THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A UNIT OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH DEALING WITH NEWFOUNDLAND DIALECT AND STANDARD ENGLISH

VARRICK COOPER

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A UNIT OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH DEALING WITH NEWFOUNDLAND DIALECT AND STANDARD ENGLISH

by

© Varrick Cooper

An Internship Report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Memorial University of Newfoundland

January 1982

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this internship was to develop and evaluate a unit of curriculum and instruction for senior high school English students in Newfoundland.

The unit, entitled Two Varieties of English, analyzes the vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar of both Newfoundland dialect and standard English and the way each has developed. Objective 1 of the unit, therefore, was to give the students who studied the unit, a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island, an understanding of the history and structure of Newfoundland dialect and standard English. The degree to which this objective was attained was determined by the administering of a post-unit quiz.

Two Varieties of English also deals with both popular and learned attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. The unit agrees with the linguists who have studied the two varieties of English that Newfoundland dialect is a legitimate, effective means of communication for certain purposes, audiences, and settings. At the same time, it recognizes the necessary role that standard English has as the accepted uniform means of communication in the larger community of divergent linguistic practice where dialectal variations would impede communication. It acknowledges the barriers to economic and social advancement that are erected if one fails to use standard English in certain kinds of communication situations. The unit advises that it is

neither necessary to accept these barriers nor to reject the language of one's family, friends, and community. The unit proposes as the solution to this dilemma bidialectalism, the use of Newfoundland dialect or standard English depending on which is more suitable for a particular communication situation.

Objective 2 of the unit, therefore, was to promote rational attitudes toward Newfoundland dialect and standard English. The degree to which this objective was achieved was determined by comparing the results of a pre-test and post-test of students' attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. The same Likert-type instrument was used for both the pre-test and post-test. It consisted of twenty-five statements each of which expressed an opinion about Newfoundland dialect or standard English or both.

Data as generated would appear to support the following conclusions:

1. Objective 1 was achieved to a high degree.
2. Objective 2 was achieved to a fairly high degree.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. F. Wolfe, supervisor of this internship, for his assistance, encouragement, and advice, and Dr. B. Brett and Dr. L. Brown for initial encouragement when the idea for the internship was first suggested.

The cooperation of Mr. Richard Croucher, Principal of Coaker Academy, New World Island, and the Grade Eleven class made possible the field work necessary to the internship.

Finally I wish to express my gratitude to my wife Margie for her patience and encouragement while the internship was being prepared.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

THE INTERNSHIP

Purpose of the Internship

The purpose of this internship was to develop and evaluate a unit of curriculum and instruction for senior high school English students in Newfoundland.

The unit, entitled Two Varieties of English, analyzes the vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar of Newfoundland dialect and standard English and the way each has developed. One objective of the unit, therefore, was to give students an understanding of the structure and history of both Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Attitudes to the two variables of English, and the reasons for these attitudes, were also examined. The unit deals with the way in which each variety is perceived by the layman as well as by more serious students of language whose areas of interest include Newfoundland dialect as well as standard English. Despite the more popular notion that Newfoundland dialect is inferior to standard English, the unit reflects the view that our dialect is a legitimate, effective means of communication for certain kinds of purposes, audiences, and settings. It fully accepts the way in which a person's language, whether it be standard or nonstandard, is closely tied to one's identity or sense of belonging to a group. At the same time, it recognizes the essential role that standard English has as the accepted uniform means of

communication in the larger community of divergent linguistic practice where dialectal variations would impede communication. It acknowledges the barriers to economic and social advancement that are erected if one fails to use standard English in certain kinds of communication situations. The unit advises that it is neither necessary to accept these barriers nor to reject the language of one's family, friends and community. It proposes instead as the solution to this dilemma "bidialectalism" - the use of one variety of English or the other depending on which is more suitable for a particular communication situation.

Through such an approach, the objective was to encourage students to adopt more positive and rational attitudes toward standard English and Newfoundland dialect; to have students recognize that both varieties of English are effective linguistic systems, but at the same time realize that partly because of the necessity of a standard version of English, and also because of widespread negative attitudes toward Newfoundland dialect, it is wise for a speaker of Newfoundland dialect to learn to speak standard English and to use it where it is more suitable than the nonstandard dialect. Speakers who fail to do so will be handicapped by an inability to communicate effectively in certain settings, by the discrimination directed against them because of their nonstandard dialect, or by both.

The unit was taught by the intern to a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island. The

success of the unit in achieving its objectives was evaluated through the use of a post-unit quiz, and a pre-test and post-test of students' attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Background Information on Newfoundland Dialect

For many years, visitors to our shores, whether learned or casual observers of language, have noticed that Newfoundland dialect is distinct from other regional dialects of North America. Patterson (1895) reports:

> In recently visiting Newfoundland, I had not more than begun to associate with her people till I observed them using English words in a sense different from what I had ever heard elsewhere. (p. 27)

Tomkinson (1940), referring to Newfoundland as "a Paradise for collectors", comments that "a collector of something as intangible as words and atmosphere is also in his element there (p. 60)." Such impressions have been shown to be valid by more systematic investigation of the local language. Scargill and Warkentyne (1972), reporting the results of a survey of Canadian English, remark:

> Several clear-cut regional differences emerge from the Survey. If one were to draw lines (isoglosses) on a map to note these differences as dialectologists do, the largest number of isoglosses could be drawn between Newfoundland and the rest of Canada. (p. 104)

Story (1957b, 1958) suggests that Newfoundland is a linguistic enclave because of historical and geographical factors. The first settlers in Newfoundland emigrated mainly from Great Britain, especially the southwest counties and

Ireland, beginning in the late sixteenth century. The result was "the transplanting of English dialects of a period unusually early as Canadian communities go (Story, 1957b, p. 5)." This has meant that, even today, one can find many similarities, especially in vocabulary, between the popular speech of Newfoundland and Elizabethan English. Tomkinson (1940) says: "Possibly no place is left in the world which remembers so many Elizabethan words (p. 64)." Some examples are dout (to extinguish a fire) and firk (to bustle about) from Shakespeare, and empt (empty) from Chaucer. Jordan (1967) traces many Newfoundland words to Gaelic sources, including angashore (a worthless fellow) and streel (an untidy person). Liles (1972) says that linguistic conservatism in a colony of the mother country is quite understandable as "limited communication would block the spread of some changes [to the colony] (p. 292)."

Tomkinson (1940) points out that it is a geographical factor, Newfoundland's isolated position, which is "the chief reason why she has been able to preserve so many vigorous words which the language has lost elsewhere, and to keep her speech distinctive (p. 69)." Story (1958) concurs, stating that "it is chiefly to geographical isolation, rather than the transplanting of Elizabethan English in the late 16th century, that the unusual features are to be attributed (p. 321)." Because there was infrequent contact with other people, the language was not modified appreciably by a standard language,

allowing words which had become obsolete elsewhere to remain as part of the language in Newfoundland.

This separation from a spoken and written standard English also contributed to the development of another group of words in the Newfoundland vocabulary, corruptions of words in the standard language (Story, 1957a). Examples are upstrapless (obstreperous), flatform (platform), and braffus (breakfast). These forms developed because Newfoundland's culture was primarily oral (Brown, 1976). The speaker had no visual image to guide him and often created a new word which embraced familiar forms, in order that the word 'make sense'. In some cases at least, the corruption does seem to be more obviously related (by form) to meaning than the standard word. Brown (1976) points out that upstrapless "naturally creates the impression of disorder and lack of restraint (p. 2)."

New coinages also make up a large part of the Newfoundland vocabulary. Linguistic inventiveness is most evident in the activities in which Newfoundlanders have traditionally been engaged (Story, 1957b, 1958). From the fisheries, we have such inventions as collar (to moor a small boat) and puddick (codfish stomach); from the annual seal-hunt, such words as swatch (a patch of open water in an icefield) and scunner (the man who directs the sealing vessel from the barrel). Newfoundlanders have also coined many words to describe the natural world around them, such as ballycatters (ice formed on seashore), glitter (silver

thaw), cronnic (stunted, or dead, fir or spruce). Story (1958) concludes: "while the vocabulary of Newfoundland is drawn from every conceivable field, it is particularly rich in terms dealing with the practical affairs of life on the island (p. 322)."

Another feature of the vocabulary is the words which have taken on additional meanings or altered meanings since their arrival in Newfoundland. Patterson (1895) refers to words "in strange use to me, or used in peculiar senses (p. 27)." He lists in this category such words as lodge (to place or put, as in 'Lodge it on the shelf'); clever (large and handsome, may refer to people, animals or inanimate things); and civil (calm). Story (1958) mentions car (sled for hauling wood) and lead (a passage of open water in an icefield) as words that have taken on additional meanings.

The linguistic conservatism and inventiveness which are evident in the Newfoundland vocabulary are characteristic also of the pronunciation and grammar of Newfoundland. Story (1958) says:

> In both sounds and syntax it is apparent that local usage reflects the twin interests of Newfoundland English: its mixture of linguistic conservatism, . . . and linguistic development of an untutored, popular language. (p. 322)

In pronunciation, one can find examples of survivals from the earlier dialects of the mother country. Var (fir) illustrates a sound change from f to v which has been preserved in Newfoundland (Story, 1957a). Paddock (1975)

mentions the failure of many Newfoundlanders to distinguish between such words as boy - bye, tie - toy, and speak - break and shows, by examining the rhymes of Alexander Pope and Jonathan Swift, that this phenomenon was acceptable in standard English in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Grammatical features of earlier dialects are often retained as well. Multiple negatives and superlatives to indicate emphasis are common to Chaucer, Shakespeare ('most unkindest cut of all') and to the folk speech of Newfoundland (Paddock, 1975). The use of don't with third person singular subjects "occurred at least a century earlier than doesn't and was frequent in cultivated speech throughout the nineteenth century and was not uncommon in the early 1900's (Pyles and Algeo, 1970, p. 23)."

Because the Newfoundland dialect was isolated from standard varieties, it was free, as Story (1957a) says, to

> live and change and develop free from the conditions and restrictions which are imposed on any standard, written language, with its received vocabulary neatly packaged in dictionaries and its obligatory grammar codified in books. (p. 16)

As a result, Newfoundland grammar has changed and in some ways become more systematic and economical than standard English grammar. Paddock (1975) states, "Linguists often find that more isolated dialects of a language are more regular in their structure than is any standard variety of the language (p. 2)." He cites an example:

> The contrast in form between past tense and past participle (as in gave - given, ate - eaten and sang - sung) was disappearing rapidly by the eighteenth century.... Our forefathers in Newfoundland, out of reach of the linguistic tyrants in the schools, continued a natural development of the English language and chose one form to represent both the above grammatical functions in almost all verbs. Also, their use of -s with a simpler meaning (that is, present tense only instead of present tense third person singular) enabled them to achieve further regularities and economies in the grammar of the verb. The result is that certain Newfoundland dialects use only three forms (e.g., give, gives, givin') to make all the semantic distinctions which require five forms (e.g., give, gives, gave, given, giving) in standard English. (p. 2)

Pronunciations that have developed in Newfoundland also fall into "regular and recurrent patterns (Story, 1957a, p. 17)." The sound represented by the spelling th may be voiced, ð , or voiceless, θ . Many Newfoundlanders regularly pronounce /ð/ as /d/ and /θ/ as /t/. Thus, thy becomes 'dy', and thigh, 'tigh'. This amounts to a 'sound law' and is not a series of arbitrary violations of the standard. By in Newfoundland is pronounced as 'by' or as 'be'. To analyze local speech is to see that 'by' is used in stressed position and 'be' in unstressed position, as in 'I was be the fence when she walked 'by'.

In summary, Newfoundland vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar can largely be explained by two general characteristics outlined by Story (1958): they "have retained many features of the points of origin, but they also have developed and changed strikingly in their localities (p. 321)."

Who speaks the Newfoundland dialect? Actually, there is no single, fixed dialect for all of Newfoundland. Story (1958) says:

> Newfoundland English consists of many varieties of speech, ranging from several distinct dialects and regional modifications to a varying 'standard' English which is like neither that of the Mother Country nor of Eastern North America, though having points of resemblance with both. (p. 321)

Earlier, he proposed that "there is probably a greater variety of speech in Newfoundland than in any other English-speaking region of Canada (1957a, p. 16)." Patterson (1897) says:

> The variation in speech of the people of the south or the west is such that a person from one of these quarters will sometimes laugh at the words or phrases used by people in the other. (p. 213)

Drysdale (1959) attributes this variety to the natural conservatism of emigrant populations, the different places of origin of the settlers, and the isolation from each other of many of the fishing communities along the coast. Story (1977) feels that this last factor mentioned by Drysdale is often overestimated.

> It seems clear that the conventional picture of the Newfoundland settlements of former days as existing in virtual isolation not only from the outside world but from one another must, on the linguistic evidence, be substantially modified. The shared experiences of life (the sealhunt, the Labrador and Bank fisheries, the woods industry) has, at least during the past century, exerted a generalizing influence on the dialect which originally, and in some places, may have been distinct. For this shared experience insured that certain terms became widely known and employed, it diffused stories, sayings, ordinary idioms, grammatical forms, and possibly . . . even phonetic qualities throughout large parts of the coast, and sometimes throughout the whole country. (p. 78)

However, referring to recent investigations of Newfoundland speech, Story says that distinct dialect areas in Newfoundland still exist.

In spite of the linguistic diversity within the Province, it is possible to consider the different dialects collectively. Story (1977) speaks of a "distinct regional language, some elements of which are found on the lips of all Newfoundlanders born and bred on the Island and in Labrador (p. 74)." Consequently, 'Newfoundland dialect' or 'Newfoundland English' is a composite term embracing speech traits exhibited with varying frequency by Newfoundlanders generally, "regardless of their education, occupation or geographical location (Story, 1957a, p. 16)." Regarding this last point, England (1925) writes:

> One does not have to talk long with even the best-educated Newfoundlander to discover his nationality. Though such Newfoundlanders will often deny that such dialects exist, the very words they use in their denial will sometimes betray them . . . in many a poignant and entertaining turn of speech, their race will stand revealed. (p. 323)

The passing of time has seen increased standardization of Newfoundland popular speech, although perhaps not as much as might have once been expected. Story (1956) refers to "the rapidity with which Newfoundland speech . . . [has] been changing under pressure of the events beginning with the Second World War and culminating in Confederation with Canada (p. 2)." However, in 1977 he writes:

> Centralization of population, the growth of regional schools, the impact of radio and television, are all having, it appears, a levelling effect on the dialects. Yet the direction of change is not altogether what might have been expected two or three decades ago. The coming of the American wartime bases, and Confederation itself, far from opening local speech from widespread modification from North American English, seem to have had, so far, only a superficial linguistic effect. Isolated words and phrases have come into use from this outside context, but the native sinew of the language has remained indigenous. (p. 79)

Thus, in spite of the changes that have taken place, it is probably true to say that the pecularities of Newfoundland speech can still be encountered at all social and economic levels although, of course, they will be observed more commonly among the uneducated and in rural areas. Standardization is occurring very gradually; there still exists a distinctive regional speech.

Justification of Internship

To the intern's knowledge, no study attempting to develop and evaluate a unit of curriculum and instruction on Newfoundland dialect and standard English has ever before been undertaken.

Two Varieties of English will help meet the need for more Newfoundland material in the school curriculum. The increasing use of Newfoundland novels and anthologies in the high school English programme in recent years is evidence of the growing interest being shown by local educators in acquiring curriculum materials which reflect our distinctive

culture and way of life. At the present time, Newfoundland students have an adequate opportunity to gain an appreciation of local literature, but because of the unavailability of suitable curriculum materials, do not have an opportunity to develop an appreciation of our language. This language is an important aspect of our culture, for in no way are we more distinctive culturally from the rest of Canada than in the way we speak. The unit of study developed in this internship will be available to interested teachers through the Memorial University of Newfoundland, Faculty of Education Resources Clearinghouse, and so will help to meet the need for materials through which students can engage in systematic study of a significant aspect of their culture.

Brown (1976) agrees that our dialect is an integral part of our culture and is worthy of study:

> Because language is the expression of one's culture, determining largely the way we look at the world, a study of Newfoundland dialect would provide an excellent introduction to the life of the Newfoundland people. (p. 3)

Story (1977) says that "[the] store of word, phrase, and proverb [in Newfoundland dialect] serves as a revealing and vivid index to the experience of life on this Island and Labrador (p. 77)." This being so, the unit may be suitable for Newfoundland Culture 1200, a new social studies course in the reorganized high school programme.

In addition, Two Varieties of English may also prove to be suitable for Language Study 3104, which will deal with such topics as regional and social dialects, culture and

language, and the principles of growth within a language. With whatever course this unit may be used, the understanding that students will gain of the structure of language, its flexibility, its regional and social variations, and the way that it operates in practice should lead them to think rationally about standard English and Newfoundland dialect and the use of those forms of English in daily life. For example, the information presented in the student text (and reinforced in the supplementary exercises and activities, many of which are discovery- and inquiry-oriented) should demonstrate that the language of the students is a legitimate, effective system of communication with a respectable, expressive vocabulary and a system governing its pronunciation and grammar similar to that underlying the grammar and punctuation of standard English. The presentation of this point of view should encourage the attitude that Newfoundland dialect is not an inferior form of English, but a <u>different</u> form appropriate for communication with family, friends, and other speakers of the dialect. Studying the Newfoundland dialect as a legitimate and interesting variety of language may bolster the students' self-esteem, for their dialect is closely tied to his family and social class. It may also increase the learning of literacy skills because any existing antagonism to standard English may be lessened when students understand that it is possible to use this variety without abandoning the language with which they are most comfortable.

The examination of attitudes toward Newfoundland dialect and standard English should help to develop an understanding of the importance of being able to use the standard variety of English as well as one's dialect; of being able to use appropriate forms of English in different language contexts. The intern believes that this is both a rational and practical approach for students to take in using Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Objectives of the Unit

The objectives of the unit were:

1. to give students an understanding of the history and structure of Newfoundland dialect and standard English.
2. to promote rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Limitation of the Internship

The internship was limited in that field testing of the unit was confined to a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island.

Assumptions of the Internship

1. Since the students who were taught the unit had up to this time not engaged in a systematic, sustained study of the history and structure of Newfoundland dialect

and standard English, the intern assumed that no pre-unit quiz was necessary, and that the post-unit quiz alone accurately revealed the extent to which Objective 1 had been met.

2. The intern assumed that the pre-test and post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English accurately evaluated the success of the unit in achieving Objective 2.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Standard and Nonstandard Dialects and Attitudes Toward Them

Each person's speech is distinctive (Malstrom, 1972). Although each child has a great capability for learning any language easily, he learns the language to which he is exposed, regardless of whether he is born of English, German or Russian parents. Furthermore, the child's linguistic experiences determine the exact form of the language which he will use. Liles (1972) says:

> Since no two children hear exactly the same sentences or necessarily draw the same linguistic conclusions about the ones they hear, there will be individual differences in vocabulary and in the rules of the grammar. (p. 285)

Each feature of a person's speech will be shared by other speakers, but no other single person will have all of the same linguistic idiosyncrasies - that is, the same combination. This distinctive combination of linguistic features is a person's idiolect.

A group of idiolects with a large number of common aspects is a dialect. There are two kinds of dialect, regional and social. Both kinds arise because of some kind of barrier to communication (Fasold and Wolfram, 1972). A physical barrier such as an ocean or a political boundary can separate people, limit communication and thus lead to the development of regional dialects. As Chapter I of this

internship explains, a physical barrier - the Atlantic Ocean - was one reason for the development of a distinctive set of dialects within Newfoundland. Social attitudes can limit relations among people from different social classes, races or religions and can help to create social dialects.

These barriers lead to the development of dialects in that they cause incomplete dissemination of changes in the language. Every language undergoes changes as time passes, but some of these changes do not spread uniformly to all speakers of the language, and this sets off the language of these speakers as distinctive. Liles (1972) says that "restricted communication is the most common reason why changes do not spread uniformly to all speakers of a language (p.287)."

Restricted communication is not, however, the only reason that changes fail to spread. Sometimes speakers consciously or unconsciously resist adopting changes because of their attitudes to the group of speakers who originated the change (Labov and others, 1968; Trudgill, 1974). On the other hand, a speaker may wish to emulate the speech of another group because he finds that group's lifestyles, goals and ambitions attractive and shares its values (Liles, 1972). Such a group is prestigious and the kind of language it uses is a prestige dialect. A dialect attains prestige because of the success - political, economic, social - of its users (Paddock, 1975). For example, in the fourteenth century, London developed into an important trading and commercial center. Furthermore, the center of government had been moved

to Westminster and no other city could compare socially or culturally. Hence, the dialect of upper-class Londoners became the prestige dialects for other parts of England (Malmstrom, 1972).

Trudgill (1974) points out that the term dialect is not "a particularly clear-cut or watertight concept (p. 15)." It is often impossible to state in linguistic terms where people stop speaking one dialect and begin speaking another. Trudgill explains that although dialects are often referred to "as if they were self-evident, discrete varieties with well-defined, obvious characteristics (p. 16)", the picture is often far more complex than this. As an example, he mentions that it would be very difficult to find a particular linguistic feature which is common to all varieties of Canadian English and not present in any variety of American English.

Bolinger (1975) says that it is often difficult to state when two varieties of language are dialects of the same language or two separate languages. He states that "there is really no satisfactory definition of language that will distinguish it from dialect (p. 345)."

Chomsky (1978) agrees:

> "Language" is no well-defined concept of linguistic science. In colloquial usage we say that German is one language and Dutch another, but some dialects of German are more similar to Dutch dialects than to other, more remote dialects of German. We say that Chinese is a language with many dialects and that French, Italian, and Spanish are different languages. But the diversity of the Chinese

> "dialects" is roughly comparable to that of the Romance languages. A linguist knowing nothing of political boundaries or institutions would not distinguish "language" and "dialect" as we do in normal discourse. (p. 3)

The layman often fails to appreciate such difficulties in using the term dialect. He often uses it to mean non-standard forms of a language only. The linguist, however, believes that everyone speaks a dialect or variety of a language. Trudgill (1974) says:

> Insofar as it [standard English] differs grammatically and lexically from other varieties of English, it is legitimate to consider it a dialect: the term dialect can be used to apply to all varieties, not just to nonstandard varieties. (p. 17)

Labov (1970) describes standard/nonstandard differences in terms of the frequency of occurrence of certain vocabulary, pronunciation and grammatical features.

The popular view is to see the differences between standard and non-standard speech not as the difference in frequency of certain usages or pronunciations, but as the difference between 'good' and 'bad' English. Popular attitudes toward dialects are rarely neutral, more often colored by emotion. Pyles and Algeo (1970) say:

> It is perhaps not strange that this should be so, since even the humblest of men, simply by virtue of being human, have language always with them. (p. 1)

There is a long history of intolerance for forms of speech different from one's own. The notions of 'linguistically pure' languages and 'linguistic degeneration', described by

Pyles and Algeo (1970) as furnishing "an interesting chapter in the history of human folly (p. 12)", continue to thrive. Walker, Paddock, Brown, and Baksh (1975) say, "nonstandard dialects are frequently perceived to be inferior varieties of language both by those who use them and those who do not (p. 4)."

Linguists, on the other hand, do not conceive of standard varieties as 'good' or 'correct' and of nonstandard varieties as 'bad' or 'incorrect'. They conceive of all dialects as legitimate, viable means of communication. Nonstandard dialects are seen as different from, not inferior to, standard varieties. This is not to say that linguists are unable or unwilling to recognize the differences in status of standard and nonstandard dialects. Trudgill (1974) summarizes these views:

> The scientific study of language has convinced most scholars that all languages, and correspondingly all dialects, are equally 'good' as linguistic systems. All varieties of a language are structured, complex, rule-governed systems which are wholly adequate for the needs of their speakers. It follows that value judgements concerning their correctness and purity of linguistic varieties are social rather than linguistic. There is nothing at all inherent in nonstandard varieties which makes them inferior. Any apparent inferiority is due only to their association with speakers from under-privileged, low-status groups. In other words, attitudes towards nonstandard dialects are attitudes which reflect the social structure of society. (p. 20)

Pyles (1972) says that the purist and prescriptivist believes that the attainment of 'good' English "involves only the consistent avoidance of certain proscribed constructions . . . and the consistent employment of certain prescribed

ones (p. 161)." It matters little whether the proscribed item occurs commonly in the usage of the best educated people or whether it is historically legitimate English. Pyles points out that folk speech, which is often criticized as 'bad' English, has often retained many characteristics of the earlier and presumably 'pure' English of Chaucer, Shakespeare and Milton, which the purists are supposedly trying to preserve.

Similarly, it is of no consequence to the layman that certain constructions in 'bad' English offer advantages expressively. Pyles and Algeo (1970) say:

> As for the double or multiple negative construction, we lost a useful device for emphasis when it was arbitrarily outlawed. The simple man who says "I ain't going to do nothing about it' has a distinct advantage over those of us who reject this emphatic construction. (p. 22)

As a nonstandard variety, Newfoundland dialect has been much maligned by the uninformed. Patterson (1895), one of the first to show an interest in the Newfoundland language, says:

> Persons laying claim to education have regarded them [peculiarities of Newfoundland speech] simply as vulgarisms, and have expressed surprise that I should have deemed them worthy of thoughtful investigation. (p. 37)

Story (1857b) believes that "a good deal of unintelligent prejudice exists, where it should not, against local speech (p. 9)."

Among those who have shown the most contempt for the popular speech of Newfoundland are educators. Brown (1976) refers to "the strong disapproval with which the popular Newfoundland language is received in our schools (p. 1)." He remarks:

> Some opinions expressed are: Newfoundland dialect is sloppy, made up of ignorant violations of standard English; it has faulty grammar; it is an inferior means of communication . . . not one of these adequately describes our language. (p. 1)

Paddock (1975) says:

> In our schools we force our children to abandon vernaculars which are often lovely, fluent and various for a lingua franca which is usually ugly, stilted and homogeneous. (p. 1)

Story (1957a) feels that the dialects of Newfoundland are "far from deserving the disapproval they receive (p. 17)." He regards the Newfoundland dialect as being "marked by a quite striking regularity and uniformity (p. 17)." More specifically, Story (1957a) and Brown (1976) offer a strong rebuttal to those who consider the archaisms and inventions in the Newfoundland vocabulary as not really words at all because they cannot be found in the desk dictionary. Story says:

> When we hear in popular speech words unknown to our dictionaries, the common attitude is not unlike that towards dialect pronunciation and grammar. They are not dictionary words; they are counterfeit currency. (p. 18)

Brown says that "it would be unfortunate for teachers to regard words peculiar to the language of the province as phony" because "dictionaries are only incomplete records of the words we use and not creators of them" and because "these words tell us a great deal about life in the province (p. 2)." Of the archaisms, he adds: "These are vigorous, colorful, pleasant-sounding words and standard language is poorer without them (p. 2)."

Brown (1976) argues that the new words "reveal our capacity for Creativity (p. 2)." He says that these words were invented because of the inadequacy of the words settlers brought with them to show new shades of meaning that were necessary "to describe what was important in the life of a Newfoundlander (p. 2)." He gives an example:

> It was important, for instance, for the Newfoundlander to make distinctions among different kinds of snow. Generally he did this by using modifiers to describe it (powdery, clammy, sandy, crusty) but if these could not adequately crystallize his experience, he invented a word. "Dwigh" is such a word, describing a light, gentle kind of falling snow as distinct from a snow storm, a snow fall, or a snow blizzard. (p. 2)

Story (1957a) says that "[The inventions] range over the whole field of Newfoundland life and embody the experience of living on the island in vivid and forceful terms (p. 19)." He believes that they demonstrate "that older capacity for word-creation which, in the standard language, has often seemed to be weakened by a magpie fondness for foreign derivatives (1957b, p. 6)." He further cautions the outsider against assuming that the Newfoundlander is unintelligent and advises him to consider the numerous terms which the Newfoundlander might use to call him a weakminded fool: gomeril, joskin, omadawn, omaloor, ownshook, scoopendike, scrumpshy.

Paddock (1975) defends the pronunciation in Newfoundland dialect and shows that in many ways it is more regular that that of the standard variety. He explains that in his own nonstandard dialect, such words as boot, food, good and

foot all have the same short vowel sound, whereas in standard varieties of English, there are "what seem like arbitrary vowel lengths for such words (p. 2)." (Standard English uses the tense vowel [u] in boot and food and the lax vowel [u] in good and foot.) Story (1957a) agrees with Paddock that Newfoundland dialect pronunciation is regular and systematic He says:

> In the absence of systematic analysis of the dialects, it is not yet possible to define exactly their phonology or sound systems; but enough is obvious to refute the notion that variation from standard English pronunciation is arbitrary. The local dialects have sound systems of their own, just as regular, just as uniform and just as 'correct' as that of standard English. (p. 17)

He points out that the dropping and adding of the initial [h] in local speech is often a means of indicating degrees of emphasis. One of Whalen's (1978) findings was that [h] occurred more frequently before stressed vowels (as in 'We shot the cow, not the ox.') than before unstressed vowels.

Story (1957a) also argues that the grammar of Newfoundland dialect has its own rules which are "frequently more logical than those of standard English (p. 18)." Newfoundland dialect, for example, still preserves the distinction between you and ye. Story (1957a) says:

> One of the advantages popular speech has over standard speech is its freedom from constricting rules and stereotyped usage. It can preserve from the past forms that are useful and it can create new forms at will on the analogy of the old. (p. 18)

Paddock (1974) points out that the -s ending on present tense verbs in standard English "is merely a redundant item which

agrees with third person singular subjects (p. 6)", whereas in Newfoundland dialect the -s ending is used for all subjects with present tense lexical verbs. Because the present tense auxiliary verb never takes the -s ending no matter what the subject, the -s ending in Newfoundland English is used for a definite purpose - to show the distinction between lexical and auxiliary verbs. Thus we would find 'I (he, she, you, we, they) does* a good job' when do is a lexical verb, and 'I (he, she, you, we, they) do like that job' when do is an auxiliary verb.

There is a consensus among linguists who have investigated local speech that the dialect is not an absurd collocation of arbitrary violations from standard English, but rather a systematic means of communication with a respectable vocabulary and system of pronunciation and grammar. Beyond that, the style of Newfoundland language has been praised. Brown (1976) says, "Something needs to be said about the character of the Newfoundland expression (p. 2)." He praises its vigor and action, exaggeration and unique comparisons, terseness and precision, and concrete imagery. Pointing to such examples as 'Ant nar marn'll kitch me in bead after 5 o'clock'; 'He's so big two men couldn't car his eye-balls on a han'bar'; and 'Me axe is so soft that I got to put un under me jacket, 'cause if he sees a var knot, pieces flies out of un like harnets', he says:

---

*This is often pronounced as [duz].

> There is no pretentious diction here; this is not the cliche-ridden, colorless speech we are used to from some educators, psychologists, and sociologists. It is the expression, not of the ego, interested more in expression than in communication, but as Northrop Frye puts it, of "genuine personality." George Orwell, in his discussion of Politics and the English Language, says that politicians, in their use of cliches and familiar phrases sound more like dummies than live human beings. The popular speech of Newfoundland, whatever else it may be, is the expression of live human beings, communicating their own feelings, ideas, peculiarities. (p. 3)

Story (1957a) makes much the same point when he says that an important function of popular language is to give the vigour, expressiveness, and freshness of a living tongue to standard language, whose "effective expression of human thought and feeling" is often overwhelmed by "an artificial, arbitrary conception of 'correctness' (p. 20)."

Other writers have also praised the style of Newfoundland language. Paddock (1975) refers to the "beauty, the structural elegance . . . of the local Newfoundland dialect (pp. 2-3)." England (1925) says that the archaisms in Newfoundland speech "lend it much of its charm; its force, dignity, and simplicity are refreshing in this world of modern slang and vulgarisms (p. 323)."

The Educational Implications of Linguistic Divergence

Given that the language of schools is standard English and the consensus that this might lead to certain difficulties for children who are speakers of a nonstandard variety, it is not surprising that in recent years a considerable amount of

attention has been focused on investigating the relationship between nonstandard dialect and the relative high failure rate of children who speak a nonstandard variety. Many linguists and educators believe that nonstandard dialect may interfere with the attainment of a primary goal of the school - literacy. Trudgill (1974) says:

> Not only do they [speakers of nonstandard English] have to learn the mechanics of reading and writing, they also have to learn standard English, since this is the variety that is normally used in writing. (p. 77)

The hypothesis that nonstandard dialect interferes with the development of reading skills results from a modern theory of reading which sees it as an extension of the ability to use language in the spoken form. Smith (1971) says:

> The task of the beginning reader is to construct a set of rules that will enable him to translate the surface structure of a written language - the visual symbols on the page - into meaning. To a considerable extent, these rules for reading will include rules that the beginning reader has already acquired in his mastery of the spoken form of the language, although other rules are specifically related to the visual aspects of written text. (p. 35)

Wide investigation of this 'structural interference hypothesis' has failed to establish clearly that such interference actually exists. Walker and others (1975), in a study of the oral reading of a group of Newfoundland elementary students who were speakers of Newfoundland dialect, found that 15.8% of the total number of miscues seemed to involve dialect transformations. They concluded that dialect intrusions in oral reading did

occur in the school system studied. However, the results of another Newfoundland study by Walker (1975) failed to support the structural interference hypothesis. He found that dialect reading materials did not facilitate reading. Because of similar conflicting results in studies of the effects of black dialect on learning to read, Schneider (1971) in her review of research in this field, says, "that deviations in a child's dialect from standard English pose serious obstacles to learning to read remains a hypothesis (p. 549)."

There has been a great deal less investigation of the relationship between dialect and writing, but there is some evidence to suggest that some writing errors can be logically attributed to dialect interference. Walker and his associates (1975) found 25% of spelling errors to be attributable to dialect. Wolfram and Fasold (1974) found that over 40% of the errors in a set of compositions by black inner-city students admitted to a major university could be attributed to dialect interference. They concluded that these were not really errors at all, but "simply the reflection in writing of the differences in grammar, pronunciation and verbal expression between the nonstandard dialect and the standard one by which the writing is judged (p. 204)."

Labov (1966, 1970, 1972) believes that, strictly speaking, a nonstandard dialect does not interfere with the development of literacy skills. Although Trudgill (1974) says that "the differences between BEV [Black English vernacular] and standard English . . . are quite large, and in some respects fairly fundamental (p. 76)", Labov emphasizes

the similarities between dialects of English. He argues that differences in dialects arise from different transformations in intermediate structures rather than differences in deep structures (i.e., meanings). "They [differences in dialects] are largely confined to superficial, rather low-level processes which have little effect upon meaning (1970, p. 40)." For example, he believes that the absence of the -ed ending on verbs in Black English does not mean that its speakers have no concept of past tense or that past tense in Black English indicates somewhat different meanings. It is simply the manifestation of the operation in intermediate structures of a reduction rule which standard English does not have (1972).

Labov believes that the difficulties nonstandard speakers have in learning to read or write are attributable mostly to "political and cultural clashes in the classroom (1972, p. xiv)" rather than to dialect interference per se. The critical factor in the learning of literacy skills may be the attitudes of teachers toward nonstandard dialect rather than simple dialect interference (Labov, 1970). Teachers should, therefore, treat nonstandard dialects not as inferior forms of language but as different and completely adequate varieties of language. Similarly, they should assign the correction of dialect-based oral reading miscues a lower priority than the correction of other miscues, since comprehension is rarely impeded by dialect-causes miscues (Y. Goodman, 1972). The major purpose in reading is to extract meaning from the printed page, and the child who

makes dialect-based miscues is attempting to do that by translating the language of his text into his own dialect. Before teachers can be sensitive to such miscues, they need to know the nonstandard dialect of their students (Walker and others, 1975). Such knowledge is also necessary if teachers are to devise effective teaching strategies to deal with problems in spelling and phonics caused by a nonstandard dialect (Graham and Rudorf, 1970; Walker and others, 1975).

Interference in the development of literacy skills is only one, and for the purpose of this internship not the most important, aspect of linguistic divergence in the schools. If children are to become fully literate, sooner or later they must learn to read and write standard English. But what of the language that the students actually use in speech? Loban, Ryan, and Squire (1969) point out a problem that concerns many linguists and educators:

> Scholars have fully appreciated the role of language in maintaining sharp lines of social class distinction. . . . In closed societies, class mobility was almost impossible, and language was an effective wall keeping everyone in his place. As long as societies remained closed, the differences in social class caused little difficulty. In the upwardly mobile societies of today, class dialects become a social problem and an educational problem. Even in a society like our own, where individual worth and aspiration are intended to count more than circumstances of birth, language preserves class distinction and remains one of the major barriers to crossing social and economic lines. (p. 69)

There is no doubt that in a free and open society schools should play an important role in making equality of

opportunity a reality. Three different approaches have been proposed for accomplishing the goal of giving speakers of nonstandard dialect the freedom to be socially mobile. The first approach might be termed 'elimination of nonstandard speech'. This approach is traditional and perhaps still quite widespread (Crocker, 1971). Essentially, the school attempts to discourage the student from speaking his non-standard variety and, in most cases, nonstandard usages are promptly 'corrected'. Students who use standard English are considered most favourably and rewarded with success in school.

This approach has received added impetus in recent years from Bernstein's (1964, 1970) theory of 'restricted' and 'elaborated code'. As defined, 'elaborated code' tends to be used in situations like formal debates and academic discussions, does not rely on extra-linguistic factors such as facial expressions or a set of commonly-shared assumptions, and is characterized by a high percentage of subordinate clauses, passive verbs, adjectives, uncommon adverbs and conjunctions, and the pronoun I. 'Restricted code' is used in informal situations, stresses the speaker's membership in a group and depends on that group's assumptions, and is characterized by a high proportion of you and they and tag-questions. Bernstein found that middle-class children can and do use both codes whereas some working-class children use only 'restricted code' (1964).

Bernstein says that 'elaborated code' allows access to universalistic orders of meaning and that schools are, by nature, concerned with transmitting and developing these meanings (1964). There have been various interpretations of Bernstein's findings. It has been argued that since 'restricted code' is less adequate than 'elaborated code' for dealing with certain concepts and modes of thinking, children who speak nonstandard dialect are cognitively deprived. Bereiter, Engelman, Osborn and Reidford (1966) say:

> The language of culturally-deprived children . . . is not merely an underdeveloped version of English, but is a basically non-logical mode of expressive behaviour which lacks the formal properties necessary for organization of thought. (pp. 112-113)

They report that the four-year old children with whom they worked could not give simple directions, ask questions or make statements of any kind. The solution to such deficiencies, they say, is to teach the children who do not have 'elaborated code' how to use it and to eradicate the nonstandard dialect.

There has been much criticism of programs like those set up by Bereiter and his associates (Shores, 1972; Weingartner, 1970; Labov, 1970). Labov states:

> The 'badly connected words and phrases' which Bereiter attributes to the children are exemplified by <u>They mine</u> and <u>Me got juice</u>. It has already been pointed out that nonstandard Negro English shows many low level phonetic processes which make the surface forms look quite different from standard English . . . <u>Me got juice</u> shows that the child has not mastered the formal alternation of <u>I</u> and <u>me</u> -- not at all uncommon at this age. No one would

> suggest that the child does not understand the logical connection between himself, the getting, and the juice: that he thinks that in fact the juice got him! (pp. 47-48)

Labov further says that it becomes apparent as we examine the children's language that the description by Bereiter and his associates is more an account of their attitudes toward nonstandard dialects than a report of the children's verbal and logical capacities. Weingartner (1970) and Labov (1970) say that disadvantaged children may seem to lack verbal ability when they are faced with hostile and aggressive situations such as those arranged by Bereiter where anything they say can be held against them. The children say little or nothing at all which is interpreted as evidence for the deficiencies which Bereiter describes. Trudgill (1974) believes that "working-class children can produce 'elaborated code'. One can infer that they do not normally produce 'elaborated code' because they are not used to employing it or they do not wish to (pp. 53-54)."

The elimination of nonstandard dialect is the solution proposed by those who believe that nonstandard dialect speakers have cognitive deficiencies. It is also the approach favored by two other groups: those who believe that it is necessary if those students who use nonstandard speech are to have an opportunity for social, economic and educational success equal to that of standard dialect speakers; and those who believe that nonstandard dialects are inferior aberrations from standard English. It is perhaps true that

most Newfoundland educators who wish to change the speech of their students belong to one of these latter two groups.

Whatever the reason for favoring this approach, it has been pointed out that the approach is wrong. Paddock (1975) explains that it is psychologically and socially wrong. He says that in forcing the student to abandon his dialect,

> we reduce his own self-esteem by attacking the speech which is so intimately identified with his family, his social class, his community . . . our methods have maximized the psychological and social damage while minimizing the learning of standard English. Simply by recognizing the validity of the local dialects, we could decrease the damage and increase the learning. (p. 1)

Trudgill (1974) says that the approach is also practically wrong. He says that students will not want to change their language because of the "pressures of group solidarity and peer-group identification (p. 81)." This point is supported by studies by Labov (1966) which showed that the adolescent peer group is in many cases the most important linguistic influence. To those who seek to eradicate nonstandard dialects in the schools, Lin (1970) says "nonstandard dialects cannot be eliminated by resorting to dictatorship (p. 423)."

A second approach to dialect in the schools, which has received only minority support, is sometimes called 'appreciation of dialect differences'. This view states that if children suffer because of their nonstandard dialects, this is because of the attitudes that society as

a whole and teachers in particular have towards such varieties (Sledd, 1972). Those who support 'appreciation of dialect differences' believe that it is the attitudes of society rather than the language of nonstandard speakers that must be modified. They believe that we should attempt to educate our society to understand and appreciate and be tolerant of nonstandard dialects (Sledd, 1972). Supporters of this approach hope that one day we will have a society where every speaker has an equal opportunity for success, regardless of the dialect he speaks. Loban, Ryan and Squire (1969), typical of those who believe that this approach is hopelessly optimistic and impractical, say that "the stubborn fact is that leaders of many communities <u>are</u> sensitive to deviations (p. 105)." Pyles, and Algeo (1970) believe that "it cannot be denied that there is widespread, if unreasoning, prejudice against certain forms of speech, and that younger speakers had best eschew these forms (p. 22)," Trudgill (1974) argues that, even if it were possible to change popular attitudes towards nonstandard dialects, it would require a long time. The 'appreciation of dialect differences' approach may improve matters for future generations of nonstandard dialect speakers, but what do we do in the meantime to meet the needs of today's students?

The widespread belief that appreciation of dialect differences, like elimination of nonstandard dialect, is inadequate has led to the development of a third approach, bidialectalism. Proponents of this school also recognize the need for students to be able to speak standard English

(Lin, 1970; Fowler, 1965), but they differ from those who favor the first approach in that they do not believe the school should attempt to eliminate nonstandard speech. Loban, Ryan and Square (1969) say that "rather than attempting to eradicate or change the language of such pupils, teachers must help extend their linguistic repertoire to include a standard variety of English and thus become bidialectal (p. 109)." The bidialectalism approach recognizes the appropriateness of nonstandard varieties for interaction with the peer group, family and friends. By recognizing the right of the non-standard speaker to continue using his dialect in appropriate situations, this approach respects the student's feelings about his own language (Lin, 1970). The child's interest in language is encouraged by study of his own dialect as a legitimate and interesting variety of language (Lin, 1970), and the differences between the student's language and standard English are pointed out as being mere differences, not evidence of the superiority of standard English. Smiley (1970) says "teacher and learner together can escape embarrassing and hence inhibiting value judgements of dialects (p. 410)." The aims of bidialectalism are to demonstrate that the student's language is a completely adequate and worthwhile communication system and, at the same time, to equip the student with standard English so that he is able, if he wishes, to move into certain social groups with which standard English is associated. Hook (1972) explains:

> We do not say that their parents who use these forms [nonstandard usages] are in the wrong, but we do try to make it possible for them to know the prestigious ones, to practice using them, and hopefully to switch as easily to those forms as they switch dialects when they go to a ball game or talk to someone not their own age. (p. 8)

Bidialectalism makes it necessary for the teacher to understand the nature of language and be familiar with his students' dialect. Lin (1970) defines the disadvantaged teacher as one "who lacks adequate background to help him understand the nature of language (p. 421)."

There is consensus in the literature that bidialectalism is more socially and psychologically sound than the first approach mentioned, and more practical than the second. Bidialectalism aims to solve two problems at once - it attempts to prepare students with the language varieties they will need, and at the same time it attempts to educate the future leaders of our society to be more tolerant of nonstandard dialects (Loban, Ryan and Squire, 1969). It is partly for this reason that bidialectalism has received the overt support of most linguists and educators.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Student Text

The student textbook is found in Appendix A. It has five chapters. Each chapter is divided into three sections. At the end of each section there are a number of suggested exercises and activities. First among these is a group of questions entitled Check Your Reading which require students to recall some of the more important information given in the preceding section. These questions enable students to determine how well they understand and remember what they have studied. Following this, there is a group of questions and activities entitled For Further Study and Thought. These are inquiry- and discovery-oriented and encourage further reading and thinking about standard English and Newfoundland dialect. They also encourage students to consider their own use of language and to independently investigate and describe the rules governing some of the choices of pronunciation and grammatical usage in their dialect.

Chapter 1 of the text is entitled Introduction: Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English. This chapter deals with the following topics: why Newfoundland speech is distinctive, why there are different dialects within the Province, why Newfoundland dialect is becoming more standardized, why the different dialects within the Province are becoming more similar, definitions of standard and

nonstandard English, and popular attitudes to standard and nonstandard English.

Chapter 2 is entitled Vocabulary. It shows that Newfoundland's distinctive vocabulary can be broken down into four categories: (1) words that can be traced in some form to earlier use in Britain, but which are now wholly or partially obsolete outside of Newfoundland; (2) words that Newfoundlanders have invented; (3) standard English words that have taken on new meanings in Newfoundland; (4) corruptions of standard English words. Examples of words in each category are given. Chapter 2 explains why these developments took place. Furthermore, it shows that the same processes have equally influenced the development of standard English vocabulary. This is used as an argument to indicate that negative attitudes to Newfoundland vocabulary are unjustified. A second argument that is given is that our vocabulary allows us to accomplish a fundamental aim of all languages - clear, precise, effective communication - and so cannot justifiably be labelled inferior.

Chapter 3 is entitled Pronunciation. It begins by comparing British and Canadian pronunciation, showing that each is governed by an underlying system and regularity. This same regularity is shown to exist in Newfoundland dialect as well. This chapter also shows pronunciation in Newfoundland dialect to have many points in common with old standard English pronunciation. It also demonstrates that transposition of sounds and changing or adding of sounds have

influenced pronunciation in standard English as well as Newfoundland dialect. All of this reveals that the attitude that Newfoundland pronunciation is lazy or sloppy is not supported by an analysis of our dialect.

Chapter 4 is entitled Grammar. It begins by defining grammar as our knowledge of our language which tells us the order which words may take in a sentence and the way in which a word changes form when it is used in different positions in a sentence or changes its function. This chapter demonstrates that instead of breaking the grammatical rules of standard English, Newfoundlanders follow the rules of their own grammar. This grammar is different from standard English grammar because (1) we have retained some grammatical features from older English which standard English has dropped, and (2) we have continued grammatical developments begun in standard English but later halted by the artificial restrictions that grammarians placed on language development. The chapter shows that the first factor has, in some cases, allowed our language to be more expressive and concise, and that the second has allowed us to simplify and economize our grammar and continue the natural process of language development. These points indicate that our grammar is anything but inferior to standard English grammar.

Chapter 5 is entitled Conclusion: Using Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English. This chapter begins by showing that local language scholars believe that Newfoundland dialect is not inferior to standard English. The chapter then explains

that our language has not gained popular acceptance or prestige because we as a people have historically not had much power, influence, or material prosperity. Negative judgments about our dialect are based on this, and have nothing to do with the actual quality of the dialect. The following section of the chapter shows that because of these widespread negative attitudes, and in spite of the fact that they are unjustified, a speaker of Newfoundland dialect would be wise to learn standard English and use it in situations where communication would be hampered by the use of a nonstandard dialect or where one might be discriminated against for using it. It shows that one does not have to abandon one's dialect to speak standard English, but that one can choose to be bidialectal, using whatever variety of English is more suitable in a particular communication situation. The last section of Chapter 5 uses one of the definitions of "good English" given by Henderson and Shephard (1973): good English is English "which gets the desired effect with the least friction and difficulty for its user (p. 67)." Examples are given to show that standard English is sometimes "bad English" and sometimes "good English", and to show that the same is true of Newfoundland dialect. Each variety of English can be used appropriately or inappropriately.

Teaching Strategies

The intern taught the unit in such a way as to encourage students to acquire an understanding of major principles, such as why Newfoundland vocabulary, pronunciation,

and grammar are different from the vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar of standard English. The intern believed this to be more important than encouraging the acquisition of a detailed knowledge of a large number of facts. For example, it was unnecessary, the intern believed, to have students memorize the meanings of Newfoundland vocabulary with which they had heretofore been unfamiliar. Of course, a certain body of knowledge was necessary for understanding the principles alluded to earlier. It was likewise necessary for the development of rational attitudes to the two varieties of English, since attitudes are most likely to change when there are new insights resulting from new knowledge. However, as long as the student was able to use an example or two to explain a point he might wish to make, or to defend an attitude toward Newfoundland dialect or standard English, that was deemed sufficient. Students were not expected to retain all of the detail given in the unit.

The writer believed that the amount of time needed to deal adequately with the unit was fifteen to twenty class periods of forty minutes. Students were assigned to read one section of a chapter prior to most classes. The intern and students then discussed that section using the suggested exercises and activities at the end as a guide. The intern did not feel bound to have his class discuss all of the questions or complete all of the activities, especially when students seemed to be interested in exploring one or more in depth.

The intern did not adopt the practice of assigning a section for reading and then having students write an answer to each question at the end of that section. This would have become tedious, especially if it had been done from day to day until the unit had been completed. This would have been unfortunate, for the study of one's dialect should be fascinating rather than tiresome.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION

Introduction

The intern taught Two Varieties of English to a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island, and subsequently employed three instruments to evaluate the success of the unit in achieving its objectives. These instruments were: (1) a post-unit quiz; (2) a pre-test of attitudes toward Newfoundland dialect and standard English, and (3) a post-test of attitudes toward Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

The Post-Unit Quiz

Description and Rationale for Use

The post-unit quiz is found in Appendix B. The purpose of this instrument was to determine the degree to which Objective 1 had been achieved. The quiz required students to recall some factual information and to demonstrate an understanding of (1) the way in which Newfoundland dialect and standard English have developed, and (2) the structure and system underlying each of these varieties of English as it presently exists.

Prior to beginning study of the unit, students were informed of the post-unit quiz and given an outline of what they would be expected to know after they had completed the unit. This outline is found in Appendix C. Students were

told that they would be expected to use examples where possible to demonstrate their understanding of the points given in this outline. Because Two Varieties of English was treated the same as any other unit of study which the students might have done they were told that the mark received on the post-unit quiz would be counted as credit toward their final grade in the course, and that understanding of the unit would be tested in the comprehensive examination given at the end of the first term. Although the intern felt that the relevance of the unit to the students' lives would heighten the motivation to learn, he also believed that treating the unit as an important part of the Grade Eleven English course, and not as a frill, would increase motivation as well.

Results

Thirty-six students studied Two Varieties of English and all wrote the post-unit quiz. Each student was given a code number. The results of the post-unit quiz are presented in Tables 1-3.

Table 1 gives the percentage mark each student received on the quiz. The marks ranged from 25% to 96% with an average mark of 71%. Thirty-two students had a mark of 50% or more, while four failed the quiz.

Table 2 presents the percentage marks that students achieved on the post-unit quiz differently from Table 1. Table 2 shows the number of marks occurring between 90% and

Table 1

Percentage Marks on Post-Unit Quiz;
Average Percentage Mark;
Number of Passes* and Failures

Student Number	Percentage Mark
1	86
2	71
3	36
4	81
5	80
6	90
7	96
8	50
9	76
10	91
11	81
12	74
13	40
14	60
15	33
16	81
17	84
18	93
19	80
20	91
21	51
22	79
23	69
24	65
25	83
26	25
27	85
28	55
29	79
30	58
31	96
32	70
33	68
34	66
35	65
36	68

*The pass mark for the post-unit quiz was 50%

Average percentage Mark	71
Number of Passes	32
Number of Failures	4

Table 2

Breakdown of the Range of Marks on the Post-Unit Quiz

Number of Marks Within the 90-100% Range	6	90, 96, 91, 93, 91, 96
Number of Marks Within the 80-89% Range	9	86, 81, 80, 81, 81, 84, 80, 83, 85
Number of Marks Within the 70-79% Range	6	71, 76, 74, 79, 79, 70
Number of Marks Within the 60-69% Range	7	60, 69, 65, 68, 66, 65, 68
Number of Marks Within the 50-59% Range	4	50, 51, 55, 58
Number of Marks Within the 40-49% Range	1	40
Number of Marks Within the 30-39% Range	2	36, 33
Number of Marks Within the 20-29% Range	1	25
Number of Marks Within the 10-19% Range	0	
Number of Marks Within the 0-9% Range	0	

100%, 80% and 89%, 70% and 9%, etc. It also gives the actual specific marks occurring within each range of ten marks. Six students scored between 90% and 100%, nine scored between 80% and 89%, six scored between 70% and 79%, and seven scored between 60% and 69%. Thus, six students scored 90% or more, fifteen scored 80% or more, twenty-one scored 70% or more, and twenty-eight scored 60% or more. Since only one mark in the 60% to 69% range was less than 65%, twenty-seven students out of a total of thirty-six students who wrote the quiz obtained a score of 65% or more.

There were four marks in the 50% to 59% range, and four marks below 50%, specifically, 40%, 36%, 33%, and 25%. These lower marks can be attributed in part to the fact that the thirty-six students who studied Two Varieties of English comprise the total population of Grade Eleven students at Coaker Academy. Thus, the class which was taught this unit was a heterogeneous group with a wide range of abilities. In such a class, it is to be expected that at least a small percentage will experience some difficulty with the concepts and materials dealt with in Grade Eleven. Also, with a class of thirty-six students, it was often difficult for the intern to give as much individual help as some of the weaker students needed.

Table 3 gives the percentage mark each student received on each of the four questions on the post-unit quiz, the average percentage mark for each question, and the number of passes and failures for each question. The average mark

Table 3

Percentage Marks on Each of the Four Questions on the Post-Unit Quiz. Average Percentage Mark, Number of Passes, and Number of Failures for Each Question

Student Number	Percentage Work on Question 1	Percentage Work on Question 2	Percentage Work on Question 3	Percentage Work on Question 4
1	80	95	80	90
2	65	80	90	50
3	20	40	75	10
4	100	60	95	70
5	90	90	70	70
6	90	90	90	90
7	90	100	95	100
8	65	80	40	15
9	85	80	80	60
10	85	100	85	95
11	65	70	95	95
12	60	85	75	75
13	31	50	60	20
14	10	70	70	90
15	10	70	10	40
16	85	95	95	50
17	80	90	80	85
18	85	95	90	100
19	95	100	65	60
20	95	95	95	80
21	20	60	30	95
22	80	80	85	70
23	60	65	80	70
24	70	70	60	60
25	90	90	90	60
26	10	60	30	0
27	70	100	90	80
28	50	80	60	30
29	80	85	90	60
30	60	65	75	30
31	95	95	95	100
32	75	75	70	60
33	70	90	50	60
34	65	75	70	55
35	85	75	70	30
36	95	90	85	0
Average Percentage Mark	68	80	74	61
Number of Passes	30	35	32	25
Number of Failures	6	1	4	9

for Question 1, 2, 3, and 4 was 68%, 80%, 74%, and 61% respectively. Thirty, thirty-five, thirty-two and twenty-five students passed Question 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

The lower marks on Question 4 relative to the other questions can partly be accounted for by the fact that it was the last question on the quiz. The quiz was administered in one forty-minute class, and all students did the questions in the order in which they appeared on the quiz. The fact that some students did not complete the answer to this question suggests that insufficient time to deal properly with it was a contributing factor to the lower marks here in relation to the marks on the other questions. In addition, the intern discovered while teaching the unit that the concept of system in language (which Question 4 dealt with) was one with which students experienced more difficulty than with many of the other concepts in the unit. The intern believes that these two factors, insufficient time and the difficulty students experienced with the particular concept involved, account for the relatively poor marks for Question 4.

The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Attitudes to Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English

Description and Rationale for Use

A Likert-type instrument was used both as a pre-test and post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. This instrument is found in Appendix D. Its purpose was to determine the degree to which Objective 2 had been achieved.

The pre-test and post-test consisted of twenty-five statements, each of which expressed an opinion about Newfoundland dialect or standard English or both. Accompanying the tests was an answer sheet on which students indicated by drawing a circle around 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 whether they strongly agreed with each statement, agreed, were undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed.

The pre-test was administered during the first Grade Eleven English class of the school year. The instructions which preceded the test were read to students to ensure that they were understood. These instructions explained the format of the test and the way in which answers were to be given on the answer sheet. They also gave an example of Newfoundland dialect and an example of standard English. As well, they pointed out that it was not possible to pass or fail the test, but that the important thing for students to remember was to be honest in their answers. While introducing the test, the intern emphasized that the purpose of the test was to find out students' opinions on Newfoundland dialect and standard English, and not to evaluate them or to assign a grade.

This point was again emphasized when the post-test was written and instructions were again read to students. Students were told that a different kind of quiz would be given later, the purpose of which would be to evaluate their mastery of the unit. They were reminded that they would be given no mark or grade on the post-test of attitudes.

The answer sheets for the pre-test and post-test were collected and later analyzed to determine the degree to which Objective 2 had been achieved.

Results

Tables 4-28 which follow compare the responses to each of the twenty-five statements on the pre-test to the responses to the same statements on the post-test.

The intern has indicated in each of Tables 4-28 the desired responses to the particular statement it deals with. In each table, two desired responses are given, either Strongly Agree and Agree, or Strongly Disagree and Disagree. Each table also shows for each kind of response (Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) the amount of change in the number of responses from the pre-test to the post-test.

The total number of responses shown in each of Tables 4-28 for both the pre-test and post-test is thirty-five. Although thirty-six students studied the unit, one student did not write the post-test. In order to facilitate the comparison of responses on the pre-test and post-test, that student's responses on the pre-test have been disregarded.

Table 4, which gives the results for Statement (a), shows that on the post-test, three additional students gave the desired response Disagree as compared to the pre-test. Four additional students gave the desired response: Strongly Disagree. These seven additional desired responses on the post-test seem to have come from Agree, which was the response

Table 4

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (a): An educated person would not make a statement such as 'I likes dat book' because it is bad English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	0	0		0
Agree	14	10		4
Undecided	4	1		3
Disagree	14	17	Disagree	3
Strongly Disagree	3	7	Strongly Disagree	4

of four fewer students on the post-test than on the pre-test, and from Undecided, which was the response of three fewer students.

Table 5 shows that on the post-test, eight additional students gave one of the desired responses to Statement (b), Strongly Agree or Agree. The shift here was from Undecided and Strongly Disagree, where there were three and five fewer responses respectively on the pre-test than on the post-test.

Table 6 shows that for Statement (c), twelve additional students gave the desired response Strongly Disagree on the post-test as compared to the pre-test, and that seven fewer students gave the desired response Disagree. Thus, five additional students gave one of the two desired responses. Most of the change in response to Statement (c) was from Disagree on the pre-test to Strongly Disagree on the post-test.

Table 7 shows only a small difference in the reactions of students to Statement (d) on the pre-test and post-test. One additional student gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree; however, one additional student also gave an undesired response, Strongly Agree.

Table 8 shows that on the post-test seventeen additional students gave one of the two desired responses to Statement (e), Strongly Agree or Agree. Most of the change in response for Statement (e) was from Disagree and Undecided to Strongly Agree and Agree.

Table 9 gives the results for Statement (f). Whereas only fourteen students gave one of the desired responses,

Table 5

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (b): A person who speaks Newfoundland dialect should learn how to use Standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	5	14	Strongly Agree	5
Agree	14	17	Agree	3
Undecided	4	1		3
Disagree	2	2		0
Strongly Disagree	6	1		5

Table 6

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (c): Because of their dialect, Newfoundlanders cannot express their ideas very well.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses[a]	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	2	0		2
Agree	4	2		2
Undecided	2	1		1
Disagree	11	4	Disagree	7
Strongly Disagree	16	28	Strongly Disagree	12

Table 7

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (d): Older Newfoundlanders talk worse than the school-age generation of Newfoundlanders.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	7	8		1
Agree	16	16		0
Undecided	6	4		2
Disagree	4	3	Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	2	4	Strongly Disagree	2

Table 8

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (e): There is nothing really wrong with the way Newfoundlanders pronounce words.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	3	11	Strongly Agree	8
Agree	12	21	Agree	9
Undecided	8	1		7
Disagree	12	2		10
Strongly Disagree	0	0		0

Table 9

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (f): No matter what the situation, standard English is the most suitable form of English to use.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	11	2		9
Agree	5	0		5
Undecided	5	3		2
Disagree	12	16	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	2	14	Strongly Disagree	12

Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, thirty students did so on the post-test. Many students changed their response from Strongly Agree and Agree on the pre-test to Strongly Disagree on the post-test.

Table 10 shows that for Statement (g), twelve students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, whereas nineteen did so on the post-test. Most of the change in response to Statement (g) seems to have been from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

Table 11 gives the results for Statement (h). Twenty-seven students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, whereas thirty did so on the post-test. There were ten additional responses of Strongly Agree on the post-test, most of these having come from Agree on the pre-test.

Table 12, which presents the results for Statement (i), shows that eight additional students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the post-test as compared to the pre-test. For Statement (i), most of the additional desired responses came from Undecided.

Table 13 shows that for Statement (j), seven students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, but twenty did so on the post-test. The shift came from Disagree and Strongly Disagree, which were chosen by six and seven fewer students respectively on the post-test.

Table 10

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (g): A lot of words that Newfoundlanders use are not really words at all.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	8	1		7
Agree	12	11		1
Undecided	3	4		1
Disagree	10	9	Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	2	10	Strongly Disagree	8

Table 11

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (h): In certain situations, Newfoundland dialect is the most effective way to express our thoughts and feelings.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	12	22	Strongly Agree	10
Agree	15	8	Agree	7
Undecided	4	2		2
Disagree	3	1		2
Strongly Disagree	1	2		1

Table 12

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (i): People in some parts of Newfoundland use even worse English than we do.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	8	5		3
Agree	13	14		1
Undecided	11	5		6
Disagree	2	8	Disagree	6
Strongly Disagree	1	3	Strongly Disagree	2

Table 13

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (j): The grammar that Newfoundlanders use is just as good as the grammar of standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	1	10	Strongly Agree	9
Agree	6	10	Agree	4
Undecided	5	5		0
Disagree	14	8		6
Strongly Disagree	9	2		7

Table 14 shows that for Statement (k) eighteen students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, whereas twenty-five students did so on the post-test. The change in response on the post-test was from Agree, Undecided, and Disagree to Strongly Disagree.

Table 15 shows that for Statement (l), thirty-one students gave a desired response, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, and that thirty-one students did so on the post-test. The main shift was from Strongly Disagree on the pre-test to Disagree on the post-test. Disagree was the response of four additional students on the post-test.

Table 16 shows the results for Statement (m). Twenty-three students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, whereas thirty-three did so on the post-test. The change was from each of Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Table 17 presents the results for Statement (n). Whereas eighteen students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, twenty-two did so on the post-test. Most of the change in response to Statement (n) was from Undecided and Disagree to Strongly Disagree.

Table 18 shows that for Statement (o), twenty-seven students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree and Strongly Disagree, on the post-test, while eighteen did so on

Table 14

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (k): The fact that many educated people have a negative attitude to Newfoundland dialect shows that it is not as good as standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	0	0		0
Agree	9	5		4
Undecided	8	5		3
Disagree	13	10	Disagree	3
Strongly Disagree	5	15	Strongly Disagree	10

Table 15

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (1): Most of us who speak Newfoundland dialect will never need to learn how to use standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	3	1		2
Agree	1	2		1
Undecided	0	1		1
Disagree	12	16	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	19	15	Strongly Disagree	4

Table 16

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (n): Newfoundlanders speak differently from other people, not better or worse.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	8	26	Strongly Agree	18
Agree	15	7	Agree	8
Undecided	6	2		4
Disagree	4	0		4
Strongly Disagree	2	0		2

Table 17

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (n): There is "no rhyme or reason" to the way Newfoundlanders pronounce words.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	1	0		0
Agree	7	7		0
Undecided	9	6		3
Disagree	12	8	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	6	14	Strongly Disagree	8

Table 18

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (o): When we are with other people who speak Newfoundland dialect, we should use standard English so that they will have a better idea of the right way to speak.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	2	2		0
Agree	7	3		4
Undecided	8	3		5
Disagree	7	16	Disagree	9
Strongly Disagree	11	11	Strongly Disagree	0

the pre-test. The shift was from Agree and Undecided to Disagree.

Table 19 presents the results for Statement (p). Whereas twenty-four students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, nineteen did so on the post-test. Most of the change in response to Statement (p) was from Disagree to Agree.

Table 20 shows that on the pre-test twelve students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, to Statement (q). On the post-test, twenty-seven students did so. Most of the shift to Strongly Agree and Agree came from Disagree and Strongly Disagree.

Table 21 shows that for Statement (r), twenty-four students gave a desired response, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, while thirty did so on the post-test. The shift was mainly from Undecided and Disagree to Strongly Agree.

Table 22 shows that for Statement (s), thirty-one students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, whereas thirty did so on the post-test. Most of the change in response to Statement (s) was from Strongly Disagree to Disagree.

Table 23 presents the results for Statement (t). Whereas twelve students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on the pre-test, twenty-seven did so on the post-test. Three, five, and seven of these additional desired responses came from Strongly Agree, Agree and Undecided respectively.

Table 19

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (p): The only way to get a certain job in Newfoundland is to stop using your dialect and use standard English all the time.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	2	3		1
Agree	4	9		5
Undecided	5	4		1
Disagree	17	13	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	7	6	Strongly Disagree	1

Table 20

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (q): Newfoundland words are just as good as standard English words..

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	1	12	Strongly Agree	11
Agree	11	15	Agree	4
Undecided	8	5		3
Disagree	11	3		8
Strongly Disagree	4	0		4

Table 21

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (r): Newfoundland dialect is a more suitable kind of English to use in certain situations than standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	9	14	Strongly Agree	5
Agree	15	16	Agree	1
Undecided	7	4		3
Disagree	3	0		3
Strongly Disagree	1	1		0

Table 22

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (s): Newfoundlanders should just use their own way of talking and forget about standard English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	1	1		0
Agree	1	1		0
Undecided	2	3		1
Disagree	15	19	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	16	11	Strongly Disagree	5

Table 23

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (t): A professional person such as a lawyer or doctor should never use Newfoundland dialect.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	4	1		3
Agree	10	5		5
Undecided	9	2		7
Disagree	10	21	Disagree	11
Strongly Disagree	2	6	Strongly Disagree	4

Table 24 shows that for Statement (u), twenty-nine students gave a desired response, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, whereas thirty-two did so on the post-test, on which there were three additional responses of Strongly Agree, and one fewer response of each of Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

Table 25 shows that for Statement (v), eighteen students gave a desired response, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, and that twenty-nine did so on the post-test, on which there were three, seven, and one fewer responses of Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree respectively. There were eight additional responses of Strongly Agree, and three additional responses of Agree.

Table 26 presents the results for Statement (w). On the pre-test, thirty-three students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, while on the post-test, thirty-two students did so. Most of the change was from Disagree to Strongly Disagree.

Table 27 shows that for Statement (x) twenty-eight students gave one of the desired responses, Strongly Agree or Agree, on the pre-test, and that twenty-one did so on the post-test. Most of the change was from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree and Agree.

Table 28 shows the results for the last Statement (y). Thirty-two students gave one of the desired responses, Disagree or Strongly Disagree, on both the pre-test and post-test. There were two additional responses of Strongly Disagree on the post-test.

Table 24

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (u): It is necessary for any English-speaking society to have a standard version of English.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	13	16	Strongly Agree	3
Agree	16	16	Agree	1
Undecided	4	3		1
Disagree	1	0		1
Strongly Disagree	1	0		1

Table 25

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (v): It is more appropriate to use Newfoundland dialect than standard English when we are talking with our family.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	7	15	Strongly Agree	8
Agree	11	14	Agree	3
Undecided	7	4		3
Disagree	9	2		7
Strongly Disagree	1	0		1

Table 26

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (w): Newfoundland dialect is really only an ignorant way of talking.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	1	1		0
Agree	0	0		0
Undecided	1	2		1
Disagree	7	3	Disagree	4
Strongly Disagree	26	29	Strongly Disagree	3

Table 27

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (x): Teachers should use Newfoundland dialect in the classroom.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	0	6		6
Agree	0	2		2
Undecided	7	6		1
Disagree	14	15	Disagree	1
Strongly Disagree	14	6	Strongly Disagree	8

Table 28

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to Statement (y): One reason that many Newfoundlanders don't pronounce words correctly is that they are too lazy to say the word properly.

	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Desired Responses	Amount of Change for Each Kind of Response from Pre-Test to Post-Test
Strongly Agree	0	1		1
Agree	1	2		1
Undecided	2	0		2
Disagree	6	4	Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	26	28	Strongly Disagree	2

Table 29 presents an overview of the desired changes in attitudes as evident from the comparison of pre-test and post-test responses to the twenty-five statements. The table shows for each statement the difference between the number of desired responses on the pre-test and the number of desired responses on the post-test. Where the difference is expressed as a positive number, it indicates a desired change in attitudes; where it is expressed as a negative number, it indicates an undesired change in attitudes.

Table 29 shows that for Statements (e), (f), (q) and (t) there were fifteen to seventeen additional desired responses on the post-test as compared to the pre-test. There were ten to thirteen additional desired responses to Statements (j), (m), and (v); six to nine additional desired responses to Statements (a), (b), (g), (i), (k), (o), and (r); three to four additional desired responses to Statements (c), (h), (n), and (u); one additional desired response to Statement (d); no change in the number of desired responses to Statements (l) and (y); one fewer desired response to Statements (s) and (w); and five and seven fewer desired responses to Statements (p) and (x) respectively.

There were sixteen statements on the pre-test and post-test for which the desired responses were Disagree and Strongly Disagree. For each statement, students were asked to draw a circle around 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 depending on whether their response was Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. Thus, a high number on each of the sixteen

Table 29

Differences Between Number of Desired Responses on Pre-Test and Number of Desired Responses on Post-Test

Statement	Difference
(a)	+7
(b)	+8
(c)	+4
(d)	+1
(e)	+17
(f)	+16
(g)	+7
(h)	+3
(i)	+8
(j)	+13
(k)	+7
(l)	0
(m)	+10
(n)	+4
(o)	+9
(p)	-5
(q)	+15
(r)	+6
(s)	-1
(t)	+15
(u)	+3
(v)	+11
(w)	-1
(x)	-7
(y)	0

statements reflected rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English, and a low number did the opposite.

In Table 30 the information in Tables 4-28 is used to ascertain whether the numbers for all students on each of these statements are higher on the pre-test or post-test. For example, for Statement (a), the number of responses of Strongly Agree on the pre-test and the number of responses of Strongly Agree on the post-test are taken from Table 4 and multiplied by 1, the number of responses of Agree on the pre-test and the number of responses of Agree on the post-test are multiplied by two, etc. The pre-test products are added and the post-test products are added to allow comparison of pre-test and post-test results.

In Table 30, the post-test totals are appreciably larger than the pre-test totals except for Statements (l), (p), (s), (x), and (y), for which the post-test totals are smaller, and Statements (d) and (w), for which the post-test totals are larger by one and two respectively. In the case of Statements (l), (s), and (y), this is attributable to the fact that there were between thirty-one and thirty-three desired responses to these statements on the pre-test, and only minor fluctuations on the post-test. Indeed, this factor also accounts for the marginal increase from 162 to 164 in the pre-test and post-test totals for Statement (w).

The high pre-test totals for these statements may be partly due to the fact that the intern had already taught the class for one year when they wrote the pre-test, and during

Table 30

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to the Sixteen Statements to which the Desired Responses Were Disagree and Strongly Disagree

Statement	Pre-Test Products	Pre-Test Total	Post-Test Products	Post-Test Total
(a)	0	111	0	126
	28		20	
	12		3	
	56		68	
	15		35	
(c)	2	140	0	163
	8		4	
	6		3	
	44		16	
	80		140	
(d)	7	83	8	84
	32		32	
	18		12	
	16		12	
	10		20	
(f)	11	94	2	145
	10		0	
	15		9	
	48		64	
	10		70	
(g)	8	91	1	121
	24		22	
	9		12	
	40		36	
	10		50	
(i)	8	80	5	95
	26		28	
	33		15	
	8		32	
	5		15	
(k)	0	119	0	140
	18		10	
	24		15	
	52		40	
	25		75	

Table 30 (continued).

Statement	Pre-Test Products	Pre-Test Total	Post-Test Products	Post-Test Total
(l)	3	148	1	147
	2		4	
	0		3	
	48		64	
	95		75	
(n)	1	120	0	134
	14		14	
	27		18	
	48		32	
	30		70	
(o)	2	123	2	136
	14		6	
	24		9	
	28		64	
	55		55	
(p)	2	128	3	119
	8		18	
	15		12	
	68		56	
	35		30	
(s)	1	149	1	143
	2		2	
	6		9	
	60		76	
	80		55	
(t)	4	101	1	131
	20		10	
	27		6	
	40		84	
	10		30	
(w)	1	162	1	164
	0		0	
	3		6	
	28		12	
	130		145	

Table 30 (continued)

Statement	Pre-Test Products	Pre-Test Total	Post-Test Products	Post-Test Total
(x)	0	147	6	118
	0		4	
	21		18	
	56		60	
	70		30	
(y)	0	162	1	161
	2		4	
	6		0	
	24		16	
	130		140	

that time they may have assimilated some of the intern's attitudes to standard English and Newfoundland dialect in the course of class discussion of language.

The desired attitudinal change was not evident in the results for Statement (x), which was 'Teachers should use Newfoundland dialect in the classroom'. The desired responses were Disagree and Strongly Disagree, but those who agreed with the statement may have done so because they were more conscious of the effect of audience (dialect-speakers) on suitability of language choice than of the effects of role and setting. Also, vagueness may have been another problem with Statement (x). The intended meaning would have been clearer if an adverbial such as regularly had been used to modify the verb use. The fact that the desired attitudinal change was not evident in the results for Statement (x) may be partly attributed to the lack of clarity resulting from the omission of a qualifying adverbial.

The fact that the desired attitudinal change was not evident in the results for Statement (p) can perhaps also be accounted for by the wording of the statement. It read: 'The only way to get a certain job in Newfoundland is to stop using your dialect and use standard English all the time.' The desired responses were Disagree and Strongly Disagree because of the words 'and use standard English all the time.' However, the first half of the statement is well-supported by Chapter 5 of Two Varieties of English. Statement (p) is really two statements at the same time, and the higher number

of Agree and Strongly Agree responses on the post-test may have been in reaction to the first of the two statements.

Furthermore, the phrase a certain job in Statement (p) may have been unclear, for it could mean either "a particular job" or "a secure job". (The first meaning was the intended one.) This ambiguity may also have contributed to the higher number of undesired responses on the post-test as compared to the pre-test.

Statement (d), 'Older Newfoundlanders talk worse than the school age generation of Newfoundlanders', was another statement for which the post-test total was smaller than the pre-test total. As was the case for Statement (p), this may have been attributable to the wording.

Chapter I of the unit included a section explaining that Newfoundland language is becoming more standardized. As evidence of this, it was pointed out that the language of most parents, and especially grandparents, is more nonstandard than the language of the high school student. In light of this, it is understandable that students' responses to Statement (d) showed little change from post-test to pre-test, especially when it is noted that there was nothing in the unit which overtly stated that the fact that the language of older generations is more nonstandard does not make it any worse than the language of younger generations of Newfoundlanders.

The intern believes that if Statement (d) had read 'Older generations of Newfoundlanders use a more nonstandard form of English than the school-age generation of Newfoundlanders,

but their language is no worse than ours', there would have been more desired responses on the post-test than on the pre-test.

One might argue that students' responses to Statement (d) as it was actually worded show that they equated non-standard language with 'bad English' just as much on the post-test as they did on the pre-test; that the wording of Statement (d) 'tricked' students into unconsciously revealing their real attitudes to Newfoundland dialect. If one argues this, however, one is essentially questioning the validity of Likert-type instruments unless all statements on them are designed to be indirect and 'tricky', thereby causing those with whom the instruments are used to reveal those attitudes which they are supposedly trying to conceal. Thus, one is calling into question a great deal of educational research in which the Likert-type instrument has been used to measure changes in attitude.

Table 31 is similar to Table 30 except for the fact that it deals with the nine statements for which the desired responses were Strongly Agree and Agree. For these statements, a low total reflects rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

For each statement in Table 31, the total is lower for the post-test than the total for the pre-test.

If the pre-test totals for the sixteen statements for which the desired responses were Disagree and Strongly Disagree are added, the aggregate is 1958. If the post-test totals are

Table 31

A Comparison of Responses on the Pre-Test and Post-Test to the Nine Statements to which the Desired Responses Were Agree and Strongly Agree

Statement	Pre-Test Products	Pre-Test Total	Post-Test Products	Post-Test Total
(b)	9	87	14	64
	28		34	
	12		3	
	8		8	
	30		5	
(e)	3	99	11	64
	24		42	
	24		3	
	48		8	
	0		0	
(h)	12	71	22	58
	30		16	
	12		6	
	12		4	
	5		10	
(j)	1	129	10	87
	12		20	
	15		15	
	56		32	
	45		10	
(m)	8	82	26	46
	30		14	
	18		6	
	16		0	
	10		0	
(q)	1	111	12	69
	22		30	
	24		15	
	44		12	
	20		0	
(r)	9	77	14	63
	30		32	
	21		12	
	12		0	
	5		5	

Table 31 (continued)

Statement	Pre-Test Products	Pre-Test Total	Post-Test Products	Post-Test Total
(u)	13	66	16	57
	32		32	
	12		9	
	4		0	
	5		0	
(v)	7	91	15	63
	22		28	
	21		12	
	36		8	
	5		0	

added, the aggregate is 2127. The difference between these aggregates is 169. If all thirty-five students had given the most desired response, Strongly Disagree, on the post-test, and circled 5 for each of the sixteen statements, the aggregate would have been 2800 (35 x 5 x 16).

If the pre-test totals for the nine statements for which the desired responses were Agree and Strongly Agree are added, the aggregate is 813. If the post-test totals are added, the aggregate is 571. The difference between these aggregates is 242. If all thirty-five students had given the most desired response, Strongly Agree, and circled 1 for each of the nine statements, the aggregate would have been 315 (35 x 1 x 9).

If the difference between the aggregate totals for the sixteen statements is added to the difference between the aggregate totals for the nine statements, the result is 411 (169 + 242). To see the significance of this number, it is necessary to ascertain how large it could possibly have been if the responses of all students on the post-test had been the most desired ones. Thus, for each of the two groups of statements, it is necessary to find the difference between the aggregate on the pre-test and the best possible aggregate on the post-test. If these two differences are then added, it will be clear how large the number 411 could have been had all students given the most desired response to each statement on the post-test. The calculations follow:

Statements to which Disagree and Strongly Disagree were the desired responses.

Pre-test Aggregate	1958
Best Possible Aggregate	2800
Difference	842

Statements to which Agree and Strongly Agree were the desired responses.

Pre-test Aggregate	813
Best Possible Aggregate	315
Difference	498

Sum of the Two Differences

842 + 498 = 1340

If all students had given the most desired responses on the post-test to each of the twenty-five statements, there would have been 1340 moves in the direction of desired attitudinal change, such as from Strongly Agree to Agree, or from Agree to Undecided, in the case of the statements for which the most desired response was Strongly Disagree. In fact, the results of the post-test of attitudes show that there were 411 such moves, an average of 16.4 per statement.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Internship

The purpose of this internship was to develop and evaluate a unit of curriculum and instruction for senior high school English students in Newfoundland.

The unit, entitled Two Varieties of English, analyzes the vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar of Newfoundland dialect and standard English and the way each has developed. One objective of the unit, therefore, was to give students an understanding of the structure and history of both Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Attitudes toward the two varieties of English, and the reasons for them, are also examined. The unit deals with the way in which each variety is perceived by the layman as well as by more serious students of language whose areas of interest include Newfoundland dialect as well as standard English. Despite the more popular notion that Newfoundland dialect is inferior to standard English, the unit agrees with the linguists that our dialect is a legitimate, effective means of communication for certain kinds of purposes, audiences, and settings. It fully accepts the way in which one's language, whether it be standard or nonstandard, is closely tied to one's identity or sense of belonging to a group. At the same time, it

recognizes the necessary role that standard English has as the accepted uniform means of communication in the larger community of divergent linguistic practice where dialectal variations would impede communication. It acknowledges the barriers to economic and social advancement that are erected if one fails to use standard English in certain kinds of communication situations. The unit advises that it is neither necessary to accept these barriers nor to reject the language of one's family, friends and community, proposing as the solution to this dilemma bidialectalism, the use of one variety of English or the other depending on which is more suitable for a particular communication situation.

Through such an approach the objective was to encourage students to adopt more positive and rational attitudes to standard English and Newfoundland dialect; to have students recognize that both varieties of English are effective linguistic systems, but at the same time realize that partly because of the necessity of a standard version of English but also because of widespread negative attitudes to Newfoundland dialect, it is wise for a speaker of Newfoundland dialect to learn to speak standard English and to use it where it is more suitable than the nonstandard dialect. Otherwise, he will be handicapped by an inability to communicate effectively in certain settings, by the discrimination directed against him because of his non-standard dialect, or by both.

The unit was taught by the intern to a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island. The success of the unit in achieving its objectives was evaluated through the use of a post-unit quiz and a pre-test and post-test of students' attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Format of the Unit

The student textbook has five chapters. Each chapter is divided into three sections. At the end of each section there are a number of suggested exercises and activities. First among these is a group of questions entitled Check Your Reading which required students to recall some of the more important information given in the preceding section. These questions enabled students to determine how well they understood and remembered what they had studied. Following this, there is a group of questions and activities entitled For Further Study and Thought. These are inquiry- and discovery-oriented and encouraged further reading and thinking about standard English and Newfoundland dialect. They also encouraged students to consider their own use of language and to independently investigate and describe the rules governing some of the choices of pronunciation and grammatical usage in their dialect.

Chapter 1 of this text is entitled Introduction: Newfoundland and Standard English. This chapter deals with the following topics: why Newfoundland speech is distinctive,

why there are different dialects within the Province, why Newfoundland dialect is becoming more standardized, why the different dialects within the Province are becoming similar, definitions of standard and nonstandard English, and popular attitudes to standard and nonstandard English.

Chapter 2 is entitled Vocabulary. It shows that Newfoundland's distinctive vocabulary can be broken down into four categories: (1) words that can be traced in some form to earlier use in Britain, but which are now wholly or partially obsolete outside of Newfoundland; (2) words that Newfoundlanders have invented; (3) standard English words that have taken on new meanings in Newfoundland; (4) corruptions of standard English words. Examples of words in each category are given. Attention is given to the reasons that these developments took place. Furthermore, Chapter 2 shows that the same processes have equally influenced the development of standard English vocabulary. This is used as an argument to indicate that negative attitudes to Newfoundland vocabulary are unjustified. A second argument that is given is that our vocabulary allows us to accomplish a fundamental aim of all language - clear, precise, effective communication - and so cannot justifiably be labelled inferior.

Chapter 3 is entitled Pronunciation. It begins by comparing British and Canadian pronunciation, showing that each is governed by an underlying system and regularity. The same regularity is shown to exist in Newfoundland dialect as well. The chapter also shows pronunciation in Newfoundland

dialect to have many points in common with old standard English pronunciation. It also demonstrates that transposition of sounds and changing or adding of sounds have influenced pronunciation in standard English as well as Newfoundland dialect. All of this reveals that the conclusion that Newfoundland pronunciation is lazy or sloppy is not supported by an analysis of our dialect.

Chapter 4 is entitled Grammar. It begins by defining grammar as our knowledge of our language which tells us the order which words may take in a sentence and the way in which a word changes form and/or its function when it is used in different positions in a sentence. This chapter demonstrates that instead of breaking the grammatical rules of standard English, Newfoundlanders follow the rules of their own grammar. This grammar is different from standard English grammar because (1) we have retained some grammatical features from old English which standard English has dropped, and (2) we have continued grammatical developments begun in standard English but later halted by the artificial restrictions that grammarians placed on language development. The chapter shows that the first factor has, in some cases, allowed our language to be more expressive and concise, and that the second has allowed us to simplify and economize our grammar and continue the normal processes of language development. These points indicate that our grammar is anything but inferior to standard English grammar.

Chapter 5 is entitled Conclusion: Using Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English. This chapter begins by showing that local language scholars believe that Newfoundland dialect is not inferior to standard English. The chapter then explains that our language has not gained popular acceptance or prestige because we as a people have historically not had much power, influence, or material prosperity. Negative judgements about our dialect are based on this and have nothing to do with the actual quality of the dialect. The following section of the chapter shows that because of these widespread negative attitudes, and in spite of the fact that they are unjustified, a speaker of Newfoundland dialect would be wise to learn standard English and use it in situations where communication would be hampered by the use of a nonstandard dialect or where one might be discriminated against for using it. It shows that one does not have to abandon one's dialect to speak standard English, but that one can choose to be bidialectal, using whatever variety of English is suitable in a particular communicatron situation. The last section of Chapter 5 uses one of the definitions of "good English" given by Henderson and Shephard (1973): good English is English "which gets the desired effect with the least friction and difficulty for its user (p. 67.) Examples are given to show that standard English is sometimes "bad English" and sometimes "good English", and to show that the same is true of Newfoundland dialect. Each variety of English can be used appropriately or inappropriately.

Objectives of the Unit

The objectives of the unit were:

1. to give students an understanding of the history and structure of Newfoundland dialect and standard English.
2. to promote rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

Methods of Evaluation

The intern taught Two Varieties of English to a Grade Eleven English class at Coaker Academy, New World Island, and subsequently employed three instruments to evaluate the success of the unit in achieving its objectives. These instruments were (1) a post-unit quiz, (2) a pre-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English, and (3) a post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

The purpose of the post-unit quiz was to determine the degree to which Objective 1 had been met. Thus, the quiz required students to recall some factual information and to demonstrate an understanding of (1) the way in which Newfoundland dialect and standard English have developed and (2) the structure and system underlying each of these varieties of English as it presently exists.

Prior to beginning study of the unit, students were informed of the post-unit quiz and given an outline of what they would be expected to understand after they had completed the unit. Students were told that they would be expected to

use examples where possible to demonstrate their understanding of the ideas and information presented. Because Two Varieties of English was treated the same as any other unit of study which the students might have done, and not as a frill of the Grade Eleven English course, they were told that the mark received on the post-unit quiz would be counted as credit toward their final grade in the course, and that understanding of the unit would be tested in the comprehensive examination given at the end of the first term. Although the intern felt that the relevance of the unit to the students' lives would heighten the motivation to learn, he also believed that treating the unit as an important part of the Grade Eleven English course, and not as a frill, would increase motivation as well.

A Likert-type instrument was used both as a pre-test and post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. Its purpose was to determine whether Objective 2 had been achieved. The pre-test and post-test consisted of twenty-five statements, each of which expressed an opinion about Newfoundland dialect or standard English, or both. Accompanying the tests was an answer sheet on which students indicated by drawing a circle around 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 whether they strongly agreed with each statement, agreed, were undecided, disagreed, or strongly disagreed.

The pre-test was administered during the first Grade Eleven English class of the school year. The instructions which preceded the test were read to students to ensure that they were understood. These instructions explained the format

of the test and the way in which answers were to be given on the answer sheet. They also gave an example of Newfoundland dialect and an example of standard English. As well, they pointed out that it was not possible to pass or fail the test, but that the important thing for students to remember was to be honest in their answers. While introducing the test, the intern emphasized that the purpose of the test was to find out students' opinions on Newfoundland dialect and standard English, and not to evaluate them or give them a grade.

This point was again emphasized when the post-test was written and instructions were again read to students. Students were told that a different kind of quiz would be given later whose purpose would be to evaluate their mastery of the unit. They were reminded that they would be given no mark or grade on the post-test of attitudes.

The answer sheets for the pre-test and post-test were collected and later analyzed to determine the degree to which objective 1 had been achieved.

Results of Evaluation

Thirty-six students wrote the post-unit quiz. Thirty-two students passed (the passing mark being 50%) and four failed. The marks ranged from 25% to 96%, with the average mark being 71%.

Six students scored between 90% and 100%, nine between 80% and 89%, six between 70% and 79%, seven between 60% and 69%, and four between 50% and 59%. Thus, there were fifteen marks

of 80% or more, twenty-one of 70% or more, and twenty-eight of 60% or more. Since only one mark in the 60% to 69% range was less than 65%, twenty-seven students of the thirty-six who wrote the post-unit quiz scored 65% or more.

The four students who failed the quiz had marks of 40%, 36%, 33%, and 25%. The fact that four students failed the quiz while twenty-six students received marks of 65% or more can be attributed to the nature and size of the class. First, it was a heterogeneous class with a wide range of abilities. In such a class, it is to be expected that some students will experience difficulty with concepts and material deemed suitable for Grade Eleven. Second, it was a class of thirty-six students, so it was often difficult for the intern to give as much individual help as some of the weaker students needed.

The average mark for Question 1, 2, 3, and 4 was 68%, 80%, 74%, and 61% respectively. Thirty, thirty-five, thirty-two, and twenty-five students parsed Question 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

The low marks on Question 4 relative to the marks on the other questions is partly attributable to the particular concept with which Question 4 dealt, system or regularity in language. The post-unit quiz was written in a single forty-minute class period, and insufficient time to deal properly with Question 4, the last one on the quiz, seemed also to have been a contributing factor.

The pre-test and post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English were used to determine the extent to which Objective 2 had been met. The responses of thirty-five, rather than thirty-six, students were analyzed. One student was absent from school on the day that the post-test was written. In order to facilitate the comparison of responses on the pre-test and post-test, that students' responses on the pre-test were disregarded.

For each statement on the pre-test and post-test, the desired responses were Strongly Agree and Agree, or Strongly Disagree and Disagree, depending on whether or not the statement reflected a rational attitude to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. For Statements (e), (f), (q), and (t) there were fifteen to seventeen additional desired responses on the post-test as compared to the pre-test. There were ten to thirteen additional desired responses to Statements (j), (m), and (v); six to nine additional desired responses to Statements (a), (b), (g), (i), (k), (o), and (r); three to four additional desired responses to Statements (c), (h), (n), and (u); one additional desired response to Statement (d); no change in the number of desired responses to Statements (l) and (v); one fewer desired response to Statements (s) and (w); and five and seven fewer desired responses to Statements (p) and (x) respectively.

There were sixteen statements on the pre-test and post-test for which the desired responses were Disagree and

Strongly Disagree. For each statement, students were asked to draw a circle around 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 depending on whether their response was Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. Thus, a high number on each of the sixteen statements reflected rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English and a low number did the opposite.

For each statement, the numbers for thirty-five students were added to form a total for both the pre-test and post-test. Of the sixteen statements for which the desired responses were Disagree and Strongly Disagree, the post-test totals were appreciably larger than the pre-test totals except for Statements (l), (p), (s), (x), and (y), for which the post-test totals were smaller, and Statements (d) and (w), for which the post-test totals were larger by one and two respectively. For Statements (l), (s), (w), and (y), this was attributable to the fact that there were between thirty-one and thirty-three desired responses to these statements on the pre-test, and only minor fluctuations in the responses of the class to these statements on the post-test. In the case of Statements (p), (x), and (d), there were inherent weaknesses, especially in ambiguous wording which were unforeseen at the time the pre-test and post-test were designed.

If the pre-test totals (for the sixteen statements for which a high number indicated rational attitudes) are added, the aggregate total was 1958. The post-test aggregate total was 2127. The difference between the two is 169. The highest possible total was 2800.

There were nine statements on the pre-test and post-test for which the desired responses were Agree and Strongly Agree. In this case a low total reflects rational attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English. For each of the nine statements, the total was lower for the post-test than for the pre-test. The aggregate total for the pre-test was 813; for the post-test it was 571. The difference was 242. The best possible total was 315.

If the difference between the aggregate totals for the sixteen statements is added to the difference between the aggregates for the nine statements, the sum is 411. If all students had given the most desired response to each statement on the post-test, the sum would have been 1340. This latter number gives the relative significance of 411 as an indicator of the amount of desired attitudinal change which occurred.

Conclusions

The intern believes that the results of the post-unit quiz demonstrate that Objective 1 was achieved to a high degree. The results show that Question 4 was poorly answered relative to the other three questions. However, even in this case, twenty-five students did pass the question. The intern believes that this is much better than the students would have done on a pre-unit quiz, given the fact that they had not engaged in any sustained, systematic study of the history and structure of Newfoundland dialect and standard English

prior to studying the unit developed in this internship. The results for the remaining three questions on the post-unit quiz show that the majority of students did gain an understanding and knowledge of the history and structure of the two varieties of English in question.

The intern believes that the results of the pre-test and post-test of attitudes to Newfoundland dialect and standard English demonstrate that Objective 2 was achieved, albeit to a lesser degree. On the post-test, there were four statements to which there were fifteen or more additional desired responses as compared to the pre-test; seven statements to which there were ten or more additional desired responses; and fourteen statements to which there were six or more additional desired responses. These numbers are fairly high in light of the fact that for twelve of the twenty-five statements, there were twenty-three or more desired responses on the pre-test.

In summary, the intern makes the following conclusions:

1. Objective 1 was achieved to a high degree.
2. Objective 2 was achieved to a fairly high degree.

REFERENCES

References

Bereiter, Carl, Seigfried Engelman, Jean Osborn, and Philip A. Reidford. "An Academically-Oriented Pre-School for Culturally Deprived Children." In Fred M. Hechinger (Ed.), Pre-School Education Today. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966, pp. 105-137.

Bernstein, Basil. "Elaborated and Restricted Codes," American Anthropologist, 66 (1964), pp. 55-69.

_____. "Education Cannot Compensate for Society," New Society, 15 (February, 1970), pp. 344-347.

Bolinger, Dwight. Aspects of Language. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanivich, Inc., 1975.

Brown, Lloyd. "Characteristics of the Newfoundland Dialect," The Morning Watch, 4 (November, 1976), pp. 1-3.

Chomsky, Noam. "Language and Unconscious Knowledge." In Joseph H. Smith (Ed.), Psychoanalysis and Language, Vol. 3, Psychiatry and the Humanities. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1978.

Crocker, Oswald K. School Grammars in Historical Perspective. St. John's, Newfoundland: Committee on Publications, Faculty of Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1971.

Drysdale, P.D. "A First Approach to Newfoundland Phonemics," Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association, 5 (1959), pp. 25-34.

England, G.A. "Newfoundland Dialect Items," Dialect Notes, 5 (1925), pp. 322-346.

Fasold, Ralph W. and Walter A. Wolfram. "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect." In David L. Shores (Ed.), Contemporary English Change and Variation. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. 53-85.

Fowler, Mary E. Teaching Language, Composition and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Goodman, Yetta M. "Qualitative Reading Miscue Analysis for Teacher Training." In Richard E. Hodges and E. Hugh Rudorf (Eds.), Language and Learning to Read. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1972, pp. 160-166.

Graham, R.T. and E.H. Rudorf. "Dialect and Spelling," Elementary English, 47 (1970), pp. 363-376.

Henderson, Jim and Ronald T. Shephard. Language Moves. Don Mills, Ontario: Thomas Nelson and Sons (Canada) Limited, 1973, p. 67.

Hook, J.N. "English Language Program for the Seventies." In Hal D. Funk and Dewayne Triplett (Eds.), Language Arts in the Elementary School: Readings. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. 5-13.

Jordan, John. "Induction to Dialect," The Newfoundland Quarterly, 65 (1967), pp. 23-26.

Labov, William. Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

_____. The Social Stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

_____. The Study of Nonstandard English. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970.

Labov, William, Paul Cohen, Clarence Robins, and John Lewis. A Study of the Non-Standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican Speakers in New York City. Final Report, Cooperative Research Project No. 3288, Volume 1. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1968.

Liles, Bruce. Linguistics and the English Language. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Lin, San-su C. "Disadvantaged Student? Or Disadvantaged Teacher?" In Dwight L. Burton and John S. Simons (Eds.), Teaching English in Today's High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970, pp. 419-427.

Loban, Walter, Margaret Ryan and James Squire. Teaching Language and Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1969.

Malmstrom, Jean. "Dialects." In David L. Shores (Ed.), Contemporary English Change and Variation. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. 17-25.

Paddock, Harold. Some Variations in the Phonology and Grammar of Newfoundland English. Unpublished paper, 1974.

_____. "The Destruction of Language in Newfoundland," The Morning Watch, 2 (January, 1975), pp. 1-3.

Patterson, George. "Notes on the Dialect of the People of Newfoundland," Journal of American Folklore, 8 (1895), pp. 27-40.

_____. "Notes on the Dialect of the People of Newfoundland," Journal of American Folklore, 10 (1897), pp. 203-213.

Pyles, Thomas. "English Usage: The Views of the Literate." In David L. Shores (Ed.), Contemporary English Change and Variation. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. 160-169.

Pyles, Thomas and John Algeo. English: An Introduction to Language. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.

Scargill, M.H. and H.J. Warkentyne. "The Survey of Canadian English: A Report," The English Quarterly, 5 (1972), pp. 47-104.

Schneider, M. "Black Dialect: The Basis for an Approach to Reading Instruction," Educational Leadership, 28 (1971), pp. 543-549.

Shores, David L. "Preface." In David L. Shores (Ed.), Contemporary English Change and Variation. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. vii-xii.

Sledd, James. "Bi-Dialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy." In Hal D. Funk and Dewayne Triplett (Eds.), Language Arts in the Elementary School: Readings. New York: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1972, pp. 199-207.

Smiley, Marjorie B. "Gateway English: Teaching English to Disadvantaged Students." In Dwight L. Burton and John S. Simmons (Eds.), Teaching English in Today's High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970, pp. 402-418.

Smith, Frank. Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Story, George. "A Newfoundland Dialect Dictionary: A Survey of the Problems." A paper read before the St. John's Branch of the Humanities Association of Canada, 13 April, 1956.

_____. "Dialect and the Standard English," Newfoundland Teacher's Association Journal, 49 (1957), pp. 16-20.

_____. "Research in the Language and Place Names of Newfoundland." A paper read before the Canadian Linguistic Association at Ottawa, 13 June, 1957.

_____. "Newfoundland English Usage," The Encyclopedia Canadiana, 7 (1958), pp. 321-322.

_____. "The Dialects of Newfoundland English." In Harold Paddock (Ed.), Languages in Newfoundland and Labrador, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland, 1977, pp. 74-80.

Tomkinson, Grace. "Shakespeare in Newfoundland," Dalhousie Review, 20 (1940), pp. 58-70.

Trudgill, Peter. Sociolinguistics: An Introduction. Markham, Ontario: Penguin Books Canada Ltd., 1974.

Walker, Lawrence. "Dialect and Reading in Newfoundland Schools," The Morning Watch 2 (1975), pp. 3-6.

_____, Harold Paddock, Lloyd Brown, and Ishmael Baksh. "Nonstandard Dialect and Literacy: An Inservice Project in Newfoundland," Interchange, 6 (1975), pp. 4-10.

Weingartner, Charles. "English for What?" In Dwight L. Burton and John S. Simmons (Eds.), Teaching English in Today's High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970, pp. 388-401.

Whalen, John. The Effects of Varying Contexts on the Adding and Dropping of [h] by Grade IV and Grade IX Readers on New World Island, Newfoundland. Master's Thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1978.

Wolfram, W. and R.W. Fasold. The Study of Social Dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

APPENDIX A

TWO VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

A UNIT OF ENGLISH STUDY

TWO VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

Varrick Cooper

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction: Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English

> Dat young angishore got a swile bone stuck across his kingcarn and he can't glutch.
>
> I'm after eatin' two or t'ree of 'em, but I'm not goin' t' eat ne'er nudder one, 'fraid dere'll be none left for Mom when she gets home; she bees some mad when we eats 'em all.

The sentences above are easily recognized as Newfoundland dialect. Have you ever wondered why we have such a distinctive dialect?

Our speech has always been different to a certain degree from that used in the rest of North America. To understand why this is so, we have to remember that Newfoundland was the first part of North America to be settled. Our forefathers, attracted by the abundance of fish, began to arrive in Newfoundland as early as the late sixteenth century. The speech they brought with them was, of course, the same as that which they had used in the old country. At the time of settlement, such words as <u>firk</u> (to rummage about) and <u>dout</u> (to extinguish a fire) were still in use in Britain, and so were brought to Newfoundland.

For some reason, these words later disappeared from British speech. Thus, when emigrants from Britain settled the rest of Canada in later years, some words in use in

Newfoundland were not carried there because they were not part of the settlers' vocabulary. Right from the beginning, therefore, our vocabulary was different from that used in the rest of Canada. The same is true of our pronunciation and grammar. Some of these differences in vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar remain to this day.

However, the fact that Newfoundland was settled earlier than the rest of Canada is not the main factor accounting for the distinctiveness of Newfoundland speech. More important is the fact that for hundreds of years we were isolated from the rest of Canada. Our inhabitants had little contact with the outside world. If we had not been isolated, many of the original differences between the speech of Newfoundlanders and other Canadians would have gradually disappeared as the two groups copied elements of each other's language when they met and interacted.

However, as a result of isolation, the language used by the two groups not only remained different, but became even more different, for the changes that took place in the speech of one group did not spread to the other. For example, after settlement, Newfoundlanders created new words such as rodney (a small keeled boat) and changed the meaning of old words such as civil (which we use to mean 'calm' or 'quiet'), but these changes did not spread to the rest of Canada. Thus, over a long period of time, our vocabulary became even more distinctive from that used in the rest of Canada than it had

been at the time of settlement. In a similar way, our pronunciation and grammar also became more distinctive.

In this century, and especially in the last forty years or so, this isolation has almost ceased to exist, and as a result our speech today is more like that of other Canadians than it was fifty or sixty years ago. Great improvements in transportation have lessened our isolation. The coming of the automobile and the airplane, and the increased prosperity that Confederation has brought us have all enabled Newfoundlanders to travel much more and have frequent contact with other Canadians. There have also been revolutionary inventions in communication, such as radio and television. As a result, the outside world is brought into our homes every day. Because our isolation has been largely broken down, we are in contact with the kinds of English used in the rest of North America a great deal more than we have been historically, and gradually our speech is becoming more similar to that used outside the province.

You can prove that this is so by listening carefully to the language used by different generations of Newfoundlanders. If you do, you will probably discover that you speak a more standard English* than your parents, who in turn speak a more standard English than your grandparents. To get an idea of how much Newfoundland speech has changed since the

---

*Standard English is any kind of English which is commonly thought of as "correct English" or "proper English".

1920's, we can look at excerpts from The Greatest Hunt in the World by George Allan England, an American journalist who wrote a report of the seal fishery as he experienced it in 1922. He became very interested in the speech of Newfoundlanders and faithfully recorded it in his book. In the following passage, the master watch is speaking to England.

> "I'll get ye a rope an' gaff, me son, an ye can go on ice alang o' me, killin' swiles. I'll get ye some good offers (chances) as'll putt ye up in glee. Ye mightn't like dat, first-alang, an' it might put ye in a fluster, but after ye tracks around a spill (while) wid we an' gets de how of it, I lows ye'll get shockin' fond of it. Yere," and he drew his knife, "yere'm a knife ye can have, b'y. A wonnerful knife, dat. Two jags on de steel wid dat, and ye can rip a swile rate out."

The following is what one sealer said during a testimony meeting in the regular church service held aboard ship:

> God an' Christ is me best frien's. Dem'll stan' by me. I'll stand by dey, so when I nade 'em, dem'll stan' by me. I was plunged in de pit o' sin---but now I'm save. I ain't ashamed fer to testify fer you, Lord. I praise thy dear name an' -- . . . an' I knows in de hour o' deat' you'll stan' by me! Amen!

This is the language of the sealer of 1922. Today, the speech of most, if not all, sealers would be much more standard than this. Again, the main reason for this is that we are no longer as isolated as we once were. However, there are other reasons as well.

In the 1920's, few Newfoundland parents could afford to keep their children in school until graduation. Young men

and women were needed to help their parents provide for the family. Many of them attended school for only a few years. Today, there is compulsory education to age fifteen, and a far greater percentage of Newfoundland young people are graduating from school. Since standard English is the language used in the classroom, today's young Newfoundlanders are in contact with this kind of English for a greater length of time, and this probably has a significant effect on their speech. Also, as Newfoundland students have become better educated, they have in greater numbers moved into areas of employment in which they are expected to use standard English.

It is for such reasons as these that the speech of Newfoundlanders has been, and is, becoming more similar to the language used by other Canadians. In spite of this, however, our speech is still quite distinctive, and probably will remain so for a long time, since most language change occurs slowly.

Check Your Reading

1. With how many of the following statements would you agree?
   a) The speech used by any group of people changes with the passage of time.
   b) Some words "die", or disappear from the speech of a group of people.
   c) Some words take on new or additional meanings.
   d) New words may be invented and become part of a language.

e) When two groups of people are isolated from each other, their language becomes more and more different as time passes.

f) When two groups of people have frequent contact with each other, their language becomes more and more similar.

2. How has both Newfoundland's history and geography played a part in making our speech distinctive? (Clues: history--early settlement; geography--isolation)

3. What are some of the reasons for the fact that the speech of Newfoundlanders is becoming more standardized?

For Further Study and Thought

1. a) How much of the dialectal vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar in the two sentences at the beginning of this chapter is used in your community?

b) Attempt to rewrite these dialectal sentences in standard English.

2. a) Can you think of specific ways in which your speech is different from that of your parents and grandparents?

b) In what specific ways is your speech similar to and different from that used by the sealers as they are quoted in The Greatest Hunt in the World?

3. What are some areas of employment for which a requirement might be the ability to use standard English?

4. a) How do you feel about Newfoundland dialect becoming more standardized? In your opinion, is it good or

bad that this is happening?

b) Do you think that within your lifetime the speech of most Newfoundlanders will be indistinguishable from that of Canadians generally? Would you like to see this happen? Why or why not?

c) If the "oil boom" materializes, what effect might it have on Newfoundland speech? Would it tend to make our language more standard or less standard? Why?

Up to this point, we have been discussing Newfoundland speech in such a way that it would seem that all Newfoundlanders in every community and along every coast speak the same way. In reality, the term 'Newfoundland dialect' which we have used is an oversimplification, for there are many dialects within Newfoundland. You are well aware of this if you have friends in other parts of the province. Because of the differences in the way people from different parts of Newfoundland speak, you may have found each other's speech quite amusing. In different areas of the province, low bushes on the barrens are referred to as <u>tuckamore</u>, <u>goowitty</u>, and <u>browse</u>. Are you familiar with all of these words? If not, it is because one or more is not part of the particular Newfoundland dialect which you speak.

Why are there different dialects within Newfoundland? This can partly be explained by the fact that the people who settled Newfoundland originated in different places. In some

parts of Newfoundland, most of the settlers came from England, while in other parts they were mainly of Irish stock. (Some of our ancestors came from other countries, but the great majority came from either England or Ireland.) The speech of those Newfoundlanders whose ancestors emigrated from Ireland often has an Irish quality, while the speech of those whose forefathers came from England has often retained features of the speech in England at the time of emigration. For instance, Notre Dame Bay was settled by the English, and St. Mary's Bay on the Avalon Peninsula was settled by the Irish. Thus, you will often find that people from these two areas are clearly distinguishable in their speech.

However, different places of origin of our settlers is not the most important reason for the fact that there are different dialects within Newfoundland today. Again, isolation is the most important factor, just as it was the key factor in making Newfoundland speech as a whole different from the kind of English used in the rest of Canada. While Newfoundlanders were isolated from people in the outside world, they were in many cases also isolated from each other. For many years, many of the people in the numerous fishing communities along the coast travelled little outside their immediate area. Some industries such as the seal hunt and the woods industry brought some Newfoundlanders from different areas of the Province together, but there was not nearly as much contact between people from different areas of the Province as there is today. In his book I Chose Canada, former premier Joey Smallwood described the isolation as it existed when he took

office in 1949:

> There were more than 1,200 different settled communities in Newfoundland on the day that I became Premier. Hundreds of them were tiny coves with fewer than fifty families. There weren't a dozen places with as many as 8,000 souls. Virtually all of the places in Newfoundland and Labrador stretched along the 6,000 miles of deeply indented coastline, and you could count on the fingers of your two hands the places that were out of sight and sound of the Atlantic Ocean. You could reach perhaps 300 of them by road. For the rest, the sea was the only roadway; or you could walk through the trees, over the barrens and bogs, trying always to keep the sea in sight most of the time. . . the great majority of communities were physically as isolated, as remote as they had been centuries before.

If there had not been such tremendous isolation for such a long period of our history, the different dialects that were brought by the settlers would have gradually become more and more alike. Many of the original differences in the speech of people from different areas of the province would eventually have disappeared, as through daily contact a speaker from one area affected another from another area. What happened instead was that the isolation preserved some of the original differences.

Just as Newfoundland dialect has become more similar to the kind of English used by other Canadians, so have the different dialects within Newfoundland become more similar to each other. Once again, it is because of the great reduction in isolation. With increased prosperity, the opening up of new roads, and the resettlement of many isolated communities, we now have much more contact with people in other parts of

the province than we once did. Because of this, there are now fewer differences in the speech of Newfoundlanders from different areas of the province than there were fifty years ago. However, language habits change slowly, so it is often still possible for someone with a good ear for dialect to tell what part of the province you are from, and sometimes even the particular community, simply by hearing you speak.

In spite of the fact that there are different dialects within the province, we are going to use the term 'Newfoundland dialect' because these dialects have many features in common, and because each is more similar to the other Newfoundland dialects than it is to any dialect in any other part of Canada. For example, it is probably true to say that the majority of Newfoundlanders have heard and used squish, duckish, vamps, rodney, and flankers, whereas these words would be meaningless to other Canadians who are unfamiliar with Newfoundland dialect.

Check Your Reading

1. Give two reasons that there are different dialects within Newfoundland.
2. Why have these dialects become more similar in the last half-century?

For Further Study and Thought

1. If you have friends in another part of Newfoundland, tell the class some ways in which their speech differs from yours.
2. Are you familiar with squish, duckish, vamps, rodney, and flankers? Can you define them?

3. Using Dr. E.R. Seary's Family Names of Newfoundland, attempt to find out where your ancestors might have sailed from.

Check in Dr. Seary's book a few names that are common in your area. You may find that your area was predominantly settled by people from a particular area of England or Ireland.

Put your sandwich in this container so that the ants and mosquitoes won't get at it.

Lodge your sandwich in this chummy where the emmets and nippers won't get at it.

How are these sentences alike? How are they different? If you examine them, you will see that while they express the same idea, they do so with different vocabularies. This is because they are written in two kinds of English--standard English and Newfoundland dialect, which is one kind of non-standard English.

Standard English is any kind of English that is normally referred to as "proper English" or "correct English". There are different forms of standard spoken English. For example, the standard English of England is different from the standard English of Canada. If a student from England used the phrase "proper English", he would be thinking of a different form of English than you would if you used the same phrase. The greatest number of differences between the standard English of England and the standard English of Canada probably occur in pronunciation, but there are also a

fair number of differences in vocabulary, as in petrol and gasoline, lorry and truck, and lift and elevator.

Other English-speaking countries also have a standard English which is somewhat different from other forms. The standard English of one country is usually accepted as a standard form of English in another country. For example, a speaker of Canadian standard English holidaying in Australia would not normally be considered to be using "incorrect" or "inproper English".

In this unit, we will be dealing with the standard English of Canada. You come in contact with this kind of English in the classroom, where your teachers use it and expect you to do likewise, especially in writing. Just as it is the language of the classroom, so it is also the language of the church, of the courts, of business, of the media, of government, and of many other institutions of Canadian society. Standard Canadian English is the kind of English that Canadians are thinking of when they speak about "proper English". It is the kind of English commonly used by the educated and influential in Canadian society.

Nonstandard English is any kind of English normally thought of as "improper English" or "incorrect English". Most English-speaking countries have many different varieties of nonstandard English, and the nonstandard dialects of one country are often considered to be "incorrect English" in other countries as well. Canada has many nonstandard dialects, but nowhere in our nation can be found a more

distinctive nonstandard language than Newfoundland dialect. This is the language that you are perhaps most comfortable with. It is probably the principal kind of English that you use. It is likely to be the language of your family, of your friends, and, to a large extent, of your community.

If you are a speaker of nonstandard Newfoundland dialect, you may be wondering why your language is considered "bad English" while other kinds of English are considered "good English". After all, why is it "correct" for the British to refer to a truck as a lorry, but "incorrect" for us to refer to a mosquito as a nipper? If it is "good English" when the British pronounce darling as dalling (to rhyme with appalling), why is it "bad English" when we pronounce bread as brid? Why is it more acceptable for Americans of the South to pronounce five with the i sounding like the ah that you hear in the dentist's office (fahve), than it is for us to pronounce five as foiv?

The rest of this unit deals with Canadian standard English and Newfoundland dialect. It says that our dialect is just as "good" as any other kind of language. The major purpose of a language is to communicate thoughts and feelings, and our dialect does that as well as any. (For example, doesn't nipper communicate effectively the idea of a biting mosquito?) In spite of this, most people consider Newfoundland dialect to be "bad English".

In Chapter 5 of this unit, you will learn the reasons for this attitude and what influences it should have on the kind of English you should use in different situations. But first, in Chapters 2, 3, and 4, we will take a close look at Newfoundland vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar, respectively. Each will be shown to be similar to that of standard English in the way that it has developed. Although many believe that Newfoundland dialect is made up of "bad" grammar, and "sloppy" or "lazy" pronunciations, and has in its vocabulary a lot of words that are not really words at all, the rest of this unit shows that our vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar are in no way "inferior". We begin in the next chapter by examining Newfoundland vocabulary.

Check Your Reading

1. a) What is standard English?
   b) What is Canadian standard English?
2. a) What is nonstandard English?
   b) Why is Newfoundland dialect a kind of nonstandard English?
3. What does the title of this unit refer to?

For Further Study and Thought

1. From your experience, which is more similar to Canadian standard English--the standard English of the United States or the standard English of England? Why do you think this is so?

2. Would you say that Australian standard English is more like Canadian standard English or the standard English of England? Why do you think this is so?
3. Why do you think Canadian standard English of a century ago was more like the standard English of England than it is today?
4. Besides those given on page 128, what are some other differences in vocabulary between Canadian English and the standard English of England? (See pages 11-13 of Mastering Effective English for help.)
5. In Mark Twain's Huckleberry Finn, read from "Well, I don't know" in Chapter 14 to the end of the chapter. This is a conversation between the negro Jim and his young white friend, Huck. Whose speech is more nonstandard?

Chapter 2

Vocabulary

The story is told of the following conversation between a tourist and a Newfoundlander:

"What's that you are carrying?"

"A starrigan."

"How do you spell that?"

"Well, in summer I spells en out on me back, and in winter I spells en out on me harse."

Not knowing that in Newfoundland dialect a starrigan is a stunted, weatherbeaten tree, and that spell means to carry, the tourist learned little from his exchange with the Newfoundlander, except possibly that Newfoundland has a quite distinctive vocabulary.

As was noted in Chapter 1, the key factor in the development of this unique vocabulary was isolation. Because communication with the outside world was restricted, we developed a vocabulary of our own. For the purpose of discussion, this distinctive stock of words can be broken down into four categories: (1) words that can be traced in some form to earlier use in Britain, but which are now wholly or partially obsolete (i.e., no longer in use) in the old country; (2) words that Newfoundlanders have invented; (3) standard English words that have taken on new meanings in Newfoundland; (4) corruptions of words in standard English. We will examine each of these in turn. Incidentally, it is

unlikely that you will be familiar with all the Newfoundland words given in this chapter, because some of them may be used in certain areas of the province only.

(1) Obsolete Words

Those who have investigated the origins of Newfoundland vocabulary have found that many of our words existed in some form in earlier British use, but have now become obsolete except in Newfoundland. The following is a list of some of these words:

angashore (n.) -- a worthless fellow; one to be pitied

biver (v.) -- to shiver with cold

conkerbills (n.) -- icicles

cronnic (n.) -- stunted, weatherbeaten tree; a synonym for starrigan

dout (v.) -- to extinguish a fire

droke (n.) -- sloping valley between two hills

duckish (adj.) -- near twilight

empt (v.) -- empty

firk (v.) -- to rummage about, to search for

flankers (n.) -- sparks from a chimney

fousty (adj.) -- mouldy, spoiled

glutch (v.) -- swallow

lop (n.) -- wave, as in "There's a good lop on today." The adjective is loppy.

lun (n.) -- a place of shelter from the elements

mouch (v.) -- to skip off from school

nesh (adj.) -- tender, sore, as in "I just hit me knee and it's some nesh."

randy (n.) -- a ride, especially on a coaster or sleigh

tickle (n.) -- a narrow passage of water

stog (v.) -- to stuff full

tole (v.) -- to allure with bait

yaffle (n.) -- an armload

yarry (adj.) -- alert, wide awake, as in "You won't be so yarry tomorrow morning when you got to get up and go to school."

Firk, dout, and fousty were used by Shakespeare (1564--1616); empt was used by Chaucer, who lived in the fourteenth century. Lop was used as late as 1867 in a London newspaper, Westminister Gazette. Biver, stog, tole, and nesh were also used in older English, with meanings identical or similar to their meanings in Newfoundland. For example, biver meant "to shake or tremble."

Conkerbills and duckish were used in Devonshire; yaffle, in Cornwall; yarry, in Kent. (Many Newfoundland settlers emigrated from these countries of England.) In the late nineteenth century mouch was still being used in the north of Ireland, and randy had been retained in Scotland.

Other Newfoundland words have a form that is slightly different from the older English word. Flankers comes from the older English word flanke, meaning "a spark"; glutch, from older English gulch, meaning "to swallow"; angashore, from Irish aindeiseoir, meaning "unfortunate person"; and randy, from older English randon, denoting rapid and violent motion.

Some words are still used in Newfoundland in the sense that they originally had in older English, whereas they

now have a new meaning in standard English. In other words, it is the meaning of the word that is obsolete, and not the word itself. For instance, in older English squat meant "to crush", just as it does today for the Newfoundlander who says, "He squat his finger." Likewise, maze originally meant "to bewilder", whereas in today's standard English it means "an intricate arrangement of passages." In Newfoundland, however, one might still say, "What a racket! It's enough to maze you."

(2) Inventions

Many of our distinctive words did not originate in Britain, but in our own province. We have invented many words, many of which are related to the activities in which we have traditionally been engaged. From the fishery, for example, come such terms as leggies and rounders (small, unsplit cod), sunker (a barely submerged rock), trunkhole (the hole through which fish offal is thrown in a fishing stage), puddick (codfish stomach), grumpheads (the posts on a wharf for tying up boats), and caplin-scull (the appearance of caplin inshore, usually in June).

From the sealing industry came jowler (a successful sealing captain), sculp (to separate the skin and fat of a seal from its carcass), bobbin'-hole (the ice-hole through which seals come up to feed their young), scunner (the man who directs the dealing ship from the barrel), sun-hound (an illusory sun seen when on the ice), and highliner (captain to be first in port with a full load of seals). And, of course, there are the

names applied to seals, such as harp, hood, whitecoat, raggedy-jacket, and bedlamer.

To describe the natural world around them our forefathers created such words and phrases as battycatters (ice formed along the seashore), frankum (hardened rosin of fir tree), dwy (or dwigh) (a slight rainfall or snowfall), pissabed (dandelion), sish ice (new or thin ice), rafted ice (ice piled in layers by pressure of sea and story), growler (a large cake of ice like a small iceberg), slob ice (ice broken into large pans), glitter (silver thaw), tickleass (Atlantic black-legged kitiwake), tur (common Atlantic murre), bull-bird (Common Dovekie), beachy-bird (Spotted Sandpiper), stearin' (Northern Common Tern), and twillick (Greater Yellow Legs).

Other inventions include brin-bag (a coarse sack for carrying vegetables, etc.), ronk (having a bad smell), cracky (a small dog), figgy duff (pudding with some fruit), splits (slivers of wood used for kindling), and spudgle (container for bailing a small boat).

(3) Words with New or Altered Meanings

Newfoundland vocabulary contains a number of words that are part of the vocabulary of standard English but are used in new ways in this Province. The unique meaning of some of these words is given below:

abroad (adv.) -- apart, as in "Her shoe came abroad."

car (n.) -- sled for hauling wood

civil (adj.) -- calm, quiet, as in "It's a civil day today."

cuff (n.) -- mitten

cod (v.) -- trick, as in "He's trying to cod you."

crooked (adj.) -- contrary, hard to please, as in "You're some crooked this morning."

head (n.) -- a most unusual occurrence, as in "That's the head! I never seen the like o' dat before!"

find (v.) -- to feel pain in, as in "He finds his back."

gaze (n.) -- a hiding place from which to shoot sea-birds and other game

lead (n.) -- passage of open water in an icefield

poison (v.) -- to greatly annoy, as in "There's some lot o' sports on television. It's enough to poison you."

steady (n.) -- that part of a river that widens until there is no perceptible current

reach (n.) -- alternative for tickle

run (n.) -- a series of connected tickles

scoff (n.) -- a big meal

scuff (n.) -- a dance, as in "Let's have a scuff."

sound (n.) -- a small bay, large harbour, or long and narrow tickle

stout (n.) -- a large fly

(4) Corruptions of Standard English Words

There are fewer words in this category than in either of the first three categories. Some examples are: outport motor (outboard motor), upstrapless (obstreperous), flatform (platform), swile (seal), braffus (breakfast). These corrupted words often developed because the standard English word was not

seen in print, but only heard. Not having heard the word correctly, speakers created a new word made up of already familiar words. For example, outboard became outport, a word already in frequent use. This was repeated and passed on to other speakers, who also said outport motor.

Check Your Reading

1. Into what four categories can Newfoundland words be divided? Give examples of words belonging to each category.

For Further Study and Thought

1. Of the words invented by Newfoundlanders, Dr. George Story of Memorial University has said, "These words range over the whole field of Newfoundland life and embody the experience of living on the Island in vivid and forceful terms." What invented words do you consider vivid and forceful?
2. Read Ray Guy's essay "Randying" in That Far Greater Bay in which he describes the "delights" of a randy on a coaster.
3. (a) Approximately what percentage of the Newfoundland words given in this chapter are you familiar with?
   (b) In your particular Newfoundland dialect, do any of these words have a different meaning than the ones given?
   (c) Do any of the words have a different form or pronunciation in your dialect? (For instance, perhaps you say ballycatters or baddycatters instead of battycatters.)

4. Write a story using as many Newfoundland dialect words as possible. Read your story to the class. (Remember that good writing is coherent. Do not sacrifice coherence in your attempt to use a large number of Newfoundland words.)

Keeping in mind the four categories of words that have just been discussed, let us now examine some common attitudes to Newfoundland vocabulary to see if they are valid. Many people think that Newfoundland words are not as "good" as standard English words. In fact, we have seen that a fair number of our words were standard English words at one time. Some of them, such as firk, dout, fousty, and empt, were used by two of the greatest writers ever to use the English language, Shakespeare and Chaucer. These are, of course, the words in the first category, the obsolete words. These disappeared from British usage but were retained in Newfoundland because our British settlers, having little contact with the homeland, had no way of knowing they were no longer used.

Perhaps, many of these words would have been kept in use in Newfoundland anyway, for our forefathers no doubt found them useful to describe their way of life. It is easy to see why such words as lop, angashore, yaffle and tickle remained as part of our language--they were useful words to fishermen. Perhaps lun was kept in use because of the fickleness of our weather. To have given our coves and harbours such names as Heart's Delight, Heart's Content, Heart's Desire, Happy

Adventure, Famish Gut, Come-By-Chance, Seldom-Come-By, and Pushthrough, our ancestors must have been a lively, spirited group endowed with optimism and humor. To such people, randy (which you will remember denoted rapid and violent motion in older English) was a word which complemented this spirit of fun too well to be abandoned. For various reasons, Newfoundland dialect held on to some words which disappeared in Britain.

In some cases, Canadian standard English has done a similar thing. An example is the use of 'I guess' to mean 'I suppose'. This usage has been lost in Britain, but is retained in Canada. Likewise, in older English, bug referred to any insect, and this meaning is still in use in Canada. However, in England bug now refers to the bedbug only. Thus, we see that in retaining words that have become obsolete in Britain, Newfoundland dialect has followed a development that is not too much different from that of Canadian standard English.

Similarly, the invention of new words is not something that has happened only in Newfoundland dialect. In the creation of such words as puddick, rounders, battycatters and cracky, our language has made the natural progression that all languages do. Like the human body which is continually building new cells, a language is continually adding new words. A language which does not produce new words grows stale and stagnant; new words revitalize a language and demonstrate its adaptability to changing circumstances. The constant addition of new words to standard English can be seen in the fact that

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary has 22,000 words that were not entered in Webster's Third New International Dictionary, published just twelve years earlier.

Before a word is added to a language, there are three requirements which must be met: first, a need for a new word; second, an inventive person; third, a group of speakers to adopt the new word and use it. When settlers came to Newfoundland, they were in a new environment and needed new words to describe it. This is how many of our inventions came about. The seal fishery was a new experience, and through it arose such words as sculp, scunner, bedlamer, and jowler. Likewise, a changing world has brought to standard English such new words and phrases as hippie, hassle, punk rock, hijack, uptight, Afro, buzzword, hang-up, and freak out.

Just as adding words is a natural development in a language, so is giving new meanings to old ones. As a matter of fact, a word may undergo quite a significant change in its meaning over a long period of time. For instance, in older English, minister meant "servant", meat referred to any kind of food, and pretty meant "sly". Change in the meaning of words is still occurring in standard English. For example, in has recently come to mean (in addition to its other meanings) fashionable or trendy, as in "It's the in thing to do." Into is now used to mean "involved with or interested in" as in "I'm really into Newfoundland literature right now." We have already seen that this natural progression of language has also occurred in Newfoundland dialect in such words as steady,

poison, and civil, all of which have taken on new meanings in our province.

The retention of obsolete words, the formation of new ones, and the development of new meanings for others have all occurred in both standard English and Newfoundland dialect. Finally, let us examine the fourth category, corruptions of words in standard English. Remember that these words sometimes developed because they were not seen on the printed page, but heard only. Because they were not heard properly, new words were created from them which contained familiar words or word-parts. For example, platform became flatform because flat was a familiar word. In the same way, obstreperous, meaning "unruly" or "aggressively noisy", became upstrapless. You will notice that in each of these cases, the new word is perhaps more closely linked to the intended meaning than the original word is. After all, a platform is flat, and upstrapless does somehow seem to convey the idea of defiance and unruliness.

Once again, we can find examples in standard English of words being formed by the same process. For example, hangnail was originally agnail, but because it refers to a bit of skin that hangs loose at the side of a fingernail, the word eventually became hangnail. Likewise, helpmate was at one time helpmeet. Since the word refers to a companion or helper, the part mate seemed to suit the meaning more effectively than meet. The result is the new word helpmate. (Helpmeet is still used, but helpmate is much more common.)

Check Your Reading

1. In what ways has Newfoundland vocabulary developed along the same lines as the vocabulary of standard English?
2. Why were words that became obsolete in Britain kept in use in Newfoundland?
3. Why does a language continually add new words?
4. Using an example, explain how a word becomes corrupted and takes on a new form.

For Further Study and Thought

1. Look at a detailed map of Newfoundland. In addition to those given in this chapter, what other interesting place names can you find?
2. (a) Read "Creation of Words" on pages 9-11 of Mastering Effective English for more on how words are added to a language.
   (b) Read "Changes in Meaning" on page 7 of Mastering Effective English for more information on how words change meaning.
3. From which field of human endeavor did most of the 22,000 new words in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary probably come -- business, art, science, or politics? Why?
4. What do the new standard English words listed on page 141 mean?

Are popular attitudes towards Newfoundland vocabulary valid? Two main arguments can be given to show that Newfoundland words are not "inferior" to standard English words. The

first is that an investigation of how languages change shows that much of our distinctive vocabulary developed in the same way as the vocabulary of standard English. In both kinds of English, new words have been added, other words have been given new meanings, and through mispronunciation some words have been changed into new forms. Likewise, where Newfoundland dialect has retained some words that have become obsolete in Britain, standard Canadian English has retained obsolete usages of certain words.

To derive the second and more important argument, we have to remember that the main reason we use language is to communicate thoughts and feelings. If this is so, then the claim that Newfoundland words are "inferior" does not hold up. The obsolete words, the new ones, the new meanings, and the corruptions are all part of our language because they have helped us to communicate effectively about the things that are important to us. For example, the new words and new meanings have given us ways of speaking about new experiences or describing old ones more effectively. The obsolete words were retained partly because we found them to be still useful and expressive in our new environment. Our corruptions often turned out to be better suited to the intended meaning than the original words.

In all of these ways, Newfoundland dialect has developed a vocabulary that communicates effectively. Just as standard English has words such as <u>cantankerous</u> and <u>moan</u> which seem to express the intended meaning particularly well, Newfoundland

dialect has words whose expressiveness cannot be denied, such as walloperdown (vigorous dancing), tongue-bangin' (scolding), squabby (soft), and slire or slur (to look at sideways in a sly fashion). If the purpose of language is to communicate, who is to discredit these Newfoundland words as "inferior": mouch, stog, sunker, puddick, growler, cracky, upstrapless?

Both standard English and Newfoundland dialect enable their speakers to express themselves clearly, precisely, and effectively. Their words should not be thought of as "correct" or "incorrect", but as different words that developed to a large extent independently of each other in different localities and under different conditions. It is likely that those who consider our vocabulary to be "inferior" have not considered our language in terms of how well it accomplishes the fundamental aim of all languages--communication.

Check Your Reading

1. How have the words in each of the four categories discussed in this chapter enabled us to communicate more effectively?

For Further Study and Thought

1. (a) How many of the following Newfoundland words and phrases can you define?

streel (n.)	bough-wiffin (n.)
blasty bough (n.)	blear out (v.)
tabbety (adj.)	prise (v.)
woodjack (n.)	bogie (n.)
cuddy (n.)	jannies (n.)

chinch (v.)
jinker (n.)
mug-up (n.)
slew around (v.)
rawny (adj.)
rhyme off (v.)
smatchy (adj.)
rampse or rompse (v.)
vamps (n.)
smellers (n.)
helf (n.)
lounder (v.)
up-along (adv.)
catch over (v.)
scote (v.)
swig (n. and v.)
whore's eggs (n.)
yes-ma'ams (n.)
scrunchins (n.)

(b) Choose the one word in this list which you consider to be most vivid and colorful. Compare your choice with the choices of your classmates.

2. (a) How many of the following similes and other expressions are you familiar with?

in your bare buff
in a crump
to come to your taps
pog-auger days
to fuss for yourself
till Tib's Eve
all in slings
to have ructions
to know someone all to pieces
to sing out to someone
a good few (or a nice few)
to drive works
by (be) rights
to do something the once
the proper ting (thing)
to get a lacin'
in the fat (as used by sealers)
Don't make strange.

Long may your big jib draw.
Let'er go for the gullies.
Dar 'tis and can't be no tisser.
as busy as a nailer
as white as the driven snow
as dark as pitch
as deaf as a haddock
as ignorant as a pig
as old as Buckley's goat
as slow as cold molasses
like a birch broom in the fits.
as stiff as a poker

(b) Of all these expressions, which in your view is most vivid?

3. In Newfoundland we have unique ways of addressing people. For example, we might say "What time is it, buddy?" However, buddy would not be used to address any person. First, we would not use it if we were speaking to a female. Second, it is highly unlikely that we would use it to address a senior citizen. Third, we would be more likely to use buddy if we were speaking to someone we didn't know than to someone we did know. These are all restrictions on the use of buddy as a term of address.

Whom would you address with each of the following: skipper, cocky, my duck, my son, my dear, b'y, maid?

4. Think of the people with whose names you use uncle and aunt, and then show that these words are used in a unique way in Newfoundland.

5. As a class, make up your own list of Newfoundland words and expressions.
6. Read Ted Russell's story "Whorts" in The Chronicles of Uncle Mose. Mr. Russell clearly shows how he feels about Newfoundland vocabulary.
7. The following is a comment on the obsolete words in Newfoundland dialect: "These are vigorous, colorful, pleasant-sounding words and standard language is poorer without them" (Dr. Lloyd Brown, Memorial University). Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Why?

Chapter 3

Pronunciation

In this chapter we will be looking at the differences in pronunciation between Newfoundland dialect and standard Canadian English. As a background to this, we will first examine in more detail something that was briefly mentioned earlier. In Chapter 1, you learned of the different forms of standard English in different countries. You were told that standard Canadian English and the standard English of England are more different in pronunciation than in vocabulary or grammar. We will now explore two of these differences in pronunciation.

To even the most casual listener, one of the most noticeable differences lies in the pronunciation of such words as ask, path, aunt, dance, and romance. The English pronounce the a in these words as Canadians pronounce the o in top. On the other hand, Canadians pronounce ask, path, etc., using the a of tap. Say each of the above words as it would commonly be pronounced in England and Canada.

A second important difference lies in the pronunciation of r in such words as far and darling. Most of the British do not pronounce the r at all when it comes in final position, as in far, or middle position, as in darling. (They do pronounce the r in initial position, as in rat.) For example, darling is pronounced as if it were spelled dawling, while far in British speech sounds like the first syllable of father, with

no trace of the r sound. In standard Canadian English, of course, the r is pronounced whether it is in initial, middle, or final position.

From these two differences in pronunciations, a couple of points can be made. The first thing to be noticed is that although the British speaker and the Canadian speaker pronounce words differently, neither set of pronunciations is thought to be "incorrect". Both have universal acceptance in the English-speaking world. For instance, an English tourist in Canada who pronounced darling as dawling would not be said to have mispronounced the word. Two groups of people may pronounce words differently without either being considered "incorrect". This point has been made to demonstrate that pronunciations in Newfoundland dialect cannot logically be termed "lazy" or "sloppy" simply because they are different from those of Canadian standard English.

The second point that can be made from the comparison of British and Canadian pronunciations is that each set of pronunciations follows a regular system. The word system here denotes that words are pronounced according to certain regular patterns. For instance, the British pronounce all words such as far and darling without the r. They do not, for example, say far with an r and car without an r. In other words, there is regularity in their pronunciation of the r. Canadians are also systematic in their pronunciation. They pronounce the r whether it occurs at the beginning or end of a word, or in the middle.

If we look at some common pronunciations in Newfoundland dialect, we will see that they are just as regular and systematic as the pronunciations in standard British or Canadian English. For example, just as the British regularly pronounce the a in romance and dance with the same vowel sound as we use in top, so speakers of some Newfoundland dialects regularly pronounce an o before an r as an a. Thus we have farty, starm, tarment, harse, etc. Similarly, in some Newfoundland dialects, the a of cash has the long vowel sound of cake, rather than the short vowel sound of can, which is the sound other Canadians use. All similar words, such as dash, lash, and ash, are also pronounced with the long vowel sound.

Regularity of pronunciation in Newfoundland dialect can also be seen in the following: divil (devil), yillow (yellow), chickers (checkers), bint (bent), git (get), bist (best), yit (yet). Other Canadians pronounce the e of devil, yellow, etc. as -eh, of course, but we can see here that speakers of some Newfoundland dialects pronounce the e in these words the same as the i of tip is pronounced. These speakers also pronounce breast as brist, bread as brid, and said as sid, because the ea of breast and bread, and the ai of said represent the same sound as the e of devil.

It is clear that Newfoundlanders pronounce words according to a regular system, just as other Canadians do. In some cases, our pronunciations are even more regular than those of other Canadians. For example, in some Newfoundland

dialects, foot, food, broom, good, boot, room, and roof are all pronounced with the short vowel sound used in foot, whereas in standard English the oo in foot and good is pronounced with the short vowel sound, while in food, broom, boot, room and roof, it is pronounced with a long vowel sound.

From the examples given, it is obvious that there is an order underlying pronunciation in Newfoundland dialect. It is not different from the pronunciation of other Canadians in a haphazard way. It is different in a systematic way, and thus cannot logically be called "lazy" or "sloppy". Later in this unit, we will find out why this attitude prevails despite the evidence against its logicality.

Check Your Reading

1. Give one example of a difference in standard Canadian and standard British pronunciation. Which pronunciation is considered "correct"?
2. What is meant by "system" or "regularity" in pronunciation?
3. Give an example of a set of Newfoundland pronunciations in which regularity is evident. Point out the regularity.

For Further Study and Thought

1. Pronounce the following sets of words: (a) oil, boil, noise, point; (b) calm, palm. Does your pronunciation differ from standard Canadian English pronunciation?
2. How do most Newfoundlanders pronounce first, round, cold, lost, and end? After you have answered this question, fill in the blanks in the following pronunciation "rule":

When _____ or _____ comes at the end of a word and is preceded by another _____, the _____ or _____ is not pronounced.

3. Dr. George Story of Memorial University says: "The local dialects have sound systems of their own, just as regular, just as uniform and just as correct as that of standard English." Do you agree?

In addition to being regular and systematic, pronunciation in Newfoundland dialect bears resemblance to older English. For example, in some Newfoundland dialects, speak and break, away and tea, none and own, feel and mill are rhyming words, and boy and bye are homonyms, just as they were in older English. Our present pronunciations were considered "correct" hundreds of years ago, but because standard English pronunciations have changed, they are now considered "incorrect". This shows that there is nothing inherently wrong with our pronunciations; they have just gone out of style in standard English.

By in Newfoundland dialect is sometimes pronounced as be. This is the old pronunciation of the word, and is the source of such words as beside, behind, and before. For instance, beside was originally 'by (be) the side of' and later became shortened to beside. (You will notice that sometimes a speaker of Newfoundland dialect will say by, and other times, be. This may at first seem to be an irregularity in our pronunciation. However, a closer examination will show

that there is regularity once again, for be is used in unstressed position and by in stressed position, as in this sentence: "I was be the fence when she walked by." Can you imagine saying, "I was by the fence when she walked be?" It is not likely that you can, for this would mean breaking the rule that we unconsciously follow when we use by or be. This rule tells us that be cannot be used in stressed position.)

Our pronunciation of -ing on verbs also has its roots in older English. We pronounce walking as walkin', trouting as troutin', eating as eatin', and so on. This -ing ending was pronounced as in' in older English as well. The present standard pronunciation developed later because many people, overly conscious of pronouncing words correctly, mistakenly pronounced the g just because it was part of the spelling. This is what linguists (linguists study human speech, both past and present) call a "spelling pronunciation". (Today, you may sometimes hear boatswain and gunwale pronounced as they are spelled, even though the accepted pronunciation of each is bosun and gunnel.) The mispronunciation of the -ing ending of verbs was so widespread that eventually it became the accepted pronunciation in standard English. However, many Newfoundlanders retain the older pronunciation, and the g remains silent.

Another sound which results from a spelling pronunciation is the th of such words as theme and theater. These words with a th spelling were borrowed from Latin and French. The th was pronounced as a t in Latin and French, and it was

with this sound that the words came into English. In the fourteenth century, when these words were first recorded in English, they were spelled two ways, with th or t, the latter reflecting the actual pronunciation. However, the spelling th eventually prevailed, and with it came the spelling pronunciation that is used today. Only a few words, such as Thomas and Thames, escaped this spelling pronunciation. In Newfoundland dialect, the th of theme and theater is still pronounced as t, giving us teme and teater. (Incidentally, th in the French language is still pronounced as if it were just a t.)

In Newfoundland dialect, th is not always pronounced as t, however. Sometimes we use the d sound. For example, we say dere (there), dis (this), and den (then), instead of tere, tis, and ten. To understand why, we need to look more closely at how th is pronounced in standard English. It will perhaps surprise you to learn that the th sound in theme is not the same as the th sound in there. The first is a devoiced sound, while the second is voiced. A voiced sound is produced by vibrating the vocal cords, whereas a devoiced sound is produced without this vibration. You will understand this better if you begin to say theme but hold on the th sound, at the same time placing your fingers on your throat. Next begin to say there and hold on the th sound, again placing your fingers against your throat. This time you will feel your vocal cords vibrating. You feel no sensation in your fingers when you say the th of theme.

Following the same process saying teme and dere, you will realize that t is a devoiced sound and d is a voiced sound. Thus you can see once again the regularity in our pronunciation. When the th in a word is devoiced (as in theme), we substitute another devoiced sound, the t; when the th in a word is voiced (as in there), we substitute another voiced sound, the d. We do not substitute a voiced sound for a devoiced sound, or vice versa. This is why it is impossible for us to imagine ourselves saying deme (theme) or tere (there). It also explains why we say dy for thy, but ty for thigh.

In some Newfoundland dialects, th in middle or final position is pronounced as f or v. The speakers of these dialects do not say breed (breathe) or bat (bath); instead they say breave and baf. Again there is regularity, for f is a devoiced sound, and v is a voiced sound. Thus, whenever th is devoiced, f is substituted, and whenever th is voiced, v is substituted.

In Chapter 2, you learned that some Newfoundland words were formed in the same way as some standard English words. For instance, upstrapless in Newfoundland dialect and hangnail in standard English were both formed by corrupting existing words. Likewise, some Newfoundland pronunciations have developed in the same way as some standard English pronunciations.

For instance, the transposing (or changing around) of sounds has occurred in both varieties of English. In Newfoundland, the asp tree is usually called the aps, and

crispy and signal are in some dialects pronounced cripsy and singal. In standard English, bird and third were brid and thrid before sounds were transposed. Haps became hasp in standard English, although we in Newfoundland still retain the original pronunciation. We still speak of "hapsing up our coats."

Transposition of sounds is still happening today. It is not unusual to hear even a speaker of standard English say hunderd, pernounce, and interduce.

Another process that has affected pronunciations in both Newfoundland dialect and standard English is the changing or adding of sounds in certain words. These words usually have awkward or difficult sound combinations. In standard English, cupboard was originally pronounced as a combination of cup and board, but because the p and b sounds are a little difficult to put together, the pronunciation cubberd developed. The same thing is happening when something is pronounced sompthing and warmth is pronounced warmpth.

In Newfoundland, we sometimes add and change sounds in forming a plural when the plural results in an awkward combination of consonants with no vowel, such as -sts or -sks. Thus we say desses (desks), blasses (blasts), asses (asks), and posses (posts). Notice that we substitute the -uh sound (represented by the letter e) for the k or t to make the words less difficult to say.

Check Your Reading

1. Using an example, show that some pronunciations in Newfoundland dialect can be traced to older English.
2. (a) Using an example, tell what is meant by spelling pronunciation.
   (b) What type of person is likely to make this kind of error?
3. (a) Define voiced sound and devoiced sound.
   (b) How can one tell whether a sound is voiced or devoiced?
   (c) Why do Newfoundlanders say fadom (fathom) instead of fatom? ting (thing) rather than ding?
4. Using an example for each, show that transposition of sounds has occurred in both standard English and Newfoundland dialect.
5. Using examples, show that changing or adding of sounds has affected pronunciation in both standard English and Newfoundland dialect.

For Further Study and Thought

1. (a) Explain the rule underlying the choice of me or my in the following sentences:
   I puts on me coat to go outdoors.
   That's my coat, not yours.
   (b) Explain the rule underlying the choice of yuh or your in the following sentences:
   Are you going to put on yuh coat. It's cold outdoors.
   Give me your coat, not Mike's.

2. Explain what might cause the following mispronunciation:

I have eating my dinner.

With the background information of this chapter in mind, we can now examine the question "Is Newfoundland dialect pronunciation 'inferior' to standard English pronunciation?" First, the fact that it is different does not necessarily make it "inferior". Second, our pronunciations follow regular patterns, just as the pronunciations of standard English do. When we make a pronunciation such as divil, we are not making ignorant violations of a standard English pronunciation rule; instead, we are following our own rule. Third, some of our pronunciations are actually standard pronunciations from an earlier time. Fourth, the processes at work in our dialect, such as transposing sounds, have also affected standard English pronunciations. All of these considerations indicate that our pronunciation is not 'inferior".

Linguists agree that our pronunciation is just as "good" as that of any kind of English. Dr. George Story of Memorial University reached the following conclusions after studying Newfoundland language:

> . . . though different in many respects from standard language, Newfoundland dialects are far from deserving the disapproval they receive. . . . They are marked by a quite striking regularity and uniformity of their own.
>
> Consider, for example, dialect pronunciation. Different it certainly is from standard pronunciation, but not for that reason incorrect. It has its own 'sound laws', falling in regular and recurrent patterns.

Check Your Reading

1. What arguments can be given to refute the idea that Newfoundland pronunciation is "inferior"?

For Further Study and Thought

1. Read Ray Guy's "The Tourists Are Coming! The Tourists Are Coming!" in You May Know Them as Sea Urchins, Ma'am. This essay is a humourous look at Newfoundland pronunciation.
2. The following are quotations from West Somerset, England in 1905:
   (a) Maister zend me down t' ax' 'er to plase to len' un a dipper nif you'd a got other one.
   (b) Mother zess you must let her hab 'n again to once, 'cause her an't a-got nother-nother.

   As a Newfoundlander, what do you find interesting about these sentences?

Chapter 4

Grammar

Before we look at some examples of differences in the grammars of standard English and Newfoundland dialect, let us make sure that we know what grammar means. Grammar is the unconscious knowledge we all have about our language; this knowledge tells us how to use words to express a meaning. Thus, we would never say, "O'clock I married to five got at" because we know that these words do not express any meaning when used together in this way. As children, we learned the grammar of our language by listening to others and imitating them. Because of this, we know that there are only two possible ways in which these words can be combined in a meaningful way: "I got married at five o'clock" and "At five o'clock I got married."

What we learned as children also makes it easy for us to supply the missing words in the sentences below.

That pole is twenty feet high.
The _____ of that pole is twenty feet.
She is a beautiful woman.
She is a woman of _____.
He is speaking to the policeman.
He _____ to the policeman an hour ago.

Defined more specifically, grammar is our knowledge of our language and tells us (1) the order which words may take in a sentence, and (2) the way a word changes form (such

as from beautiful to beauty) when it is used in different positions in a sentence or changes its function.

Every language has a different grammar. We can take French and English as an example to show that this is so. (If you do not know French, you will have to remember that verte is French for "green" and porte is French for "door" in order to understand the following discussion.) "Green door" in French would be porte verte. From this can be seen one difference in English and French grammar. In the English phrase the adjective comes before the noun, whereas in the French phrase the opposite is true. We would not say "door green" because according to English grammatical rules, the order of words is first the adjective and then the noun. However, one grammatical rule of French says that an adjective of color (such as green) always comes after the noun.

Different kinds of English have different grammars as well. One difference in the grammar of standard English and the grammar of Newfoundland dialect is illustrated in the following sentences:

Standard English: She just got out of the hospital, but she still looks sick in spite of that.

Newfoundland dialect: She just got out of the hospital, but she still looks sick even so.

The only difference in these two sentences is at the end. Whereas the standard English sentence uses in spite of that, the Newfoundland dialect sentence uses even so. Of course,

the words even and so are used in standard English, but they are not used in this particular order at the end of a sentence.

One of the reasons that our grammar is different from that of standard English is that we have retained some grammatical features from older English. Even so is an example of this. It was used by Chaucer, the greatest literary figure of the fourteenth century. Similarly, so do (as in "I'm coming down to supper tomorrow evening." "Yes, so do.") was used by Shakespeare. There are many other retentions from older English, such as We'm (and also he'm, she'm, you'm, and they'm), as in "We'm all ready to go"; and thee, meaning "you", as in "What's wrong with thee?" (usually pronounced "What's wrong wid 'ee?").

Also originating in older times is the distinction between you and ye in our dialect. In today's standard English, you is both singular and plural. For example, in the sentence, "Billy, did you brush your teeth?" you refers to one person, whereas in the sentence "Did you study together?" you obviously refers to two or more people. However, in some Newfoundland dialects at least, you is used to refer to one person, while ye refers to two or more. (Thus we have "Billy, did you brush your teeth?" but "Did ye study together?"). This was also the case in older English.

It is very common in Newfoundland to hear a sentence such as "I'm not going to do nothing about it." This sentence uses two negative words, not and nothing. Double negatives are forbidden by the formal grammatical rules of today's

standard English, but they were once quite respectable and were used by the best writers, such as Chaucer. As a matter of fact, Chaucer sometimes used more than two negative words together, and this occurs in Newfoundland dialect as well. An example is "I never said nuttin' (nothing) to nobody."

The most common attitude towards the grammar of Newfoundland dialect is that it is "bad grammar", but of course most people are unaware that in many ways it is similar to the grammar of old English. On the other hand, linguists feel that in some ways retaining aspects of old English grammar has made our dialect more effective than standard English. A case in point is our use of the multiple negative. Thomas Pyles, in The English Language: A Brief History, says:

> One loss in standard English ... has never been made up for--the emphatic double or multiple negative construction. Many simple folk, who couldn't care less about such matters, have here the advantage of us, for there is no question that 'I'm not going to do nothing about it' or even 'I ain't never going to do nothing about it', is rhetorically far more effective--as our older writers were well aware--than the prescribed, somewhat wishy-washy 'I'm not going to do anything about it.'

If we look at other examples such as 'I don't want none', in each case we see that the double negative is far more emphatic and expressive than the single negative allowed in standard English. A speaker who says "I don't want none" seems more certain about his "not wanting" than the one who says "I don't want any."

Check Your Reading

1. What is grammar?
2. Using an example, explain one reason that our grammar is different from standard English grammar.
3. What is meant by saying that "I don't want nothing" is more expressive than "I don't want any"?

For Further Study and Thought

1. In Newfoundland dialect, even so often takes place of the standard English in spite of that. In each of the sentences below, replace the underlined part with its standard English equivalent.
   a) She got to watch her step now where she won't fall down and hurt her leg again.
   b) She watches him all the time fraid he's going to get out of the yard.
   c) Harry shouldn't be down on the wharf this late. Fer de 'gard o' dat, it's time for Tom to come up too.
2. In Newfoundland dialect, either may be used to mean "a", "an", or "any", and neither may be used to mean "no". This is illustrated in the following sentences:
   They don't have either (or neither) car.
   I haven't got either (or neither) book.
   There's neither teacher in the classroom.
   There's neither bank in Pigeon Inlet.

   Look back to the sentences in the last question in Chapter 3.
   a) Where do you think this usage originated?

b) What are some of the ways in which either and neither are pronounced in Newfoundland?

3. You walk into a store and say to the shopkeeper: "Give us a pack of gum." How many people are you talking about? How does our use of us differ from the standard English use?

4. What is the standard English equivalent of each of the following?

a) I never said nothing to nobody.

b) She'm always complaining about ye young people.

c) Tom: You said you don't know how to do those problems.
Pete: No more I don't.

d) Mother: Did you break his hammer?
Son: No, I never done it?

5. Imagine that you know the meaning and pronunciation of all the words in some foreign language. What else would you need to know before you could carry on a normal conversation with a speaker of that language? Why?

6. Contrary to what is said in this chapter about the way in which ye is used in Newfoundland, in the passage from The Greatest Hunt in the World in Chapter 1 in which the master watch is speaking, the word ye obviously refers to one person. How do you account for this?

In the first part of this chapter, we saw that one reason that our grammar is distinctive from that of standard English is that we have held on to certain aspects of older

English grammar that standard English has dropped. A second reason is that our forefathers have over the centuries gradually developed grammatical rules that we follow in our speech. Let us look at an example of this.

In Newfoundland dialect, the past tense and past participle of a verb have the same form, whereas this is not always so in standard English. (The past tense and past participle both refer to past time, but the past participle is always preceded by has, have, or had.) For example, in standard English the past tense form of see is saw, and the past participle form is seen. Thus, a speaker of standard English would say, "I saw the movie last night", "I have seen that movie", "He has seen the movie", and "I had seen the movie twice before last night."

In Newfoundland dialect, however, we use the same form of the verb for both past tense and past participle. Thus, we would say, "I seen the movie last night", "I've seen that movie", "He's (or He've) seen that movie", and I'd seen that movie twice before last night."

It can be argued that this system of having one form for both past tense and past participle is an improvement over the standard English system of having a different form for each. Ours is a simpler system. In our dialect, the same form serves two purposes without causing confusion for the listener. There is no actual need for two forms of the verb.

Throughout the history of the English language, the trend has always been toward language change. This trend has been checked to some degree since the eighteenth century, when for the first time, grammarians began to write grammar books setting down that they thought to be "correct English" and what was not. These books were taken seriously by the growing middle classes who were ambitious to improve their social status and so wanted to speak the kind of English that the grammarians perceived to be "proper". This brought to a stop some natural changes and developments that were occurring in the English language.

One of these developments that were halted was the use of the same form for both the past tense and the past participle. There are many verbs in standard English today that take the same form in both cases; for example, bring, make, teach, find, leave, and tell. These verbs had already been given the same form for past tense and past participle before grammarians decided what was "correct English". However, Newfoundlanders were out of reach of these grammarians, and so continued to give other verbs the same form for both past tense and past participle. Some examples are sing, do, come, eat, drive, break, write, freeze, and take.

What happened, therefore, was that Newfoundland dialect continued on a course that standard English would have undoubtedly taken if the grammarians and their rules

for "correctness" had not put to a stop some changes that the English language was undergoing. Thus, for many verbs such as to see, standard English has two past forms while we get along quite well with one.

Check Your Reading

1. (a) Why is it that only some verbs in standard English have the same form for past tense and past participle?
   (b) Why does Newfoundland dialect have the one past form for all verbs?

For Further Study and Thought

1. Give the dialect and standard English form of the past tense and past participle for sing, do, come, eat, drive, break, write, freeze, and take.
2. Some verbs in standard English are regular verbs; that is, their past tense is formed by adding -ed. Others are irregular because their past tense is formed by some other way than adding -ed. Help and walk are regular verbs; eat and stand are irregular.

   Help and walk, like many other regular verbs, were once irregular. They gradually became regular because the natural tendency of a language is to regularize itself.

   In Newfoundland, we may say growed instead of grew, knowed instead of knew, and blowed instead of blew.

(a) Why have these verbs remained irregular in standard English?

(b) Why have they become regular verbs in Newfoundland?

The way in which we form the past tense and past participle of a verb illustrates the regularity in our grammar. The fact that we follow a grammatical system is also demonstrated by the pronoun we choose to use in particular contexts. In standard English, he refers to males, she refers to females, and it refers to things with no sex, such as book, as in the sentence "It was written in 1842." Thus, the choice of pronoun is based on whether the object which the pronoun refers to is masculine, feminine, or neuter (i.e., neither masculine nor feminine).

Newfoundland dialect has a different system for determining whether he, she, or it is used to refer to a particular noun. In our grammar, the choice of pronoun is in some cases determined by the sex of the object referred to, but in other cases it is determined by other factors. This is evident from the sentences below. (In each sentence, the noun to which the pronoun refers is enclosed in parentheses.)

1. He plays hockey. (boy)
2. He owns a store. (man)
3. She likes the outdoors. (girl)
4. She plays guitar. (woman)
5. She was demolished. (car)
6. She needed more fuel. (airplane)
7. She went ashore. (boat)

8. She got a lot of cars. (train)
9. She got a big motor. (snowmobile)
10. He looks nice on you. (hat)
11. He's broke off. (shovel)
12. He won't close. (door)
13. He stopped ringin'. (phone)
14. 'Tis (It's) really comin' down. (snow)
15. 'Tis (It's) not fit to drink. (water)
16. There's no sugar in it. (tea)
17. It tastes bad. (milk)

By examining these seventeen sentences, we can see that there is a definite system in the way he, she, and it are used in Newfoundland dialect. First of all, in sentences 1 through 4 we see that a male is referred to as he, and a female is referred to as she. This, of course, is the same as in standard English. In sentences 5 through 13, the pronouns refer to count nouns; cars, airplanes, boats, etc. can all be counted. These count nouns in sentences 5 through 13 can be broken into two groups. Car, plane, boat, train, and skidoo are all vehicles of some sort, while hat, shovel, door, and phone are non-vehicles. You will notice that with count nouns, she is used to refer to vehicles and he to non-vehicles.

In sentences 14 through 17, we have non-count nouns. Snow, water, tea and milk cannot be counted. (Inches of snow, gallons of water, etc. can be counted, but that is a different matter.) We see that the pronoun it refers to all of these non-count nouns. Of course, it is also used in standard English to refer to snow, water, tea, and milk. This may seem to indicate a similarity between standard English and

Newfoundland dialect. However, in standard English *it* is used because these nouns are neuter, not because they are non-count nouns. Thus, the use of *it* to refer to these nouns in both standard English and Newfoundland dialect is coincidental, and does not occur because their grammatical rules for using *it* are the same.

The following table summarizes our grammatical system for using *he*, *she*, and *it*:

Type of Noun	Pronoun
Males	He
Females	She
Count Nouns: Vehicles	She
Count Nouns: Non-Vehicles	He
Non-Count Nouns	It

From the preceding analysis of past participles and third person singular pronouns in Newfoundland speech, it is clear that there is a system to word order and word choice in Newfoundland dialect. Because the grammatical rules in our dialect are just as regular and systematic as those of standard English, our grammar cannot logically be called "inferior". If anything, it might be "superior", since it has not been hampered by artificial restrictions imposed by grammarians, as has been the case with standard English. Our grammar has been free to develop. An example of this is the continuation in Newfoundland of the trend begun in standard English whereby a single form is used to represent both the past tense and the past participle.

The attitude that we use "bad grammar" stems from a lack of understanding of our dialect. When we make a statement such as "I seen three moose this morning", we are not breaking the grammatical rules of standard English. It is more accurate to say that we are following the rules of our own grammar, which allows words to be combined into phrases and sentences in ways not permissible in standard English.

Normally, many of us do not try to use the grammar of standard English. Sometimes, however, in more formal situations we are trying to follow standard English rules, but fail to do so. We have difficulty because we know the grammar of standard English mainly on a conscious level, whereas our knowledge of our own grammar is unconscious. This simply means that we speak in our own dialect out of years of experience and habit, whereas we have to be more conscious of rules when we use standard English grammar. Most of us learned the grammar of our dialect in our early years at home. On the other hand, we probably came in contact with standard English grammar later. Also, for most of us, our dialect is still the primary kind of English that we live with every day, since it is the language of our homes, our friends, and our communities. On the other hand, the grammar of standard English is more alien to us, something that many of us use only when we feel that we must. Looked at in this light, any difficulty we experience in trying to use standard English is quite understandable. Undoubtedly, a person who has grown up with standard English would have the same difficulty in attempting to use the grammar of our dialect.

Check Your Reading

1. Explain the restrictions our grammar places on the use of one of the three third person singular pronouns.

For Further Study and Thought

1. The present perfect tense in standard English is formed by using the appropriate form of the verb to have (either have or has) followed by the past participle form of the main verb. This produces such sentences as "He has lost his watch."

   In Newfoundland dialect, the present perfect tense may be formed by using the appropriate form of the verb to be (either am, is, or are) followed by the word after and the present participle form (the -ing form) of the main verb. This produces such sentences as "He is after losing his watch", which is usually shortened to "He's after losin' his watch."

   (a) With this information in mind, change the following dialect sentences to standard English:

   He's after eatin' his dinner.
   I'm after be[illegible]' there twice.
   They're after goin' home.

   (b) What difference in the speaker's attitude do you detect in the following sentences?

   He's after losin' his watch.
   He's only after losing' his watch.

2. Express the meaning of the following sentences in standard English:

   (a) Sure, that's no odds.
   (b) Foolishlike, I turned around and turned on the oven.
   (c) Tidden nar bit warm, look see.
   (d) Where you goin' to?
   (e) I bees right tired when I wakes up.

Chapter 5

Conclusion: Using Newfoundland Dialect and Standard English

By analyzing Newfoundland vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar, we have seen that there are many arguments to show that our dialects are not "inferior". In this, we have the support of local scholars from Memorial University who have done this analysis before us. Dr. George Story says that our dialects are "far from deserving the disapproval they receive." Dr. Harold Paddock speaks of "the beauty, the structural elegance, the historical respectability of local Newfoundland dialects." Dr. Lloyd Brown praises our language for its vigorous expression, its exaggeration and unique comparisons, its precision, and its concrete imagery--all important qualities of effective communication. He quotes the following passage from The Greatest Hunt in the World as an illustration:

> Well, sir, dis feller rayched out o' de bunk and bit a piece out o' Sandy Weller's shoulder, and he jumped out o' de bunk and kicked un in de face and cut scallops o' flesh out of his face. It tuck t'ree or four men to hold un; every 'ar dropped off his 'eed. Dey lashed un two or t'ree times, but he burst it and went screechin' crazy.

Dr. Brown says:

> The two outstanding qualities of this sample are its vigorous action and its detail. Sandy Weller was not 'subjected to a severe beating'; he was bitten, kicked and cut. He was not just cut, he had 'scallops of flesh' cut out of his face. 'Dis feller' was not 'tied up'; he was 'lashed'; he didn't 'run away', he went 'screechin' crazy.'

Most language scholars feel that nonstandard varieties of English in general are just as "good" as standard varieties. Peter Trudgill, in Sociolinguistics: An Introduction, says:

> The scientific study of language has convinced most scholars that all languages, and correspondingly all dialects, are equally 'good' . . . . All varieties of a language are structured, complex, rule-governed systems which are wholly adequate for the needs of their speakers. . . . There is nothing at all inherent in nonstandard varieties which makes them inferior.

But if our speech is just as "good" as any other, why is it that so many think our dialect is "bad English"? To discover the answer to this question, we need to know something about how a dialect obtains prestige. Basically, a dialect is thought to be "good English" if the people who use it are successful economically, politically, and culturally. Historically, as a people we have not been successful, largely because of the nature of the environment in which we live. J.R. Smallwood points this out in I Chose Canada:

> Scores of years after Newfoundlanders first settled on the Island, other settlers from Europe made feeble clearings in the forest on the mainland of what is now Canada and cultivated half-acre by half-acre, seeding between the stumps. By 1900, they had coaxed millions of acres into smiling green meadows and prosperous fields, with their barns and stone dwellings and livestock and local roads and post offices, and a degree of material prosperity that Newfoundland had never known, had never imagined, in all its generations.
>
> Newfoundlanders cultivated too, but at the end of the first 400 years of toil, they had no productive meadows, almost no local or any other roads, precious few substantial houses, and no standard of material prosperity anywhere near that known in any other part of North America. For during these

> four centuries, their cultivation was of the unquiet, infuriate North Atlantic Ocean. They toiled as no farmers ever toiled in North America, risking death daily, and all the toil and danger had not won an acre for them or earned them much more, for most of the time, than unending scarcity on land and on sea and in the house.

As Smallwood shows, we have suffered as much poverty throughout our history as any other group of North Americans. When Canada was a prosperous, respected nation, we were still a poor nation with a small population and with no elected government, a colony of Britain that did not command much attention on the world stage. As a result, Canadian speech gained acceptance as a kind of standard English, while our speech was thought of as "bad English".

Thus, Newfoundland dialect is commonly considered to be "bad English" not because it is a poor vehicle of expression and communication, but because the people who use it do not have as much power, influence or material prosperity as other groups. As Trudgill says, "any apparent inferiority [of nonstandard varieties of language] is due only to their association with under-privileged, low-status groups." Negative judgments against our speech have nothing to do with its actual quality.

If Newfoundland had become a prosperous and powerful nation, our language would have gradually become more like the standard English of Canada and the United States. Remember that we developed a distinctive speech largely because we were for hundreds of years cut off from frequent contact with the

outside world. Thus, our language developed in isolation from standard English, and the two became more and more different as time passed. If we had been a prosperous country, that isolation, which since Confederation has to a large extent been broken down, would have disappeared much earlier. Through constant contact with the outside, we would have adopted many features of the speech used in the rest of North America much sooner than we have, and by now these features would be firmly entrenched in our language.

A second thing that might have happened if we had become a prosperous nation is that standard Canadian English might have adopted some of the distinctive features of our dialect that are now regarded as "incorrect". For example, perhaps such words as nipper might have gained entrance into standard Canadian English. This might have happened because our language would have been looked at in a new way if it had been associated with a high-status group. In other words, if we had had a more fortunate history, some features of our language might today be considered "correct" even though, as things turned out, they are now regarded as "incorrect".

That this is true can be demonstrated by looking at the history of the English language in England. In 1066, the French-speaking forces of William, Duke of Normandy, invaded England. They did not invade to settle and farm and mix with the English. Instead, they went as a ruling class determined to keep using their own language. They became the new upper

class and occupied important government and church positions. As a result, French became the official language of England. It was the language used in Parliament, the courts, schools, and literature.

Most people, of course, still spoke English, but it was scorned by the Normans. French was the language of the upper classes, and English the language of the masses. English was thought to be an "inferior" language because it was used by a conquered, unsuccessful people. French was thought to be "superior" because it was used by the more successful people, the ruling Normans.

Eventually, this changed and English regained its former position. A couple of developments brought this about. First, the Normans, many of whom owned property in both France and England, were forced by the kings of both countries to ally themselves with one or the other. Some Normans returned to France. Those who remained in England had no reason to consider themselves anything but English. As a result of this, there was a decline in the use of the French language in England. By the end of the thirteenth century, the beginning of a period of strong unity among the English, government and religious leaders were once again using English.

Secondly, with increased commerce and the growth of large cities, a middle class began to emerge in England. The members of this new middle class were tradesmen, craftsmen,

minor government officials, and others who were gaining independence, wealth, and prosperity. These people spoke English and, combined with the increasing numbers of the ruling class who were beginning to speak English, they restored English to its former position as the prestigious language of England. It was now once again used in Parliament, in the courts, in schools, and in literature.

To summarize, when English was the language of the poorer classes of people, it was thought to be "inferior", but once the more prosperous began to use it, it became the standard language of England. This demonstrates that a language is considered "good" or "bad" on the basis of the material prosperity of the people who use it, and not on the basis of its actual quality.

Check Your Reading

1. In spite of evidence to the contrary, why is Newfoundland dialect thought of as "bad English"?
2. What is meant by a "prestigious" language or dialect?
3. According to Smallwood, what is the main reason that Newfoundlanders have not been as successful economically as their mainland counterparts?
4. Why might standard Canadian English have adopted some features of Newfoundland speech if we had been more prosperous?
5. After a period in English history when it was scorned, the English language had begun to regain its former position as a prestigious language by the end of the thirteenth century. Why?

For Further Study and Thought

1. Why would our isolation have been broken down sooner if we had been more prosperous?
2. If we had been more prosperous, our governments would have had more funds and public education would have come earlier and been more widespread. How would this have contributed to the standardization of our language?
3. In England and the United States, some speakers do not pronounce an 'r' that occurs after a vowel. This feature is prestigious in England, but often draws a negative reaction in the United States. Why do you think this is so? What do the different reactions to this language feature demonstrate about "good" and "bad" English?

Although the view is unjustified, Newfoundland dialect is considered "bad English". When one kind of English is thought of as "good" and another kind as "bad", the people who speak the "bad" must learn to use the "good" if they are to be thought of as successful. For example, no matter how well-educated a person who uses nonstandard English may be, or no matter how much influence he may have, most people will think less of his education, background and intelligence than they would if he used standard English. This is why Newfoundlanders who want to be successful in a society where standard English is a sign of success try to learn how to use it. They know that if they do not, their chances of realizing their ambitions will be considerably lessened.

As a speaker of a nonstandard dialect who understands that his language is just as "good" as standard English, you may feel that it is not you who should change. In other words, you may think that you should not have to change your speech; instead, you may think that those who believe your dialect to be "bad English" should change their attitudes to your speech. However, the latter is unlikely to happen. The negative attitudes to nonstandard dialects are a social reality which speakers of nonstandard dialects have to live with and learn to adjust to. Almost everyone has these negative attitudes; the exceptions, for the most part, are the relative few who have seriously studied the structure of nonstandard dialects. In fact, many speakers of nonstandard dialects themselves feel that their speech is "inferior"; if not, they often believe the nonstandard dialects of others to be "bad English".

It is highly improbable that such widespread attitudes will change quickly. Even if the public is educated to the system and structure of nonstandard dialects (and that in itself does not seem to be imminent), it will take generations for the deep-rooted prejudices against nonstandard dialects to change, for a great deal of our reaction to the speech of others is emotional rather than rational. Also, even if these negative attitudes did change, it would still be necessary for us to learn to speak standard English, for some kind of uniform means of communication is essential if people from different regions and social backgrounds are to communicate effectively.

It is not difficult to learn to speak standard English, especially if you want to or feel that you need to. Many Newfoundlanders have entered professions in which they feel pressure resulting from the expectations of others that they use standard English. Some (or perhaps most) of your teachers, for example, probably grew up speaking a nonstandard Newfoundland dialect, but found it necessary to learn to use standard English partly because of the expectations of those with whom they are associated, including students. Also, we all have friends who have gone to some part of mainland Canada and returned in a few months speaking standard English. Feeling the pressure to conform, they learned quite readily.

Some people only learn to speak standard English when they feel pressure from others to do so. They may feel that to use standard English one must in a sense reject one's family, friends, community, language, culture and identity. They may feel that if they use standard English, others will see them as vain or proud, or they may be accused of trying to be "big shots". However, you can learn to speak standard English without rejecting anything, even your nonstandard dialect.

To accomplish this, you must be bidialectal; that is, you must use both your own nonstandard dialect and standard English in appropriate situations. You will probably find that your Newfoundland dialect is more suitable when you are conversing with your family and friends and other speakers of the dialect. Both you and the listeners will probably be

more comfortable and the communication better if you use your dialect. Newfoundland dialect is a legitimate, effective means of communication for certain communication situations.

On the other hand, there are situations in which standard English is more appropriate. As we have seen, you may be discriminated against in certain communication settings if you use Newfoundland dialect; others will make negative judgments about you. Furthermore, if you are to communicate effectively, there should be no distractions while you speak. Your listeners must be concentrating on what you are saying rather than on how you are saying it. Also, the differences in vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar will impede communication if you are speaking with someone who is unfamiliar with your dialect. You must remember that standard English is the accepted uniform means of communication in the larger community of which we are all members.

If you use your dialect and standard English selectively, you will communicate effectively without having either to abandon your dialect or suffer the consequences of using your dialect unwisely in a society in which nonstandard speech can be a hindrance to economic and social advancement. You do not have to choose to use standard English or your dialect; you can choose to use the kind of English that is suitable for the particular communication situation.

Check Your Reading

1. Why do speakers of a nonstandard dialect often find it necessary to learn how to use standard English?
2. Why is it unlikely that negative attitudes to nonstandard dialects will change quickly?
3. If they did change, why would it still be necessary to learn to speak standard English?
4. What is meant by being bidialectal?
5. Why might you use your dialect when speaking with your family?
6. Why might you use standard English when speaking with speakers of standard English? Give three reasons.

For Further Study and Thought

1. Does every student need to learn to speak standard English? What about the student who plans to be a fisherman? a housewife? a carpenter? a trucker? a waiter or waitress? a hairdresser? a secretary? a mechanic? (Add any others you wish to this list.)
2. "To a certain degree, most students are already bidialectal." Do you agree? Why or why not?
3. Does your Newfoundland dialect hinder you in your school work?
4. Is standard English demanded in your classes both in speech and writing? Should it be? Why or why not?
5. You are in a store to complain about poor service to the manager. Should you use your Newfoundland dialect or standard English? Why?

6. You are a salesperson entering a small store in an outport for the first time. The storekeeper says, "Nice wedder today, skipper (or missus)." Why might you reply, "Yes, b'y, 'tis wonderful wedder"?
7. For the next day, bring to class one Newfoundland dialect sentence that you have actually heard. Present it to the class to be changed into standard English.

To most people, standard English is "good English" and nonstandard English is "bad English". This attitude is born of prejudice rather than knowledge. Most people do not realize that standard English is not a fixed system that will always stay the same because it is "correct" and "good". We have seen that standard English changes as time passes; this is evident in the fact that some aspects of Newfoundland dialect were at one time standard English but are now non-standard. Rather than being a fixed system of everything that is "correct" in our language, standard English is a social convention, a kind of English that through common agreement is accepted as the uniform means of communication in a society where different varieties of English abound. Thus, there is nothing inherent in standard English that makes it "better" than nonstandard English. Instead, standard English is the particular variety of English that happens to be most widely accepted and used.

If standard English is not "good English", then what is? In Language Moves, Henderson and Shepherd define "good

English" as that "which gets the desired effect with the least friction and difficulty for the user." In other words, standard English is sometimes "good English" and sometimes "bad English". The same is true for nonstandard English such as Newfoundland dialect.

When standard English causes "friction and difficulty", it is "bad English". For example, the use of standard English with a group of friends (who are speakers of Newfoundland dialect) at a hockey game may be awkward and unsuitable for the occasion and audience as well as for the role you are playing. If it is, it is "bad English", for it shows a lack of awareness of the communication situation and an insensitivity to your friends, thus impeding communication. In this particular situation, your Newfoundland dialect is likely to be "good English" because it is more appropriate.

On the other hand, if you were participating in a graduation ceremony by offering a toast to your teachers, standard English would be "good English". The occasion and audience are both very much different from those described in the previous example. Furthermore, you are now playing the role of a student rather than the role of a friend as you were at the hockey game. Your language must be consistent with what is expected of you in a particular role. Even if you were not delivering that particular toast, but were just talking to your friends at the table, it is likely that your speech would be more standard than it was at the hockey game just as the way you are dressed is different. Your speech

and dress are different because the occasion is different. A speaker who uses nonstandard English in a situation which calls for standard English shows either that he does not know the variety of English commonly used by the educated, or that he does not care to use it.

Because "good English" is the kind of English that is appropriate for a particular occasion, audience, and role, it is important that a person be bidialectal. He must be able to switch from nonstandard dialect to standard dialect and back again as particular communication situations demand. In this way, there will be less "friction and difficulty" for the speaker, making his communication more effective and his relations with others more rewarding and enjoyable. Furthermore, the social, economic, and academic opportunities for such a speaker will be greatly enhanced. Bidialectalism, therefore, is a worthy goal. It can be attained by anyone who sees it as such and is willing to make an effort.

Check Your Reading

1. (a) Why is standard English "bad English" in certain cases?
   (b) Why is nonstandard English "good English" in certain cases?
2. What is meant by occasion, audience and role? How does each affect the variety of English that is appropriate for a particular situation?

For Further Study and Thought

1. Create a situation in which standard English might be "bad English" and Newfoundland dialect, "good English" (or vice versa). Using the concepts of occasion, audience and role, explain why. After you have finished, exchange your answers. Select one situation from all the answers and create two skits around it, one in which standard English is used and one in which nonstandard English is used.
2. Imagine that your English teacher is also your basketball coach. For which role would his speech be more standard? Why?
3. Standard English is often further broken down into two categories, formal English and informal English. For good definitions, see page 26 of Mastering Effective English. After you have studied the definitions, do Practices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, pages 27-30. Another section from which you will learn more about formal and informal English is "Words Often Misused", pages 45-63 of Mastering Effective English. Complete the exercises which follow this section.
4. What does the title of this unit imply about standard English and Newfoundland dialect?

APPENDIX B

THE POST-UNIT QUIZ

1. Write a short paragraph of about 100 words explaining why there are different dialects within Newfoundland.

2. Give and explain briefly two reasons why Newfoundland speech is becoming more standardized.

3. (a) Using examples, show that either Newfoundland dialect vocabulary or standard English vocabulary includes corruptions and inventions.
   (b) Why are some words corrupted?
   (c) Why are new words invented?

4. Using examples, show that one of the following is regular and systematic:
   (a) Newfoundland pronunciation
   (b) Newfoundland grammar
   (c) Standard English pronunciation
   (d) Standard English grammar

APPENDIX C

UNIT OUTLINE GIVEN TO STUDENTS IN PREPARATION FOR POST-UNIT QUIZ

1. Students will understand how the historical fact of early settlement in Newfoundland played a role in developing a distinctive variety of English in the Province.

2. Students will understand how Newfoundland's many years of isolation from the rest of North America played a role in the development of a distinctive Newfoundland speech.

3. Students will understand how the different places of origin of Newfoundland's settlers played a role in the development of different dialects within Newfoundland.

4. Students will understand how the many years of isolation of community from community played a role in the development of different dialects within Newfoundland.

5. Students will understand why Newfoundland speech is gradually becoming more standardized.

6. Students will understand why the different dialects within Newfoundland are gradually becoming more similar.

7. Students will understand that Newfoundland has a distinctive vocabulary because of the following developments and will understand why each of them has occurred: (a) we have retained some words and usages of words which are now obsolete elsewhere, (b) we have invented some new words, (c) we have given new meanings to some words, (d) we have corrupted some standard English words.

8. Students will understand that these are natural processes of language development which have also occurred in standard English.

9. Students will understand that there is an underlying regularity and system governing pronunciation and grammar both in Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

10. Students will understand that Newfoundland pronunciation is distinctive partly because it has retained pronunciations now obsolete in standard English, but also because new pronunciations have developed within the Province through such processes as transposition of sounds and the changing or adding of sounds.

11. Students will understand that these processes have also occurred in standard English pronunciation.

12. Students will understand that Newfoundland grammar is distinctive because we have retained grammatical rules now obsolete in standard English and we have continued trends in grammatical usage begun in standard English, but later halted.

APPENDIX D

THE PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST OF ATTITUDES TO NEWFOUNDLAND DIALECT AND STANDARD ENGLISH

Note to Students

Below you will find twenty-five statements related to two kinds of English, Newfoundland dialect and standard English. Examples of each kind of English are:

Newfoundland dialect: Me knee is some nish.

Standard English: My knee is really sore.

Read each statement carefully, then indicate by drawing a circle around 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 whether you strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement.

You are asked to be honest in your answers. This is not a test to be passed or failed. As a matter of fact, you will be given no mark or grade at all. The idea of this exercise is just to find out what you think about Newfoundland dialect and standard English.

(a) An educated Newfoundlander would not make a statement such as 'I likes dat book', because it is bad English.

(b) A person who speaks Newfoundland dialect should learn how to use standard English.

(c) Because of their dialect, Newfoundlanders cannot express their ideas very well.

(d) Older Newfoundlanders talk worse than the school-age generation of Newfoundlanders.

(e) There is nothing really wrong with the way Newfoundlanders pronounce words.

(f) No matter what the situation, standard English is the most suitable form of English to use.

(g) A lot of words that Newfoundlanders use are not really words at all.

(h) In certain situations, Newfoundland dialect is the most effective way to express our thoughts and feelings.

(i) People in some parts of Newfoundland use even worse English than we do.

(j) The grammar that Newfoundlanders use is just as good as the grammar of standard English.

(k) The fact that many educated people have a negative attitude to Newfoundland dialect shows that it is not as good as standard English.

(l) Most of us who speak Newfoundland dialect will never need to learn how to use standard English.

(m) Newfoundlanders speak differently from other people, not better or worse.

(n) There is "no rhyme or reason" to the way Newfoundlanders pronounce words.

(o) When we are with other people who speak Newfoundland dialect, we should use standard English so that they will have a better idea of the right way to speak.

(p) The only way to get a certain job in Newfoundland is to stop using your dialect and use standard English all the time.

(q) Newfoundland words are just as good as standard English words.

(r) Newfoundland dialect is a more suitable kind of English to use in certain situations than standard English.

(s) Newfoundlanders should just use their own way of talking and forget about standard English.

(t) A professional person such as a lawyer or doctor should never use Newfoundland dialect.

(u) It is necessary for any English speaking society to have a standard version of English.

(v) It is more appropriate to use Newfoundland dialect than standard English when we are talking with our family.

(w) Newfoundland dialect is really only an ignorant way of talking.

(x) Teachers should use Newfoundland dialect in the classroom.

(y) One reason that many Newfoundlanders don't pronounce words correctly is that they are too lazy to say the word properly.

Answer Sheet Name _____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a)	1	2	3	4	5
b)	1	2	3	4	5
c)	1	2	3	4	5
d)	1	2	3	4	5
e)	1	2	3	4	5
f)	1	2	3	4	5
g)	1	2	3	4	5
h)	1	2	3	4	5
i)	1	2	3	4	5
j)	1	2	3	4	5
k)	1	2	3	4	5
l)	1	2	3	4	5
m)	1	2	3	4	5
n)	1	2	3	4	5
o)	1	2	3	4	5
p)	1	2	3	4	5
q)	1	2	3	4	5
r)	1	2	3	4	5
s)	1	2	3	4	5
t)	1	2	3	4	5
u)	1	2	3	4	5
v)	1	2	3	4	5
y)	1	2	3	4	5