at the syntactic level, as far as the features under discussion are concerned.

1 negative clause: ("who have no homes").

1 question: ("What did he want?").

3 auxilary verbs:

- 1 "be" form: (would be);
- 1 "do" form: (did);
- 1 "can" form: (could).

8 occurrences of copulas ('m, are, is, was, to be); ("'m", "was", and "to be" are each used twice in the text as copulas).

1 "have" form as main verb: (have).

32 different verbs and nouns with the relevant inflectional suffixes :

- 13 with -ed for past tense;

3 with -ed for adjectival past participle;

3 with -ing for forming noun phrase;

1 with -ing for marking aspect;

1 with -s for third person singular of verb;

9 with -s, -es for nominal pluralization;

2 with -'s for possession;

5 different strong verbs in the past tense: (came, told, went, said, got).

9 different pronouns:

8 personal (I, they, he, we, it, their, our, my);

1 relative (who).

It should be noted that although there are 8 "be" forms, the infinitive, "'m", and "was" appear twice, functioning as copulas. However, while the structure of the sentences containing the infinitive is the same - infinitive plus adjectival phrase - one of the sentences containing "was" is basically copula plus adjectival phrase while the other is copula plus adverbial phrase, as is shown here:

... but he was too busy.

I was always in the way.

The two pairs of sentences containing "'m" and "to be" differ on a similar basis. In the case of "'m" it is copula plus (past participial) adjective versus copula plus noun phrase while with "to be" it is copula plus adjective versus copula plus adverb. Consequently, although 6 of the "be" forms are identical, they perform different functions and

were not treated merely as repeated forms. Repeated nouns and verbs do not, in the text, present the same dilemma of same form but different function. Therefore, repeated nouns and verbs that have the suffixes of concern to this study are not included in the 32 nouns and verbs in the list above. This treatment of the auxilary verbs applies to the analysis of the other two texts.

It is worth noting two additional points with regard to the list. The 2 instances of the possessive case are actually part of the name of a business ("Little Nino's" and "Little Tony's") and are not followed in the text by the item possessed. Second, there are 5 instances of different words with the "-ing" suffix. However, one of them forms a part of the noun "dining room" and consequently is not considered here as a syntactic feature.

Basically, it can be concluded that Little Nino's Pizzeria does not shows much diversity in all of the syntactic features considered. Although there is a variety of inflectional suffixes, there is only one instance of negation and one question. Moreover, the small amount of auxilary verbs indicates the scarcity of such verbal constructions as the progressive aspect, the past perfect tense, and the passive voice.

Graphophonological Level

Tables 2 through 5 report the results of the descriptive analysis of Little Nino's Pizzeria at the graphophonological level. In Table 2, each row lists one of the graphemes under consideration in the study, the number of time it appears in the text, the number of new words in which the grapheme appears once repeated words have been discounted, and the phoneme(s) represented by the grapheme. Also, the number of new words in which the grapheme represents a particular phoneme appears in parenthesis. The Table shows that 19 different vowel graphemes are used in the text. Thirteen of them are digraphs but the digraphs are utilized much less frequently that the letters.

While "e" is the most used vowel letter in the text, occurring a total of 126 times, when "silent e" is discounted, "i" becomes the prominent grapheme. It occurs 85 times in the text. However, the grapheme that the reader will encounter most often in new words is "a". It appears in 38 different words and represents 5 phonemes. As Table 2 shows, "o" is also a significant grapheme in that it is used to represent 6 phonemes and appears in 32 new words.

Although "i" is the prominent grapheme in the text, being the most frequently used grapheme and appearing in only 4 less new words than "a" does, it is one of the most consistent grapheme in terms of phoneme representation. One of the 4 phonemes that "i" represents is used in 70.6% of

Table 2 - Frequency Of Graphemes And Phonemes

In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Graphemes	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phonemes	Phonemes Used
a	72	38	5	æ(16), e(9), ə(5), ɑ(3), ɔ(5)
ai	3	3	2	e(2), ɛ(1)
au	5	3	3	ə(1), ɔ(1), ɑ(1)
ay	5	4	1	ey
e	70	22	4	ɛ(12), i(5), ɪ(4), ə(1)
ea	3	3	1	i
ee	2	2	1	i
eo	2	1	1	i
ew	1	1	1	yu
ey	4	3	2	i(2), e
i	85	34	4	aɪ(6), ɪ(24), i(3), y(1)
ie	1	1	1	aɪ
o	63	32	6	o(14), ɑ(9), ʌ(3), ə(3), u(2), ωʌ(1)
oi	1	1	1	ωɑ
oo	6	5	2	u(4), ʊ(1)
ou	6	5	3	aʊ(2), o(1), ʊ(2)
ow	5	3	2	aʊ(2), o
u	10	8	3	ʌ(6), ʊ(1), ɪ(1)
y	15	5	2	i(4), aɪ(1)
th	6	6	1	ϑ

the new words in which "i" occurs while the phonemes of "a" are used more diversely. Only "y" and "u", representing 2 and 3 phonemes respectively, are more consistent. Table 2 shows that these two graphemes are the least used of the vowel letters as well as the ones representing the least amount of different phonemes.

In proportion to the vowel letters, the vowel digraphs are used very infrequently. "ew", "ie", and "oi" are the least used, each occuring in one word only in the entire text. "ou" and "oo", on the other hand, are the most prominent of the vowel digraphs. Furthermore, "ou" is the most significant digraph, inasmuch as it is one of the two appearing in the largest number of new words and representing the most phonemes. The "th" digraph, the only consonant grapheme considered in this study, is used in 6 different words but it represents only one of the two phonemes it represents in the English language.

Of the vowel + r units in the text, "er" is most frequently used and represents the most phonemes (Table 3). As the ratio in which its phonemes are used indicates, most of the 9 "er" units in new words are word final. In two cases, "er" is followed by a consonant and in a third it is followed by "silent"e"'. It is followed in frequency and phonemic representation by the "ir" unit which, in the Table, incluses one "ire" ending, one "ir" ending, and one "ir" plus consonant. It should also be noted that the "or"

Table 3 - Frequency Of Vowel Plus Consonant Units And Phonemic Representations In Little Nino's

Vowel + Conson.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phon.Rep.	Phon. Rep.
ow+n	1	1	1	aʊn
ar	2	2	1	ɑr
eir	1	1	1	ɛr
er	11	9	3	ɚ(7),ɛr(1),ɜr(1)
ir	6	4	2	ɜr(2), aɪɚr(2)
or	4	3	2	ɜr(2), or(1)
our	1	1	1	aʊɚr

category represents one "ore" ending and 2 "or" plus consonant units.

The text contains 7 different initial consonant clusters, all of which are two-letter groups. A close examination of Table 4 shows that in the majority of cases the first letter of the clusters is a voiceless consonant while the second letter is a voiced consonant, so that only in one of the 7 clusters are both letters voiced consonants and only in 2 of the clusters are both letters voiceless consonants. In both of the 2 voiceless consonant clusters, "s" is the initial voiceless consonant.

Table 4 - Frequency Of Initial Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Little Nino's

Initial Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
st	2	2	st
tr	4	2	tr
fr	4	2	fr
gr	1	1	gr
pl	1	1	pl
sm	1	1	sm
sp	1	1	sp

In the case of the final clusters (Table 5), the voiced consonant is generally the initial letter while the voiceless consonant is the final consonant. The combination of voiceless and voiced consonants in the clusters are more evenly matched than in the case of the initial consonant clusters. There are two final consonant clusters with both consonants voiceless, two with both consonants voiced, and the other two consist of a voiced and a voiceless consonant.

In terms of the graphic units with which this study is concerned, Little Nino's Pizzeria is a text in which the vowel letters dominate the vowel digraphs - in frequency, occurence in new words, and the number of phonemes each

Table 5 - Frequency Of Final Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Little Nino's

Final Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
st	5	2	st
ld	2	1	ld
nt	6	2	nt
nd	9	1	nd
lp	4	1	lp
xt	2	1	kst

represents. The vowel - letter or digraph - that the reader will meet most often is "e" and the grapheme that will be met most often is "i". However, when repeated words are discounted, the graphemes that the reader will encounter most often requiring the most amount of different vocalizations (that is, phonemes) are "a" and "o". In terms of the vowel plus consonant units, "er" is the one that the reader will meet most often - in particular, final "er".

The consonant clusters in the text are two-letter clusters. Generally, a voiceless consonant takes the initial position and a voiced consonant the final position in initial clusters. In the case of the final consonant clusters, the reverse is generally true.

The "th" digraph is used in the text to represent only one of the two phonemes it represents in the English language.

Gorilla

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

Gorilla is the story of a neglected girl's love of gorillas bringing on a fanciful outing one night. A toy gorilla that was given to her by her father transforms into a real gorilla and takes her to the zoo, the cinema, and to eat. The setting of the story moves from the girl's home to the zoo but not to the cinema or to the location where they ate. This story is told in 469 words of which 187 are items, processes, and qualities. When repeated and inflected words are discounted, there are 103 different items, processes, and qualities (Table 6).

As the asterisked words in Table 6 show, only the concepts "gorilla", "zoo", "primates", "orang-utan", and "chimpanzee" are specific enough to suggest a setting in the story, or at least a topic with which the story deals. "Swinging" and "trees" may be added to those five concepts, but seven concepts is still a very small number, inasmuch as 103 words comprise the list in the Table .

Although the characters move to two other locations - the cinema and a place where one eats out - there is a scarcity of concepts concerning those locations. In fact,

Table 6 - A List Of The Items, Processes, and Qualities In Gorilla

tell	want	looked
happy (3)	morning	rushed
love-d (4)	middle	outside
*gorilla-s (21)	woke (up) (2)	come (on)
read	small	gently
books	parcel	lifted
watched	foot	were off
television	bed	swinging
drew	toy-s (3)	trees
pictures	threw	arrived
saw/see-n (6)	corner	closed
real	other	high
father-'s (4)	lawn	wall
time (3)	sleep	around
take	amazing	never mind
*zoo (5)	happened (2)	straight
went (6)	frightened (2)	*primates
work-ed (2)	hurt	thrilled
day (2)	wondered	many
school (2)	like (2)	took
evening	go (4)	*orang-utan
home (2)	nice	*chimpanzee
asked (5)	smile-d	thought
question	afraid	beautiful
say/said (11)	crept	sad
busy (2)	downstairs (2)	cinema
tomorrow (2)	put (on) (2)	walked
next (2)	coat (2)	street
weekend (2)	hat	wonderful
tired	perfect	hungry
night (3)	fit	eat
birthday (2)	whispered	nodded (2)
go to bed	opened	danced
tingling	front	excitement
door	sleepily	

"cinema" is the only one relating to going to the cinema and "hungry" and "eat" the only two to eating out.

The list reveals also that concepts relating to the home where the story begins and ends are not plentiful nor directly associable. "Bed", "toys", and "television", for example, may be related to a hospital stay as much as to a person own home. Moreover, the relatively high frequency of "father-'s" and "loved" is not related directly to the central fact of the story that the father did not have time for the protagonist, Hannah. The concept "love" is used once to convey the degree of Hannah's attachment to gorillas, twice in expressions by Hannah to indicate her desire to participate, and once as a term of endearment by Hannah's father.

It should be noted that although the word "gorilla" is used 21 times in the story, this high frequency is a result of the third person reporting technique of "said the gorilla" and "asked the gorilla". Had the gorilla been designated a name, the word "gorilla" would not have appeared so frequently in the text.

The text can be summarized at the semantic level as a wide ranging one, with only one of the settings incorporated in the story having a distinctly related group of concepts.

Syntactic Level

The following list serves as a description of Gorilla at the syntactic level.

7 negative sentences:

She had never seen a real gorilla.

They never did anything together.

Her father didn't have time to take her ...

Don't be frightened.

I won't hurt you.

Hannah wasn't afraid.

Hannah had never been so happy.

4 questions:

What would you like to do now?

Time for home?

Really?

Do you want to go to the zoo?

17 occurrences of auxilary verbs:

5 different "be" forms: (would, 'd, 'll, was, be);

2 "have" forms: (had, 'd);

2 different "do" forms: (do, did);

(Some of these forms are used more than once in the text so they do not add up to a total of 17. The same is the case with the copula and "have" as main verb).

17 occurrences of copulas: (had ... been, 'm, was, were);

3 occurences of "have" forms as main verbs: (have, had);

2 "do" forms as main verbs: (did, do);

30 different verbs and nouns with the relevant inflectional suffixes:

16 with -ed for past tense;

4 with -ed for adjectival past participle;

3 with -ing for adjectival present participle;

6 with -s for nominal pluralization;

1 with -'s for possession;

10 different strong verbs in the past tense: (read, went, woke, saw, threw, said, crept, took, thought, drew).

1 strong verb in past participle form: (seen).

11 different pronouns:

10 personal pronouns: (she, her, he, I, they, they both, it, you, we, him);

("her" is used in the accusative as well as the genitive case).

1 demonstrative: (that).

1 "there" expletive construction:

... there was a high wall all around.

It should be pointed out that copulas and auxilary verbs that have a contracted form of the negator ("-n't") suffixed to them are not listed under the subheading of copula and auxilary verbs. They are considered as negative

forms. It should be also noted that there is an eighth negative structure in the text. It is, however, basically the same as the third negative sentence listed above, except that "he" replaces "her father".

The number of questions, negative sentences, and auxilary verbs are the main features that can be used to characterize Gorilla as a text that is diverse syntactically and contains many complex elements. Complexity can be seen, for example, in the abbreviated form "'d" which is used in the text to represent both "had" and "would". The forms of the auxilary verbs are made more complex by the suffixation of the negative indicator to 4 of them. Negation in the text is varied, however, by also being expressed through another indicator - "never". The presence of expletive "there" is another example of complexity in the text while the fact that all persons of the pronominal system are represented in one form or another is an example of the range and diversity in the syntactic features used.

Graphophonological Level

The results of the descriptive analysis of Gorilla at the graphophonological level is shown in Tables 7 through 10. Table 7, the Table dealing with the "th" and vowel graphemes, shows that 19 different vowel graphemes are used in the text. Thirteen of them are digraphs but they are not used as much as the vowel letters are, especailly "e" which

Table 7 - Frequency Of Graphemes And Phonemes

In Gorilla

Graphemes	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phonemes	Phonemes Used
a	157	44	7	æ(13), ə(10), ɒ(6), ɑ(5), ɔ(5), e̞(2), e̞ɪ(3)
ai	11	3	2	e̞ɪ(2), e̞(1)
aw	3	2	1	ɔ
ay	11	6	1	e̞ɪ
e	120	28	4	ə(1), e̞(17), i(6), ɪ(4)
ea	4	4	3	e̞(1), i(1), ɪə(2)
ee	12	9	1	i
ew	2	2	1	u
eau	1	1	1	yu
ey	10	1	1	e̞ɪ
i	87	45	3	ɪ(23), aɪ(16), ə(1)
o	93	36	7	ɔ(1), əʊ(11), ɒ(6), ʊ(3), ə(7), ʌ(7), ɯʌ(1)
oa	2	1	1	əʊ
oo	12	7	2	ʊ(4), u(3)
ou	14	7	4	aʊ(2), u(3), ʊ(1), ɔ(1)
ow	10	3	2	aʊ(2), əʊ(1)
oy	3	2	1	ɔɪ
u	15	9	4	ʌ(6), ɪ(1), ʊ(1), ə(1)
y	14	10	1	ɪ
th	68	15	2	ð(7), θ(8)

is used the most in the text. When "silent e" is discounted, "a" becomes the most frequently used vowel grapheme, appearing 157 times in the text. When repeated words are discounted, "a" falls into second place to "i" in frequency by one word. However, inasmuch as "a" represents the most phonemes, it remains the grapheme that the reader will encounter the most often in environments that require it to be decoded differently. "o", in representing 6 different phonemes over 36 different words will also be met in many different environments that require a different vocalization.

"u" is the least used of the traditional vowel letters. In fact, the frequency of its use in the text, especially with regard to new words, is comparable to the use of "y" and a few of the digraphs - "ee", "oo", and "ou" (see Table 7). What make "u" more potentially significant than "y", "ee", and "oo" in the reading of the text is that it represents more phonemes than they do. Similarly, it is the amount of phonemes that "ou" represents that makes it the prominent grapheme among the digraphs.

The graphemes "eau" is the least used, appearing only once in the entire text. In relation to that, it should be noted that although "ey" is used quite frequently, its 10 appearances is a result of the same word appearing 10 time in the text. The "th" digraph splits it representation in

the 15 different words in which it appears, almost equally between its two phonemes.

"er" is the most frequently used vowel + r unit and represents the most phonemes (Table 8). Most of the graphic units in this category are word final. Two are followed by a 'silent "e"' and 7 by a consonant. "or", the next frequently used of these graphic units, consist of one final "or" and one final "ore", the others being "or" plus consonant.

Table 8 - Frequency Of Vowel Plus Consonant Units And Phonemic Representations In Gorilla

Vowel + Conson.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phon.Rep.	Phon. Rep.
ow+n	3	2	1	aʊn
ou+n	1	1	1	aʊn
ar	3	3	3	ɑ(1), ə(1), ɔ(1)
air	2	1	1	ɛr
er	33	18	3	ə(14), ɜ(3), ɛə(1)
ir	3	2	2	ɜ(1), aɪə(1)
oor	1	1	1	ɔ
or	8	6	2	ɔ(4), ɜ(2)
ur	1	1	1	ɜ

Table 9 - Frequency Of Initial Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Gorilla

Initial Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
thr	3	3	θr
str	2	2	str
sm	4	2	sm
fr	3	2	fr
sch	1	1	sk
sl	2	2	sl
sw	1	1	sw
dr	1	1	dr
cl	1	1	cl
cr	1	1	cr
pr	1	1	pr
tr	1	1	tr

There are 12 different initial consonant clusters in the text (Table 9), with all of them except "str" being two letter consonants. As the Table shows, the initial letter in 11 of the clusters are voiceless consonants while the last letter of the cluster is a voiced consonant in as many of the clusters. The high incidence of voiceless and voiced

consonants in the first and last position respectively results in only two of the clusters having all of its consonants either voiced or voiceless.

With regard to the final consonant clusters under consideration in this study, all are two letter clusters (Table 10). Four of the 6 are made up exclusively of voiceless consonant sounds. One of the remainding 2 consist of 2 voiced consonant sounds, while the other one consist of a voiced and a voiceless consonant sound.

Table 10 - Frequency Of Final Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Gorilla

Final Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
nd	4	3	nd
nt	2	2	nt
ct	1	1	kt
pt	1	1	pt
st	2	1	st
xt	2	1	kst

From a graphophonological point of view, Gorilla may be described as a text in which the vowel letters appear more

often and represent more phonemes than the vowel digraphs. The vowel letter that the reader will meet most often is "e" and the grapheme that will be met most often is "a". When repeated words are discounted, the graphemes "a" and "i" will be met with almost equal frequency. However, it is "a" and "o" that individually require the greatest number of phonemic representation. In terms of the vowel plus consonant units, "er" - especially final "er" - is the one that will be met by far most often.

The consonant clusters in the text are predominantly two-letter clusters. The initial clusters have a voiceless consonant in the initial position and a voiced consonant in the final position. Most of the final clusters, on the other hand, are comprised of voiceless consonant clusters. The "th" digraph is evenly used between its two phonemes.

Simon's Surprise

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

Simon's Surprise is the story of a boy who, having become impatient waiting for his parents' permission to wash the family car, gets up early one morning and proceeds to do so. The action of the story moves from inside the house to the yard where the car is. Three hundred and sixty-three words are used to tell this story. One hundred and fifty-two of the words are items, processes, and qualities and that number is reduced to 99 when repeated and inflected words are discounted.

The 12 concepts that can be directly associated with the act of washing or cleaning are marked by an asterisk in Table 11. It only requires the addition of a few concepts ("car", "tires", and "silver parts") to indicate that a car is being washed or cleaned. Taking the story line into consideration, another group of concepts can be easily identified. This third group consists of "father", "mother", "pillow", "alarm clock", and "sleep" as well as "asleep" - when "sleep" is considered as a process and "asleep" as a quality.

The concepts relating to the act of washing, those to a car being the object of the action, and those filling in some of the other action in the story amount to a total of

Table 11 - A List Of The Items, Processes, and Qualities In Simon's Surprise

every (2)	wonderful	parts
said (13)	wet	eyes
parents	*soapy	closed
want	morning	aimed
*wash-ed (2)	sun	suds (2)
car (10)	problem	slid (away)
days	reach	made
big-ger (3)	roof	rest
waited	easy (2)	dull
seemed	pie	know
one	find/found (2)	took
slipped	went	asleep
outside	fishing rod	rag (2)
fast asleep	mother (3)	enormous
whispered	pulled	bag
going	pillow	finished
surprise	head	perfect
poured	silver parts	admired
*soap (2)	tires	long
turned (on)	used	time
*water	pot	alarm clock
*hose (2)	*scrubber (3)	felt
hissed	vegetable	rang
jumped	back (2)	window
father-'s (4)	*brush (4)	snow-ed (2)
mumbled	look-ed (3)	rushed
raining	*shiny (2)	hall
went	idea	stairs
sleep	*polish (3)	kitchen
*bubbles	fancy	side
way	forks	door
began	spoons	paint
*scrub-bed	put (2)	house

21. These 21 concepts account for 21% of the 99 items, processes, and qualities under consideration.

Before concluding, it should be noted that the high frequency of "said" is due to the recounting of the story in the third person. "Simon", the name of the protagonist, appears as many times.

It can be said in conclusion that Simon's Surprise is a well balanced story semantically. The main action is washing or cleaning, the object of the action is a car, and there is background action to the main action involving the protagonist's parents. These three aspects of the story are specifically related to three groups of concepts.

Syntactic Level

The following list describes Simon's Surprise at the syntactic level.

5 negative sentences/phrases:

... he never seemed to get big enough.

Not too much ...

... he couldn't reach the roof.

Nothing to it ...

... the car didn't look very shiny.

2 questions:

In July?

Am I big enough to paint the house yet?

2 auxilary verbs:

1 "be" form: (must be);

1 "can" forms: (could).

8 occurrences of copulas: ('re, was, be, 's, is, am);

("was" and "'s" are used twice in the text as copulas).

2 occurrences of "have" form as main verb: (had).

3 occurrences of "do" form as main verb: (do, did).

33 different verbs and nouns with the relevant inflectional suffixes:

18 with -ed for past tense;

1 with -ed for adjectival past participle;

2 with -ing for marking aspect;

10 with -s for nominal pluralization;

2 with -'s for possession;

8 different strong verbs in the past tense: (said, went, began, found, slid, made, took, rang).

9 different pronouns:

8 personal: (his, her, my, I, they, you, he, it);

1 demonstrative: (this).

1 "there" expletive constructions:

There were bubbles everywhere.

It should be noted that although the text contains 3 different words with the "-ing" suffix, only 2 have been recorded in the list above. The third word with the "-ing" suffix forms a part of the noun "fishing rod" and is not

treated here as a syntactic feature. Also, as in the description of the last text, the amalgamated forms "didn't" and "couldn't" are treated as negators instead of auxilary verbs.

From the listed above, it can be concluded that Simon's Surprise shows syntactic diversity in most of the features considered. The small amount of auxilary verbs indicates the scarcity of such verbal constructions as the past perfect tense and the passive voice. However, The number of negative sentences, involving the use "never", "not", and "-n't", attest to some syntactic variety. Also, the presence of an expletive structure is an example of syntactic complexity in the text.

Graphophonological Level

Tables 12 through 15 report the result of the descriptive analysis of Simon's Surprise at the graphophonological level. Table 12 showns that this text has 18 different vowel graphemes, 12 of which are digraphs. The vowel letters, however, are used much more frequently. "e", the most used of the vowel letters, falls into third place in terms of the frequency with which graphemes are used, once "silent e" is discounted.

The dominant grapheme by far is "i", occuring 84 times in the text and in 40 different words. "i" represents only 2 different phonemes, however, which means that the reader is

Table 12 - Frequency Of Graphemes And Phonemes

In Simon's Surprise

Graphemes	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phonemes	Phonemes Used
a	58	34	5	æ(15), ɔ(6), ɑ(7), ɔ(4), e(2)
ai	17	5	2	e(4), ɛ(1)
ay	6	5	2	e(4), ɪ(1)
e	81	28	4	ɛ(14), ɪ(6), ə(4), i(4)
ea	6	5	4	i(2), ɜ(1), ɛ(1), ɪə(1)
ee	3	3	1	i
ey	3	1	1	e
eye	1	1	1	aɪ
i	84	40	2	ɪ(28), aɪ(12)
ie	1	1	1	aɪ
o	64	24	6	ɑ(11), o(5), ʌ(3), u(2), ə(2), wʌ(1)
oa	3	2	1	o
oe	1	1	1	u
oo	9	8	2	u(5), ʊ(3)
ou	10	9	5	aʊ(4), ʊ(2), ʌ(1), u(1), ə(1)
ow	6	6	2	o(5), aʊ(1)
u	28	19	4	ʌ(14), ʊ(3), u(1), yu(1)
y	14	10	2	i(3), aɪ(2)
th	49	12	2	ð(9), θ(3)

only faced with two alternative interpretation when "i" is encountered in the text. Even "u", the least used of the traditional vowels, represents more phonemes than "i". "a" may be the dominant grapheme as far as the reading of the text is concerned, inasmuch as it represents 5 different phonemes over 34 different words.

Table 12 shows "eye", "ie", and "oe" as the least used of the vowel graphemes, occurring in 1 word each throughout the text. With regard to that, it should be noted that the grapheme listed as "eye" is actually the singular form of the word "eyes" which is used only once in the text.

The dominant vowel digraph is "ou", not so much for its frequency in the text ("ai" appears more often and "oo" appears in almost as many different words) but for the large number of phonemes it represents - as many as "a" does. The "th" digraph represents both of its phonemes, favoring one in a 3 to 1 ratio to the other.

Nearly all of the "er" units listed in Table 13 are word final. Three of them have a final (silent) "e" and one is followed by a consonant. With regard to other of these units, one of the "our" units listed in the same Table comes from the contraction "you're". Also, in its 2 appearances, "ir" represents an "ire" ending.

As Table 14 shows, the consonant cluster "scr" is the only initial cluster in the text that contain three sounds; the other 7 contains 2 sounds each. In all cases but one,

Table 13 - Frequency Of Vowel Plus Consonant Units And Phonemic Representations In Simon's Surprise

Vowel + Conson.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	No. of Phon.Rep.	Phon. Rep.
ow+n	1	1	1	aʊn
ou+n	1	1	1	aʊn
air	2	2	1	ɛr
ar	13	3	1	ar
er	19	15	3	ɜr(10), 3r(3), ɛr(2)
ir	2	2	1	aɪɜr
or	5	4	1	ɔr
oor	1	1	1	or
our	2	2	2	or(1), ur(1)
ur	4	3	2	ɜr(2), 3r(1)

the initial letter is a voiceless consonant. With regard to the final letter in these clusters, all but 2 are voiced consonants. As a result 2 clusters are voiceless consonant clusters while only one is a voiced consonant cluster. The voiceless fricative "s" is in 5 of these clusters, in the initial position. Voiceless consonants represented by the "th" digraph and "c" are also in the initial position of clusters, thus making the explosive represented by "b" the only voiced consonant sound to appear in the initial position of a cluster.

Table 14 - Frequency Of Initial Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Simon's Surprise

Initial Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
scr	3	3	skr
st	2	2	st
sl	3	2	sl
sn	2	2	sn
cl	2	2	kl
sp	1	1	sp
br	4	1	br
thr	1	1	θr

Table 15 - Frequency Of Final Consonant Clusters And Phonemic Representations In Simon's Surprise

Final Con. Clus.	Times In Text	Diff. Wds.	Phon. Rep.
nt	2	2	nt
nd	13	2	nd
st	3	3	st
ct	1	1	kt

Of the final consonant clusters selected for consideration in this study, 5 different ones are in the text (Table 15). "nd" is the most frequently used while "ct" and "lt" are the least. "t" takes the final position in 4 of these clusters and in three of those cases it is preceeded by a letter representing a voiced consonant.

In this text, vowel letters appear more often and proportionally represent more phonemes than the vowel digraphs. The vowel letter that the reader will encounter most frequently is "e" and the grapheme that will be met most often, with and without repeated words being considered, is "i". However, the grapheme that the reader will encounter the most often requiring the most amount of different phonemes is "a". With regard to the vowel plus "r" units, it is "er" that the reader will encounter most often.

The consonant clusters are generally two-letter clusters. In the case of the initial clusters, the first letter is generally a voiceless consonant and the final letter a voiced consonant. For the final consonant clusters, the final letter is generally a voiceless consonant while the first letter is a voiced consonant. With regard to "th", it represents both of its phonemes in the text, but one much more so than the other.

Little Nino's Pizzeria

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

Semantically, the story falls within the experience of many JB children. Although parental ownership of a restaurant may not be a familiar experience for many of these children, the activities central to the restaurant business are familiar ones - at least the food preparation, the ingredients, and the clearing away of dirty plates. Similarly, such concepts as "money" "money talk", "fancy", and "expensive" - associated with the restaurant business in the story - exist in the community. However, the concepts in the text that may be problematic for JB children are "pizza", "alley", "chef", and "waiter".

"Pizza" may be problematic from the point of view of distribution, as a result of its absence in the environment of the children. Moreover, since some of the common ingredients associated with pizzas - such as tomato paste, salami, and pepperoni - may not be present in the JB environment, form may also be a problem. "Alley" (a narrow street between buildings) may be problematic for JB children in rural areas but not for those residing in the cities where alleys exist."Chef" may not be as problematic as "pizza" and "alley", since JB children are familiar with cooks and cooking is what basically a "chef" does or is

responsible for. However, the status of a "chef" in a fancy restaurant (distribution) makes him or her more than a cook (meaning). So distribution may be interacting with meaning as far as this concept is concerned. Similarly, with regard to "waiter", the serving of food by one person to another in the home and the removal of their dirty dishes are not unfamiliar to JB children. However, the presence of uniformed people in a restaurant for the purpose of performaning these activities may be a new concept for JB children. Here again, the concept of "waiter" may not be problematic for urban JB children as it may be for rural children since a range of different restaurants exist in Caribbean towns and cities.

Syntactic Level

Appendix 4 shows the text of Little Nino's Pizzeria and its JB version in contrast. The text and the JB version are printed line by line and one above the other in such a manner that the reader can easily observe the points of contrasts in the features with which this study is concerned. Data have been drawn from the contrast between the standard English text and the JB version and are presented in Table 16. The Table illustrates numerically the extent to which standard English and JB differ with regard to the phrasal structures and other syntactic features that occur in the text.

Table 16 - Syntactic Differences Between

Little Nino's Pizzeria And Its JB Version

Syntactic Features	Amt. In Text	Amt. Rendered Diff'ly In JB
Interrogatives	1	1
Negative clauses	1	1
Auxilary verbs	2	2
Copulas	8	8
"Have" as main verb	1	0
Past Tense "ed" suffix	13	13
Participle "ed" suffix	3	1
Noun phrase "ing" suffix	3	3
Aspect marking "ing" suffix	1	1
3rd pers. sing. "s" suffix	1	1
Nominal pluralization	9	9
Possession with "'s"	2	2
Strong verbs past tense	5	5
Pronouns	9	8

The most straightforward contrasts of the syntactic features under consideration are those between the representation of the past and the third person singular present in standard English and JB. While the past tense of the 13 different weak verbs in the text are represented by the "-ed" suffix, their past tense form in JB is represented

by the present tense form used in standard English for the first person. Similarly, the past tense of the strong verbs and the one instance of the third person singular present tense are represented in JB by the first person present tense form. Thus, "tripped", "told", and "makes" in the text are "trip", "tell", and "make" in JB.

Of the 3 verbs that have an "-ed" suffixed to form adjectival past participles (Table 17), two do not follow the simple rule of the JB counterpart taking the present tense form, but retain the "ed" suffix. (Inasmuch as "extra-tired" is a compound word and different in form from "tired", it has been treated as a different or new word). Perhaps this exception to the rule of dropping the "-ed" results from the word "tired" being used quite frequently in the English language as an adjective while its present tense form "tire" - unlike "finish" - is used much less frequently.

The "ing" ending for forming noun phrases and for marking aspect have been treated as separate categories in Table 6, since they result in different transformation in JB, as Table 18 reveals. The three gerunds used for forming noun phrases in the text are represented in JB as "fe" + the present tense of the verb while the present participle is reduced to the present tense alone. Two more points should be noted with regard to the gerunds. In the first case, "fe" is expressed before the first gerund and optionally before

Table 17 - Adjectival Past Participles

In Little Nino's Pizzeria And JB

Text	JB
finished	finish
tired	tired
extra-tired	extra-tired

Table 18 - Verbal Noun Phrase And Aspect

In Little Nino's Pizzeria And JB

Text	JB
cutting	fe cut
chopping	(fe) chop
kneading	(fe) knead
making	make

the other two that follow. Secondly, although the gerunds have been translated in JB as two words ("fe" and the verb), each gerund is treated as a unit so that "fe cut" for "cutting" is tabulted as one instance of differences, not as two - one for "fe" and one for "cut".

Nominal pluralization in the text and in JB contrasts in two ways, JB either simply deletes the "-s" (or "-es") marker or deletes the pluralization marker and adds the suffix "dem". "Dem" is added, it seems, when the plural noun is preceeded by the definite article or a possessive (adjectival) pronoun. The result is, for example, that "no homes" in the text becomes "no home" in JB and "the customers" becomes "the customer-dem". Of the nine plural nouns in the text, four have the plural marker deleted while the remaining five have the suffix "dem" added.

The two instances in the text of possession marked by "'s" are proper nouns being used as the names of businesses ("Nino's" and "Tony's") with no explicit possessed noun following the possessive form. These two possessive forms are rendered in JB as "Nino" and "Tony".

Of the nine pronouns identified for comparison in standard English and JB, three are possessive pronouns and one is a relative pronoun (see Table 19). As the Table further shows, JB and standard English differ in all but one of these nine pronouns.

Table 19 - Pronouns In

Little Nino's Pizzeria And JB

Type	Text	JB
Personal:	I	me
	they	dem
	he	im
	we	we
	it	im
	their	fee-dem
	our	fee-we
	my	fee-me
Relative:	who	wey

Transforming copulas and auxilary verbs from standard English to JB follows the least straightforward rules. As Table 20 shows, in one situation, the copula "'m" (for "am") is deleted while in another situation it is represented by "a". However, "could" and "have" (where "have" is a main verb) are the same in both dialects. Two additional points should be noted with regard to Table 20. Firstly, the infinitive "to be" and the auxilary "would be" are taken as one unit so that JB "a go" and "fe de" have not been recorded in each case as two instances of difference, but one. Secondly, "fe (deleted)" means that in JB "to" is represented by "fe" and "be" is deleted.

Table 21 isolates the contrast between the interrogative and negative structures in the text and the JB version. The Table shows that the question has the particle "a" attached to the interrogative pronoun "what", "did" deleted, and "im" replacing "he". However, the auxilary verb and the pronoun have been taken into account already in the Tables dealing with those features. Therefore, to avoid duplication, only the introductory "a" is credited with being an instance of difference in the question. In the case of the negative clause, it is the insertion of an addition "no" that renders the standard English and JB structures different.

Table 20 - Copulas And Auxilary Verbs

In Little Nino's Pizzeria And JB

Features	Text	JB
Auxilaries:	would be	a go
	did	(deleted)
	could	could
Copulas:	'm (+NP)	a
	'm (+Adj)	(deleted)
	are	(deleted)
	is	(deleted)
	was (+Adj)	(deleted
	was (+Adv)	de
	to be (Adj)	fe (deleted)
	to be (Adv)	fe de
"Have" as main verb:	have	have

Table 21 - Question And Negation

In Little Nino's Pizzeria And JB

Text:	What did he want?
JB:	A-what im want?
Text:	... who have no homes.
JB:	... who no have no home.

The contrast between the text and JB in the 14 categories as listed in Table 16, shows all of them but one to contain instances of difference. Moreover, of the 60 individual features that comprise the 14 categories, 55 are different when the text and JB are contrasted.

Graphophonological Level

Through contrast, Tables 22 through 25 show the relationship between the text and JB at the graphophonological level. To complete the contrast, GA was taken as the standard English pronunciation.

The group of graphic units that shows the least relationship to JB is the vowel plus consonant. As Table 22 reveals, every one of these units require a phonological representation in JB that is different from the GA representation. This group of 7 units represents only 8 different phonemes between them. However, when the occurrence of these units in new or different words is

Table 22 - Phonological Representations in GA and JB

For Vowel Plus Consonant in Little Nino's Pizzeria

Vowel/ Conson.	Phono. Rep.	Diff. Wds.	Corresp'g JB Phono. Rep.
ow+n	aʊn	1	ɔ̈ŋ
ar	ɑr	2	a:
eir	ɛr	1	e
er		9	
	ɚr	7	a
	ɛr	1	e
	ɜr	1	ɔ̈
ir		4	
	ɜr	2	ɔ̈
	aɪɚr	2	aɪa
or		3	
	ɜr	2	ɔ̈
	or	1	uo
our	aʊɚr	1	ɔ̈ʊa

considered, they are encountered 20 times. This means that as far as these units are concerned in the reading of the text, the JB child is likely to produce a vocalization that is different from the appropriate GA sound 20 times out of 20.

The final consonant clusters are only slightly better (Table 23). There are 6 such clusters in the text, appearing a total of 8 times with respect to new different words. Six of these times, the JB representation is different from the GA representation.

Table 23 - Phonological Representation In GA And JB For Final Consonant Clusters In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Final Con. Clus.	Phon. Rep.	Times in Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB Phon. Rep.
st	st	2	s
ld	ld	1	l
nt	nt	2	nt
nd	nd	1	n
lp	lp	1	lp
xt	kst	1	ks

As multi-purpose as they are in their phonemic representation, the graphemes do not present as clear a picture. For example, each of the 5 GA phonemes for "a" has a different correspondent in JB. However, the correspondence is not one-to-one. As Table 24a shows, GA /e/ is JB /ie/ (in such words as "came") but JB /ɛ/ in others (like "make"). Also, Table 24c and 24d show that graphemes like "ou" and "u" may have some of their phonemes the same in GA and JB and others different. One aspect of the graphemic analysis that seems clear enough is that two of the top four graphemes ("a" and "o") contribute heavily to a negative relationship of the text to JB. Together they contribute 68 times when JB representations will be different for the appropriate GA representation. On the other hand, in all of their appearences, "i" and "e" do not require JB phonemes that are different from the required GA phonemes. Nonetheless, when all of the graphemes are considered, including "th", the reader will encounter them 180 times in new words. Ninety-eight of these times (that is, 54% of the times), the JB reader will produce a phoneme that is different in GA for the situation.

This text approaches JB closest in its initial consonant clusters (Table 25). Seven of these consonant clusters appear in 10 different words throughout the text and of these 10 appearences, the clusters will result in

Table 24a - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
a		38	
	æ	16	a
	ə	5	a
	ɑ	3	a
	e	9	ie (6), ɛ (3)
	ɔ	5	a:
ai		3	
	e	2	ie
	ɛ	1	ɛ
au		3	
	ə	1	a
	ɔ	1	a:
	ɑ	1	a
ay	e	4	ie

Table 24b - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
e		22	
	ɛ	12	ɛ
	i	5	i
	ɪ	4	ɪ
	ə	1	i
ea	i	3	i
ee	i	2	i
eo	i	1	i
ew	yu	1	yu
ey		3	
	i	2	i
	e	1	ie

Table 24c - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
o		32	
	o	14	ʉo
	ɑ	9	a
	u	2	ʉ
	ʌ	3	ɔ̈
	ə	3	a(ɪ), ʉo(ɪ), a(ɪ)
	w/ʌ	1	ɯa
oi	wɑ	1	ɯa
oo		5	
	u	4	ʉ
	ʊ	1	ʊ
ou		5	
	aʊ	2	ɔ̈ʊ
	o	1	ʉo
	ʊ	2	ʊ
ow		3	
	aʊ	2	ɔ̈ʊ
	o	1	ʉo

Table 24d - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
i		34	
	aɪ	6	aɪ
	i	3	i
	ɪ	24	ɪ
	y	1	y
ie	aɪ	1	aɪ
u		8	
	ʌ	6	ɔ̈
	ʊ	1	ʊ
	ɪ	1	ɪ
y		5	
	aɪ	1	aɪ
	i	4	i
th	ð	6	d

Table 25 - Phonological Representation In GA And JB For Initial Consonant Clusters In Little Nino's Pizzeria

Initial Con. Clus. Phon. Rep.	Times in Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB Phon. Rep.
st	2	t
tr	2	tr
fr	2	fr
gr	1	gr
pl	1	pl
sm	1	sm
sp	1	p

only 3 JB representations that are different from the appropriate GA representation.

Forty different graphic features were extracted from the text for consideration in this study (20 graphemes, 7 vowel plus consonant units, and 13 consonant clusters). Out of a total of 218 times that these features appear in the text, they will result in 127 representations that are different from the required GA representations.

Gorilla

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

There are several concepts in this story that may not exist in the experiential background of JB children. Five of them are associated with the zoo - the only one of four settings, referred to in the story, on which the author devoted any significant detail.

Inasmuch as zoos are absent from the environment of most JB children, the items "zoo", "gorilla", "primates", "orang-utan", and "chimpanzee" are outside the direct experience of JB children. However, with monkeys existing in some of the Caribbean islands, and with gorillas, orang-utans, and chimpanzees being members of the primate family, the problems JB children may have with these concepts is one of form (differentiating), not necessarily meaning (an animal) or distribution (where they are found).

Similarly, "coat" is a concept that may not be problematic with regard to distribution (in a house), or to meaning (used when one is going out somewhere) but to form. JB children may well imagine a short light garment with lapels (a jacket), since that is what they are familiar with for the purpose of going out. "Lawn" (low grass covering the ground around a house) is not an item that is familiar to most JB children so the concept may be problematic.

Syntactic

The contrast of the text of Gorilla and its JB version comprises Appendix 5. This contrast resulted in data that are shown in Table 26.

Table 26 - Syntactic Differences Between Gorilla And Its JB Version

Syntactic Features	Amt. In Text	Amt. Rendered Diff'ly In JB
Interrogatives	4	1
Negative clauses	7	5
"There" construction	1	1
Auxilary verbs	8	8
Copulas	7	7
"Have" as main verb	2	1
"Do" as main verb	1	1
Past Tense "ed" suffix	16	16
Participle "ed" suffix	4	3
Paticiple "ing" suffix	3	2
Nominal pluralization	6	6
Possession with "'s"	1	1
Strong verbs past tense	10	12
Strong verbs past participle	1	1
Pronouns	12	10

There are four interrogative structures in Gorilla, two of which show instances of difference from the JB version (Table 27). In the first question, two instances of difference can be observed - the particle "a" preceeds the interrogative pronoun and the word order is changed. In the last question, "do" is deleted and "to" is replaced by "fee". However, inasmuch as the auxilary "do" will be accounted for under auxilary verbs and the infinitive particle "to" is not under consideration in the study (as conjunctions and prepositions aren't), this fourth question is not recorded as having any instances of difference. So, of the four questions in the text only the first one, as listed in Table 27, is tabulated as being different from JB.

Table 27 - Questions In Gorilla And JB

Text:	What would you like to do now?
JB:	a-what you would like fee do now?
Text:	Time for home?
JB:	Time for home?
Text:	Really?
JB:	Really?
Text:	Do you want to go to the zoo?
JB:	You want fee go to the zoo?

Similarly, the auxilary verbs occurring in negative constructions are recorded as instances of differences in a later Table dealing with that group of verbs. Only the negators are considered with regard to the negative constructions. Reference to the constructions appearing in the text will illustrate the point. In the first structure listed in Table 28, the contrast between "had" and "bin" or "seen" and "see" is not significant in the focus on contrasting negation. Therefore, since the negator "never" is used in the text and JB, the phrase is deemed not to be different as far as negation is being considered. Likewise, the reduction of the pluperfect tense ("have ... been") to the simple past ("bin") in the second structure in the Table is not a result of negativization.

In the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth structures, on the other hand, the auxilary is fused with a contraction of the negator to form a unit that is different from both the auxilary and negator. This unit is taken as the negating unit in the structures and are not recorded under auxilary verbs. However, inasmuch as the main verbs "be" and "did" in the sixth and seventh structures respectively are not involved in negation, they are recorded later in a category dealing with those verbs. So, since the negator (or one of the negators in the case of the third and seventh structures) is different in the last five structures and

Table 28 - Negation In Gorilla And JB

Text:	... she had never seen ...
JB:	... she bin never see ...
Text:	Hannah had never been so happy.
JB:	Hannah bin never so happy.
Text:	... father didn't have time
JB:	... father no bin have no time
Text:	Hannah wasn't afraid.
JB:	Hannah no bin 'fraid.
Text:	I won't hurt you.
JB:	Me no go hurt you.
Text:	Don't be frightened.
JB:	No frighten.
Text:	They never did anything together.
JB:	Dem never do nothing together.

their JB version, these structures are recorded as different in the two dialects.

Although one JB structure may differ from standard English to a greater or lesser degree than another does (compare the third and fourth pairs of structures in Table 28 for example), it is worthwhile to reiterate that no attempt was made to rate the structures according to their varying degree of complexity. One point each was recorded for the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh standard English structures being different from their JB version.

One other relevant construction extracted from the text was the expletive structure "There was a high wall around ... " which translates in JB as "A high wall bin de around ...". The contrast reveals a word order change, a substitution of "bin" for "was", and "de" for "there". "Was/bin" as an instance of difference is recorded else while no provision was made at the outset for contrasting "there" as a unit. Word order, then, is recorded here as the instance of difference for this construction.

The copulas, auxilary verbs, and main verbs "have" and "do" account for 17 instances of difference between the text and JB. Only one of these verbs was rendered the same in the JB version, as Table 29 shows. Although more than 18 of these verbs appear in the text, wherever any of them were identical in form, performed the same function, and resulted in the same difference between the text feature and the JB feature, they were recorded only once. Of these 18 verbs, six (marked in Table 29 with asteriks) occurred in the interrogative and negative structures discussed above.

The text contains 16 different verbs with "-ed" appended for the past tense, all of which take a different form in JB. In Table 30, the contrast between "watched" and "watch" exemplifies the contrast between the text and JB with regard to 13 of those verbs. The two other verbs listed show a difference in contrast resulting from the context in which they were used.

Table 29 - Copulas And Auxilary Verbs

In Gorilla And JB

Features		Text	JB
Auxilaries:		would	a
		would	(deleted)
		'd	would
		'd	(deleted)
		'll	a go fi
	*	do	(deleted)
		did	go
	*	had	bin
Copulas:		'm	(deleted)
		was	(deleted)
		was	bin
	*	be	(deleted)
		were	bin
		were	(deleted)
	*	had ... been	bin
"Have":		had	bin have
	*	have	have
"Do":	*	did	do
(main verbs)			

Table 30 - Simple Past Tense Of Weak Verbs

In Gorilla And JB

Text	JB
watched	watch
loved	bin love
worked	a work

Like the majority of weak verbs in the text, the strong verbs in the past tense are represented in JB by the present tense form. There are two occasions, however, when "went" is represented by forms other than "go". In one situation, it is rendered as "a go" and in another situation "went to bed" is rendered as "gone to bed". So although 10 different strong verbs were recorded in the past tense, they result in 12 instances of differences.

Of the four verbs that have an "-ed" suffixed to form the past participle, three follow the rule of the JB counterpart taking the present tense form. "Tired" is the fourth participle that retains the "-ed" ending. There is only one strong verb past participle ("seen") and that also takes the present tense form in JB.

The present participles in the text (formed by suffixing "-ing") are strongly adjectival. Two of them take the present tense form with a preceeding "a", as in "a

tingle" for "tingling" and "a swing" for "swinging". The other one ("amazing") retains the "ing" ending. Since it qualifies the impersonal pronoun "something", "amazing" comes closest of the three present participles to being a true adjective. It does not therefore, take the particle "a".

As Table 31 shows, of the 12 pronouns under

Table 31 - Pronouns In Gorilla And JB

Type	Text	JB
Personal:	she	im
	her	im
	he	im
	I	me
	they	dem
	they both	the-two-a-dem
	it	im
	you	you
	we	we
	him	im
(Possessive)	her	im
Demonstrative:	that	dat-dey

consideration in this text, one is a possessive and another is a demonstrative. The second person singular and the first person plural forms are the only ones that are the same in standard English and JB as far as this text is concerned. The rendition of "they both" as "the-two-a-dem" in JB illustrates the significance of taking language units into consideration. Had "they" and "both" not been considered a unit, "they" would have been translated simply as "dem".

With regard to the six nominal pluralizations, three delete the "-s" marker and the other three add the "-dem" ending in JB. The "'s" marker for the possessive in the phrase "her father's hat" is dropped in JB.

All 15 categories as listed in Table 26 contain instances of difference between the text and JB. Of the 83 individual features comprising the 15 categories, 75 are different when the text and JB are contrasted.

Graphophonological Level

Shown in Tables 32 through 35 is the contrast between the RP and JB phonological representations for the graphic features under consideration. With regard to this text, which is the British text represented in this study, RP is the dialect taken as the standard for examining the relationship of the text to JB.

The group of graphic units that shows the least relationship to JB is the vowel plus consonant. As Table 32

Table 32 - Phonological Representations in RP and JB

For Vowel Plus Consonant in Gorilla

Vowel/ Conson.	Phono. Rep.	Diff. Wds.	Corresp'g JB Phono. Rep.
ow+n	əʊn	3	ɔŋ
ou+n	əʊn	1	ɔŋ
ar		3	
	ɑ	1	ɑ:
	ɜ	1	ɑ
	ɔ	1	ɑ
air	ɛə	1	ie
er		18	
	ə	14	ɑ
	ɜ	3	ɔ̈
	ɛə	1	e
ir		2	
	ɜ	1	ɔ̈
	aɪə	1	aɪa
oor	ɔ	1	uo
or		6	
	ɔ	4	ɑ(1), ɑ:(3)
	ɜ	2	ɔ̈
ur	ɜ	1	ɔ̈

reveals, every one of these units require a phonological representation in JB that is different from the RP representation. The 9 units in this group are encountered 36 times in new words, which means that as far as these units are being considered, the JB child reading this text is likely to produce a vocalization that is different from the required RP sound 36 times out of 36.

With regard to the final consonant clusters, the JB child will produce only one phonological representation that matches the appropriate RP representation (Table 33). There are 6 of these clusters in the text, appearing 9 times in all when only new words are considered. The only matching representation is likely to be the "-nt" in the word

Table 33 - Phonological Representation In RP And JB For Final Consonant Clusters In Gorilla

Final Con. Clus.	Phon. Rep.	Times in Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB Phon. Rep.
nd	nd	3	n
nt	nt	2	-, nt
ct	kt	1	k
pt	pt	1	p
st	st	1	s
xt	kst	1	ks

"front". The other word with final "nt" is "want" and in that situation both "n" and "t" are dropped, as the JB representation in Table 33 indicates.

The contrasting phonemic representations necessary for the 20 graphemes (consisting of the "th" digraph, "y", and the traditional vowels) are illustrated in Tables 34a through 34d. In this text, not only "a" and "o" among the top four graphemes are contributing heavily to a negative relationship of the text to JB; "e" is also. It should be noted too that the one phoneme represented "y" in 10 different words has a different counterpart in JB. This was not the case with "e" and "y" in the contrastive analysis of the last text. However, when all of these graphemes are considered together, they will occur 232 times in new words. One hundred and fifty-one of these times (or 65% of the times) the JB child will produce a phoneme that is different in RP for the situation.

The initial consonant clusters provides the closest approximation between the text and JB. From Table 35 it can be seen that 3 of the clusters have phonological representations that are different in RP and JB. The first of these - "thr" - is /tr/ in JB but this is not a result of consonant cluster sounds. Rather, it results from the phoneme /θ/ being absent in JB. So although the RP and JB representations for these clusters differ 4 out of the 18

Table 34a - Phonemic Representations In RP And JB For Graphemes In Gorilla

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
a		44	
	æ	13	a
	ə	10	a
	ɒ	6	a
	ɑ	5	a
	ɔ	5	a:
	e̞	2	ɛ
	e̞ɪ	3	ɛ(1), ie(2)
ai		3	
	e̞ɪ	2	ie
	e̞	1	ɛ
aw	ɔ̈	2	a:
ay	e̞ɪ	6	ie

Table 34b - Phonemic Representations In RP And JB For Graphemes In Gorilla

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
e		28	
	ə	1	i
	ɛ̝	17	ɛ
	i	6	i
	ɪ	4	ɪ
ea		4	
	ɛ̝	1	ɛ
	i	1	i
	ɪə	2	ie
ee	i	9	i
ew	u	2	u
eau	yu	1	yu
ey	ɛ̝ɪ	1	ie

Table 34c - Phonemic Representations In RP And JB For Graphemes In Gorilla

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
o		36	
	əʊ	11	uo
	ɒ	6	a
	u	3	u
	ə	7	uo(2), u(3), a(2)
	ʌ	7	a(3), ö(4)
	wʌ	1	wa
	ɔ	1	a:
oa	əʊ	1	uo
oo		7	
	ʊ	4	ʊ
	u	3	u
ou		7	
	aʊ	2	öʊ
	u	3	ö(2), u(1)
	ʊ	1	ʊ
	ɔ	1	a:
ow		3	
	əʊ	2	öʊ
	əʊ	1	uo
oy	ɔɪ	1	aɪ

Table 34d - Phonemic Representations In RP And JB For Graphemes In Gorilla

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
i		44	
	ɪ	28	ɪ
	aɪ	16	ədɪ
	ə	1	i
u		9	
	ʌ	6	ʊ
	ɪ	1	i
	ʊ	1	ʊ
	ə	1	a
y	ɪ	10	i
th		15	
	ð	7	d
	θ	8	t

Table 35 - Phonological Representation In RP And JB For Initial Consonant Clusters In Gorilla

Initial Con. Clus.	Phon. Rep.	Times in Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB Phon. Rep.
thr	θr	3	tr
str	str	2	tr
sm	sm	2	sm
fr	fr	2	fr
sch	sk	1	k
sl	sl	2	sl
sw	sw	1	sw
dr	dr	1	dr
cl	cl	1	cl
cr	cr	1	cr
pr	pr	1	pr
tr	tr	1	tr

times the clusters appear in new words, only 3 times are being recorded.

Twenty graphemes, 9 vowel plus consonant units, 12 initial consonant clusters, and 6 final consonant clusters (for a total of 47 different graphic features) were extracted from the text. Out of a total of 295 times that these features appear in different words in the text, they will result in 198 representations that are different from the required RP representations.

Simon's Surprise

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Semantic Level

Cars, the process of washing or cleaning, and items associated with sleeping are all familiar to JB children. Consequently, very few of the concepts in Simon's Surprise will be problematic. Only "snowed", "hall", and "hose" may be a problem. "Snowed" will be especially problematic in terms of form (how it looks when it is falling or how it feels) and meaning (the various ways in which it can be enjoyed). With regard to the concept "hall", distribution and form may be problematic but meaning (what is it for) will be especially so. Traditionally, a hall in the Caribbean is used for public meetings and entertainment and not associated with the home. Although the concept of water flowing through a tube (form and meaning) is within the experience of JB children, hoses are not common items in the environment of JB children. Moreover, the purposes for which a hose is commonly used (washing cars and watering lawns) are not common in the JB milieu.

Syntactic Level

Appendix 6 show the text of Simon's Surprise and its JB version in contrast. Data have been drawn from that contrast and are presented in Table 36.

Table 36 - Syntactic Differences Between

Simon's Surprise And Its JB Version

Syntactic Features	Amt. In Text	Amt. Rendered Diff'ly In JB
Interrogatives	2	0
Negative clauses	5	1
"There" constructions	1	1
Auxilary verbs	2	1
Copulas	6	6
"Have" as main verb	1	1
"Do" as main verb	2	1
Past Tense "ed" suffix	18	18
Participle "ed" suffix	1	1
Aspect marking "ing" suffix	2	2
Nominal pluralization	10	10
Possession with "'s"	2	2
Strong verbs past tense	8	10
Pronouns	9	8

Tables 37, 38, and 39 show respectively the interrogative, negative, and "there" constructions from the text and their JB version. The preceding analysis of Little Nino's Pizzeria and Gorilla involved an explanation of how the differences between similar

Table 37 - Question In Simon's Surprise And JB

Text:	In July?
JB:	In July?
Text:	Am I big enough ... yet?
JB:	Me big enough ... yet?

Table 38 - Negation In Simon's Surprise And JB

Text:	... he never seemed to get ...
JB:	... he never seem fe get ...
Text:	Not too much ...
JB:	Na' too much ...
Text:	He couldn't reach the roof
JB:	Im couldn' reach the roof.
Text:	Nothing to it ...
JB:	Nothing to it ...
Text:	The car didn't look very shiny.
JB:	The car na bin look very shine.

Table 39 - Expletive "There"

In Simon's Surprise And JB

Text:	There were bubbles everywhere ...
JB:	Bubbles bin dey everywhere ...

structures and their JB versions were analysed for the purpose of recording the instances of difference. To avoid redundancy, the explanation will not be repeated here. It will be pointed out only that in the case of the second and third negative structures in Table 38, "na'" for "not" and "couldn'" for "couldn't" have been treated as graphophonological and not syntactic differences. Table 40 also, which contains the contrast of auxilary verbs, copulas, and "have" and "do" as main verbs, requires no explication.

All of the strong verbs in the past tense are rendered in JB by the present tense form. However, contextual constraints required "said" and "went" to be translated as "a say" and "gone" in addition to "say" and "go" respectively. So although eight different strong verbs in the past tense is recorded, Simon's Surprise reveals a similar circumstance as occured in the Gorilla text by having 10 instances of difference between standard English and JB as far as the past tense of strong verbs are concerned.

Of the 18 verbs with "-ed" for past tense, only one of them does not have the present tense form as the JB equivalent. "Waited" in the text has been translated as "bin a wait" to reflect the context - a continuitive state existing in the past. The only past participle ("closed") follows the regular pattern of past participles in JB by

Table 40 - Copulas And Auxilary Verbs In Simon's Surprise And JB

Features	Text	JB
Auxilaries:	must be	musa
	could	could
Copulas	're	(deleted)
	was	bin
	to be	fe be
	's	a
	is	a
	am	(deleted)
"Have":	had	bin have
"Do":	do	do
(Main verbs)	did	do

Table 41 - Pronouns In Simon's Surprise And JB

Type	Text	JB
Personal:	I	me
	they	dem
	you	you
	he	im
	it	ee
	his	im
	my	(fe-)me
(Possessive)	her	im
Demonstrative:	this	dis-ya

being in the present tense form ("close"). Two present participles are used in the text to mark aspect and these are rendered in JB in the present tense form.

In this text, the manner in which nominal pluralization is rendered in JB is almost evenly split between adding the "dem" suffix and deleting the "s" marker. Of the 10 plural nouns, four are transformed by simply dropping the "s" marker. The "'s" marker for the two possessive nouns listed are also deleted. They both preceed a (possessed) noun and one is a proper noun.

Two new pronoun are introduced by this text - "his" and the demonstrative "this" (see Table 41). It should be noted too that "it" is rendered as "ee" also.

The contrast between the text and JB in the 14 categories as listed in Table 36, shows that all of them but one contain instances of difference. Furthermore, of the 69 individual features that comprise the 14 categories, 62 are different when the text and JB are contrasted.

Graphophonological Level

Tables 42 through 45 show the contrast between the GA and JB phonemes for the graphic features being studied. The features that show the least relationship to JB constitute the vowel plus consonant group. As Table 42 shows, every one of these units require a phonological representation in JB that is different for the GA representation. There are 10 of these units and they appear, as far as new words are concerned, a total of 34 times. This means in considering these units alone, the JB child reading the text is likely to produce a vocalization that is different from the appropriate GA sound 34 times out of 34.

The final consonant clusters is only slightly better, since the JB child will produce only one phonological representation that matches the appropriate GA representation (Table 43). There are 4 of these clusters in

Table 42 - Phonological Representations in GA and JB

For Vowel Plus Consonant in Simon's Surprise

Vowel/ Conson.	Phono. Rep.	Diff. Wds.	Corresp'g JB Phono. Rep.
ow+n	aʊn	1	ɔ̈ŋ
ou+n	aʊn	1	ɔ̈ŋ
air	ɛr	2	ie
ar	ɑr	3	ä:
er		15	
	ɚr	10	ä
	ɜr	3	ɔ̈
	ɛr	2	e
ir	aɪɚr	2	aɪa
or	ɔr	4	à:
oor	or	1	uo
our		2	
	or	1	uo
	ur	1	ɔ̈
ur		3	
	ɚr	2	a
	ɜr	1	ɔ̈

the text, appearing a total of 8 times in new different words. Seven of those times, the JB representation is different from the GA representation. As Table 43 shows, in one of the "nt" case, the entire final cluster is dropped.

Among the 19 graphemes shown in Tables 44a through 44d, "i" accounts for 19% of grapheme appearance in new words and each time it appears, the JB representation will match the approapriate one in GA. This helps in a positive way in the relationship between the text and JB. "a" and "o", however, contribute heavily in the opposite direction. When all the graphemes are considered, the reader will encounter them 212 times in new words. One hundred and fourteen of those times (or 54% of the times), the JB child will produce a phoneme that is different in GA for the situation.

Table 43 - Phonological Representation In GA And JB For Final Consonant Clusters In Simon's Surprise

Final Con. Clus.	Phon. Rep.	Times in Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB Phon. Rep.
nt	nt	2	-, nt
nd	nd	2	n
st	st	3	s
ct	kt	1	k

Table 44a - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Simon's Surprise

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
a		34	
	æ	15	a
	ɔ	6	a(5), ɛ(1)
	ɑ	7	a
	ɔ	4	a:
	e	2	ie
ai		5	
	e	4	ie
	ɛ	1	ɛ
ay		5	
	e	4	ie
	I	1	i

Table 44b - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Simon's Surprise

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
e		28	
	ɛ	14	ɛ
	ɪ	6	i(3), ɪ(3)
	ə	4	i(1), a(2), ɛ(1)
	i	4	i
ea		5	
	i	2	i
	ɜ	1	ɔ̈
	ɛ	1	ɔ̈
	ɪə	1	aɪ
ee	i	3	i
ey	e	1	ie
eye	aɪ	1	aɪ

Table 44c - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Simon's Surprise

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
o		24	
	ɑ	11	ɑ
	o	5	uo
	ʌ	3	ɔ̈
	u	2	u
	ɔ	2	ɑ
	wʌ	1	ωɑ
oa	o	2	uo
oe	u	1	u
oo		8	
	u	5	u
	ʊ	3	ʊ
ou		9	
	aʊ	4	ɔ̈ʊ
	ʊ	2	ʊ
	ʌ	1	ɔ̈
	u	1	u
	ɔ	1	ɑ
ow		6	
	o	5	uo
	aʊ	1	ɔ̈ʊ

Table 44d - Phonemic Representations In GA And JB For Graphemes In Simon's Surprise

Graphemes	GA Phonemes	Diff. wds.	Corresp'g JB phonemes
i		40	
	ɪ	28	ɪ
	aɪ	12	ə̈ɪ
ie	aɪ	1	ə̈ɪ
u		19	
	ʌ	14	ö
	ʊ	3	ʊ
	u	1	u
	yu	1	yu
y		10	
	i	8	i
	aɪ	2	ə̈ɪ
th		12	
	ð	9	d
	θ	3	t

Of the four groups of graphic features under consideration in this text, the initial consonant clusters approach JB the closest (Table 45). But the proximity is not much closer than that found for the graphemes. In fact, the initial consonant clusters in the other two texts relate much closer. Throughout this text, eight initial consonant clusters appear a total of 14 times in new words and 6 of those times will result in JB representations that are different from the required GA representations. It should be

Table 45 - Phonological Representations in GA and JB For Initial Consonant Clusters in Simon's Surprise

Vowel/ Conson.	Phono. Rep.	Diff. Wds.	Corresp'g JB Phono. Rep.
scr	skr	3	kr
st	st	2	t
sl	sl	2	sl
sn	sn	2	sn
cl	kl	2	kl
sp	sp	1	p
br	br	1	br
thr	θr	1	tr

noted that in analysing the clusters in this text, as in the last one, the JB representation of "thr-" as "tr-" has not been considered as a consonant cluster reduction.

Forty-one different graphic features were extracted for the text for consideration 19 graphemes, 10 vowel plus consonant units, 8 initial and 4 final consonant clusters. Out of a total of 268 times that these features appear in the text, they will result in 161 representations that are different from the requred GA representations.

COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM CONTRASTIVE ANALYSES

Data from the results concerning the three texts are compared in Table 46, where the subheadings Amount and Different mean respectively the amount of features considered and the quantity of that amount that showed differences between the standard English and JB. The third column for each language level contains the Difference as a percentage of the Amount.

The Amount column for each language level shows Gorilla with the greatest amount of features, Nino with the least, and Simon with an intermediate amount. Except for the semantic level, the Difference columns show a similar pattern. Inasmuch as this pattern may be a direct

Table 46 - Comparison Of Results From Contrastive Analyses

	Semantics			Syntax			Grapho.		
Texts	Amt.	Diff.	%	Amt.	Diff.	%	Amt.	Diff.	%
Nino	88	4	5	60	55	92	218	127	58
Simon	99	3	3	69	62	90	268	161	60
Gorilla	103	7	7	83	75	90	295	198	67

result of Gorilla being the longest text and Nino the shortest, the percentage has been included to facilitate comparison. It can be seen that Simon has the lowest percentage of differences at the semantic level while Nino has the lowest percentage at the graphophonological level. The rounding of the percentage figures to the nearest whole number conceals the fact that Simon also has the lowest percentage of differences at the syntactic level as well. It has 89.85% difference with JB in the syntactic features considered while Gorilla has a 90.36% difference.

On the basis of these percentages, it can be concluded that Simon relates most closely to JB at the semantic and syntactic levels while Nino relates most closely at the graphophonological level. This conclusion, however, is subject to certain limitations which will be taken up in the Discussion section of the next chapter.

SUMMARY

This chapter has been concerned mainly with reporting the results from 1) the descriptive analyses of the three selected texts, 2) the analyses that contrasted features and concepts in the texts with JB, and 3) a comparison of the findings of the contrastive analyses of the three texts and JB. Based on results from comparing the contrastive analyses, a conclusion was drawn with regard to which text related most closely to JB. The reporting of the results was preceeded by comments which explained how the features were classified for the presentation of the results.

CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will discuss the results reported in the preceding chapter in terms of the stated purpose of the study. The discussion will include the limitations to the study that may affect conclusions drawn from the results. The chapter will also include some remarks on the implications of the results in terms of the relevant literature and future research. The chapter will end with a summary of the conclusions that may be drawn from the findings of this research study.

DISCUSSION

The research reported in this study investigated selected semantic, syntactic, and graphophological features of three texts, each from a different polity. The investigation sought answers specifically pertaining to: 1) the status of the texts at these language levels, 2) the relationship of concepts and features in the texts to JB, and 3) the determination of which text related most closely to JB. Answers to these questions were to lead to addressing the stated purpose of this study - to determine whether one text originating from a particular geographic polity relates more closely than others to the phonological, syntactic, and semantic background of children who speak JB.

Semantic Level

Concerning the semantic aspect of the investigation, the results from comparing the contrastive analyses of the three texts with JB indicate that Simon, the Canadian text, relates most closely to JB. This result is not surprising when the categorization of the concepts in the three stories are compared. Twenty-two percent of the concepts in Simon can be classified into three groups, one relating specifically to the process of washing, another to the object of the washing (a car), and a third group to the protagonist's parents who are sleeping. These three broad areas are within the experiential background of JB children. "Hose" is the only concept in any of those groups that JB children may not be familiar with.

Although the concepts in Nino are not easily categorized in similarly distinct groups, as large a number of concepts (25%) are readily associated with the principal topic (the restaurant business). However, three of the concepts directly associated with the principal topic may not be familiar to JB children. These are "pizza", "chef", and "waiters".

Inasmuch as four settings are alluded to in Gorilla, it presents a greater opportunity of containing more concepts that are not familiar to the JB children. This prospect is reduced by the author focussing on one setting. This one setting results, however, in five concepts that may be

problematic for JB children - "zoo", "gorilla", "chimpanzee", "orang-utan", and "primates".

The foregoing comparison of the texts lends support to the results from the contrastive analyses that Simon relates most closely to JB at the semantic level. However, with regard to the question of whether the fact that Simon is a Canadian text - and not American or British - is related to its greater proximity to JB at the semantic level, it cannot be concluded from the results of the analysis that such is the case. Since the polities from which the texts originated have restaurants, zoos, and the washing of cars as aspects of their culture, each of the stories could have come from any of the polities involved. The differences seem to result from the topic the story deals with and from the author's decision. For example, the topic in Simon requires at least two groups of concept - one relating to the process of washing and the other to the item being washed. The influence of author's decision is seen in the case of Gorilla, where it is the author's decision not to elaborate on the cinema and the location where the protagonist and the gorilla ate. (In turn, the publisher's requirements on the length of the story may have been the cause of the author's decision).

Syntactic Level

The comparison of the contrastive analyses indicate that Simon relates most closely to JB at the syntactic level as well, with Gorilla approximating JB more closely than Nino. At first glance, these results are perplexing, inasmuch as Nino is the shortest of the texts and from the descriptive analyses seemed to have the least syntactic diversity and complexity. A closer examination of the texts, achieved through the contrastive analyses, reveals that it is the phrasal structures that heavily influence the results in favor of Simon and Gorilla.

While Nino has one interrogative and one negative construction and no "there" constructions, Gorilla has four, seven, and one respectively. Simon falling between these two extremes, has two interrogative, five negative, and one "there" constructions. The interrogative and negative structure in Nino are both rendered differently in JB. On the other hand, only one of the five negative structures and none of the two interrogative structures in Simon are rendered differently in JB. These data indicate that while Nino has 100% difference with JB in terms of these structures, Simon has only 25% difference.

With regard to these constructions, Gorilla does not relate to JB as well as Simon does either, but it relates better than Nino. One of Gorilla's four interrogative and five of its seven negative constructions are rendered

differently in JB, giving it a 58% difference with JB versions. When these three types of constructions are removed, and the contrastive analyses of the three texts are then compared, Nino turns out decidedly to be the text that relates most closely to JB, while Simon becomes the text that relates least to JB. These syntactic structures, then, carry a significant weight in comparing the contrastive analyses of the texts.

Also carrying similar weight in the comparison - but not as significant - are auxilary verbs, strong verbs, "have" and "do" forms when acting as main verbs, and the group comprising the "ed" and "ing" suffix used for forming noun phrases and participals. Take the group comprising the "ed" and "ing" suffix for example. Gorilla and Nino show percentages of difference with JB in this area, amounting to 71 and 67 respectively. Simon, however, shows 100% difference. When this group of features is removed in addition to the structures discussed above, the difference in the data is sufficient to put Simon in second place behind Nino in terms of the approximation of the texts to JB.

This approach to looking at the data permits a pattern to appear. The syntactic constructions discussed above, auxilary verbs, strong verbs, "have" and "do" forms, and participal "ing" and "ed" suffix seem to vary in their translation from the texts to JB. On the other hand,

copulas, the past tense "ed" suffix, the aspect forming "ing" suffix, and the "s" marker for nominal pluralization and possession are invariable. The study was not designed to identify which of the texts contained the most variable or invariable features, but the results indicate that overall Simon is the text that approaches JB closest at the syntactic level.

But does the fact that the results in this study indicate that Simon approaches JB closest at the syntactic level allow the conclusion to be drawn that the reason lies in the text originating in a particular polity? The answer seems to be no. The differences among the texts at this language level seems to be more a matter of quantity than quality (due in part, most likely, to the difference in the length of the stories). The difference in the quantity of features from text to text made it difficult to draw a conclusion with regard to the question of the influence of geographic origin.

For example, there is only one negative construction in Nino (" ... who have no homes") compared to seven in Gorilla, most of which are expressed through the contracted form "-n't". It cannot be concluded, based on the one negative construction in Nino, that the contracted negative form is not used or is infrequently used in the polity where Nino originated. Similarly, no conclusive comment can be made with regard to the use of "I'd" and "you'd" for "I

would" and "you had (better)" in Gorilla as a distinctive feature resulting from the polity where that book originated. The fact is that "I would" and "you had better" do not appear in one form or another in the other two texts so there is no way to ascertain how they might have been rendered.

Graphophonological Level

The results relating to the graphophonological level suggest that Nino approximates JB closer than the other two texts. But while the texts do not diverge greatly from each other in terms of their approximation to JB at the semantic and syntactic levels, at the graphophonological level Nino and Simon approaches JB much more closely than Gorilla. The explanation for this lies in JB using a phoneme for "e" and for "y" that is the same for GA but not for RP. When allowances are made for this phonological difference the divergence of Gorilla from the other two texts decreases.

The differences among the texts with regard to the graphemes and other graphic features under consideration, does not demonstrate any consistent preference in one or another of the texts for the use of any particular graphic features. In fact the texts seem to be more homogeneous at this level than at the other two levels. In all three texts, "e" is the most frequently used of the letters considered, "a" and "i" are the two most frequently used graphemes when

repeated words are discounted, and "a" and "o" are the graphemes that represent the most phonemes. The texts are also similar in terms of "er" being the most common vowel-plus-consonant unit and initial consonant clusters being composed of voiceless consonant plus voiced consonant. Moreover, in all three texts, the rank order of the four groups of features with regard to approximation to JB was vowel plus consonant units, final consonant clusters, graphemes, and initial consonant clusters.

The texts differ greatly only with regard to the composition of final consonant clusters and the use of the "th" digraph. This fact may be due to the nature of the English language which seems to allow more flexibility in the consonants that may be combined finally than initially, and in having "th" represent one of its phonemes overwhelmingly in function words such as "that" and "then".

Overall, rather than linguistic factors distinctive to a particular polity, it is language constraints of a more general nature that may be the influencial factor behind the differences found among the texts. Inasmuch as there is more than one way for an author to construct an expression in writing or to label an item or process, texts will vary at the syntactic and semantic levels. The standardization in spelling, however, may tend to mitigate the differences at the level of graphemes and other graphic features.

Limitations Of The Study

Although the results of the study allow a conclusion to be drawn with regard to which text relates most closely to JB at the semantic, syntactic and graphophonological levels, certain factors inherent in the study leads to limitations being placed on the conclusions. The conclusion that Simon relates most closely to JB at the semantic level is limited by the methodology used in contrasting the concepts in the texts with the concepts in JB children's background. It should be clear that while the graphophological and syntactic features of JB are based on data from pertinent sources, the semantic features are based on this investigator's native knowledge of JB children's experiential background. Another investigator drawing upon his own knowledge may come up with different findings.

Also, the influence of pictures on JB children's understanding of concepts in the texts has not been addressed in this study. In effect, although the texts contain pictures, they have been treated in this study as if they had none. As a consequence, it is not clear whether the pictures in Gorilla for example, would facilitate JB children drawing relationships between concepts known to them and concepts in that story any more than the picutres in Simon would facilitate such relationship between JB children's concepts and concepts in this second story. With its focus on the written language, the study was not

designed to measure the effect of pictures on the relationship between JB concepts and concepts in the texts. However, such an affect may take place if JB children read the three texts with adjoining pictures and, as a result, may influence which of them was understood best by JB children.

It should be apparent that inasmuch as this study considered only certain syntactic features out of the array of syntactic features that may exist in the texts - such as prepositions, the plural form of the present tense of verbs, imperative structures, and impersonal pronouns - the conclusion that Simon relates closest to JB at the syntactic level is also limited. With the inclusion of all possible syntactic features, the result concerning which text relates most closely to JB at this level may or may not have been different.

Due to the limitions acknowledged, the conclusions and generalizations that may be drawn from the results of this study must be done so with caution. However, the limitations do not obscure the fact that the analyses and resulting data presented in this study can provide valuable insights concerning the literature on this area of research, classroom practice, and the relationship between texts written for children and certain nonstandard dialects.

Implications

The results of this study have implications foremost for teachers who have JB children in their classroom. Inasmuch as these results show that the three texts approximate JB most closely at the semantic level, they indicate as well that, speaking generally, English language texts for children may present the least problems at the semantic level for children from English language dialect speaking areas such as the Caribbean. However, the semantic analyses of the texts have much to say to the teacher in terms of the selection of reading material. The analyses indicate that the general or principal topic of a story may not be the significant factor for teachers to use in the selection of stories for children from a different linguistic-cultural background.

The story comprising Nino, for example, focusses on a pizza restaurant business. Pizzas and fancy restaurants are not familiar items to most children of JB background. However, the concepts associated with them are. Conversely, in Gorilla , the protagonist's visit to the zoo did not include a visit to monkeys, parrots, snakes and such animals with which most JB children are familiar. If such animals had been visited by the protagonist, the zoo would have entered, so to speak, the experiential background of JB children. It is the concepts within the general topic, the

findings indicate, that teachers should consider as the significant factor in the selection of texts.

This implication that the study bears for the teacher suggests a parallel implication for the author (and publisher) of children's books. If children's books are to be effective reading material in classroom with children from different cultural backgrounds, authors need to pay special attention to their products at the semantic level. It has already been pointed out in this chapter that Gorilla might have related to JB children's background more than it does if the author had included certain animals and perhaps more concepts associated with the cinema and eating out. The implication from this, in general terms, is that although an author may write a story that centers around a culturally limited topic such as a family of seals on an ice floe, the extent to which the author includes universal concepts - such as "eat", "sleep", "food" and "parent" - reflects the extent to which the comprehension of the story (by students from different cultures) may be increased. This strategy of incorporating universal concepts in stories is one that authors should endeavour to utilize, especially since the English language allows the author more control at the semanticl level than at the syntactic and graphophonological levels.

At the syntactic level, the author's choices are much more limited than at the semantic level. Once the topic that

will be the center of the story has been selected, the author has to choose from a limited number of structural forms. For example, the alternate forms for a particular interrogative or negation phrase are limited. Nonetheless, the results from the syntactic analyses imply that authors can still make syntactic choices to mitigate linguistic problems for children from a nonstandard dialect background - without compromising the naturalness of the language used in the story.

For example, the standard English negative phrase "... who have no homes" can also be rendered as "... who don't have any homes". Both of these phrases are rendered in JB only as "who no have no home". It is clear that the first standard English phrase is closer to the JB rendition and may be preferrable in texts for the sake of mitigating differences for JB children. Similarly, since the English language has more than one form for some interrogatives, the author has the choice of using the one that is closer to JB. As the study indicates with regard to Simon, it is the preponderence of the informal structures in which the interrogatives are cast that plays a major role in rendering that text closer to JB than the other texts at the syntactic level.

The analyses further imply that those syntactic features over which the author does not have much control can be categorized by the teacher for special treatment in

an effort to further facilitate reading by such nonstandard dialect speakers as JB children. The study indicates that the differences between standard English and JB in some features (such as the copula and the possessive marker) are invariable while other differences (regarding such features as the auxilary verb and the participal "ed" suffix) are variable. The implication of this for the teacher is two-fold. First, the teacher must be aware of this apparent inconsistency in the relation of some JB features to their standard English counterparts. Second, the teacher must be vigilant with regard to determining whether the variable differences, lacking regularity, are proving to be more problematic than the invariable ones. If so, there may be a need in the classroom to put more effort on those differences between JB and standard English that are variable.

Inasmuch as analyses in the study show that the greatest similarity among the three texts is at the graphophonological level, they indicate that this is the language level over which authors have the least control when writing - except if they are writing stories that are deliberately controlled syntactically or phonetically. Teachers have even less control at this level when analyzing books for selection for classroom use. Inasmuch as the English language has an orthography that is near universal, offering little to no alternate spellings for words, the

implication for the author at this level is clear: the graphophonological level is the language level that will most readily reflect any attempt to manipulate the language in stories.

The writer may attempt to accomodate the nonstandard dialect speaker at the graphophonological level by violating the traditional spelling of words, but changing the traditional orthography in books to suit a particular dialect has in the past led to a number of problems, such as a limitation in the number of readers to whom such a book may be useful for learning to read, the financial viability of publishing such books, and the question of whether such 'dialect' books do indeed facilitate reading among nonstandard dialect speakers. Although, such questions do concern authors, publishers and teachers, this study was not designed to address them. It should be sufficient to conclude that as far as the author, the publisher and the teacher are concerned, the implications from the study call for children's books that contain universal concepts (especially when the story topic itself does not have much appeal across linguistic-cultural borders), choice of those alternate syntactic structures that are closest to nonstandard dialect, and a graphophonological system that has not been tampered with.

With regard to research and the existent literature, the implications of the study are no less significant. The

fact that the results of the study show syntax to be the language level that would present the most problems for JB children concurs with statements by Baratz (1973), Goodman (1969), and Shuy (1979) that it is the syntactic features that will present problems for the nonstandard dialect speaker. Specifically, the insight which this study has revealed, regarding the existence of variable and invariable syntactic differences, bears significant implications for the relevant body of research literature. The copula, nomimal pluralization, and possessive marker are traditionally employed in research studies as the major representative differences between standard English and Black English. However, the variable use in JB compared with the invariable use in standard English of such features as the auxilary verb and the participial "ed" suffix should be investigated as a major source of difficulty for JB children. This suggestion that focus be placed on such features as the auxilary verb and the participial "ed" suffix is a departure from the traditional focus in the literature on the copula, nominal pluralization, and possessive marker as major problems.

That this study utilized JB while the major part of the relevant literature focusses on Black American English (BAE) may be a significant factor in the new focus being suggested here. While the auxilary verb in BAE is omitted in a sentence such as "The boy is playing", in JB the auxilary is

not omitted, but replaced by the particle "a". Both JB and BAE are similar, however, in omitting the copula in "He is sick". Inasmuch as the word "is" is omitted in both sentences in BAE there is a tendency for writers - such as Smitherman (1977) - to speak of "be" being omitted in such sentences. It is quite clear that in the case of JB a distinction must be made between auxilary verb and copula in the classroom as well as in the literature. There is a general need to distinguish the differences between BAE and standard English from those between JB and standard English.

Similarly, the results from the syntactic analyses indicate a need in the literature for a distinction between negators that are problematic and those that are not. The results indicate strongly that while the contraction "n't" is invariably a difference between standard English and JB, "never" and "nothing" are not problematic. Furthermore, inasmuch as interrogative and negative phrases in standard English may have alternate structures, one of which may be closer to JB than the other, there is a need for research which compares such structures, their alternate(s), and their JB rendition. Inasmuch as there are lists in the literature that contrast the diverse relationship of graphemes and phonemes in JB and standard English, there is a need for such contrastive lists of syntactic structures.

It has been stated above that the language level over which the author has the least influence is the

graphophonological level. That being the case, the preponderence of one "th" phoneme over the other in Simon raises the intriguing research question of whether a higher-order organizational structure exists at the syntactic or semantic level to account for it.

Inasmuch as the semantic level is the language level at which the three texts approximate JB most closely, there is the indication that research studies in the area of semantic differences between English language texts and the background of nonstandard dialect speaking children may not be fruitful. Indeed, the close relationship that this study has found between concepts in the texts and concepts in JB children's background may explain the scarcity of research studies in this area at this language level. The overall implication of this study with regard to research is clear however: there is a need for much more research on standard English and JB differences at the syntactic level.

Before concluding this section on the implications of the study, some attention must be paid to some of the issues raised in the earlier chapters of this thesis. With regard to the current lack of research on the relationship among reading, standard English texts, and the speakers of Black English, this study shows that such research can be fruitful, particularly with regard to speakers of such dialects as JB and particularly at the syntactic level. Such research can reveal much useful information with regard to

the linguistic issues surrounding less divergent dialects such as BAE. Moreover, even when studies stay away from directly involving human subjects (such as this one has), which helps to avoid arousing socio-political sentiments in the community, the results can still be valuable in their contribution to the body of knowledge and the promotion of further research in this area of study.

The foregoing discussion on the need and value of more research can not be left behind without commenting on its relevance to the issue of the hypothesis that, in general, the nonstandard dialect speaker encounters a greater problem in approaching the written language than the standard speaker does. It is in investigating such dialects as JB, rather than BAE, that the hypothesis may be found to be valid.

The writing and publishing of 'dialect' material for nonstandard dialect speakers has been another issue. Although the need to produce books specifically written for a particular dialect group is understandable, it is inevitable that the more a book diverts from standard English to suit a particular dialect group, the more it becomes less universal, regardless of whether the focus of attention is the semantic, syntactic or graphophonological level. As this study indicates, there is room for a moderate approach to the problem.

First, there may be no need for concern that concepts in books, which speakers of Black English may encounter in the classroom, are so far removed from the speakers experiential background that they would not be able to understand them. Second, it is within the power of authors to "universalize" their stories. Third, alternate syntactic structures may exist at the disposal of authors to achieve closer proximity between the language in their books and nonstandard dialects. In the fourth place, although the study indicates that half of the graphemes extracted from the texts for examination may be problematic for JB children, the problem is one of pronunciation. This does not necessarily intimate a problem of comprehension. The problem of pronunciation may be best approached through the suggestion (Goodman, 1969; Goodman & Burke, 1973) that teachers become aware of and accept the students' dialect rendition of the text.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, the results of the analyses have been discussed with particular reference to the purpose of the study. Limitations on the conclusions that may be drawn from the results were discussed. These involved the methodology for contrasting concepts at the semantic level, the inability (due to space and other reasons) to investigate all syntactic and graphophonological features, and the fact

that the influence of pictures on concept comprehension was not addressed. The limitations, however, did not prevent the results from providing valuable insights concerning the literature on this area of research, classroom practice, and the relationship between texts written for children and certain nonstandard dialects.

It was found that the results do not support the assumption that the polity in which children's texts originate is related to the extent to which they approximate JB. However, the analyses conducted indicate that:

- children's texts vary in their approximation to JB at the semantic, syntactic, and graphophonological levels;

- texts approximate JB most closely at the semantic level;

- topic and author decision may be factors at the semantic level influencing approximation;

- the most problems for JB children in standard English texts may be at the syntactic level;

- variation in the structure of negative and interrogative phrases and the tendency for some features to be variable and others invariable (such as the forms of "be") may present the greatest problems at the syntactic level;

- there is a need for literature differentiating the differences between BAE and standard texts and JB and standard texts;

- texts follow the strongest pattern of similarity among themselves at the graphophological level.

The chapter also addressed the implications that the results of this study have for the author, the publisher, and the teacher as well as for research studies and the relevant body of literature in general.

APPENDIX 1

TABULATION OF READING LEVELS FOR TEXTS

Little Nino's Pizzeria

Variable 1 = 21 (unique unfamiliar words) : 208 (words in the sample taken from the text) x 100
= 10.096

Variable 2 = 208 (words in sample) : 21 (sentences in the sample)
= 9.905

Calculating the reading level using given weights:
(10.096 x .094) + (9.905 x .168) + .502
= 3.115

Gorilla

Variable 1 = 14 : 209 x 100 = 6.699

Variable 2 = 209 : 19 = 11

Reading level = (6.699 x .094) + (11 x .168) + .502
= 2.936

Simon's Surprise

Variable 1 = 24 : 207 x 100 = 11.594

Variable 2 = 207 : 22 = 9.409

Reading level = (11.594 x .094) + (9.409 x .168) + .502
= 3.173

The Harris-Jacobson Formula places all scores between 2.85 and 3.30 at the low third grade reading level (Harris & Sipay, 1980).

APPENDIX 2

A SELECTED LIST OF CONTRASTIVE PHONEMES USED IN TRANSCRIBING THE TEXTS

VOWELS	GA	RP	JB
beet	i	i	i
boot	u	u	u
bit	ɪ	ɪ	ɪ
put	ʊ	ʊ	ʊ
pet	ɛ	e̞	ɛ
bud	ʌ	ʌ	ɔ̈
bird[3]	ɜr	ɜ:	
pat	æ	æ	
pot	ɑ	ɒ	ɑ
deeper	ər	ə	
Bart	ɑr	ɑ:	ɑ:
bought	ɔ	ɔ:	
board		ɔ:	
poor	or	ʊə	uɔ̈
boat	o	əʊ	
page	e	e̞ɪ	
peer	ɪr	ɪə	ie
pair	ɛr	ɛə	
boil	ɔɪ	ɔɪ	
bite	ɑɪ	ɑɪ	ɑɪ
bout	ɑʊ	ɑʊ	ɔ̈ʊ
body	i	ɪ	i
w-et	ɯ	ɯ	ɯ

CONSONANTS	GA	RP	JB
p-ick	p	p	p
b-at	b	b	b
k-in	k	k	k
g-ap	g	g	g
t-in	t	t	t
d-en	d	d	d
th-in	θ	θ	
th-en	ð	ð	
f-at	f	f	f
v-an	v	v	v
ch-in	ʧ	ʧ	ʧ
g-in	ʤ	ʤ	ʤ
s-at	s	s	s
z-oo	z	z	z
sh-in	ʃ	ʃ	ʃ
vi-si-on	ʒ	ʒ	ʒ
m-an	m	m	m
n-ut	n	n	n
bri-ng[4]	ŋ	ŋ	ŋ
l-ook	l	l	l
r-un	r	r	r
h-it	h	h	h
y-et	y	y	y

APPENDIX 3

GORILLA AND JB VERSION IN CONTRAST

Hannah loved gorillas. She read books about gorillas, she
Hannah bin love gorilla. Im read book 'bout gorilla, im

watched gorillas on the television, and she drew pictures of
watch gorilla on the television, and im draw picture of

gorillas. But she had never seen a real gorilla.
gorilla. But im bin never see a real gorilla.

Her father didn't have time to take her to see one at
Im father na bin ha' no time fe tek im fe see wan at

the zoo. He didn't have time for anything.
the zoo. Im na bin ha' time fuh nuting.

He went to work every day before Hannah went to school, and
Im a go work every day before Hanna go school, and

in the evening he worked at home.
in the evening he a work at home.

When Hannah asked him a question, he would say, "Not now.
When Hannah ask im wan question, im a say, "Nat now.

I'm busy. Maybe tomorrow."
Me busy. Maybe tomorrow."

But the next day he was always too busy.
But the nex day im always too busy.

"Not now. Maybe at the weekend," he would say.
"Not now. Maybe at the weekend, im say.

But at the weekend he was always too tired.
But at the weekend im always too tired.

They never did anything together.
Dem never do noting together.

The night before her birthday, Hannah went to bed tingling
The night before im birthday, Hannah gone to bed a tingle

with excitement - she had asked her father for a gorilla!
with excitement - im bin ask im father fuh wan gorilla!

In the middle of the night, Hannah woke up and saw a very
In the middle of the night, Hannah wake up and see a very

small parcel at the foot of the bed. It was a gorilla, but
small parcel at the foot of the bed. Bin a gorilla, but

it was just a toy.
bin just a toy.

Hannah threw the gorilla into a corner with her other
Hannah throw the gorilla into a corner with im other

toys and went back to sleep.
toy-dem and go back fe sleep.

In the night something amazing happened.
In the night someting amazing happen.

Hannah was frightened. "Don't be frightened, Hannah," said
Hannah bin frighten. " Na frighten, Hannah," say

the gorilla, "I won't hurt you. I just wondered if
the gorilla, "Me na go hurt yuh. Me just wonder if

you'd like to go to the zoo."
you would like fe go to the zoo.

The gorilla had such a nice smile that Hannah wasn't
The gorilla bin have such a nice smile that Hannah no bin

afraid. "I'd love to," she said.
'fraid. "Me would love to," im say.

They both crept downstairs, and Hannah put on her coat.
The two of dem creep downstairs, and Hanna put on im coat.

The gorilla put on her father's hat and coat. "A perfect
The gorilla put on im father hat and coat. "A perfect

fit," he whispered.
fit," he whisper.

They opened the front door, and went outside.
They open the front door, and go outside.

"Come on then, Hannah," said the gorilla, and he gently
"Come on then, Hannah," say the gorilla, and im gently

lifted her up. Then they were off, swinging through the
lift im up. Then dem off, a swing through the

trees towards the zoo.
trees toward the zoo.

When they arrived at the zoo it was closed, and there was a
When dem arrive at the zoo it bin close, and a high wall

high wall all around. "Never mind," said the gorilla, "up
bin de all 'round. "Never mind," say the gorilla, "up

and over!"
and over!"
They went straight to the primates. Hannah was thrilled.
Dem go straight to the primate-dem. Hannah bin thrill.

So many gorillas!
So much gorilla!

The gorilla took Hanah to see the orang-utan, and a
The gorilla tek Hannah fe see the orang-utan, and a

chimpanzee. She thought they were beautiful. But sad.
chimpanzee. Im think dem beautiful. But sad.

"What would you like to do now?" the gorilla asked. "I
"A-what yuh would like fe do now?" the gorilla ask. Me

'd love to go to the cinema," said Hannah. So they did.
would love fe go to the cinema," say Hannah. So dem gone.

Afterwards they walked down the street together. "That was
Afterwards dem walk down the street together. "Dat bin

wonderful," said Hannah, "but I'm hungry now."
wonderful," say Hannah, "but me hungry now."

"Okay," said the gorilla, "we'll eat."
"Okay," say the gorilla, "we a go fe eat."

"Time for home?" asked the gorilla.
"Time fuh home?" ask the gorilla.

Hannah nodded, a bit sleepily.
Hannah nod, a bit sleepily.

They danced on the lawn. Hannah had never been so happy.
Dem dance on the lawn. Hannah bin never so happy.

"You'd better go in now, Hannah," said the gorilla. "See you
"You better go in now, Hannah," say the gorilla. "See you

tomorrow."
tomorrow."

"Really?" asked Hannah.
"Really?" ask Hannah.

The gorilla nodded and smiled.
The gorilla nod and smile.

The next morning Hannah woke up and saw the toy gorilla.
The nex morning Hannah wake up and see the toy gorilla.

She smiled.
She smile.

Hannah rushed downstairs to tell her father what had
Hannah rush downstairs fe tell im father what

happened.
happen.

"Happy birthday, love," he said. "Do you want to go to the
"Happy birthday, love," he say. " You want fe go to the

zoo?"
zoo?"

Hannah looked at him.
Hannah look at im.

She was very happy.
Im bin very happy.

(Standard English text of Gorilla by Anthony Browne © 1983. Published in Great Britain by Julia MacRae Books and in the United States of America and Canada by Alfred A. Knopf).

APPENDIX 4

LETTER OF PERMISSION

Julia MacRae Books
A division of Walker Books Limited

87 Vauxhall Walk
London SE11 5HJ
Telephone: 01-793 0909
Telex: 8955572 · Fax: 01-587 1123

2 November 1988

Mr Garbette Garraway
42 - 125 Moray Street
Port Moddy,
B.C.
Canada V3H 3C8

Dear Mr Garraway

Thank you for your letter requesting permission to use the text of GORILLA by Anthony Browne in your thesis.

We are happy to grant you permission to use the text in your thesis in the ways you outline in your letter and for the National Library to microfilm your thesis and loan or sell copies of the microfilm as necessary.

We would, however, be grateful if you could ensure that full acknowledgement is made as follows both in your thesis and on any microfilm:

© 1983 Anthony Browne from GORILLA published in Great Britain by Julia MacRae Books and in the United States of America and Canada by Alfred A. Knopf.

Yours sincerely

Linda Summers

APPENDIX 5

SIMON'S SURPRISE AND JB VERSION IN CONTRAST

Every Saturday Simon said to his parents, "I want to
Every Saturday Simon a say to im parent-dem, "Me wa' fe

wash the car." They always said, "One of these days
wash the car." Dem always say, "Wan of dem day yah

Simon, when you're bigger." Simon waited but he never
Simon, when yuh bigger." Simon bin a wait but he never

seemed to get big enough.
seem fe get big enough.

Early one Saturday, he slipped outside while every-
Early wan Saturday, he slip outside while every-

body was still fast asleep. "Shhhhhhh," he whispered:
body still fast asleep. "Shhhhhhh," he whisper:

"It's going to be a surprise."
"Ee a go fe be a surprise."

Simon poured soap all over the car and turned on
Simon pour soap all over the car and turn on

the water. The hose hissed...and jumped.
the water. The hose hiss ... and jump.

Inside, Simon's father mumbled, "It must be raining,"
Inside, Simon father mumble, "Ee must be a rain,"

and he went back to sleep.
and im gone back fe sleep.

Soon there were bubbles everywhere. "Not to
Soon bubble bin de everywhere. "Not too

much," said Simon, and he put the soap out of the way.
much," say Simon, and im put the soap out of the way.

He began to scrub the car. It felt wonderful to be wet
Im begin fe scrub the car. Ee feel wonderful fe be wet

and soapy in the morning sun.
and soapy in the mornin sun.

Then Simon had a problem - he couldn't reach
Then Simon ha' wan problem - he couldn reach

the roof. "Easy as pie," he said, and he went to find his
the roof. "Easy as pie," he say, and he gone fe find fe-him

father's fishing rod.
father fishin rod.

Inside, Simon's mother pulled a pillow over her head.
Inside, Simon mother pull wan pillow over im head.

Simon scrubbed the tires. He used the pot scrubber,
Simon scrub the tire-dem. He use the pot scrubber,

the vegetable scrubber, the back scrubber, a scrub brush,
the vegetable scrubber, the back scrubber, a scrub brush,

a shoe brush, a hair brush, and his tooth brush. "Nothing
a shoe brush, a hair brush, and fe-him tooth brush. "Noting

to it," he said.
to ee," he say.

Still, the car didn't look very shiny. Simon had an
Still, the car no bin look very shiny. Sinom ha' wan

idea. He found the polish for the fancy forks and spoons
idea. He find the polish for the fancy fork and spoon-dem

and put it on the silver parts of the car.
and put ee on the silver part of the car.

"I could do this with my eyes closed," he said -
"Me could do this with fe-me eye-dem close," he say -

and he did.
and that a what he do.

Simon aimed the hose at the car. Suds and polish
Simon aim the hose at the car. Sud and polish

slid away, but now the shiny parts made the rest of the
slid away, but now the shiny part-dem mek the rest of the

car look dull.
car look dull.

Simon said, "I know what to do." It took every rag
Simon say, "Me know what fe do." Ee tek every rag

in the enormous rag bag to polish the car.
in the enormous rag bag fe polish the car.

When Simon finished, the car was perfect. He
When Simon finish, the car perfect. Im

admired it for a long time.
admire e for a long time.

Inside, the alarm clock rang.
Inside, the alarm clock rang.

Simon's mother looked out the window. "It snowed,"
Simon mother look out the window. "It snow,"

she said. "In July?" said his father.
im say. "In July?" say im father.

They rushed along the hall, down the stairs,
Dem rush along the hall, down the stairs-dem,

and through the kitchen to the side door. "It is snow,"
and through the kitchen to the side door. " A snow fuh

said Simon's father. "It's suds," said Simon's mother.
true say Simon father. " A sud," say Simon mother.

"It's Simon," they both said. "He washed the car!"
" A Simon," the two of dem say. "Im wash the car!"

"It was easy," said Simon. "Am I big enough to paint
"Ee bin easy," say Simon. " Me big enough fe paint

the house yet?"
the house yet?"

(Standard English text of Simon's Surprise by Ted Staunton © 1986. Published in Canada by Kids Can Press).

APPENDIX 6

LETTER OF PERMISSION

Kids Can Press

Mr Garbette Garraway
42-125 Moray St.
Port Moody, BC
V3H 3C8
November 10, 1988

Dear Mr Garraway

It is my pleasure to grant permission for you to use words and phrases from SIMON'S SURPRISE throughout the body of your master's thesis and to execute a word by word comparison of text and an oral nonstandard dialect in the appendices to the thesis. Further, as requested permission is granted for the National Library to loan or sell microfilmed copies of the thesis as is their policy.

Best of luck with your work. Kids Can Press is delighted that you have selected SIMON'S SURPRISE as one of the items for study for your thesis.

Sincerely

Ricky Englander

585½ Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M6G 1K5 (416) 534-6389 FAX (416) 534-6152

NOTES

1. Gimson (1980) and Jones (1964) use the phoneme /e/ to represent the vowel sound in RP in such words as "fed" and "head" and the dominant sound of the diphthong in such words as "late" and "face". American and Caribbean linguists, on the other hand, use two different phonemes for those sounds - /ɛ/ and /e/ respectively. It is quite clear from Gimson's discussion that RP /e/ is not the same as either /ɛ/ or /e/ in GA and JB. To facilitate identification of the RP /e/ and the GA and JB /e/ in the study, the RP /e/ is written as /e̞/.

2. In their pronunciation dictionary for American English, Kenyon and Knott (1953) transcribe the letter "y" in such words as "daily" and "lady" as /ɪ/. However, Thomas (1958) pointed out that "y" in such a position is being increasingly pronounced as /i/ throughout America. His point seems to be substantiated by the pronunciation used on American as well as Canadian television news casts. Therefore, final "y" in GA has been transcribed by /i/ in this study.

3. For convenience of space only, vowel + "r" combinations, final "y" and initial "w" have been included with vowels.

4. It should be noted that although the grapheme "ng" is /ŋ/ in JB, the participial ending "-ing" is rendered in that dialect as /ɪn/.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adler, S. 1979. Poverty children and their language: Implications for teaching and treating. New York: Grune & Stratton, Inc.

Allington, R. L. 1984. Oral reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Anderson, R. C., & Pearson, P. D. 1984. A schema-theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Aukerman, R. C. 1981. Approaches to beginning reading (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bailey, B. L. 1963. Teaching of English noun-verb concord in primary schools in Jamaica. Caribbean Quarterly, 9, 10-14.

Bailey, B. L. 1966. Jamaica creole syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, B. L. 1971. Jamaican creole: Can dialect boundaries be defined? In D. Hymes (Ed.), Pidginization and creolization of languages: Proceedings of a confrence held at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, April 1968. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baratz, J. C. 1969. Teaching reading in an urban negro school system. In J. C. Baratz & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Centre For Applied Linguistics.

Baratz, J. C. 1973. Relationship of Black English to reading. In J. L. Laffey & R. Shuy (Eds.). Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark: International Reading Association.

Baratz, S. S., & Baratz, J. C. 1969. Negro ghetto children and urban education: A cultural solution. In A. C. Aarons, B. Y. Gordon, & W. A. Stewart (Eds.), Linguistic-cultural differences and American education. Miami: Florida FL Reporter.

Baratz, J. C., & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). 1969. Teaching Black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Centre For Applied Linguistics.

Barbour, K. 1987. Little Nino's Pizzeria. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Barr, R. 1984. Beginning reading instruction: From debate to reformation. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Bereiter, C., & Englemann, S. 1966. Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Berelson, B. 1952. Content analysis in communication research. New York: Hafner Publishing Company.

Berko-Gleason, J. 1973. Code switching in children's language. In T. E. Moore (Ed.), Cognitive development and the acquisition of language. New York: Academic Press.

Bernstein, B. 1971. Class, codes and control, Vol. 1. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bickerton, D. 1975. Dynamics of a creole system. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bloomfield, L. 1942. Linguistics and reading. Elementary English Review, 19, 125-130.

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. 1967. The cooperative research program in first grade reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 6(2), 5-142.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. 1983. Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Bridgman, S., & Iannacone, J. 1987. Book evaluation list: Recent Canadian picture books. (Available from Vancouver Public Library, Vancouver, B. C.).

Browne, A. 1983. Gorilla. London: Julia MacRae Books.

Burmeister, L. E. 1983. Foundations and strategies for teaching children to read. Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1983.

Cambourne, B. 1981. Oral and written relationships: A reading perspective. In B. M. Kroll & R. J. Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Cammire, A. 1986. Something about the author: Facts and pictures about authors and illustrators of books for young people, Vol. 45. Detroit: Gale Research Company

Carney, T. F. 1972. Content analysis: A technique for systematic inference from communications. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Carrington, L. 1983. The challenge of Caribbean language in the Canadian classroom. TESL Talk, 14, 4, 15-28.

Carroll, J. B., & Walton, M. 1979. Has the reel reeding prablum bin lade bear? Summary comments on the theory and practice of early reading. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Cassidy, F. G. 1971. Jamaica Talk: Three hundred years of the English language in Jamaica (2nd ed.). London: MacMillan Education.

Cazden, C. B. 1972. The situation: A neglected source of social class differences in language use. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Celce-Murcia, M. 1983. The universalist hypothesis: Some implications for contrastive syntax and language teaching. In B. W. Robinett and J. Schachter (Eds.), Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Chall, J. S. 1967. Learning to read: The great debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Chall, J. S. 1983. Learning to read: The great debate (Updated ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Chambers, J. K. (Ed.). 1975. Canadian English: Origins and structures. Toronto: Methuen.

Chambers, J. K., & Trudgill, P. 1980. Dialectology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheshire, J. 1982. Variations in an English dialect: A sociolinguistic study. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chin Pang, M. M. 1981. Aspects of Trinidadian creole. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, B. C.

Clay, M. M. 1968. A syntactic analysis of reading errors. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 7, 434-438.

Craig, D. R. 1966. Some developments in language teaching in the West Indies. Caribbean Quarterly, 12, 25-34.

Craig, D. R. 1971. Education and creole English in the West Indies: some sociolinguistic factors. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Pidginization and creolization of languages: Proceedings of a confrence held at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, April 1968. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craig, D. R. 1977. Creole languages and primary education. In A. Valdman (Ed.), Pidgin and creole linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Craig, D. R. 1980. Models for educational policy in creole-speaking communities. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), Theoretical orientations in creole studies. New York: Academic Press.

Davis, L. M. 1983. English Dialectology: An Introduction. University of Alabama: Alabama University Press.

DeCamp, D. 1971. Towards a generative analysis of a post-creole speech continuum. In D. Hymes (Ed.), Pidginization and creolization of languages: Proceedings of a confrence held at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, April 1968. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dillard, J. L. 1972. Black English: Its history and usages in the United States. New York: Random House.

Di Pietro, R. J. 1973. Bilingualism and bidialectalism. In R. P. Fox (Ed.), Essays on teaching English as a second language and as a second dealect. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Di Pietro, R. J. 1971. Language structures in contrast. Rowley, MS: Newbury House of Publishers.

Doubtfire, E. 1983. A comparative investigation of cohesion in aspects of children's speech and in selected early reading books. Early Child Development and Care, 11, 89-104.

Downing, J. 1973. Linguistic environments, II. In J. Downing (Ed.), Comparative reading: Cross-national studies of behavior and processes in reading and writing. New York: Macmillan Company.

Downing, L., & Leong, C. K. 1982. Psychology of reading. New York: Macmillan.

Edwards, V. 1976 Effects of dialect on the comprehension of West Indian children. Educational Research, 30, 51-58.

Edwards, V. 1983. Language in multicultural classrooms. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.

Edwards, V. 1986. Language in a Black community. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Elkonin, D. B. 1973. USSR. In J. Downing (Ed.), Comparative reading: Cross-national studies of behavior and processes in reading and writing. New York: Macmillan Company.

Fasold, R. W., & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). 1970. Teaching standard English in the inner city. Washington, D.C.: Center For Applied Linguistics.

Fasold, R. W., & Wolfram, W. 1975. Some linguistic features of Negro dialect. In P. Stoller (Ed.), Black American English: Its background and its usage in the schools and in literature. New York: Dell Publishing Co.

Flesch, R. 1948. A new readability yardstick. Journal of Applied Psychology, 32, 221-233.

Flesch, R. 1955. Why Johnny can't read: And what you can do about it. New York: Harper & Row.

Flesch, R. 1981. Why Johnny still can't read: A new look at the scandal of our schools. New York: Harper & Row

Fowler, R. 1971. An introduction to transformational syntax. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Garman, D. 1978. Language patterns and beginning readers. The Reading Teacher, 31, 393-396.

Gibson, E. J., & Levin, H. 1975. The psychology of reading. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

Gimson, A. C. 1980. An introduction to the pronunciation of English (3rd ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Goodman, K. S. 1968. The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process. In K. S. Goodman (Ed.), The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Goodman, K. S. 1969. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension. In J. C. Baratz and R. W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Centre For Applied Linguistics.

Goodman, K. S. 1970. Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. In H. Singer & R. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading. Newark: International Reading Association.

Goodman, K. S. 1973. Psycholinguistic universals in the reading process. In F. Smith (Ed.), Psycholinguistics and reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Goodman, K. S. 1986. What's whole in whole language. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Goodman, K. S., & Burke, C. 1973. Dialect barriers to reading comprehension revisted. Reading Teacher, 27, 6-12.

Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. 1979. Learning to read is natural. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gourley, J. W. 1984. Discourse structure: Expectations of beginning readers and readability of texts. Journal of Reading Behavior, 16, 169-188.

Gray, C. 1963. Teaching English in the West Indies. Caribbean Quarterly, 9, 67-77.

Hall, M. 1978. The language experience approach for teaching reading: A research perspective (2nd ed.). Newark: International Reading Association.

Hall, M. 1981. Teaching reading as a language experience (3rd ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Harris, J. A, & Sipay, E. R. 1980. How to increase reading ability: A guide to developmental and remedial methods (7th ed.). New York: Longman.

Hart, N. W. M., Walker, R. F., & Gray, B. 1977. The language of children: A key to literacy. Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hartmann, R. R. K. 1980. Contrastive textology: Comparative discourse analysis in applied linguistics. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Heath, S. B. 1983. Way with words - Language, life, and works in communities and classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hochman, C. H. 1973. Black dialect reading tests in the urban elementary school. Reading Teacher, 26, 581-583.

Holdaway, D. 1979. The foundations of literacy. Sydney: Ashton Scholastic.

Horn, T. D. (Ed.). 1970. Reading for the disadvantaged: Problems of linguistically different learners. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Hughes, A., & Trudgill, P. 1979. English accents and dialects: An introduction to social and regional varieties of British English. London: Edward Arnold.

James, C. 1980. Contrastive analysis. Essex: Longman.

Johns, J. L. 1984. Students' perceptions of reading: Insights from research and pedagogical implications. In J. Downing & R. Valtin (Eds.), Language awareness and learning to read. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Jones, D. 1964. An outline of English phonetics. Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.

Kirkwood, K. J., & Wolfe, R. G. 1980. Matching students and reading materials: A cloze-procedure and method for assessing the reading ability of students and the readability of textual materials. Toronto: Ministry of Education.

Kochman, T. B. 1969. Social factors in the consideration of teaching standard English. In A. C. Aarons, B. Y. Gordon, & W. A. Stewart (Eds.), Linguistic-cultural differences and American education. Miami: Florida FL Reporter.

Kress, G. 1982. Learning to write. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Krippendorff, K. 1980. Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications

Labov, W. 1969. The logic of non-standard English. In A.C. Aarons, B. Y. Gordon, & W. A. Stewart (Eds.), Linguistic-cultural differences and American education. Miami: Florida FL Reporter.

Labov, W. 1972. The study of language in its social context. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Lado, R. 1957. Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Laffey, J. L., & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). 1973. Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark: International Reading Association.

Langacker, R. W. 1967/68. Language and its structure: Some fundamental linguistic concepts. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Leon, P. R., & Martin, P. 1979. Toronto English: Studies in phonetics. Ottawa: Marcel Didier.

Leaverton, L. 1973. Dialect readers: Rationale, use and value. In J. L. Laffey & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark: International Reading Association.

Leu, D. J. Jr. 1982. Differences between oral and written discourse and the acquisition of reading proficiency. Journal of Reading Behavior, 14, 111-125.

Lindfors, J. W. 1980. Children's language and learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lipinska, M. 1983. Contrastive analysis and modern theory of language. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), Current issues in

linguistic theory: Theoretical issues in contrastive linguistics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Long, M. H., & Sato, C. J. 1984. Methodological issues in interlanguage studies: An interactionist perspective. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. Howatt (Ed.), Interlanguage. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Lorge, I. 1949. Readability formulae: An evaluation. Elementary English, 26, 86-95.

Lutz, J. 1974. Some comments on psycholinguistic research and education. The Reading Teacher, 28, 36-39.

Mackay, D., & Thompson, B. 1968. The initial teaching of reading and writing: Some notes towards a theory of literacy. (Programme in linguistics and English teaching, Paper no. 3). London: University College, London.

Marwit, W., & Newman, G. 1974. Black and White children's comprehension of standard and nonstandard English passages. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 329-332.

Massaro, D. W. 1984. Building and testing models of reading processes. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Mathews, M. M. 1966. Teaching to read: Historically considered. Chicago: Universidy of Chicago Press.

Melmed, P. J. 1973. Black English phonology: The question of reading interference. In J. L. Laffey & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark: International Reading Association.

Milne, J. 1977. Recent trends in linguistics: General survey (Appendix B). In S. H. O. Tomori. The morphology and syntax of present-day English: An introduction. London: Heinemann.

Mitchell, A. S. 1972. Should dialect differences be considered in reading instruction? In H. A. Klein (Ed.), The quest for competency in reading. Newark: International Reading Association.

Newman, J. M. (Ed.). 1985. Whole language: Theory in use. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Nolen, P. S. 1972. Reading nonstandard dialect materials: A study at grades two and four. Child Development, 43, 1092-1097.

O'Neil, W. 1973. The politics of bidialectalism. In R. H. Bentley & S. D. Crawford (Eds.), Black language reader. Urbana: Scott, Foreman & Company.

Perera, K. 1984. Children's writing and reading: Analysing classroom language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Petyt, K. M. 1980. The study of dialect: An introduction to dialectology. London: Andre Deutsch.

Phillips, D. 1978. Linguistic skills and ethnic group. Research in Education, 19, 25-37.

Piestrup, A. M. 1973. Black dialect interference and accommodation of reading instruction in first grade. (Monographs of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory, no. 4). Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.

Pflaum-Connor, S. 1979. Language and reading acquisition for the English-speaking minority student. In S. Pflaum-Connor (Ed.), Aspects of reading education. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Pumfrem and Lee. 1982. Cultural group, reading attainments and dialect interference. Journal of Research in Reading, 5, 133-145.

Pyles, T., & Algeo, J. 1982. The origins and development of the English language (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Resnick, L. B. 1979. Theories and prescriptions for early reading instruction. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 2. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1979.

Resnick, L. B., & Weaver, P. A. (Eds.). 1979. Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rosen, H., & Burgess, T. 1980. Languages and dialects of London school children. London: Ward Lock Educational

Ruddell, R. 1965. The effects of oral and written patterns of language structures on reading comprehension. The Reading Teacher, 18, 271-275.

Rumelhart, D. E. 1977. Towards an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornic (Ed.), Attention and Performance VI: Proceedings of the sixth international symposium on attention and performance, Stockholm, Sweden, July 28-August 1, 1975. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rystrom, R. 1970. Dialect training and reading: A further look. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, 581-599.

Sachs, J. C., & Devlin, J. 1976. Young children's use of age-appropriate speech styles in social interaction and role-playing. Journal of Child Language, 3, 81-98.

Schachter, J. 1974. An error in error analysis. Language Learning, 24, 205-214.

Schafer, J. C. 1981. The linguistic analysis of spoken and written texts. In Kroll and Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships: Connections and contrasts. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

Shatz, M., & Gelman, R. 1973. The development of communication skills: Modification in the speech of young children as a function of listener. Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development, 38, no. 152.

Shuy, R. W. 1979. The mismatch of child language and school language: Implications of beginning reading instruction. In L. B. Reanick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shuy, R. W., & Stanton, J. 1982. Assessing oral language ability in children. In L. Feagan & D. C. Farran (Eds.), The language of children reared in poverty: Implications for evaluation and intervention. New York: Academic Press.

Simons, H. D. 1974. Black dialect phonology and work ±sicF recognition. Journal of Educational Research, 68, 67-70.

Simons, H. D. 1979. Black dialect, reading interference, and classroom interaction. In L. B. Resnick and P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Simons, H. D., & Johnson, K. R. 1974. Black English syntax and reading interference. Research in the teaching of English, 8, 339-357.

Sledd, J. 1973. Doublespeak: Dialectology in the service of big brother. In R. H. Bentley & S. D Crawford (Eds.), Black language reader. Urbana: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Smith, F. 1971. Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, F. 1975. Comprehension and learning: A conceptual framework for teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, F. 1978. Understanding reading: A psycholinguistic analysis of reading and learning to read (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Smith, F. 1983. Essays into literacy: Selected papers and some afterthoughts. Exeter, NH: Heinemann Educational Books.

Smitherman, G. 1977. Talkin' and testifyin': The language of Black America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Spodek, B. 1978. Teaching in the early years (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Staunton, T. 1986. Simon's surprise. Toronto: Kids Can Press.

Stitch, T. G., & James, J. H. 1984. Listening and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of reading research. New York: Longman.

Strickland, R. G. 1962. The language of elementary school children: Its relationship to the language of reading textbooks and the quality of reading of selected children. Bulletin of the School of Education, 38, no. 4. Bloomington: Indiana University.

Stubbs, M. 1983. Language, school and classroom (2nd ed.). London: Methuen.

Sutcliffe, D. 1982. British Black English. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Tatham, S. M. 1975. Reading comprehension of materials written with select oral language patterns: A study at grades two and four. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, 402-426.

Thomas, C. K. 1958. An introduction to the phonetics of American English (2nd ed.). New York: Ronald Press.

Tomori, S. H. O. 1977. The morphology and syntax of present-day English: An introduction. London: Heinemann.

Traugott, E. C., & Pratt, M. L. 1980. Linguistics for students of literature. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Trudgill, P. 1975. Accents, dialects and school. London: Edward Arnold.

Venezky, R. L., & Chapman, R. S. 1973. Is learning to read dialect bound? In J. L. Laffey & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark: International Reading Association.

Wardhaugh, R. 1983. The contrastive analysis hypothesis. In B. W. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), Second language learning: Constrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Waterland, L. 1985. Read with me: An apprenticeship approach to reading. Stroud, England: The Thimble Press.

Weber, R-M. 1970. A linguistic analysis of first grade reading errors. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, 427-451.

Wells, J. C. 1973. Jamaican pronunciation in London. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wilson, R. M., & Hall, M. 1972. Reading and the elementary school child: Theory and practice for teachers. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Wode, H. 1984. Some theoretical implications of L2 acquisition research and the grammar of interlanguages. In A. Davies, C. Criper, & A. Howatt (Ed.), Interlanguage. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wood, B. S. 1981. Children and communication: Verbal and nonverbal language development (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.