

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The present study, as it has already been stated, is an attempt at examining the ways in which the two non-native writers of fiction in English — Raja Rao from India and Chinua Achebe from Nigeria — have exploited the resources of a foreign language for their creative purpose. The main thrust of this study is to arrive at certain tentative conclusions about Raja Rao's and Achebe's styles on the basis of a description of certain formal features of their English. It was assumed that the two writers' English being non-native varieties, would share certain features in common, and differ in some others. ^{they would also differ in some other features, obviously because they each write in a different way} The present investigation, accordingly, focused mainly on the following issues:

- i) What are some of the characteristic features which the two writers' English share in common ?
- ii) What are the different linguistic features in respect of which the two writers' English differ significantly from each other ?

either say 'Englishes' or 'English' ^{Englishes} _{English}

iii) Since many stylistic features are not always consciously controlled, any particular author is not expected to exhibit identical values of stylistic elements. Moreover, while certain stylistic features of an author remain more or less constant, others are likely to change as his subject-matter, purpose, speaker or his audience changes. Therefore, the present study also focused on the issue: which of the two writers displays, within his own writings, a greater variation and at what levels of analysis?

The present study, being a linguistic analysis of style, was not concerned with the interpretation or the aesthetic evaluation of the literary works or passages examined. Its main concern was with revelation and precise description of linguistic features which, as Halliday (1966) points out, might remain undiscovered by a less exacting and less intricate examination. Thus, a linguistic study of style, in its attempts at being more exacting and intricate, often, includes some linguistic features which usually claim little or no attention from a literary critic. Fowler (1966a), accordingly, holds that a stylistic analysis of a literary text is likely to lay bare the formal structure of the language in more detail than a literary critic would want. At the same time, it will be, of course, an error to assume

that a stylistic analysis of a literary text would necessarily take into consideration all such linguistic features which are of interest to a professional linguist. Cluysennar (1976), therefore, rightly points out that the investigator of a linguistic study of style, for obvious reasons, wants to omit from his description many features properly described by the linguist and mentions others, to which, the linguist, qua linguist, cannot justify giving special (or perhaps any) attention.

3.1. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING INDIAN FICTION IN ENGLISH AND NIGERIAN FICTION IN ENGLISH

The two writers, whose styles were investigated in the present study, are from India and Nigeria respectively — the two countries which shared a common experience in being colonized. Both are "countries with English as a second language (with English in certain official functions)" (Gorlach, 1983; p.235). Put in other words, English, in India and Nigeria (both being multilingual), enjoys almost a similar status and plays important roles in the national affairs. In both the countries English has an initial advantage over the vernaculars; it is not merely a medium for international communication but also a means of achieving cohesion within the nation. In addition, the two countries have already made significant contributions to ^{the} non-native variety of creative writing.

in English. And the two literatures — Indian English literature and Nigerian English literature — may be said to face the same basic questions about their existence (Singh, 1979).

Despite the warning "Don't write in English ... English is not your mother tongue" (Das, 1965), the Indo-Anglians continued voicing their 'joys', 'longings', 'hopes' in English and already have succeeded in producing a considerable body of literature in that language. Similarly, the African writers, too, did not submit to the cautionary remark that Africans writing in English and French would be merely pursuing a dead end which can only lead to sterility, uncreativity, and frustration (Wali, 1963). The answer given by the African writers to the question "Can an African ever learn English well enough to be able to use it effectively in creative writing?" is "certainly yes" (Achebe, 1975; p.21). The significant body of African writing in English in general, and that of Nigerian Writing in English in particular, which, over the years, has attained global recognition, amply substantiate this statement.

Today, therefore, it is no more asked, 'Why do Indians and Africans write in English?' Instead, the interest has shifted from 'Why do they write in English?' to 'How do they write in English?' Such a shift of attention is justified

hands - are usually all over the place
 on the ground that the success of a non-native writer depends, to a great extent, on a masterful use of the borrowed medium. Going to ^{the other} a further extreme, an African critic has categorically stated that language is 'the thing' by which the success of an author is to be judged (Chukwukere, 1969). In their attempts at using English for creative purposes, the non-native writers have to make their characters speak in English in which neither the writers themselves nor their characters normally speak or think. In other words, they have to express in English a mode of feelings and experiences which are peculiar to their medium. Brought up in a culture different from that of their chosen medium, the non-native writers, it is said, find themselves doubly exiled — culturally from the sources and traditions of that language and linguistically from the landscapes and peoples they write about (Griffiths, 1978). Thus the greatest problem they face is certainly the challenging task of remaking the borrowed language a fit medium for conveying their own feelings and sentiments. So, in order to attain success in their attempts, the non-native writers, as Walsh (1973) points out, have to discover and exploit new resources in the adopted language to suit "the necessities of a sensibility remote in time and place from that out of which it grew" (p.XVII).

3.2. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING RAJA RAO AND

CHINUA ACHEBE

The selection of the two writers was dictated by several factors. The most important ones were their representativeness and stylistic innovativeness. Raja Rao, it is often said, is "India's most significant novelist writing in the English language today" (Narasimhalah, 1973; p.1). The Times Literary Supplement also hailed Raja Rao as 'India's greatest novelist' in English. Of all Indo-English writers, Raja Rao is considered to be the most Indian in his sensibility and values. An 'India obsessed expatriate', an 'insider outside' Raja Rao, as he himself has confessed, lives abroad "by force of circumstance, purely accidental and sentimental" (Raja Rao, 1977; p.30). He is deeply rooted in India and has successfully communicated Indian modes of feelings and expressions in English. His work projects the essential India in her wholeness. The fountain-head of his creative impulse is, of course, the rich Indian culture, philosophical and religious heritage (Sharma, 1980).

Chinua Achebe, on the other hand, "is Nigeria's best-known novelist and probably the best-known writer of fiction in English from black Africa" (Killam, 1969; p.1). Like Raja Rao, he too, is a committed writer and is centrally preoccupied in his writings with Nigeria. He believes in the social responsibility of a writer and has tried to uphold the view

that African peoples did not hear of culture for the first time from the Europeans; that their societies were not mindless but frequently had a philosophy of great depth, and value and beauty, and that they had dignity (Achebe, 1964). His works, thus, reflect his interest in the history of the Nigerian people, their culture and religious traditions.

In so far as the questions of language and style are concerned, both Raja Rao and Chinua Achebe are regarded as great experimentalists. Both of them were fully aware of the intrinsic problems ^{encountered with} encountered in the process of creative writing in a non-native language, in their case English. Realizing the difficulty of conveying his own spirit in a language which is not his own, Raja Rao says, "We cannot write like the English. We should not. We cannot write only as Indians. We have grown to look at the large world as part of us. Our method of expression therefore has to be a dialect which will someday prove to be as distinctive and colourful as the Irish or the American" (Raja Rao, 1938; pp.5-6). Referring to the use of English for creative writing by an African writer Achebe also has expressed the view that it is neither necessary nor desirable for him to be able to learn English to use it like a native speaker. Instead, he "should aim to use English in a way that brings out his message best without altering the language to the extent that its value as a medium of international exchange

will be lost" (Achebe, 1966; pp.19-20). It thus appears that both Raja Rao and Achebe, in order to achieve their goal through a proper language, have tried in their own way, to fashion out an English which should be at once universal and able to carry their peculiar experience - an English, the body of which would be correct English usage but whose soul would be Indian and Nigerian, respectively, in colour, thought and imagery.

Both Raja Rao and Achebe, have their own views about style and have made conscious efforts to evolve their own styles in English - a style that could successfully reproduce the authentic rhythm of their people, their life and thought, and, at the same time, serve as an effective means of creative self-expression. According to Raja Rao, "The style of a man - the way he weaves word against word, intricates the existence of sentences with the values of sound, makes a comma here, puts a dash there: all are signs of his inner movement, the speed of his life, his breath (Prāṇa), the nature of his thought, the ardour and age of his soul" (The Serpent and the Rope, p.166). Similarly, a 'careful' artist and 'serious craftsman', Achebe is "in full control of his art" and he "disciplines himself not only to write regularly but to write well" (Lindfors, 1968; p.3). Further, like Raja Rao, Achebe also believes in "the integrity of words" (Achebe, 1975;p.34).

Raja Rao is not a prolific writer. So far he has published four novels and two collections of short stories. His first book, Kanthapura, a novel, appeared in 1938. It was followed by "The Cow of the Barricades and Other Stories, a collection of short stories, in 1947. His third book The Serpent and the Rope, also a novel, was published in 1960. He then published two novels, The Cat and Shakespeare in 1965 and Comrade Kirillov in 1976. In 1978, he brought out his second collection of short stories entitled 'The Policeman and the Rose. It contains ten short stories of which seven appeared in the earlier collection.

Chinua Achebe, too, so far has written four novels. He published his first novel Things Fall Apart in 1958. Since then he has brought out three more novels No Longer At Ease (1960) Arrow of God (1964), and A Man of the People (1966), two collections of short stories — The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories (1962) and Girls at War and Other Stories (1972) which includes the stories of the earlier anthology. He has also published a volume of poems entitled Beware, Soul Brothers (1972) and three children's books — Chika and the River (1966), How the Leopard Got His Claws (1973) and The Drum (1977). His essays, written at different times, on literary and general subjects, have been ^{brought} published together ^{a volume entitled} in Morning Yet on Creation Day (1975). X

The present study was concerned only with the fictional works of Raja Rao and Chinua Achebe - out of the six books of fiction published so far by each of them, five (four novels and one collection of short stories) were selected. The earlier volumes "The Cow of the Barricades and Other Stories" by Raja Rao and The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories by Chinua Achebe, were excluded from the present study. The specific reason for their exclusion was that seven out of nine stories of The Cow of the Barricades and Other Stories have reappeared in Raja Rao's The Policeman and the Rose, and all the stories of Chinua Achebe's The Sacrificial Egg and Other Short Stories are included in his later volume Girls at War. Thus, the texts selected for analysis were Kanthapura (K), The Serpent and the Rope (SR), The Cat and Shakespeare (CS), Comrade Kirillov (CK) and The Policeman and the Rose (PR) by Raja Rao, and Things Fall Apart (TFA), No Longer At Ease (NLAE), Arrow of God (ACG), A Man of the People (AMOP) and Girls at War (GAW) by Achebe.

3.3. SAMPLING PROCEDURES

A stylistic analysis of fiction, especially of a novel, is, often, beset with the problem of a big, unwieldy text containing thousands of sentences. It may, sometimes, be possible to investigate a particular feature of style, such as 'sentence length' or 'inter-sentence cohesion' from a large

corpus. But it is, of course, impracticable to study a number of distinctive features of style from a corpus comprising several texts running to hundreds of pages. Such a huge corpus, often, does not allow sufficient room for detailed examination of different stylistic features and thereby makes a satisfactory analysis of style difficult. In such a situation, the obvious resort, therefore, is to sampling. Adopting a sampling method enables a stylistician to reduce a big corpus into a limited, manageable unit and offers scope for a more comprehensive and enlightening investigation of style.

In stylistic studies different methods of sampling have been employed. For instance, Watt (1960) has tried to give an account of Henry James's style on the basis of ^{the} analysis of the first paragraph of The Ambassadors. Carroll (1960) has studied prose styles on the basis of 150 sample passages of about 300 words each from various sources ranging from British and American novels to scientific papers, including such categories as essays, newspaper features and editorials, biographies, textbooks, speeches, legal documents, sermons and low-grade high-school English compositions. Lane (mentioned in Leaska, 1970) has investigated the style of Dorothy Richardson selecting one chapter from each of her novels. The mean length of each sample comes to 1340 words approximately. Leaska (1970) has worked on samples of 840 words

each. In all, she has investigated the style of nine samples "taken from sections as early in the text as that narrator first appeared" (p.23).

The sampling procedures followed in the studies cited above, are not, however, free from subjective decisions. Since in an empirical research an objective method is often preferred to a subjective one, in the present study a random sampling procedure was followed thinking that it would make the selection 'entirely objective' by providing each and every item of the text (population) equal probability of being selected. Ten percent of the total pages of the five books of each of the two writers were selected using Fisher's Table of Random Numbers. Thus, the size, of the entire sample of Raja Rao, (comprising the samples of five texts), came to 30,301 words and that of Achebe consisting of the samples of his five texts), amounted to 25,733 words. The texts of Raja Rao and Achebe from which the samples were selected were of the following editions:

Raja Rao

Kanthapura, New Delhi; Orient Paperbacks, 1971.

The Serpent and the Rope, New Delhi; Orient Paperbacks, 1968.

The Cat and Shakespeare, New Delhi; Orient Paperbacks, 1971.

Comrade Kirillov, New Delhi; Orient Paperbacks, 1976.

The Policeman and the Rose, New Delhi; Oxford University Press, 1978.

Chinua AchebeThings Fall Apart, New Delhi; Arnold Heinemann, 1975.No Longer at Ease, London; Arnold Heinemann, 1981.Arrow of God, London; Arnold Heinemann, 1980.A Man of the People, London; Arnold Heinemann, 1981.Girls at War, London; Arnold Heinemann, 1980.

Judging from the size of the samples of some of the earlier studies, carried out by Carroll (1960), Watt (1960), Leaska (1970) and Winters (1981) the sizes of the samples used in the present study appear to be fairly justified. Moreover, the samples selected through random procedure might be taken to be fairly representative of the two writers' English. It is, however, to be mentioned here that another way of selecting the samples would be to choose a continuous discourse of certain length from each book. But such a method, it was thought, would involve subjective decisions and the passages chosen would not be truly representative of the texts.

3.4. SELECTION OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES

After the selection of the samples, came the question of their linguistic description. In this context one should keep in mind that language is a complicated and open-ended system. Obviously, therefore, the list of linguistic features that may be counted from a literary text is indefinitely large. Hence, it is not possible and also often not desirable, to list

exhaustively all the features that may be found in a text. Therefore, a stylistician, unlike a linguist, has to be selective. He selects certain significant features which call for more careful investigation and ignores others. Different stylistic studies, accordingly, have taken into consideration several characteristic aspects of language of a text. Watt (1960), for instance, has conducted his study on the examination of five features of style, viz. (1) non-transitive verbs, (2) abstract nouns, (3) the word 'that', (4) elegant variation, and (5) delayed specification of referents. Hayes (1966) has studied styles of Gibbon and Hemingway comparing their prose in terms of nearly seventy different variables (transformations). Milic (1957) has analysed Swift's Style investigating a relatively few dimensions, such as seriation, connectives, verbals, modifiers, introductory connectives, verbs plus auxiliaries, nominal-verbal ratios, adjective-verb quotients, and three-word patterns. While Cope (1969) has based her study on the analysis of as many as seventy-two language variables in the verbal output of groups discussions, Leaska (1970) has looked at only seven features of Virginia Woolf's prose and Sandell (1977) has examined twelve variables. A stylistician, thus, studies only those features of a text which are stylistically significant - which constitute special qualities of the text and ignores those which are stylistically neutral.

The stylistically significant features are usually called "style-markers" (Enkvist, 1964; p.34). But the questions one

may reasonably ask at this stage are 'How can a stylistician distinguish between the style-markers and the style-neutrals? Is there any definite way to identify the linguistic features in terms of which style can be measured? Unfortunately, there is no single way, no infallible technique and commonly ^{accepted} agreed, coherent framework to guide the process of selecting or identifying the style-markers. In most cases, however, the selection of stylistically significant features from the 'linguistic format', that is, from the sum total of minute linguistic choices, is dictated by the requirements of stylistic analysis. In other words, the selection depends, largely on the aims and objectives of the particular stylistic study under investigation. But stylistic studies, hitherto, have been haphazard without a common goal. What Hatzfeld said as early as 1955 that "There is no agreement on the aim of stylistic investigation" and "consequently there can be none on the methods", (p.49) has been re-echoed in a more recent study where it has been stated that "stylistics, understood in the general sense of close study of aspects of linguistic details of a literary text, appears to be an area of theoretical indecision and contradiction and methodological adhocness" (Discourse analysis monographs No.3; Literary Texts, ELR; Birmingham University, 1977, p.1).

It is, therefore, not surprising that the linguistic features which are regarded as style-markers in one study may

not appear so in another with a different aim. In the absence of any rigid order of procedure ^{in selecting} to select the characteristic features, the technique often followed is subjective in nature. Fowler (1966a) approves of such a subjective method when he says that keeping in view the aim of his study, a researcher, with linguistic sophistication "Can select for description certain features which he thinks to be significant" (p.161). Widdowson (1974) also suggests that in the absence of any rigid order of procedure to select the characteristic features, the technique often followed is to pick ~~on~~ features in the text which appeal to first impression as unusual or striking in some way.

Such a subjective method, often known as the 'as-if-model' (Sandell, 1977; p.13) is based on 'the heuristic notion of style-markers' (Leech and Short, 1981; p.69). It relies largely on intuitive speculation or "educated guesswork" (to use Sandell's (1977) term, p.115) and demands a sound knowledge of linguistics on the part of the investigator. Although not exhaustive, this heuristic method, in the absence of a better procedure, enables a researcher to collect data on a fairly systematic basis. This is, perhaps, the point, where subjectivity and objectivity, as Wetherill (1974) remarks, join hands in quantitative stylistics to "fight against slipshod impressionism" (p.165). Thus, in searching for style-markers from the linguistic format a stylistician has

to apply his linguistic training, his own understanding of how a language works, so that he may not miss ~~out~~significant features of style. It, therefore, follows that, there are bound to be procedural and terminological differences between individual studies of style.

The linguistic format contains both linguistic features proper, such as phonology, morphology, syntax and lexis; and para-linguistic affective devices which comprise imagery, symbolism, myth, allusion and allegory (Ngara, 1982). These latter devices, however, are not analysable in terms of normal linguistic description. Hence, they have been excluded from the present study. Among the linguistic features proper, the aspects considered cover sentence length, sentence types, clause length, clause types, structure of nominal group, verb-verbal ratio, type-token-ratio, lexical formation, inter-sentence cohesion and some other characteristic features of style.

3.5. GRAMMATICAL MODEL

Once stylistic areas to be investigated have been identified, the next task before a researcher is to examine the selected features of style. Since all literary texts are accessible to analysis by existing methods of linguistics, a stylistician can analyse his samples by any particular linguistic model. Accordingly, different scholars have drawn upon different theories of linguistic structure. Ohmann (1964 and 1966) and

Thorne (1965) for instance, have analysed styles applying the Transformational Generative Model. Milic (1967) has based his analysis mainly on the grammarian Charles Fries's (1952) structure of English. Miles (1967) and Leaska (1970) have followed the model of traditional grammar and Cluysennar (1976) in her study has used Halliday's 'Scale and Category Grammar'. It needs to be mentioned in this context that although linguistics today claims to be an autonomous discipline, it is not a homogeneous one; it, in fact, embraces a number of theoretical stances and consequently, there are many schools, theories and methodologies. Furthermore, it is not unlikely that some times a researcher may find a particular model, by itself, inadequate for the purpose of his own description. In such cases, he can either formulate a model of his own or set up an eclectic method incorporating whatever elements he considers useful from the existing models of linguistics. Recognizing this fact, Halliday (1962) also has suggested that although the linguistic study of literature is not a new branch or a new kind of linguistics but the application of the existing principles of linguistics to literary work, it may, however, require new alignments or groupings of descriptive categories to recognize special properties of a text.

The grammatical framework followed in the present study is an eclectic one and hence does not wholly conform to any

particular model. Instead, it has combined elements from traditional grammar, Transformational, Generative Grammar, and ~~Seale~~ and Category Grammar. The use of such an eclectic model could be justified by Enkvist's (1971) statement that the best approach to the linguistic description of styles tends to be an eclectic one. The eclectic method was preferred here because it offered a convenient way of adequately describing different aspects of ^{the} language chosen. Since "style is indeed a matter of surface appearance" (Sandell, 1977;p.23), the Transformational Generative Model, which relate 'deep structure' to 'surface structure' proved 'less useful' in isolating "the recurrent combination of lexical choices", and also in relating "these salient characteristics of one text to other texts" (Kintgen, 1974; p.821). However, in the description of constituent sentences functioning as the noun phrases (NPs) of complex sentences, the TG model has been used. Scale and Category Grammar has been found more useful in the analysis of the structure of the nominal groups (NGs). In studying sentence and clause typologies, traditional grammar has been used.

No grammar of any language, is ever said to be complete by itself. Like language, the linguistic model, too, undergoes constant modification. The descriptive framework, followed here, accordingly, can have no claim to 'exhaustiveness'. It is not intended to be a complete grammar of the English

language. But it has been designed primarily as an instrument of stylistic description. It only provides a useful set of reference points in relation to which the linguistic features of the two writers' English have been brought into focus. To be precise, it is just one way of analysing language in a stylistic study.

The investigator, however, hopes that the framework has served the purpose for which it has been constructed since it has allowed an "easy recognition of where in a grammar the stylistic distinctiveness of a text may be said to lie" (Crystal and Davy, 1969, p.40). ✓

3.6. STATISTICAL METHODS

The style of a text (or of a writer), often, is characterized not by the 'choices in isolation' but by those features which occur more frequently and belong to the text as a whole. In other words, style is a probabilistic concept, a preference for one or another mode of expression. It is, in fact, a tendency that can be described by probability distribution. ✓ ?
In his stylistic analysis, a researcher, accordingly, tries to find out the fluctuation of stylistically significant formal features by a process of quantification. In assessing the role of a particular stylistic device, such an approach, that is quantification, instead of mentioning whether the

device occurs once or twice or in every page, gives some indication about its density and thus, as Ullmann (1957) holds, helps to avoid "serious errors of perspective" (p.30). Quantification reveals the stylistic stability behind the variability of concrete manifestations. Therefore, by applying specific statistical procedures, a student of style is able to distinguish between insignificant fluctuations which normally "do not affect the basic character of a style and significant fluctuations which signal differences in styles or stylistic change" (Dolezel, 1969;p.11). Wetherill (1974) also, in a similar way, suggests that statistical finding about authors "point not to a particular fact at any particular moment in a text or to a fixed rigid habit, but rather to a tendency" (p.160-1). Stylistic studies, conducted along this line, have been found useful in determining disputed authorship. Two important instances of such studies are Yule's (1939) "On Sentence-length as a Statistical Characteristic of Style in Prose, with Application to Two cases of Disputed Authorship" and Mosteller and Wallace's (1964) "Inference and Disputed Authorship: The Federalist".

In the present study, the observations made from the linguistic description of Raja Rao's and Chinua Achebe's English were quantified to determine the frequency of different linguistic features which characterize their respective linguistic choices. In 'stylostatistics', i.e., statistical

study of style, the frequency of any particular observation is always counted in terms of a 'population'. A 'population', in stylistic study, is the total number of occurrences of any particular linguistic item within a text under investigation. It, thus, follows that, the one and the same text can serve as the source of population for different linguistic items the researcher intends to investigate. For instance, in studying sentence typology of a text the population is the total number of sentences within the text and in studying clause typology of the same text the population is constituted by the total number of clauses occurring within that text. X

Having worked out the frequencies of different linguistic features the stylistician proceeds to present the results of his analysis. He can present the results mainly in two different ways - in figures and/or with the help of graphs. In order to present the results in figures a researcher, usually, follows the simple percentage system. But in some more serious studies, where, as Crystal & Davy (1969) hold, the researcher is required to furnish more precise information the use of certain more sophisticated statistical methods, such as Chi-square (χ^2) test of statistical significance becomes imperative. Such techniques are found all the more useful in comparing distributions between texts or authors and determining the extent to which they differ from each other. Stylisticians, like Rickert (1929), Ewbank (1931),

Chatman (1967), Crystal (1972) and Fish (1973) have discussed the pros and cons of quantification and the discussions of quantification, applied to the problem of style, have introduced and popularized several terminologies and typologies, such as "the method of statistical analysis" (Ewbank, 1931), "Stylostatistics" (Posner, 1963) and "the statistical approach" (Ullmann, 1964). The application of statistics in stylistic analysis has been found useful in the studies carried out by Yule (1939), Herdan (1960 and 1964), Millic (1967), Williams (1969) and Winters (1981).

Stylistics, from the above discussion, appears to be a statistical undertaking. But one should not forget that the use of statistics in stylistic studies is only "incidental to the mode of operation, which is quantification" (Sandell, 1977; p.22). The use of statistics is merely a matter of data description and reduction; it is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. Accordingly, in the application of quantification in the present study, great care was taken so that the meaning of the data was not lost in the process of their numerical transformation, classification and organisation.

In the present study, the Chi-square (χ^2) test of statistical significance has been used to measure the significance of difference, if any, of the selected stylistic features between Raja Rao's and Chinua Achebe's English. Since the data were

non-parametric, the Chi-square (χ^2) test was found the most relevant technique. In some cases, the differences have been shown with the help of ratios. In showing the difference within the individual writer, that is, the variations among the five books of each writer the simple percentage system has been followed. In measuring sentence length and clause length statistical measures, such as mean, median, mode and standard deviation have been applied. *used*

3.7. CONCLUSION

In many empirical studies, the results of analysis are used to accept or reject a null hypothesis. But in a linguistic research like the present one, the situation is somewhat different. Although it is true to say that the overall linguistic habits of an individual are determined, as stated earlier, by several 'situational variables', it is difficult to establish coherent relationships between such situational variables and linguistic features. The reason behind this is the fact that "linguistic features do not usually correlate in any neat ^{to} ~~one-for-one~~ way with the situational variables in an extra-linguistic context" (Crystal & Davy, 1969; p.62). X
So, it is, often, not possible to say with confidence and precision that the presence of the factor X is responsible for the choice of the linguistic feature Y in a particular literary text. Because of this non-predictable nature of linguistic features, any attempt at correlating them with situational

variables, seem to lie beyond a stylistician's jurisdiction. Hence, in the present study, excepting a few occasional remarks, no such special attempts have been made.

The results of the analysis have been presented through tables as well as with the help of graphs. Graphs have been found useful because they provide visual presentations of the differences between the two writers' choices of linguistic features. In stylistic study the presentation of results is also accompanied by discussions where the stylistician makes comments about the style or styles under investigation. That is to say, when the results are presented the stylistician is in a position to make statements about the overall stylistic features of a writer or of a text. It needs to be mentioned here that linguistic science, even today, is not in a position to "offer an extensive, systematic body of information which goes beyond description to interpretation" (Leaska, 1970; p.129). In a linguistic study of literature, the researcher's chief concern, therefore, is to provide linguistic facts reflecting the style of a writer. Accordingly, after the presentation and discussion of data, the linguist's role is virtually complete, "The tasks which then follow", to quote Crystal and Davy (1969), "critical interpretation and evaluation - are not his concern" (p.22), and hence lie beyond the scope of an objective study like the present one.