LANGUAGE AND READING

Bridging The Language Difference For Children Who Speak Hawaiian English

Gisela E. Speidel

In Hawaii a large portion of the population speaks a variety of English that has developed out of the pidgin spoken by Hawaiians and various immigrant groups upon coming into contact with the English language.[1] Hawaiian English today represents a creole speech continuum, subsuming a number of linguistic varieties which extend from highly-creolized forms to closer approximations of standard English.[2] For convenience, the terms "Hawaiian English" and "Hawaiian dialect" will be used when referring to this creole speech continuum; recognizing, however, that these are cover terms for a number of speech varieties. Hawaiian English and standard English differ in pronunciation, morphology and syntax, but overlap in lexical items. The Hawaiian children attending KEEP thus tend to grow up in a bidialectal community—a community in which family and friends speak Hawaiian English, while school personnel and the media speak standard English.

Educational consequences of the language difference between home and school, particularly problems in learning to read, have, therefore, been of great interest to KEEP researchers. The language issues confronting KEEP are comparable to those confronting researchers in the late 1960s and early 1970s working with children from various other dialect-speaking communities. A commonly-accepted notion then was that children speaking a dialect would have difficulty learning to read because the reading material was in standard English and differed from the children's own language patterns. Thus, Goodman writes that ". . . literacy is built on the base of the child's existing language;"[3] Labov declares that a source of reading problems for divergent speakers is an "ignorance of standard English rules;"[4] and Stewart suggests that ". . . learning to read . . . may be rendered infinitely more difficult by a tradition of writing . . . in some language other than the one . . . which the population normally learns to speak."[5] The solution recommended by this group of writers is that the texts used for teaching beginning reading should be adjusted to the language of the dialect-speaking child.[6] A decade later, however, it appears that American education has not yet successfully applied these recommendations.

This paper will summarize the research conducted at KEEP that pertains to the language-reading issue. KEEP anthropologists, linguists and psychologists have studied various facets of the language behavior of Hawaiian children and the present summary will draw on research from all these disciplines. The first section will deal with the relationship between different language skills and reading acquisition. This is followed by a brief description of the KEEP research on methods for developing oral language. The final section will elucidate the manner in which the KEEP reading program bridges the difference between the language of Hawaiian children and the standard reading texts.

The issue of different languages spoken at home and at school is frequently cast into the question of whether the home dialect interferes with school learning. This formulation, however, does not provide the appropriate focus for the problem. The inquiry should be reworded to ask whether unfamiliarity with the standard language, or with the language spoken at school, results in reading or other school difficulties. The point is illustrated best by using two different languages as an example. Thus, speaking English does not interfere with learning to read French, but not knowing French makes learning to read in that language very difficult. Similarly, speaking Hawaiian English does not interfere with learning to read in English, but a lack of familiarity with standard English probably would make learning to read in English extremely laborious.

The inquiry into whether speaking Hawaiian dialect at home has any consequences for school achievement must, therefore, begin by asking how familiar or proficient with standard English the Hawaiian English-speaking children are. Do they lag behind or have any specific difficulties in comparison to their peers who speak only standard English? Should children speaking Hawaiian dialect be less familiar with certain aspects of standard English, the question then becomes whether that finding is of any consequence to their schooling, particularly to their learning to read in English. Only if degree of familiarity with standard English is actually found to be implicated in learning to read, do we need to search for an effective way to accommodate to the dialect issue.

Methodological Issues in the Assessment of Language Proficiency

Studying the degree of mastery of a language is a difficult task and requires a multifaceted approach to address the many variables affecting language performance. Proficiency in a language is not an either/or phenomenon: There are many different levels of knowing a language. First, the well-known distinction must be drawn between comprehension and production. An individual may have excellent comprehension of a language and yet may be unable to speak it intelligibly. Conversely, a person may use words without knowing their meaning, as for instance a child may recite the "Pledge of Allegiance" without knowing the meaning of many of the words contained therein. At another level of analysis, there may be degrees of expertise with the various categories of rules in a language system, such as vocabulary, morphology, and syntax. For instance, a child may possess a large vocabulary, but may have difficulty with syntax or with morphology.

Another important consideration is that an individual's performance of the same linguistic feature may differ depending upon the procedure used to measure it: Is knowledge of a particular feature measured by pointing, by repetition, in connected discourse, in discourse with adults or peers, in response to a tester, in or out of context? All of these assessment variables may affect whether an individual will, or will not, exhibit competence.

To complicate assessment of proficiency in language even further there are the seemingly random fluctuations in language performance illustrated by the sudden inability to name a familiar item: the "whatchamacallit" phenomenon we have all distressingly experienced at one time or another.

Such potential irregularities in language performance make any definitive description of general proficiency in a language virtually impossible. Nevertheless, by "sinking in many shafts," by using different assessment procedures we may be able to obtain a fairly representative picture of facility in a language that will allow relatively accurate predictions of performance for certain settings.

A further issue pertains to the use of standardized language measures. Language measures constructed to assess the language development or linguistic competence of children who speak standard English would be inappropriate in most contexts for use with children who speak a dialect. Such measures have been normed on standard-English-speaking children and assume a language history similar to theirs. Thus, they cannot and should not be used for assessing general language development or linguistic competence of children who have had a divergent language history. Nevertheless, such measures yielding age norms for monolectal standard speakers can be helpful when they are used as achievement measures for the dialect-speaking child, to describe how far along he is in his mastery of the standard language.

Studies on Language and on the Relationship between Language and Reading

With the above methodological difficulties in mind, we will now turn to various KEEP research projects which provide information on Hawaiian dialect-speaking children's proficiency in various facets of English. Whenever possible the relationship between performance on a particular skill and reading achievement will be described.

The Repetition Tests. One of the first undertakings at KEEP was the development of two repetition tests: The Standard English Repetition Test or SERT[2,7] and the Hawaiian Creole English Repetition Test or HCERT.[8] On these tasks children are presented with a series of sentences they are to repeat. The logic behind repetition measures of language performance is that the more familiar an individual is with the particular forms of a language, the easier it will be for him to repeat the sentences accurately. For constructing the SERT, sentences were chosen to include features that are commonly used in standard English, but which are atypical of Hawaiian English. The HCERT, constructed to assess the children's facility in Hawaiian English, consists of Hawaiian English counterparts of the SERT sentences as well as some more complex Hawaiian English structures. These two measuring devices, the SERT and HCERT, allowed the systematic investigation of the children's facility in the two language codes as well as the association between proficiency in either of the language codes and reading achievement.

An inspection of the responses of Hawaiian children to the SERT showed that they often repeated the gist of the sentence correctly in their dialect rather than repeating the sentence in standard English. In terms of actual verbatim repetition of the standard English, it was only

at the third-grade level that they performed as well as a group of standard-English-speaking kindergarteners. This indicates that the children had comprehended the English sentences but, in attempting to repeat them, replaced the less-familiar standard-English features with Hawaiian English. On the basis of these findings, Gallimore and Tharp[9] concluded that Hawaiian-dialect-speaking kindergarteners perform less well on oral production of English than their standard-English-speaking peers; but that they comprehend English almost as well.

The degree to which the children are more facile in Hawaiian English than standard English cannot be described quantitatively at this point since their differential success on identical features of the SERT and the HCERT has not yet been analyzed. Too, an attempt to compare performance on the HCERT by Hawaiian and standard English speakers failed when a group of standard-speaking children were too perplexed by the Hawaiian English sentences that they were unable to do the task.[8]

In a series of statistical analyses, the relationship of performance on the SERT and on the HCERT to reading achievement was studied. Performance on the HCERT was found to be either unrelated[10] or slightly positively correlated[8] with reading scores. This means that children who are very proficient in Hawaiian English are not the children who will have all the problems in learning to read in English. On the contrary, within a group of children speaking primarily Hawaiian English, the most proficient dialect speakers may actually be the somewhat better readers, perhaps because of verbal or intellectual abilities underlying both linguistic and reading proficiency. In contrast to the findings with the HCERT, the performance on the SERT was among the best predictors of reading achievement.[10] Children who showed greater mastery of standard English were the better readers.

In addition, an analysis of oral reading errors indicated that the children who were more proficient in standard English as measured on the SERT made more meaningful substitution errors, while children who were less proficient made more non-meaningful substitution errors.[11]

These findings with the HCERT and the SERT support our earlier argument that speaking a dialect does not interfere with learning to read in English, but a lack of familiarity with standard English might.

The Phoneme Inventory. Results from the SERT had suggested that our dialect speaking children had little or no difficulty in comprehending English. We assessed their comprehension of English, however, in further detail at several levels of language structure. At the most fundamental level we studied difficulties in comprehension that might be related to differences in pronunciation between the two language codes. A systematic analysis of different phoneme usage in English and Hawaiian Creole English was made.[12] Although there are many differences in pronunciation, only five phoneme pairs were considered to be candidates for sources of confusion and comprehension problems. These five pairs are: /ð/ - /d/ as in there and dare; /u/ - /ʊ/ as in full and fool; /o/ - /ʌ/ as in cot and cut; /θ/ - /t/ as in three and tree; /s/ - /z/ as in sue and zoo. The proficiency with which KEEP children were able to distinguish these allo-phonemes was found to be related to their reading achievement.[13] In the first grade, the more easily the children were able to distinguish these sounds, the better readers they were. By the end of the second grade, the children had learned to discriminate the sounds without specific instruction; nevertheless, their first-grade performance on this phoneme discrimination task still predicted their reading performance at the end of the second grade. In other words, children who were able to discriminate the critical sounds in the first grade had a head start in reading and retained that advantage during the second grade. Due to the correlational nature of the study we do not know whether the initial superiority in reading in the first grade was directly due to better phoneme discrimination or whether it was due to some other factor which is merely reflected in the phoneme discrimination task, such as a greater familiarity with English.

Auditory Comprehension of Language. To measure comprehension of English at a higher semantic, more meaningful level, Carrow's Test of Authority Comprehension of Language[14] was given to the KEEP children. On this particular test, children's ability to comprehend different features of spoken English is assessed by asking the children to point to the appropriate picture in a series of pictures in response to a word, phrase, or sentence spoken by the tester. In kindergarten, children at KEEP perform very much like the standard English speaking norm group;[15] however, by the time the children are in the third grade their comprehension of some features of standard English appears to be lagging. Again, degree of comprehension of English as measured by this task was related to reading achievement: Children who comprehended better tended to be more advanced in reading.[16]

Comprehension of Narrated Stories. At the highest level of comprehension of spoken English we have studied the understanding of narrated stories. A group of second-grade children living on Hawaiian homestead lands were told stories either in Hawaiian dialect or in English.[17] These children comprehended the English stories to a fair degree, but understood the dialect stories better, indicating that they are not equally proficient in both dialects. Furthermore, the

dialect-speaking children found the English versions more difficult than a group of second graders speaking English as their first dialect. These findings are corroborated by Choy and Dodd[18] who found that fourth-grade boys speaking Hawaiian English as their first dialect understood stories in their dialect better than stories in English. Since comprehension of oral instructions and of connected discourse must rely on processes similar to those involved in the comprehension of narrated stories, the findings from the above two studies suggest that Hawaiian English-speaking children may be less proficient in understanding the instructions of standard English-speaking teachers and as a result may have difficulties in learning in the classroom.

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA).[19] The greatest amount of information on the language skills, particularly the English skills, of children at KEEP have been obtained using the ITPA.[20] We have administered this test in kindergarten, first, and third grade over several years. The ITPA assesses several different language skills, ranging from comprehension of vocabulary, to short-term auditory memory, to different facets of oral production.

Some will claim that the ITPA is inappropriate for use with dialect-speaking children, arguing correctly that many of the items are biased against such children. This is indeed the case for our children who speak Hawaiian English. However, the reader is reminded that the utility of the ITPA for the present purpose is precisely that some of its subtests sample performance on more specific standard English skills. Such differences and biases among different subtests allow us to assess which tasks are easy and which tasks are difficult for the dialect speakers. It also permits us to assess the extent to which a dialect speaker is familiar with or has mastered different types of standard English skills. Thus, it is used here as a standard English achievement test assessing performance based on past learning situations.

When children at KEEP first enter kindergarten, their performance on the ITPA is uneven compared to English-speaking kindergarteners. Generally, on those language tasks in which there is similarity between standard English and Hawaiian English, the children perform appropriately for their age level. Thus, the children's facility in describing familiar objects—a task in which the number of appropriate characteristics a child can name is critical, while responding with Hawaiian English sentence structure and morphology is not penalized—is at least average. Similarly, their auditory short term memory which is assessed by the repetition of numbers—numbers being identical in standard English and in Hawaiian English—is good. The range of their vocabulary comprehension shows a slight lag, corroborating the findings from the Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language reported above. However, the task of greatest difficulty for children at KEEP is the automatic production of English syntactical and morphological features as assessed by a cloze task called Grammatic Closure. For example, the children are to complete with the help of pictures such sentences as: "The boy is opening the gate. Here the gate has been ____." and "This horse is big. This horse is even ____. And this horse is the very ____." It will be remembered that the greatest difference between standard and Hawaiian English is in morphology and syntax. Richard Day, an authority on Hawaiian English, has analyzed the items on the Grammatic Closure task and found that at least half of the sentences would be completed differently in Hawaiian English. Since the testing as well as the linguistic contexts are in standard English we would expect from the sociolinguistic research on code switching that a bidialectal child would use standard English linguistic forms on the Grammatic Closure task if these linguistic forms were readily available to him. The children at KEEP however, tend to have great difficulty with this particular task and tend to complete the sentences using Hawaiian English.

The uneven pattern of development noted on the ITPA does not change markedly during the children's four years at KEEP. If anything, their difficulty with the automatic production of English grammatical features is more pronounced in third grade. However, it will be seen in the subsequent section that this characterization is only accurate if classroom instruction does not include special features for promoting proficiency in English.

We may conclude, therefore, from the ITPA findings that on tasks on which there is overlap between Hawaiian and standard English, dialect-speaking children perform satisfactorily and within the range expected for their age. On items, though, on which the two language codes differ, they tend to lag behind and are less familiar with the standard English versions than their monolectal, English-speaking peers.

To what extent then is the KEEP children's difficulty with the automatic production of standard English grammar and syntax associated with difficulties in learning to read? Of the various language skills measured, does this knowledge of English grammar and syntax play a special role in reading acquisition?

To address this question, a study[20] was conducted to see which of the skills measured on the ITPA as well as general verbal ability (i.e. WISC-R Verbal IQ)[21] predicted reading achievement most accurately.

Specifically, multiple regression analyses were performed using the subtests of the ITPA and verbal IQ as the predictor variables, and the scores on the Gates-MacGinitie[22] reading test as the dependent variable. The best predictor of reading achievement in both first and third grade was the automatic use of standard English syntax and morphology as assessed on the Grammatic Closure Test. Performance on this test alone accounted for 43 percent of the variance in reading achievement at the end of first grade and 54 percent of the variance at the end of the third grade. Addition of the other measures to the prediction model did not increase the accuracy of prediction appreciably. Thus, those children who had greater facility with the automatic production of English syntax and grammar were generally observed to learn to read more quickly.

Research with other groups of children has shown that the more similar the language patterns of the reading material is to the language which the child speaks, the easier it is for a child to read.[23] There is also growing evidence among English-speaking children that the better their mastery is of adult English grammar, the less difficulty they have learning to read.[24,25,26,27] Wisher points out that syntactic information assists in organizing word strings into coherent, convenient units for processing and remembering. He proposes that, "The ability to anticipate structure and meaning is vital to reading, especially to the young reader burdened with the rules of identification. For reading to be most efficient, the reader must profit from all the cues the language offers."[28]

Elsewhere, I have suggested that syntactic/grammatic as well as contextual expectancies might be particularly important for dialect speakers when learning to read English.[20] Due to the irregular and inconsistent grapheme-phoneme correspondences in English, single letters provide unreliable information in the decoding process. George Bernard Shaw's example of "ghoti" as an alternate spelling of "fish" illustrates this point. For dialect speakers of English the mapping of phoneme to grapheme is even more inconsistent. Goodman, for instance, argued that with divergent speakers phonics instruction may not only be inappropriate but also confusing.[3] It would appear, therefore, that for dialect-speaking children, such as our Hawaiian English speakers, syntactic/grammatic cues, as well as word association cues, would be even more helpful and important in decoding than for standard speaking children. Yet, the above Grammatic Closure results indicate these cues may be less available to our Hawaiian dialect-speaking children.

Summarizing briefly the findings described thus far: Lower-income children who speak Hawaiian English appear to be more proficient in their dialect than in standard English. However, their reading difficulties do not seem to be caused by their speaking a dialect, since proficiency in Hawaiian English was shown to be essentially unrelated to reading performance. These children differ among each other in the degree to which they have mastered standard English. Generally, those children who were more familiar with standard English tended to be the better readers. These observations suggest that to be most effective, a reading program for lower-income children who speak Hawaiian English should address and accommodate to their unfamiliarity and their difficulties with standard English.

Studies on Instructional Methods for Oral Language Development

A series of studies have been conducted at KEEP to delineate characteristics of effective instructional methods of oral language development.[29,30,31] One can distinguish two fundamentally-different approaches to language development and second language learning in young children. One approach focuses on teaching lexical items and grammatical forms. The second approach, which I have called the natural context method, stresses communication; here, language is the *medium* for a child's interaction with a teacher or with his peers and not the *target* or *goal* of the interaction—at least from the child's point of view.

In the former approach, grammatical rules are taught and practiced. There is much emphasis on rote and automatic learning and on repetition, particularly with younger children. The children are told what to say and asked to repeat new or unfamiliar language forms. Unison responding is common as well as is patterned drill. For example, the children might be asked to repeat after a teacher who points to a series of objects, "This is a pear; This is a banana; This is a lemon;" and "These are bananas; these are pears; these are oranges." Rhymes or songs are often used. For example, to teach new vocabulary items children learn songs such as,

> Bibbety-bob, Here's our job
> New words to say for work and play
> Oranges and pears are fruit you see
> Words we learn from P. Mooney.[32]

Or to learn the subject-noun agreement the children might be taught the following rhymes:

> Owl is one, owls are two
> What do they say when they talk to you?
> Whooo—Whooo.
>
> Cat is one, cats are two
> What do they say when they talk to you?
> Meow, meow, meow.[32]

The natural context method, in contrast, emphasizes communication by the children rather than language learning *per se*. Language learning is to occur through conversation and communication between a child and the teacher as well as between a child and other children. Language

forms are not taught explicitly or rotely. The teacher, though, may have in mind definite language patterns or vocabulary items that she wishes the children to acquire during a conversation.

The techniques a teacher uses in such a natural context approach are similar to what mothers often do with their young children and are based on a number of assumptions about language acquisition. Children are assumed to learn new language best when it is associated with something they already know or with something they can see and feel. When a teacher introduces a new word or grammatical form she must first *model* it in the context of a conversation—either by talking about objects that are present, or by describing pictures or talking about things that the children talk about and are familiar with, such as a field trip experience. To acquire a language pattern, a child must hear it in relationship to his thoughts and in relationship to events meaningful to him.

Furthermore, children learn new language forms best if they want to say something—if they want to convey their thoughts to someone else. Vygotsky[33] suggested that socialization is the catalyst for language acquisition. It is the desire to express one's ideas which forms an impetus for language acquisition. The teacher, therefore, needs to create a situation that will make the child want to talk. She should *elicit* the new language forms within meaningful contexts and within existing and interesting communicative settings and she should provide dialogues which require the use of new language. Within the immediate context of a dialogue the teacher should *expand, refine* or *restructure* a child's response whenever it seems appropriate and does not hinder communication.

The studies on oral language development conducted at KEEP have found the instructional procedures advocated by the natural context method to be effective in developing such verbal skills as are assessed on the WPPSI[34] and on the verbal expression subtest of the ITPA.[29] In contrast, direct grammatical rule instruction and group responding had minimal impact.[35] Patterned drill, automatic repetition of sentences, the songs and nursery rhymes from the Peabody Language Development Kit[32] did not foster the acquisition of functional verbal skills among our KEEP children.

Bridging the Language Difference: The KEEP Comprehension Reading Program

In the earlier section on the relationship of language skills to reading achievement, it was concluded that for a reading program to be of maximum effectiveness with children who speak Hawaiian English, accommodations to their unfamiliarity with certain facets of standard English would be necessary.

As the paper in this issue by Roland Tharp will show during the first years of operation, reading instruction at KEEP stressed decoding; particularly, the ability to sound out words phonetically. There was no emphasis on any form of language development, and the small group reading lessons with the teacher were dedicated solely to the teaching of decoding skills. Evaluation data indicated that this approach was unsuccessful in teaching reading to children speaking Hawaiian English.

Subsequently, the instructional emphasis shifted toward reading for meaning. This comprehension orientation has been successful in raising the average reading scores of children at KEEP to national norms.[36] A number of features have changed between the two forms of reading instruction, and more detailed portrayals of the current comprehension-oriented reading instruction are found in the papers by Tharp, Sloat, Au and Jordan in this issue.

The current KEEP comprehension program has not only accommodated to Hawaiian children's ways of learning[37] but also to their language difference. A plausible reason for the effectiveness of the reading program is that it has been able to bridge successfully the gap between Hawaiian and standard English for these children. Thus, for children just beginning to learn to read, the language experience approach is used in which the teacher bases her reading instruction on the children's own words, sentences, or stories.[38] This means that the teacher accepts formulations by the children, whether they are in standard or Hawaiian English. Only gradually are the children given regular English texts for reading. Furthermore, in the small-group reading lesson there is emphasis on discussion of the text being read and on different levels of comprehension questions. This insures that the children have understood phrases which may have been unintelligible to them.

Two features of the KEEP comprehension program specifically appear to foster the acquisition of standard English. The first is the system of reading objectives (KROS)[39] and, in particular, the nature of their measurement. It will be recalled from the earlier papers that an essential feature of the KEEP comprehension program is the reading objective system which provides instructional goals for the teacher, and monitors the children's progress closely by means of continuous assessment. The assessment procedure for many of the objectives utilizes a cloze procedure similar to that of the Grammatic Closure Test and relies heavily on automatic English production skills and the correct prediction of missing words in a sentence.

Perhaps the most important facet of the reading program for bridging the language difference and for

expanding the children's familiarity and mastery of standard English is the small group reading lesson. A detailed description of these reading lessons is found in Au's paper in this issue and also in a transcript of a whole lesson.[40] Closer scrutiny of these reading lessons shows that they possess many features we have found to be effective in our research on instructional procedures for developing oral language skills described in the earlier section.[41] The teacher is continuously *eliciting* language from the children while *modeling* in a communicative context many different patterns of the English language; she *extends* and *refines* the children's speech in a supportive manner and in meaningful communication. The children are desirous of talking and of putting their ideas into words. Even though language development may be included in the teacher's hidden agenda, the children view the reading lesson as an arena for exchanging ideas and experiences and for talking about the stories they have read; they do *not* see the lesson as instruction in boring language patterns.

There is also some evidence showing that children in the comprehension-oriented reading program developed greater proficiency in English compared to children in the phonics program. Since a close association between the automatic use of standard English grammatic features and reading achievement was noted above, the children in the two reading programs were compared on their performance of the Grammatic Closure task from the ITPA. In the phonics program, third-grade children showed minimal improvement on this task over first-grade students; while in the comprehension program, third graders performed significantly better than first graders. Furthermore, first graders instructed with the comprehension program performed somewhat better, but not significantly better than first graders in the phonics program; by the third grade, however, the comprehension-instructed children were clearly superior to the phonics program children.

To recapitulate briefly, we are postulating that the comprehension-oriented reading program has effectively accommodated to dialect-speaking children who are not very familiar with standard English. The program's emphasis on oral language develops in these children a greater proficiency and fluency in standard English, particularly in the area of grammar and syntax. Such proficiency in turn facilitates reading in English. This is probably not a one-way street, however, for the process of reading surely develops oral English skills. We can expect such mutual support between oral language and reading to be the case, especially in the KEEP reading lesson, where the development of oral language and of reading are so closely meshed. Nevertheless, we must remember that teaching language and teaching reading are separable processes and that there exist reading programs which do not emphasize oral language development and usage. A study is underway to examine more systematically and in greater detail the language development occurring in the KEEP small-group reading lessons.

Conclusion

This overview of the language research conducted at KEEP has shown that lower-income Hawaiian children tend to be more proficient in Hawaiian English, the dialect spoken in many of their homes, than in standard English. Speaking Hawaiian English, as such, does not appear to be implicated in any reading problems. In the standard code they tend, as a group, to perform unevenly, being average on some tasks while having difficulties on others. Familiarity and mastery of standard English is related to reading achievement; children who are further along in their mastery of standard English tend to be the better readers.

The present review thus suggests that attention should be given and accommodations should be made to the language difference issue of low-income children speaking Hawaiian English. The KEEP comprehension reading program has achieved its success, among other reasons, because it appears to have made the required accommodations. It has successfully bridged the gap between the dialect of the child and the standard English reading text in the following manner. When the children begin to learn to read, their own words and sentences are used for instruction rather than English texts; only gradually are regular reading texts introduced. Simultaneously, familiarity and mastery of standard English are developed in a meaningful, natural manner.

It fills one with admiration and delight to hear the older children at KEEP discuss the reading text in complex standard English and the next moment make a quick personal comment to a friend in Hawaiian English.

Footnotes

[1]Bickerton, D. *Change and Variation in Hawaiian English*, Volumes I and II. Final report on National Science Foundation Grant No. GS-39748; Honolulu: Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1976, 1977.

[2]Day, R.R., S.T. Boggs, R.G. Tharp, R. Gallimore and G.E. Speidel. "A Standard English Performance Measure for Young Children: The Standard English Repetition Test (SERT)," in *Working Papers in Linguistics*; Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

[3]Goodman, K.S. "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension," in *Elementary English*, 1965, 42, pp. 853-860.

[4]Labov, W. "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English," in J.C. Baratz and R.W. Shuy, eds., *Teaching Black Children to Read;* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

[5]Stewart, W. "On the Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading," in J.C. Baratz and R.W. Shuy, eds., *Teaching Black Children to Read;* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

[6]Baratz, J.C. and R.W. Shuy, eds. *Teaching Black Children to Read;* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

[7]Day, R.R., S.T. Boggs, R.G. Tharp, G.E. Speidel and R. Gallimore. *The Standard English Repetition Test (SERT): A Measure of Standard English Performance for Hawaiian Creole English-Speaking Children,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 72; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[8]Gallimore, R., R. Day and R.G. Tharp. *A Test of Performance in Hawaiian Creole English Repetition Test,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 28; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[9]Gallimore, R. and R.G. Tharp. *Studies of Standard English and Hawaiian Islands Creole English: KEEP Linguistic Research 1971-1976,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 59; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[10]Gallimore, R. and R.G. Tharp. *The Prediction and Explanation of Academic Achievement,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 54; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[11]Au, K.H., personal communication.

[12]Smith, K.J., H. Truby, R.G. Tharp and R. Gallimore. *The KEEP Phone Discrimination Test,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 64; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[13]Kobayashi, L., personal communication.

[14]Carrow, E. *Test for Auditory Comprehension of Language—English/Spanish;* Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1973.

[15]Speidel, G.E., unpublished data.

[16]Rasp, L.M. *Standard English Comprehension and Production as Related to Reading Achievement in Part-Hawaiian Children,* unpublished doctoral dissertation; Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1978.

[17]Speidel, G.E., R.G. Tharp and L. Kobayashi. "Listening Comprehension in Bidialectal Children: The Influence of Language Code and Syntactic Complexity," paper presented at the annual convention of the Western Psychological Association, Honolulu, 1980.

[18]Choy, S.J. and D.H. Dodd. "Standard-English-Speaking and Nonstandard Hawaiian-English-Speaking Children: Comprehension of Both Dialects and Teacher's Evaluations," in *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1976, 68, pp. 184-193.

[19]Kirk, S.A., J.J. McCarty and W.D. Kirk. *Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities,* revised edition; Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1968.

[20]Speidel, G.E. "The Relationship Between Psycholinguistic Abilities and Reading Achievement in Dialect-Speaking Children," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

[21]Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Revised;* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

[22]Gates, A.I. and W.H. MacGinitie. *Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests;* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

[23]Tatham, S.M. "Reading Comprehension Materials Written with Select Oral Language Patterns: A Study of Grades Two and Four," in *Reading Research Quarterly,* 1970, 5, pp. 402-426.

[24]Clay, M.M. "A Syntactic Analysis of Reading Errors," in *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 1968, 7, pp. 434-438.

[25]Guthrie, J.T. "Reading Comprehensions and Syntactic Responses in Good and Poor Readers," in *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1973, 65, pp. 294-299.

[26]Vogel, S.A. *Syntactic Abilities in Normal and Dyslexic Children;* Baltimore: University Park Press, 1975.

[27]Weaver, P.A. "Syntactic Differences in Good and Poor Readers," paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, 1978.

[28]Wisher, R.A. "The Effects of Syntactic Expectations During Reading," in *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 1976, 68, p. 601.

[29]Speidel, G.E. *Developing Children's Oral Language: A Study of the Effectiveness of Minicourse Instruction With Hawaiian Creole-Speaking Children,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 85; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[30]Speidel, G.E. "Creole and Standard English in Hawaii: A Comparison of Two Approaches to Language Development in Hawaiian Creole-Speaking Children," in Karl Li and John Lum, eds., *Research on Asian and Pacific Bilingual Education,* National Dissemination and Assessment Center, Los Angeles, in press.

[31]Speidel, G.E. and R.G. Tharp. *The Effectiveness of Art and Language Instruction on the Intelligence and Achievement Scores of Disadvantaged Dialect-Speaking Kindergarten Children,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 84; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, 1978.

[32]Dunn, L.M., K.B. Horton and J.O. Smith. *Peabody Language Development Kits, Manual for Level #P,* Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, Inc., 1968.

[33]Vygotsky, L.S. *Thought and Language,* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963.

[34]Wechsler, D. *Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence,* New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1967.

[35]Day, R.R. *The Acquisition of Plurality and Tense and Pidgin-Speaking Children,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 30; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[36]See Klein, T., in this issue.

[37]See Au, K. H., in this issue. See Jordan, C., in this issue.

[38]Baird, L. "Early Reading Instruction for Preliterate Children," paper presented in the symposium on The Education of Minority Children at the annual convention of the Western Psychological Association, Honolulu, 1980.

[39]Crowell, D.C. *The Kamehameha Reading Objective System,* Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools, 1980.

[40]McMillan, G., S.T. Boggs and K.H. Au. *A Discourse-Annotated Transcription of a Model KEEP Second-Grade Reading Lesson,* Kamehameha Early Education Program Technical Report No. 94; Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

[41]Speidel, G.E., manuscript in preparation.

Gisela E. Speidel has been with KEEP since 1972 and was former Coordinator of the program. She is Research Psychologist with KEEP and Affiliate Graduate Faculty, Department of Psychology, University of Hawaii at Manoa. She received her BS and MS from McGill University in Canada, and her PhD in Clinical Psychology from the University of Hawaii at Manoa.