

## BLACK-ON-BLACK AN INTERVIEW ANALYZED

Edith Trager Johnson  
San Jose State University

The aim of this paper was to have two Black informants from Cincinnati interview each other, the specific methodology of the interview to be explained below. Then portions of the interview were analyzed for the application or lack thereof of specific optional phonological rules for natural speech devised by various people. The applicability of variable rules to idiolects is then briefly discussed.

As is generally known, there has been a vast proliferation of literature on Black English by whatever name it may have been called (e.g. Labov's NNE for non-standard Negro English) in the last ten years. My contribution is a small one, unaided by computers or minions of assistants. I acknowledge with appreciation my university's granting a sabbatical year which made possible the use of two informants and a graduate student who acted as amanuensis.

There is a new book produced by I. and W. Brasch and it is indeed a comprehensive book, as its title claims, and it should certainly be in the library of everybody concerned with Black English and dialect geography.

It is for linguists and anyone concerned with language. Almost everything in it has been seen and read/skimmed by one or both authors. It is 80% annotated and it includes things forthcoming such as Mouton reader edited by Dillard, Perspectives in Black English, which may be out but which I have not seen. But the point is that it is somewhat time-wasting to discuss bibliography and do anything more than refer you to the Brasches' book. They appear to have mentioned most publications relevant to Black English (with the exception of Aurbach and doubtless a few others) by Labov, Dillard, Fasold, Stewart and other people in the area.

Burling's extremely useful book, which though very recent, is included in Brasch, was reviewed by Carol Pfaff in the latest issue of Language, September 1975. It has one chapter on pronunciation and another on grammar to which she has called particularly laudatory attention which I pass onto you now by including it in this brief bibliography. Labov, Yaeger and Steiner does not belong in the Brasch book but is here included because of its discussion of the newer formal notation for variable rules (p. 37ff) earlier discussed in Fasold's Tense Marking in Black English (p. 6ff). This two-volume study by Labov et al., is absolutely seminal to the study of sound change, although it does not specifically refer to Black English, as well as being essential to the discussion of variable phonological rules, to be mentioned below. cursory inspection of Brasch did not reveal anything done on Cincinnati English so that it seemed worthwhile to go ahead with my study as a small addendum to the far vaster studies done in New York, Chicago, Washington and Detroit, to name just some of the principal places.

Now, let us return to the name and the aim of this study which was to have two black informants, one of each sex, interview each other without any interference from me. My woman informant is F for female, Black, 28 and married to my male informant. Their four children are his, hers and theirs. It is relevant that she is a second generation Cincinnati, who has a double major in Speech and Black Studies at a southern California university.

The male informant, M, five years older, is a first generation Cincinnati and is going to a city college. I appear only in the last 12 lines of the 1063-line forty-five minute discourse. It seems necessary to mention the microphone and the questionnaire since they did in fact interact with the informants in significant ways

There will be included below transcriptions of portions of the interview employing a few special conventions one of which were initials of non-speech noises between asterisks; principally \*B\*\*, audible breathing, \*TC\*\*, throat clearing, \*S\*\*, smack; \*C\*\*

cough, \*N\*\*, noise. Another convention is the use of parentheses for deleted consonants and -n for -ng. These interview portions will be discussed presently. The interview fell naturally into three sections, more by accident than by design. More also about parts A (1-315), B (316-656) and C (656-1052) below

My original plan was simply to turn loose on each other the two speakers who, I had been told, came from the so-called General American area--Ohio-born and Cincinnati-ghetto bred. It was my intention to give them the questionnaire which had successfully been used before to gather natural or casual speech. The standing microphone and Ampex 350 had already been set up and after a few words of explanation, I left the speakers on their own with the intention of not inhibiting them.

However, the interview took on a life of its own. The informants and I had good rapport and they had been assured that they could speak freely and that I would not listen to the tape in their presence (often an embarrassing procedure) nor would anyone else in town. Both speakers had had some previous experience recording--in spite of all this, the microphone seemed to have a dampening effect on the interview, at least for the first half-hour of the 45-minute taping. Missing were the stream-of-consciousness rambles, the revealing anecdotes, the free application of casual speech rules often found in English, both Black and non-Black.

Let me add that perhaps it was the structure of the questionnaire or the combined effect of initial self-consciousness with the microphone, plus wariness of a kind of prying in reaction to the questionnaire that caused the speakers to be on their "best" linguistic behavior. F first interviewed M with the help of the questionnaire, often using the language of their contact of years, in order to pry loose some of the answers. She acted as though she had been interviewing people all her life. When she came to the end of the questionnaire, there ended the first part, now called Part A.

Then M put F through the questionnaire, now called Part B, both of them loosening up as they went, with

male-female differences becoming more discernible  
 Various statistical observations will be made later in  
 this paper

To return to the questionnaire, let me say that it may look familiar to some of you from the manual Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study by Shuy, Wolfram and Riley published by Center for Applied Linguistics in 1968. Their informant data sheet and questionnaire are given in full on their pages 45-57. It is clear by comparison, that the questionnaire which I employed was simply a shortened version of their questionnaire (See Table 1, next page.)

An inspection of it will suffice to inform you that the first topic is leisure and gives the speaker a chance to expand on childhood games, TV programs, movies and the like. Part II of the questionnaire concerns the people they associate with and incidentally may betray the midwestern orientation of the questionnaire when it is asked whether speakers have any friends who speak Polish, Spanish or Hungarian. Part III deals with neighborhood and leadership and the latter is pretty well slighted in this particular interview.

See below for the first portion of Part A to be followed by Table 2, a line-numbered analysis of any departures from spelling pronunciation, Black English or otherwise.

Black-on-Black Interview: Lines 1-48

Part A    F interview M

F	OK	I guess we should start with the names	1
		*B** uh, what's your name?	2
M		My name is (gives full name).	3
F		And where were you born *L** ?	4
M		I was born in Springfield, Illinois.	5
F		*S** And what's your age?	6
M		I am thirty-three . nex(t) month...I will be	7
		thirty-four Christmas baby	8
F.		What date *B**?	9
M		Twenty-second of December	10
F	Oh, OK	an(d) OK what's the residence	11

Name  
 Place of Birth  
 Age  
 Parents' Place of Birth  
 Residences and Length

### I Games and Leisure

- A What kinds of games did you play when you were a child?  
 --Note each game and ask how each is played, the number of players, etc
- B What are your favorite TV programs (theatres, movies)?  
 --Elicit recent episode or recently-seen movie.
- C Do you have a pet? Tell me about it.
- D What do you do in your free time?
- E If you had your choice, free of any other considerations, where in the world would you like to vacation or live? Why?

### II Group Structure

- A Is there a particular group of people with which you associate?
- 1 How old are they?
  - 2 Did you associate with another group when you were younger, for example, in high school? Do you see any of the people from this group anymore?
  - 3 Do any of the people with whom you associate now speak Polish, Spanish, Hungarian, etc.? Are they of special ethnic origin?
- B Do you have a job? (What is your major?)
- 1 Where do you work?
  - 2 Describe what you do in a day's work
  - 3 What interests you most about your major?  
 What fields are you in?
  - 4 Do you associate much with your professors?  
 Do you ever see any of them outside of class?

### III Neighborhood and Leadership

- A Tell me about the neighborhood in which you grew up?
- 1 When you were younger, what kinds of things would cause trouble in your neighborhood?
  - 2 How about now? What can cause trouble in your present neighborhood?
  3. Have you ever been involved in any trouble in your neighborhood, either your present one, or some other place that you lived?
- B What do you consider to be the qualities of a good leader?
- 1 In your group, is there one person who is considered to be the leader? Why?
  - 2 What qualities of leadership does the person have?

Table 1 Speech-Sampling Questionnaire

- of or what's ... where was the place of birth  
of your parents? 12
- M. \*S\*\* My father was born in, uh, Peoria, 13  
Illinois .. My mother was born in ... uh, 14  
Louisville, 15  
Kentucky 16
- F Why is your bottom lip white \*L\*\*? 17
- M: What? 18
- F. \*B\*\* Why is your bottom lip white? 19
- M: \*S\*\* Uh, huh, I guess because I'm a little 20  
nervous 21
- F: \*B\*\* OK. Uh .. what's the length of the 21  
residence 22  
that, you know, like, where have you lived in 23  
your lifetime? 24  
An(d) \*B\*\* wha(t)'s been the ..the length of 25  
the stay \*L\*\*? 26
- M: Well, (th)e longest(t)...I've live(d) in Cin- 27  
cinnati 28  
for about, ah, well, the greater part of my 29  
life I've 'n 30  
livin(g) in Cincinnati.. but durin(g) the time 31  
I was 32  
in the services...I was in the services for 33  
about . twelve 34  
years ..an(d) I've lived, um ..in Illinois 35  
for a while 36  
.New Jersey.. an(d) . a lot of, lot of. .um 37
- F Tha(t)'s enough \*L\*\*! 38
- M. Time was \*L\*\* was spent overseas. 39  
\*L-(F)\*\*! 40
- F Um \*TC\*\*, wha(t) kin(d) o(f) games did you 41  
play when you were a chil(d)...? 42
- M \*S\*\* Mainly, uh, sport game(s) .foo(t)ball... 43  
baske(t)ball .. 44
- F Didn'(t) you ever play any stree(t) games . 45  
like Hide . Go an(d) Get it? 46
- M Yeah \*Overlap\*\*! Hide an(d) Seek \*L-(F)\*\*! 47  
Hide an(d) Hide an(d) Seek .tha(t)'s about 48  
all 49
- F You didn'(t) play nothin(g) else? 50
- M Stree(t) games \*Overlap\*\*! .No... Like what? 51
- F I don'(t) know, like, sport games with 52  
you know, like...really wasn't ..regular official

	sport	43
	games...like you know how they have touch	
	football	44
	an(d) stuff like that...! M	45
M:	Right *Overlap**, right, touch football. But,	
	um...	46
	well, it wasn't any regular officiating in	
	there...We did it ourselves. .	47-48

A second part of the dialogue is of sociolinguistic as well as phonological interest (See Tables 2 and 3 on the following pages )

	I woul(d) enjoy livin(g) in the	718
	suburb(s) an(d) then commuting...down into	719
	the city like you said...for shopping	720
	or for entertainment, night-life...things	721
	like that... I woul(d) like to be comfortable	722
	...in life. I woul(d) like to give...my	
	children	723
	things that...you know...that I can see	724
	them getting without...you know,	725
	wouldn'(t) be any...monetary strain on the	726
	rest of us, you know...an(d) if I can	727
	get it for (th)em, I'm going to get it	728
	...you know. My life was pretty good,	729
	my mother an(d) father...they tried...the	730
	bes(t) they could to give me an(d) my	
	brothers...	731
	an(d) sister what we wanted. .and me	732
	lookin(g) at them and seeing what they	733
	gave us...I know...that I can do,	734
	you know...a little better for my	735
	children ..what about you?	736
F:	*L** Oh, that was heavy, (name) *L**!	737-738
M:	Said a lot! Not too much.	739
	*L-(F) & (M)**	740
F:	No, I don'(t) know. Like .	741
	like I've been struggling so hard to give	742
	the kids everything that I'm beginning	743
	to question...you know, the validity of ..	744
	you know.. is it right or wrong *TC**?	745
	(Be)cause, like...like, well, I -- I grew	746
	up an(d) I was.. like, an only chil(d),	747
	but...my mother raised me by herself	748

an(d) .she couldn't give me a lot	749
of things, but she work(ed) real hard an(d)	750
I appreciate it (B**, Like, I	751
had a lot of things compared to other	752
people who live(d) where I did But...	753
You know, compared to my children, I	754
didn't have half o(f) the things.. *B**	755
and. I don'(t) know I'm beginning to	756
wonder if. .in my, you know, obsession	757
to, to make sure that their life is	758
comfortable an(d) *B** they have everything	759
I might be doin(g) an injustice	760
..to them, an(d), like...I kin(d) of	761
feel sending them back home to	762
Cincinnati every summer ..*B** an(d)	763
tryin(g) to give them some feels of	764
what Black life is all about. *B**	765
that it keeps a happy medium, you know	766

It is interesting to note something F says earlier on line 632-33 There she says, "I didn'(t) realize how ticky white people can be about . " various things like parking places and loud music Again she is demonstrating her awareness of the differences between the white and black subcultures and incidentally introduces us to a new word, "ticky " I have checked with A L Davis (personal communication), one of our most distinguished dialect geographers, and he says the word is completely unfamiliar to him despite anything he has worked with or read about in the Midwest, so I imagine that we can assume that this is either a Black English vocabulary item or F's own invention for "particular, fussy " Al Davis also was reassuring on the score of no extensive work having been done in Cincinnati although some nearby areas have indeed been blanketed with sociolinguists (I owe to Ms Kathleen Jordan, Black instructor of English in Southern State College, Magnolia, Arkansas, who heard the oral presentation of this paper at the University of Kansas, the information that "ticky" is used in the above sense in Arkansas )

In Part B where M is questioning F, the interviewing is somewhat less skillful. He seems a little ill-at-ease in the role of interviewer, but does nevertheless plow through the questionnaire A few more Black





<u>Orthography</u>	<u>Phonetics</u>	<u>Rules</u>
F30 'that's'	[ðæs]	t→φ __s#V
M31 'spent'	[spent]	t/ not deleted but clearly articulated
F33 'what kind of'	[wʌ? kaɪn ə]	t→ /?/V__# d→φ/Vn__# v→φ often in 'of'
F34 'child'	[tʃaɪl]	d→φ/Vl__#
M35 'sport games' 'football, basketball'	[geɪm] [fʊ?bɔɪ, bʌskɛ?bɔɪ]	z→φ/VC__# often in '-es' t→?/V__#C
M36 'didn't you' 'street games'	[dɪn ju] [stri geɪmz]	didn't→/dɪn/, hence no palatalization t→φ/__#C
M37 'Hide and seek'	[-ən-]	'and' often→/ən/ between nouns, d→φ/n__#
M38 " "	" "	(repeated twice)
39 " "	" "	
'that's'	[ðæs]	t→φ __s#V
F40 'didn't' 'nothing'	[dɪn] [nʌθɪn]	see line 36 ɣ→n/V__#
M41 'street games'	[stri]	t→φ/__#C
F42 'don't know'	[dənɔ]	common contraction of /ntn/→/n/ here
45 'and'	[ænd]	d→φ/n__#
48 'officiating'	[-ɪŋ]	ɣ→n/V__#

Table 2b Analysis of rule application. (Lines 30-48)

<u>Orthography</u>	<u>Phonetics</u>	<u>Rules</u>
M718 'I would enjoy living in'	[aɪ wʊ? əndʒɔɪ lɪvɪn ɪn]	d→? / __#V ɪŋ→ɪn / __#V
719 'suburbs and'	[sʌbərɪb ən]	z→φ / C__# d→φ / __#
720 'shopping or'	[ʃɑpɪŋ ɔr]	note the [ɪŋ] and cf. line 718
722 'would like'	[wʊ? laɪk]	d→? / __#
723 'would like'	[wʊ? laɪk]	d→? / __#
726 'wouldn't be  'monetary'	[wʊn bɪ  [mɒnətəri]	d→φ / ɪn Aux and <u>n't</u> t→φ / n__# idiosyncratic pronunciation
727 'and if'	[ænd ɪf]	d→φ / n__#
728 'get it for them' 'I'm going to get it'	[gɛdɪt fɔr əm] [aɪm ɔʊnə ɡɛɪd ɪt]	ð→φ / #_V ŋ→n / __# , no [g] in 'gonna' t→φ / n__#
730 'mother and father'	[mʌðər fɑðər]	n→φ / n__# 'and'→∅ between words in a semantic unit
731 'the best they'  'and my'	[ə bɛst ðeɪ]  [ænd maɪ]	ð→φ / #_V t→φ / __# d→φ / __# Vn→Ṽ_C (homorganic)

Table 3a Further analysis of rule application (Lines 718-731)

	<u>Orthography</u>	<u>Phonetics</u>	<u>Rules</u>
732	'and sister'	[ʔ sísder]	see line 731, note [t] voicing
733	'looking at'	[lʊkIn æt]	ɣ→n / __#V
	'seeing what'	[síʔy wʌʔ]	ɣ→ɣ / __#C
			t→ʔ / __#
F737	'that was'	[ðæ wʌz]	t→φ / __#C
741	'I don't know'	[áI də nŏ]	t→φ / __# , nn→n
746	'because'	[*TC kʌz]	masking by non-speech noise
747	'and I'	[æn aI]	d→φ / n__#
747-8	'child but'	[tʃáɪl bəʔ]	d→φ / l__#
			t→φ / __#
748	'by herself'	[baI ərsɛlf]	h→φ / #__V
749	'and'	[æn]	d→φ / n__#
	'couldn't give'	[kʊdən gɪv]	t→φ / n__#
750	'she work(ed) real'	[ʃi wɔrk rɛɪl]	t→φ / C__#
751	hard and I'	[hard ən aI]	d→φ / n__#
753	'who live(d) where I'	[hu lív wer aI]	d→φ / C__#
755	'didn't have'	[dɪnt hæv]	d→φ / often in 'didn't'
	'half of the'	[hæf ə ðə]	v→φ / __# in 'of'
	'don't know'	[doʊ noʊ]	t→φ / n__#
			nn→n

Table 3b Further analysis of rule application (Lines 732-755)

Orthography	Phonetics	Rules
F759 'comfortable and *B**	[kámftərbəl ən]	[f] is phi-like, [ə] idiosyncratic?
760 'might be doing an'	[maɪ? bɪ duːn ən]	d→φ / __# t→ʔ / __# ŋ→n / __#
761 'and like'	[ən laɪk]	d→φ / n__#
761 'kind of feel'	[kaɪn ə fiːl]	d→φ / n__# v→φ / __# in 'of'
762 'sending them'	[sɛndɪŋ ðɪm]	ð→φ / #__V
763 'and'	[ən]	d→φ / __#
764 'trying to'	[traɪn tə]	ɪŋ→n / __#
765 'feels of what'	[fiːlz əv wʌʔ]	v not deleted here
		t→ʔ / __#C
'about'	[əbáʊ]	t→φ / __#

Table 3c. Further analysis of rule application. (Lines 759-765)

English characteristics emerge in Part B than Part A, notably consonant-cluster deletion.

The most interesting part of the interview is perhaps Part C, where the formality of the procedure of using the questionnaire is over with, and M and F wonder if they should go on, and then indeed continue in a way that reveals the closeness and the kind of joking relationship that they have with each other. The consonant-cluster deletion rate rises sharply, as well as the typical Black English verb usages summarized so neatly by Burling. F even relaxes to the extent of saying, "They know I don' (t) be jivin (g) (th)em."

Perhaps the most interesting theoretical question that arose as I listened to the tape was the applicability of the variable rule to idiolects. What, for instance, leads my informant M to use [ɪŋ] and [ɪn] endings in the same paragraph or even in the same sentence? Fatigue might be an idiosyncratic extra-linguistic factor, formality of style a social extra-linguistic factor, both of them in addition to some unknown linguistic factor. Again, despite the close approximation to standard English in other areas, why does F exhibit a high consonant-cluster deletion rate in this interview?

This leads me to remind you of Wolfram's famous rule for consonant-cluster deletion in his Detroit study which I am sure operates far beyond the confines of that city.

$$\begin{bmatrix} + \text{ cons} \\ - \text{ cont} \\ \alpha \text{ voice} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \phi / \begin{bmatrix} + \text{ cons} \\ \alpha \text{ voice} \end{bmatrix} \_\_\_\_\_\#$$

In other words, in a final  $C_1C_2$  cluster,  $C_2$  drops only if it is a stop and agrees with  $C_1$  in voicing.

Fasold quotes this in his Tense Marking in Black English and then goes on to point out that the application of this rule is affected by 1) "Is the cluster followed by C?" and, less importantly, 2) "Does a morpheme boundary intervene between  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ?" That is, /mis/for/mist/ is more likely in 'mist with fog'.

than in 'missed the connection.' Furthermore, the four possible combinations of the factors correlate with the four social classes he sets up. The higher the class, the fewer deletions. This leads him to rewrite the rule in Labovian style with lower-case Greek letters (later to be abandoned) thus:

$$C_2 \rightarrow (\phi)/C_1\beta(\#) \text{ \_\_\_\_\_\_ } \# \alpha (\sim V)$$

What this means is that if  $\beta$  (beta) has a plus-value, then a morpheme boundary is present. Also if  $\alpha$  (alpha) is plus, then there is no vowel present.

There are of course other rules that apply to cluster reduction but a complete listing of them is beyond the scope of this paper. It is however pertinent to cite a different kind of rule from Zwicky (1970, p. 326), his rule for glide deletion, "This rule drops morpheme-initial [h] quite generally, [w] in will, would, was and were and [ð] in 'they, them, than, this, that, these and those'." In our interview [h] is dropped often, as by most people, in the third person singular pronouns, [w] is twice dropped by M in 'was' and [ð] is dropped at least once apiece by M and F from 'the' (not mentioned by Zwicky, but done despite the resulting homonymity with 'a' more often than one would suspect.)

Zwicky (1972, p. 292-3) also has what he calls the Rule Dent-Del, a "rule deleting [t] and [d]/# (C in moderately fast speech, but extended to apply before vowels and in phrase-final position) and following [fsnl]." The data (as in the case of his glide-deletion rule where we had to extend his list of words to include 'the') forced us to use the rule to its full extension and to acknowledge that other consonants than the four he lists may be involved (and covered, incidentally, by Wolfram's rule). There is unfortunately no single, universally agreed-upon, list of rules but the rules of Fasold and Zwicky have made it possible to calculate the percentages given below.

Note that in merely forty-eight lines of Part A, analyzed in Table 2, there are 27 consonant cluster deletions, 12 for M and surprisingly 15 for F. F on the whole sounds better educated, as indeed she is,

and so it was surprising to find a higher deletion rate for her. On the other hand, it may not have been fair to count /dɛnó/ as an instance of ordinary deletion. Given that it was, her rate was 28.85% and his was 26.09%. In the 47 lines of Part C, analyzed in Table 3, the rate for M rises to 40.54%, for F to 36.66%.

This is probably not the place to go into the neat summary (p. 37) of formal notation by Labov, Yager and Steiner for phonological rules although they could certainly be applied by others more deeply familiar than I with the phenomena mentioned above and to those that follow

Inspections of Tables 2 and 3 show that -ing and -in occur in the same sentence, that final [z] seems to be in free variation with  $\emptyset$  in Illinois. Although we eliminated the few false starts on words and phrases we feel that little information of importance has been lost. It should be mentioned at the outset that, perhaps because of the demographic history, both recent and earlier, there are far fewer Southernisms than in Detroit and Chicago Black English. There is no trace of [r] deletion finally, pre-vocally and certainly not intervocally. Likewise [l] remains pre-consonantly in 'help' and 'ourselves', for instance. For one feature that does seem Southern, I have kept [aɪ] in Tables 2 and 3 rather than [aɪ̯] which would be far from the phonetic truth which is closer to [aɪ̯>], in words like 'time' and 'like'.

The growing use of [ʔ] in (Aux + n't) such as 'wouldn't' occurs several times. It is hoped that the reader will actually take the time to use Tables 2 and 3 in conjunction with the quasi-phonemic orthographic transcription of the two sections of the thousand-odd lines of discourse which it was not possible to include in this limited study. One line, M 46, includes a well-known Black English bit of usage "it wasn't any regular officiating" where 'it' is used instead of 'there.' Other such usages (e.g. in line 764, 'give them some feels') have been noted but they are surprisingly rare probably because of the educational background of M and F



Gillian Sankoff (personal communication) is beginning, she tells me, to work more and more with individuals and it does seem to me that we can apply the concept of the variable rule to idiolects--remembering always how "ticky" people can be about tricky things like measuring variables.

Freder and Lambert give us a staggering list of thirteen variables for their population of Canadian boys: 1) amount of intonation, 2) appropriateness of intonation, 3) hoarseness of voice, 4) speed of speech, 5) standardness of pronunciation, 6) pleasance [sic!] of voice, 7) masculinity of voice, 8) articulateness of pronunciation, 9) accuracy of pronunciation, 10) pitch of voice, 11) confidence of speaker, 12) fluency of speaker, 13) eagerness of speaker. These individual variables were applied to the reading of two passages. The list could be greatly expanded for girls, men and women, all applied to natural speech. Anyone, especially a linguist, could think of dozens more I fear so there is a real possibility that limitations must be put on variables.

Sankoff, by the way, discusses scaling in rules in her "A Quantitative Paradigm for the Study of Communicative Competence" in Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking, there she points out that "well known phenomena such as middle-class hypercorrection of conscious variables, multiple geographic foci of innovations, and age group specific usages are all incompatible with simple scaling" (p. 43)

Although few new discoveries have been reported here, perhaps there is one rather interesting one It has become clear that code-switching can take place even when nobody else but two informants at ease with each other and at home in several worlds are present. Microphone and/or questionnaire are sufficient. Once the questionnaire was done with, and the microphone had become familiar, the switch to a more vernacular type of speech set in, although it was also interspersed with a more formal style of speech as a reading of the dialogue shows. Various questions about rules have been raised, based on observations on a small part of the data gathered.

It is reasonable to assume that many more interesting things would emerge were we somehow able to record M and F in a more informal situation. As it is, I am grateful to them for what they have helped me learn

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aurbach, Joseph. 1971 A phonemic and phonetic description of the speech of selected Negro informants of South-Central Los Angeles (Speech Communications Research Laboratory Monograph No 6.) Santa Barbara, California
- Brasch, I.W. and W M Brasch. 1974 A comprehensive annotated bibliography of American Black English Baton Rouge Louisiana State University Press.
- Burling, Robbins 1973. English in black and white. New York: Holt; Rinehart and Winston, Inc
- Cedergren, H J and David Sankoff. 1974. Variable rules, performance as a statistical reflection of competence Lg.50, 333-355.
- Fasold, Ralph W 1972. Tense in Black English. a linguistic and social analysis. Washington, D.C Center for Applied Linguistics
- Freder, Robert and Wallace Lambert 1973. "Speech style and scholastic success the tentative relationships and possible implications for lower social class children." Report of 23rd Annual Round Table on Linguistics and Language Studies, ed R Shuy, Washington, D C Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics.
- Labov, William 1969 Contraction, deletion, and inherent variability of the English copula Lg. 45 715-762.
- Labov, W , M Yaeger and R Steiner. 1972 A quantitative study of sound change in progress. Philadelphia United States Regional Survey, 204 N 35th Street, Philadelphia, Pa 19104

- Pfaff, Carol W. 1975. Review of Burling 1973 Lg 51. 770-76.
- Sankoff, Gillian. 1974. "A quantitative paradigm for the study of communicative competence," Explorations in the ethnography of speaking, ed Richard Bauman and Joel Sherzer, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Shuy, Roger, Walter A. Wolfram, and William K Riley 1968. Field techniques in an urban language study Washington, D.C Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, Walter. 1969. A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1970. "Auxiliary reduction in English." Linguistic Inquiry, 1.323-6.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. The rule dent-del, Linguistic change and generative theory, ed. by Robert P. Stockwell and Ronald K.S. Maculay Bloomington Indiana University Press.