DIALECTIC LEXICONS OF EASTERN TENNESSEE CHILDREN

A Thesis

by

JOYCE GREY ENGLISH

Submitted to the Graduate School

Appalachian State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August 1982

Major Department: Speech Pathology

DIALECTIC LEXICONS

OF EASTERN TENNESSEE CHILDREN

A Thesis

by

Joyce Grey English

August 1982

APPROVED BY:

M. Louis Joselson

Dr. M. Louis Joselson
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

E.C. Hutchinson

Dr. E.C. Hutchinson
Member, Thesis Committee

Alice P. Naylor

Dr. Alice P. Naylor
Member, Thesis Committee

E.C. Hutchinson

Dr. E.C. Hutchinson
Chairperson, Department of Speech Pathology/Audiology

Joyce V. Lawrence

Dr. Joyce V. Lawrence
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

DIALECTIC LEXICONS

OF EASTERN TENNESSEE CHILDREN. (August 1982)

Joyce Grey English, B. S., Appalachian State University

M. A., Appalachian State University

Thesis Chairperson: M. Louis Joselson

The purpose of this study was to compare the dialect usage of Appalachian Mountain children living in two-generation family households to those children of the same region living in three-generation family households.

The literature related to this subject was reviewed and reported under three headings: (1) literature related to the interpersonal factors related to communication development and style; (2) literature related to the description of Southern Mountain dialect; and (3) literature related to dialect interference and the implications for the poverty child.

Two groups of Johnson County, Tennessee seventh graders constituted the subjects of this study. Ten subjects were members of two-generation family households and ten subjects were members of three-generation family households. Each subject was given a dialect test and the resulting data were subjected to a two-tailed t-test.

The t-value of the mean scores of the data collected was .857. No significant difference was found in the mean scores of the two-

generation versus the three-generation groups. On the basis of the data derived from this study, the author makes no generalizations other than the mean scores of the subjects were remarkably close in this study done in Johnson County, using this particular testing instrument and these particular subjects.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to give her sincere thanks to Dr. M. Louis Joselson for his helpful assistance throughout the writing of this thesis. Grateful acknowledgement is also extended to Dr. Alice P. Naylor and Dr. E.C. Hutchinson for their feedback and participation in this project. This study would not have been possible without the support of my parents, Joyce and Cecil English of Rockingham, North Carolina. I would like to thank them and all my very special friends who provided me with the understanding and assistance necessary to complete this project. I would also like to give special thanks to Dr. Deanna Bowman for her assistance in the statistical analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The English language varies from one region of the United States to another and within different social and ethnic groups. People notice this diversity as they travel and interact with individuals from different areas of the country. Skills related to the educational process, particularly language skills, are affected by this diversity of dialect, causing educators to be concerned (Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

The language spoken by the people of Southern Appalachia is a national source of identification. McDavid (1978) notes, "the speech of the hill people is quite different from both dialects of the Southern lowlands for it is basically derived from the Scotch-Irish of western Pennsylvania" (p. 51).

Cratis Williams (1961) describes the speech patterns of the people of the southern mountains as having, "low intonations, a leisurely pace and, in matters of grammar and diction, showing a lack of self-consciousness which precludes the false starts and sputterings sometimes heard in the speech of the educated" (p. 51). Many expressions current in Appalachia today can be found in the writings of others. The dialect is particularly evident in the writings of some of the English authors dating back to Anglo-Saxon times. Wylene Dial (1978) brings up the fact that when the poet Gray composed his famous

"Elegy," the title he chose for it was, "An Elegy Wrote in a Country Churchyard." Southern Mountain dialect (as Appalachian folk speech is referred to by linguists) has been called archaic, but it represents the historical period during the reign of the first Queen Elizabeth. Many of those who study this dialect refer to it as being a sort of, "Scottish flavored Elizabethan English" (Dial, 1978, p. 62).

However, with the spread of education, and ever increasing population mobility, the areas in which pure dialects are spoken are decreasing year by year (Wright, 1913). If this statement was true in 1913, then what is the prevalence of the dialect spoken in the Appalachian Mountains today? Husian L. Quazilbash in 1971 found that there was a 19.4% variation in Appalachian English from standard English, which led to the conclusion that there is a distinctive linguistic structure difference in the region. In 1978, a teacher moving to the Appalachian mountains from northeast Virginia, reported to the author that her seventh grade English students seemed to write in dialect and did not know the standard English forms that she had taken for granted were taught in elementary schools. This was in agreement with the research findings of Wilma Coleman in 1936. She stated in her master's thesis, that

> the mountain man clings to the Shakespearean word, not because he considers it better than modern words, but because he does not know the modern words. The old words are sufficient because his life is still simple. To the mountaineer his speech is natural and proper (p. 9).

Language is a learned behavior. Children acquire only the language or languages spoken around them (Rees, 1980). A dialect is

associated with a speech community formed by a group of people who are in constant communication. A family, for example, is a speech community. The members of the family talk together constantly, and certain words have certain special meanings within the family constellation (Suhy, 1967). The Appalachian family is no exception. There is a need to study Appalachian dialectical variety because it is common knowledge that while the area is linguistically divergent, it is also a much neglected research area (Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

This paper will attempt to study Appalachian dialect usage and the implications for educational achievement.

Statement of the Problem

Because many Appalachian children are residentially, economically, and socially isolated from the outside world, their experiential backgrounds differ significantly from children in other areas. Consequently, the Appalachian child is not linguistically prepared to perform successfully in a middle-class school system where standard American English is commonly used. Thus, the sub-culture child, such as the Appalachian child, suffers linguistic deficiencies or deviations from the norm, and these deficiencies tend to develop into academic problems which in time may lead to vocational handicaps (Fusiler, 1971).

The child who speaks a nonstandard dialect faces two problems when being taught to read, while the standard English speaking child has only one. The standard English speaking child primarily needs to learn the process and mechanics of reading, of deriving

meaning from the printed page. The child who speaks a nonstandard variety must learn the reading process, but must also learn the language of the reading materials at the same time -- and this is a language variety which is no less alien than would be German (Wolfram & Fasold, 1974).

Skinner (1967) urgently recommends pre-school oral language programs be used by educators in the Appalachian region. He states that if the literacy rate is to be improved, Appalachian children should be taught standard American English at an early age.

Early environment and family culture have a major influence on the development of these language and learning problems which the Appalachian child frequently encounters (Dunn, 1969).

Some of the cognitive and language ability characteristics Fusiler (1971) has assigned to the Appalachian children include: (1) retarded verbal ability, (2) nutrition and health factors interfering with learning, and (3) weakness in vocabulary and underdeveloped verbal expressive and receptive abilities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to compare the dialect usage of Appalachian mountain children living in three-generation family households to those children of the same region living in two-generation family households.

Hypothesis

To give direction to the data analysis, the following hypothesis, stated in the null form was tested at the .05 level of significance.

There is no significant difference in dialect usage between children living in three-generation family households and children living in two-generation family households.

Definition of Terms

1. Southern Mountain Dialect - a generalized term referring to the Appalachian variety of the English language.

2. Appalachian English - the social dialect of standard American English associated with the working class rural population of the Appalachian region, varying in grammatical features and phonological and lexical aspects (Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

3. Standard American English - the real and accepted spoken language of the educated middle class (Wolfram & Fasold, 1974).

4. Appalachian region & southern highlands - includes parts of Kentucky, southwestern Virginia, northwestern North Carolina, northeastern Tennessee and all of West Virginia (Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

5. Dialect - a systematic deviation from the ideal standard norm which is predictable in the speech of certain identifiable groups (Wolfram & Fasold, 1974).

6. Three-generation family household - a family household consisting of grandchild (or grandchildren), mother or father of the grandchild, and mother or father of the parents of the grandchild living in the same household.

7. Two-generation family household - a family household consisting of a mother or father and their natural children living in the same household.

8. Dialect interference - occurs when the regional style of communication of an individual deviates to such an extent from standard American English that it causes a conflict in the educational process or in the process of clear and precise communication.

Assumptions and Limitations

It is assumed that the children living in a home peopled by users of regional and dialectical speech and language patterns will ultimately incorporate into their own semantic repertoire those regional and dialectical words and phrases. The assumption is also made that knowledge of regional linguistic patterns by parents and grandparents implies the use of those patterns in the home.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Interpersonal Factors Related to Communication Development and Style

Traditionally children have been regarded as having entered upon the linguistic scene at the moment they produce their first intelligible utterances. This is usually a single word which listening adults interpret as meaningful and intentional on the child's part. In most instances, children begin to produce intelligible, intentional single words sometime between their first and second birthdays. There is no hard and fast rule however, because some children reach this stage before the end of the first year while other normal developing children do not produce any intelligible words until after the second year (Rees, 1980).

A primary function of this research project was to study the effect of different home communication backgrounds on the development of language and language style variances.

The essential ingredient in normal development of communication in children is exposure, from birth, to communication models. Before children can learn grammatical rules, they must be exposed to the adult speech models that follow the rules of their particular language. Family and friends are communication models from which children's communication is patterned. Even though children have innate

capabilities of using language, they must still be exposed to language in order to discover its rules. The child must be exposed to at least one speaker of a language in order to acquire language. Children will copy examples provided by adults and/or other children. This is a process referred to as imitation, which is a key factor in the development of communication. Most children are potential communicators who must learn to send and understand verbal and nonverbal messages. Their communication must be viewed as an integral part of their total development as human beings. To function effectively in their families, in peer groups, and in classrooms, children must be aware of the power of communication and the essential power which communication offers them (Wood, 1976).

Edward Sapir (1968) makes an interesting analogy between the processes of learning to speak and learning to walk.

> In walking, culture is not seriously a factor. Biologically, making all the muscular movements and nervous adjustments that result in walking is in a way predestined in the human. Walking is an inherent, biological function. If left alone, man will walk. Language is determined entirely as to the circumstances that the child is born into. Eliminate society and the child will walk -- but certainly he will never learn to talk. Change societies at birth and the language developed will be the language of those around him, not of his natural environment. Speech varies as we pass from one social group to another. Language is inherited (pp. 3-4).

According to Bernstein (1972), "a productive approach to viewing communication differences as a product of the environment lies in the analysis of family communication styles" (p. 445). His research deals with two family communication styles which are distinctly different. The first is the person-oriented family style, in which

language patterns are more elaborated in terms of meaning and structure. Each member of the family has a greater opportunity to communicate and make decisions, and thus learn to cope with greater abstractions. The second style is the position-oriented family communication style. This type of family has a prescribed role system, and each member of the family has little choice in establishing a role. There is a great likelihood that a restricted language code will develop in this kind of environment. The restricted code is characterized by syntactically simple sentences and more concrete meanings rather than the greater abstract form as is evidenced by the more elaborate code of the person-oriented family.

Fusiler (1971) has examined these codes of communication and related them to children's communication in certain socioeconomic backgrounds. She states that the middle class population uses both patterns and varies their use according to the situation at hand. Children of lower socioeconomic backgrounds were found to operate primarily within the restricted code. This issue will be examined in more detail in the review of factors relative to dialect interference later in this chapter.

The interpersonal forces involved in language acquisition must involve appropriate circumstances. Children must have communication models that they can observe, and must have opportunities to interact with these models. The essential ingredient in normal development of communication in children is exposure, from birth, to communication models. Before children can learn grammatical rules they must be exposed to adult speech that follows the rules of their language. Family and friends are communication models from which children's

communication is patterned. Even though children have innate capabilities of learning and using language, they must still be exposed to language in order to discover its rules (Wood, 1976).

A common sense theory of language acquisition is that children simply imitate what they hear. Children imitate the communication styles of their parents. Wanting to be like their parents and older siblings, their speech patterns contain obvious characteristics of these important others. Parents teach them by correcting them when they err. We can look at this acquisition and development process as a simplified three step schema: (1) imitation, which is the source of learning new linguistic forms; (2) practice, or repetition of these forms by the child in his free speech; and (3) reinforcement of them, which teaches the child which forms are appropriate for which situations (Dale, 1972).

Elaradao, Bradley, and Caldwell (1977), employed a process-oriented research strategy to examine relationships between various aspects of the early home environment and language development. Their results demonstrated that it is possible to specify some of the early experiences related to certain aspects of language development. The aspect which they found provided the greatest influence on language development is the mother's emotional responsiveness and involvement with the child, and provisions for appropriate play materials.

There are opposing views among those who research the area of language acquisition. One view stresses the way children develop their own grammar or phonological rule system and views children as active contributors who adopt strategies, form hypotheses, and search

for evidence to confirm or deny these hypotheses. The other view relates to the structured environments of children, the simplified language that is heard from parents, and their responses to their children's attempts at speech. It also emphasizes their role in the learning of the language (deVilliers & deVilliers, 1979).

Hymes (1979) leans toward the idea of culture, environment, and family as major contributors to language acquisition. While he views Chomsky (1965) as a major contributor to our understanding of language acquisition theory, Hymes goes on to constructively present his professional viewpoint relative to a serious flaw in the thoughts of Chomsky. "From the standpoint of the children we seek to understand and help...Chomsky's statements may seem almost a declaration of irrelevance. All the difficulties that confront the children and ourselves seem swept away" (p. 36).

Dale (1972) promotes an eclectic view. He contends that the more we learn about language development, the less we understand exactly how it works. He implies that the concepts of imitation and reinforcement, although relevant, are inadequate as explanations. The verbal exchange between parents and child probably plays an important role in fostering language development but, "most important is the role of the child and her attempts to master the linguistic system" (p. 6).

According to Bruner (1979), language acquisition occurs in the context of an action dialogue in which joint behaviors are undertaken by infant and adult. "The evolution of language itself probably reflects the requirements of a joint action and it is probably because

of evolutionary history that its use is mastered with such relative ease, though its theoretical explication still eludes us" (p. 97).

Weininger's (1981) viewpoint supports the idea that the interpersonal relationships established within the family have a direct bearing on the acquisition of language. He concludes that children learn so much of what they know while they live at home, not through rote memory with grades for passing and failing, but through playing, sharing, and trusting, through relationships with the caring and guiding adults in their lives, through their own intrinsic desire to learn to master the world around them. He believes that communication is basic among families and the act of nurturing children's communication development to one extent or another is inevitable through family interpersonal interaction.

The majority of the studies of child language development conducted in the United States have assumed that the mother is the major source of input for the child's acquisition of language. For many American middle-class households, this assumption is probably valid. However, there is evidence that this assumption might not be true in certain countries, cultures, and social groups. In a ghetto community in California, for example, a child's siblings are key models for the child's development of language. In certain Chinese cultures, the grandmother may be the key figure in caring for the child and in the child's language development (Wood, 1976).

Broen (1972) studied the language which mothers used while communicating with their 18 to 25 month old children. The mothers were interviewed and were determined to be the primary

caretakers of their children. Broen predicted that a mother's language was somehow geared to the age of the child. An analysis of a mother's language showed that it was quite different than the style of language used with older children and that the younger the child, the more simplistic the language of the mother. This indicated that a mother adapts her language to her perception of what her child's language should sound like.

Wells (1979) states that "formal organization of language and the meanings and purposes it serves to communicate are learned chiefly through social and personal interaction" (p. 393). He believes that as this varies from one social group to another there will be variations in child language which can be related to group membership.

Each of us is born into a particular speech community, family, and social and ethnic group. Victor Lee (1979) considers it important to examine how such environments affect language acquisition, and he makes the statement, "we are only at the beginning of understanding such processes" (p. 11).

Even though many experts share the same view with Lee about the paucity of research in this area, Wells (1979) puts the idea of research into more realistic consideration. "Social background is probably the most controversial of all the dimensions of variation in child language" (p. 393).

However, it is this author's opinion that an understanding of children's communication is not possible without an understanding of the interpersonal and social system characterizing their family environment. Wood (1976) eloquently concurs on this point, and states,

"the often cited language 'deficiencies' in children from certain environments are not so much deficiencies as differences in family structure and styles of communication" (p. 56). Hopper and Naremore (1973) add that, "even though children can learn to speak in almost any environment, providing there are models to nurture this behavior, only in supportive, teaching environments will they learn to read, write, or speak eloquently" (p. 18).

Description of Southern Mountain Dialect

The Appalachian Mountain region covers territory from Maine to Alabama, but the area termed Appalachia has generally been considered to encompass parts of Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee and all of West Virginia. Many of the early settlers of the more northern parts of this region were Pennsylvania Dutch who migrated south, often continuing on to North Carolina. In addition to the Germans, there were also English, Dutch, and smaller groups from other parts of Europe. The Scottish began arriving about 1640. There are conflicting opinions as to just how homogeneous the settlers were. Some claim the mountain people are native born Americans of Scotch-Irish and Highland Scot lineage, whereas others believe that they are simply a representative sample of the nation's population in the early nineteenth century. The fact remains that the difference between the English spoken in the Appalachian Mountain area and other areas is well recognized by people as they travel through the Appalachian region or have occasion to meet people who have come from there (Wolfram & Christian, 1976).

In its native setting, Appalachian Mountain English is a regional variety of American English. It is unique in both phonological and lexical aspects. Only when Mountain English is transplanted out of its native setting does it acquire social distinction. This author has observed the communication of speakers of this dialect from all walks of life and found that this linguistic variety invariably occurs to one degree or another. Nevertheless, Mountain English is an ordered, systematic variety of American English. Its differences are not the product of deviations from standard English but are the results of the dialects spoken by the original settlers in Appalachia and of the conservatism of the Mountaineer (Adler, 1979).

Certain unusual features of Appalachian English appear to result from what Adler refers to in the preceding paragraph as "conservatism." This writer interprets his reference to "conservatism" as a resistance to or lack of linguistic evolution. For example, the use of "hit" as a third-person singular neuter pronoun is quite old (one may find the form in early English writings), and the pronoun "it" is really the modern innovation. An example of the use of this variation of Appalachian Mountain Dialect is, "hit was a blue car." Also, the characteristic a-prefixing is the result, according to Adler, of the preservation of an older form. "He was a-runnin' and a-jumpin'."

Kephart (1922) credits the mountaineer with a kind of semantic creativity. He describes the people as seldom, if ever, at a loss for words, even if they have to create them. He contends that the words are produced from English roots. The use of the old English past tense of "holp" for "help" is one of the examples he presents.

Cratis Williams (1964), one of the foremost authorities on Appalachian dialect, considers the dialect of the southern mountains of the United States to be a more poetic language than standard American English. He describes this poetic and dramatic nature of the language in the following passage.

> Mountain people become dramatic easily. In moments of excitement and anger they rise to superb heights in the quality of their rhetoric. In reciting personal experiences or telling what they have been witness to they display qualities which belong to the best of oral literature. They love figures of speech, trenchant epigrams, compound oaths, and superlative phrases, but at the same time they have scrupulous regard for the exact detail and the actual event (p. 153).

A list of some of the distinctive grammatical features of Mountain English follows. It is adapted from the research of Wolfram & Christian (1976), Adler (1979), Williams (1964), and Kephart (1922).

Consonant Cluster Reductions

Words ending in 'sp, 'st, and 'sk add the -es plural while retaining the cluster intact, giving 'deskes,' ghostes,' and 'waspes.'

Final Unstressed 'ow'

In word endings, the 'ow' of standard English may be produced as 'er,' giving 'holler' for 'hollow,' 'swaller' for 'swallow,' or 'winder' for 'window.' It may also occur when the plural -s is added giving 'taters' for 'potatoes' or 'winders' for 'windows.'

'ire' Sequences

In many varieties of standard English 'ire' sequences are pronounced as two syllables, so that fire or tire are pronounced

something like 'fayer' or 'tayer.' This may be reduced to one syllable which includes the reduction of a glide. In Appalachian Mountain English, therefore, the words tire and fire may be pronounced much like 'tar' and 'far.'

Completive Aspects with the Verb, 'Done'

'Done' is used with a past form such as 'I done tried.' This form denotes an action started and completed at a specific time in the past.

A-verbing

An a- can be prefixed to a following verb which has an -ing participle form. These verb forms may function as progressives as in "I knew he was a-tellin' the truth" or in certain types of adverbials, as in "I went down there a-huntin' for 'em," and, "He woke up a-screamin'."

Absence of Form 'To Be'

When contracted forms of the copula 'is' and 'are' forms are expected in standard English, they may be deleted in Appalachian Mountain English. "They no eggs here today." When the subject is 'I,' the standard English form 'am' or its contraction 'm' is almost always used.

Double Modals

Certain modals may co-occur within the same verb phrase, giving forms such as 'might could,' 'might should,' 'used to couldn't,' and so forth.

Intensifying Adverbs

The intensifier 'right' is often used in a wider set of contexts than in its standard distribution. These include placement before adjectives, 'right large,' 'right amusing,' with an expanded group of adverbs 'right loud,' 'right quick,' and in construction with 'smart' such as 'a right smart while.'

Another intensifier, 'plumb,' occurs with adverbs, verbs, and some adjectives, and refers to completeness, 'burn plumb down,' 'scare you plumb to death,' and 'plumb foolish.'

Possessive Construction

When a possessive pronoun does not modify a following noun phrase, -n may be added to it, resulting in forms like 'your'n,' 'his'n,' and 'our'n.'

Plural Suffix

For nouns that refer to weights and measures, the plural suffix may be absent. Most typically, this occurs when the noun is preceded by a numeral as in 'two pound,' 'three foot,' and 'twenty year ago.'

Relative Pronoun Deletion

In most standard English dialects a relative pronoun is obligatory if the relative pronoun represents the subject of the subordinate clause. In some nonstandard dialects such as Appalachian Mountain dialect, this relative pronoun can be deleted, giving sentences like, "that's the dog bit me," and "there's a man comes down the road."

Questions

The same patterns used in the direct question may apply to the indirect question. "I wonder was he walking?," or "I wonder where was he going?" The conjunction introducing indirect yes/no questions is eliminated in this process since the question can be derived from the word order.

Existential 'There'

'They' may also be used as a correspondence for standard English 'there,' in sentences such as, "if they's a lotta woolly worms, it'll be a bad winter," or "they's copperheads around here."

The existence of the unique dialect of the Southern Mountaineer is a linguistic fact. It is this author's personal observation that Appalachian English is alive and well in the mountains of Tennessee and North Carolina. Cratis Williams (1964) gives an interesting perspective as to the possible reason that the mountaineers' speech retains its severe deviation from standard American English.

> The average child from the mountain home, unwilling to subject himself to the blistering sarcasm of his elders, clings to the local forms even when he knows the modern forms, for the condemnation that one is 'gittin' above his raisin',' or 'up-headed,' or 'stuck-up,' or 'too big for his britches' carries terrible implications among people whose highest accolade for the returned migrant is that he is still 'as common as an old shoe rag' (p. 15).

Dialect Interference and the Implications for the Poverty Child

The fact that dialectical speech exists is an inescapable fact. A child born and raised in Mountain City, Tennessee will not speak like a child born and raised in New Orleans, Louisiana. A person

born and raised in a wealthy home and educated in the best schools will not speak the same way as a person born and raised in poverty, who may have dropped out of school at age sixteen, even though both may be from New Orleans. Just as people from different regions of the country have different ways of speaking, differences in ethnic grouping, social class, and educational level also lead to differences in speech patterns (Sarbin, 1970; Jensen, 1968; Zacharias, 1964).

The difficulty, according to Naremore (1980), "arises out of the fact that certain dialects in the society are socially valued by some people while others are socially stigmatized" (p. 182). A person who speaks Appalachian Mountain Dialect may be regarded by some listeners as unsophisticated and of low intelligence, because that dialect suggests such a stereotype. On the other hand a person using an upper-class urban dialect may be regarded as sophisticated and intelligent. Actually the two speakers may be exactly the same in terms of measured intelligence and sophistication. Naremore continues, "the good or bad image does not exist in the dialect -- it exists in the mind of the listener" (p. 182).

For the purpose of the organization of this section of the project, the author has addressed certain areas of dialect interference individually. Although there are definite generalities which each area shares, for the sake of clarity each area will be assigned an individual section for specific review.

Dialect Deficit or Different

There are two theories of dialect, the deficit theory and the different theory. Early researchers believed that nonstandard speech

such as Appalachian English represented a disorganized and poorly articulated version of standard English. These researchers concluded that nonstandard speakers were deficient in grammar. This position is known as the Deficit Theory. It is now fashionable in scholarly circles to suggest that dialects of English are simply different from each other. According to this Difference Theory, no dialect is inferior to others. Educational problems result not because minority children know no grammar, but because the school atmosphere offers instruction only in the alien standard grammar (Hopper & Naremore, 1973).

Williams (1970) defines the Deficit Theory:

> Deficit position: an approach that contrasts poverty children with their middle-class counterparts in the area of language capacity (as well as other areas of function), moving from such contrasts to generalizations about the appearance of "developmental lags" thought to stem from a deprived environment. This deprivation, or deficit, diagnosis of the poor suggests a kind of cultural injection as an antidote for poverty, and that the earlier it is given, the better the results. Some have agreed that the language portion of the cultural antidote for poverty is by far the most critical (p. 4).

Adler (1979) presents a definition of the Difference Theory:

> Difference position: The viewpoint that the dialectical variations are merely differences, not deficits. Standard American English, under this outlook, would not be a replacement for a substandard form, but taught as a "second language" to be used when appropriate (p. 236).

The Influence of Environment

Charleta Dunn (1969) believes that early environment and family culture have a major influence on the development of language and

learning problems. Dale (1972) felt that many factors, including profession and age, were determinants of dialect differences, but two factors were most significant. One was geography. He states:

> Even in the United States, which has remarkable uniformity of language for a country its size, there are considerable differences which are primarily geographic in nature. Generally speaking, the greatest difference occurs on the East Coast of this country and gradually become weaker as one proceeds inland (p. 269).

The second major difference cited by Dale is social class. "There is a strong tendency for people to classify other individuals on the basis of their language. Ethnic-group differences are usually classified as social-class differences" (p. 269).

Venezky (1970) makes some generalizations about individuals coming from low socio-economic backgrounds. In his review of pertinent research in this area, he found that they, as a group, score lower than the higher socio-economic children on IQ tests, that they tend to fall behind in school work, especially in reading, and that the difference between their performance and that of the upper group widens as the child progresses through school. This phenomenon concerning the widening gap is sometimes referred to as the "cumulative deficit" theory (Deutsch, 1965).

Traditionally, the study of dialect has been the province of the linguist and the sociologist. In recent years, with the new emphasis on environmental relationships to dialect, there has developed a new field called sociolinguistics, drawing on the techniques and concepts of both parent disciplines.

Reading Problems

Venezky (1970) maintains that the educational process and especially the reading programs in the United States are not equipped to teach the nonstandard dialect speaking child. He argues that the articulation and discrimination screening devices, the readiness tests, the reading materials, and the teacher's handbook, with rare exceptions, are designed solely for producers of standard American English. He advocates the development of a guide which distinguishes normal articulation from aberrant articulation, that lists expected vocabulary or age-graded syntactic development, or that suggests how reading is to be taught where dialect-based problems exist. He stresses that such a guide is desperately needed for the American Indian, the Mexican-American, the urban Negro, the Appalachian Mountaineer and other speakers of nonstandard dialects.

Burling (1971) recognized the agonizing problems faced by school children who speak nonstandard English. When these children learn to read, they must not only cope with a certain amount of linguistic interference, but also with the deprecatory attitudes of teachers toward their dialect. He argues that teachers need to understand more about the nature of dialect variability and its effects on the educational process, particularly reading.

Boiarsky (1969) examined the Metropolitan Achievement Test for possible dialect-prejudiced items. Many items on this particular test were found to be impossible for speakers of Black dialect to discriminate, based on the distinctive features of Black English according to the research of Wolfram & Fasold in 1970. From the data

derived above, Hutchinson (1972) argues that Black children are being asked to meet standards that other groups of children are not being asked to meet: namely, the standard of being tested and taught in a dialect they do not speak. She feels that if the child is not assisted in making the transition early in the educational process, the gap which exists will grow even wider, so that the child may never gain the skill of reading well enough to make it a useful tool for other learning.

There is a great deal of speculation among the experts as to how to approach the problem of teaching reading to the nonstandard dialect speaking child. Dale (1972) feels that an educational system should capitalize on the capacities children bring to school with them. He sees the issue as requiring a combination of imagination, creativity and careful research.

Other researchers, such as Venezky (1970), feel that any method used for teaching reading must include training for the teacher in understanding the language patterns of the child. He feels that the differences between a child's nonstandard speech and standard English are a barrier to learning, but the extent to which this is an obstacle to learning is not known.

Experimentation with primary dialect readers is advocated by Wolfram (1971), to determine what value they might hold for reading programs for these children.

Fasold (1969) holds the opinion that reading teachers need some type of understanding of the linguistic system of the nonstandard dialect speaking child. He does not consider the phonics approach to

the teaching of reading totally inappropriate for these children. The main consideration is that the teacher understand the type of sound-symbol relations appropriate for the dialect.

Some suggestions for the teaching of reading to the nonstandard dialect speaker come from Venezky (1970).

> 1. Children whose dialects deviate markedly from standard English should be taught the standard brand before they are taught reading, under the explicit assumption that it is a second dialect and not a more correct dialect that is being taught.
>
> 2. Reading materials for beginning reading should, in content, vocabulary, and syntax, be as dialect free (and culture free) as possible.
>
> 3. Children should be allowed to translate from writing to that form of language from which they already obtain meaning; that is, dialect differences should not be considered reading errors (pp. 334-345).

According to Burke & Goodman (1969), as children become more proficient readers, dialect miscues or mistakes tend to increase, although they do not seem to affect comprehension. Their research suggests that children begin to slip into their mother tongues in oral reading when they are more at ease with their reading. Dialect miscues often result in passages which are acceptable grammatically within the reader's dialect and in which the meaning is left unchanged. Some of the examples they cite are dialect sound changes such as 'rowed' for rolled, 'cawed' for called, also 'don't' for doesn't and 'was' for were, were confused by the students.

Language Problems

It is necessary for those who teach nonstandard English speaking, economically disadvantaged children, to understand the nature of their language problems. The literature suggests that these children have a fully developed but nonstandard language code. Work with this child must be viewed in a different light than work with other language deviant children, such as the retarded or the aphasoid child. The economically disadvantaged child does have language and has learned to speak. What this child has not learned is how to speak standard American English -- not because of a physical or genetic difference or because the child comes from a broken home, or a home where the parents are frequently absent, but because the child has not been in a language environment where standard American English is spoken. It is recommended that when professionals, such as speech pathologists, are dealing with children such as deprived head-start children, they must try not to obliterate the language that is present, but rather build on the foundation which is present and teach a language that is necessary for the child to participate in the middle-class culture (Baratz, 1968).

Gussow (1965) cautions research experts about making generalizations concerning specific language and speech deficits of children from deprived backgrounds. Children from deprived backgrounds reflect the great diversity within the population. Children of the urban slums with speech models provided by poor blacks and whites from the southern and mountain states speak differently from Mexican-American children whose parents are itinerant farm workers, from Spanish

children of Puerto Rican heritage, or from Indian children on a remote reservation in Arizona.

It is reflected in some of the literature which follows, that this point made by Gussow has not been well taken by many of those interested in the language problems of the disadvantaged. However, it is the opinion of this author that certain generalizations which have been made can be reviewed objectively and applied to particular populations when practical.

Deutsch (1965) studied the expressive language skills of black and white children from the lower and middle socioeconomic classes who were in the first and the fifth grades in school. Quantitative measures of language such as type-token ratios, number of nouns, number of word repetitions were used in this study. The results indicated that lower class children were less verbal than were their middle-class peers.

Templin (1957), Thomas (1962), and Deutsch (1964) researched the dialect of low socioeconomic children and found that the use of nouns and verbs predominated their communication. The use of adjectives and adverbs were limited and rigid. Lack of differentiation of referents appeared frequently.

Raph (1965) indicated in her review of the literature that the language of the disadvantaged child was "meager, restricted in variety of vocabulary, repetitive and routinized, incorrect grammatically, inaccurate in pronunciation, and articulation, with poor syntactical form" (p. 144).

Factors necessary for the development of verbal mediators may not be present in the lower class environment, according to John and Goldstein (1964). They theorized that the economically deprived child experiences a lesser amount of verbal interaction with adults than does the non-economically deprived child. Thus, they reason, this child learns most of the language from hearing others rather than by verbally interacting with them and thereby practicing the language. They also felt that an individual's ability to solve complex problems, to hypothesize, generalize, categorize, or to see relationships is related to the ability to manipulate verbal mediators.

According to Templin (1957), children from lower socioeconomic classes take about a year longer to reach mature articulation than do those from the middle-class.

As was previously mentioned (p. 8) in this report, Basil Bernstein (1972), an English sociologist, has hypothesized a theory concerning social class variation in linguistic codes. Bernstein (1964) makes a distinction between 'restricted' and 'elaborated' codes. The 'restricted' code implies redundant, stereotyped linguistic communication carried on between members of a family or close friendship group. The 'elaborated' code, on the other hand, implies less redundancy, greater complexity, both specific and varied. According to Bernstein's research, the middle class uses both patterns and varies this use according to the situation, while members of the lower socioeconomic class are generally familiar with only the restricted code. He considers these differences in linguistic patterns important for psychological development because of the close relationship between language and thought.

Diana Adlam (1979) attempts to clarify Bernstein's position on linguistic codes. She relates that a child's orientation to language is first acquired in the family and is initially determined by the relationship existing within the family. The communication patterns to which a child is exposed both reflect the social make-up in the family and give a social basis to understanding the construction of the world. This, according to Adlam, is in the sense that the child's orientation to language use will extend to the coding of objects as well as the experience of persons and ways of dealing with everyday living.

These studies all imply that the culturally disadvantaged nonstandard English speaking child has less language than the middle-class child and that this child's language is insufficient for communication in a middle-class environment. It is important to note that all of these studies used standard American English as the criterion of adequate speech and language.

Black English

"The real tragedy of the educational system is the young Negro child who just never does learn to read" (Dilliard, 1972, p. 279). According to Dilliard, the young speaker of Negro nonstandard English must, as a first step in the educational process, learn to master the reading process. This consists of learning to turn those strange marks on the printed page into the sounds of Black English. This is where the breakdown occurs, Black English. Dilliard argues that learning to read is a difficult enough process for any youngster; but the standard English speaker who attempts to learn to read usually

finds that there is a direct relationship between speech and the written word. This, unfortunately, is not the case for the black child who speaks a nonstandard variety of American English.

Labov (1969) argues that there exists a different set of speech rules governing black nonstandard vernacular. When speech rules are different the child has no clues to the standard spelling differences from the child's own speech patterns and may have difficulty recognizing many words in standard spelling. He indicates that black dialect differs from standard English in both grammar and phonology. He feels that from the standpoint of learning to read, some of these differences present handicaps, especially those in which phonological differences coincide with grammatical differences. Labov also suggests that among the major causes of reading failure of the black child are political and cultural conflicts in the classroom. He cited dialect differences as being important because they are the symbols for communication in this conflict. He found that the more active an individual was in participating in certain cultural aspects in the inner city, such as certain street gangs, the more likely it was that the individual would experience reading failure.

Loban (1967) conducted a series of tests in which disadvantaged black children read a text in standard English. He found that, frequently, the mismatch between standard English and the children's dialect accounted for their mistakes in reading. Some of the problems he noted were, change in verb tense, additions of extra inflectional endings, possession juxtaposition and errors related to variation in their sound system.

Mays (1977) suggested that black children operate under many of the handicaps of non-English speaking children. The most serious difficulties arise not in vocabulary usage but in structurally based phonological differences which result in a set of homonyms unfamiliar to teachers and not found in text books. She proposes to teach dialect speaking children to speak standard English before teaching them to read. In this way, she feels there will be no linguistic conflict caused by exposing the child to standard English in beginning readers.

Appalachian English

Skinner (1967) has conducted much of the research in the area of defining the difficulties experienced in the overall education of the Appalachian child. He found that many children have trouble reaching the usually prescribed standard because of the speech characteristics they bring with them to school. They have a language system which Skinner describes as complex and sophisticated, but not like the middle-class language systems prevalent in most sections of the nation. Skinner attributes illiteracy among the Appalachian people to educators' failure to supply these children with the means of learning to use the language effectively, stating, "we impose on them a language system totally alien to their experiences, and we incorporate reading and writing codes into it. When the pupils cannot meet our demand that they learn our language system, we label them illiterate" (p. 1). He argues that such children are not illiterate but that they only appear to be so when we measure them according to our middle-class language system standards. He reports that Appalachian schools use the usual texts and other materials that are written in

standard American English. Teachers demand that the children learn the decoding and encoding systems used in standard English and according to his findings, many Appalachian children are simply incapable of doing this. Skinner attributes this, in part, to the fact that they have not had the necessary experience of living in a culture that talks like "standard" Americans.

Boiarsky (1969) found that the Appalachian dialect, as compared with standard American English, is associated with spelling performance. In her research, conducted in rural West Virginia and Philadelphia, she found that the Appalachian students of West Virginia manifested pronunciation deviations by reversing long and short vowels. The Appalachian students also had a greater percentage of spelling errors, which reflected pronunciation deviations of the Appalachian dialect speaking student. Boiarsky also makes the statement that "the pronunciation and vocabulary of certain words by Appalachian residents differs so markedly from that of standard English that the mountain man often has difficulty understanding those outside his community" (p. 348).

Skinner (1967) recommends that programs must be introduced to Appalachian children which would permit them to acquire the standard English language system. He acknowledges the fact that, indeed, they are introduced to standard English, but argues that this introduction is at a critically wrong point. "We cannot continue to demand that they demonstrate facility at the reading readiness stage until they have had the opportunity to develop facility in the oral stage first" (p. 33). He advocates that pre-school oral language programs should

be introduced based on standard American English so that "the Appalachian child has a fighting chance when introduced to the printed word in the first grade" (p. 33).

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 20 seventh grade students, ranging in ages 12-3 to 13-2. Ten subjects were members of three-generation family households and ten subjects were members of two-generation family households. They were selected from eight seventh-grade classes at the Johnson County Middle School in Mountain City, Tennessee.

Method of Subject Selection

A questionnaire was circulated in each seventh grade homeroom in which each student was asked to provide information about the number of people living in the household and the relationship of each of these people to the student respondent. A review of the questionnaire provided the examiner with the names of potential subjects and information as to whether they were members of three- or two-generation family households. After reviewing the questionnaire, 22 subjects were determined to be members of three-generation family households and 140 responded that they were members of two-generation households. The ten three-generation subjects used in the study were randomly chosen from the list of 22 potential subjects after meeting the following qualifications. (1) Subject qualified for

free school lunch based on total family income, (2) subject is a lifetime resident of Johnson County, Tennessee, (3) grandparent and parents in the subjects household are also lifetime residents of Johnson County, Tennessee, and (4) subject is a regular academic student at JCMS and is not enrolled in any special education program. The ten two-generation subjects were also randomly chosen using the same criteria, with the exception that grandparents were not members of the family household. All subjects had working televisions in their home.

Testing

A 25 item test designed to measure the subjects knowledge of Appalachian Mountain dialect was developed. The dialect test was presented to each subject in order to test the hypothesis stated in this study. Each item consisted of a stimulus item and four distractor items. The words were taken from an unpublished list of words collected by Minnie M. Miller, lifetime educator, in Johnson County, Tennessee. The list of dialect words, according to Ms. Miller, consisted of words and phrases common to the language used in Johnson County and East Tennessee. A copy of the dialect test and test key appear as Appendix A on page 49 of this manuscript.

Method

The author conducted all testing and interviews for subject selection, and made all observations involved in the generation and completion of this study. Two meetings were held at the family residence of each subject. The first contact consisted of setting up an

appointment for testing and informal observation of parents and grandparents dialect usage. The families were told at the time of the initial contact that the examiner was conducting educational research, the results of which would be shared with the Johnson County Board of Education. The second and last family contact consisted of testing the subjects. In order to control for the reading skill variability of each subject, the test items were read to the subject by the examiner. The subjects then verbally responded with their answer. A discussion time followed the testing during which the examiner and family members discussed the testing and other issues in general conversation. The families were asked to withhold all discussion of the testing until all subjects were tested. Each subject was given a number for confidentiality and computer scoring purposes. Permission was granted to the author by the Johnson County Board of Education to do this study providing that total confidentiality was exercised in carrying out the research within the family homes.

Data Analysis

The data were treated independently using a two-tailed t-test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the mean score of the three-generation group and the two-generation group at the .05 level of significance.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a statistically significant difference in the dialect usage of children who live in two-generation and three-generation households on a dialect test. Information relative to the dialect test and test results appear in Appendices B-E. These include the individual subjects performance on the dialect test, the subjects raw score range, mean score, median, mode, analysis of error scores, and an item analysis providing information of the percentage of subjects to pass each of the 25 items on the dialect test. The mean scores, standard deviation and standard error scores for the two groups appear in Table 1. The mean scores are the average scores of the two groups. The standard error provides an index of how much the sample means vary about the population means. Thus, it provides information about the amount of error likely to be made by inferring the value of the population mean from a sample mean. Standard deviation is an index of the variability or spread of scores about the mean distribution. The greater the spread of scores, the greater the standard deviation (Shavelson, 1981).

Table 1

Mean Scores, Standard Deviation and Standard Scores for the Two Groups

Groups	Number of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
two-generation	10	18.80	2.573	0.814
three-generation	10	18.60	2.319	0.733

Analysis of Data

To test the null hypothesis, that there is no significant difference in dialect usage between children living in two-generation and three-generation family households, a t-test was used at the .05 level of significance. Best (1977) indicated that if significance of the difference exceeds the .05 level, the researcher may conclude that chance fluctuations in the estimate will account for such a difference in as many as five out of 100 cases. The t-value of the mean scores of the data collected in this study was .857. Therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected using this particular population and this particular measure of dialect. For even the novice statistician, it is evident that the respective mean scores for the two groups were extremely close: two-generation $\bar{X}$=18.80; three-generation $\bar{X}$=18.60.

The author's initial hypothesis, even though supported in the literature, concerning the theory of language acquisition upon which the study was predicted was unacceptable on the basis of the data derived for this particular population.

Several other factors were examined to determine if there were any other differences in the subjects' performance even though they

were not addressed in the original hypothesis. These factors are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Score Comparisons on Dialect Test*

Groups		Mean Score
Factor (1)	Male mean score	78.90
	Female mean score	78.44
Factor (2)	Two-generation male mean score	79.20
	Two-generation female mean score	71.20
Factor (3)	Three-generation male mean score	75.50
	Three-generation female mean score	75.30
Factor (4)	Grandfather present in three-generation family, Sub. mean	76.00
	Grandmother present in three-generation family, Sub. mean	73.40
Factor (5)	Subject only child in family household, mean score	75.20
	Subject has other siblings in family household, mean	73.40

*The mean scores are presented in percentages correct on the basis of 100 total possible percentage points.

These mean scores do not provide any significant support to the general premise of the original hypothesis. These scores do support the t-test findings and the failure to reject the null hypothesis of this study. On the basis of the data derived from this study, we cannot make any generalizations about the dialect perpetuation in children of two- versus three-generation households, except that their mean scores were remarkably close in this study done in Johnson County, using this particular instrument and these particular subjects.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study and conclusions drawn from the data. Also, implications are made from the study based on the statistical analysis of the data, and recommendations for further research are given.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to compare the dialect usage of Appalachian Mountain children living in two-generation family households to those children of the same region living in three-generation family households.

The literature related to this subject was reviewed and reported under three headings: (1) literature related to the interpersonal factors related to communication development and style; (2) literature related to the description of Southern Mountain dialect; and (3) literature related to dialect interference and the implications for the poverty child including such sub-topics as, dialect deficit or different, the influence of environment, reading problems associated with dialect interference, language problems associated with dialect interference, problems attendant to speaking of Black English, and

the problems of the speaker of Appalachian English associated to dialect interference.

Two groups of Johnson County, Tennessee seventh graders constituted the subjects of this study. Ten subjects were members of two-generation family households and ten subjects were members of three-generation family households. Each subject was given a dialect test and the resulting data were subjected to a two-tailed t-test.

Conclusions

The mean scores of the two groups suggest that for this particular population, using this particular dialect test, no significant differences in dialect usage seem to exist between the two-generation versus the three-generation groups. The severe deviation of the Appalachian dialect from Standard American English was reported earlier in this study (Quazilbash, 1971). The results of this study that the perpetuation of this dialectical deviation occurs not only within families housing 'old timers,' but also in younger families which do not have the influence of older mountain-born and bred grandparents living in the family home.

Implications

The literature suggests that children who speak a nonstandard dialect will experience difficulties in the educational process, particularly in the areas of reading and language arts. The subjects in this study scored on the average approximately 78% correct on a dialect test consisting of what the author considered to be difficult, obscure, Appalachian dialect words. Given this consistent high score, it is evident that the dialect is being perpetuated within

this group of subjects. An educator must be able to determine if the dialect that is evident, as is exhibited with the subjects of this study, is interfering with the educational process, and if so, where the breakdown occurs, and thus be able to prescribe teaching methods to help the student overcome the educational obstacle.

Recommendations

Several recommendations for further study in the dialect areas can be made. The following are recommendations for future research.

The author recommends a follow-up study to determine if the educational levels of the parents and grandparents in the family household have an influence on their children's dialect usage.

A study which would compare the educational achievement of subjects in the areas of reading and/or language arts to the subjects' dialect deviation is also recommended.

The role of the perceptual aspect of auditory memory and retrieval on a verbally presented test, such as the format of the dialect test used in this study, would also provide useful information. Researchers might possibly gain insight into the child's ability to deal perceptually with auditory test stimuli when presented in this fashion.

Closing Remarks

Appalachian children are unique individuals. They have a language and culture that is respected by those who have taken the time to study them. The author has a compelling wish to preserve the beauty of the dialect which is spoken in the Appalachian Mountains,

while at the same time, provide an educational milieu in which the dialect is not inhibitory to learning effectively the vital tasks of reading, writing and general verbal communication. It is hoped that this study has presented pertinent information to the reader while expressing an attitude of care, love, and concern for the children of Appalachia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adlam, D. Code in context. In V. Lee (Ed.), Language Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1979.

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

Baratz, J. Language in the economically disadvantaged child: A perspective. ASHA, April 1968, 10, 143-145.

Bernstein, B. A sociolinguistic approach to socialization: With some reference to educability. In J. Gumpenz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Bernstein, B. Elaborated and restricted codes: Their social origins and some consequences. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66(2), 346-353.

Best, J. Research in education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Boiarsky, C. Consistency of spelling and pronunciation deviations of Appalachian students. Modern Language Journal, May 1969, 53, 357-360.

Broen, P. The verbal environment of the language-learning child. American Speech and Hearing Association Monograph No. 17, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Bruner, J. From communication to language. In V. Lee (Ed.), Language Learning. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Burke, C. & Goodman, Y. Do they read what they speak? Grade Teacher. March 1969, 86, 144-150.

Burling, R. Talking to teachers about social dialects. Language Learning, 1971, 21(2), 221-234.

Chomsky, N. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Boston: MIT Press, 1965.

Coleman, W. Mountain dialect in north Georgia. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1936.

Dale, P. Language development, structure and function. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

deVilliers, J. & deVilliers, P. Language acquisition. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Deutsch, M. The role of social class in language development and cognition. American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, 1965, 35, 24-25.

Deutsch, M. Communication of information in the elementary school classroom. Cooperative Research Project No. 908. New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, Dept. of Psychiatry, New York Medical College, 1964.

Dial, W. The dialect of the Appalachian people. In D. Mielke (Ed.), Teaching Mountain Children. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium Press, 1978.

Dilliard, J. Black English. New York: Random House, 1972.

Dunn, C. The characteristics and the measured language arts abilities of deprived youth in the school desegregation institute. Elementary English, March 1969, 46(3), 266-273.

Elaradao, R., Bradley, R. & Caldwell, B. A longitudinal study of the relation of infants home environments to language development at age three. Child Development, 1977, 48, 595-603.

Fasold, R. Orthography in reading materials for Black English speaking children. In J. Baratz & R. Suhy (Eds.), Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Fusiler, F. Speech and language characteristics of Appalachian children. Appalachian Medicine, Fall 1971, 3, 88-89.

Gussow, J. Language development in disadvantaged children. Information Retrieval Center of the Disadvantaged Bulletin. New York: Yeshiva University, 1, 1965.

Hopper, R. & Naremore, R. Children's speech. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Hutchinson, J. Reading tests and non-standard language. Reading Teacher, 1972, 25, 430-437.

Hymes, D. On communicative competence. In V. Lee (Ed.), Language Learning. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Jensen, A. Social class and verbal learning. In M. Deutsch, I. Katz, and A. Jensen (Eds.), Social Class Race, and Psychological Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

John, V., & Goldstein, L. The social context of language acquisition. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior Development, 1964, 10, 265-275.

Kephart, H. Our southern highlands. New York: Macmillan Company, 1922.

Labov, W. Some sources of reading problems for Negro speakers of nonstandard English. In J. Baratz and R. Suhy (Eds.), Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Lee, V. Language development. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Loban, W. Problems in oral English. NCTE, 1967.

Mays, L. Black children's perception of the use of their dialect. San Francisco, California: R. and E. Research Associates, Inc., 1977.

McDavid, R. Dialect of the Appalachian people. In D. Mielke (Ed.), Teaching Mountain Children. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium, 1978.

Miller, M. Personal Communication, 1982.

Naremore, R. Language variation in a multicultural society. In Hixon, Shriberg, & Saxmon (Eds.), Introduction to Communication Disorders. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

Quazilbash, H. A dialect survey of the Appalachian region. Final Report. Morehead, KY, Morehead State University: Appalachian Adult Basic Education Demonstration Center, 1971.

Raph, J. Language characteristics of the culturally disadvantaged child: Review and implications. Review of Educational Research, 1965, 35, 373-400.

Rees, N. Learning to talk and understand. In Hixon, Shriberg, & Saxmon (Eds.), Introduction to Communication Disorders. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1980.

Sapir, E. Language defined. In Gleeson, P. & Wakefield, N. Language and Culture: A Reader. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.

Sarbin, J. The culture of poverty, social identity, and cognitive outcomes. In V. Allen (Ed.), Psychological Factors in Poverty. Chicago, Illinois: Markham, 1970.

Shavelson, R. Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1981.

Skinner, V. Literary problem in Appalachia. Education Digest, 1967, 33, 32-33.

Suhy, R. Discovering American dialects. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

Templin, M. Certain language skills in children. Institute of Child Welfare Monograph Series Number 26. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.

Thomas, D. Oral language sentence structure and vocabulary of kindergarten children living in low socioeconomic urban areas. Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 23(3), 1014.

Venezky, R. Nonstandard language and reading. Elementary English, 1970, 47, 334-345.

Weininger, O. Learning language is a family affair. Education, 1981, 102(2), 102-105.

Wells, G. Variation in child language. In T. Lee (Ed.), Language Development. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1979.

Williams, C. Mountain speech. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian State University, 1964.

Williams, C. Mountain life and work. Boone, N.C.: Appalachian Consortium, Fall 1961, 7-10.

Williams, F. Language and poverty. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Wolfram, W., & Christian, D. Appalachian speech. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1976.

Wolfram. W. & Fasold, R. The study of social dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1974.

Wood, B. Verbal and nonverbal language development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Wright, E. Rustic speech and folklore. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Zacharius, J. Innovative and experimentive education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1964.

APPENDIX A

Dialect Test

Dialect Test

1. abide
   a. follow
   b. tolerate
   c. marry
   d. give

2. beal
   a. to cry out in pain
   b. to sing
   c. to load hay
   d. to fester

3. bedevil
   a. to gossip
   b. to do evil
   c. to use swear words
   d. to worry or tease

4. complected
   a. different
   b. color of skin
   c. to consider, think about
   d. to worry about danger

5. coon
   a. sing a love song
   b. climb or crawl
   c. nickname for a dog
   d. cry

6. deadening
   a. area where timber has died
   b. cemetery
   c. loud noise
   d. scene of fatal accident

7. dip
   a. disinfect
   b. method of topping tobacco
   c. to use snuff
   d. unpopular person

8. favor
   a. want
   b. marry
   c. give birth
   d. resemble, look like

9. gip
   a. child
   b. small vegetable
   c. female dog
   d. rodent

10. mizzling
    a. moving away
    b. snooping
    c. walking too slow
    d. drizzle

11. job
    a. to stab
    b. to dig
    c. to gather sticks
    d. preach

12. let on
    a. give away secret
    b. pretend
    c. hire
    d. invite inside

13. lick
    a. molasses
    b. large spoon
    c. lightning
    d. button

14. mess
    a. a meeting
    b. general store
    c. post office
    d. many, alot

15. opine
    a. to use drugs
    b. need
    c. judge or consider
    d. carefree

16. plunder
    a. wonder
    b. lightning
    c. gossip
    d. household effects

17. poke
    a. bucket
    b. box
    c. bag
    d. bowl

18. poppet
    a. doll
    b. flower
    c. muffin
    d. child

19. ruction
    a. terrible blizzard
    b. auction
    c. fight
    d. church service

20. sangin'
    a. digging ginseng
    b. using a net to catch fish
    c. telling a lie
    d. snowing, very lightly

21. slick
    a. rhododendron thicket
    b. clear spot in garden
    c. sticky gum from tobacco
    d. insect bite

22. long sweetening
    a. syrup, molasses
    b. sugar
    c. honey
    d. apple butter

23. wax
    a. grease
    b. chewing gum
    c. linseed oil
    d. rosen

24. woods colt
    a. mean horse
    b. spook, ghost
    c. illegitimate child
    d. wild pig

25. snake feeder
    a. grasshopper
    b. spider
    c. woolly worm
    d. dragonfly

Answer Key

1. b; 2. d; 3. d; 4. b; 5. b; 6. a; 7. c; 8. d; 9. c; 10. d; 11. a;

12. b; 13. a; 14. d; 15. c; 16. d; 17. c; 18. a; 19. c; 20.a; 21. a;

22. a; 23. b; 24. c; 25. d.

APPENDIX B

Individual Subjects Percentage Correct on Dialect Test

Individual Subjects Percentage Correct on Dialect Test

Two-generation Subjects

Student Number	Percentage Score
1	80
2	84
3	76
4	68
5	56
6	80
7	84
8	60
9	84
10	80

Three-generation Subjects

Student Number	Percentage Score
11	84
12	76
13	60
14	84
15	60
16	76
17	64
18	88
19	68
20	76

APPENDIX C

Raw Score Range, Mean Score, Median, Mode

Raw Score Range, Mean Score, Median, Mode

Raw Score Range	14-22
Mean Score	18.700
Median	19.0
Mode	21

APPENDIX D

Error Scores

Error Scores

Two-generation Families

Child #		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Item	1			x	x	x	x	x			
	2				x	x			x		
	3								x		
	4				x						
	5	x	x	x		x			x		
	6			x			x		x		
	7	x		x	x	x					
	8										
	9		x			x			x		x
	10										
	11										
	12				x						x
	13										
	14						x				
	15		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	16								x		
	17	x			x	x					
	18						x		x	x	x
	19									x	
	20	x									
	21					x				x	
	22										
	23			x		x			x		
	24		x	x	x	x		x	x		x
	25							x			

x = error

Error Scores

Three-generation Families

Child #		11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Item	1			x	x			x		x	
	2			x				x			
	3			x							
	4		x								
	5		x		x	x	x				
	6							x			
	7										
	8			x							
	9	x		x						x	
	10	x	x				x				
	11			x		x					x
	12		x	x			x	x		x	
	13										x
	14					x					
	15	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
	16									x	
	17									x	
	18		x	x				x			
	19								x		x
	20										x
	21	x				x	x	x			
	22				x	x					
	23		x			x		x			
	24			x		x	x	x	x	x	
	25									x	

x = error

APPENDIX E

Item Analysis

Item Analysis

Item	Percentage of Subjects to Pass
1	.55
2	.75
3	.90
4	.85
5	.55
6	.80
7	.80
8	.95
9	.65
10	.85
11	.80
12	.65
13	.95
14	.90
15	.10
16	.90
17	.80
18	.65
19	.85
20	.90
21	.70
22	.90
23	.70
24	.35
25	.90

VITA

Joyce Grey English was born in Hamlet, North Carolina and raised in Rockingham, North Carolina. She attended schools in that city and was graduated from Rockingham High School in 1970. The following September she entered Appalachian State University, and in May 1976 she received a Bachelor of Science degree, Cum Laude, in Speech and Language Pathology. After completion of the undergraduate degree, Ms. English began a teaching career as a public school speech and language specialist. Her career began in 1976 in Conway, South Carolina, where she spent one year serving the Green Sea-Floyds area schools. She returned in 1977 to the Blue Ridge Mountains of western North Carolina to teach in Mountain City, Tennessee, and pursue a master's degree in Speech and Language Pathology at Appalachian State University. This degree was granted in August, 1982.