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This study examined (a) how the variables that comprise the construct social situation—interlocutor, setting, and topic—influenced which language variety (standard English [SE] or black English [BE]) was chosen as a means of communication within a black English-speaking community; and (b) how that language variety was strategically used to elaborate topics of conversation.

Eight social situations derived from Fishman's construct of social situation (Fishman, 1972; Greenfield & Fishman, 1968) provided the social context in which linguistic variation between SE and BE was examined. Twenty-eight students attending classes at the City University of New York were assigned to one of the eight social situations. Their language use was recorded, transcribed, and coded for BE, SE, and shared dialect (SH), features both BE and SE speakers use. The proportion of BE, SE, and SH features of the language protocols was compared in a chi square analysis.

It was predicted and demonstrated that BE features would occur more frequently in status differentiated social situations.

Language use within the context of conversation was examined with respect to Dore's analysis (Note 1) of how topics are changed, extended, or resumed. Within each exchange between interlocutors, each clause was designated as a change, extension, or resumption of the topic. The number of changes, extensions, and resumptions of topic in each social situation was compared in a chi square analysis. It was anticipated and demonstrated that (a) in the intimate social situations, changes, extensions, and resumptions of topic would be marked by self-determined (SD) turn-taking between the
interlocutors; and (b) in the status differentiated social situations, the three measures of how topics of conversation are treated would be marked by questions being asked.

The findings of this study suggest that language is used across a series of hierarchically arranged concentric contexts, those emphasizing a community's use of language, and those emphasizing the individual's use of language. The variables of each context can produce differing effects on language use depending on what level of the hierarchy language use is being studied, and how these variables interact with one another. Variables that are associated with one context more than with another can in no way be excluded from influencing language in those contexts where they are not a dominating influence.
Situational Variables

Situational Variables in Language Use

The focus of this paper is on the use of language in face-to-face interaction and how it is affected by those variables that constrain a speech community's choice and use of alternative language varieties.

More specifically, the focal interest is on how the variables that comprise the construct social situation—interlocutor, setting, and topic—influence whether BE or SE is chosen as the language of communication, and the strategies BE/SE speakers use to elaborate topics of conversation.

Whenever language is used for the purpose of interaction, it is used in context. All interaction is produced in a context which is made up of features relevant to a group's use of language and those relevant to face-to-face interactions. Individual speakers are also members of a larger societal group. They bring with them to each face-to-face interaction their knowledge of communication which is based on this full range of contextual features. This study therefore takes the point of view that while there may exist context-specific variables influencing language use on differing levels, these variables operate simultaneously and interactively with one another (Fine, Note 2) and contribute to what is produced in the face-to-face interaction.

The Issues

Sociolinguistics, the study of the relation between language and social context, has been concerned with two levels of analysis: (a) the macro-level, stressing the language behavior of entire speech communities; and (b) the micro-level, stressing the language behavior of individuals in
face-to-face interaction (Fishman, 1972). The two levels of inquiry are distinct because they differ in theoretical purpose, methodological procedure, and definition of the social context (Fishman, 1972; Gumperz, 1974). However, in addition to these two discreet levels of inquiry, there are sociolinguistic studies that provide a middle ground or link between those studies that are primarily concerned with macro-structures and those focusing on micro-processes. These studies point up the interrelatedness of societal regularities and linguistic structures.

The macro-level of analysis, originally the major concern of sociolinguistic inquiry, stressed the speech community as the relevant social context in which language should be examined. Studies in this vein focused on descriptions of the distribution and use of particular speech varieties. Diglossia is a special instance of how a speech community may distribute those speech varieties as used for communication.

Societies characterized by diglossia use separate languages, dialects, registers, or differentiated language varieties (Ferguson, 1964) to communicate two existing classes of complementary values, attitudes, and behaviors. There are L-(low) related values of intimacy, solidarity, spontaneity, and informality that are related to the home and friendship domains. The complement of L-related values are H-(high) related values which emphasize status differences, ritual, and formality related to religion, education, and government. Language varieties or codes associated with L-related values are generally learned first in an informal setting, such as the home, while varieties that are H-related are learned later in a more formal setting such as school.
Fishman (1972) advances the notion of diglossia in his discussion of social situations and domains, with the former being related to the micro-level of sociolinguistic inquiry, and the latter being related to macro-level concerns. The social situation is comprised of role relationships, setting, and topic. Role relationships are implicitly recognized and accepted sets of mutual rights and obligations between members of the same sociocultural system. They are revealed via variation in the way members of the group talk to each other. The significance of the setting and topic most appropriate to the role relationship is also shown via the language used between the group members. While these three components comprise the construct of social situation, the aggregate of the same kinds of social situations, appropriate to different societally recognized functions, comprises the construct of domain—the study of language at the level of macrosociolinguistics. Domains classify those seemingly different social situations as being recognized as the same by each speech network or community. Domain appropriate role relationships, settings, and topics are thus specified by the grouping together of those similar social situations found to be internally congruent with respect to their three components. Some relevant domains for describing language use in many multilingual societies would include family, friendship, religion, education, work sphere, and government.

In a sociologically oriented study that illustrated the concept of diglossia and bilingualism, Greenfield and Fishman (1968) examined language use in relation to person, place, and topic among Puerto Rican bilinguals. They found that Spanish was associated with values of solidarity and intimacy.
and was used in such domains as family and friendship, while English was associated with the values of status differentiation and was used in such domains as religion, education, and employment. However, these studies and others concerned with micro- and macro-structures do not reflect any systematic attempt to examine the constraints governing the behavior of the participants in any one encounter (Gumperz, 1974). As a result, Gumperz suggested that there is a need for a speaker-oriented theory of language, focusing on strategies governing a speaker's full range of grammatical and sociolinguistic knowledge in the production of messages in context.

At this microsociolinguistic level of inquiry, several approaches to examining how language is used in face-to-face interaction have developed, including the study of speech acts, turn-taking strategies, and interpretive strategies.

One strategy for examining language used in the context of face-to-face interaction combining speech act analysis, pragmatics, and turn-taking rules has been developed by John Dore (Note 1). With Dore's system, conversational sequences are described in terms of their grammatical purpose. A speaker who produces an utterance that initiates a sequence establishes the topic of the sequence and "gets the floor." The utterances that follow must be relevant to the initial utterance. The analysis developed by Dore includes (a) segmenting principles that classify aspects of the conversation, and (b) evaluating principles that specify the particular values of the parameters of the conversation. Utterances in a speaking turn are segmented into one of seven speech act types which include requests, responses, acknowledgements, descriptions, statements, performatives, and conversational devices. These
speech acts are identified on the basis of grammatical form, content, and conversational contingency. Thus, for Dore's segmenting purposes, a speech act is an utterance which often expresses a propositional attitude or performs an elocutionary function in a conversation. The evaluating principles consist of four factors: topic, form, function, and content.

Topic, the evaluating principle most important to this study, is coded in terms of shifts which include changes, extends, and resumes. Changes are shifts from one topic to another; extends are utterances remaining in the same semantic sphere but shifting to different aspects of that sphere; resumes are returns to previous topics in the conversation. Dore has observed that requests usually introduce new information and therefore initiate sequences.

The above discussion of macro-structures and micro-structures suggests that the factors which influence language use and language choice are context specific. There exists a range of social contexts in which language occurs, each context having particular variables that influence language use. Additionally Gumperz (1974) argues for a distinction between group-oriented studies and speaker-oriented studies because of the theoretical assumptions and methodological approaches to be considered. Yet the variables that influence language used in one context cannot be isolated from affecting language used in an adjacent context.

The particular language community of interest here is the black English, standard English (BE/SE) speech network. It is among the many speech communities that have been examined with respect to micro- and macro-levels of sociolinguistic concern. In keeping with the tradition of group-oriented
studies, BE has been characterized and described structurally as a coherent linguistic system, and has provided the context out of which many of the early variability studies grew. These studies of the BE speech community linking macro- and micro-level concerns have described how the structural features of the language are correlated with social variables.

Moreover, within the framework of the speaker-oriented tradition such face-to-face types of interaction as ritual insults, rappin', and signifyin' have been identified and described. Thus, the BE/SE speech network has provided and continues to provide a context in which to examine issues relevant to group-oriented as well as speaker-oriented concerns.

The pattern of language alternation between BE and SE allows one to infer that a diglossia-like situation obtains. Not only are linguistic variants subject to social constraints--those of age, sex (Abrahams, 1972), and socioeconomic status--but it has been observed and demonstrated that linguistic variants correlate with those values that are associated with either intimacy or status differentiation (Labov, Cohen, Robins, & Lewis, 1968; Houston, 1969, DeStefano, 1971; Mitchell-Kernan, 1972, Straker, 1978). Those situations associated with the values of intimacy, solidarity, spontaneity, and informality, centering around family or friendship relations, require the use of BE. Those situations associated with status differentiation and formality, centering around unfamiliar interlocutors, require the use of SE. To speak SE when the norm of appropriateness summons BE is felt to mark one as unduly proper, unfriendly, distant, and phony. To speak BE when the norm of appropriateness summons SE is felt to mark the speaker as ignorant.
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The BE speech network is one of several subpopulations of a larger SE speech community that is considered monolingual. The BE segment of this speech community is differentiated by its use of linguistic variants not used by other subpopulations (for example, multiple negation, copula deletion, tense marking, inverted syntax, etc.). Because the speakers of the BE network alternate among SE, the particular linguistic variants shared by BE and SE speakers (SH), and BE to indicate changes in social situations, it has been suggested that the BE speech network is diglossic (Straker, 1978).

The issue of diglossia is of interest here because the study of the BE/SE speech community within this framework further validates the concept that social variables reflect the distribution and use of language within a speech network. Moreover, the data of talk elicited to examine the distribution and use of language also allowed a more recent concern of speaker-oriented studies to be examined—conversational strategies. The BE/SE speech network was therefore examined in this study for indications of how contextual variables specific to macrosociolinguistics influence language used within the framework of microsociolinguistics.

More specifically, it was predicted that those variables that comprise the construct of social situation—interlocutor, setting, and topic—and influence the choice between SE and BE would influence the strategy involved in accomplishing conversations.

Method

Subjects

Twenty-eight freshmen students enrolled in the SEEK Program at York College of the City University of New York participated as interlocutors.
in this study. Students in the SEEK Program come from a population similar to the one in which Wolfram (1969) found a great deal of variation between BE and SE. These students, like many of the respondents in the Wolfram study, have low socioeconomic backgrounds. While meeting other eligibility requirements for the SEEK Program, these students must live in designated poverty areas, come from families with restricted incomes, and be under 30 years old. Therefore, it is likely that their speech would exhibit a great deal of variation between BE and SE features.

Materials

Eight social situations derived from Fishman's construct of social situation (Fishman, 1972; Greenfield & Fishman, 1968) provided the social context in which linguistic variation between SE and BE could be examined.

The components that were representative of the intimacy value cluster included: (a) students as interlocutors; (b) "The worst experience that I have ever experienced or witnessed" as the topic; and (c) the student lounge as the setting. This yielded a congruent social situation representative of the intimacy value. The components that were representative of the status differentiation cluster included: (a) student and instructor as interlocutors; (b) educational aspirations as the topic; and (c) the instructor's office as the setting. This yielded a congruent social situation representative of the status differentiation value. Therefore, the three intimacy value components and the three status value components respectively yielded two congruent social situations.
In order to study the independent effect of each of the situational components on language variability, six additional incongruent social situations were generated by combining each status interlocutor, place, and topic with each intimate interlocutor, place, and topic. Of these six additional incongruent social situations, three had two congruent intimacy components and were said to be representative of the intimacy value, and three had two congruent status components and were said to be representative of the status differentiation value. Thus, there were eight social situations, four representing the intimacy value and four representing the status value. Of the four status-related situations, one was congruent and three were incongruent. Of the four intimacy-related situations, one was congruent and three were incongruent.

Procedures

The participants were approached in the group setting of their respective classes and asked to volunteer one half hour of their free time to take part in an experiment designed to test long-term and short-term memory.

The 28 subjects were randomly assigned to eight social situations such that there were four subjects per social situation. The subjects were grouped as interlocutor pairs with either a status-related or intimacy-related topic and instructed to discuss the topic in the student lounge or experimenter's office for approximately 30 minutes.
All sessions were tape recorded with a visible tape recorder. The students were told that the contents of the tapes would be confidential.

**Scoring**

To examine language use as a function of the social situation, each half hour of taped conversation was transcribed. From each conversation with a status/student interlocutor pair, a series of utterances totaling approximately 1,000 words were selected for grammatical analysis. For those conversations in which there were two student interlocutors, 500 words per speaker were selected. The sentences were chosen from the beginning, middle, and end of each transcription. Each sentence included in the 1,000 or 500 words was analyzed for the occurrence of BE, SE, and shared dialect grammatical features. Appendix A defines grammatical usage with respect to BE, SE, and shared dialect features. BE features were adopted from the Baratz (1969), Dillard (1972), Fickett (1970), Labov et al. (1968), Labov (1969), and Scott (1973) formulations. SE features were defined as approximate translations of BE features, and shared dialect included grammatical features that are neither characteristically BE nor SE but for which there is no substitution in either variety. Each occurrence of BE, SE, or shared dialect was noted.

----------------------------------
Insert Table 3 about here.
----------------------------------

In order to examine the possible strategies used to indicate when topics are shifted or elaborated during discourse, the sentences in the first nine
minutes of each transcription were examined. Each exchange was then numbered. Within each exchange each clause was marked and received a designation based on Dore's (Note 1) method of conversational analysis (see Appendix B, which defines the seven categories of conversational acts).

Both the grammatical and the conversational analyses were scored twice. The results for the two scorers were compared via Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient, Rho (p), which indicates the degree of correspondence between the judgments of two raters.

-----------------------------
Insert Table 4 about here.
-----------------------------

Design

Grammatical Analysis

The eight social situations defined the independent variable. The dependent variable, language use, was defined in terms of BE and SE features (Appendix A). Language variation with respect to domain was measured by the frequency of occurrence of BE, SE, and shared dialect features in the status-differentiated situations and in the intimate social situations. The infrequent use of BE features and the frequent use of SE features in situations one to four provided a measure of BE's unrelatedness and SE's relatedness to social situations associated with the status differentiation value. The frequent use of BE features and the infrequent use of SE features in situations five to eight provided a measure of BE's relatedness and SE's unrelatedness to situations associated with the intimacy value.
In order to assess the significance of the occurrence of BE features in relation to the intimacy value and the SE features in relation to the status value, chi square analyses were performed.

Conversational Analysis

Language use within the context of discourse was examined with respect to how topics were elaborated. Topic was coded in terms of change, extend, and resume, as outlined above. Change referred to shifts to different semantic domains. Extend referred to sequences which remained in the same semantic domain but shifted to different aspects of this domain. Resume referred to returns to previous topics in the conversation (Dore, Note 1). Because requests usually introduce new information and thus initiate sequences, the number of requests provided a measure of the formal use of language. Other speech acts associated with topic elaboration and self-determined turns provided a measure of the informal use of language. The eight social situations were then compared to one another in order to discover whether significant differences in language use might occur according to the components of the social situation.

Results

In examining the use of BE, SE, and SH with respect to the social situation, the following predictions were made:

1. BE would occur more frequently within the context of the intimacy value cluster.

2. SE would occur more frequently within the context of the status-differentiated value cluster.
3. SH would occur more frequently within the context of the status-differentiated value cluster.

4. Each independent component of the social situation (setting, interlocutor, and topic) would have an effect on the use of language within a given situation.

The chi square analyses comparing (a) language use by value cluster, (b) grammatical features by value cluster, (c) language use by social situation by value cluster, and (d) the effects of the situational components on language use by value cluster were all significant at or beyond the .05 level.

-----------------------------
Insert Table 5 about here.
-----------------------------

These findings illustrate the following:

1. BE is associated with the intimacy value cluster (L-related values that emphasize intimacy, solidarity, and spontaneity) and is used more frequently in those situations representative of the intimacy value cluster (home and friendship), while SE and SH are associated with the status value cluster (H-related values that emphasize status differences, ritual, and formality) and are used more frequently in those situations representative of the status differentiation value cluster (religion, education, and government). (See Table 5, Part I)

2. Specific BE grammatical features, including negation, verb forms, pronoun forms, and specific syntactic structures occurred more frequently in the intimacy-value-related situations. Specific SE grammatical features,
including negation, verb forms, and syntactic structures occurred more frequently in the status-related situations. (See Table 5, Part II)

3. The use of BE, SE, and SH dialect varied across the social situations, such that in those situations associated with the intimacy value cluster (situations I-IV), BE features occurred more frequently; and in those situations associated with the status differentiation cluster (situations V-VIII) SE and SH features occurred more frequently (see Table 5, Part III A, B, C). Not only did language use vary between value clusters, but language use varied within value clusters. Note in Table 5, Part III D and E, the comparisons of SE, SH, and BE features within the status differentiation and intimacy clusters. Ultimately, Table 5, Part III F, comparing the use of SE, SH, and BE across all eight situations, points up that language use varied across all situations.

4. Within the status value cluster, topic and interlocutor are significant factors in influencing the use of SE and SH language varieties. Within the intimacy value cluster, all three situational components—topic, interlocutor, and place—are significant factors in eliciting the use of BE. (See Table 5, Part IV)

Thus, BE seems to be associated with the intimacy value cluster, and its use is elicited by the situational components (topic, interlocutor, and setting) and those social situations associated with the intimacy value cluster. SE and SH seem to be associated with the status value cluster, and its use is elicited by the situational components and those situations associated with the status value cluster.
Language use within the context of conversation was examined with respect to Dore's analysis (Note 1) of how topics are changed, extended, or resumed. It was predicted that topic elaboration strategy is related to value cluster in such a way that (a) the frequency of RQ structures would be greater in the status differentiation value cluster and its related factors, (b) the frequency of self-determined turns would be greater in the intimacy value cluster and its related factors.

The chi square analyses comparing (a) topic elaboration strategy with value cluster, (b) topic elaboration strategy with situational context, and (c) topic elaboration strategy with the situational components were all significant at the .05 level.

Insert Table 6 about here.

1. RQ structures, formal questions asked in order to shift, extend, or resume the topic of conversation, are associated with the status value cluster and used more frequently in those situations representative of the status value cluster. SD structures, self-determined turntaking, and other types of speech acts which cause the topic of conversation to shift, extend, or resume, are associated with the intimacy value cluster and used more frequently in those situations representative of the intimacy value cluster. (See Table 6, Parts I and II)

2. Within the status mode, topic and interlocutors are significant factors in influencing the topic elaboration strategy. Within the intimacy mode, only setting is a significant factor in influencing the topic elaboration strategy. Thus, it is indicated that those situational components
influencing which language variety is used in a social situation also influence how language is used during the course of conversation. (See Table 6, Part III)

The strategy used to elaborate topics of conversation, then, is associated with the situational context, its components, and the related value cluster. Self-determined shifts in topic are related to the intimacy value cluster, the social situations related to the intimacy value cluster, and the corresponding situational components. Formal questions eliciting answers are associated with the status value cluster, the social situations related to this cluster, and the corresponding situational components.

Discussion

This study examined how the sociolinguistic variables associated with diglossia (person, setting, and topic) influenced language use in the context of macro- and microsociolinguistics. In the macrosociolinguistic context emphasizing the speech community's use of language, these variables described which language variety would be used. In the microsociolinguistic context, emphasizing the individual's use of language, these variables described which conversational structures would be used. The results seem to imply that language is used across a range of contexts, each context having particular variables that influence language use. The variables of each context can produce differing effects on language use, depending on the context in which language use is being studied and how these variables interact with one another. Variables that are associated with one context more than with another can in no way be excluded from influencing language use in those contexts where they are not a dominating influence. Therefore, contexts
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are not mutually exclusive. Face-to-face interaction may be the most complex of all contexts, for it is in this context that all of the variables of the other contexts exert their influence. If a variety of factors affect how language is used, then in talk we should be able to extract meaning at several levels—cultural, social, and interactional.
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Table 1
General Outline of the Social Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Clusters and Associated Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlocutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worst experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Table 2
Specific Outline of the Eight Social Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situations</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/instructor</td>
<td>Inst. off.</td>
<td>Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/instructor</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Experience&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/student</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/instructor</td>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>Aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/student</td>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/student</td>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>Aspirations&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/instructor</td>
<td>Lounge</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student/student</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Congruent social situation—all components are representative of one value.

<sup>b</sup>Incongruent social situations—components are representative of both values.

<sup>c</sup>Indicates those particular components causing the situation to be anomalous in terms of co-occurrence relations.
Table 3

Summary of Score Reliability Computed From
Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient Rho ($\rho$)
(Grammatical Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Probabilities Associated with Observed Values of $S$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Association of rankings of 5 grammatical features of BE.</td>
<td>.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Association of rankings of 5 grammatical features of SE.</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Association of rankings of 5 grammatical features for MX.</td>
<td>.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Association of rankings of BE features in situations 1-8.</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Association of rankings of SE features in situations 1-8.</td>
<td>.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Association of rankings of MX features in situations 1-8.</td>
<td>.000025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Summary of Score Reliability Computed from Kendall's Rank Correlation Coefficient Rho (ρ) (Conversational Analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Score</th>
<th>Probabilities Associated with Observed Values of S</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Association of rankings of RQ structures in situations 1-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Association of rankings of SD structures in situations 1-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Summary of Chi Square Analysis Grammatical Features,
Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Overall language/value cluster</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BE vs. SE by value cluster</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. BE vs. SE vs. SH by value cluster</td>
<td>19.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Grammatical features/value cluster</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BE status vs. BE intimacy</td>
<td>13.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SE status vs. SE intimacy</td>
<td>27.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SH status vs. SH intimacy</td>
<td>25.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BE vs. SE vs. SH status</td>
<td>465.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. BE vs. SE vs. SH status</td>
<td>714.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Total language vs. situation by value cluster</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. BE intimacy vs. BE status</td>
<td>53.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SE intimacy vs. SE status</td>
<td>17.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. SH intimacy vs. SH status</td>
<td>18.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. BE vs. SE vs. SH status</td>
<td>17.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. BE vs. SE vs. SH intimacy</td>
<td>104.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. BE vs. SE vs. SH across all situations</td>
<td>162.6***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Effect of situational component vs. language within value cluster
A. Status value cluster
1. I vs. II effect of topic  \[39.5^{***}\]
2. I vs. III effect of interlocutor  \[7.0^{*}\]
3. I vs. IV effect of setting  \[3.0^{*}\]
B. Intimacy value cluster
1. V vs. VI effect of topic  \[56.6^{***}\]
2. V vs. VII effect of interlocutor  \[28.0^{***}\]
3. V vs. VIII effect of setting  \[29.4^{***}\]

* \(p < .05\)
** \(p < .01\)
*** \(p < .001\)
Table 6
Summary of Chi Square Analysis

Topic Elaboration Strategy,
Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Topic elaboration strategy by value cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ vs. SD by value cluster</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Topic elaborations strategy by situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. RQ status vs. RQ intimacy</td>
<td>73.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SD status vs. SD intimacy</td>
<td>8.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. RQ vs. SD status</td>
<td>46.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. RQ vs. SD intimacy</td>
<td>20.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Effect of situational component vs. topic elaboration strategy within value cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Status Value Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I vs. II effect of topic</td>
<td>25.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I vs. III effect of interlocutor</td>
<td>45.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I vs. IV effect of setting</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Intimacy Value Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. V vs. VI effect of topic</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. V vs. VII effect of interlocutor</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. V vs. VIII effect of setting</td>
<td>5.9***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
Appendix A

Part 1: Features of Black English

I. Negation

A. Single

She not singing.
She ain't singing.
She don't sing.
She don't be singing.

B. Multiple

1. concord

I ain't never had no trouble with none of 'em.

2. quantifier

She ain't in no seventh grade.

3. postposing

We ain't write over no street nothing.

4. preverbal

The Negro doesn't know about the Negro and neither does the white man know about the Negro.

5. inversion

Can't nobody break up a fight.

II. Copula

A. Deletion

1. __noun phrase

She the first one started us off.

2. __pred. adj.

He fast in every thing he do.

3. __locative

You out the game.

4. __NEG

But everybody not black.

5. __V (ing)

He just feel like he gettin' cripple up.

6. __gon

He gon try to get help.

7. question

Who he?
Part 1 (continued)

B. Invariant "be"
1. be + VERB + ing
   'Cause sometimes I be sleeping. . .
2. ___adj.
   Everybody be happy and shit. . .
3. past participles
   They be mixed up all kinds of ways.
4. prep. phrase
   Sometime I be with Ruby.
5. imperative
   Don't be jiving around.
6. auxiliary
   Fred be comin'.

III. Verb Forms

A. Present Tense
1. agreement
   Mary go home when she get ready.

B. Past Tense
1. irreg. verbs
2. agreement
   We was
3. past. participle
   I seen three police.
4. past perfect
   In the mean time the fellow had went home.
5. passive got/was
   I got promoted.
6. been + VERB
   I been wash the dishes.
7. done + VERB
   I done wash the dishes
8. been done + VERB
   I been done wash the dishes
9. done been + VERB
   I done been wash the dishes.
10. pro. agr.
   We was going.

C. Future
1. marker
   I'm a throw it.
Part 1 (continued)

IV. Pronouns
A. Appositive
   Marsha, she...
B. Possessive
   The students put they books away.
C. I/there
   ..it was some fellas shootin' craps in the street.
D. Reflexive
   I got me a new tow truck.
E. Them/those
   They have them bars.

V. Possessive
A. Noun Juxtaposed
   John book
B. Pronouns (see IV, B above)

VI. Alternate Syntactic Structures
A. If Construction
   I asked did he do it.
B. Questions
   Why you don't know?
C. Got/have
   I got me a tow truck.
D. Modal Modification
   They useta could beat you.
E. ? Do Deletion
   What you want me to do?
Part 2: Features of Standard English

I. Negation

A. Single

She is not singing (now).

She is not singing (now or ever).

She doesn't sing.

She isn't singing (habitually).

B. Multiple

1. concord

I have never had any trouble with any of them.

2. quantifier

She's not in the seventh grade.

3. postposing

We didn't write anything over the street.

4. preverbal

The Negro doesn't know about the Negro nor does the white man.

5. inversion

Nobody can break up a fight.

II. Copula

A. Deletion

1. _____ noun phrase

She is the first one who started us off.

2. _____ predicate adj.

He's fast in everything he does.

3. _____ locative

You are out of the game.

4. _____ NEG

But everybody is not black.

5. _____ V(ing)

He just feels like he is getting crippled.

6. _____ gon

He is going to try to get help.

7. question

Who is he?
B. Invariant "be"

1. be + VERB + ing  Because sometimes when I am sleeping...
2. ___adj.  Everybody is happy and shit...
3. past participles  They are mixed up in all kinds of ways.
4. prep. phrase  Sometimes I'm with Ruby.
5. imperative  Don't jive around.
6. auxiliary  Fred will be coming.

III. Verb Forms

A. Present Tense

1. agreement  Mary goes home when she gets ready.

B. Past Tense

1. irregular verbs
2. agreement  We were.
3. past participle  I saw three policemen.
4. past perfect  In the mean time the fellow had gone home.
5. passive got/was  I was promoted.
6. been + VERB  I washed the dishes (a while ago).
7. done + VERB  I washed the dishes (recently)
8. been done + VERB  I washed the dishes (finished a whole ago).
9. done been + VERB  I washed the dishes (recently finished).
10. prog. agr.  We were going.

C. Future

1. marker  I'm going to throw it.
Situational Variables

Part 2 (continued)

IV. Pronouns

A. Appositive

Marsha.

B. Possessive

The students put their books away.

C. It/there

...there were some fellows shooting craps in the street.

D. Reflexive

I have a new tow truck.

E. Them/those

They have those bars.

V. Possessive

A. Nouns Juxtaposed

John's book

B. Pronouns (see IV, B above)

VI. Alternate Syntactic Structures

A. If Construction

I asked if he did it.

B. Questions

Why don't you know?

C. Got/have

I have a tow truck.

D. Modal Modification

They used to be able to beat you.

E. ? Do Deletion

What do you want me to do?
Part 3: Features of Shared Dialect

I. Negation
   A. Single
      It wasn't bothering me.
      It won't stop bleeding.

II. Copula

III. Verb Forms
   A. Present Tense
      1. Agreement
         I, you, we or they go home.
   B. Past Tense
      1. irregular verbs
         He drove. He went. I came.
      2. agreement
         I, he was,
         ...
         ...
      10. prog. agr.
         I, he was going.

IV. Pronouns
   1. appostive
   2. possessive
      My, your, his, her, our

V. Possessive

VI. Alternate Syntactic Structures

These features have been designated as shared dialect. They are not direct translations of BE into SE, but features that both BE and SE speakers use.
Appendix B

Conversational Acts:

Codes, Definitions, and Examples of Conversational Acts

CODES, DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES OF CONVERSATIONAL ACTS

REQUESTS solicit information, action or acknowledgement.

RQYN Yes-No Questions seek true-false judgments about propositions: "Is this an apple?"

RQWH Why-Questions seek specific factual information (include either-or and fill-in-the-blank question forms):

"Where's John?"

RQCL Clarification Questions seek clarification of the content of a prior utterance: "What did you say?"

RQAC Action Requests solicit a listener to perform (or cease to) an act (or process): "Give me some juice!"

RQPM Permission Requests solicit a listener to grant permission to the speaker to perform an act: "May I go?"

RQRQ Rhetorical Questions seek an acknowledgement from a listener to allow the speaker to continue: "You know what I did?"

RESPONSES provide information directly complementing prior requests.

RSYN Yes-No Answers supply true-false judgments of propositions:

"No."

RSWH Wh-Answers supply the solicited factual information:

"John's here."
RSCL Clarifications supply the relevant repetition:
"I said no."

RSCO Compliances verbally express acceptance, denial, or acknowledgement of a prior Action or Permission Request:
"Okay, I'll do it."

RSQL Qualifications supply non-canonical information in relation to the soliciting question: "But I wasn't the one who did it."

RSRP Repetitions repeat parts of prior utterances.

-----------------------------

DESCRIPTIONS express observable (or verifiable) fact, past or present.

DSID Identifications label objects, events, etc.: "That's a house."

DSEV Events describe acts, events, processes, etc.: "I'm making pizza."

DSPR Properties describe traits or conditions of objects, events, etc.: "That's a red house."

DSLO Locations express direction or location of objects, events, etc.: "The zoo is far away."

DSTI Times report phrases of time: "It happened yesterday."

-----------------------------

STATEMENTS express facts, rules, attitudes, feelings, beliefs, etc.
Situational Variables

STRU Rules express rules, procedures, definitions, facts, etc.:
"You have to share your things with others."

STEV Evaluations express attitudes, judgments, etc.:
"That's nice."

STIR Internal Reports express emotions, sensations, mental events, etc.: "I like to play." (also include intents to perform future acts).

STAT Attributions report beliefs about another's internal state:
"He doesn't know the answer."

STEX Explanations express reasons, causes, and predictions:
"It will fall."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS recognize and evaluate responses and non-requestives.

ACAC Acceptances neutrally recognize answers or non-requestives:
"Yes," "Oh."

ACAP Approvals/Agreements positively recognize answers, etc.:
"Right," "Yes."

ACDS Disapprovals/Disagreements negatively evaluate answers or non-requestives: "No," "Wrong," "I disagree."

ACRT Returns acknowledge rhetorical questions and some non-requestives, returning the "floor" to the speaker:
"What," "Really."
Situational Variables
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ORGANIZATIONAL DEVICES regulate contact and conversation.

ODBM Boundary Markers indicate openings, closings, and other significant points in the conversation: "Hi," "Bye," "By the way."

ODCA Calls solicit attention: "Hey, John."

ODSS Speaker Selections explicitly label speaker of next turn: "John," "You."

ODPM Politeness Markers indicate ostensible politeness:
"Thanks," "Sorry."

ODAC Accompaniments maintain verbal contact, typically conveying information redundant with respect to context:
"Here you are."

PERFORMATIVES accomplish facts by being said.

PFPR Protests register complaints about the listener's behavior: "Stop."

PFJO Jokes display non-belief toward a proposition, for a humorous effect: "We threwed the soup in the ceiling."

PFCL Claims establish rights by being said: "That's mine,"
"I'm first."

PFWA Warnings alert the listener of impending harm: "Watch out."

PFTE Teases annoy taunt, or playfully provoke a listener:
"You can't do it"
MISCELLANEOUS CODES

NOAN  No Answers to questions (after two seconds of silence).

UNTP  Uninterpretable for unintelligible, incomplete, or anomalous utterances.
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