ABSTRACT

Designed to interpret and synthesize the existing research and related information about dialects for those people who are involved in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects, the information in this report is based on an analysis and synthesis of over 1,250 articles and reports dealing with dialects and dialect learning. The content is divided into general descriptive materials on dialects; issues in dialect study; materials, methods, and existing programs; teacher preparation; and bibliographies. Among the specific dialects examined are regional, social, and non-standard, including black dialects, Mexican-American and Puerto Rican dialects, and the American Indian, Appalachian, Chinese, and Hawaiian dialects. Two appendices—a glossary and a report of the treatment of features of non-standard usage in language arts textbooks—complete the report. (HOD)
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INTRODUCTION

Much has been learned about dialects and about the problems involved in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects. Yet much of this information never reaches the people actually working with speakers of other dialects. One way to attack this problem is through a series of communications which will provide educationally and linguistically sound materials for those people who are directly involved in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects.

Targeted communications, in effect, are reports aimed at specified audiences, which will interpret and synthesize for these audiences the existing research and related information about dialects. A comprehensive summary of the literature reviewed is contained in this Basic Report for Targeted Communications. The information is based upon an analysis and synthesis of over 1250 articles and reports dealing with dialects and dialect learning. Much of the literature was scattered; much was contained in obscure, out-of-print, and generally unavailable sources. Much of it will need to be further summarized and reshaped for the specific audiences involved.

This Basic Report sets forth the major ideas, points of view, issues, materials and methods, and recommendations which were revealed by the comprehensive review of the literature. The content of the Basic Report is divided into the following sections:

1. General descriptive materials on dialects
2. Issues in dialect study
3. Materials, methods, and existing programs
4. Teacher preparation
5. Bibliographies
This document, then, serves as the base of information from which the targeted communications will draw their substance. Differences among target groups and their needs for information will dictate adaptations and changes of emphasis from this document. It is anticipated that no targeted communications will include all of the information contained in this report.

A glossary of the terms used in this report is found in Appendix A. The terms defined include: dialect, functional variety of usage, grammar, idiolect, language, lexicon, linguistics, morphology, nonstandard English, phonology, prestige dialect, regional dialect, social dialect, syntax, standard English, and usage.
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SECTION ONE

WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT DIALECTS--GENERAL INFORMATION
CHAPTER ONE--GENERAL CONCEPTS ABOUT DIALECTS

EVERYONE SPEAKS A DIALECT. A dialect is simply a variety of language. The dialect a person speaks is influenced by his age, sex, education, occupation, avocation, social class, regional and ethnic background, and by the social situations in which he usually operates. The complex interaction of all these factors produces the individual's unique way of speaking, his idiolect. The language a person chooses to use may also vary depending on the style employed; a cogent description of the functional varieties which currently exist in American English is given in The Five Clocks (21). Fortunately, although no two people speak in exactly the same way, communication is possible through the sharing of more-or-less conventional phonological, lexical, and grammatical systems in the language.

As Roger Abrahams has stated: "Every language, from the social point of view, is made up of a number of varieties, each designating and symbolizing membership in one segment of the speaking community" (1). In Discovering American Dialects, Roger Shuy gives the historical basis for dialects and discusses the three basic ways in which language may show variety: phonology, lexicon, and syntax (34).

The changes which American English dialects have undergone through time are clearly illustrated by the record Our Changing Language which devotes all of Side One to examples of historical dialects (29).
SOME SPOKEN DIALECTS HAVE PREFERRED SOCIAL STATUS AND ARE CALLED
"STANDARD" ENGLISH DIALECTS. One variety of language invariably becomes
the standard in all countries (6). The phonological, lexical, and
grammatical patterns which are accepted and used by the majority of the
educated English speaking people in the United States form a series of
regionally standard American English dialects. As Virginia French Allen
has stated: "Standard English may be defined as what the majority of
educated speakers habitually use" (2).

It must be recognized that "standard" English in any absolute sense
is a myth. As noted, in the United States there exist a number of regionally
standard dialects. Standard English must be viewed as being comprised of a
broad spectrum of usages and pronunciations, subject to change according to
circumstance and over time. Ravin McDavid clearly refutes the mystical
standard devoid of all regional associations (26). He urges us to
remember that a standard dialect is not an ideal of which the non-
standard varieties are degenerate versions. Nor is the standard dialect
necessarily a monolithic entity—in the United States there are many
varieties of standard American English reflecting the divisions of cultural
history (28). In spite of this diversity, there is one area of language varia-
tion which does seem to approach a national standard. The major features of
standard English grammar are, by and large, agreed upon (30). Robert
Politzer feels that the safest and most defensible guideline for establishing
minimum requirements for a standard English is furnished by the grammatical
criterion: a pronunciation must be considered nonstandard if it interferes
with the possibility of using standard grammar (30).
NONSTANDARD DIALECTS ARE NOT INFERIOR TO STANDARD DIALECTS. Non-standard dialects are simply dialects which differ from the standard. It is well-documented that many people do not speak any of the varieties of standard English. Those who do not are said to speak a nonstandard (not a sub-standard) dialect. It is not thought wise or useful to speak of "sub-standard" dialects since the phrase is mildly insulting and implies a deficiency of sorts in nonstandard dialects which modern linguistic studies do not support. Frequently those who speak a nonstandard dialect are the economically disadvantaged and those from minority groups. The historical base for much of our nonstandard dialects has been described by Virginia French Allen (2). A more complete description of the characteristics of nonstandard dialects will be presented later in this section.

Some statements about nonstandard dialects include completely false information. A good example of this can be found in a statement describing dialects as: "Abnormal speech patterns characterized by oral aberrations such as phonemic and subphonemic replacements, segmental phonemes, phonemic distortions, defective syntax, misarticulations, limited and poor vocabulary and faulty phonology. These variables exist commonly in unsystematic multifarious combinations" (18).

ALL DIALECTS--STANDARD AND NONSTANDARD--ARE SYSTEMATIC AND LOGICAL. William Labov has noted that "American education has always considered the nonstandard or sub-standard form of speech used by children to be an imperfect copy of standard English. The defects of this approach have now become a matter of urgent concern in the face of the tremendous educational problems of the urban ghettos" (22). The misconceptions about dialects need to be dispelled: "A divergent dialect represents a system of its own and is not
simply an accumulation of mistakes" (32). Roger Shuy states: "Non-
standard dialect is a systematic, not a deficient form of English.
Teachers need to be disencumbered of notions about non-verbal children
and right-wrong attitudes towards language production" (35).

Linguists and educators including Roger Abrahams, Beryl Bailey,
Joan Baratz, Irwin Feigenbaum, Ralph Fasold, William Labov, Raven McDavid,
Ralph Robinett, Roger Shuy, William Stewart and Walter Wolfram all concur
that every dialect is a highly structured (1), (7), consistent (1), patterned
(3), well-ordered (7), (42), (43), (44), systematic (4), (5), (11), (15), (24),
(26), (42), (43), (44), highly developed (7) language system. It is "a basic
linguistic axiom that language is systematic and ordered" (43), and the basic
assumption can be drawn that "nonstandard dialects differ systematically from
standard English" (11).

Not only are nonstandard dialects systematic, they are also logical (15),
(38), (41); they are valid systemr with their own rules (5). As Labov has
stated: "The traditional view of nonstandard English held by many public
school teachers is that it is an illogical form of speech; that when chil-
dren are taught the standard forms they are also being taught to think
logically" (23). This simply is not true; "all languages are capable of
conceptualization and expressing logical operations" (42).

ALL DIALECTS ARE ADEQUATE FOR COMMUNICATION. Because each dialect is
a "self-contained system inherently neither superior nor deficient" (42),
a second premise of the linguist is that "all language systems are adequate
for communication" (42), (43). As Baratz noted: "No language is structur-
ally better than any other" (7). Just as all natural languages are adequate,
so, each dialect of English is adequate (1), (12), (22), (26), (42), (43).

**ALL DIALECTS MUST BE RESPECTED AND ACCEPTED.** Since each dialect is systematic, logical and adequate for communication, teachers should accept and respect the dialect the child brings to school, as indicated by Kenneth Johnson: "Language programs in inner city schools should be built on the language the child brings to school" (19), (20). In a similar suggestion Dorothy Strickland states: "The school, and particularly the teacher of language arts, must accept the language which the learner brings to school. It is doubtful that these children will accept the language of the school if the school does not accept their language. Teachers must refrain from referring to students' speech as careless or wrong...Language programs must be based on the language the child brings to school" (40). Other noted experts who emphasize acceptance and respect for the dialect of the child include Beryl Bailey (4), Joan Baratz (8), Charlotte Brooks (10), Muriel Crosby (1), Karl Dykema (14), Mary Galvan and Rudolf Troike (16), Mildred Gladney and Lloyd Leaverton (17), Jean Malmstrom (25), William Raspberry (31), James Sledd (36), (37), and William Stewart (38), (39). Most of these individuals stress the overriding importance of attitudes toward language acceptance and respect for language variety.
SUMMARY

Several basic concepts about language have been set forth in this first chapter: (1) Everyone speaks a dialect; (2) some spoken dialects have preferred social status and are called "standard" English dialects; (3) nonstandard dialects are not inferior to standard dialects; (4) all dialects—standard and nonstandard—are systematic and logical; (5) all dialects are adequate for communication; and (6) all dialects must be respected and accepted. These basic concepts should be kept clearly in mind throughout this Basic Report.

REFERENCES—GENERAL CONCEPTS ABOUT DIALECTS AND DIALECT LEARNING.
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* See annotated bibliography following Section One.
CHAPTER TWO--GENERAL AREAS OF DIALECT STUDY

DESCRIPTIVE DIALECT STUDIES

Linguistic Analysis -- Descriptive studies analyze the language used in terms of the specific elements of the language which show variation--phonology, lexicon, and grammar. Most of the research reported in this Basic Report concentrates on the phonological or grammatical aspect of dialect.

Three over-lapping aspects of descriptive dialect studies -- Descriptive dialect studies have been conducted on three aspects of dialect: Regional, cultural, and social. Obviously, these aspects are interrelated. The artificial distinctions drawn among the three aspects of dialect are made for ease of discussion. The interrelation may be seen in the contrastive studies of standard and nonstandard English which have been conducted. As previously noted, most of the studies indicate that the nonstandard dialects are well-ordered, highly structured, highly developed language systems. Descriptions of some of the distinct linguistic features of the specific dialects have been written in an attempt to provide accurate and useful information for educational programs. A cautionary note: The descriptions are not yet complete. Further investigation is needed; and since language is dynamic and constantly changing, it is doubtful if it is strictly possible for the descriptions ever to be "complete."
REGIONAL DIALECT STUDIES

The study of regional dialects has been going on for several decades and is perhaps the language variation about which there is the least controversy. These studies show that often what is nonstandard in one part of the country is standard in another region. The most comprehensive field studies of regional varieties in language are the linguistic atlases which have focused principally on phonology and lexicon (2), (3). The Dictionary of American Regional English, concentrates on lexicon rather than on phonology (11).

Several general descriptions of regional dialects are currently available. Furbee's The Study of Dialects (23), Allen and Underwood's Readings in American Dialectology, Part One (4), and Reed's Dialects of American English (49), offer sound general information about regional dialects. Tapes such as American Speech Dialects (5), or records such as Americans Speaking offer samples of the speech used in different regions of the United States (6).

Materials which describe regional variations have also been developed for use in the classroom. Koger Shuy's Discovering American Dialects is one such material (51). Teachers may wish to begin dialect study by focusing on regional variations since there is not such a highly emotional aura surrounding regional speech variations.

Since regional variation evidenced in the dialect spoken does not carry significant social stigma, further elaboration of regional dialects is not included in this Basic Report. Section Five contains regional dialect bibliographies for those who wish to read more extensively on this
topic. It should be noted that some feel geographic research procedures should be abandoned since geography is of no major importance in the social acceptance of the language spoken (17). In reality, regional and social variation often become so intermingled that it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate the two. Raven McDavid treats the differences between regional and social dialects and then provides some information as to the ways by which a regional dialect becomes a social one. He recommends discarding the term "dialect" altogether in dealing with varieties of American English and proposes that we confine ourselves to a discussion of regional and social variations, accepting a pluralism of standards and styles (44).

SOCIAL DIALECTS

Social dialects are sometimes defined as "the nonstandard dialects of English such as those spoken primarily by Negroes and other minority groups in the United States" (8). While emphasis on the study of social dialects is of more recent origin than the study of regional dialects, the increasing concern for the social aspects of dialects has over-shadowed the earlier emphasis on regional language variation (2). The majority of social dialect studies concentrated on lower socio-economic groups. Understandably these studies have focused on the economically disadvantaged speakers from minority cultures.

Sociolinguistics -- Descriptive sociolinguistics seeks to provide an answer to the question: "Who speaks (or writes) what language (or language variety) to whom, when, and to what end?" (22).

Context is of great importance to the sociolinguist (51). As Abrahams
has noted, "What is needed is a framework in which the larger patterns of communication may be analyzed, a framework which will not only bear on linguistic differences but also on the differences in the entire system of speaking behavior" (1). He cites as an illustration: "Black English is not just a linguistic system; it is the expressive system of Black culture" (1). Erickson also stresses the importance of context. He suggests that the shared context phenomena, together with social class, is a major determinant of the language style used, and must be taken into account when examining social class dialects to avoid insidious comparisons (19).

Of great importance to the study of social dialects is the linguistic variable (described by Labov), which is a structural unit whereby isolated phonological variables are associated with social, stylistic, ethnic, and individual factors. Quantitative indexes can be constructed for the linguistic variable (30). As Wolfram explains: "The linguistic variable may be viewed as a function of its correlation with extra-linguistic variables (socio-economic class, sex, age, contextual style, and racial isolation) or independent linguistic variables (linear environment and syntactic construction)" (61). His highly technical article "Sociolinguistic Factors in Speech Identification" describes in detail the variables of status, sex, age, racial isolation, and style as they relate to language variety (63). Wolfram stresses that an adequate understanding of sociolinguistic variation must include a description of the effects of the independent linguistic constraints on variability (59). He found a pattern of sex differentiation with females using more standard forms than males; a pattern of age differentiation with adults tending to use socially stigmatized variants less...
than pre-adolescents and teen-agers. He also found that grammatical
differences more discretely differentiate social class than phonolo-
gical differences (59). He states: "Grammatical features are consid-
erably more stigmatized than phonological ones, at least in American
society" (62). This was also found to be true in a survey conducted
by the Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory in 1970. Baratz
and Wolfram identified several of the sociolinguistic factors used
in speech identification (55). One of the significant findings of
their investigation has been that: "Social class is the single most
important factor accounting for speech differences" (59).

The linguistic variable employed in social dialect studies is one
indication of the objectivity employed in studying social dialects.
The sociolinguist employs a relativistic viewpoint which emphasizes
the fully systematic, but different nature of nonstandard dialects (65).

McDavid discusses five variables which influence language: Maturity,
responsibility, vogue, associations, and attitudes. There is also a
difference in language based upon the medium of communication used. The
speaker has some choice over these five variables. There are three other
variables, however, over which the speaker has no choice: Historical,
territorial, and social class (44).

Social Dialect Studies--Several social dialect studies have been con-
ducted. One of the most comprehensive and significant of these studies
is William Labov's, The Social Stratification of English in New York City
(32). In this study Labov systematically accounts for linguistic variation.
This study is a landmark for those wishing to investigate social dialects in
that it clearly describes the approach, the isolation of contextual styles, interviewing techniques, and subjective evaluation of the variables. By studying linguistic behavior in its social context, Labov has shown that the apparently inconsistent structure of New York City English is explicable in terms of certain social and stylistic norms (32).

Other investigations which have been conducted in urban social settings include Pederson's study of speech in Chicago (47), Shuy's study of speech in Detroit (50), (54), Dillard and Stewart's study of speech in Washington, D.C. and Dunlap's study in Atlanta (44), Cohen's study in New York City (13), Anderson's study in Baltimore (22), and Wolfram's study in Detroit (59), (62).

Findings of the investigations--The findings of these investigations indicate that social variations in language do exist and that certain features can be identified. Progress is being made in identifying socially significant nonstandard features which can form the basis for designing teaching materials (53). Labov, for example, discusses the regular structure of social and stylistic stratification and Shuy has found that the major linguistic differences across social class are not a matter of the presence versus the absence of a feature as much as the relative frequencies of their distribution (52). Walter Wolfram has described four phonological and four grammatical variables (59). He reiterates that grammatical features are more important than phonological features (59). Standard English as a Second Dialect gives a compilation of data dealing with the phonology and morphology of nonstandard dialects (57). Robert Pooley has listed twenty-five nonstandard
features which should be avoided in speech (48), and Roger Shuy, likewise, presents a description of some of the more crucial non-standard features (52).

A sample of some earlier attempts at describing critical non-standard features provides some insight into what most linguists have found to be common features in "nonstandard" English.

1. The pamphlet Nonstandard Dialect, published by the Board of Education of New York City and the National Council of Teachers of English, includes a list of features used by many nonstandard speakers. The content of instruction outlines the important features as: Verb usage, noun forms, pronouns, adjectives and adverbs, sentence patterns and double negatives, articulation and pronunciation problems (45).

2. Garvey and McFarlane found that some similar features were present for almost all nonstandard speakers: Past tense verb, plural verb, possessive noun, copula, reflective pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, third person singular verb, embedded questions with "if" possessive pronoun, clause introducer, negated auxiliary verb, embedded questions with "whether" negative concord (25).

3. Walter Loban, in Problems in Oral English (for grades K-9), establishes some of the most crucial and frequent oral language difficulties. His categories include:

A. Verb:

- Lack of agreement of subject and verb, third person singular.
- Lack of agreement of subject and verb for all forms except the third person singular.
- Lack of agreement of subject and verb while using forms of the verb to be.
- Omission of the verb to be.
- Omission of auxiliary verbs.
- Nonstandard use of verb forms.
- Inconsistency in the use of tense.
B. Pronoun: Nonstandard use of pronouns. Use of that instead of who as a relative pronoun referring to persons. Confusing use of pronouns.


4. McDavid's "Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" includes the following features which: "Are diagnostic everywhere, though not all of them occur in every situation where differences in social dialects are important:"

Pronunciation
1. No distinction between /θ/ and /t/, /ʃ/, /s/.
2. Failure to make the similar distinction between /ð/, and /d/, /v/, /z/.
3. Failure to make the distinction between the vowels of bird and Boyd, curl and coil.
4. A statistically disproportionate front-shifting of the primary stress.
5. Omission of a weak stressed syllable preceding the primary stress.
6. Heavy stress on what is a weak stressed final syllable.

Inflection-Noun
7. Lack of the noun plural.
8. Lack of the noun genitive.

Pronoun
9. Analogizing of the /-n/ of mine to other absolute genitives.
10. Analogizing of the compound reflexives.

Demonstratives
11. Substitution of them for those.

Adjectives

Verbs
15. Unorthodox person-number concord of the present of to be.
16. Unorthodox person-number concord of the past of be.
17. Failure to maintain person-number concord of the present indicative of other verbs.
18. Omission of the /iŋ/ of the present participle.
20. Omission of /-t/,/-d/,/-ed/, of the past participle.
21. Omission of the verb to be in statements before a predicate nominative.
22. Omission of to be in statements before adjectives.
23. Omission of to be in statements before present participles.
24. Omission of to be in statements before past participle.
25. Omission of the /-s/,-z/,/-ez/, reflex of has before been in statements.
26. Substitution of been, done, or done been for have, especially with a third person singular subject (40).

In the majority of the studies investigated, it was reported that verb usage was the most frequent grammatical variation from standard English.

In spite of the emphasis on the importance of grammatical variation, a few studies suggest that the greatest cause of communication difficulty is in the lexicon, or in the semantics of sentences. Kaplan, for example, says that phonologic and syntactic variations are not significant in number, are not racially identified, and are not major impediments to communication. He suggests they are merely surface manifestations of deeper separations at the cognitive level. He concludes: "It may be that the significant differences between 'standard' and 'nonstandard' dialect lie in the area of cognition rather than in the areas of phonology or syntax" (28).

Other lists of features for specific cultural groups will be discussed later in this chapter.
Judgments based on language—The research shows that social dialect differences do exist, and that people do make social judgments based on language used (9). In a study done by Bouchard it was predicted and confirmed that certain spoken dialects would elicit stereotypes. Middle-class white speakers were judged significantly higher than the lower-class Negro speakers by judges ages ten and eleven. The conclusion drawn was that children of these ages were indeed aware of the social significance of language differences (9).

It appears to be true that "language is one of the most reliable of class indicators" (14). Cohen, for example, found a strong difference between the relative prestige of various speech forms as judged by White and Negro listeners (13). Dillard stated that all (100%) of dialect variation could be accounted for in terms of social factors (17). Labov, too, has found that linguistic behavior is closely correlated with productive indicators of Socio Economic Status (SES) (27). He states that language is the most accurate single criterion of social class (32). Shuy also deals with the issue of social markedness. He found that the lower the socio-economic status, the more accurate the identification. He indicated that the most outstanding fact in differentiation of social dialects in Detroit was the presence of "stigmatized" grammatical and phonological features in the speech of the lower SES groups whereas the speech of the middle SES group was socially unmarked (52). In attempting to describe social dialect differences some individuals use the term "acrolect" to indicate the high prestige dialect and "basilect" to indicate the low prestige dialect (38).
exist, and in spite of the fact that people do make judgments about other people based on the language they use, there are certain cautions one should consider. Language is a form of social behavior. Teachers who attempt to change a student's language patterns should not lose sight of the social and psychological implications of the task (35). The relative importance of a standard English is still considered to be an open issue by many individuals, as will be discussed in Section Two of this Basic Report. Some state that the "barrier postulate," i.e. the barriers imposed by the language used by nonstandard speakers, is not justified. They argue that content is more important than dialect and that dialect modification should give way to communication training, for it is within the framework of the entire communication act that the real differences lie (34). Some say that standard English should be a socially neutral code of linguistic behavior. We can no longer claim to be the melting pot but must change to a culturally and linguistically pluralistic society (27). The problem of attitudes toward intricate and unique language systems is one of the largest problems faced in the study of nonstandard dialects (65).

**Recommended references on sociolinguistics**—Since an understanding of the linguistic and sociolinguistic premises about the nature of nonstandard dialects will serve as a good basis for teaching, it is expedient at this point to cite some of the more useful general reference works in this area. The first section of Davis' Language Resource Information includes general linguistic background needed by the teacher. The second section deals with social dialects and includes information about phonetics, phonemics and suprasegmentals, progressing from the most simple
to the more complex. Study of the most troublesome areas of grammar precedes a list of phonological, morphological features found to be nearly universally associated with lower-class or nonstandard English (15). Labov's *The Study of Nonstandard English* dispels many false notions about nonstandard and social dialects and includes basic linguistic information teachers should have (33). Allen and Underwood's *Readings in American Dialectology*, Part Two, (4) contains information on social dialects as do the two texts by Fishman, *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (21), a comprehensive text, and *Sociolinguistics* which covers academic and descriptive sociolinguistics (22). Hymes *The Ethnography of Speaking* is a programmatic discussion of sociolinguistics (26). McDavid's *American Social Dialects* includes a summary of the history of dialects (39). "Dialect Differences and Social Differences in an Urban Society" (42) approaches the harmful attitudes many people hold about dialects, and "Sense and Nonsense about American Dialects" (4) dispells many false notions about dialect. Wolfram's "Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective: Assumptions, Current Research, and Future Directions" (60), and his "Sociolinguistic Perspectives on the Speech of the Disadvantaged" (64) provide good general background in sociolinguistics.
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CULTURAL DIALECTS

The study of variations particular to the speech of given ethnic groups is also a more recent phenomenon than regional dialect study. Donald Lloyd, in an analytic study, found that the language of the central city contained many different terms for the same thing and that the differences were sub-cultural in origin (45). Cazden has provided an extensive review of the literature on the subcultural differences in child language (9).

The studies have focused on various cultural groups including Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Indian, and Appalachian. The results of the most significant studies will be presented in this chapter. The reader should remember that regional and social influences are always an integral part of the specific dialect under discussion.

Black Dialects--The great bulk of the cultural dialect investigation has been focused on the speech of the Negro, particularly the linguistic features of Negro nonstandard dialects. Roger Shuy has pointed out that some of the studies have done more harm than good:

The various disciplines that have been studying Negro speech in this country have said enough damaging things already to produce an uncrossable gulf. Early childhood educators have told him that he is non-verbal, that he has defective hearing and that his language signals cognitive deficits. Speech people have told him that he is deficient and suffering from a kind of pathological weakness. English teachers have dismissed him as inarticulate and ignorant of the most fundamental aspects of grammar and pronunciation. Reading teachers have considered him illiterate. Psychologists have observed that he deviates from the prescribed norm. Linguists have described his speech in order to observe sound change, historical origins and underlying grammatical forms. Where do we begin to repair the damage? (70).

A partial response to this question is being made by investigators such as
Joan Baratz who has sought to dispel what she calls some of the current "myths" about Negro speech (4). She stresses that although the dialect of the Negro is distinct and different from standard English, it is neither defective nor inferior. This view is commonly held by most linguists—Black dialect is different, not defective. Further discussion of this issue will be presented in Section Two of the Basic Report.

Baratz attacks the statements made by psychologists and educators that the ghetto Black child is cognitively underdeveloped, that his language is inferior, that his environment is impoverished in language experiences, and that he is lacking in discriminative ability possibly attributable to the noise level in his home. She states emphatically that these ghetto children are not verbally destitute; nor are they nonverbal.

Other "myths" that Baratz discounts are the genetic inferiority doctrine, the social pathology theory which describes the Negro as a "sick white man," the linguistic incompetence theory that Negro speakers are verbally destitute, and the theory that the speech of the Negro is a deterrent to cognitive growth (4). All of these "myths" have been found in print and many have had an effect on teaching practices in the past.

There is often a great deal of interference from current sociopolitical views that deters objectivity in the study of Black dialects (81). Garvey and McFarlane found that both race and social class were important determinants of performance on sentence repetition tasks (significant at the .01 level); and their data supported the conclusion that "variation observed in
the standard English proficiency of lower economic class Black children is primarily a function of interference from their normal language patterns rather than a function of differences in academic ability" (26). Likewise, Baratz and Povich studied the language development of a group of Black Head Start children and found that: "The Negro Head Start child is not delayed in language acquisition—the majority of his utterances are on the kernel and transformational levels..." (73). This does not imply lack of a language but the mastery of a somewhat different language.

Entwisle found that inner-city children were more advanced in language development when they entered school than were their white suburban counterparts (18), (19). She also found that there were far-reaching differences in the systematic structures between Negro and White inner-city children (19). In a comparative study between Negro and Puerto Rican nonstandard speakers, Negroes scored higher on the language facility test, on the syntactic structure test, and on the fluency test (52).

McDavid refutes the idea that the speech of the American Negro is somehow related to his physical characteristics by presenting historical evidence for the development of the dialect (55). Dillard (16) and Taylor (83) also present general historical background of Black dialect. Stewart, who has written several articles on the historical background of Black dialect (75), (76), (77), (78), (79), & (80), feels that ideally, educators at all levels would learn about the historical background of Black dialect and its overall structural relationship to standard English in order to familiarize themselves with some of the more important points of structural conflict (76).
Several general recommendations have been made for teachers of students who speak a Black dialect. LaBrant, for example, discusses the talents and capabilities Negro students bring to school and the need for capitalizing on these elements. Many are very verbal, very able to dramatize, very able to convey subtle shades of meaning in their words, etc. (42). Light stresses that the nature of context in which speech takes place, i.e., topic, race, and age of the participants, cannot be overlooked as influences upon speech (43).

Children's productive as well as receptive control of standard English should not be underestimated (43). Wolfram hits upon this same theme when he says it is necessary to identify relevant linguistic environments which may affect the variation of the items (88).

Social class is the most important correlate with speech differences. Sex and age are also important considerations. In order to account for systematic variation within variables, a consideration of extralinguistic and independent linguistic constraints is imperative. Only a consideration of these two factors will fully reveal the systematic nature of variation and the constraints on the relative social significance of certain variants (87).

Stewart feels that "an absolute necessary prerequisite to teaching English is analysis and description of nonstandard dialects" (82). Fortunately, we now have the start of such descriptions from which to work.

General descriptions have been made by Bailey (4), Ecroyd (17), Erickson (20), Fasold (21), Fasold and Wolfram (24), Johnson (33), Labov (41), Loban (46), McKay (56), Schneider (69), Stewart (76), (82), & (88), Wolfram (90), and Wood (91). In a unique study which differentiated between dialect differences and articulation defects, Monsees screened
students and was able to make such differentiations and to confirm
linguistic findings regarding some of the morphological and syntactical
characters of Negro nonstandard English (57).

Other studies have concentrated only on grammatical features. For example:
Fasold covered major grammatical nonstandard features in relatively non-
technical terms (22). Henrie presented some important general findings about
verbs. He found that Negro nonstandard speaking subjects controlled all the
standard English verb phrases given as input in all transformations. Although
approximately one-third of their output was nonstandard, there were no stand-
ard forms they could not use. The following nonstandard forms were shown
to differ in semantic distribution from their standard English equivalents:
(1) Unconjugated be - present/habitual/active; (2) deleted be - present/
active; (3) uninflected third person present tense verbs - active, and
(4) uninflected past tense verbs - active (27). Fasold also discussed be
in a very technical article (23). Labov, too, gave a technical discussion
of the copula (36). Light discussed the syntactic structures used in Negro
nonstandard dialect (44). Loflin presented a technical discussion on whether
the grammatical differences are at the deep or the surface structure level
(47), a controversy to be discussed in Section Two. He also discussed the
general verb structure of Black dialect (49). Politzer presented a clear
discussion of the syntax of Negro nonstandard English (65). Smith discussed
the phenomenon of cross-code ambiguity as one explanation for the persistance
and interrelatedness of certain nonstandard grammatical structures in Negro
dialects (74).

Other studies have focused on the lexicon used in Negro nonstandard.
Kochman has written two such articles dealing with lexical differences (34), (35).
Several studies have focused on both grammar and phonology, including Politzer (66), and Ken Johnson, who prepared five tapes giving a succinct, clear summary of the phonology and grammar of Negro nonstandard English (33). Labov and Cohen presented information on the phonology and grammar of nonstandard and Negro dialects in a form useful to the English teacher. The most important problem areas were outlined and presented in terms of the general rules differentiating standard and nonstandard forms. Some grammatical points discussed are (1) verb tenses, (2) forms of the noun, (3) negation patterns, (4) pronouns, (5) embedded questions, and (6) count and mass nouns. Articulation and pronunciation patterns in nonstandard speech were also considered (41).

Other studies have focused exclusively on phonology. Markel examined the pronunciation characteristics of students and found there were significant pronunciation differences between the White and the Negro children (52). Houston also indicated that the chief differences were phonological (30). Smith, however, did a contrastive analysis of Negro speech using very thorough phonological analysis and concluded that most of the phonological differences between Negro and White dialects were relatively shallow in their structure (72). Wolfram discussed the underlying phonological representations in Black English and arrived at the same conclusion (89).

Loman went into detail on the intonation patterns used in Black dialect (51). An interesting observation was made by McDavid in speaking of the communication barrier which seems to exist. He felt that the suprasegmentals and paralanguage were more effective indicators of ethnic background than vocabulary, grammar or pronunciation (54), an observation also made by other linguists and educators.
General observations have been derived from these studies. Joan Baratz, for example, sums up the differences between standard English and Negro nonstandard when she states: "Differences between standard English and Negro nonstandard occur in varying degrees in regard to the sound system, grammar, and vocabulary. Although Negro nonstandard has many similar phonemes to those of standard English...The syntax of low income Negro children also differs from standard English in many ways" (5). She then lists eight of the rules employed by the nonstandard speaker to produce language which is grammatical for other speakers in his environment:

1. Non-obligatory morphemes for the plural
2. Different use of possessive marker
3. Third person singular has no obligatory morphological ending
4. Verb agreement differs
5. Use of the copula is not obligatory
6. Rules for negation are different
7. Use of ain't in expression of the past
8. Use of be to express habitual action (5)

Juanita Williamson studied the speech of Negro high school students in Memphis and found that the verb structure is the most noticeable feature in the nonstandard dialect used by many of the students. She observed that the students:

1. Often left the -s off the third person singular verb, but put it on the form used with the first and second person, singular and plural
2. The past participle form was used as a past tense form
3. Done was used as the auxiliary with the past participle
4. Have frequently replaced has
5. Often -ed was added to a strong verb to form the past tense
6. Be was used as a finite verb
7. The verb to be was omitted in some sentences
8. Often the plural -s form was added to forms which were already plural
9. The most noticeable feature in their pronunciation was the loss of the final consonant in consonant clusters
10. The loss of preconsonantal clusters
11. Medial /r/ was also sometimes lost
12. Other pronunciations which occurred frequently: /stbom/ /k p/ /ks/ (86)
Samples of Black dialects are also available. Baratz presents language samples from the Washington region (6). Chandler and Erickson's *The Sounds of Society* has fifty-one pages of Negro nonstandard dialect samples (10). Loman's *Conversations in Negro American Dialects* is an entire book of speech samples (50). Morris gives a transcription of a fourteen year old Negro girl's speech (58). Stewart includes numerous examples of Negro dialect in one of his articles (80). Wolfram gives a Black English translation of John 3:1-21 with grammatical annotations (90). Channon gives numerous examples of Negro dialect, and discusses the four main aspects of the problem of dialects as being phonological, lexical, syntactical, and attitudinal. He suggests that the attitudinal variable is the most difficult to deal with (11).

Other studies have focused on the Negro nonstandard speech of specific regions: Anderson in Baltimore (1), Baratz in Washington, D.C. (6), Bills in Waco, Texas (7), Carroll and Feigenbaum in Washington, D.C. (8), Cohen in New York (12), Dillard in New York (14), (15), Garland in Texas (25), Houston in Florida (28), (29), (30), (31), Labov in New York (37), (38), (40), Loflin in Washington, D.C. (47), Osser in Baltimore (59), Pederson in Minneapolis (61), and in Chicago (62), (63), (64), Robins in New York City (67), Walker in Louisiana (85), and Wolfram in Detroit (87).

**Recommended Sources**—For those wishing further information about Black dialects, there are several major references. Baratz's "The Language and Cognitive Assessment of Negro Children--Assumptions and Needs" (4), the record *Dialect of the Black American* by Western Electric, Johnson's five tapes Nonstandard Negro Dialect--Effects on Learning (33), Loman's *Conversations in a Negro American Dialect* (50), and Vasold's "Distinctive linguistic
Characteristics of Black English" (21) provide general information. 
Fasold and Wolfram's "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialects," written 
for teachers in relatively nontechnical language, outlines and describes 
the major nonstandard features and provides examples (24). Labov and 
Cohen's "Some Suggestions for Teaching Standard English to Speakers of 
Nonstandard" presents concrete suggestions for preparing materials to 
teach contrastive patterns (39). Other materials which would be helpful 
in the classroom will be discussed in Section Three.
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Dialects of the Mexican-American--Other cultural groups are often confronted with a situation which is closer to, or may indeed be, the learning of a second language. Such is frequently the case with the Mexican-American speaker. Numerous aspects of bilingualism are pertinent to this population, as will be discussed in Chapter Five. Reports dealing specifically with Mexican-American speakers and bilingualism have been made by Cornejo (7), Lance (17), Modiano (20), Rosen (31), Rubel (32), and Taylor (42). These reports all stress the necessity of using some Spanish in teaching the Mexican-American student. Taylor clearly found that some instruction in Spanish is beneficial to English language proficiency (41). According to Rubel, prohibiting the use of Spanish in school degraded the Mexican-American's traditional way of life. The retention of Spanish identified them as a separate cultural group, while the use of English lessened their identification with Mexico and their Mexican cultural heritage (32). Andersson stressed the fact that Tex-Mex is fine in certain contexts (1), a verification that all dialects must be accepted and respected.

Frequently, however, acceptance and respect have not been granted. Ortego provides some shocking educational statistics on Mexican-Americans: the drop-out rate is more than twice the rate of the national average and almost half of the Mexican-Americans in Texas are functionally illiterate (22). Stemmler notes that of the approximately 100,000 non-English speaking first graders entering school each year, between 40-60% will have dropped out of school by the end of the elementary grades (39). A staff report, "A Study of Equality of Educational Opportunity for Mexican-Americans in Nine School Districts of the San Antonio Area," indicates that inadequate understanding of the language and culture of Mexican-American children on the part of many
educators has resulted in drastic shortcomings in their education and in disruption of their lives. Specifically, the report reveals that Mexican-American children are sometimes assigned to classes for the mentally retarded merely because their language happens to be different. In view of such findings, Silvaroli's comment that their language puts them at a distinct disadvantage seems to be an understatement. Because their home language is different from English, these Mexican-American students also appear to have auditory discriminatory problems; they simply do not hear some of the distinctions made in standard English because these distinctions do not exist in their own language.

Progress is being made in identifying the features which seem to cause the most interference between Spanish and English, Bills, Burke, Cornejo, Davis, Garland, Hernandez, Ott, Pena, Politzer, Rivero, Saville, Seidman, Stockwell, and Troike. The fourth chapter of Saville's *Handbook of Bilingual Education* gives a brief description of English phonology and grammar as they contrast with Spanish and illustrates some of the common teaching problems. Garland notes that there is a wide range of variation and that many nonsystematic features seem to occur. He also cites examples of several features.

Recommended Reading—Those interested in the dialect problems of Mexican-American students will find further information in the Michigan State Bulletin *The Disadvantaged Child and the Language Arts* which discusses the culturally disadvantaged child, identifies his language difficulties, and lists minimum tasks and realistic objectives for him. Stockwell's *The Sounds of English and Spanish*, a phonological contrastive structure.
study undertaken by the Center for Applied Linguistics, contains valuable information for teachers of English to Spanish-speaking students (40). Also valuable is his Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish (41). Troike's Linguistics and the Bilingual Child contains general concepts about language as well as a section on contrastive phonology including examples and explanations taken from a contrast of English and Spanish (43).

Dialects of Puerto Rican Americans--Less attention has been paid to the language problems of the Puerto Rican. Of the studies reviewed for this report, half did not focus solely on the Puerto Rican but studied Negro and Puerto Rican speech simultaneously (5), (6), (14), (15), (16), (18), and (28). These same studies focused on the speech of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York City only. Mattleman did a comparative study of Negro and Puerto Rican speech and found that Negroes scored higher on the language facility test and on the syntactic structure test (18). It should be remembered, however, that the Negro is only faced with the problem of learning a second dialect whereas the Puerto Rican is usually faced with the problem of learning a second language.

Fishman has done an extensive study of Puerto Rican's attitudes and beliefs about Spanish (10). Fisher, in Bilingualism in Puerto Rico: A History of Frustration, gives an historical account of the development of bilingualism and concludes that the people of Puerto Rico would have to achieve a higher degree of bilingualism before congress could allow them statehood. In Puerto Rico, Spanish is the medium of instruction in all grades, and 75% of entering freshmen at one university in Puerto Rico cannot conduct a simple conversation in English. Fisher further points out that the situation is equally bad on our Eastern seaboard (9).
The literature review did not reveal any extensive descriptive studies of interference in the speech of Puerto Ricans. However, Nash examined three aspects of phonological interference: segmentation patterns, accentual patterns, and pitch patterns (21), and Simpson presented a transcription of a thirteen year old Puerto Rican speaking English (36) which provides one example of the types of speech difficulties encountered.
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Dialects of the American Indian--The language problems of the American Indians have not been studied very extensively, and seldom has the bi-lingual approach been taken, although, as with the Mexican-American and the Puerto Rican speaker, the Indian is often faced with the task of learning a second language. Hopkins gives a historical background on teaching English to Indians. Until 1928 there was a policy against using tribal language. From 1932-1952 there was the development of a set of curriculum guides called Minimum Essential Goals for Indian Children. According to Hopkins, Wayne Holms (1964), Dr. Elizabeth Willink (1965) and Ruth Werner (1966) have done much to foster modern English as a Second Language pedagogy with Indians (8). Modiano has concluded that children should be taught to read from materials in their own dialect first and then be transferred into materials written in traditional orthography (12). Povey stresses that we should use Indian culture and language as a starting point and that we should recognize the difference between learning a foreign language and a second dialect (15). Brier has developed a series of tests of proficiency in English as a second language to be used with Choctaw, Eskimo, Hopi, Navajo, and Sioux (1). Saville has outlined a program using Navajo as the primary medium of instruction with English taught as a second language (17).

An emphasis on the Indian culture is stressed. Crawford, for example, places major emphasis on understanding their culture and their learning problems. He provides an annotated list of selected teaching materials for use with Chippewa Indians (4). Young also stresses the need for cross-cultural training for teachers (25). Scoon discusses ethnic attitudes as well as instrumental and integrative motivation. His study showed that Indian students indicated a desire to learn the English language but showed
little evidence of being attracted to other aspects of Anglo culture (19).
Slager also dealt with the problem of motivation. As one approach to the problem, he has written a newsletter with several stories, legends, and omens taken from Shoshoni, Nahuatl, Cherokee, Navajo, and Yorok with English translations (21).

Many of the problems faced by the Indians in learning English have been discussed. Hopkins, for example, points out the numerous problems which exist and mentions some programs which have attempted to deal with them (7). Ohannessian's "A Study of the Problems of Teaching English to American Indians: Report and Recommendations" provides further insight into the problems facing the Indian nonstandard speaker (13). Ivey discusses the influence of Indian language on reading and speech. He presents evidence showing that where deficiencies exist in vocabulary and reading, defective speech is the major contributing factor. Such defects were found in both reading and vocabulary, but they did not differ significantly one from the other (9). Mickelson, likewise, presents data which suggests that language deficiencies tend to remain in the verbal repertoire of the child. His data also supports the hypothesis that this phenomenon can be corrected (11). In spite of the linguistically unsophisticated terms "defective" and "deficient" used in the latter two studies, the results remain the same...the language used by the Indians in these studies did differ enough from standard English to cause significant difficulties.

Mickelson's contention that these children can be helped is supported by McKenzie, who has established that Indian children will benefit from pre-school language instruction and from any aural-oral linguistic programs,
which when presented in a sequential fashion from kindergarten to grade six, can lead to competence in English (10).

Some studies have isolated particular linguistic features which may pose a problem for the Indian learning to speak a standard dialect. Burke presents a phonetic analysis of likenesses and differences between English and the language of the group (2). Saville also outlines some distinctive sounds of English which need to be mastered, lists vocabulary which would be sufficient for classroom procedures and beginning reading texts, and presents content and ordering of language lessons based on contrastive analysis of Navajo and English which allows prediction and description of the problems the speaker of one will have in learning the other (17). Saville's Handbook of Bilingual Education, Chapter 4, gives a brief description of English phonology and grammar as they contrast with Navajo and illustrates some common teaching problems (18). Likewise, Young discusses phonological, grammatical, and structural features which constitute areas of wide divergence between the two languages. A framework is presented for the development of materials, instructional techniques, and teacher training to specifically meet the needs of the Navajo student in English (25).

Appalachian Dialects--Although classifiable as a regional dialect, the cultural aspects of the people living in Appalachia warrant its inclusion in this section of the Basic Report. Skinner has found that the Appalachians have a very sophisticated language of their own, acquired almost exclusively from oral tradition, making reading materials used in the schools irrelevant. He stresses the need to accept and understand their culture and language (20). Stewart, likewise, comments that the Appalachians have a logical dia-
lect that we need to understand and accept, and illustrates several fea-
tures of nonstandard Appalachian speech (22). Furbe provides a transcript
of the speech of a ten-year-old Appalachian boy as an example of this
dialect (6). A. Hussain Qazilbash conducted nine interviews from each of
the thirteen states in the Appalachian region. Analysis of the 117 hours of
speech includes: (1) an alphabetized list of words and their frequency by
respondent, (2) an overall alphabetized list of the data with word frequency
for the region, (3) an overall alphabetized word frequency list of misused
words and their correct forms; and (4) an overall alphabetized word fre-
quency list of colloquial terms and their explanations. Qazilbash found an
overall variation of 19.4 percent of Appalachian English from standard
English, leading him to conclude that there is a distinct pattern of lin-
guistic structure in the Appalachian region (16).

Other Studies--Since the scope of this Basic Report must of necessity
be limited, only a few studies of other cultural groups are included.
Tucker's study of Chinese English speakers outlines some of the differences
to be found in their language including: very few consonants in word or
syllable final position; no singular/plural distinction for nouns; no word
order manipulation for meaning change; no masculine/feminine distinction
essential for correct use of English pronouns; no varying forms for verbs;
syllabic tone is very important (23).

A contrastive analysis including a phonemic symbol list and a section
on phonology and structure of Hawaiian are presented by Peterson (14), and
Vanderslice has described the suprasegmental or prosodic features of
Hawaiian (pidgin) English (24).
Summary—Recognizing the virtual impossibility of separating regional, cultural, and social dialects, Chapter Two incorporated some of the more important findings of descriptive studies in these three areas, including what has been said about several specific dialects spoken by Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, Appalachians, Chinese, and Hawaiians. The majority of the studies focused on the Black dialect; very limited studies were reported for the Puerto Rican, Indian, Appalachian, Chinese, and Hawaiian. The Bibliographies included in Section Five contain additional references for those wishing to further investigate any of these specific dialects.
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FIELD WORK TECHNIQUES

The methods employed by dialectologists have been described in several reports and articles, some giving evidence that many techniques used are not the best. Dillard, for example, points out three main principles at work in tracing the history of language variety: (a) the paradox principle—what is in the record was not there and what is not recorded was there; (b) the virginity principle—in etymology, only the first time counts; and (c) the cafeteria principle—picking and choosing, i.e., forms in a New World language or dialect may be traced to any part of the area where the putative source language is spoken without the bother of explaining the transmission (4). Goodman, in his description of the ethnocentric researcher also presents a negative view of the methods used by the dialectologist. He presents a facetious model based on the assumption that language can be judged on a single norm and that language difference and language deficiency are synonymous. His model uses a control group as much like himself as possible, assumes his own dialect is standard, encodes all directions, questions, and answers into his own dialect, and judges responses to be correct only if they are properly stated in his own dialect. He concludes his article with the statement, "We need objective humility for effective research" (7).

Although obviously exaggerated in their presentations, Dillard and Goodman do show some of the current shortcomings in dialectology methods. Nevertheless, several sound approaches to dialect study have been used. Atwood, in The Methods of American Dialectology, gives a succinct statement of the methods used in regional dialect study (1). Roger Shuy outlines
specific objectives and the field procedures which were set up to meet these objectives in his study of social dialects in Detroit (26). He also discusses the problems of research design and fieldwork, stressing the necessity of looking at a speaker in a number of social situations and using a variety of styles (24). Additionally, he feels that there currently exists a "human zoo syndrome" which sets the researcher against the researched (25). Shuy and Wolfram discuss variables in field techniques such as: size of sample, role of race, sex, social class, and elicitation procedures in the last portion of their paper "Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective: Assumptions, Current Research, and Future Directions" (34).

Two comprehensive manuals which outline the procedures needed for effective field work are available. Ervin-Tripps' *A Field Manual for Cross-Cultural Study of the Acquisition of Communicative Competence* deals with methodological factors such as contrastive analysis, recording techniques, informants, and interpreters. The appendices contain model sentences of elicited imitation, elicitation techniques, and techniques for studying multilingualism (5). Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley's *Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study* includes the general principles of field work and a description of the methodology employed in the Detroit Dialect Study to provide a practical basis for large-scale urban language studies. The major chapters are concerned with general aims, sampling procedures, research design, fieldwork design, field worker orientation, the questionnaire, the actual fieldwork, and fieldwork evaluation (27). Less technical and perhaps of more interest to teachers, is Labov's *The Study of Nonstandard English*, Section Five, which deals with sociolinguistic research in the school: face-to-face interviews; group sessions, and formal tests (16).
Since the interview is such an integral part of field work, many writers including the authors cited in the above paragraph, have gone into great detail as to the best methods for eliciting speech from informants. Grimshaw discusses the processes involved in eliciting verbal information. He stresses the need to correct current shortcomings in research which exist because we simply do not know how to phrase questions which are meaningful to random samples of diversified populations (8). A report from the Johns Hopkins R and D Center describes speech elicitation techniques used in their study of standard language acquisition in educationally disadvantaged children including game playing, direct elicitation, connected discourse, and recordings of group sessions (9). Horner, in "The Verbal World of the Lower-Class Three Year Old," describes his use of an ecological verbal sample, i.e., a sample collected in natural settings using hidden body microphones (11). Hurst offers suggestions for generating spontaneous speech through the use of a doll and crib, toys, coloring books, a male puppet, and a telephone (12). Shuy describes a questionnaire which yields three styles of speech, a method for eliciting, and samples of the speech elicited (26).

Not only methods are important. The examiner himself is a critical variable in the speech elicitation procedure. As Phillips has found, the interaction between the race of the examiner and the task complexity causes Negro subjects to perform less well for White examiners on complex tasks due to the interfering effects of anxiety associated with White examiners. These effects may be reversed if a task is made less complex or the anxiety associated with White examiners is reduced (19).
LANGUAGE TESTS

Several of the currently used language tests do not seem to be appropriate, fair, or valid for the nonstandard speaker (2), (10), (13), (18), (29). One of the most seering critiques of current standardized tests as tools for the measurement of language development is made by Roberts who feels that the makers of the tests are either unaware of or are consciously neglecting knowledge about language gained from the linguistic studies of recent decades. In the tests studied, all answers had to be given in standard English in order to be counted as correct. Therefore, the tests were systematically biased against speakers of nonstandard dialects of English (21).

This same criticism has been made against the tests used to measure auditory discrimination. According to Politzer, what often appears to be an auditory discrimination deficit is simply the result of bad tests which do not take different language backgrounds into account (20).

It has been suggested that to overcome such deficiencies, i.e., if tests are to be a true measure, they should be prepared in the child's own dialect (15).

The inappropriate, unfair, invalid tests frequently used with nonstandard speakers may partially account for our failure to teach a standard English. If a child cannot speak a standard English at the appropriate time, we need to know whether it is because he cannot hear the difference, cannot mimic the difference, does not know the difference between different situations, or whether, although he has acquired all these "components," he just cannot combine them. Knowledge of this information would definitely have an effect on how we teach (23).
Efforts to construct such measures have been made. Golub describes the development and refinement of a measure of linguistic ability, the Wisconsin Inventory of Linguistic Development, which deals with twelve abilities not normally gauged by conventional tests. This test has been revised and a second version, the Linguistic Ability Test, is currently being tested. Although this is a commendable start, the test does not take into account contextual factors and abilities to interpret nonverbal cues (6). Klima's article "Evaluating the Child's Language Competence" outlines constructing fair tests and gives several linguistically sound suggestions (14). The Michigan Oral Language Test, although aimed at migrant workers' children, should also be effective for use with other Spanish-American speakers of nonstandard English. This test, designed to assess both the ability to produce standard grammatical structures and to use basic concepts in math, science, and social studies, makes use of pictures. The student expresses his answers both verbally and nonverbally; thus the test measures the child's understanding of specific concepts in a manner free from the affects of dialect (17). Rystrom presents procedures used in developing a measure designed to reliably discriminate Negro dialect speech from standard English. He discusses the development of the test and demonstrates why "dialect by checklist" is a totally useless method. A sample from the Rystrom Dialect Test (RDT) is included. The face validity of the RDT has been demonstrated (22). Another test, the Language-Cognition Test (LCT), a test for the educationally disadvantaged child beginning school, has as its major purpose to provide an estimate of the child's present status of development (30). A test is also being developed in Dade County, Florida, which is designed to assess the
occurrence of selected features of nonstandard English in the speech of disadvantaged primary children. Four tests have been developed: (1) Aural comprehension test, (2) oral usage test, (3) evaluation forms, (4) oral language rating forms. The reliability of the test has been established and correlations have been found to be generally high (31).

One area in which little research has been conducted is in the use of the computer to analyze nonstandard speech. Uskup has reported on a method for automating dialect analysis. He has devised a system for coding phonetic transcription permitting computer analysis. The computer program is available from ERIC (32). It appears, however, that we are still a long way from being able to fully utilize the computer in the analysis of nonstandard speech.

Those wishing to pursue study of field techniques further should read Labov's The Study of Nonstandard English and Shuy, Wolfram, and Riley's Field Techniques in an Urban Language study. They may also find other references from this chapter helpful.
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CHAPTER FOUR—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Since language development could well comprise a Targeted Communications in its own right, only representative studies which have direct bearing on the problem of teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects will be discussed in this chapter of the Basic Report. For those who are interested in greater depth in this area, an annotated bibliography on language development is available (16). Cazden's Subcultural Differences in Child Language: An Interdisciplinary Review which outlines the major studies in language development, would also be of value. All of the studies she includes show that children of the upper socio-economic status are more advanced in language development than those of lower socio-economic status (8).

Cazden has found that children learn language only partly through imitation. They also learn by experimentation and overgeneralization. Correcting their syntax does not seem to have any significant effect, but talking with them about things in which they are interested does (7). Marckwardt suggests that we use introspection to discover how language is learned by relying upon our individual experiences. Vocabulary learning would be a convenient starting point. He also suggests that an awareness of the kinds of restructuring typically done when a first draft is converted into a finished piece is a helpful guide to the processes involved in language learning (19).

Labov's "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English" maintains the existence of several developmental stages in language acquisitions: (1) Mastery of the main body of grammatical rules and lexicon of spoken English, sufficient for communication of needs, (2) acquisition of a local dialect
consistent with that of friends and associates, (3) acquisition of social perception in early adolescence, (4) development of the ability to modify speech in the direction of the prestige standard, in formal situations, and to some extent in casual speech, (5) ability to maintain standard styles and switch appropriately (acquired primarily by the middle class), and (6) development of complete consistency appropriate to a wide range of occasions (15).

Studies of the language development of lower SES children, usually conclude that the lower SES children are at a distinct language disadvantage (8). In addition, Arnold and Wist found that the auditory discrimination abilities of the disadvantaged appear to be considerably underdeveloped (1). One should remember, however, that the tests used to measure auditory-discrimination are not necessarily valid for nonstandard speakers. Further, the population studied was of Mexican-American background. Therefore, interference from another language could well have been a variable which effected the results.

Baldwin found that children's communication accuracy was related to race and socioeconomic status: The middle SES were more accurate than the lower SES and White lower SES were more accurate than Black lower SES (2). Baratz looked at the grammatical constructions used in the language of the Negro pre-school child and found that the economically deprived child was not delayed in language acquisition. Although the child used a qualitatively different language system, his transformations were used appropriately (3). In a comparison of the oral language patterns of three socioeconomic groups of pupils entering first grade (Anglo-Negro-Spanish), Silvaroli found that their language was sufficiently different from the standard to put them at
a distinct educational disadvantage. Since they were aware of and used
basic English syntax patterns in approximately the same manner, he concluded
that differentiated materials were not needed in class as much as exposure
to total language development experiences (31). Wakefield arrived at a
similar conclusion in his comparative study of the language patterns of
low socioeconomic first graders, Negro and Spanish. He found no significant
difference in the overall syntactical oral language patterns of first grade
children in the three lower SES groups (34).

Other studies have dealt with general language development. Entwisle
found that children from the slums were accelerated at the first grade, but
were relatively retarded by the third grade compared to suburban children.
She attributes this to the living conditions in American urban slums which
may favor rapid development of basic language skills (9). The majority of
the studies, however, make the opposite claim. Osser, in studying social
class factors in the language development of pre-school children found
that in speech production there were significant differences in favor of
the middle class children on several indices including (1) total number
of different syntactic structures used and (2) average sentence complexity.
He also found that in speech imitation and comprehension middle-class chil-
dren performed significantly better than lower class children on both scales
(24). In a comparison of information processing abilities of middle and
lower class children (Negro kindergarten boys), Ryckman found that cultural
depprivation is essentially language deprivation. He found that the major
differentiating characteristic between the middle and lower class was
general language ability (28). Consider, however, that the tests used
were not necessarily valid for a nonstandard speaker.
One interesting study in language development which has direct bearing on when students should be taught a standard English has been conducted by Lenneberg. He presents evidence indicating that the primary acquisition of language is predicated upon a biologic developmental stage which is quickly outgrown at puberty. Between the ages of three and the early teens the possibility for primary language acquisition continues to be high. After puberty, the ability for self-organization and adjustment to the physiological demands of verbal behavior quickly declines (17).

Other factors in language acquisition have also been considered. Osser, for example, in studying the syntactic structures of five-year-old culturally deprived children, found that environment plays a major role in language development (24). Few of the authorities writing on language development would deny this basic premise. Several studies have been conducted on the influence of the home environment on language acquisition. Gordon did a study of the relationship between the English language abilities and home language experiences of first-grade children from three ethnic groups, of varying socioeconomic status and varying degrees of bilingualism. His main hypotheses, supported at the .01 level, stated that a significant relationship exists between English language ability and language modeling by the mother. His sub-hypothesis, also supported at the .01 level, was that English language ability differed by ethnicity. Navajo children scored lowest, followed by Pueblo, then rural Spanish. Also, tests for SES were significant at the .01 level; the lower-lower SES group scored lowest, followed by the upper-lower, then the lower-middle SES (11). McCarthy's study, too, supported the hypothesis that home
experiences do influence a child's language abilities (22). May, in a study of the effects of home environment on oral language development found that the language usage of parents largely determines the language usage of their children (20).

May also studied the influence of the school environment and found that, on the average, teachers spoke 72% of the time. With this verbal barrage there was little opportunity for the student to practice using language effectively. He also found that the older a child is, the more influential his peers become (20). This same observation has been made by others, including Labov (15).

In light of what has been learned about language acquisition, most people involved with the subject advocate providing the nonstandard speaker with a rich environment (4). Cazden stresses that we can help the child most by expanding his language repertoire rather than by trying to correct his nonstandard forms (6).

All discussions of language acquisition of a standard dialect by a nonstandard speaker should consider the distinction between competence and performance. There is a distinct difference between competence—abilities, what a person can do, and performance—habits, what a person does (5). There is a further distinction which should be made: The distinction between receptive and productive competence. A person may understand (receptive competence) a standard dialect and still not be able to produce this dialect in his own speech. Both of these distinctions are extremely important in any discussion of acquiring a standard dialect. This distinction between productive and receptive competence has been
discussed by several persons including Sapon (29), Houston (13), (14), Light (18), and others.

Light stresses that children's productive as well as receptive control of a standard dialect should not be underestimated (18). McCallig insists that a confusion between competence and performance often occurs in research and that simply because a speaker does not pronounce a form, researchers assume that he cannot (21). Quay found that although nonstandard-speaking Negroes produced nonstandard speech, they were able to comprehend standard English as well as they did their own dialect (27). McKay, likewise, found that there was a considerable difference between the informant's competence and performance with respect to the standard English variables studied, although he used only one respondent upon which to base his conclusion (23).

This distinction has direct implications for the methodology employed in the classroom as discussed by Hendrickson. He feels that English as a second language (ESL) techniques should be used only for those students who have no receptive competence in English (12). This would certainly limit the number of students for whom unmodified ESL techniques would be appropriate. Troike, too, stresses the fact that the differences between receptive competence and productive control have implications for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) (33). He also makes the interesting observation that teachers often lack both receptive and productive competence in nonstandard dialects (32).

This chapter, although of necessity brief, is an attempt to outline several aspects of language development which have direct relevance to
second dialect learning. The stages in the acquisition of standard English variables which seem to influence language development and the difference between receptive and productive competence in a dialect have been summarized.
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As pointed out earlier in Chapter Two of the Basic Report, some of the students who are attempting to learn a standard English may not in reality be facing the task of learning a second dialect but rather are learning a second language. Although, like language development, bilingualism is a very broad field and could constitute a targeted communication in its own right, there are certain facets of bilingual education which need to be considered when discussing the problems encountered in teaching a standard English to all students.

Spolsky has pointed out that the teaching of English to speakers of other dialects and languages is a central responsibility of the American educational system and that the schools must be aware of the language or dialect background of their students if they are to make it possible for them to acquire the standard language as quickly as possible. This calls for TESOD, TESOL and bilingual education (18). Bernal, too, has stressed the necessity of the schools' recognition of the importance of bilingualism (2).

Before getting into the discussion of the implications of bilingual education for second dialect teaching, the distinction between two types of bilingualism should be made. Co-ordinate bilingualism occurs when two languages seem to operate on two different channels and are always kept separate (6). Usually in co-ordinate bilingualism one language in the society dominates and the social functions of the two languages are different (5). In compound bilingualism the two languages are easily mixed (6); the two languages have equal exposure and the social functions are minimally
General principles of bilingualism have been outlined by Cornejo (4), John (9), Olstad (13), Saville (16), Spolsky (18), and Zintz (22). Typical of the information found in these general references is the content in Zintz' article "What Classroom Teachers Should Know About Bilingual Education;" Chapter One gives general cultural background and principles of bilingualism, Chapter Two deals with basic linguistic principles and contrastive analysis, Chapter Three deals with techniques for teaching and Chapter Four deals with developing vocabulary (22).

Most of those writing on bilingualism stress the importance of allowing the student to use his native language in learning. As Gaarder noted in a statement before the special subcommittee on bilingual education, the use of the child's mother tongue by some of his teachers and as a school language is necessary since language is one of the most important exteriorizations or manifestations of self. Our peoples' native competence in foreign languages and the cultural heritage each language transmits are a national resource we need badly and must conserve (8). In Ott's "Instructional Improvement Program in Language and Reading for Selected Subculture Groups in the Southwest," emphasis is placed on developing communication skills in a standard English dialect, with simultaneous training in the students' native language (14), (15). Likewise, Spolsky states that at the same time a student is learning a standard English dialect he has a right to be taught in his own language at the time he is learning enough English to handle the rest of the curriculum (18). Taylor, too, has stated that students are better able to learn when they use their native language while receiving systematic instruction in English as a second
language (20). Some textbook publishers are aware of the increased concern for instructing non-English speaking students in their native language. Silver Burdett Publishing Company, for example, has materials currently available in Spanish:

Modern Mathematics Through Discovery, Grades 1-8 - Spanish title, Mathematica Moderna
Biology - Spanish title, Biologia
Chemistry - Spanish title, Quimica
Physics - (available soon)
Analytic Geometry - Spanish title, Geometria Analitica

In spite of the exhortations of the experts in bilingualism, students often are not allowed to use their native language in school. Wilson, in an article "Whose American Dream Is It?" points out the shocking, deplorable conditions which often result when the schools will not teach students using the bilingual approach but insist instead that everything be in English.

He suggests that we should take advantage of a child's language and his culture in our teaching. From that point we can progress to teaching a standard English (21). Evidence that bilingual education programs can be effective and have been effective is given by Flores (7) and Modiano (11), (12). Modiano did a comparative study of two approaches to the teaching of reading. Students taught with the bilingual approach scored significantly higher on the reading comprehension test and evidenced greater efficiency (11).

Diebold goes one step further and argues that the bilingual person may indeed have distinct advantages over the monolingual person since bilingualism is associated with and may in fact be facilitative of significantly superior performance on both verbal and non-verbal intelligence tests (5).

In spite of its proven effectiveness, problems in bilingual education
have been indicated (10). Flores observes that the problems of availability of materials, evaluation procedures, teacher training, recruitment, and financing continue to be chief concerns for advocates of bilingual programs. The observation is made that radio and television have been neglected as useful bilingual media (7). A report of the South West Council of Foreign Language Teachers delineates the various sociocultural, psychological, linguistic, and pedagogical barriers to academic achievement among Spanish-speaking children in the South-West (18). Several of their statements would also be pertinent to teachers of students from other subcultures. Taylor points out in "An Overview of Research on Bilingualism" that strong personal motivation is required of the non-English speaker and that although the new methods of teaching languages do not have the advantages often claimed, they are no worse than the old methods (20).

Some of the articles and reports on bilingualism, such as the one by the South West Council, deal specifically with the problems faced by the Spanish-American Bilingual: Andersson (1), Bernal (2), Cornejo (4), Flores (7), Olstad (13), and Zintz (22). Olstad (13) and Zintz (22) also include some suggestions for specified Indian populations.

Most of the descriptions of existing programs contain ideas which teachers could incorporate and many articles offer specific suggestions for teachers. Andersson, for example, in "What is an Ideal English-Spanish Bilingual Program," provides fifteen suggested guidelines, offers advice on how to start a bilingual program, suggests seven necessary qualifications for teachers, and describes an ideal English-Spanish bilingual program (1). Flores found that as of the spring of 1969 the number of "real" bilingual
educational programs in the United States was approximately twelve and that their effectiveness had been clearly established (7). Vera John, in *Early Childhood Bilingual Education*, devotes a chapter to describing current programs, a chapter to teacher recruitment, and a chapter to curriculum materials (9). Ott has described the Bilingual Education Program of the South West Educational Development Laboratory, the objectives, and the complete plan of the program (14). Saville, too, has outlined suggestions for setting up bilingual programs (16). Wilson cites examples of bilingual education programs that are effective (21).

For those interested in further investigation on the subject of bilingual education, Saville's *A Handbook of Bilingual Education* would be invaluable. It includes a historical view of bilingualism, outlines suggestions for setting up bilingual programs, includes descriptive material, discusses curriculum and language teaching, and offers some practical teaching suggestions based on traditional axioms adapted to bilingual education (16).
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ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SECTION ONE

The following annotated bibliography may serve as a guide for those wishing to pursue in more depth any of the areas discussed in Section One. The selections included in the bibliography are keyed to indicate the area to which they are most applicable.

Key:

1. General concepts about dialects
2. General areas of dialect study
   a. Social and regional dialects
   b. Black dialects
   c. Mexican-American dialects
3. Field work techniques
4. Language development
5. Bilingualism


Abrahams first dispells many false notions of linguistic deprivation or pathology. He then stresses the importance of the varieties (codes) used in Black English and the need for an analytic framework which would permit examination of patterns of communicative interaction larger than simple linguistic difference. He points out numerous examples of the expressive system of Black English and gives reasons for the persistence of Black English.


Part One of this book concentrates on regional dialects. It includes readings on area studies, single feature studies, the comparative approach, and dialect theory. Part Two concentrates on social dialects and includes several readings of direct relevance to the classroom teacher or the college methods teacher.


This article outlines the trends in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects and describes some second-language techniques as they may be applied to dialect differences. Linguistic versatility is stressed as the goal of second dialect teaching, and the importance of working on truly critical features to reach that goal is brought out. The historical
basis of many nonstandard features is discussed. Also discussed are the
art of conducting meaningful drills, role playing, and reading and writing.
The article is ideal for the relatively uninitiated.

American speech dialects. National Center for Audio Tapes, University
of Colorado, Boulder. (Tape) (2a).

This tape consists of eighteen readings of "Grip the Rat," one each
from Maine, New Hampshire, Ontario, Illinois, Ohio, Virginia, North
Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. There are two readings from
Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Texas, and three from New York.

Baratz, J. C. Language and cognitive assessment of Negro children--
assumptions and research needs. American Speech and Hearing Asso-

Baratz begins by describing the three major types of professionals
involved with describing the language abilities of children: (1)
educators, (2) psychologists, and (3) linguists, and then points out
how some educators and psychologists mistakenly believe children who
speak nonstandard dialects to be verbally destitute or unable to
function cognitively. The article contains a reference list of
sources from linguistics and anthropological studies.

Burke, E. et al. Curriculum guide for child development centers, five
year old program. Gallup, New Mexico: Gallup-McKinley County Schools,
1967. Also in ERIC: ED 024 519. (2c).

This guide, intended for those involved in teaching a standard
English to Mexican-American students, includes a brief description
of the value systems, a phonetic analysis of the likenesses and
differences between English and Spanish, and objectives and activities
developed for five-year-olds in language development, social studies,
numbers, physical education, health, science, music, and art. The
guide also includes a bibliography of 35 books and 18 pamphlets.

Cazden, C. B. Subcultural differences in child language: An interdisci-
plinary review. Report, 1966, Harvard Research and Development Center

In this literature review Cazden summarizes and evaluates research
in linguistics, developmental psychology, sociology, and anthropology
on children from different social and cultural groups. She
differentiates between standard and nonstandard English and discusses
whether nonstandard English should be replaced or augmented. Several
recent studies of language development, all of which show that children
of upper socio-economic status are more advanced than those of lower
socio-economic status, are outlined with discussions of the problems
which dialect differences pose for studies of language development.

This record, which presents general information about Black dialect and gives numerous examples of its coherence and communicability, is an excellent resource for teachers and mature students. It illustrates how the dialect may be misunderstood in an interview situation, and how it can be used in teaching standard English.


This article is written on a semi-technical level which most teachers could understand. The authors outline and describe major nonstandard features found in Black dialect and give examples of each. An annotated bibliography of non-technical descriptions for use by the uninitiated and a bibliography of technical descriptions for those with more experience in the area are included.


The authors outline the three major goals of the East Texas dialect project: (1) Study language patterns in Texas; (2) develop in-service courses to affect attitudes towards language and culture; and (3) produce teaching materials to be used in the schools. They stress attitudes and acceptance of language variety and cultural differences above all else. The content of this article should be valuable to college methods teachers and administrators interested in developing programs for their nonstandard speaking students.


The model described in this article encourages teachers to respect and accept a child's established dialect and at the same time to provide a framework to help the child recognize, learn, and hopefully begin to use a standard English. The model uses everyday talk and school talk rather than nonstandard and standard English descriptors. It starts at a point meaningful to the learner, i.e., with an actual statement made by him. It focuses on one pattern at a time and proceeds systematically in accordance with linguistic principles. Within this article there is a discussion of the four striking differences which were found to occur in verb usage.


These tapes illustrate why nonstandard Negro English should be supplemented
by a standard English. The tapes show that Negro culture is simply different, not inferior to middle class white culture. Johnson gives a succinct summary of Negro nonstandard phonology and grammar which is enhanced by his ability to shift dialects. The tapes would provide good general background on Black dialects for elementary and secondary teachers and college methods teachers.


Labov first discusses the general nature of language and then presents some of the most important findings of sociolinguistics during the past few years. He discusses the role of the school in relation to the nonstandard speakers and concludes that one of the fundamental problems is the cultural conflict symbolized by nonstandard dialects, rather than any lack of logic or structure. The last section of the article focuses on what educators can do in the classroom. The intent of the selection is to make the teacher aware of the language spoken by the nonstandard speaker, to help the teacher observe the language more accurately, and to adapt his own materials and methods to fit the actual problems encountered. A 36 item bibliography is appended.


Labov and Cohen present information on the phonology and grammar of Negro dialects in a form understandable to English teachers. The authors discuss the most important problem areas in phonology and grammar. All linguistic terminology used in the paper would be understandable to the nonspecialist.

Loban, W. Problems in oral English. NCTE Research report no. 5, 1966, Urbana. Also in ERIC: ED 023 053. (2a), (2b).

Loban's purpose is to clarify the most crucial language difficulties of speakers of nonstandard dialects to enable teachers to plan an effective, efficient program for teaching a standard English. He discusses and lists several examples of the nonstandard oral usages found in students in grades K-9. Loban suggests speakers of nonstandard dialects may be helped by drill on usage, especially the verb to be. There is no object in drilling all pupils on the same skill, he says they should be drilled only on those features with which they have difficulty.


This text would be most helpful for teachers who are looking for samples of Negro dialect since it contains fourteen conversations with children, transcribed in a modified standard orthography. Some knowledge of phonetics would be helpful to the reader of the text. The samples are free, spontaneous conversations between members of a family
and between neighborhood children. A sample tape recording (parts of each conversation) is available.


McDavid refutes many ill-founded ideas about standard and nonstandard speech such as the belief in a "mystical standard devoid of all regional associations" and the belief in "racial dialects." He discusses social dialects to some extent and concludes by making some recommendations to the schools.


This bulletin, useful for the classroom teacher, discusses some of the characteristics of the culturally disadvantaged child, identifies some of his chief language difficulties, lists minimum tasks and realistic objectives for teachers of this group, and describes some of the techniques which have been developed and some current practices in Michigan language arts programs. Relevant needed research is also outlined. Recommendations are made to local school systems and to teacher education institutions.


This monograph could serve as a model for schools wishing to develop their own curriculum in teaching a standard English. The first portion of the monograph cautions teachers not to use the "corrective" approach to language. It then shows that a good program must be based on a careful analysis of the speech patterns which exist in the specific situation. There are two main sections to the monograph. The first deals with the most common problems identified in the speech of the nonstandard speaker. The second section presents a program of instruction, outlines a sequence of activities which might be used including contrastive studies, and suggestions for working with tapes, dialogues, drills and games.


Ott describes a program which has as its goal the command of standard usage, focusing on the Spanish-American speaker. The program objectives and the plans of the program are outlined. Several of the objectives, as well as portions of the plan of the program, would be easily adaptable to other schools which have Mexican-American students.

Politzer, R. L. Problems in applying foreign language teaching methods to the teaching of standard English as a second dialect. Research and development memorandum no. 40, December 1968, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, California. (1).
This report is divided into five sections, each having relevance for the classroom teacher and for the college methods teacher. The first section describes the role of the native dialect and calls for an augmentation approach rather than an attempt at eradication. The second section presents a definition of standard English. The third section outlines special considerations concerning the pupil—both in motivation and in aptitude. The fourth section discusses teaching methodology stressing the audio-lingual approach and its chief pedagogical instruments. The fifth section deals with teacher training and the necessity of the teacher to have knowledge of the structural differences between the target language and the native language of the pupil. A bibliography is included.


This handbook is intended for use by teachers and administrators involved in bilingual education. The first chapter contains historical background on bilingualism and discussion of some of the controversies which exist in the field. The second chapter discusses the linguistic, psychological, social, and cultural factors which must be considered in bilingual education. The third chapter includes a brief contrastive description on English and Spanish and Navaho phonology and illustrates some common teaching problems which result from the differences. The fifth chapter offers some practical teaching suggestions based on the principles of bilingualism. The last chapter discusses evaluation.


This book is easily understandable by teachers and students alike. Shuy provides a thorough discussion of dialectology including what a dialect is, how regional and social dialects differ in grammar, lexicon and pronunciation, how these dialect differences came to be. He also discusses current American dialects, the influence of foreign languages on American dialects and the use of dialects in literature. Especially helpful is Chapter Six which lists field research projects for teachers to conduct with their classes as well as word lists, interview forms, dialect maps, and illustration of speech sounds. The book also contain a lengthy bibliography.


The authors describe the methodology used by the Detroit dialect study staff in their survey of Detroit speech in 1966-67. They attempt to provide a practical basis for large scale urban language study. To do so, the authors first present general principles of fieldwork, including details from their work which they feel would be useful in similar projects. The main chapters deal with general aims, sampling
procedures and research design, fieldwork design, fieldworker orientation, the questionnaire, the actual fieldwork, and fieldwork evaluation.


This study, done by the Center for Applied Linguistics, is of value to teachers of English to Mexican-American students. It is not a methods book, but rather a book about the problems of interference resulting from structural differences between the native language of the student and English.


This text presents an analysis of the structural differences between English and Spanish. The focus is on the nature of the conflicts between the structure of a language which has already been learned (English) and the structure of one which is still to be learned (Spanish). Included in the text are chapters on (1) introduction to grammatical analysis, (2) basic sentence patterns, (3) word classes and morphological characteristics, (4) the noun phrase and its constituents, (5) verb forms, (6) the auxiliary constituents of the verb phrase, (7) other constituents of the verb phrase, (8) simple sentence transformations, (9) complex and compound sentence transformations, (10) lexical differences, and (11) hierarchy of difficulty. The appendix contains a section on pedagogy as well as references, abbreviations, and symbols.


Wolfram deals with the attitudinal problems associated with nonstandard dialects. He discusses some of the basic premises of sociolinguistics and shows how many currently held views about nonstandard dialects violate these basic premises. He also points out that a knowledge of the systematic differences between the various nonstandard dialects and standard English can serve as a basis for effectively teaching a standard English to speakers of these nonstandard dialects.
SECTION TWO

ISSUES IN THE TEACHING OF A STANDARD ENGLISH
INTRODUCTION

The teaching of a standard English to nonstandard speakers should be based on research about language. The preceding section reviewed the current state of this research. While much more information is available now than was available a decade ago, much remains unknown and, although linguists have developed a large body of information about language and about dialects, much of this knowledge frequently is not known or is ignored by the non-linguist faced with teaching nonstandard speakers a standard English.

The major issues in the teaching of a standard English treated in this section of the Basic Report are:

1. What is standard English?
2. What is nonstandard English?
3. Should students be taught a standard English?
4. How should students be taught a standard English?
5. When should students be taught a standard English?
CHAPTER SIX -- ISSUES: DESCRIPTIONS OF STANDARD
AND NONSTANDARD DIALECTS

The preceding section presented definitions and characteristics of
both standard and nonstandard dialects. It cannot be assumed, however,
that all people accept the concepts outlined in Chapter One of this Basic
Report. This is especially true when it comes to the descriptors applied
to standard and nonstandard dialects since there are several major points
of controversy surrounding these descriptions.

ISSUE ONE: WHAT IS STANDARD ENGLISH?

The issue here is not a matter of definition; most people are in
agreement that there are a series of regionally standard dialects in
the United States. The problem arises in delineating the specific charac-
teristics of these regionally standard Englishes. A major shortcoming
in the research on teaching a standard English dialect is the lack of com-
plete descriptions of any of the American dialects. While the work of com-
piling atlases of American English has been under way for more than forty
years, the concentration thus far has been mainly on phonological and
lexical features, when in reality the grammatical features seem to be
the ones which are the most crucial in marking a dialect as standard or
nonstandard.

The analysis of the speech of even one person is extremely complex,
for speech is composed of not only lexicon, grammar, and phonology, but
also styles of delivery, rules for choices in given social situations, and
rules for distances between the sender and receiver of a message.
These are only some of the numerous elements involved in the act of commun-
icating. Thus, the first issue which confounds the teaching of a standard
English dialect is: What is standard English and what aspects of the communication act are involved in using a standard English?

Without knowledge of the target for proficiency, the instructional program is necessarily blunted. Historically, teachers have attempted to bring students to control certain critical linguistic features—mainly verb and pronoun forms—as one way of acquiring what was perceived to be "the" standard English. Current efforts tend to follow this path, although with a revised set of attitudes among teachers and students. As Section Three of this Basic Report will show, the focus on critical linguistic features is still dominant. Accompanying this focus is the fallacious assumption that someone who merely avoids "ain't" and "he don't" in his discourse will speak a standard English. This is unfortunate in that a dialect is intricate and subtle, and the avoidance of critical linguistic features is only one step in acquiring a standard English.

Although information about the various regionally standard English dialects is not complete, we do have a great deal of information from which to proceed. We should utilize the current information and attempt to keep abreast of future studies which will reveal more fully the characteristics of standard English dialects.

ISSUE TWO: WHAT IS NONSTANDARD ENGLISH?

The descriptors which have been applied to the nonstandard dialects spoken in the United States are considerably more controversial than those dealing with standard English. Three main questions provoke debate:
(a) Are nonstandard dialects different or are they deficient? (b) Are
The differences at the surface structure level or are they at the deep structure level? and (c) Is there such a thing as "Black Dialect"?

The first sub-issue: "Are nonstandard dialects different or are they deficient?" has been partially treated in Chapter One of this report. The answer provided by the literature reviewed was that linguistically nonstandard dialects are different, NOT deficient.

In spite of the literature to the contrary, numerous references to "language deficient" children can be found in the literature. The language-deficiency hypothesis is most fully articulated by Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Engelmann. They view the child as coming to school functionally without language, at least without a language which will suffice for academic learning. Children, therefore, must be taught a wide range of concepts such as color, spatial relationships (up, down, over), and numerical classification, as well as such verbal concepts as tense, number, and conditionality. There are others who share this view—or at least use the term deficient in describing children's language. Hubbard and Zarate, for example, in a report on the progress made in Head Start programs report that "the culturally disadvantaged child is usually verbally deficient with respect to society as a whole" (22). Lee claims that we are better off with a deficiency model than a different model (30). Deutsch, also closely associated with deprivation theory, has an intervention model based on the hypothesis that environment plays a major role in the development of cognitive skills and in the functional use of intellectual capabilities. He feels disadvantaged children have intellectual deficits which may be overcome by use of remedial measures (13). Ryckman, in a comparison of information processing abilities of middle and lower class Negro kindergarten boys, found that
cultural deprivation is essentially language deprivation (36). Whiteman, in studying the effects of social class and race on children's language and intellectual abilities, uses a deprivation index. Concurring with Bereiter, Englemann, and Deutsch, Whiteman feels that preschool intervention may prevent the accumulation of deficits early in a child's life (43). Mickelson's study, "Cumulative Language Deficit Among Indian Children" presents data to suggest that there are language deficiencies in Indian children (33).

As noted in Chapter One, however, most linguists do not concur with the view of deficient language development among speakers of nonstandard English. They assert that the language development of speakers of non-standard English is NOT deficient or inferior—it is merely different.

This disagreement may represent a semantic problem. If it were always clearly stated that the nonstandard speaker is deficient in a standard English—that may be granted. Conversely, however, it would have to be granted that standard speakers are deficient in a nonstandard dialect. But to assume that the language of the nonstandard speaker is deficient, or that his reasoning powers are lessened by the language he uses, is to ignore linguistic data. As Abrahams has noted, "We must begin by admitting that the idea of linguistic deprivation or pathology, an idea calculated to assuage the consciences of unsuccessful teachers of standard English, is utterly meaningless" (1). Baratz has shown that whites are deficient in nonstandard English (3) and has written several articles which attack the deficiency theory (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8). Others who have written against the deficiency model include Brooks (10), Cazden (12), Ecroyd (14), Erickson (15), Feigenbaum (17), Johnson (26), Labov (26), Politzer (35),
Schneider (37), Stewart (41), Valentine (43), and Wolfram (45), (47).

One of the most forceful statements against the deficiency theory is posited by William Labov who calls the deficiency thesis wrong and corrupting. Labov says that the Bertsger-Englemann view is based on ignorance of the nature of language, ineptness in experimental techniques, and simply bad observation of children as they are in any but threatening contexts, such as classrooms or interviews with supposedly "large friendly interviewers." Most damaging of all, says Labov, is that this view of children tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy: If you believe the child is deficient, then soon he will believe it too (28).

Another straightforward attack of the deficiency model is Valentine's: "It's either brain damage or no father: The false issue of deficient vs. difference models of Afro-American behavior." A case study of a black child who was hastily diagnosed and institutionalized as brain damaged, retarded, and psychotic was used to illustrate the point that distorting notions of the deficient and different Afro-American subculture have led White psychologists and guidance counselors to incorrectly diagnose behavior in Black children. A bicultural model, rather than the oversimplified deficit model, is a preferable conceptual framework (43).

Although the literature does contain several instances where speakers of nonstandard dialects are labeled deficient, the well-informed educator should remember the linguistic principles set forth in Chapter One of this report and consider the term deficient to be applicable only to the lack of skills in a standard English, not the lack of skills in general language facility.
Two key articles are available for those wishing to study this controversy in greater detail. Baratz and Baratz, in "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," point out that genetic racists and social pathologists are guilty of the same offense: assuming that difference from the norm means inferiority. On the contrary, linguistic analysis of Black nonstandard speech makes the retention of genetic or environmental pathological deficient theories impossible (8). Wolfram in "An Appraisal of ERIC Documents on the Manner and Extent of Nonstandard Dialect Divergence" examines eleven ERIC documents dealing with the deficiency and the difference theories. In this overview, Wolfram summarizes the positions of Deutsch, John, Osser, Cazden, Baratz, Povich, and Skinner. He concludes that those advocating the difference theory rather than the deficiency theory have the soundest arguments (45).

A second sub-issue involved in the descriptors applied to nonstandard dialects "Are the differences at the surface or the deep structure level?" arises from the writings of Loflin who maintains that the Black nonstandard speaker, at least, speaks the way he does because of certain deep structure differences such as in the use of verbs (31), (32). Some linguists, like Bailey and Stewart, believe that these differences may arise from Creole language backgrounds (2), (41). If the differences found in nonstandard dialects are indeed at the deep structure level, this would suggest that programs of instruction should not deal with particular features (e.g., multiple negation, non-use of standard English tense and number markers, etc.) but should rather approximate
teaching a complete, systematically different dialect from the one
the student is using.

Most linguists feel that while Loflin's thesis is thought provoking,
the differences between standard English and most nonstandard dialects
are merely surface differences and that the deep structure of the two
is presumably the same. As Hendrickson has stated, except in the most
extreme cases, differences are confined to surface rather than to deep
structure (20). The view that most of the syntactic differences
between nonstandard and standard English are explainable in terms
of transformational rules which define surface structure and that
the deep structure components of the dialects are virtually identical
has been supported by Frentz (18), Labov (28), Smitherman (40), and
Wolfram, Fasold and Shuy (46).

The third sub-issue relates to the question "Is there a phenomenon
called Black English?" meaning a distinct dialect spoken only by Black
Americans (but by no means all Blacks). While it appears that there
are certain features used almost exclusively by certain Black speakers,
(e.g., he my friend, he be my friend), most of the nonstandard features
used by Blacks are widely distributed among other racial/ethnic groups
(e.g., ain't, he done it, etc.). Even the features ascribed primarily
to Black speakers have been observed in samples of Caucasian speakers,
but with far less frequency. The arguments range from not a different
dialect—to some differences—to all differences.

Houston examined the speech of Negro children in Northern Florida
and found two "genre" of English: Black English and White English.
She did not find a Black dialect, but varieties within the genre. The two varieties were: educated and uneducated. They were further characterized as school register and non-school register, each of which could include more than one style. The non-school register was characterized by longer utterances, more rapid speech, lower pitch, less stress, inventive and playful use of words, and greater variety of content. She suggested that Black English and White English differed principally in phonology (21).

Wolfram, in "Black/White Speech Differences Revisited" did identify definite Black/White speech differences which could not be dismissed as statistical skewing. However, the extent of the differences was not as great as is frequently claimed and almost all differences were at the surface level (46). The existence of nonstandard Negro dialect has been established by both educators and linguists. According to Johnson, there is no doubt this dialect exists (24). A basic assumption of the Urban Language Study of the Center for Applied Linguistics is that nonstandard Negro dialect differs systematically from standard English in grammar, phonology, and lexicon (11).

Shuy found that characterization of Negro speech as a distinct variety of speech was confirmed; correct identification of Negro speakers from taped samples of both Negro and White speakers was made over 80% of the time (38). Recent linguistic research has demonstrated that the speech patterns of southern Negroes constitute a legitimate dialect of English with grammatical and phonological rules which are somewhat different from general American English (29). Research has supported the existence of Black English, according to Fasold (16). The language
does have a linguistic structure which is clearly distinguishable from standard English (14).

Abrahams supports the existence of a Black English and suggests that the crux of the difference is not strictly phonological or grammatical but cultural. There are crucial differences between Black English and standard English in terms of the rules, boundaries, and expectations carried into the communicative encounter. Black English is not just a linguistic system; it is the expressive system of the Black culture. There are both linguistic and non-linguistic differences. Some important paralinguistic features include: Elongation of words or raising pitch level for emphasis, use of a wide range of vocal effects from falsetto to false bass to growl, unexpected slowing or speeding of delivery, and emphasizing unexpected syllables or words (1). This emphasis on style as well as linguistic content has been made by others including Smitherman (40).

Loflin goes so far as to argue that since the differences are at the deep structure level, Negro nonstandard will show a grammatical system which must be treated as a foreign language (16). Most articles and reports support the existence of a Black dialect. The major issue seems to be just how numerous and how significant these differences are.
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CHAPTER SEVEN--ISSUES: IS LEARNING A STANDARD ENGLISH IMPORTANT?

Issue Three: Should students be taught a standard English?

Until recently, teachers rarely asked whether there was value in learning a standard English dialect. It was assumed that because this was the "correct" way to speak, standard English (like mathematics) was inherently right and therefore valuable. However, studies of regional and social dialects have lead to a more relativistic view of the value of dialect, and have raised the question: Is speaking a standard English valuable; and if so, in what ways and for what reasons?

AGAINST TEACHING A STANDARD ENGLISH. Some linguists and educators feel that learning a standard English is not necessary and that it may, in fact, be harmful. Probably the most vocal speaker against bi-dialectalism is James Sledd. In an often quoted article, "Bi-dialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy," Sledd states:

The basic assumption of bi-dialectalism is that prejudices of middle-class whites cannot be changed but must be accepted and indeed enforced on lesser breeds. Upward mobility, it is assumed, is the end of education. But white power will deny upward mobility to speakers of Black English who must therefore be made to talk white English in their contacts with the white world.

The bi-dialectalist, of course, would not be so popular with government and the foundations if they spoke openly of the supremacy of white prejudice; but they make it perfectly clear that what they are dealing with deserves no better name. No dialect, they keep repeating, is better than any other--yet poor and ignorant children must change theirs unless they want to stay poor and ignorant. (69).*

He suggests that we are initiating children into a world of hypcorrection, insecurity, and linguistic self-hatred. Psychological consequences are

*This same position is re-iterated in an article which appeared after the compilation of materials for this report: Sledd, J. Double-speak: Dialectology in the service of big brother. College English, January 1972, 33(4), 439-456.
likely to include nervous affectation, self-distrust, distrust for everyone not equally afflicted with the drive to get ahead, and eventual frustration by the discovery that the reward for so much suffering is intolerably small. At worst a Black speaker of standard English will be cut off from other Blacks, still not accepted among Whites, and economically no better off than he was before. Furthermore, northern employers and labor leaders dislike Black faces but use Black English as an excuse for not hiring Negroes (69). Sledd reiterates that bidialectalism is in the interest of the privileged and leads the nonstandard speaker to despise himself and his way of life (68). The effort to make students bidialectal is immoral and should not be tolerated—even if it were possible, which it is not at the present time (69).

Kaplan, likewise, charges that standard English is too often taught as a vehicle for assimilation and standardization of the individual within the culture (38) and Plumer comments on the "moral" issue of whether schools should attempt to teach a standard dialect (61).

Kochman presents several reasons why a standard English is not necessary and should not be taught: (a) bidialectalism does not develop the ability of a person to use language; it sacrifices individual language growth, (b) the input in time and effort is prodigious and the results are often negligible, (c) the importance of standard English has been exaggerated; there are several factors in getting a job which take precedence over ability to perform in standard English such as labor supply and demand, race, membership in the dominant group,
and educational level. Like Sledd, he also feels that we do not have much chance of succeeding in our efforts, even if they were worthwhile, since the two major teaching problems associated with learning a second dialect, motivation and reinforcement, are social in nature (42).

Lee claims that the "barrier postulate" imposed by speaking a nonstandard dialect has not been proven and that since content is more important than the dialect in which it is delivered, dialect modification should give way to communication training (49). He feels dialect modification is objectionable in its social application and is intellectually flacid in an analysis of human communication (48). Cline, concurring with this view, states that what most interviewees say in response to an interview question is far more important, as a cue, than the combination of what they look like, what the voice sounds like, and how they act or move (15). His findings are strikingly different from those reported by Putnam and O'Hearn, Labov, Harms, Tucker, and Lamberts, as will be discussed in the last half of this chapter.

O'Neil feels that we are misusing linguistics in the classroom and that we should be working to eradicate the language prejudices and language mythology which currently exist rather than attempting to change student's speech (59).

Two major themes are present in the preceding arguments against teaching a standard English. First, most of the authorities cited indicate that bidialectalism is morally wrong and should not be taught because it may be psychologically damaging, may alienate nonstandard speakers from their sub-culture, may not result in better jobs or
greater social opportunities, and may indeed be a form of racism compelling speakers of nonstandard dialects to conform to a standard which is not consistent with the cultural pluralism the United States presumable values.

The second theme is that it is not possible to teach students a second dialect, or, at least it is not an efficient use of time in school. Support for this view is provided by the arguments that (a) linguistic descriptions of nonstandard dialects are not complete, (b) there are no available materials with proven effectiveness, (c) the students have little motivation to learn a standard English, (d) because of the limited social interaction of standard and nonstandard speakers, there is little opportunity for the nonstandard speaker to use the standard dialect, and (e) effort directed toward achieving bidialectalism could more profitably be spent on developing the child's capability of using the range of styles afforded by his dialect.

IN FAVOR OF TEACHING A STANDARD ENGLISH. A number of educators and linguists concur with the view of Walter Loban that "unless they can learn to use standard English, many pupils will be denied access to economic opportunities or entrance to many social groups" (52). Representative of statements by linguists on the usefulness of standard English dialects is that of Harold B. Allen who observes that many people are denied entrance to the Great Society "because they are handicapped socially, educationally, and vocationally through their restriction to nonstandard varieties of English" (1). This is essentially the view of Raven McDavid (55), (56), William LaBov (43), (45), William Stewart (72), Lee Pederson (60), and many others.
Professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English, the Center for Applied Linguistics, and various Project English Centers and Curriculum Development Centers throughout the country have expressed similar concern. Others who cite the importance of the standard dialect include Salisbury who states "although many would like to see the monolithic structure of society altered to allow cultural pluralism to flourish, it should be realized that for at least the next generation, large segments of minority citizens will remain in a socially and economically disadvantaged status, penalized because their life styles and languages differ from the establishment norm. With standard English they will have greater social acceptance and mobility, a broader range of options, and greater ability to compete on an equal footing with other members of the main stream society (65). Slager, likewise, points out that in the school systems of the United States, which assume that every child should be given equal opportunity, it is our responsibility to see that all of the students are able to control the prestige dialect when it is to their advantage to do so (67). According to Stewart, a variety of English conforming to the norms of standard English is required for many educational purposes and in many vocational situations (72). One of the most forceful statements was made by William Labov in a speech at the Georgetown Roundtable Conference on Linguistics, "There is nobody on this panel or in this room, I am sure, who would advise that a child speaking a nonstandard dialect should not be given every opportunity to learn the standard dialect. We all realize he needs this in order to have access to the scientific literature and to become a full member of the community."
Six main points can be isolated from the arguments set forth by those who advocate teaching nonstandard-speaking students a standard English as an additional dialect.

1. **Standard English is the prestige dialect of the United States.**

As noted by Baratz and other educators and linguists, one variety of language invariably becomes the standard, in all countries. Since some dialects are considered more valuable than others in certain contexts, linguistic relativity does not take into account the social reality (5), (6). This same observation has been made by Marckwardt who states: "Those who have urged the establishment of a functional bidialectalism as part of the school language program have been charged with hypocrisy and sometimes worse...." Marckwardt continues: "In general, however, these attacks have been uninformed and naive. Some of them restate positions which any competent student of the language already holds. This is especially true of those who insist that all dialects possess equal value and have an equal right to their existence as media of communication. As far as I know, no linguist has ever called this into question, but no linguist in his right mind could possibly say that all have equal prestige, and there is little point in insisting upon the self-deception that they do" (53). Others who point out the socially limiting effect of nonstandard dialects include: Bailey (3), Billiard (8), Caselli (14), Cromach (17), Fasold (22), (24), Garvey and Baldwin (26), Green (27), Hoffman (32), Johnson (37), McDavid (56), McNeil (57), Pederson and Stewart (60), Plumer (61), Williams (78), Williamson (79), and Wolfram (80).
As Spolsky points out, a paramount purpose of an educational system is to make it possible for its graduates to take a place in society, which presupposes their being able to effectively control the language of that society (71). McDavid concurs in his comment that it would be naive to assume that a better command of standard English would in itself solve all the frustrations of our volatile urban minorities, but it is certain that the lack of this command is one of the major causes of such frustration, both in school and on the job. He feels we can expect these frustrations to continue as long as teachers of English fail to realize the amount of stigma attached to the language practices of these minority groups (56). Plumer, in a comprehensive review of the literature on the language problems of disadvantaged children, presented historical evidence that achieving the standard dialect is an important milestone in an individuals' general social progress and that nonstandard dialects had the effect of limiting or confining those who used them (61).

In addition to the statements made by educators and linguists, there is some research to support the contention that nonstandard dialects are often perceived negatively. Bouchard found that children were aware of the social significance of language difference as early as ten or eleven years old (9). Children rated middle-class White speech highest, lower-class White speech next, and lower-class Black speech lowest. Bryden's study revealed a number of phonetic
distortions by speakers which were used to correctly predict racial identification (12). Buck found that Negro and White dialectal variations had a statistically significant effect on the attitudes of college students (13). Cohen, Labov, et al presented data indicating a strong difference between the relative prestige of various speech forms as judged by White and Negro listeners (16). Harms found that listeners were able to distinguish among speakers according to status at the .01 level of significance. Those rated as high status were believed most credible, low status least credible, also significant at the .01 level (31). In a factor analytic study of attitudes, Naremore found that people did make inferences based on speech, that these inferences were often very stereotyped, and that variations in social status corresponded to variations in speech, which in turn corresponded to variations in listener's attitudes toward the speaker (58). Tucker's statistical analysis of White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects showed that dialect differences are significant. The most apparent trend was a nearly unanimous selection of the network speakers as being most favorable by both groups of judges. This dialect group was considered most favorable by the Negro judges on every trait, and by the White judges on twelve of the fifteen traits (76). In a study of the pygmalion effect in the classroom, Williams presented research reflecting the degree to which speech characteristics of children were related to teacher attitudes. His results indicated a definite, but only moderate, statistical relation between ratings of the stereotypes and ratings of the children (79).

2. Learning a standard English need not be psychologically damaging
or alienating. If the child's nonstandard dialect is criticized or ridiculed, there could be a chance of damaging his self-identity. However, there is no evidence to indicate that teaching him an additional dialect, with all respect accorded to his own dialect, will result in psychological damage. This view is held by experts such as Baratz who states that it is fallacy to believe students will necessarily come to devalue their own dialect (5), (6), by Brooks who states it is not necessary for them to reject their first language (10), and by Hudson who says that not having control of a standard English may be damaging to a student's self-esteem since the acquisition of verbal skills in standard English is absolutely essential to the child's success in school and later in the world of work.

Learning a standard English need not be alienating. There should be no alienation from their sub-culture if they retain the ability to operate in the culture and speak the dialect of that culture (33).

3. **Standard English is an aid to academic achievement.** As Hudson stated, "The acquisition of verbal skills in standard English is absolutely essential to the child's success in school" (33). Also, McDavid states that, "Nonstandard dialect makes academic progress more difficult...a command of standard grammar is one of the minimal touchstones of academic achievement." (55). Others who stress the importance for a standard dialect in academic achievement include Johnson (37), Bailey (3), Maxwell (54), Baratz (5), (6), and Labov (46). As Baratz has pointed out, nonstandard English may hinder development of
oral skills and may make the task of learning to read more difficult (6). Research on reading as related to nonstandard English shows that the speaker of a nonstandard dialect faces extreme difficulty in learning to read a dialect which in many respects is almost a foreign language to him. Reading difficulties encountered by speakers of nonstandard dialects are described and discussed by Baratz and Shuy (7), Broz (11), Davis (19), Fasold (23), Goodman (27), Labov (44), Lloyd (51), McDavid (56), Stewart (73), Wolfram and Fasold (81). See Chapter Eleven for further discussion.

Another area in which the speaker of a nonstandard dialect may have difficulties is in understanding spoken standard English. Lane and others determined that some aspects of the Negro dialect lead to differences in perception of spoken messages. Speakers of the southern Negro dialect were less accurate when attempting to comprehend standard English than were Caucasian students from the same geographic area and of the same socio-economic level (47). In school a child could be severely handicapped by such differences. In a democracy, where the democratic processes are conducted largely in standard English, such a limitation could have serious consequences.

4. **Standard English is helpful to economic advancement.** Caselli noted that proficiency in standard English is deeply involved with obtaining and holding most jobs (14). The relationship between dialect spoken and employability was investigated to provide an empirical basis for the Job Corps speech training programs. This study indicated that: (a) there are critical speech skills that differentiate between the employable and the non-employable and (b) that 3/4 of Job Corpsmen have deficiencies in one or more such skills (29). Other direct
evidence indicates that the use of a nonstandard dialect will lead to limitations and advancement within employment. Roger Shuy studied the responses of Washington, D. C. employers to taped discourses of Negro nonstandard speakers from several socio-economic groups. The employer's ratings of the speaker's employability were analyzed, and Shuy concluded that nonstandard speech systematically affects employability or at least job placement within businesses and corporations. The conclusion was reached that generally reactions of employers to taped speech samples were fairly consonant with the idea generally perpetrated by classrooms of America, namely, that the level of speech used is directly proportionate to employability...those who were judged unemployable were invariably those with a lesser degree of standard English (66). Findley arrived at essentially the same conclusion through similar techniques (25). In a summary of the proceedings of the working conference on language development in disadvantaged children, Gussow states that the basic language goal for disadvantaged children should be literacy in standard English so they will become employable (30).

Other linguists and educators who stress the economic importance of a standard English include H. Allen (1), V. Allen (2), Billiard (8), Cromach (17), Fasold (24), Garvey and Baldwin (26), Hudson (33), Johnson (37), King (39), Loban (52), McDavid (56), McNeil (57), Salisbury (65), and Stewart (72).

5. **Standard English facilitates communication.** Since language is used to communicate, it is reasonable to assume that a common language would facilitate communication. According to Dillard, we all need to learn the Consensus Dialect (20). In agreement, King states: "I believe that effective communication is THE most vital force in determining an
individual's personal and social fulfillment... It is my carefully considered opinion that the most powerful educational weapon in that struggle [war on poverty] is in teaching English as a second language to pupils of a foreign language background" (39). Shirley McNeil observes that "The limits of my language are the limits of my world" (57). Donelson points out that sympathetic instruction in standard English as the "universal" dialect will enable students to communicate easily in situations where the standard dialect may be necessary (21). Crosby reminds us that language is power. Lincoln, Stevenson, and Kennedy are cited as examples of men who have had such power, a power we need to develop in all students (18). Likewise, Spolsky states: "A paramount purpose of an educational system is to make it possible for its graduates to take a place in society, which presupposes their being able to control effectively the language of that society." (71).

6. Teaching students a standard English is NOT racist.

According to many Black educators, NOT teaching a standard English is a form of racism. McNeil is one who considers not teaching children a standard English to be an extreme form of racism. She considers the acceptance of nonstandard speech without providing language instruction in standard English to be educational genocide. Further, individuals who argue against second dialect teaching obviously are not aware that slum children already are isolated and alienated from the world long before they enter school. The segregated nature of the ghetto itself means that from birth the child has been separated from the main stream of American life and culture;
therefore it is incumbent upon teachers to help children become bi-
dialectal. Several students with whom McNeil talked were adament about
not wanting to speak their Black dialect in school. The students per-
ceived the teachers' acceptance of their dialect as a ploy to keep
them subservient and inferior. McNeil's summary maintained that:

Witholding educational advantages from a disadvantaged child
is a subtle form of discrimination and prejudice. Regardless
of the terminology used to discuss the rationale for this
approach, I perceive that it is a classic example of deluded
professional thinking which is condescending, degrading, and
particularly damming for disadvantaged youth (57).

McDavid observes that nonstandard English may make it easy for employers
to justify discrimination on the grounds that customers will not be
able to understand the prospective employee (55). Hoffman points out
that bidialectalism is not the linguistics of white supremacy. He
states we are dealing with a stereotype which does provide correct
identification in the great majority of cases and which therefore
has a firm basis in social reality (32). Green has referred to the
Negro dialect as the last barrier to integration and insists that
Blacks need to learn a standard English (27). Johnson feels that
the acquisition of a standard English must precede and contribute
to the eradication of racism by broadening the range and number of
vocational opportunities for Blacks (37).

Some recurring support for the importance of standard English
can be found in the above statements: (a) Standard English carries
prestige and allows one access to certain social groups. (b) Learning
a standard English need not be psychologically damaging or alienating.
(c) Standard English is needed for achievement in school. (d) Standard
English is helpful economically. (e) Standard English facilitates
communication. and (f) Learning a standard English is not racist.
CONCLUSION

Whether learning a standard English will, indeed, open doors to nonstandard speakers is not certain. Nevertheless, the weight of informed opinion, the stated wishes of parents and students, and the appearance of the economic and social situation suggest that there is value in learning a standard English. Based upon professional observation and limited research it appears that speakers of nonstandard dialects are, or may be, hindered academically, economically, and socially.
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CHAPTER EIGHT--ISSUES: HOW AND WHEN SHOULD A STANDARD ENGLISH BE TAUGHT?

If one accepts the premise that it is the school's responsibility to provide the opportunity for all students to learn a standard English, there are other issues which must be resolved.

Issue Four: How should a standard English be taught to students?

There are two basic approaches to teaching a standard English. The first approach is to correct, change, replace, or remediate the nonstandard dialect. Beryl Bailey, for example, suggests that students need to change their dialect if they want to learn a standard English. Since it is extremely difficult to become bidialectal, it is hypocritical to say we are providing an alternative language which students can use when needed. Bailey, therefore, advocates language change, accomplished with understanding of both the students and their language (5).

Shirley McNeil advocates early corrective training in a standard English (46) as do most authors who adhere to the language deficiency concept, including Bereiter, Englemann, and Deutsch.

The majority of educators, however, feel that correction, change, replacement, and remediation are NOT the best approach to take. The direction indicated by Harold Allen that an additive or bidialectal approach is the most fruitful avenue to follow in teaching a standard English is representative of most educators and linguists. Dr. Allen states that:

Although there are still those persons who seem to advocate a ruthless replacement of the nonstandard variety by standard, the weight of evidence from psychology and linguistics as well as from the related discipline of the teaching of English as a
second language, argues rather that standard English should be taught to these people as a second dialect without prejudice to their first dialect. The goal is addition, not substitution (1).

As Gill points out, standard English can be developed most effectively by adding it to students' resources rather than by replacing "bad English" with "good English." Attempting to replace nonstandard English is a contributing cause to alienation of the student in the classroom (25). Others who criticize the corrective or remediation approach and advocate an additive approach include Baratz (8), Blaine (9), Carroll and Feigenbaum (13), Cassell (14), Cromach (16), Dillard (17), Feigenbaum (20), Galvan (23), Johnson (30), (32), Lin (37), Schiller (38), Goodman (38), Loban (39), McDavid (45), Politzer (48), Robinett (49), Rystrom (51), and Stewart (55).

The additive approach has been described by a variety of terms. Some writers call for augmentation: Allen (1), Garvey and Baldwin (24), Johnson (30), Maxwell (43), Politzer (48). Some call for bidialectalism or the second dialect approach: H. Allen (1), Garvey and Baldwin (24), Johnson (31), Leaverton (35), Maxwell (43), Politzer (48), B. Robinett (49), R. Robinett (50), Rystrom (51), and Shuy, (52), (53), (54). Some call for alternative dialects: Donelson (18), Feigenbaum (20), and Johnson (28), (32). Some call for expansion: H. Johnson (27), Goodman (38), and Strickland (56). Other terms which have been used include: J. Allen's conservation (2), Fasold and Shuy's bi-loquialism (19), Johnson's supplement (29), and Shuy's diglossia (52). The essence of the additive approach, no matter what it is technically called, is summed up by Troike's statement that in language learning it must be made clear to the child that the choice of dialect is a matter of social appropriateness and expediency rather than one of right versus wrong or good
versus bad (57). Using this statement as a guideline helps students to increase and expand their use of language. The terminal objective, as stated by Virginia French Allen, is linguistic versatility (3). The methods which are best suited to achieve this goal will be discussed in Section Three of the report.

**Issue Five: When should students be taught a standard English?**

Once the issues of whether or not to teach a standard English and how to approach the teaching of this standard English are resolved, an additional question needs to be answered. When should this teaching begin? The opinions on this issue are varied, as might be expected.

Several linguists and educators, including Bailey (4), (6), Bannaman (7), Baratz (8), Caselli (14), Bordie (10), McNeil (46), and Troike (57), contend that teachers should begin to teach a standard English as early as possible. Bordie feels that the time of birth is the ideal starting time for second language learning, for only by starting at this early age can proper performance in pronunciation be accomplished. Also, by starting this early, practice can be sequenced over a period of years (10). Troike also favors very early instruction:

To the oft-repeated objection that the first-grade child is too innocent of the social world around him to appreciate the significance of dialect differences, I can only reply, "nonsense." We should not wait until the child is six to begin that training, for by then he will have lost the four most crucial years in the language-learning process, but rather we should start working with children at the ages of two and three, in order to help them achieve the fullest development of their linguistic capabilities. When we realize that most academic casualties are made before the first grade, we can't afford to wait. There is no time to lose (57).
McNeil, likewise, advocates early training, especially for disadvantaged youth, when she states: "I consider delaying remedial instruction until a child enters secondary school to be educational genocide" (46).

Other writers advocate waiting until the upper elementary grades, but starting before adolescence: Corbin (15), Lennenberg (36), Malmstrom (42), and Politzer (47). The NCTE Task Force recommends that direct instruction in standard English should begin no earlier than the intermediate elementary grades (15). Malmstrom cites the NCTE recommendation and then suggests that the teaching should be accomplished in the elementary school since the ability to learn a language "like a native" freezes at adolescence (42). Lenneberg presents evidence that primary acquisition of language is predicated upon a developmental stage which is quickly outgrown at the age of puberty: "Between the ages of three and the early teens the possibility for primary language acquisition continues to be good...after puberty...it quickly declines (36)."

Politzer provides research-based evidence that students should not be taught a second dialect until at least the upper elementary grades: "The results of this study show some evidence that it may be most profitable to begin such training some time during the upper grades of the elementary school. It is at this age that the ability to recognize and overtly label standard and nonstandard speech seems to be taking shape (47)."

There are others who contend that teaching a second dialect should not begin until the student enters secondary school and has the maturity to decide whether he wants or needs to learn a standard English. Advocates of this position include Burling (12), Feigenbaum (21), K. Johnson (29); (31),
and Labov (34). Labov notes that the social perceptions of speech stratification start to match the adult norms about the ages of fourteen or fifteen (34). This approximates the findings of Politzer (47). Feigenbaum also feels that it is not until secondary school that students are aware of social appropriateness; if a student is too young to understand appropriateness, teaching a standard English and when to use it will be very difficult and perhaps fruitless (21). Burling, likewise, states: "I am dubious about our prospects for success in teaching the production of standard colloquial English in the early grades...I think the schools would have more hope of success with high school age children than with children in the early grades, for by then a student could make his own choice" (12).

**SUMMARY**

If the decision to teach a standard English has been made, there are further issues to be resolved: How should the students be taught and when? The majority of the research studies and professional opinions favor using an additive approach rather than a corrective or replacement approach. The evidence on when to teach a standard English is not as easily interpreted. There are strong arguments for beginning early; there are equally strong arguments for waiting until at least the upper elementary grades.
REFERENCES - Issues in Teaching a Standard English: How and When Should A Standard English be Taught?


17. Dillard, J. L. How to tell the bandits from the good guys, or what dialect to teach. Florida FL Reporter, 1969, 7(1), 84-85, & 162.


41. Malmstrom, J. Love me or leave me but don't waste the time: Dialects in today's schools. English Record, April 1971, 102-108.


47. Politzer, R. L. Developmental aspects of the awareness of the standard/nonstandard dialect contrast. Research and development memorandum no. 72, February 1971, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, California.


56. Strickland, D. S. Black is beautiful vs. white is right. Paper presented at NCTE convention, Atlanta, 1970.


*See annotated bibliography at the end of Section Two.*
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SECTION TWO

This bibliography contains selected references which deal with the issues involved in teaching a standard English. They are coded to refer to the specific issues included in the chapter indicated.

Code:

6. What is standard English? What is nonstandard English? Are nonstandard dialects different or deficient? Are the differences surface structure or deep structure differences? Is there a Black dialect?

7. Should students be taught a standard English?

8. How and when should students be taught a standard English?


Abrahams first dispells many false notions of linguistic deprivation or pathology. He then stresses the importance of the varieties (codes) used in Black English and the need for an analytic framework which would permit examination of patterns of communicative interaction larger than simple linguistic difference. He points out numerous examples of the expressive system of Black English and gives reasons for the persistance of Black English.


This article outlines the trends in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects and describes some second-language techniques as they may be applied to dialect differences. Linguistic versatility is stressed as the goal of second dialect teaching, and the importance of working on truly critical features to reach that goal is brought out. The historical basis of many nonstandard features is discussed. Also discussed are the art of conducting meaningful drills, role playing, and reading and writing. The article is ideal for the relatively uninitiated.


Baratz begins by describing the three major types of professionals involved with describing the language abilities of children: (1) educators, (2) psychologists, and (3) linguists, and then points out
how some educators and psychologists mistakenly believe children who speak nonstandard dialects to be verbally destitute or unable to function cognitively. The article contains a reference list of sources from linguistics and anthropological studies.

Baratz, J. C. Who should do what to whom...and why? Florida FL Reporter, 1969, 7(1), 75-77, & 158-159. (6), (7).

Baratz first discusses the different-deficient argument and concludes that the language of the nonstandard speaker is not deficient, it is merely different. She then cites several reasons for teaching a standard English: (1) it doesn't necessarily make the student devalue his own dialect, (2) in refusing to teach standard English we cut off even further his possibility of entering the mainstream of American life, (3) it hinders his development of oral skills and makes his task of learning to read considerably more difficult. The article concludes with a discussion of what a competent teacher needs to know about language and culture to do an effective job of teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.


Although this book was written in 1965, several of the findings and recommendations of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged are still relevant in the 1970's. The book is divided into six parts: (1) The Task Force and the problem, (2) programs for the disadvantaged--at all grade levels, (3) findings, (4) points of view, (5) recommendations, and (6) appendixes. The general recommendations made by the Task Force should be of interest to all those involved in teaching a standard English to disadvantaged students.


This book contains articles by leaders in the field who advocate using an additive approach to teach a standard English to all students. The articles provide not only theoretical information, but a wealth of practical commentary on teaching a standard English. Included are: (1) William Stewart's "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations;" (2) Joan Baratz's "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children;" (3) Ralph Fasold and Walt Wolfram's "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect;" (4) Irwin Feigenbaum's "The Use of Nonstandard English in Teaching Standard: Contrast and Comparison;" (5) Walt Wolfram's "Sociolinguistic Implications for Educational Sequencing;" and (6) Roger Shuy's "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems." Several of these articles have been listed separately in this annotated bibliography. The book is invaluable to teachers involved with teaching a standard English.

After attacking the deficit theory and advocating teaching a standard English as an alternate dialect, Feigenbaum comments on promising techniques which can be used in teaching a standard English, and on the importance of discussing appropriateness and motivation with the students. He sees the task as one of teaching the recognition and mastery of alternate linguistic forms for use in appropriate situations. Translation is one of the principle pedagogical techniques involved, focusing on one pattern at a time and proceeding systematically. The article concludes with a bibliography.


These tapes illustrate why nonstandard Negro English should be supplemented by a standard English. The tapes show that Negro culture is simply different, not inferior to middle class white culture. Johnson gives a succinct summary of Negro nonstandard phonology and grammar which is enhanced by his ability to shift dialects. The tapes would provide good general background on Black dialects for elementary, secondary and college methods teachers.

Johnson, K. R. Should black children learn standard English? In M. Imhoof (Ed.), *Viewpoints, 1971, 47*(2). (6), (7), (8).

Johnson presents a very convincing argument that Black children must learn a standard English because Black dialect handicaps the children who speak it academically, socially, and vocationally. Teaching a standard English will broaden the range and number of vocational opportunities for Blacks. He cites some reasons for our lack of success in teaching a standard English and then advocates using the bi-dialectist approach since it recognizes the legitimacy of Black dialect and the phenomenon of interference. Included at the end of the article is a five step summary of the second language approach which includes: (1) Recognizing the difference between standard and nonstandard English, (2) hearing the standard English, (3) discriminating between the two forms, (4) reproducing the target feature, and (5) drilling orally on the feature.


Labov first discusses the general nature of language and then presents some of the most important findings of sociolinguistics during the past few years. He discusses the role of the school in relation to the nonstandard speakers and concludes that one of the fundamental problems is the cultural conflict symbolized by nonstandard dialects rather than any lack of logic or structure. The last section of the article focuses on what educators can do in the
classroom. The intent of the selection is to make the teacher aware of the language spoken by the nonstandard speaker, to help the teacher observe the language more accurately, and to adapt his own materials and methods to fit the actual problems encountered. A 36 item bibliography is appended.


Loban's purpose is to clarify the most crucial language difficulties of speakers of nonstandard dialects to enable teachers to plan an effective, efficient program for teaching a standard English. He discusses and lists several examples of the nonstandard oral usages found in students in grades K-9. Loban suggests speakers of nonstandard dialects may be helped by drill on usage, especially the verb to be. There is no object in drilling all pupils on the same skill, he says they should be drilled only on those features with which they have difficulty.


The authors present a selection of documents from ERIC providing up-to-date information on the current views concerning instruction in standard English as well as materials available for the classroom and general reference sources. They conclude that the field is broad and controversial and the issues complex, that linguists aren't in agreement in defining language characteristics, and that linguists and psychologists aren't in agreement on how language is learned or what approach to take with a nonstandard dialect speaker. Several key articles are summarized.


McDavid points out that university English departments have neglected the urgent problems of social dialects and suggests that they encourage systematic research in the field.


Plumer presents a well-organized, concise, comprehensive review of the literature on language problems of the disadvantaged. He deals with several aspects of the problem, including learning to read, general language development, and social status. Although no research is given to support the assumption, he presents historical evidence that achieving the standard dialect is at least an important milestone in an individual's general social progress and that nonstandard dialects have the effect of limiting or confining those who use them. Plumer also notes that researchers and theorists alike agree on the need for rich and varied language experience as an essential condition for
successful reading. A bibliography is included.

Politzer, R. L. Problems in applying foreign language teaching methods to the teaching of standard English as a second dialect. Research and development memorandum no. 40, December 1968, Stanford Center Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, California. (8).

This report is divided into five sections, each having relevance for the classroom teacher and for the college methods teacher. The first section describes the role of the native dialect and calls for an augmentation approach rather than an attempt at eradication. The second section presents a definition of standard English. The third section outlines special considerations concerning the pupil—both in motivation and aptitude. The fourth section discusses teaching methodology stressing the audio-lingual approach and its chief pedagogical instruments. The fifth section deals with teacher training and the necessity of the teacher to have knowledge of the structural differences between the target language and the native language of the pupil. A bibliography is included.


Salisbury presents convincing arguments for teaching a standard English since for at least the next generation large segments of minority citizens will remain in a socially and economically disadvantaged status, penalized because their life styles and languages differ from the establishment norm. Teachers of English as a Second Language and Teachers of English as a Second Dialect should seek to broaden the linguistic versatility of their students, giving them greater social acceptance and mobility, a broader range of options, and greater ability to compete on an equal footing with other members of the mainstream society. He then goes on to show how role playing can provide a link between the classroom drill and the real life situation.


An analogy is drawn between Bonnie and Clyde and those who want to eradicate nonstandard dialect. Shuy presents three currently popular approaches to the problem of nonstandard English (1) eradication (2) biloquialism—which he suggests is a more neutral term than bidialectal, and (3) teaching nonstandard to standard speakers. He presents social and intellectual goals which can be achieved by learning a standard English. In discussing materials currently being used to teach a standard English, Shuy voices concern that the majority of the materials rest on the uneasy assumption that TESOL methods will work with speakers of nonstandard dialects, and that most current materials deal with pronunciation while the evidence seems to point out that the grammatical features are the most important. Shuy then gives five questions he feels all English teachers should answer as they attempt to teach a standard English to nonstandard speakers.

In this frequently quoted article, Sledd attacks bidialectalism, offering arguments as to why teaching nonstandard speakers a standard English is immoral and racist and should not be tolerated even if it could succeed. He gives several reasons why teaching standard English is doomed to failure and how teacher's time might be better spent.


Wolfram examines and evaluates eleven ERIC documents dealing with the deficiency theory and the difference theory. He illustrates how the deficit model violates some of the basic assumptions about language held to be true by linguists. The articles examined were by Deutsch, John, Osser, Cazden, Baratz, Baratz and Povich, and Skinner. A bibliography is included.
SECTION THREE

IMPLEMENTATION IN THE CLASSROOM.
INTRODUCTION

The mandate to schools to provide students with the means of social mobility, including control of a standard English, is well established and widely accepted despite limited protestations that, since all dialects are equally respectable, the school has no responsibility to teach a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.

Linguistic scholarship has begun to particularize the fact that all people speak dialects and that each dialect has regular observable features. But, being aware of, or having a knowledge about, dialects is only part of the answer. Providing teachers with information about what to do in the classroom is an even more pressing problem. Learning technologies needed for augmenting (adding to) the student's repertoire of linguistic choices are presently being developed and refined. Current practices in usage correction appear to be largely ineffective. Extensive research has demonstrated the ineffectiveness of formal grammar study. Written, blank-filling usage exercises, another common method, appear rather futile, particularly for the nonstandard speaker, though little direct research has been done on the effectiveness of the technique.

Linguists, in addition to characterizing the speech of ethnic and social dialect groups, have begun to develop dialect training systems, largely based on oral/aural techniques, similar to those used in teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Experimental research into teaching a standard dialect (TESOD) using such oral/aural techniques has been promising but not conclusive.
The following section describes selected methods and materials currently used in dialect augmentation at both elementary and secondary levels as well as several of the more promising dialect augmentation programs.
CHAPTER NINE—METHODS

The historical view of dialects suggested that differences were "errors" which needed to be "corrected." Studies investigating the efficacy of "correcting" usage "errors" via the traditional means of formal grammatical study are numerous and fairly conclusive. Too many studies have been conducted to include in this report. A revealing and concise statement made on the subject is found in a review of the research conducted prior to 1960: "Summaries of research in the teaching of language have consistently concluded that there is no shred of evidence to substantiate the continued emphasis on grammar prevalent in most classrooms" (104). Sherwin's more recent report, "Research and the Teaching of English," reiterates the ineffectiveness of diagramming and formal grammar instruction (105). Hoffman, in his criticism of traditional language arts teaching methods, states that they are not only ineffective, they may even be harmful, at least when used with disadvantaged Afro-American children (57).

A large portion of the responsibility for the historically ineffective practice of "correcting" usage "errors" must be taken by publishers and authors of texts. As Bostain observed, "About nine-tenths of the statements about language in the textbooks disregard what people say. Textbooks are full of dream-world statements about what things might be like if only English-speaking people would shape up—if they would quit using English the way they do and start using it some other way" (16). Based on his analytical studies, Pooley has made similar criticisms of textbooks (93).
During the mid-sixties the field of education sought to find answers for newly realized problems of the culturally disadvantaged. A number of investigators found that language development could be improved when particular attention was paid to language enrichment activities. Marion Blank, in a short range study, investigated the cognitive gains in "deprived" children as a function of an individual teaching procedure using language for abstract thinking and found a rapid, marked gain in IQ for the experimental group (15). John L. Carter evaluated the long range effects of a linguistic stimulation program upon Negro educationally disadvantaged first-grade children and found very significant gains by the experimental group in IQ, mental age, and language age, but no significant difference in reading ability (24).

Language enrichment programs in New York (Higher Horizons) and Detroit (Detroit Improvement Program) have concentrated both on the stimulation of children through broadening their experiences and on the aspiration level while simultaneously using oral experiences as a way of producing higher scores on standardized tests (47).

Many studies reported under language enrichment are associated with Project Head Start, a pre-school intervention program apparently designed to make up for alleged deficiencies in children and their home environments. While this orientation has been condemned by linguists as adhering to the deficiency theory, it is doubtful that practitioners who attempted to provide stimulating experience for children were motivated by a deficiency concept. They were doing what primary schools have always done for children—except earlier. Daniel and Giles reported that Project Head Start participants displayed greater oral language development than non-Head Start participants (29).
Positive gains were also found in other Head Start Projects: In Kansas modeling was used and positive gains in language abilities were reported (18). In Tulane, positive gains were reported in reading (119), and in Dade County, Florida, positive gains were reported in language skills (62). However, at Texas University no significant gains were reported (60). Numerous Head Start projects and the results are reported in Hellmuth's "Disadvantaged Child: Head Start and Early Intervention" (53).

TESOL METHODS

Another procedure used in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects has been to apply the methods and materials used for teaching English to speakers of other languages. Several writers have attacked the use of such methods (54), (62), and (103). Specifically, Jacobsen stresses that teaching a standard dialect requires methodology different from and separate from English as a second language (ESL) (54).

Scott has reported several substantial attacks on the efficacy of oral practice in learning foreign languages, attacks which suggest that oral/aural techniques are insufficient for both TESOL and TESOD programs. Scott does not suggest that TESOL techniques should be abandoned in favor of written materials and grammatical analysis (the classical methods of foreign-language learning), but rather that a better analysis should be made of the nature of learners, the subject matter, and the learning environment for language and dialect learning (103).

Despite attacks upon the oral/aural methods derived from foreign language learning programs, the weight of current opinion is that these techniques can
Limited research has also indicated the effectiveness of TESOL methods for use in second dialect teaching. K. Johnson, in a comparison of traditional techniques and second language techniques for teaching grammatical structures of standard oral English to tenth-grade Black students speaking nonstandard dialect, compared the use of traditional methods and TESOL methods for two groups. In Group One, students using the TESOL methods scored significantly higher than students using traditional methods (.05 level); in Group Two, those using TESOL methods also scored significantly higher than those using traditional methods (.01 level) (63).

Willink compared two methods of teaching English to Navajo children. The mean score of the children taught by TESOL methods was significantly higher than the mean score of the comparison group (.01). It was suggested that under continued instruction by the TESOL method, general academic achievement on standardized tests would improve; further that such improvement would be increased if the theoretical requirements for optimal implementation of TESOL methods were more nearly fulfilled (120).

CAUTIONS

Several educators and linguists have stated that although many TESOL techniques are applicable to second dialect teaching, there are differences which must be recognized and accommodated: V. Allen (1), Carroll and
Feigenbaum (22), K. Johnson (64), McDavid (81), Politzer (92), Povey (94), Stewart (114), and Troike (118).

K. Johnson stresses that the greatest problems when using TESOL techniques for second dialect learning are teacher attitudes and maintaining student interest (64). Troike emphasizes the crucial difference between receptive and productive competence in second dialect learning (118). Politzer indicates several parallels between TESOL and TESOD, but cites critical differences in five areas: (a) the role of the native dialect, (b) a definition of the standard, (c) special factors affecting people, (d) teaching methodology, and (e) teacher training (92). Stewart, likewise, concentrates on extensions and modifications of the differences inherent in the two kinds of language instruction (114).

V. Allen's article "A Second Dialect is Not a Second Language" summarizes the similarities and differences between TESOL and TESOD. She notes six points of similarity: (a) the use of contrastive analysis, (b) the acceptance of both language systems as equally valid, (c) the tendency to be structure centered (grammar), (d) the use of a series of small steps each rising out of the one before, (e) the emphasis on habit-formation, and (f) the measure of student success in terms of oral fluency. Similarities also exist in the classroom techniques used for TESOD and TESOL, e.g., the use of standard procedure including mimicry, repetition, and substitution. In spite of these similarities, TESOL techniques should be modified for use in teaching a second dialect. Motivational requirements must be accommodated. The teacher should never start a drill until the student has been shown the need for it. The most crucial difference between TESOD and TESOL is the motivational factor. Allen states that another
dimension must be added to pattern practice, a dimension calculated to make
the exercise seem worthwhile from the student's point of view. The teacher's
attitude toward the language of the nonstandard speaker is another crucial
variable in second dialect teaching (1).

CONTRIBUTIONS OF TESOL

Several important contributions have been made by TESOL methodology.
One of the most important contributions is the emphasis on contrastive
techniques. Most linguists agree that contrastive techniques are extremely
important in second dialect learning. Acquisition is facilitated by demon-
stration of the contrasts between a standard and a nonstandard dialect
according to Baratz (9), Belasco (11), Carroll (21), Catford (26), Davis (30),
Feigenbaum (38), Furbee (40), Gladney (41), Loflin (75), Politzer (92), Rivers
(96), and Stewart (115). Specifically, Politzer has stated that students need a
demonstration of the contrasts between standard and nonstandard English which makes
it clear that the two are simply alternate and equally legitimate modes of commun-
ication (92).

Before contrastive techniques can be employed, the most critical nonstandard
features must be described. As Stewart noted, analysis and description of the
nonstandard dialect involved is an absolute prerequisite to English teaching (115).
The importance of describing the dialect is also emphasized by V. Allen (1), (2),
Dillard (34), and Loflin (75).

A major benefit derived from describing the main features of the dialect
being studied is that problems of interference between two dialects can be
identified and anticipated. The potential difficulties encountered from
dialect interference have been mentioned by several authors including Arnold
and Wist (6), Bailey (7), Carroll (21), K. Johnson (64), and Saville (102).
K. Johnson observes that interference may not be limited to linguistic interference. Functional interference—i.e., the refusal to learn a standard English because it is "whitey's talk"—may also be operating (64). Saville cites several types of interference which might occur, e.g., linguistic, psychological, cultural, and educational. She includes negative teacher attitudes toward non-standard language as a source of educational interference (102).

TESOL methodology has also led to the use of the oral/aural approach to language learning. The importance of this approach was stated by J. N. Hook when referring to the English Language Program for the Seventies:

*As English becomes more universal, so does the oral/aural method of teaching it. In United States classrooms, children practice orally those patterns they need, experiment with word order, and gain knowledge of sentence structure. Usage is approached largely through oral practice...*(58).

The New York City school's nonstandard dialect program emphasizes oral language at all levels of instruction and incorporates many diversified oral approaches (85).

Numerous studies have been conducted to determine the effectiveness of oral practice. Gupta compared the effectiveness of speaking versus listening in improving the spoken language of disadvantaged children and found that oral responding led to greater gains. He also found that vocabulary was increased and transfer of learning and retention were higher (48). Loban, in work associated with the long-term study of speech patterns of disadvantaged children in the San Francisco area, found that oral practice was more successful than workbook drill in modifying speech patterns (74). In research comparing written drill performance to selected drill performance with a tape recorder, Meyer found improvements in both written and oral usage greater in students using the oral drill approach (84).
Other authors who stress the need for an oral approach to language learning include Belasco (11), Caselli (25), Davis (30), Feigenbaum (36), Francis (39), Furbee (40), K. Johnson (65), Plaister (90), Politzer (92), and Rodney (97). Plaister's "Audio-lingual Methods in the Language Arts Programs" describes several oral/aural techniques which might be used when teaching a standard English.

Rodney recommends the following principles for developing oral language skills: (a) encourage children to express themselves freely and let them do most of the talking (b) allow children to use their own language, and (c) accept the child's language (97).

The sequence to be followed when teaching the communicative skills is also a variable to consider. Francis stated that the most successful mode of instruction is one which initially emphasizes oral repetitive drill, pattern practice with variation, and the gradual introduction of organized facts about the structure of the new language. Reading and writing should be postponed until the student has a command of the phonological system. Francis described the usual sequence of language skills used in TESOL as proceeding from passive to active: hearing-speaking; reading-writing. He recommended the use of this sequence in teaching a standard English. He suggested, however, that the teacher may want to place reading and writing before hearing and speaking to assure that the student actually focuses on specific target features (39). Belasco described three sets of features which can be effectively acquired by an audio-lingual approach using assimilation and testing drills: (a) sound system, (b) morphophonemic system, and (c) basic syntactic structure. The pedagogical pecking order of listening, speaking, reading, writing implies the necessity for developing mastery in aural comprehension and reading, before students can communicate effectively orally or in writing (11). In agreement, Caselli saw this order as being of prime
importance. He indicated that although oral practice is vital, it must be preceded by aural understanding and that both aural understanding and oral practice must precede reading and writing practice. He suggested that these guidelines should be followed from the earliest school years (25).

K. Johnson criticized current methods of language teaching for not providing students with enough opportunities for oral drill and for placing too much emphasis on analytical and written drills. He summarized the second language approach in five steps: Students must (a) recognize the difference between standard English and nonstandard English, (b) hear the standard English, (c) discriminate between the two forms, (d) reproduce the target feature, and (e) drill orally on the feature (65).

The importance of applying grammatical concepts was indicated by research conducted by Guthrie on the effects of discrimination drills, grammatical rules, and application of these rules on the acquisition of grammatical concepts. Learning an auditory discrimination of instances and non-instances of the grammatical concept did not facilitate concept formation. Training in the application of the verbalized rule, however, strongly facilitated concept formation (.001) (49).

PATTERN PRACTICE DRILLS

One of the chief pedagogical procedures of the audio-lingual approach is the pattern practice drill. As noted by Politzer, pattern practice usually takes one of three forms (a) repetition exercises in which utterances are simply echoed by the pupil, (b) substitution exercises in which the linguistic construction remains constant but different sentences are produced by substituting words, and (c) transformational or conversion exercises (92).
In a three year experiment at Claflin College, Lip used pattern practice to help well-motivated southern Negro college students acquire control of a standard English in speech and writing. As stated in her tentative conclusions: "Pattern practice, used properly, can provide an answer to the dialect problem... (however)... The student must become keenly aware of the differences between standard and dialect usages." Lin was most successful in increasing the students' awareness of their language problems and in providing them with learning techniques and the self-confidence required for further development (71). Malmstrom found that four types of drills, discrimination, identification, translation; and response, were highly effective with nonstandard speakers (78). Feigenbaum's "Using Foreign Language Methodology to Teach Standard English: Evaluation and Adoption" contained a variety of sample drills. He stated that (a) one foundation of TESOL is the cycle of imitation, repetition, manipulation, and transferring learned patterns to new situations, (b) that plain repetition drills may bore students and do not necessarily lead to improvements, and (c) that teachers should concentrate on contrastive drills, minimal pair drills, and the concept of appropriateness. He suggested that one promising area of TESOL methodology is the question-answer drill. He further suggested that class interest might be increased by having one of the students lead the drills (38).

Suggestions and aids for writing pattern practices were also found in the writings of V. Allen (2), Anthony and Grose (4), Feigenbaum (37), (38), K. Johnson (64), Lin (73), MacLeish (76), (77), Malmstrom (78), Rutherford (99), and Slager (107).

MacLeish advocated that when creating pattern drills, tight control over phonology and vocabulary should be maintained. He emphasized the need for consistency and organization. Five basic operations which can be manipulated,
several important principles in the composition of replacement and expansion pattern practice drills, and examples of contrasting "good" and "bad" drills are included (76). In another article, MacLeish discussed the use of questions and directed discourse for developing phonologically correct, habitual responses in approximations of realistic speech situations. He identified four problems which must be considered: (a) the structural comparison between question and answer, (b) controlling the nature and content of the answer, (c) making the drill as realistic and natural as possible, and (d) using questions and answers which are colloquial and realistic, yet, at least at the beginning, are short and simple (77).

Feigenbaum offered procedures for using nonstandard English to teach a standard English through contrast and comparison. He discussed five types of drills: presentation, discrimination, identification, translation, and response. The procedures for using these drills included presentation at a brisk pace with regular rhythm for brief periods of time on a regular basis (ten to fifteen minutes a class period), and in natural standard English (37). K. Johnson also stressed short, interesting, humorous, or provocative drills presented rapidly (64).

OTHER APPROACHES

Other approaches to second dialect, most using oral/aural techniques, have been used.

Language laboratories -- Language Laboratories have been advocated as a means of making oral drills and oral practice more effective and more interesting for students (28), (85), and (91).

Language masters -- In an investigation of the contribution of machine-based instruction to performance of preschool disadvantaged children in specific
language skills, Alsworth found that selected word cards presented via a
language master positively influenced children's basic language skills (3).

The use of tapes -- Feigenbaum found taped lessons to be significantly
effective for aiding students in acquiring features of a standard English (36).
Golden used taped lessons to modify the language patterns of nonstandard
speaking elementary and secondary students. Positive changes in writing,
speech patterns, and self-esteem resulted through the use of taped lessons. In
this formal study of elementary school children, the experimental group did
almost twice as well as the control group (significant at the .01 level) (43).
In two similar investigations by Golden using taped lessons with nonstandard
speaking urban primary children, successful results were obtained significant
at the .05 level (43), (44). Golden's article, "Slow Learners--Instructional
Tapes and Insights," offered advice on the use of tapes for slow learners:
(a) keep presentations simple, (b) proceed slowly, (c) sequence the activities,
and (d) provide extra practice in listening to and repeating standard English (44).

Role playing -- The use of role playing as an oral approach to language
learning was supported by educators and linguists including V. Allen (2), Berg
(13), Burks (19), K. Johnson (64), Lin (71), Plaister (90), and Salisbury (100).
Berg stated that role playing and other activities based on the language
experience approach bridge the world of the student with the world of the
classroom (13). The Wakulla County Oral Language Project found role playing
to be the best approach to second dialect learning (19). K. Johnson indicated
that role playing was very appropriate for nonstandard speaking Black students
and that students usually enjoyed the experience (64). Salisbury's article:
"Role Playing: Rehearsal for Language Change" provided several suggested uses
of role playing. Salisbury pointed out that when a student assumes a role,
he spontaneously adopts language patterns and gestures he perceives to be appropriate to the situation—a bridge between classroom drill and real life (100).

**Dialogues** — The use of dialogues in language teaching have been suggested by Davis (30), Feigenbaum (36), and Pilleux (89). Pilleux outlined several principles of and basic requirements for good dialogues: (a) They contain from three to ten exchanges; (b) they are long enough to develop a believable conversation, yet short enough for the average students to memorize; (c) they limit sentences to a length the student is capable of producing with a fair success after hearing it twice; (d) they adequately illustrate the new grammar or vocabulary of the lesson, but strictly control the number of new items presented; and (e) they take into consideration, in both content and style, the age and interests of the students. Specific types of dialogues discussed include: (a) question-answer, (b) question-answer-question, (c) situation dialogue, and (d) free dialogue (89).

**Drama** — Drama, another promising oral approach for use in second dialect learning, has been described by Burks (19), Denby (33), Knudson (68), and Plumer (90). Knudson, in his investigation of the effect of pupil-prepared videotaped dramas on the language development of rural children, found highly significant gains in written composition, significant growth in language ability, and a significant change in attitudes toward language. The study indicated that the specialized language activities program had a significant positive effect on the language growth of students. Further, the students "enjoyed" being involved in a curriculum designed for them (68).

**Speech** — Several projects have concentrated on specific aspects of the dialect of nonstandard speaking children. Clark tested the effectiveness of a training program designed to improve speech and found that speech training was related to significant improvements in general speech effectiveness and to
improvements in specific linguistic features assumed to be characteristic of Black nonstandard dialect (27).

**Games** -- Oral games which can be used for dialect augmentation and modification have been described by Barrows (10), Bereiter and Engelman (12), Golub (46), Slager (107), and Yonemura (123).

**Creative Writing** -- Some experimenters such as Burks (19), Lin (70), and Steele (109) felt that writing also has an important function in dialect augmentation. The majority of studies and activities in second dialect teaching, however, centered on oral/aural approaches to language learning.

**Study of literature** -- Golub (46) and Steele (109) have recommended the use of literature to study dialect and language variety.

**SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE FOR SECOND DIALECT LEARNING**

Most of the activities in second dialect learning emphasized the oral/aural approach. Useful activities included: pattern practice, language laboratories, language masters, tapes, role playing, dialogues, drama, speech, games, creative writing, and literature study. Three sources containing comprehensive descriptions of activities appropriate for second dialect learning are Bereiter and Englemann's "Language Learning Activities for the Disadvantaged Child" (12), Yonemura's "Developing Language Programs for Young Disadvantaged Children" (123), and Nonstandard Dialect which describes activities such as the use of: maps, tapes, news broadcasts, TV programs, class discussions, dialect censuses, dramatizations, role playing situations, impromptu speeches, pattern drills, language laboratories, writing practices, dialogues (dramatized pattern drill), recordings of popular music, dictionary studies, language history studies, games, literature study, and dialect study. Numerous ideas and examples of procedures to illustrate the differences in language are presented (85).
Audio-visual Aids -- As might be anticipated with an oral/aural approach to language learning, the use of audio-visual aids was recommended by authors including Burks (19), Conte (28), and Davis (30). The Wakulla County Oral Language Project incorporated the use of several such aids including tape recorders, overhead projectors, film projectors, and videotapes (19). Conte, in "Media and the Culturally Different Learner," noted that the disadvantaged student is often oriented to the physical and the visual, is content-centered, problem-centered, externally oriented, inductive, and spatial rather than temporal, and is inclined to communicate through actions. He suggested the use of language laboratories, microteaching, interaction analysis, and as many audio-visual aids as possible (28). Knowlden conducted an investigation of four procedures for presenting language materials to students: (a) a teacher with teaching plan, (b) a teacher with a plan and a filmstrip, (c) a teacher with a plan and a videotape, and (d) a teacher with a plan, filmstrip and videotape. The high ability groups showed little difference in relative I.Q. gain using the four methods, but method "d" produced the greatest relative I.Q. gain for low ability students (67).

In an investigation of the effects of background music on the learning of vocabulary, and the acquisition of grammar and skill in public speaking, Wolff found music had a beneficial effect in each area (121).

PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES IMPORTANT IN SECOND DIALECT LEARNING

Several principles have been set forth in the literature on second dialect learning. First, teaching should be individualized, Golden (44), Hess (55), Kleitsch (66), and Martin (79).

Second, the steps should be small, gradual and sequenced: Gladney (41), Golden (44), Hess (55), Kleitsch (66), and Wolfram (122). Wolfram discussed
the sociolinguistic implications for educational sequencing and presented six principles for sequencing features based on their frequency of occurrence, the generality of rule, and the interaction with regional and social factors. His article included a sequential list of what he felt were the ten most significant features in the Black nonstandard dialect (122).

Third, the student should be active (79). Activities should provide for oral/aural participation by the student. The classroom should be an active environment rather than a room in which a sweaty-pencil-silence prevails.

Fourth, the student needs to be saturated with a standard English and given practice in its use in as many contexts as possible (66). The student should have frequent periods of brief practices (37), (64).

The teacher variable -- An accepting teacher who is knowledgeable about language and about the features of the specific nonstandard dialect of the students is extremely important (69), (41). See Section Four for further discussion.

The classroom structure -- Blaine reported that language learning is maximized when the student is permitted to speak freely on his favorite subjects in an unstructured learning environment (14). A similar, relaxed classroom atmosphere was advocated in Nonstandard Dialects (85). Other authors, however, advocated a more structured classroom. Day, for example, investigated the effects of a structured versus a flexible classroom and found that the students in the structured classrooms were more adept at using language with clarity and specificity (32). Hart, investigating the established use of descriptive adjectives in the speech of disadvantaged preschool children, found that the use of contingency management was more effective than simple reinforcement (50). Sapon studied the effects of contingency management in modifying the verbal
behavior of disadvantaged children. His study indicated that (a) disadvantaged students are responsive to contingency management programs, (b) the individually learned behaviors did transfer to group settings, and (c) the verbal behavior of disadvantaged children was amenable to modification using contingency management techniques (101). Rosenbaum contended that an alteration of classroom logistics leading to a responsive environment incorporating behavioral contingencies is needed. He suggested that the most crucial task in language instruction today is to devise a new classroom regime capable of satisfying all criteria for a language learning environment (98).

Rosenbaum's suggestions for a new learning environment may not be incorporated for some time (particularly as applied to the subtleties of language learning). Equally distant, because of practical difficulties, is the response to the thesis that learning a language or a dialect is maximized through "total immersion," that is, trans-shipping the learner to a context where he hears nothing but the language or dialect in question.

In view of the potential of these strategies, Rosenbaum suggests that teachers should carefully watch the development of computer based, individualized instructional programs; for, in his view, this methodology is the only one having the potential for full attention to the individual learner and the capacity to add a second dialect to a nonstandard speaker's repertoire (98).

CONCLUSION

The question of the best practical means of teaching a standard English remains at issue. Oral/aural methodologies are strongly supported; programs based on alleged deficiencies in the learner are vigorously rejected; and empirical evidence on the efficacy of either approach is limited. The field of electronic technology is insufficiently developed to consider immediately;
the total immersion method is presently impractical; and teaching a standard English through a formal study of grammar has been thoroughly discredited.

The lack of empirical proof has not historically been a deterrent to action in American education. The bulk of current school activities and organization rests upon plausible arguments for one among several alternatives, and "proven" systems have had a way of breaking down in the reality of the classroom. Which way will methods go in second dialect teaching? The answer based on informed opinion and derivations from skilled experience is that a modified form of TESOL-type methods will be used in the coming decade, but it will be subject to increasingly wide and sophisticated experimental verification and variation. The question of how best to teach students a standard English will remain open-ended for empirical response.
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CHAPTER TEN---PROMISING MATERIALS

Numerous materials for use in teaching a standard English were examined during the investigative phase of the Targeted Communications Project. Language texts from major publishing companies were analyzed for their treatment of dialect and specific dialect features. (See Appendix B) It was found that few texts distinguished between written and oral language, few defined the context in which the language was used, and few dealt with specific non-standard features. The analysis of materials available from universities and research centers revealed some dialect augmentation materials.

The criteria for inclusion as a "promising material" were:
1. evidence of linguistic knowledge about nonstandard dialects, or
2. use of oral practice procedures, or
3. evidence of success, i.e., students acquired greater control of linguistic alternatives.

Few of the reported materials are "proven," since the effort has been largely formative rather than summative in intent. The bidialectal approach is relatively recent; therefore, the goal is to determine what is effective before final judgements are made.

**Dialect of the Black American** -- With the assistance of linguist William A. Stewart, Western Electric has prepared a 12 inch LP disc which presents general information about black dialects, provides numerous examples of its clarity and communicability, and illustrates the interference which Black

NOTE: Several of the materials included in this chapter are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), The National Cash Register Co., 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014. (Payment must accompany orders; add 50c handling fee to all orders; allow seven days after receipt of order for delivery.)
A dialect may cause, especially in interview situations. The record is suitable
for teacher information and student motivation (4).

Available from: Western Electric Company, Record--Educational
Relations Department, 195 Broadway, 16th Floor, New York, New
York, 10007, $1.23.

Language Learning Activity Package -- developed by CEMREL, Inc., St. Ann,
Missouri, is intended to help children in (a) expressing factual in-
formation and principles, (b) using standard grammatical structure, (c) describing
the ends of productive thinking, (d) asking relevant questions, (e) responding
appropriately to verbal instructions, (f) generating unique responses, (g)
recognizing incongruities and analogies, and (h) assimilating the above
elements. The package is composed of twelve units of work, audio and visual
materials related to a teacher's guide, and pre- and post tests (2).


Cultural Content for Linguistically Different Learners directs teachers'
attention to the cultural needs of students and procedures for meeting these
need through inclusion of aspects of their culture and their language in
classroom activities. The article contains a comprehensive bibliography on
cultural differences and the implications of these differences on classroom
practices (3).


The Audio-Lingual English Series, by Barbara Archibald and Anne E.
Mentzer, is composed of four sets of records, each set containing four
individual 12 inch LP's. Five units are covered: Unit I. Verb-subject
Agreement: Simple present tense; Unit II. Irregular Verb Forms: Simple
past and past participle; Unit III. Negatives; Unit IV: Irregular Plural
Nouns; and Unit V. Comparatives. The time of each drill within each unit is given. Recorded diagnostic tests are also included (1).


English Usage. This packet includes programmed lessons for tutoring students on the use of twenty irregular verbs including: Saw/seen, knew/known, don't/doesn't, come/came, gone/went, is/are, run/ran, was/were, did/done, ate/eaten, gave/given. This linear program with multiple choice responding consists of 600 frames (174 pages) in a 5x8 book. The intended audience is students in grades 3-8 and remedial high school students. A plastic sorter is used to select cards based on the selected response (5).

Available from: E-Z Sort Systems, LTD, 351 Bryant Street, San Francisco California, 94107.

Grammar Drills for the Teaching of Standard English as a Second Dialect, (Preliminary Edition), was developed by Jon Erickson, Department of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison. These materials, applying TESOL methods, include oral drills to be used by teachers already experienced in oral/aural instruction. The sequenced exercises concentrate on the following features: (a) the s-form of the verb, (b) noun forms and the verb be, (c) the past form of the verb, (d) the progressive, perfect, and passive, (e) adjectives and adverbs, and (f) sentence building (6).

English Language Arts in Wisconsin: A Sequential Growth Curriculum in English Language Arts for the Kindergarten through Grade Twelve. This curriculum guide developed by the Project English Center of Western Reserve under the directorship of Robert Pooley, contains two sections relevant to the instruction of nonstandard speaking students: (a) speaking and writing; (b) language programs. Each of these sections is divided into primary, inter-
mediate, junior and senior high levels. The development of a classroom dialect is stressed in the junior high level guide. Usage and dialect study are incorporated in the senior high section (7).

Available from: Publications Order Service, Department of Public Instruction, 126 Langdon Street, Madison, Wisconsin, 53702, $2.25. (Remittance must accompany request.) Also available in ERIC: ED 018 410, but not available from EDRS, 457 pp.

REFERENCES - Promising Materials


MATERIALS FOR ELEMENTARY GRADERS

Language Learning Activities, by Bereiter and Engelmann, describes several games and activities which can be used to develop skill in language fundamentals and reading readiness. The text contains suggestions for conducting language learning activities as well as explicit directions and examples for the use of the materials (1).


An Approach to Teaching English Dialects is a guide having two sections, one for preschool through grade three and one for grades four through six. The guide describes materials and suggests methods for helping children to investigate and to solve linguistic problems. The sequentially arranged learning activities are designed for individual use, or for use in large or small group instruction (2).

Available from: North Carolina State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina. Also available from ERIC: ED 048 145, EDRS hardcopy, $3.29.

An Approach to Teaching English Usage is a guide having two sections, one for preschool through grade three, one for grades four through six. The program is directed toward the study of language as used by groups of people in various environments as well as the study of differences between speech and writing. Activities are listed for each grade level (3).

Available from: North Carolina State Board of Education, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, North Carolina. Also available from ERIC: ED 048 146, EDRS hardcopy, $3.29.

A Curriculum for English: Language Explorations for the Elementary Grades, developed by the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, is intended
for use with students in grades one through six. Upon completion of the manual the students should be able to (a) perceive English as a word-order language, (b) recognize its sound patterns, and (c) comprehend the ways in which punctuation clarifies written discourse. The manual also contains chapters on American dialects, language usage, and styles of speaking (4).


Teaching English as a Second Language Materials Development Center--An Investigation of New Concepts in Language Learning. The four appendices to this document contain 150 communication activities including playlets and improvisations, songs, and physical education activities suitable for practicing a standard dialect (5).


A Self-instructional Program in Standard English stresses spoken standard English as presented in a variety of specific contexts and situations. The cyclical structure of the program encompasses three sequential classes of events: Stimulus situations, required responses, and response contingencies. The program, intended for use with fifth grade students, has been experimentally evaluated and found to be successful. An objective-based mastery test is included in the appendix of the program. Only the first six lessons of the program were completed before the project terminated (6).


Golden Primary Language Lessons (12 tapes). While taking a "corrective"
approach to students' language, these materials could be used in elementary classrooms if appropriate introduction was provided by the teacher and if tapes were carefully selected for use by individual students (7).

Available from: Golden Language Tapes, Highland Park, Michigan, 48203.

The Marie Hughes Language Training Model is intended for use with Spanish-American students in Southwestern United States. The program includes numerous curriculum activities such as trips and sensory experiences for motivating children to talk. The child's own language, in the form of stories or conversations, is recorded on tape for teacher analysis to provide feedback to the child on his progress and to individualize further instruction. The teacher is taught to analyze the language structure used by students. Specific examples of teaching procedures are provided. These materials were developed by the National Laboratory on Early Childhood Education, Research and Development Center, Tuscon, Arizona (8).

Available from: ERIC: ED 025 305, EDRS hardcopy, $1.45.

Helping Young Children Develop Language Skills: A Book of Activities, by Merle B. Karnes, contains activities in the following areas: Listening skills or auditory decoding; understanding visual materials (visual decoding); verbal expressive abilities (vocal decoding); motor expression (motor encoding); verbal associations or auditory vocal association; visual associations or visual motor association; standard syntactical constructions and auditory closure or auditory vocal automatic process; auditory memory or auditory vocal sequential process; visual memory or visual motor sequential process; and visual closure. The activities, designed specifically for culturally
disadvantaged children, are intended to improve language skills (9).


A Kindergarten Curriculum Guide for Indian Children: A Bilingual-Bicultural Approach, intended for use with Navajo Indian students, was developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D. C. The guide includes activities for language and concept development, social living, mathematics, music, natural and physical concepts, health and safety, foods and aesthetic appreciation. Examples of enrichment materials are contained in the appendices and bibliographies (10). Available from: ERIC: ED 031 318, EDRS hardcopy, $7.35, 145 pp.


Helping Children in Oral Communication, by Alberta Munkres, contains several practical suggestions for teaching oral language skills through the use of stories, plays, reports, speeches, conversations, and discussions.
The presentation format is well structured. First, an example of a specific type of presentation is given; second, an explanation of the teaching efforts leading to the oral product is given; and third, comments and questions are presented which enable the teacher to examine decisions and alternative presentation strategies (12).

Available from: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, $1.95, 102 pp., (paperback).

Oral Language Materials, Wakulla County, Florida. This series of five programs (one for kindergarten and each of the first four grades), is intended for both Black and White rural children. The program is designed to assist the teacher in analyzing the speech patterns of rural children and in writing drills to provide alternative patterns where needed. The program is based on TESOL methodology, but it lacks systematicity in some areas. The drills presented include: Repetition, substitution, progression, selective restoration, deduction, directed dialogue, and alternative reply. Only the drills themselves vary from program to program (14).

Available from: Oral Language Materials, Office of the Superintendent, Wakulla County School Board, Crawfordsville, Florida 32327, $2.00 per grade level.

The Peabody Language Development Kit, was designed for culturally deprived and mentally retarded children but has also been used with normal children. The kit treats a variety of language skills including oral expression, divergent thinking, use of spoken analogy, automatic use of inflectional endings, and auditory and visual memory. Research conducted by Milligan indicated that children using the Peabody Language Development Kit performed significantly better than a control group, particularly on the auditory-vocal association and the vocal
encoding subtests (12), (15).


ESOL-SESD Guide: Kindergarten, developed at Michigan University, Ann Arbor, by the Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior, consists of 135 lessons designed for teaching English to speakers of other languages or for teaching a standard English as a second dialect. The guide is organized into daily lesson plans including activities to be conducted and supplementary materials to be used with the lessons. The program is presented in a logical linguistic sequence and emphasizes oral speech development. Modeling and repetition drills are used (16).


Instructional Program in Standard English: Unit III, Teaching Reduced Consonantal Clusters was developed by Richard Rystrom, Marjorie Farris, and Judy Smith at the Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. The program contains four kinds of drill materials: (a) memorization of stories, dialogues, poems or songs; (b) substitution of new words into sentences which have been memorized; (c) modification of a sentence in one form to the same sentence in a different form; and (d) discrimination and production of specific features. Suggestions are included for using the drills (17).

Available from: Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 31 pp.

Curriculum Guide for Teachers of English in Kindergartens for Navajo Children. Muriel R. Saville, in conjunction with the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program at the Center for Applied Linguistics, has out-
lined the distinctive sounds of English and the basic sentence patterns of the language which Navajo children need to recognize and use. The language lessons are organized around a contrastive analysis of Navajo and English, allowing for prediction and description of problems which might be encountered by a Navajo child who is learning English as a second dialect (18).

Available from: ERIC: ED 030 122, EDRS hardcopy, $3.00, 58 pp.

Language and How to Use It, a series of elementary English texts, combines the study of language and literature. Book 5 of this series has an accompanying record which contains usage exercises for such features as pronoun use, negation, past tense, and comparatives. For further information on this series, write to Scott, Foresman and Company (19).

Usage and Dialect, grades K-6, is designed to assist students in: (a) acquiring knowledge as related to varying usages, (b) analyzing their own speech habits in terms of conventionally appropriate usage or standard usage, and (c) acquiring usage habits appropriate to varying purposes and audiences. The guide is divided into an introductory section, a section for each of the grades K through 6, and two informational sections for teachers, one on usage and one on dialect (20).

Available from: Project English Center, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 59 pp.

Developing Language Programs for Young Disadvantaged Children, by Margaret Yonemura, includes a linguistically sound discussion of language and attitudes toward language variations as well as many workable ideas which would be useful for setting up dialect programs. Numerous materials especially good for small children are contained in the appendix. This
text is based on two years of research at Abbott House in New York where Yonemura developed oral language programs applicable to Harlem English, Pidgin English, Creole English, nonstandard forms of Appalachian English and other varieties of nonstandard language used throughout the country (21).

REFERENCES - Materials for Elementary Grades


20. Usage and dialect. Project English-Center, University of Georgia, Athens.

MATERIALS FOR SECONDARY GRADES

An Approach to Teaching English Dialects includes two sections applicable to the secondary grades, one intended for students in grades 7 through 9; one for students in grades 10 through 12. The guide provides materials and suggests methods which teachers can use to assist children in investigating and solving linguistic problems. The sequentially arranged learning activities are designed for individual use or for large or small group instruction (1).


An Approach to Teaching English Usage includes two sections applicable to the secondary level, one for grades 7 through 9; one for grades 10 through 12. The program is directed towards the study of language as used by groups of people in various environments as well as the study of the differences between speech and writing. Activities are listed for each grade (2).


Standard Oral English, Tenth Grade, Instructional Guide C, developed by Wilma Cockrell and Kenneth Johnson for the Los Angeles City Schools, describes an oral language program intended for use with Black students who speak a nonstandard English. The first section of the guide presents general background information on dialects and motivational materials. The next two sections contain pronunciation and usage lessons with an analysis of those features which cause interference. The context in which the language is used is always clearly specified. Each lesson is followed
by two or three supplementary activities which last for ten to fifteen minutes. The guide also includes an outline of the main characteristics of Black dialect, general teaching suggestions, and a bibliography (3).

Available from: ERIC: ED 027 351, EDRS hardcopy, $6.95, 137 pp.

_English Now._ Based on his work in TESOL, Irwin Feigenbaum of the Center for Applied Linguistics has developed an extensive series of lessons for practicing standard English features. These lessons include tested oral pattern practices and discrimination practice materials for Black nonstandard speakers in grades 7 through 12. The self-instructional, self-correcting, workbook-text has several listening exercises for the nonstandard speaker as well as accompanying tapes. The lessons are not intended to correct or eradicate the speech of the nonstandard speaker, but rather to add a second dialect to his repertoire. Fourteen programmed lessons, each concentrating on a specific phonological or grammatical feature commonly found in nonstandard speech are included. An accompanying teacher's manual provides a commentary on each lesson as well as suggested classroom activities (4).


_Golden Series of American English Language Lessons_, a series of fourteen tapes intended for high school students, has several sections which are applicable to the speaker of nonstandard dialects. Teachers using these materials would need to carefully select relevant sections as the approach is basically "corrective" and the tone of the tapes might be insulting to some students (5).

Available from: Golden Language Tapes, Highland Park, Michigan, 48203.
Standard Oral English: Seventh Grade, Instructional Guide B, developed by Luis Hernandez for the Los Angeles City Schools, describes an oral language program intended for use in teaching a standard oral English to non-standard speaking Mexican-American students. The guide includes general background information, motivational materials, pronunciation and usage lessons, classroom activities for supplementing these lessons, a description of the major characteristics of the Mexican-American dialect, general teaching suggestions and a bibliography. There are accompanying tapes and filmstrips.


Individualized English. These materials, while traditional in orientation, are individualized and could be used selectively to provide instruction on specific features. The materials focus on the written rather than the spoken language. Drills are contained on cards systematically filed within a box. Diagnostic materials are included.


Nonstandard Negro Dialect--Effects on Learning. K. Johnson in this series of five tapes, illustrates why nonstandard Negro English should be "supplemented" by a standard English, demonstrates that Negro culture is simply different, not inferior, from other cultures, and provides a succinct summary of Negro nonstandard phonology and grammar. The tapes provide general information for teachers and could be used in motivating students to learn a standard English. The content of the tapes includes: The problem, the development of nonstandard Black dialect, false assumptions about the language of Black children, phonological characteristics of nonstandard Black dialect, grammatical characteristics of nonstandard
Black dialect, teaching Black children standard English, and the language problem at various levels. There are ten presentations on both sides of five standard audio cassettes (8).

Available from: Instructional Dynamics Incorporated, 166 East Superior Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611, $35.00 (catalogue no. 540).

**A Mature Attitude Toward Usage,** developed by the Oregon Project English staff under the direction of Albert Kitzhaber, is designed for use by 12th grade students and is divided into four sections: (a) usage in the high school English class, (b) variations within standard American English, (c) bases for judgments about usage, and (d) characteristics of a mature attitude toward usage. Upon completion of the program, students should be able to differentiate usages on varying social levels, to identify the usage levels of numerous expressions, to analyze specific expressions, and to define "good English" (9).


**Usage Manual: Language Curriculum I and II.** This manual, developed by the Oregon Project English Center under the direction of Albert Kitzhaber, is intended for use by seventh and eighth grade students. One hundred common grammar usage items are arranged alphabetically and in some cases are cross-referenced. Use of the manual is dependent on the teacher having a knowledge of transformational grammar (10).


**Varieties of English, Using the Dictionary: Language Curriculum I.** A Seventh Grade Student Study Guide for the Language Curriculum was developed by the Oregon Project English Center under the direction of
Albert Kitzhaber. The program contains background information and exercises on regional dialects, social dialects, and the functional varieties of language to be found in English (12).

Available from: ERIC: ED 010 149, EDRS hardcopy, $1.50, 30 pp.

Pattern Practice in the Teaching of English to Students with a Nonstandard Dialect, by San-So C. Lin, is the final report of an English Project at Claflin University in South Carolina, which has an all-Negro student body. The three year project involved experiments with pattern practice techniques and materials for use in the classroom setting as well as the language laboratory. The program was found to be successful (14). Lin's report cites difficulties encountered in establishing effective programs. Her suggestions about pattern practice for TESOD, pp. 46-48 are very practical; she illustrates ways of incorporating pattern practice into the classroom activities rather than introducing meaningless drills out of context. A bibliography and several sample lessons are included (13).


A Standard English for Urban Blacks, a collection of approaches to second dialect learning, includes contrastive drills, readings about dialects, dialogues, pattern practices, drills of several varieties, transformation drills (e.g. transform declaratives to imperatives) designed for mature speakers of Black nonstandard English. The program stresses phonological features; grammar is largely ignored. Two cautions to be exercised when using these materials: Attention is not given to individual differences, and it errs in confusing standard English with Northern standard; e.g., treatment of /æi/ as "standard" (for ['l])
everywhere (15).

Available from: University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Macmillan Gateway English: A Literature and Language Arts Program, designed for seventh grade disadvantaged urban children, intersperses language study with the study of literature. Records, teacher's manuals, lesson plans, related activities, and a student manual with detachable worksheets are included for each unit. In an informal evaluation of these materials conducted by Marjorie Smiley, generally favorable reactions were expressed by the teachers and the pupils (16).

Available from: Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, 10022.

Using Transformation Grammar Theory to Rebuild Language Confidence in Slow Learners in the Junior High School contains seventeen lessons which stress writing skills in a standard English. Although based on transformational grammar theory, the program is not designed to teach grammar but rather to build the student's confidence in his use of language. Successful results have been reported (17).

Available from: Linguistics Research and Demonstration Center, Rome City Schools, 307 Third Avenue, Rome, Georgia, 30161. Also available from ERIC: ED 030 101, EDRS hardcopy, $4.05, 79 pp.

Nonstandard Dialect, a teachers' guide produced by the New York City schools, includes descriptive materials and recommends classroom activities for teaching a standard English. As noted in the preface, the materials may be specific to the New York City area and non-applicable to other areas of the United States. The foreward contains a statement on the "additive" approach for use in teaching a standard English. Section One of the booklet outlines the major nonstandard features found in the speech of New York City students.
The second section, "Program of Instruction," outlines sequenced activities and includes suggestions for using tapes, dialogs, drills, and games (18).

Available from: National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois, $1.00, 38 pp. Also available in ERIC: ED 021 248, but not available from EDRS.

*Constructing Dialogs* contains eighty-six structured, patterned drills designed for use by foreign students and speakers of nonstandard dialects at the upper secondary or college level. The drills, presented in a semi-programmed format, allow for individual differences and focus on oral language development. Simple four-line dialogs concentrate on proper pronominalization, verb tenses, nominalizations, and deletions. The section dealing with the past tense of verbs is especially helpful. The sequencing is based on a grammatical analysis of English and, as such, would be most beneficial if used by someone who could select material in the appropriate pedagogical sequence. This text should be used only where situational context can be established, and then only as a supplementary material for drill. The appendix on irregular verbs is useful (19).

Available from: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, New York, 10010, $2.95. Also available in ERIC: ED 032 534, but not available from EDRS.

*Constructing Sentences*, a "self-help" in learning to control a standard English, is a non-theoretical text consisting of 112 tightly controlled drills presented in a semi-programmed format. This format allows teachers to assign drills on the basis of individual needs. The book designed for use with mature secondary or college students is better suited for work on the written rather than on the oral language. Again, a caution should be exercised in using this book. The sequencing is based on a grammatical rather than a pedagogical analysis of English and should only be used a
a supplement to other materials (20).

Available from: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, New York, 10017, $2.95. Also available in ERIC: ED 038 633, but not available from EDRS.

**English: Target Series** consists of three books, one for seventh grade (*The Space Visitors,*), one for eighth grade (*The Time Capsule,*), and one for ninth grade. The books contain timely information, numerous pictures, and a variety of language activities concentrating on important linguistic features, reading, composition, and oral language skills. The intent is to improve the students' ability to use a standard American English in both speaking and writing. The orientation is additive rather than corrective or remedial (21).


**Standard Oral English, Tenth Grade: Instructional Guide D,** developed by Dolores Seidman for the Los Angeles City Schools, describes an oral language program designed for teaching standard, oral English to nonstandard speaking Mexican-American students. The guide includes general background information on dialects, motivational materials, pronunciation and usage lessons, classroom activities, an outline of the most common nonstandard usages and pronunciations of the Mexican-American student, and suggestions for dealing with them.


**Generating English Sentences** was developed at the Project English Center at Gallaudet College by William Stokoe, et al. The materials, designed for secondary students who do not frequently hear standard dialects, e.g. the disadvantaged, as well as speakers of other languages,
consist of four volumes and a portfolio of pre- and post-tests to measure achievement. The lessons, along with 250 exercises, concentrate on (a) nominal fields containing pronouns or nouns, (b) transitive and intransitive verbs, direct and indirect objects, adverbs and adverbial fields, (c) verb combinations, (d) tense, (e) adverb and adjective fields and the active and passive voice, (f) compound elements, and (g) adjective, adverb, or noun clauses (25). The set contains four volumes, with achievement tests.

Available from: Gallaudet College Bookstore, 7th and Florida Avenues, N.E., Washington, D.C., 20002, $16.00. Also available in ERIC: ED 037 427, but not available from EDRS.

Language Varies with Approach, (Unit 802), an eighth grade unit developed by the University of Minnesota Project English Center, concentrates on variations in language, emphasizing those variations found between the written and the spoken word. The unit includes sample lectures, discussion questions, and activities. Students are encouraged to draw situations from their own personal experiences in which varying degrees of usage would be appropriate (26).


Language Varies with Backgrounds and Interests, (Unit 901), a ninth grade unit developed by the University of Minnesota Project English Center, concentrates on the influence of age, sex, education, occupation, avocation, the region of origin, race, and ethnic background on a speaker's language. Dialect as used in literature is frequently employed to illustrate regional dialect variations. Discussion questions, activities, student questions, and a test are included in the unit (27).

Available from: ERIC: ED 027 323, EDRS hardcopy, $2.05, 39 pp.
Language Varies by Place: American English, (Unit 1101), an eleventh grade unit developed by the University of Minnesota Project English Center, concentrates on regional variations of American English, as well as the causes for these variations. The unit includes information on (a) the historical basis for dialect differences, (b) current speech characteristics of the major dialect areas, (c) influences of other languages on American English, (d) linguistic geography, and (e) dialect in literature. Lists of audio-visual materials, selected reference works, literary works using dialect, sample lesson plans, discussion guides, lectures, worksheets, student activities, and a unit test are included (28).


The English Language: The Linguistic Approach, intended for junior high school students, was developed by the Project English Center at Western Reserve. The program contains a collection of papers on teaching language: (a) "The Classroom Teacher and Linguistic Eclecticism" by A. Hood Roberts, (b) "Some Notes on Linguistics and the Teaching of English" by Joseph H. Friend, (c) "A Unit of Dialects" by James F. McCampbell, and (d) "Teaching Syntax" by George Hillocks. The readings are followed by nine units related to dialect, syntax, changes in the English language, morphology, definition and etymology, and semantics. The guide includes objectives, suggestions for teachers, study guides, exercises, and bibliographies (29).


Standard Oral English, Seventh Grade: Instructional Guide A, developed by Marilyn Wilson for the Los Angeles City schools, describes an oral
language program intended for use by Black students who speak a nonstandard dialect. The first section of the guide contains general background information on dialects and motivational materials. The following sections contain pronunciation and usage exercises which concentrate on specific features found in nonstandard Black dialects. The guide includes classroom activities, an outline of the major characteristics of Negro dialect, general teaching suggestions, a bibliography, tapes and filmstrips (30).

REFERENCES - Materials for Secondary Grades
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   New York: Macmillan.


See annotated bibliography at end of Section Three.
GUIDELINES

Some general guidelines have been developed by the English staff of CEMREL, Inc., in Minneapolis for selection of materials. These guidelines are included in a program developed by CEMREL, Learning a Standard English which is discussed in Section Four. The criteria include:

1. Material (or parts of materials) must treat one or more of the specific nonstandard features.

2. Exercise items must require action on the part of the learner (not merely "notice," "observe," or "understand"). They may profitably be preceded by linguistically sound didactic material.

3. Materials should be designed or be easily adaptable to use by an individual. (Good materials requiring a group--two or more--will be acceptable, but they should be labelled as such.)

4. Materials must be inherently interesting to students, attractive, "fun," and contain relevant content.

5. Materials should be self-checkable or easily checked by a student, aide, or teacher.

6. Materials should call for (1) both oral and written response, (2) for oral response, (3) for written response--in that order of preference.

7. An objective tone is sought. Materials should not "scold" or "talk down" to students about making "errors" but should speak to the student as one who may have made a situationally inappropriate choice of forms.

8. Materials should require minimal reading on the part of the student in that reading problems tend to be more numerous among nonstandard speakers.

9. Use of audio-visual media in augmentation materials is a plus, in that it can give greater illusion of reality to the learner, in addition to a degree of variety from print.

10. Materials should be available at a reasonable cost.

11. Materials must be durable enough for classroom use and capable of storing by student and/or aide.

12. Materials should specify the social context in which the language occurs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>WEIGHTED RATING</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Treats critical features</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student action</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individualizable</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interesting</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-checkable</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Type of response</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Objective, non-pejorative tone</td>
<td>x3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Minimal reading</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use of A-V</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cost is reasonable</td>
<td>x1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Durability and self-storing</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Context specified</td>
<td>x2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING**

100 - 125 Excellent
75 - 99 Good
50 - 74 Average
25 - 49 Below Average
0 - 24 Poor
CONCLUSION

The number of materials available for use in teaching a standard English is limited, but growing. Only a representative sample of these materials has been presented in this chapter. As noted in the introduction to this section, that which is known is probably a small part of the existent materials on dialect addition. Even at this writing (Winter of 1971) there are probably several linguists and educators preparing classroom materials for dialect augmentation.
Numerous programs on dialect augmentation were evaluated during the course of this review. It is impossible to cite all the programs in this area, for many highly successful programs on dialect and dialect learning are being implemented on local and/or experimental bases. Of those selected for review, many were identified because they were government funded projects, some were identified because they were published, and a limited number were identified through discussions with professionals in the area of dialect augmentation. A number of programs may have been omitted due to the lack of circulated information as to their goals and purposes as well as data related to their effects. While several major programs are reported in this section, the part that shows is quite probably analogous to the visible part of an iceberg.

PROGRAMS AND INFORMATION ON PROGRAMS APPLICABLE FOR ALL GRADE LEVELS

Several major references are available to educators interested in establishing programs for dialect augmentation. Kneifel has compiled a list of programs for strengthening the education of Spanish-speaking students (3). Andersson's "What is an Ideal English-Spanish Bilingual Program" provides guidelines for programs as well as procedures for initiating them (1). Light points out that currently the most promising programs are those supported under the Bilingual Education Act and recommends the adaptation of their procedures for other types of programs. He also cites the Career Opportunities Program and the Triple T Programs as being worthy of study (4).
The Milwaukee Public Schools have developed an innovative speech and language development program which utilizes speech therapists in dealing with the language problems of the nonstandard-speaking student. This approach has led to significant improvement in the educational attainment of these disadvantaged children (5).

In his article, "Language Learning and Teaching," Davis states that ideally programs should combine the best of linguistic and cultural analysis (2). A complete summary of authoritative recommendations for establishing language programs for linguistically different learners has been compiled by Dorothy Strickland. Since it reflects the opinions of numerous authorities on the subject of dialect augmentation, her summary is reproduced here in its entirety.

Experts have offered guidelines for designing language programs for linguistically different learners. A look at some of these and their implications for teachers will be helpful:

1. The school, and particularly the teacher of language arts, must accept the language which the learner brings to school. It is doubtful that these children will accept the language of the school if the school does not accept their language. Teachers must refrain from referring to students' speech as "careless" or "wrong."

2. Language programs must be based on the language the child brings to school. Programs should not be based on the replacement of one dialect for another. Language expansion and flexibility should be the ultimate goal. Implications for reading would indicate the experience stories be basically written in the child's language. These should comprise a major part of the beginning reading program and continue throughout the grades.

3. No matter how deviant their language may be from standard English, children must be helped to communicate ideas and express themselves. Implications for the classroom teacher would include a variety of oral language activities as a must in the daily program.

4. Any skill instruction must be based on a careful analysis of the child's dialect and should emphasize the use of techniques proven effective in teaching English as a second language. The points of interference between the child's dialect and standard English must be dealt with on a systematic basis. This would imply that teacher training institutions must be trained in the phonology and structure of the nonstandard dialect prevalent in their area and in basic techniques used in teaching English as a second language.
5. The experts disagree as to whether or not special reading materials are absolutely necessary. They do agree, however, that reading materials and reading instruction must draw, as much as possible, on experiences and settings appropriate to the children. Teachers should select those materials suitable to their particular group of learners and every attempt must be made to make the curriculum relevant to their needs. Teachers should avoid the interruption of a child's oral reading to correct errors which reflect a point of interference between the child's dialect and the reading materials, as long as the intended meaning has been maintained. Instead, they should note the points of interference and select those for future attention.

6. Language expansion activities should, as much as possible, simulate the child's first language learning atmosphere and experiences. This means that these activities must take place in a warm, rewarding atmosphere. They must be based on experiences known to be appealing to children at the particular stage of development for which they are intended. They should employ the use of imitation, as this is a primary mode of oral language acquisition. Although the teacher must set aside specific times for planned language activities, she should be aware that language learning takes place constantly.

7. The teacher should maintain his natural speech habits. Acceptance of the child's native language does not necessitate the teacher's use of the child's dialect. The teacher should serve as a model for expanding the child's language repertoire.

It would seem, then, that the "black is beautiful" theme must be adopted by teachers to the extent that total acceptance of the child's nonstandard dialect takes place. Without this acceptance, the total language arts program is unlikely to be successful. It would also seem, however, that, while "white" is not inherently "right," it is necessary. That is, while no dialect is intrinsically any better than any other dialect, acquisition of the prestige dialect within a given broad culture is usually a prerequisite for educational, social, and economic success in that culture. Language programs which seek to expand the child's language repertoire and promote greater language flexibility, without negating the rich store of language the child brings to school, would seem to be the answer. (7).
REFERENCES - Promising Programs in Dialect Augmentation.
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Many programs reported in this section were designed for preschool children; however, they could be adapted for use in the early elementary grades. One such program, the Deutsch Model, has been designed at the Institute for Developmental Studies of the University of New York. While based on the language deficit theory, early intervention and remediation, this model has several features to offer. Learning is individualized, students receive immediate feedback, and it incorporates into instruction the use of cameras, creative dramatics, and numerous opportunities for verbal expression designed to create positive self-concepts (6). Children who participated in the institute's program for five years performed better than the control group on several measures of language ability as well as in actual achievement. It is also significant to note that they maintained much of this early achievement (5).

Another preschool program based on the deficit theory is the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool Program at the University of Illinois, Urbana. Like the Deutsch Model Institute, the Bereiter-Engelmann preschool has several features which could be adapted to other language programs. The goal of the Bereiter-Engelmann Preschool is to prepare disadvantaged children for public school by teaching a "teaching language." The curriculum, based on the writings of Basil Bernstein, makes extensive use of pattern drill as well as exemplary small group teaching techniques. Research has demonstrated the program to be effective. On the first testing, children in the program averaged from one-half to one and one-half years below average on all language tests. At the end of the second year, however, their scores were nearly average with the exception of the grammar section (2), (14). Though based
on what many linguists believe to be an erroneous set of assumptions related to the language development of children, the materials prepared by Bereiter and Engelmann are extensively used in classrooms. Some of these materials have been incorporated in the DISTAR Program published by Scott Foresman Company of Chicago. Others are included in the book, Language Activities for the Disadvantaged which is described in Chapter Ten.

Another preschool program which could be adapted for use in the primary grades is the Bilingual Oral Language and Conceptual Development Program intended for Spanish-speaking pre-school children developed by the Michigan Department of Education. This program, containing 59 lessons written in English and 61 lessons written in Spanish, focuses on basic concepts related to size, color, number, time, space, familiar objects, and relationships. It not only assists the student in acquiring control of Spanish and English, but also attempts to assist him in the acquisition of standard alternatives for certain nonstandard features of his own Spanish dialect (1).

Numerous programs have been designed specifically for use in the elementary grades. Francis has reported the development and preliminary field testing of a multisensory language development program for use in kindergarten, first grade, and fourth grade: This multisensory method, based on the theories of Piaget, Hebb, and Montessori, is directed towards ten specific features commonly found in the speech of disadvantaged children in the Southeastern United States. The effectiveness of the program was demonstrated by a student increase in: (a) the amount of language used,
(b) the number of standard forms used, and (c) auditory discrimination
skills. The program also tended to facilitate intellectual development
as measured by the Binet test of Intelligence (8).

The Syracuse Oral Language Development Program attempts to teach the oral
communication skill of auditory discrimination and to provide experiences in
language expression and comprehension. Succinctly, the major objective of
this program is to develop an awareness of standard English usage as a tool
for communicating feelings, ideas, and experiences. An informal evaluation
of the program indicated that the program is effective. A complete outline
of the content as well as a description of the teacher and student population
has been prepared by Lissitz and Cohen (11).

The Wakulla County Oral Language Project has also been successful in
enabling the teacher to analyze the speech patterns of rural children and
to write drills which will provide alternative patterns where needed (13).
Two distinct teaching strategies are used in the program: (a) Teaching of
a standard English, and (b) teaching a dual system of phonics. The major
objective of the project is to create a classroom dialect that will also
increase the social and economic mobility of the students and their function
in the working situations towards which they aspire (3).

The State of Hawaii has produced extensive training materials for use
with Pidgin-speaking children. Though only partially adaptable for use with
other nonstandard speaking children, the materials would be useful to
individuals developing locally applicable materials. The Hawaii English
Project (HEP) uses a system approach to language learning. The program has
been commended by principals of the participating schools, by visitors to
the classrooms, and by professionals in a variety of educational fields (15).
The reference, *Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Primary School Children in Hilo, Hawaii*, consists of two volumes. The first volume contains an introduction, a description of the project site, the evaluation strategy, the instrumentation, the procedures for the development of materials, the procedures for the presentation of lessons, the data analysis and results of conclusions and recommendations, a bibliography, and a contrastive analysis section. The second volume contains a teacher's guide, audio-visual aids, a phonemic symbol list, a phonology lesson section, a format for structured lesson, a glossary of terms, and a comprehensive bibliography (16).

*The Psycholinguistic Oral Language Program: A Bi-dialectal Approach,* developed by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago under the direction of Lloyd Leaverton, is intended for Afro-American children in grades 1-3, who speak a nonstandard English. The program focuses on specific features, e.g., the absence of forms of the verb *be*, *were* as the past plural of *be*, and the third person singular ending *-s* or *-es*. The language to be used is described as "School Talk" or "Everyday Talk." The materials incorporate the additive approach to dialects and include many pattern drills, followed by dialogs, written exercises, and other classroom activities. The lessons are well structured to prevent errors of distribution, thereby reducing the probability of overcorrection. The teacher is cautioned to watch for interference and not to label items which are a result of hypercorrection as "Everyday Talk." A major attribute of the book is that it provides instruction for teachers on how to protect the child psychologically. The text might be criticized for the inclusion of several paradigmatic pattern practice drills, but an effective teacher could incorporate this type of
habit-forming drill into meaningful contextual exercises (9), (10).

Although somewhat dated (1965), *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, a book produced by the National Council of Teachers of English Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged, contains several sections which would be of use to the elementary teacher or the elementary administrator who is developing a dialect augmentation program. The second section of the book deals specifically with programs at the elementary level, the fifth section contains the recommendations of the task force, and the appendices contain annotated references as well as an index to programs, projects, and participating schools (4).

Other helpful suggestions for those initiating dialect augmentation programs may be found in Yonemura's *Developing Language Programs for Young Disadvantaged Children*, which was discussed in Chapter Ten (18).
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PROGRAMS APPLICABLE FOR HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE STUDENTS

Early work on dialect augmentation was completed for the learning laboratories of the Atlanta, Georgia public schools by Eunice Sims, et al. New materials are being developed, though they are non-attainable from the Atlanta schools. A description of the Atlanta Model is available through ERIC. The program itself focuses on reading instruction, oral pattern practice drills and composition instruction. Especially noteworthy in this program is the provision made for in-service training and for release time for teachers to study the materials. Summer workshops are also utilized for the preparation of teachers (1).

The Pittsburgh Public Schools have developed an oral language program: The Standard Speech Development Program. Although, the program has not been demonstrated to have significantly influenced teacher's attitudes or procedures, revisions and modifications are continuing and the results should be followed. The program, designed for junior high school students, is directed towards the student's control of a standard English through oral pattern drills. A description of this program is available through ERIC (9).

Although somewhat dated (1965), Language Programs for the Disadvantaged, a book produced by the National Council of Teachers of English Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged, contains several sections which would be of use to secondary English teachers or administrators wishing to develop a dialect augmentation program. The second section of the book deals with programs at the secondary level; the fifth section contains the recommendations of the task force; and the
appendices contain annotated references as well as an index to programs, projects, and participating schools (2).

The American Institutes for Research has produced a series of language development training materials, with audio tapes for the Job Corps program. These are soon to be available through the U. S. Government printing office. Principal investigators in this development were George Cropper and Jerry G. Short (4).

COLLEGE LEVEL

The Brown-Tougaloo English Language Project, under the direction of W. Nelson Francis, and with the assistance of Beryl Bailey and Robert Meskill, has produced a course for improving entering freshmen's command of standard English. The emphasis is on the positive factors of standard dialect acquisition and language enrichment. It is built on a solid base of research into English and utilizes several of the techniques of TESOL. It initially emphasizes oral repetitive drill, pattern practice with variation, and a gradual introduction of some organized facts about the structure of standard English. The oral language is dealt with first; reading and writing are delayed until the student has a good command of the phonology of standard English. The appendix in the final project report contains an elaborate analysis of nonstandard syntax, a detailed statistical analysis of the study itself, and copies of the tests used in the study. Although the program has not been demonstrated to be successful, the report has much to offer. It includes a complete analysis of the differences between one non-standard dialect and a standard English. The sections on Construction (A-27) and on Predication
(A-38) are good references. According to one critic of the program, the Brown-Tougaloo Project has provided a wealth of linguistic information which could be very useful, but a program which wasn't too successful. According to Francis himself, "We still don't know what works." In spite of this, the systematic approach to find what does work is noteworthy and the results of this project should be followed (3).

Lin's developmental English program for the culturally disadvantaged at Claflin College used an audiolingual approach for teaching a standard English to entering freshmen. One of the greatest contributions of this program is the emphasis on teacher attitude and motivation--two crucial variables in any program attempting to teach a standard English as an alternative dialect for the nonstandard speaker (8).

The State of Hawaii has developed a Speech-Communication Learning System at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu. Although it is designed for speakers of Pidgin-English, several aspects of the program could be adapted for use in dialect augmentation programs. The programmed materials and accompanying tapes can be completed in ten to fifteen hours.

One interesting feature of this program is the emphasis on para-linguistics rather than the linguistic content and form of English. Emphasis is placed on such variables as eye-contact, loudness, voice-quality, pitch, rate, and articulation. Copies of the scripts used on the tapes as well as the tests employed are available (5), (6).

CONCLUSION

While none of the programs cited in this section have been an
unqualified success, each has characteristics to recommend it. All
have attempted to develop and test materials for teaching nonstandard
speakers a standard English, most have considered the importance of
teacher attitude and motivation, and almost all have stressed the
additive approach to language. Hopefully, as these programs continue
to be tested and revised, they will adequately meet the educational
needs of the speakers of nonstandard dialects.
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CHAPTER TWELVE--THE INFLUENCE OF NONSTANDARD DIALECT ON COMPOSITION AND READING

NONSTANDARD DIALECT AND COMPOSITION

Features of a nonstandard dialect may also interfere with the acquisition of skill in writing a standard English.

In a study of the written compositions of Black inner-city students at a major university, Fasold found that over 40% of the composition errors were due to dialect interference (5). Gibson, in a quantitative examination of differences and similarities in written and spoken messages, found that spoken style was significantly more readable, more interesting, and contained a simpler vocabulary than did the written style (6). Reed found a close analogy between learning a second language and learning to read and write one's native language (8). Ruddell, in "Oral Language and the Development of Other Language Skills," states that the available research evidence strongly suggests a high degree of interrelatedness among the various communications skills. His review of the research indicated that oral language development served as the underlying base for reading and writing achievement (29). In a comparison of the oral and written stylistic structure of a group of inner-city Black students, Smitherman found a significant difference between the oral and written style of the subjects studied. Black children did not write exactly as they spoke. Not only was their writing more formal and precise, it was characterized by greater sophistication and closer adherence to the standard grammar (11). Wolfram cited an informal investigation of college freshmen in inner-city Detroit which revealed that approximately 45% of their misspellings and unacceptable grammatical forms were directly related
to interference from the pronunciation and grammar of their spoken English (14).

Burling, in "Standard Colloquial and Standard Written English: Some Implications for Teaching Literacy to Nonstandard Speakers," stresses the difference between the written and the spoken language (3). This distinction is currently made in few textbooks, yet it appears to be a crucial distinction when dealing with dialect augmentation.

Schotta has recommended that learning a standard English is best approached through writing, for writing is easier to control than speaking and involves less emotional stress (10). It may also be a convenient starting point for another reason. There is little question raised about the value of being able to write in a standard English. Craig presents an interesting and helpful pamphlet, Reading and Writing Standard English, a program in which children's writing is accepted on the basis of successful communication rather than on the basis of mechanics and grammar (4).

SPELLING

Materials have also been developed to assist nonstandard speaking students in acquiring spelling skills. Among these materials are Allen's "English Sounds and Their Spelling" (2), Graham's "Dialect and Spelling" (7), The University of Minnesota Project English Unit 702, "Our System of Spelling" (12), and Venesky's "Linguistics and Spelling" (13). A common theme found in these works is stated by Venesky when he advocates a spelling program based on the speech of the learner rather than on an idealized dialect. He suggests that if sound to spelling relationships are to be used, they
must be based on sound linguistic description, not on mythological "regular" and "irregular" categories (13).
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NONSTANDARD DIALECT AND READING

The literature describing the effects of a nonstandard dialect on learning to read is extensive. Only studies representative of the various viewpoints will be included in this chapter. One of the most frequently used references on this subject is Baratz and Shuy's *Teaching Black Children to Read* (6), which contains a collection of articles on the subject by authorities in the field, including McDavid, Goodman, Labov, Fasold, Baratz, Shuy, Wolfram, and Stewart (6).

Two additional sources of information are Baratz's "Linguistic and Cultural Factors in Teaching Reading to Ghetto Children" (5) and Chall's "Research in Linguistics and Reading Instruction: Implications for Further Research and Practice" (8).

The fact that nonstandard dialect interferes with learning to read has been stated by Baratz (4), (6), Ivey (14), K. Johnson (15), Labov (17), Leaverton (18), Lee (19), Malmstrom (20), Sherk (33), and Smith (27). Plumer noted that nonstandard speakers may have a particularly difficult time in learning to read (25), and K. Johnson stated that the relationship between achievement, especially in reading, and inability to speak standard English has been frequently demonstrated (15).

The value of the oral/aural approach and of learning a standard English before attempting to read has been stressed by Anderson (1), Craig (10), May (21), Plumer (25), and Rudell (29). May, in studying the effects of environment on oral language development reports several studies which indicate the importance of oral language development before reading instruction begins (21). As noted previously, Ruddell
suggests a high degree of interrelatedness among the various communication skills and indicates oral language development serves as the underlying base for the development of reading and writing achievement (29).

The importance of knowing the specific dialect in which the materials are prepared, i.e. standard English, is emphasized by Athey (2), May (21), Milligan (22), Sherk (33), Sepulveda (33), and Smith (37). In a study of the effects of a group language development program on the psycholinguistic abilities and later beginning reading success of kindergarten children, Milligan found that the students participating in the group language development in a standard English BEFORE reading instruction began did significantly better than the control group which did not have the group language development program (22). Sepulveda represents the general impression held by authorities when he states that teaching reading before formal language usage establishes a substantial language barrier which inhibits learning in all areas. Learning to read should only be attempted after listening and speaking skills in a standard English have been acquired (36). Rystrom, on the other hand, rejected the interference hypothesis based on his studies of the effects of standard dialect training on Negro first-graders learning to read. He found that dialect training did not facilitate learning to read (31). He found no significant differences between the groups which would confirm the assumption that dialect training in a standard English has a positive effect upon reading achievement. Indeed, the dialect training seemed to have confused the child (30). Still, the weight of informed opinion and research indicates that speaking a nonstandard dialect does interfere with learning to read.
Numerous approaches to teaching reading to speakers of nonstandard dialects have been advocated. One approach requires that the teacher learn the dialect of the student. She can then mentally translate the student's nonstandard rendition of a reading passage into standard English. This approach has been advocated by Baratz (6), Donelson (12), Smith (37), and Wolfram (43).

Another approach which has many adherents is the language experience approach advocated by Berg (7), Kasdone (16), and Plumer (25). Plumer, in his review of language programs for the disadvantaged, states that researchers and theorists alike agree on the need for rich and varied language experiences as an essential condition for successful reading (25). It has also been suggested that materials should be developed in the dialect of the learner. As might be expected, there are major arguments for and against this approach. Again, only representative statements will be cited.

IN FAVOR OF DIALECT READERS

In view of the amount of interference caused by the nonstandard dialect as well as the serious limitations imposed by delaying reading instruction until a student has a command of an oral standard English, the development of dialect readers is advocated by Baratz (4), (6), K. Johnson (15), Leaverton (18), Lee (19), Malmstrom (20), Modiano (23), (24), Potter (26), Shuy (36), Stewart (38), (39), and Wolfram and Fasold (44). Baratz, in Teaching Black Children to Read, a comprehensive reference on this topic, maintains that literacy must be based on the language the child uses and that materials must be prepared in the
child's own dialect. Specifically, the materials should include only the forms he hears and uses; forms which he doesn't hear and doesn't use would be excluded. Several examples of such materials are included in the text (6). Baratz maintains that beginning readers for speakers of divergent dialects should use familiar language patterns, incorporate controlled vocabulary, and provide a transition to a standard English (4). K. Johnson, after discussing the influence of nonstandard Black dialect on reading achievement, illustrating the problem areas, and citing major points where conflict exists, stresses that nonstandard speaking students need to be taught to read their own dialect with grammatical changes made in the reading texts to match their nonstandard grammar. Later, after they have acquired the decoding process and attained some facility in speaking a standard English, they can be taught to read standard English. He indicates that teachers should ignore the phonological conflict points between nonstandard Black dialect and standard English and concentrate instead on teaching children to read in their dialect while retaining standard spellings in the reading texts (15).

Shuy agrees with this general strategy when he says that beginning reading materials should include the grammatical forms which occur in nonstandard English even though they may be absent in standard English. Grammatical forms which occur in standard English but do not occur in nonstandard English should be excluded from the beginning reading materials. Further, beginning reading materials should be written so that syntactic structures of the written text reflect the syntactic structures of the reader's oral language experience which is consistent with the task at hand—learning to read (36).
Stewart, considered a leader in the area of dialect readers, states that "Baratz and Shuy, Fasold, Wolfram, and myself, all urge using beginning readers in nonstandard dialect...I feel obliged to insist upon the empirical testing of the dialect-interference hypothesis and with it, the use of beginning reading materials in Negro dialect" (38). An example of what dialect readers meeting these characteristics might be like is found in Wolfram and Fasold's article "Toward Reading Materials for Speakers of Black English" which contains three linguistically appropriate passages for speakers of nonstandard Negro dialect (44).

Limited research has been conducted to determine the success of dialect readers. Lee, in a summary of four doctoral dissertations, recommends that reading materials initially use the same sentence structure as the child uses in his speech and incorporate gradual guidance toward improvement of the school language (19). Modiano, after conducting research on the reading development of Mexican and Indian children, concluded that Black children should be taught to read from materials in their own dialect first and then be transferred into the standard dialect materials (23), (24). In his study of reading comprehension among minority children, Potter found that child-generated instructional materials were more effective than materials written in standard English (26).

AGAINST DIALECT READERS

Bailey (3), Ramsey (27), Weber (41), and Weintraub (42) have raised serious objections to the use of dialect readers. Bailey notes that non-standard speakers have receptive competence in standard English and suggests that they need code-breaking skills. Further, the goal is literacy
for a purpose, i.e., learning to read, and since most of what is written is going to be in a standard English, that is the dialect they should learn (3). Weber, in "Some Reservations on the Significance of Dialect in the Acquisition of Reading," states that texts for beginning readers barely reflect the complexity of any child's spoken language. He points out that every child who faces reading for the first time faces a new variety of his language. It is not clearly established that speakers of nonstandard English are at greater odds with their primers than their White age-mates (41). Reed also notes that there is a close analogy between second language learning and learning to read and write one's native language (28); therefore, the nonstandard dialect speaker may not be as disadvantaged as is often claimed.

There is also limited data which supports the case against the use of dialect readers. Weintraub's "Research: Oral Language and Reading" summarizes the findings of numerous investigations which failed to reveal high relationships between measures of speaking and reading. In his review, he cites two studies: (1) Martin's study which demonstrated that the relationship between the oral language used by children and their reading achievement at the end of first grade was virtually negligible, and (2) Winter's study which indicated that learning to read has little or no dependence upon oral language (42). Ramsey, in a comparison of first grade speakers of Black dialect's comprehension of materials presented in standard English and in Black dialect found a statistically significant difference (.01 level) favoring those receiving the standard English treatment. The results of his study did not demonstrate the value of producing beginning reading materials in a Black dialect for Black dialect-speaking children. Neither did it support the contention that teachers of children speaking Black dialect are more
effective if they speak a Black dialect (27).

The most comprehensive statement against dialect readers has been posited by Venesky in his article "Nonstandard Language and Reading." Several studies are cited to support his conclusion that the native literacy approach has yet to be proven scholastically superior. He poses intensive oral language instruction in the national language prior to the teaching of reading as the only logical alternative. The advantage of this approach is that a second language is taught at an age when children acquire new languages most rapidly. If this approach is not used, materials would need to be developed for all varieties of nonstandard dialects. The dialect approach has few merits and many liabilities, but it does provide "ego-support" for the child. This is true only if the child, his parents, and his teachers share this feeling. Venesky suggests that dialect differences per se are not the major barriers for learning to read. What is more important is to allow the child, regardless of his own dialect, to translate his own speech from standard written English. This requires extensive teacher training on what is natural speech for his students. The main points posited by Venesky include: (a) Children whose dialects deviate markedly from standard English should be taught a standard English before they are taught reading; (b) beginning reading materials should, in content, vocabulary, and syntax, be as dialect and culture free as possible; and (c) children should be allowed to translate from writing to that form of language from which they already obtain meaning, i.e. dialect differences should not be considered reading errors (40).
A cogent summary of the alternatives available in the teaching of reading to speakers of nonstandard dialects is set forth by Wolfram who sees two options, each containing two subdivisions: (1) Do not use dialect readers: (a) teach a standard English prior to teaching reading or (b) allow dialect reading of extant materials; (2) Revise existing materials: (a) neutralize dialect differences, or (b) develop dialect readers. Wolfram concludes that acceptance of dialectally appropriate reading of extant materials should be initiated while further experimentation is conducted on the revision of current materials and the use of dialect primers (43). This conclusion seems sound when consideration is given the current controversy and the general lack of empirical evidence on which to base decisions.
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CHAPTER THIRTEEN--MOTIVATION

Even with the development of methods, materials, and programs for teaching nonstandard speakers a standard English as an additional dialect, efforts to teach may still fail if one crucial factor is not considered: The student's motivation to learn a standard English. The importance of motivation has been stressed by V. Allen (1), Brooks (2), Conners (3), Cowen (4), Fasold (5), Feigenbaum (6), Gardner (7), Hart (8), Jacobsen (9), K. Johnson (10), Kochman (11), Labov (12), Lambert (13), Lee (14), Linn (15), (16), Marquardt (17), Martin (18), Politzer (19), Robinett (20), Rosenbaum (21), Scoon (22), and Taylor (23).

V. Allen suggests that the most crucial difference between learning a second language and learning a second dialect is the problem of motivation where the teacher may encounter inertia or hostility (1). Fasold states that without "a viable expectation and desire on the part of the learner to become a member of the group...nothing that goes on in the classroom can make up for its absence" (5). Politzer reiterates this sentiment when he says the "motivational problem may very well be the most crucial one in the entire complex of problems concerning the contribution of the school to the betterment of the language problems" (19).

The problems involved in motivating students to learn a standard English are outlined by Jacobsen. He identifies five significant variables: (a) Racial and/or ethnic pride is usually operating; the members of the minority groups are culturally oriented; (b) relevancy is often lacking; the students see no reason for learning a second dialect; (c) performance capabilities are often low and success has seldom been achieved; therefore the student's
expectations are low; (d) psychological factors often interfere; students from minority groups frequently have a strong group consciousness; attempts to teach them a second dialect may lead to their becoming passive and unresponsive; (e) economic factors are frequently not as important as educators believe them to be; upward mobility for the members of minority groups may not be a motivator (9).

K. Johnson agrees that functional interference may be operating in teaching a standard English; many nonstandard speakers may not want to learn a standard English because it is "whitey's" talk or because it is the talk of the middle and upper class White culture. Further, he notes that standard English is not reinforced in their social environment, and, therefore, may have little chance of being successfully taught without motivation in the classroom (10).

Motivation to learn a second dialect or a second language can be divided into two general categories: (a) instrumental--learning a standard English to manipulate others and to obtain economic, academic, and social goals; and (b) integrative--desiring to become a member of the group using a standard English. Several studies have demonstrated that students having an "integrative" motivation for learning a second dialect have better success in learning that dialect than do students motivated by "instrumental" factors: Cowen (4), Gardner (7), Marquardt (17), and Scoon (22). Martin, however, in his article, "Technology and the Education of the Disadvantaged," places an emphasis on learner manipulation of the learning environment as a means of motivating students (18).
Lambert indicates two psychological aspects which are involved in motivating students to learn a second dialect or a second language. Students need (a) a general language learning aptitude and (b) favorable attitudes toward the other linguistic group, i.e., they must be motivated by a basic desire to communicate with members of the other linguistic group(s) (13).

According to Fasold, the learner will probably be better motivated to learn a standard dialect if he has an expectation of acceptance. Without this expectation, there is a limited probability of success in language or dialect teaching (5). V. All- also notes the critical effect of teacher attitude towards the nonstandard speaker (1). Conners, in a study of the effects of teacher behavior on verbal intelligence of Head Start children found that students rewarded by "warm" teacher response, tended to adopt the teacher's values and, as such would also more likely be motivated to adopt the teacher's way of speaking (3). Gardner states that second dialect learning is definitely fostered by accepting attitudes on the part of both teachers and parents (7).

Motivating a student to learn a second dialect is facilitated if the student is convinced that he can learn the second dialect. Lee emphasizes that students must believe they can change their speaking behavior (14), and Lin notes that one of the greatest challenges in the Claflin Project was to convince the members of the freshman English class that they could change their way of speaking (15), (16).

The importance of motivation in such programs cannot be overrated. As noted, numerous authorities stress the necessity for providing adequate motivation. Yet, very little has been written on how to do it. Most
articles and reports dealing with the question of how to motivate students describe the procedures in broad terms—too general to be of use to the classroom teacher. Brooks, for example, in her article "Motivating Students for Second-language and Second Dialect Learning," says we must find natural and honest ways to motivate and that we should concentrate on two functions of language: Revelation of self and communication (2). These are certainly admirable goals, but the question, How? remains unanswered.

In "Tapping the Resources of Black Culture for Classroom Success," Hart describes several activities which she feels are appropriate for motivating Black youth in the classroom, i.e., using Black literature to teach dialect features, using role playing, using motor muscle activities, using special projects, etc. (8). Practical suggestions of this type are necessary if the classroom teacher is to be successful in motivating students to learn a standard English. Motivational materials are critical, but presently are severely limited in number.
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ANOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SECTION THREE

This bibliography contains selected references which deal with current methods, materials, and programs aimed at teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects. They are coded to refer to the specific topics covered in the chapter number indicated.

Code:
9. Methods
10. Materials
11. Programs
12. Composition and reading
13. Motivation


This article outlines the trends in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects and describes some second-language techniques as they may be applied to dialect differences. Linguistic versatility is stressed as the goal of second dialect teaching, and the importance of working on truly critical features to reach that goal is brought out. The historical basis of many nonstandard features is discussed. Also discussed are the art of conducting meaningful drills, role playing, and reading and writing. The article is ideal for the relatively uninitiated.

Baratz, J. C. Who should do what to whom ... and why: Florida FL Reporter, 1969, 7(1), 75-77, 158-159. (9).

Baratz first discusses the different-deficient argument and concludes that the language of the nonstandard speaker is not deficient, it is merely different. She then cites several reasons for teaching a standard English: (1) it doesn't necessarily make the student devalue his own dialect, (2) in refusing to teach standard English we cut off even further his possibility of entering the mainstream of American life, (3) it hinders his development of oral skills and makes his task of learning to read considerably more difficult. The article concludes with a discussion of what a competent teacher needs to know about language and culture to do an effective job of teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.

This collection of readings, part of the Urban Language Series, consists of eight articles, including: (1) "Dialectology and the Teaching of Reading" by McDavid; (2) "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension" by Goodman; (3) "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English" by Labov; (4) "Orthography in Reading Materials for Black English Speaking Children" by Fasold; (5) "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System" by Baratz; (6) "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black English: Three Linguistically Appropriate Passages" by Wolfram and Fasold; and (8) "On the Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading" by Stewart.


Although this book was written in 1965, several of the findings and recommendations of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged are still relevant in the 1970's. The book is divided into six parts: (1) the Task Force and the problem, (2) programs for the disadvantaged—at all grade levels, (3) findings, (4) points of view, (5) recommendations, and (6) appendixes. The general recommendations made by the Task Force should be of interest to all those involved in teaching a standard English to disadvantaged students.


After attacking the deficit theory and advocating teaching a standard English as an alternate dialect, Feigenbaum comments on promising techniques which can be used in teaching a standard English and on the importance of discussing appropriateness and motivation with the students. He sees the task as one of teaching the recognition and mastery of alternate linguistic forms for use in appropriate situations. Translation is one of the principle pedagogical techniques involved, focusing on one pattern at a time and proceeding systematically. The article concludes with a bibliography.


The author discusses the relative values of standard and nonstandard dialect and stresses the idea of appropriateness of language rather than a corrective attitude toward language differing from the standard. He then illustrates how contrast and comparison of standard and non-standard can be used to facilitate the learning of a standard dialect. He prescribes five basic types of drills: (1) presentation drills, (2) discrimination drills, (3) identification drills, (4) translation drills, and (5) response drills. Suggestions for using the drills in the classroom and for maintaining interest in them are given. Feigenbaum maintains that nonstandard dialect can be profitably utilized in the pedagogy of standard English teaching.

Feigenbaum begins his article by citing the work of others such as Lin, Stewart, and Slager who have successfully used TESOL techniques. He notes that one foundation of TESOL techniques is the cycle of imitation, repetition, and manipulation. He stresses the concept of the appropriateness of language and the necessity for students to hear the difference before they can drill on the use of standard forms. Suggestions for making drills more meaningful and interesting are included. Feigenbaum recommends the sequence usually followed in TESOL, i.e., progressing from passive to active: Hearing-speaking; reading-writing. He notes, however, that the teacher may want to put reading and writing before hearing and speaking to assure that the student is actually focusing on the feature the teacher wants.


The project produced a complete syllabus for a freshman English course for a Southern, predominantly Black college. This program emphasizes the positive factors of standard dialect acquisition and language enrichment. It is built on a solid base of research into English and utilizes several of the TESOL techniques. The program initially emphasizes oral repetitive drill, pattern practice with variation, with gradual introduction of some organized facts about the structure of standard English. Reading and writing are postponed until the student has a good command of the phonological system. The program contains a wealth of linguistic information.


The model described in this article encourages teachers to respect and accept a child's established dialect and at the same time to provide a framework to help the child recognize, learn and hopefully begin to use a standard English. The model uses everyday talk and school talk rather than nonstandard and standard English descriptors. It starts at a point meaningful to the learner, i.e., with an actual statement made by him. It focuses on one pattern at a time and proceeds systematically in accordance with linguistic principles. Within this article there is a discussion of the four striking differences which were found to occur in verb usage.


Johnson describes a study conducted to determine if TESOL techniques
were more effective than traditional techniques for teaching specified grammatical features to tenth grade nonstandard speaking Negro students. The experimental program used a "Standard Oral English," developed by the Los Angeles City Schools, which seeks to teach a standard English as an alternative dialect. When these features were statistically compared between a test group and a control group on pre and post measures, the results confirmed the superiority of TESOL techniques over traditional techniques for teaching a number of standard grammatical features.


Johnson presents a very convincing argument that Black children must learn a standard English because Black dialect handicaps the children who speak it academically, socially, and vocationally. Teaching a standard English will broaden the range and number of vocational opportunities for Blacks. He cites some reasons for our lack of success in teaching a standard English and then advocates using the bidialectist approach since it recognizes the legitimacy of Black dialect and the phenomenon of interference. Included at the end of the article is a five step summary of the second language approach which includes: (1) Recognizing the difference between standard and nonstandard English, (2) hearing the standard English, (3) discriminating between the two forms, (4) reproducing the target feature, and (5) drilling orally on the feature.


Lin reports on the results of an experimental three-year project to teach a standard English to dialect speaking students at Claflin College, South Carolina. The report includes sample lessons, dialogues, interview transcripts, tests, and evaluative charts. Also included in the report are suggestions about pattern practice for TESOL, illustrations of ways to incorporate pattern practice into the classroom activities rather than just introducing meaningless drills. The pattern practices did help students improve control over standard English, but the students were not able to establish firm control in the nine month period. Lin discusses the difficulties encountered in establishing effective programs in second dialect learning as well as the lack of adequate evaluation instruments.


Loban's purpose is to clarify the most crucial language difficulties of speakers of nonstandard dialects to enable teachers to plan an effective, efficient program for teaching a standard English. He discusses and lists several examples of the nonstandard oral usages found in students in grades K-9. Loban suggests speakers of nonstandard dialects may be helped by drill on usage, especially the verb to be. There is no object in drilling all pupils on the same
skill; he says they should be drilled only on those features with which they have difficulty.


This monograph could serve as a model for schools wishing to develop their own curriculum in teaching standard English. The first portion of the monograph cautions teachers not to use the "corrective" approach to language. It then shows that a good program must be based on a careful analysis of the speech patterns which exist in the specific situation. There are two main sections in the monograph. The first deals with the most common problems identified in the speech of the nonstandard speaker. The second section presents a program of instruction, outlines a sequence of activities which might be used including contrastive studies, and suggestions for working with tapes, dialogues, drills and games.


Plumer presents a well-organized, concise, comprehensive review of the literature on language problems of the disadvantaged. He deals with several aspects of the problem including learning to read, general language development, and social status. Although no research is given to support the assumption, he presents historical evidence that achieving the standard dialect is at least an important milestone in an individual's general social progress and that nonstandard dialects have the effect of limiting or confining those who use them. Plumer also notes that researchers and theorists alike agree on the need for rich and varied language experience as an essential condition for successful reading. A bibliography is included.

Politzer, R. L. Problems in applying foreign language teaching methods to the teaching of standard English as a second dialect. Research and development memorandum no. 40, December 1968, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, California. (9), (13).

This report is divided into five sections, each having relevance for the classroom teacher and for the college methods teacher. The first section describes the role of the native dialect and calls for an augmentation approach rather than an attempt at eradication. The second section presents a definition of standard English. The third section outlines special considerations concerning the pupil—both in motivation and in aptitude. The fourth section discusses teaching methodology stressing the audio-lingual approach and its chief pedagogical instruments. The fifth section deals with teacher training and the necessity of the teacher to have knowledge of the structural differences between the target language and the native language of the pupil. A bibliography is included.

This program employs the concept of "everyday talk" and "school talk." This concept helps the children to distinguish between their familiar oral language patterns and those of the standard dialect without designating one as inferior or superior. By utilizing these terms the teacher is at no time required to tell the children they are "talking wrong" and thus run the risk of causing them to develop negative feelings toward the speech patterns of their family and community. On the contrary, the program encourages the teacher to accept and respect the children's established dialect and at the same time provides a framework through which the children systematically and gradually learn to use standard English in their oral language activities.


Salisbury presents convincing arguments for teaching a standard English since for at least the next generation large segments of minority citizens will remain in a socially and economically disadvantaged status, penalized because their life styles and languages differ from the establishment's norm. Teachers of English as a Second Language and Teachers of English as a Second Dialect should seek to broaden the linguistic versatility of their students, giving them greater social acceptance and mobility, a broader range of options, and greater ability to compete on an equal footing with other members of the mainstream society. He then goes on to show how role playing can be used to provide a link between the classroom drill and the real life situation.


The emphasis in the article is on the interaction of language and its social context. Saville discusses several types of interference: linguistic, psychological, cultural, and educational. Under educational interference Saville includes unsuitable instructional materials, bad teaching methods, educational segregation of minority groups, and negative attitudes held by teachers. A comprehensive bibliography is included at the end of the article.


This book is the result of two years of research at Abbott House, an institution for dependent New York City children, many of whom speak Harlem English. The oral language program presented in the book would also be applicable to Pidgin English, Creole English, nonstandard forms of Appalachian English, and other varieties of nonstandard dialect used throughout the United States. The introductory sections of the book stress the importance of attitudes toward language variety and the
additive approach to learning a standard English. A variety of exercises and activities are suggested to meet the needs of these young nonstandard speaking children. These activities were carried out in a program that also emphasized children's social, affective, and aesthetic development.
SECTION FOUR

TEACHER PREPARATION
INTRODUCTION

The teacher is probably the most crucial variable in the success of any dialect program. As has been repeatedly noted in this report, the sensitivities among minority groups demand a new and humane basis for the teacher's actions in teaching a standard English—namely, the understanding that a standard English is taught not because it is "correct," but because it is a socially, educationally, and vocationally useful dialect. This requirement forces a re-orientation of teachers from an absolutist to a relativistic attitude toward language—an orientation which may be contrary to the value systems of many teachers.

It is widely held, though as yet unproven, that a relativistic attitude toward language will emerge if teachers and students acquire more knowledge about dialects, particularly nonstandard dialects, in social-historical perspective. Yet as has been repeatedly observed, many teachers are uninformed about the nature of dialects.

This section of the report presents descriptions of past and current teacher preparation programs, a description of an ideal teacher preparation program, and examples of materials and programs which could be used as models for institutions preparing teachers (both pre- and in-service) for teaching a standard English.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN--PAST AND PRESENT TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Teacher preparation programs have not provided the informational background necessary for successfully teaching a standard English. Research conducted in 1961 by the National Council of Teachers of English and reported in The National Interest and the Teaching of English, clearly indicated that deficiencies exist in the preparation of both elementary and secondary school teachers for teaching about language. The results indicated that teacher preparation was "grievously deficient" (11). A follow-up study conducted in 1964 indicated that the teacher training programs remained inadequate (12). This early criticism of teacher preparation has been widely repeated:

In considering the total problems of language study, we face our own appalling ignorance of the subject. Few preparing for teaching in our college courses have studied even traditional English grammar, much less the history of language, lexicography, semantics, English dialects, and similar related concerns. With only 40% of all English majors reasonably educated about language, with most elementary teachers possessing absolutely no formal work in language except what can be squeezed into a general curriculum course, the profession has before it an enormous program of re-education (22).

Studies conducted in various states support the contention that teacher preparation for teaching language is inadequate. Grise found that only 4% of the teachers in Kentucky were able to meet the specific recommendations for competence in teaching a standard English (3). Hess found that both elementary and secondary English teachers in Minnesota were inadequately prepared to teach a standard English and held uninformed attitudes about language and dialect (4). Hook, in his evaluation of the teachers' preparation in Illinois, concluded that few English teachers were required to complete courses which would prepare them for teaching modern English grammar, composition, or
the history of the English language. Even fewer teachers were aware of the enormous amount of research being conducted on this topic (5). In his study of the English methods courses in selected Tennessee colleges and universities, Smith found that little time was devoted to language study or oral English. Fewer than half the instructors had participated in recent graduate courses or had read extensively in areas covering comprehensive research and publication (19).

Light cites several national studies which indicate the inadequacy of teacher preparedness for teaching a standard English—many teachers have a limited knowledge base and inappropriate attitudes. He also notes that funds do not appear to be available for upgrading this preparation (8). McDavid's "Social Dialects and Professional Responsibility" also stresses the lack of adequate teacher preparation: McDavid states that for the past thirty-seven years the emphasis of English graduate departments has been almost exclusively on the teaching of literature (10).

Project Grammar: The Linguistic and Language Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English evaluated the linguistics and grammar courses being taught in colleges and universities in the United States. The results indicated nearly unanimous agreement that "The present language preparation of most English teachers is grossly inadequate" (13). Rodney's study also notes the inadequacy of present in-service and pre-service programs for training teachers in the development of oral language skills for disadvantaged students (15). A succinct summary of the current state of teacher preparation is found in Shuy's comment:
"Little needs to be said about extant teacher preparation that would enable even the most intelligent and well-intentioned teacher to handle language problems of disadvantaged children. It doesn't exist" (17). Shuy calls for a complete overhaul of teacher training programs and for a merging of linguists and educators (17).

Adequate programs for the preparation of teachers of nonstandard speaking students do not exist. The results of inadequate preparation are clearly evident in teachers' knowledge and attitudes about language and dialect. Several studies have demonstrated that teachers do not possess the necessary information about language, specifically about dialect and usage. Pooley found no agreement among English teachers about English usage despite a thirty-year backlog of linguistic evidence on the topic (14). Similar findings were reported by Hess (4). San Su C. Lin, in "Disadvantaged Student or Disadvantaged Teacher?", points out that while some students may not have adequate understanding and control of a standard English, too many of their teachers know very little about—much less accept—any form of nonstandard English. She stresses that both teachers and students are in a sense "disadvantaged" (9).

Hughes demonstrated that randomly selected urban teachers lacked the linguistic sophistication to discuss or even consistently identify the features of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary with which they were presumably dealing in the classroom (6). In a second study, Hughes found that teachers held naïve attitudes about language. Since negative or corrective attitudes in the teaching of language arts tend to inhibit the disadvantaged child and to close off teacher-student communication, he
recommends an educational workshop on language systems (7).

Shuy has noted that teachers are incredibly incapable of recognizing and classifying nonstandard features (16). In a recent study of thirty urban teachers, Shuy found that the teachers were unable to give a precise description of their students' speech and did not know how to proceed in making such a description. The teachers' concepts of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation were formed by "popular folk-lore" rather than linguistic knowledge (18). Frogner's analysis of teacher responses to the "Language Inquiry," an instrument she designed to obtain information about concepts and attitudes towards language, revealed a puristic and unrealistic awareness of language. The respondents displayed a lack of depth in background as well as a lack of understanding of the English language (2).

Inadequate teacher preparation and the resulting, uninformed beliefs held by teachers about language has direct implications for the schools. As noted in the preface to the Project English materials from the University of Minnesota:

Linguistic scholars have developed an extensive body of knowledge (information and concepts) about language, and a quantity of reliable information is available to the mature student of language. Little of this body of knowledge or of its implications to the English language has penetrated the secondary school curriculum.... Information long known to linguists has had little influence on attitudes and instructional techniques of teachers....Information about language known to psychologists, philosophers, and anthropologists has had even less impact on the high school curriculum (21).

James Squire supported this contention in his study of high school English programs. He noted that "we should like to report instruction that reflects recent developments in language—in structural and generative grammar, in lexicography, dialects, the history of the language—but
awareness of a language program in this sense, for most schools, seems still a thing of the future" (20).

SUMMARY

Studies on both the state and national level have indicated that (a) past and present teacher preparation programs for teaching a standard English are inadequate, (b) this inadequate preparation has resulted in most teachers having uninformed ideas and attitudes about language and dialect, and (c) therefore, the language programs in most schools are not adequate to meet the needs of nonstandard speaking students.
REFERENCES - Past and Present Teacher Preparation Programs


*See annotated bibliography at the end of Section Four.*
CHAPTER FIFTEEN—IDEAL TEACHER PREPARATION

Suggestions for establishing adequate programs for the preparation of language teachers have been made by the College Entrance Examination Board (19), by the Illinois State-wide Curriculum Center for the Preparation of Secondary School Teachers of English (ISCPET) (13), and by the English Teacher Preparation Study (ETPS) which includes a comprehensive set of guidelines for teacher preparation (45).

English educators and linguists have repeatedly stressed the necessity of teachers having a knowledge about dialect. If research results are to be utilized, and, if current, successful programs are to be implemented on a larger scale, it is essential that teachers acquire specific information, attitudes, and skills. The following synthesis of these variables as recommended by authorities in the field contains four key requirements.

First, teachers must have an accepting attitude toward language and language variations. They should both recognize and accept variety in children's language as well as maintain objectivity about dialects. This position has been emphasized by numerous educators and linguists including H. Allen (2), V. Allen (3), (4), Arnold and Taylor (6), Baratz (8), (9), Brooks (11), Cassidy (12), Connors (14), Cooksey (15), Cromach (17), Galvan and Troike (20), Imhoof (21), K. Johnson (22), Malmstrom (29), and Wolfram (46). Teachers should accept regional, social, and ethnic dialects as normal, natural variations of a language. Many educators emphasize that teacher attitude is the most crucial variable in teaching a standard English to nonstandard speakers: V. Allen (4), Cromach (17), Cooksey (15),
Galvan and Troike (20), K. Johnson (22), and Wolfram (46). Imhoof contends that teachers must not only be accepting, but also resourceful, magnetic, self-knowledgeable, and loving (21).

Second, teachers should have an adequate linguistic knowledge base about language and dialect in general, and about the major nonstandard dialects which their students might use. Several authoritative descriptions of nonstandard dialects features are noted in Section One. The importance of adequate linguistic knowledge is stressed by H. Allen (1), V. Allen (3), Arnold and Taylor (6), Bailey (7), Baratz (9), Billiard (10), Crisp (16), Galvan and Troike (20), Imhoof (21), K. Johnson (22), Light (24), S. Robinett (36), Shuy (41), Smith (43), and Wolfram (46). Bailey states that an introductory course in linguistics is imperative for English teachers to alert them to the pervasive nature of the language problems and to provide them with minimum tools for coping with them (7). Billiard suggests that teacher education programs should place a greater emphasis on the study of usage, social dialects, and motivation (10). Crisp contends that such programs should contain more courses in grammar, the English language, and writing directed toward teaching high school students (16). H. Allen notes that all teachers, grades K-12, should be instructed about geographical and social dialects as well as language usage (2). Baratz states that a competent teacher should be knowledgeable about dialects in general as well as have specific training in the dialect of the children she will be teaching (8). K. Johnson states that it is critical that teachers be knowledgeable as to the nature of nonstandard Negro dialect and the specific ways in which it can interfere with learning a
standard English (22). B. Robinett suggests that teachers need instruction in three basic areas: Linguistics, the English language, and professional education. Within the first two areas she recommends the inclusion of three courses: Introduction to Linguistics, Applied Phonetics, and Modern English Grammar (36).

Shuy views the study of children's language as the central core for teacher preparation programs. Areas of suggested study include the general nature of language, the specific study of nonstandard English, field work in child language, and oral language and reading (41). Shuy recommends that the preparation of language arts teachers be overhauled to place language at the center of the program. Teachers need to know how to deal with the child's language, how to listen and respond to it, how to diagnose what is needed, how to best teach alternative linguistic systems, and how to treat dialect as a positive and healthy entity. This can best be achieved through such pre-service college courses as (a) the nature of language—language attitudes, stereotypes, phonetics, grammar, the systematic nature of language, (b) language variation—geographic and social dialects, (c) fieldwork in child language—experience in recording and analyzing language data from at least one child-subject, and (d) teaching standard English to the disadvantaged child (42). Wolfram contends that an understanding of the systematic differences between nonstandard dialects and standard English would provide for the most effective teaching of a standard English (46).

Smith states that teacher training programs should include dialectology, speech sound analysis, and the concept of phonemes. He says
that an effective reading teacher must either learn the child's dialect or teach the standard dialect as a second language (43).

Light has also identified some key elements in training programs for teachers of nonstandard speakers including: Information about the nature of language, an understanding of language variations, knowledge about interference, and an approach that stresses a standard English as a supplement rather than a replacement. Teachers need to: (a) Know that systematic language features are to be emphasized, (b) understand situational factors, and (c) be aware of the resources and studies concerning social dialects, reading, second language teaching and learning that are available through such organizations as the National Council of Teachers of English and the Center for Applied Linguistics (24).

Along with an accepting attitude towards dialects and accurate information about dialects, a third requisite for adequate teacher preparation is knowledge of the culture of the nonstandard speaking student. This cultural orientation has been stressed by such authorities as V. Allen (17), Baratz (9), and Imhoof (21). Knowledge of the students' cultural background is particularly important when working with nonstandard speakers for whom English is often a second language, e.g., the Mexican-Americans, the Puerto-Ricans, and the American Indians.

The fourth requisite for adequate teacher preparation is knowledge of the various methods which have been found to be effective in language teaching which may be helpful in teaching a second dialect as well as a second language. Chapter Nine discussed several promising methods which could be used or adapted for second language teaching. The need for incorporating such methods into teacher training programs has been stressed by
Baratz (9), Billiard (10), Imhoof (21), Light (24), Preston (33), B. Robinett (36), and Shuy (42). Specifically, Baratz, states that teachers should learn some foreign language teaching techniques, some procedures used in speech therapy, and some critical information about the language arts curricula and how language study can be integrated into the study of reading and writing (9). B. Robinett stresses that professional education should include courses in methods in teaching English as a second language and a practicum in teaching English as a second language (36).

Shuy, in commenting on how an effective teacher of English should approach teaching a standard English, states five questions which teachers should ask: (a) Is what I am teaching the most important thing for my students? (b) Is my teaching unbigated? (c) Am I giving my students the most useful alternatives for their self-fulfillment? (d) Am I using the dynamic and timely principles and data for understanding the system of language they use? and (e) Is my language teaching developing healthy attitudes toward human rights? (39). In order to answer the preceding five questions affirmatively, the teacher should be able to: (a) Recognize and react adequately to contrastive language patterns, (b) do something about them when appropriate, and (c) keep from doing something about them when appropriate. Shuy states that the development of these abilities requires maturation time. Therefore, ideally, in-service teachers should participate in a one year, part-time program (42).
REFERENCES - Ideal Teacher Preparation
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CHAPTER SIXTEEN--MATERIALS AND PROGRAMS
FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

Limited materials have been developed which might be used for pre- and in-service teachers' training in dialect and dialect learning.

American Dialects for English Teachers, an organized study of American dialects, could be used as a text in a course in English language or in English methods for a one to four week period. The manual includes seven articles on dialect: (a) "Historical, Regional and Social Variation" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.; (b) "The Study of Dialects: by N. Louanna Furbee; (c) "Suggestions for Teaching American Dialects" by A. L. Davis; (d) "Problem Areas in Grammar" by William Card and Virginia G. McDavid; (e) "Speech Samples of Disadvantaged Children" by N. Louanna Furbee, Emily P. Norris, and Dagna Simpson; (f) "Abbreviated Checklist of Lexical Items in Dialects" by A. L. Davis; and (g) "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Teaching suggestions and an annotated bibliography are included in the manual (4).

Available from: A. L. Davis, Center for American English, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois, 60616. (Free or on loan.) Also in ERIC: ED 032 298, but not available from EDRS.

Developing Language Curricula: Programmed Exercises for Teachers, Michigan Oral Language Series, introduces teachers to the basic principles of language analysis applicable in classrooms having non-English speaking or nonstandard speaking Spanish-American students. The programmed exercises for use by individuals or groups cover (a) the nature of language, (b) attitudes toward language, (c) contrast in vowel sounds, (d) consonant sounds, (e) suprasegmentals; stress pitch, and pause, and (f) the ordered forms of words (13), (15).
Introduction to English Language Study for Elementary Teachers, produced by the Texas Education Agency, consists of three volumes which could be used in a long-term course. Eleven units are covered: Linguistics and the nature of language, The history of the English language, English phonology, Language development in the child, The English language in America (American dialects), Grammar: A new view, English morphology, Patterns in English syntax, English transformations, Lexicography: Meaning and dictionaries, and The structural approach in teaching English. While the section on regional dialects is comprehensive, there is no specific treatment of social dialectology or nonstandard dialects. Nonetheless, this program could provide a solid general foundation about dialects (8), (16).

Dialects and Dialect Learning, a self-contained in-service course for elementary and secondary teachers, could be used with undergraduates in teacher preparation programs. The course is composed of four programmed, instructional units with accompanying tape recordings and evaluation materials. Directed toward teacher understanding of the major nonstandard dialects in America, the course provides information about dialects in general, the phonetics of American English, and features of nonstandard usage which commonly occur in American speech. Specifically, the four units treated are: (a) "About Dialects," (b) "Broad Phonetic Transcription," (c) "Analyzing Nonstandard Dialects," and (d) "Curriculum Decisions." (11), (12).

Learning a Standard English, a sequel to Dialects and Dialect Learning, is designed to prepare teachers to implement a classroom management system for individualizing the teaching of a standard English to nonstandard speakers. The goal of the materials is augmentation—the addition of a second dialect to the student's range of skills—with every respect accorded the dialect the student brings to the classroom.

The course is composed of six units: (a) "Individualization: The Basic Assumption," (b) "Eliciting Speech Streams," (c) "Creating an Individualized Usage Curriculum," (d) "Selecting, Organizing and Banking Curriculum Materials," (e) "Teaching English as a Second Dialect: Adapting and Creating Curriculum Materials," and (f) "Classroom Procedures, or What to Do Until the Computer Comes" (9).

For further information on this program write to: Dr. Karen Hess, CEMREL, Inc., 1640 East 78th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55423.

Other references and materials which could be used in preparing teachers to teach a standard English to speakers of nonstandard speakers have been described in Chapter Ten. Especially relevant for teacher preparation would be the Spring and Summer, 1969 issue of the Florida FL Reporter (1), Baratz and Shuy's Teaching Black Children to Read (3), Fasold and Shuy's Teaching a Standard English in the Inner City (7), and Imhoof's Viewpoints (10).

INSERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION

All of the preceding materials would be suitable for in-service teacher preparation. The in-service education of teachers of English should be an on-going process which can be organized in a variety of ways. Several schools offer professional growth courses which would be ideally suited for a course
in dialect and dialect learning. Other schools conduct summer workshops which would also be well suited for instruction in dialect and dialect learning, e.g., the Atlanta Public Schools' practice of having a three week summer workshop where teachers learn new techniques for reading instruction, oral pattern practice drills and composition instruction (2). Another successfully used approach is the institute, e.g., the EPDA Institute in Standard English as a Second Dialect, a six week institute for teachers from the Tampa, Florida area, designed to provide teachers with: (a) a basic understanding of modern linguistics and its implications for second dialect teaching, (b) a grasp of the structural similarities and differences between Black dialects and general American English, and (c) an awareness of the Black part of America's heritage. Visiting lecturers contributed to this institute during which participants developed a set of materials by which they could apply newly acquired information and skills to their own classroom situations (6).

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION

The inadequacy of courses presently available for pre-service teacher education, has been noted in Chapter Fourteen. An exception to the generally inadequate college courses is Indiana University's program which might be used as a model by colleges and universities wishing to institute an adequate program for preparing students to teach a standard English as a second dialect. The M. S. Program in Teaching Standard English as an Alternate Dialect, at Indiana University's School of Education, has as its primary objective to develop an awareness and sensitivity in language arts teachers as well as the skills necessary to help
their students use a standard English in appropriate situations. Indiana also has a course in Black English which is open to both undergraduate and graduate students. Additional workshops on dialect are held each summer. Descriptive materials from Indiana University are included on the following pages to provide an example of a relatively complete program in dialect.
L431 Black English (3 cr.)

This course will investigate the basic features of Black English as a formally structured language system particularly as it differs from other systems of English in its phonological and grammatical structures. It will explore attitudes toward speech and the relationship of language differences to the attainment of educational goals. (Also open to undergraduates.)

L490 Research in Applied Linguistics (arr.)

Individual research in Applied Linguistics. (Also open to undergraduates.)

L500 Introduction to the Study of Language (3 cr.)

A general introduction to the scientific study of language, with emphasis upon different theoretical approaches, their relevance and application for language teachers. A survey of descriptive (structural and generative), historical, and "hyphenated" linguistics.

L502 Aspects of Traditional and Structural English Grammar (3 cr.)

An examination of the salient features of pre-generative treatments of English grammar with emphasis upon their pedagogical application in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages.

L504 Introduction to Transformational Grammar for TESOL (3 cr.)

Readings in generative theory with emphasis upon the ability to analyze within the framework of a transformational grammar. Special attention to generative treatments of English phonology and syntax for pedagogical purposes. P: Educ. L500, L502*

*Stated prerequisites may be waived with the approval of the departmental adviser.
L522 Topics in Applied Linguistics (3 cr.)

Intensive readings in professional journals on selected topics relevant to the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Readings will, for the most part, be current and subject to change as the course is offered. P: Educ. L500, L502

L524 Bilingualism and Bidialectism in Urban Schools (3 cr.)

A survey of the nature and extent of the educational problems faced by speakers of a nonstandard variety of English in inner city schools.

L526 Professional Writing in TESOL (3 cr.)

Practical experience in writing professional papers, articles, and reports on a variety of topics in the field of second language or alternate dialect acquisition. Ordinarily this course is elected concurrently with L522. P: 9 credit hours in approved graduate language study.

L529 English as a Foreign Language in Developing Countries (2 cr.)

Examination of TESOL programs in selected areas of the world with emphasis on those innovative solutions to language learning problems developed in a particular country which are applicable to similar problems in other locales.

L532 Second Language Acquisition (3 cr.)

A survey of the major theories of first and second language learning and the implications of these theories for language teaching.

L534 Methods and Materials for TESOL (5 cr.)

Review of current methods and materials in teaching English to speakers of other languages with special emphasis on the preparation and demonstration of classroom teaching materials. P: 9 credit hours in approved graduate study.

L536 Methods and Materials for TESOL Teacher-Trainees (3 cr.)

Study and analysis of current methods and materials in TESOL. Development and evaluation of practical exercises, visual aids,
and demonstration materials for use by teacher-trainers in pre-service and in-service English teacher-training programs overseas. P: 18 credit hours in approved graduate language study.

L538 Methods and Materials in Teaching Standard English as an Alternate Dialect (3 cr.)

Review of current methods and materials in teaching standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects—especially nonstandard Negro speech. Emphasis on the preparation and demonstration of classroom teaching materials applicable in inner city schools. P: 12 credit hours in approved graduate language study.

L550 Language testing (3 cr.)

Consideration of theories of assessing competence in a second language, combined with preparation and trial administration of tests. Primary emphasis on English as a second language or alternate dialect. P: Educ. L500, L532.

L552 Contrastive Analysis (3 cr.)

Practice in various methods of analysis, with application to selected languages in addition to English in terms of phonetics, phonemics, morphology, and syntax. Consideration of potential interference and facilitation. P: Educ. L500, L502, L504.

L556 Instructional Techniques in the Language Laboratory (2 cr.)

Instructional rationale, equipment, and practical operation of the language laboratory. Lectures on theory combined with actual use of laboratory equipment.

L589 Programmed Foreign Language Instruction (2 cr.)

Theory and practice of programmed instruction for problems of foreign language acquisition; review of existing program material, practice in preparation of small-scale programs.

L590 Independent Research in Second Language Learning (arr.)
TEXTBOOKS USED IN THE URBAN AND OVERSEAS ENGLISH PROGRAMS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY/BLOOMINGTON

Aeter, Collier, Steinberg. *Utterances and Response Drills.*

Andersson, T. and Boyer. *Bilingual Schooling in the U.S., Vol I, II.*

Bollinger. *Aspects of Language.*

Carroll, John. *Language and Thought.*

Chomsky, Noam. *Language and Mind.*

Gleason, H.A. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics.*

Harris, David. *Reading Improvement Drills.*

Harris, David. *Testing English as a Second Language.*


Horn, Thomas. *Reading for the Disadvantaged.*

Hudson and Imhoof. *From Paragraph to Theme.*

Jacobs and Rosenbaum. *English Transformational Grammar.*

Jacobs and Rosenbaum. *Grammar I.*

Jacobs and Rosenbaum. *Grammar II.*


Lenneberg, Eric. *New Directions in the Study of Language.*

McNeill, David. *The Acquisition of Language.*

Slobin, Dan. *Psycholinguistics.*


Williams, E. *Language and Poverty.*
BLACK ENGLISH WORKSHOP

Indiana University
Institute of Afro-American Studies,
College of Arts and Sciences; and
Urban and Overseas English Programs,
School of Education

Intersession 1971, June 2-17.

Purpose

The advent of the study of differences between Black and White speech behavior has called attention to the inadequacies of many language programs conceived by middle class White or Black educators. The workshop will stimulate and develop certain basic understandings, concepts, and attitudes concerning these speech differences as well as address itself to the problems of developing an adequate description and pragmatic knowledge of Black English. Specifically, the workshop would develop:

1. understanding of the basic features of Black English as a formally structured language system,
2. understanding of the attitudes toward speech and speech behavior by Blacks,
3. the attitude that the nonstandard speaker is not aberrant or underdeveloped,
4. the attitude that what constitutes standard English is socially and arbitrarily determined,
5. understanding that students may learn a second dialect just as they learn a second language, without attempting to destroy the first.

NOTE:

The visiting lecturers in the summer of 1971 were Geneva Smitherman, Wayne State Univ. (now at Harvard) and Adrian Cox, Wayne State Univ. (now at Indiana Univ.).

Next summer we are planning a program of Black English, Methods of Teaching Alternate Dialects of English, and a Reading Methods (with an emphasis on teaching Black children to read).
BLACK ENGLISH WORKSHOP

Sponsors

The workshop will be offered in the School of Education under the direction of the Urban and Overseas English Programs and sponsored by the Institute of Afro-American Studies, College of Arts and Sciences.

Program

Mrs. Beverly Huntsman, a member of the Urban and Overseas English Programs, will coordinate the workshop which will include lectures by such outstanding specialists in the field of sociolinguistics as Walter Wolfram and Roger Shuy from the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D. C., and Kenneth R. Johnson, Assistant Professor of Education from the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. Additional contributions will be made by Indiana University specialists in urban studies.

Workshop Topics

I. Black English defined
II. Strategies for studying Black speech
III. Black English as an alternate language system: Description and comparison
   A. Phonology
   B. Morphology
   C. Syntax
IV. Black English and Black experience
V. Black English and success in school
   A. Reading
   B. Writing
   C. Standard English
VI. Black English and success in the world of work

Credit

The workshop is designed for those interested in linguistic-cultural differences and the educational implications arising from such differences: Students of language and sociology, teachers of all levels, school administrators. Qualified students in the workshop may earn three hours of graduate credit by registering for Education L590, Independent Research in Second Language Learning.

Participants in the workshop who are interested in the classroom applications of dialect and cultural information are encouraged to enroll in Education L538, Teaching Standard English as an Alternate Dialect, to be offered during the regular summer session. (June 18 - August 7).

Information

To reserve a place in the workshop, since enrollment will be limited to 30 participants, prior to registration students must contact:

Dr. Maurice Imhoof, Coordinator
Urban and Overseas English Programs
029 Education Building
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Telephone: 337-4018
Urban Language Lecture Series

Monday, February 9, 1970
Peter S. Rosenbaum
Associate Professor of Education
Director of the Center for Educational Technology
Teachers College, Columbia University

Thinking about Priorities in the Improvement of Language Instruction

Mr. Rosenbaum's presentation will take as its point of departure a conception of language instruction in which the essential elements are content, learning activities (mediation), supervision (control), and contingencies. After a brief development of this conception, appropriate criteria for evaluating the adequacy of language instruction programs will be adduced. Finally, these criteria will be applied in the evaluation of prevailing instructional practices, and the evaluation itself will serve as a basis for assigning priorities in efforts to improve instructional technique.

Wednesday, March 4, 1970
Roger W. Shuy
Director of the Sociolinguistics Program
Center for Applied Linguistics

Sociolinguistic Strategies in Studying Urban Speech

The advent of the study of urban speech has called attention to the inadequacies of past linguistic approaches to data acquisition as well as analytical modes. Recent studies have made important suggestions for changes to the fieldworker, the analyst, and the person who applies the material in the classroom. Foremost among these suggestions, and those which Mr. Shuy will discuss, are recognition of the concept of the language continuum, the linguistic variable, the matter of contextual style, subjective reactions, and social stratification.

Wednesday, March 11, 1970
Walter A. Wolfram
Research Associate in the Sociolinguistics Program
Center for Applied Linguistics

Black/White Speech Differences Revisited

Mr. Wolfram will investigate the various claims about the relationship of the speech of blacks and whites, from the extreme claims of dialectologists who believe that they are identical to the claims of some descriptive linguists, who insist that they are actually different languages. The features crucial to these arguments will be examined in terms of objective evidence, and Mr. Wolfram will offer a "realistic" conclusion about the relationship based on the available data.

This lecture is co-sponsored by the Speech and Hearing Center.

Thursday, April 16, 1970
Kenneth R. Johnson
Assistant Professor of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

Nonstandard Negro Dialect and the Implications for Educating Students Who Speak It

Mr. Johnson's lecture will cover the following topics: (1) the nature of language and dialects; (2) teachers' attitudes toward nonstandard Negro dialect and false instructional assumptions arising from these attitudes; (3) the phonological and grammatical systems of nonstandard Negro dialect; (4) interference in reading and language learning caused by nonstandard Negro dialect; (5) teaching standard English to Negro students who speak nonstandard Negro dialect.

This lecture is co-sponsored by the Institute of Afro-American Studies.
Thursday, April 23, 1970
Helen H. Johnson
Principal of McMichael Junior High School
Detroit, Michigan

Teacher Attitudes and Ghetto Language

The basic thesis of Miss Johnson's speech may be summarized as follows: Many English teachers waste valuable time on lessons of values, attitudes, and etiquette. They use standard English as the sole selector of the winners or the losers; they make no attempts to understand or evaluate the language behavior of the students; and they develop lessons which reject children and isolate citizens. These teachers are not merely wasting time, they are wasting lives. If the primary purpose of English education is upward mobility, then teachers should educate, open, and enrich the minds of children before they attend to language tidiness.

Thursday, April 30, 1970
Joshua A. Fishman
University Research Professor of Social Sciences
Yeshiva University

Spanish and English among Puerto Ricans in New York

Puerto Rican intellectual and organizational elites in New York have begun to ideologize Spanish language maintenance and Puerto Rican cultural emphases. Among ordinary Puerto Ricans such views are still very uncommon. The elites are more aware of their sociolinguistic repertoire in both Spanish and English and have greater repertoire ranges in both languages. Nevertheless, even ordinary Puerto Ricans are sufficiently language conscious to give valid self-report data in connection with many of these matters. Mr. Fishman will explain how, on the whole, language usage, self-report claims, attitude, and behavior are meaningfully and corroboratively interrelated.

This lecture is co-sponsored by the Research Center for the Language Sciences.
Graduate Department of Urban and Overseas English Programs (applied linguistics)

PROGRAMS OFFERED

Master of Science in Education (36 credits)

Majors:  Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
         Teaching Standard English in Urban Schools

Minor:   Teaching Standard English to Speakers of Other Languages and Dialects (15 credits) (for American students only)

Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (20 credits) (for foreign students only)

English Language Improvement Courses (for American and foreign students)

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMS

Master of Science in Education

The master's degree program has been designed to prepare personnel in one of two areas—teaching English to speakers of other languages or teaching standard English in urban schools.

Major in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

The overall objective of this major is to prepare persons for leadership positions in English education programs abroad. Candidates for this major should demonstrate:

1. thorough knowledge of English structure and language pedagogy;
2. ability to interpret theoretical concepts for application by classroom teachers; and
3. skill in applying theoretical knowledge and practical experience toward the improvement of national English programs in developing countries.

Major in Teaching Standard English in Urban Schools

The overall objective of this major is to prepare persons for English teaching and supervisory positions in inner-city schools. In addition to 1 and 2 above, candidates for this major should demonstrate:

4. qualities of personality and attitudes about language judged to be essential for successful work in ghetto schools;
5. understanding of the educational problems of bilingualism and bidialectism; and
6. ability in applying the techniques of modern language methodology to the teaching of standard English as an alternate dialect.

Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

The certificate program has been designed to prepare foreign students to become proficient teachers of English as a foreign language. Students in this program should demonstrate:

1. attainment of specified standards of performance in all four of the English language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing;
2. ability to plan and implement meaningful classroom activities appropriate to stated instructional goals; and
3. skill in using the resources of contributory fields, such as applied linguistics and educational psychology, in solving language-learning problems.

English Language Improvement Courses

The English language improvement courses have been designed to bring the native and nonnative students' language skills to a standard of proficiency needed to pursue regular degree programs in American universities. Extensive practice is provided in the reading comprehension and expository writing activities essential to academic success at the college level.
ADMISSION PROCEDURE

Students interested in enrolling in this Department should obtain application materials from the Office of the Graduate Division, School of Education. Completed forms, together with official transcripts of all undergraduate and graduate work taken at institutions other than Indiana University, should be returned to:

Graduate Division
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Students interested in enrolling in the English language improvement courses should apply directly to the Department of Urban and Overseas English Programs.

Applications for admission must be filed by July 15 for the fall semester and December 15 for the spring semester.

COURSES

L500 Introduction to the Study of Language (3 cr.)
L502 Aspects of Traditional and Structural English Grammar (3 cr.)
L504 Introduction to Transformational Grammar for TESOL (3 cr.)
L522 Professional Reading in TESOL (3 cr.)
L524 Bilingualism and Bidialectism in Urban Schools (3 cr.)
L526 Professional Writing in TESOL (3 cr.)
L529 English as a Foreign Language in Developing Countries (2 cr.)
L532 Second Language Acquisition (3 cr.)
L534 Methods and Materials for TESOL (3 cr.)
L536 Methods and Materials for TESOL Teacher-Trainers (3 cr.)
L538 Methods and Materials in Teaching Standard English as an Alternate Dialect (3 cr.)
L550 Language Testing (3 cr.)
L552 Contrastive Analysis (3 cr.)
L556 Instructional Techniques in the Language Laboratory (2 cr.)
L558 Programmed Foreign Language Instruction (2 cr.)
L590 Independent Research in Second Language Learning (1-3 cr.)
L122 English Language Improvement (9 cr.—10 hrs. in class, 5 hrs. lab)
L123 English Language Improvement (6 cr.—6 hrs. in class, 2 hrs. lab) (for foreign students only)
L124 Oral English Improvement (2 cr.—5 hrs. lab)
L130 English Language Improvement (4 cr.—8 hrs. in class) (for American students only)
L304 Expository Writing (3 cr.—4 hrs. in class)
SUMMARY

Materials which might be used to adequately prepare teachers to teach a standard English as a second dialect are limited. Those which do exist may need to be adapted to fit specific local needs. Adequate college programs are extremely limited. Although more courses in dialect and in language learning are offered than in the past, there is still inadequate emphasis on social dialects and on methods for teaching a standard English.
REFERENCES - Materials and Programs for Teacher Preparation


*See annotated bibliography at end of Section Four.*
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SECTION FOUR

This bibliography contains selected references which deal with teacher preparation. The references are coded to refer to the specific chapters contained in Section Four.

Code:

14. Past and Current Teacher Preparation
15. Ideal Teacher Preparation
16. Materials Available for Developing Teacher Preparation Programs


Baratz first discusses the different-deficient argument and concludes that the language of the nonstandard speaker is not deficient, it is merely different. She then cites several reasons for teaching a standard English: (1) it doesn't necessarily make the student devalue his own dialect, (2) in refusing to teach standard English we cut off even further his possibility of entering the mainstream of American life, (3) it hinders his development of oral skills and makes his task of learning to read considerably more difficult. The article concludes with a discussion of what a competent teacher needs to know about language and culture to do an effective job of teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.


This collection of readings, part of the Urban Language Series, consists of eight articles, including: (1) "Dialectology and the Teaching of Reading" by McDavid; (2) "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension" by Goodman; (3) "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English" by Labov; (4) "Orthography in Reading Materials for Black English Speaking Children" by Fasold; (5) "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System" by Baratz; (6) "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black English: Three Linguistically Appropriate Passages" by Wolfram and Fasold; and (8) "On the Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading" by Stewart.

This manual is an organized study of American dialects which could be used in a course in English language or in English methods. It includes seven articles on dialect: (1) "Historical, Regional and Social Variation" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.; (2) "The Study of Dialects" by N. Louanna Furbee; (3) "Suggestions for Teaching American Dialects" by A. L. Davis; (4) "Problem Areas in Grammar" by William Card and Virginia G. McDavid; (5) "Speech Samples of Disadvantaged Children" by N. Louanna Furbee, Emily P. Norris, and Dagna Simpson; (6) "Abbreviated Checklist of Lexical Items in Dialects" by A. L. Davis; and (7) "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Teaching suggestions and an annotated bibliography are included.


This book contains articles by leaders in the field who advocate using an additive approach to teach a standard English to all students. The articles provide not only theoretical information, but a wealth of practical commentary on teaching a standard English. Included are: (1) William Stewart's "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations;" (2) Joan Baratz's "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children;" (3) Ralph Fasold and Walt Wolfram's "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect;" (4) Irwin Feigenbaum's "The Use of Nonstandard English in Teaching Standard: Contrast and Comparison;" (5) Walt Wolfram's "Sociolinguistic Implications for Educational Sequencing;" and (6) Roger Shuy's "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems." Several of these articles have been listed separately in this annotated bibliography. The book is invaluable to teachers involved with teaching a standard English.


The authors outline the three major goals of the East Texas dialect project: (1) study language patterns in Texas; (2) develop in-service courses to affect attitudes towards language and culture; and (3) produce teaching materials to be used in the schools. They stress attitudes and acceptance of language variety and cultural differences above all else. The content of this article should be valuable to college methods teachers and administrators interested in developing programs for their nonstandard speaking students.

This course is designed to prepare teachers to implement a classroom management system for individualizing the teaching of a standard English to nonstandard speakers. The goal of the materials is augmentation—the addition of a second dialect to the student's range of skills—with every respect accorded the dialect the student brings into the classroom. The course includes six units: (1) "Individualization: The Basic Assumption;" (2) "Eliciting Speech Streams;" (3) "Creating an Individualized Usage Curriculum;" (4) "Selecting, Organizing and Banking Curriculum Materials;" (5) "Teaching English as a Second Dialect: Adapting and Creating Curriculum Materials;" and (6) "Classroom Procedures, or What to do Until the Computer Comes."


This bulletin from Indiana University contains the following articles: (1) "Sociolinguistic Strategies for Studying Urban Speech" by Roger Shuy; (2) "Black-White Speech Differences Revisited" by Walt Wolfram; (3) "Attitudes and Beliefs about Spanish and English Among Puerto-Ricans" by J. A. Fishman; (4) "Teacher Attitude and Ghetto Language" by Helen Johnson; (5) "Should Black Children Learn Standard English?" by Ken Johnson; (6) "Aspects of Instructional Design" by Peter Rosenbaum; and (7) "The Preparation of Language Arts Teachers for Ghetto Schools" by Maurice Imhoof. Bibliographies are included in the bulletin. This representative selection from the field of dialect study would be an invaluable reference to any course on dialect and dialect learning.


Loban's purpose is to clarify the most crucial language difficulties of speakers of nonstandard dialects to enable teachers to plan an effective, efficient program for teaching a standard English. He discusses and lists several examples of the nonstandard oral usages found in students in grades K-9. Loban suggests speakers of nonstandard dialects may be helped by drill on usage, especially the verb to be. There is no object in drilling all pupils on the same skill, he says they should be drilled only on those features with which they have difficulty.


This is a self-contained in-service course for elementary and secondary teachers, which could also be used with undergraduates in teacher preparation programs. The course includes four programmed instructional units with accompanying tape recordings and evaluation materials. Directed toward teacher understanding of the major non-
standard dialects in America, the course provides information about dialects in general, the phonetics of American English, and features of nonstandard usage which commonly occur in American speech. Specifically, the four units treated are: (1) "About Dialects," (2) "Broad Phonetic Transcription," (3) "Analyzing Nonstandard Dialects," and (4) "Curriculum Decisions."


McDavid points out that university English departments have neglected the urgent problems of social dialects and suggests that they encourage systematic research in the field.


An analogy is drawn between Bonnie and Clyde and those who want to eradicate nonstandard dialect. Shuy presents three currently popular approaches to the problem of nonstandard dialects: (1) eradication (2) biloquialism—which he suggests is a more neutral term than bidialectalism, and (3) teaching nonstandard to standard speakers. He presents social and intellectual goals which can be achieved by learning a standard English. In discussing materials currently being used to teach a standard English, Shuy voices concern that the majority of the materials rest on the uneasy assumption that TESOL methods will work with speakers of nonstandard dialects, and that most current materials deal with pronunciation while the evidence seems to point out that the grammatical features are the most important. Shuy then gives five questions he feels all English teachers should answer as they attempt to teach a standard English to nonstandard speakers.


Wolfram deals with the attitudinal problems associated with nonstandard dialects. He discusses some of the basic premises of sociolinguistics and shows how many currently held views about nonstandard dialects violate these basic premises. He also points out that a knowledge of the systematic differences between the various nonstandard dialects and standard English can serve as a basis for effectively teaching a standard English to speakers of these nonstandard dialects.
SECTION FIVE

BIBLIOGRAPHIES
**INTRODUCTION**

This section of the Basic Report contains bibliographies which should be of use to educators involved in teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.

The following bibliographies are included:

1. Annotated bibliography of recommended sources on dialect
2. Master bibliography of the 1500 documents which were read, analyzed, and synthesized in the Basic Report
3. Bibliography of bibliographies on dialect
4. Specialized bibliographies in the following areas:
   
   **A. Cultural Dialects**
   1. Appalachian dialects
   2. Black dialects
   3. Hawaiian dialects
   4. Indian dialects
   5. Spanish dialects

   **B. Regional Dialects**
   1. East
   2. Midwest
   3. South
   4. Southwest
   5. West

   **C. Materials and Methods**
   1. Elementary
   2. Secondary
   3. Foreign Language Methods

   **D. Current Programs**

   **E. Language Acquisition and Development**

   **F. Dialect and Reading**

   **G. Sociolinguistics**
SELECTED ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RECOMMENDED REFERENCES FOR DIALECT AND DIALECT LEARNING*

The following references are recommended to teachers and administrators interested in beginning or improving an existing program in dialect augmentation.


Abrahams first dispells many false notions of linguistic deprivation or pathology. He then stresses the importance of the varieties (codes) used in Black English and the need for an analytic framework which would permit examination of patterns of communicative interaction larger than simple linguistic difference. He points out numerous examples of the expressive system of Black English and gives reasons for the persistance of Black English.


Part One of this book concentrates on regional dialects. It includes readings on area studies, single feature studies, the comparative approach, and dialect theory. Part Two concentrates on social dialects and includes several readings of direct relevance to the classroom teacher or the college methods teacher.


This article outlines the trends in teaching a standard English to speakers of other dialects and describes some second-language techniques as they may be applied to dialect differences. Linguistic versatility is stressed as the goal of second dialect teaching, and the importance of working on truly critical features to reach that goal is brought out. The historical basis of many nonstandard features is discussed. Also discussed are the art of conducting meaningful drills, role playing, and reading and writing. The article is ideal for the relatively uninitiated.

American speech dialects. National Center for Audio Tapes, University of Colorado, Boulder. (Tape)

This tape consists of eighteen readings of "Grip the Rat," one each from Maine, New Hampshire, Ontario, Illinois, Ohio, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. There are two readings from Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Texas, and three from New York.

*Compiled and annotated by Karen M. Hess

© CEMREL, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota

Baratz begins by describing the three major types of professionals involved with describing the language abilities of children: (1) educators, (2) psychologists, and (3) linguists, and then points out how some educators and psychologists mistakenly believe children who speak nonstandard dialects to be verbally destitute or unable to function cognitively. The article contains a reference list of sources from linguistics and anthropological studies.


Baratz first discusses the different-deficient argument and concludes that the language of the nonstandard speaker is merely different. She then cites several reasons for teaching a standard English: (1) it doesn't necessarily devalue the student's own dialect, (2) in refusing to teach standard English we cut off even further his possibility of entering the mainstream of American life, (3) it hinders his development of oral skills and makes his task of learning to read considerably more difficult. The article concludes with a discussion of what a competent teacher needs to know about language and culture to do an effective job of teaching a standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects.


This collection of readings, part of the Urban Language Series, consists of eight articles, including: (1) "Dialectology and the Teaching of Reading" by McDavid; (2) "Dialect Barriers to Reading Comprehension" by Goodman; (3) "Some Sources of Reading Problems for Negro Speakers of Nonstandard English" by Labov; (4) "Orthography in Reading Materials for Black English Speaking Children" by Fasold; (5) "Teaching Reading in an Urban Negro School System" by Baratz; (6) "A Linguistic Background for Developing Beginning Reading Materials for Black English: Three Linguistically Appropriate Passages" by Wolfram and Fasold; and (8) "On the Use of Negro Dialect in the Teaching of Reading" by Stewart.


This guide, intended for those involved in teaching a standard English to Mexican-American students, includes a brief description of the value systems, a phonetic analysis of the likenesses and differences between English and Spanish, and objectives and activities developed for five-year-olds in language development, social studies, numbers, physical education, health, science, music, and art. The guide also includes a bibliography of 35 books and 18 pamphlets.

In this literature review Cazden summarizes and evaluates research in linguistics, developmental psychology, sociology, and anthropology on children from different social and cultural groups. She differentiates between standard and nonstandard English and discusses whether nonstandard English should be replaced or augmented. Several recent studies of language development, all of which show that children of upper socio-economic status are more advanced than those of lower socio-economic status, are outlined with discussions of the problems which dialect differences pose for studies of language development.


Although this book was written in 1965, several of the findings and recommendations of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged are still relevant in the 1970's. The book is divided into six parts: (1) the Task Force and the problem, (2) programs for the disadvantaged—at all grade levels, (3) findings, (4) points of view, (5) recommendations, and (6) appendices. The general recommendations made by the Task Force should be of interest to all those involved in teaching a standard English to disadvantaged students.


This manual is an organized study of American dialects which could be used in a course in English language or in English methods. It includes seven articles on dialect: (1) "Historical, Regional and Social Variation" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr.; (2) "The Study of Dialects" by N. Louanna Furbee; (3) "Suggestions for Teaching American Dialects" by A. L. Davis; (4) "Problem Areas in Grammar" by William Card and Virginia G. McDavid; (5) "Speech Samples of Disadvantaged Children" by N. Louanna Furbee, Emily P. Norris, and Dagna Simpson; (6) "Abbreviated Checklist of Lexical Items in Dialects" by A. L. Davis; and (7) "A Checklist of Significant Features for Discriminating Social Dialects" by Raven I. McDavid, Jr. Teaching suggestions and an annotated bibliography are included.


This record, which presents general information about Black dialect and gives numerous examples of its coherence and communicability, is an excellent resource for teachers and mature students. It illustrates how the dialect may be misunderstood in an interview situation, and how it can be used in teaching standard English.
This book contains articles by leaders in the field who advocate using an additive approach to teach a standard English to all students. The articles provide not only theoretical information, but a wealth of practical commentary on teaching a standard English. Included are: (1) William Stewart's "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations;" (2) Joan Baratz's "Educational Considerations for Teaching Standard English to Negro Children;" (3) Ralph Fasold and Walt Wolfram's "Some Linguistic Features of Negro Dialect;" (4) Irwin Feigenbaum's "The Use of Nonstandard English in Teaching Standard: Contrast and Comparison;" (5) Walt Wolfram's "Sociolinguistic Implications for Educational Sequencing;" and (6) Roger Shuy's "Teacher Training and Urban Language Problems." Several of these articles have been listed separately in this annotated bibliography. The book is invaluable to teachers involved with teaching a standard English.


This article is written on a semi-technical level which most teachers could understand. The authors outline and describe major nonstandard features found in Black dialect and give examples of each. An annotated bibliography of non-technical descriptions for use by the uninitiated and a bibliography of technical descriptions for those with more experience in the area are included.


After attacking the deficit theory and advocating teaching a standard English as an alternate dialect, Feigenbaum comments on promising techniques which can be used in teaching a standard English, and on the importance of discussing appropriateness and motivation with the students. He sees the task as one of teaching the recognition and mastery of alternate linguistic forms for use in appropriate situations. Translation is one of the principal pedagogical techniques involved, focusing on one pattern at a time and proceeding systematically. The article concludes with a bibliography.


The author discusses the relative values of standard and nonstandard dialect and stresses the idea of appropriateness of language rather than a corrective attitude toward language differing from the standard. He then illustrates how contrast and comparison of standard and non-
standard can be used to facilitate the learning of a standard dialect. He prescribes five basic types of drills: (1) presentation drills, (2) discrimination drills, (3) identification drills, (4) translation drills, and (5) response drills. Suggestions for using the drills in the classroom and for maintaining interest in them are given. Feigenbaum maintains that nonstandard dialect can be profitably utilized in the pedagogy of standard English teaching.


Feigenbaum begins his article by citing the work of others such as Lin, Stewart, and Slager who have successfully used TESOL techniques. He notes that one foundation of TESOL techniques is the cycle of imitation, repetition, and manipulation. He stresses the concept of the appropriateness of language and the necessity for students to hear the difference before they can drill on the use of standard forms. Suggestions for making drills more meaningful and interesting are included. Feigenbaum recommends the sequence usually followed in TESOL, i.e., progressing from passive to active: Hearing-speaking, reading-writing. He notes, however, that the teacher may want to put reading and writing before hearing and speaking to assure that the student is actually focusing on the feature the teacher wants.


The project produced a complete syllabus for a freshman English course for a Southern, predominantly Black college. This program emphasizes the positive factors of standard dialect acquisition and language enrichment. It is built on a solid base of research into English and utilizes several of the TESOL techniques. The program initially emphasizes oral repetitive drill, pattern practice with variation, with gradual introduction of some organized facts about the structure of standard English. Reading and writing are postponed until the student has a good command of the phonological system. The program contains a wealth of linguistic information.


The authors outline the three major goals of the East Texas dialect project: (1) study language patterns in Texas; (2) develop in-service courses to affect attitudes towards language and culture; and (3) produce teaching materials to be used in the schools. They stress attitudes and acceptance of language variety and cultural differences above all else. The content of this article should be valuable to college methods teachers and administrators interested in developing programs for their nonstandard speaking students.

The model described in this article encourages teachers to respect and accept a child's established dialect and at the same time to provide a framework to help the child recognize, learn and hopefully begin to use a standard English. The model uses everyday talk and school talk rather than nonstandard and standard English descriptors. It starts at a point meaningful to the learner, i.e., with an actual statement made by him. It focuses on one pattern at a time and proceeds systematically in accordance with linguistic principles. Within this article there is a discussion of the four striking differences which were found to occur in verb usage.


This course is designed to prepare teachers to implement a classroom management system for individualizing the teaching of a standard English to nonstandard speakers. The goal of the materials is augmentation—the addition of a second dialect to the student's range of skills—with every respect accorded the dialect the student brings into the classroom. The course includes six units: (1) "Individualization: The Basic Assumption;" (2) "Eliciting Speech Streams;" (3) "Creating an Individualized Usage Curriculum;" (4) "Selecting, Organizing and Banking Curriculum Materials;" (5) "Teaching English as a Second Dialect: Adapting and Creating Curriculum Materials;" and (6) "Classroom Procedures, or What to do Until the Computer Comes."


This bulletin from Indiana University contains the following articles: (1) "Sociolinguistic Strategies for Studying Urban Speech" by Roger Shuy; (2) "Black-White Speech Differences Revisited" by Walt Wolfram; (3) "Attitudes and Beliefs about Spanish and English Among Puerto-Ricans" by J. A. Fishman; (4) "Teacher Attitude and Ghetto Language" by Helen Johnson; (5) "Should Black Children Learn Standard English?" by Ken Johnson; (6) "Aspects of Instructional Design" by Peter Rosenbaum; and (7) "The Preparation of Language Arts Teachers for Ghetto Schools" by Maurice Imhoof. Bibliographies are included in the bulletin. This representative selection from the field of dialect study would be an invaluable reference to any course on dialect and dialect learning.

Johnson describes a study conducted to determine if TESOL techniques were more effective than traditional techniques for teaching specified grammatical features to tenth grade nonstandard speaking Negro students. The experimental program used a "Standard Oral English," developed by the Los Angeles City Schools, which seeks to teach a standard English as an alternative dialect. When these features were statistically compared between a test group and a control group on pre and post measures, the results confirmed the superiority of TESOL techniques over traditional techniques for teaching a number of standard grammatical features.


These tapes illustrate why nonstandard Negro English should be supplemented by a standard English. The tapes show that Negro culture is simply different, not inferior to middle class White culture. Johnson gives a succinct summary of Negro nonstandard phonology and grammar which is enhanced by his ability to shift dialects. The tapes would provide good general background on Black dialects for elementary, secondary and college methods teachers.


Johnson presents a very convincing argument that Black children must learn a standard English because Black dialect handicaps the children who speak it academically, socially, and vocationally. Teaching a standard English will broaden the range and number of vocational opportunities for Blacks. He cites some reasons for our lack of success in teaching a standard English and then advocates using the bi-dialectist approach since it recognizes the legitimacy of Black dialect and the phenomenon of interference. Included at the end of the article is a five step summary of the second language approach which includes: (1) Recognizing the difference between standard and nonstandard English, (2) hearing the standard English, (3) discriminating between the two forms, (4) reproducing the target feature, and (5) drilling orally on the feature.

Labov first discusses the general nature of language and then presents some of the most important findings of sociolinguistics during the past few years. He discusses the role of the school in relation to the nonstandard speakers and concludes that one of the fundamental problems is the cultural conflict symbolized by nonstandard dialects, rather than any lack of logic or structure. The last section of the article focuses on what educators can do in the classroom. The intent of the selection is to make the teacher aware of the language spoken by the nonstandard speaker, to help the teacher observe the language more accurately, and to adapt his own materials and methods to fit the actual problems encountered. A 36 item bibliography is appended.


Labov and Cohen present information on the phonology and grammar of Negro dialects in a form understandable to English teachers. The authors discuss the most important problem areas in phonology and grammar. All linguistic terminology used in the paper would be understandable to the nonspecialist.


Lin reports on the results of an experimental three-year project to teach a standard English to dialect speaking students at Claflin College, South Carolina. The report includes sample lessons, dialogues, interview transcripts, tests, and evaluative charts. Also included in the report are suggestions about pattern practice for TESOD, illustrations of ways to incorporate pattern practice into the classroom activities rather than just introducing meaningless drills. The pattern practices did help students improve control over standard English, but the students were not able to establish firm control in the nine month period. Lin discusses the difficulties encountered in establishing effective programs in second dialect learning as well as the lack of adequate evaluation instruments.


Loban's purpose is to clarify the most crucial language difficulties of speakers of nonstandard dialects to enable teachers to plan an effective, efficient program for teaching a standard English. He discusses and lists several examples of the nonstandard oral usages found in students in grades K-9. Loban suggests speakers of nonstandard dialects may be helped by drill on usage, especially the verb to be. There is no object in drilling all pupils on the same skill, he says they should be drilled only on those features with which they have difficulty.

This text would be most helpful for teachers who are looking for samples of Negro dialect since it contains fourteen conversations with children, transcribed in a modified standard orthography. Some knowledge of phonetics would be helpful to the reader of the text. The samples are free, spontaneous conversations between members of a family and between neighborhood children. A sample tape recording (parts of each conversation) is available.


The authors present a selection of documents from ERIC providing up-to-date information on the current views concerning instruction in standard English as well as materials available for the classroom and general reference sources. They conclude that the field is broad and controversial and the issues complex, that linguists aren't in agreement in defining language characteristics, and that linguists and psychologists aren't in agreement on how language is learned or what approach to take with a nonstandard dialect speaker. Several key articles are summarized.


This is a self-contained in-service course for elementary and secondary teachers, which could also be used with undergraduates in teacher preparation programs. The course includes four programmed instructional units with accompanying tape recordings and evaluation materials. Directed toward teacher understanding of the major nonstandard dialects in America, the course provides information about dialects in general, the phonetics of American English, and features of nonstandard usage which commonly occur in American speech. Specifically, the four units treated are: (1) "About Dialects," (2) "Broad Phonetic Transcription," (3) "Analyzing Nonstandard Dialects," and (4) "Curriculum Decisions."


McDavid refutes many ill-founded ideas about standard and nonstandard speech such as the belief in a "mystical standard devoid of all regional associations" and the belief in "racial dialects." He discusses social dialects to some extent and concludes by making some recommendations to the schools.

McDavid points out that university English departments have neglected the urgent problems of social dialects and suggests that they encourage systematic research in the field.


This bulletin, useful for the classroom teacher, discusses some of the characteristics of the culturally disadvantaged child, identifies some of his chief language difficulties, lists minimum tasks and realistic objectives for teachers of this group, and describes some of the techniques which have been developed and some current practices in Michigan language arts programs. Relevant needed research is also outlined. Recommendations are made to local school systems and to teacher education institutions.


This monograph could serve as a model for schools wishing to develop their own curriculum in teaching a standard English. The first portion of the monograph cautions teachers not to use the "corrective" approach to language. It then shows that a good program must be based on a careful analysis of the speech patterns which exist in the specific situation. There are two main sections to the monograph. The first deals with the most common problems identified in the speech of the nonstandard speaker. The second section presents a program of instruction, outlines a sequence of activities which might be used including contrastive studies, and suggestions for working with tapes, dialogues, drills and games.


Ott describes a program which has as its goal the command of standard usage, focusing on the Spanish-American speaker. The program objectives and the plans of the program are outlined. Several of the objectives, as well as portions of the plan of the program, would be easily adaptable to other schools which have Mexican-American students.


Plumer presents a well-organized, concise, comprehensive review of the literature on language problems of the disadvantaged. He deals with several aspects of the problem including learning to read, general language development, and social status. Although no research is given to support the assumption, he presents historical evidence.
that achieving the standard dialect is at least an important milestone in an individual's general social progress and that nonstandard dialects have the effect of limiting or confining those who use them. Plumer also notes that researchers and theorists alike agree on the need for rich and varied language experience as an essential condition for successful reading. A bibliography is included.


This report is divided into five sections, each having relevance for the classroom teacher and for the college methods teacher. The first section describes the role of the native dialect and calls for an augmentation approach rather than an attempt at eradication. The second section presents a definition of standard English. The third section outlines special considerations concerning the pupil—both in motivation and in aptitude. The fourth section discusses teaching methodology stressing the audio-lingual approach and its chief pedagogical instruments. The fifth section deals with teacher training and the necessity of the teacher to have knowledge of the structural differences between the target language and the native language of the pupil. A bibliography is included.


This program employs the concept of "everyday talk" and "school talk." This concept helps the children to distinguish between their familiar oral language patterns and those of the standard dialect without designating one as inferior or superior. By utilizing these terms the teacher is at no time required to tell the children they are "talking wrong" and thus run the risk of causing them to develop negative feelings toward the speech patterns of their family and community. On the contrary, the program encourages the teacher to accept and respect the children's established dialect and at the same time provides a framework through which the children systematically and gradually learn to use standard English in their oral language activities.


Salisbury presents convincing arguments for teaching a standard English since for at least the next generation large segments of minority citizens will remain in a socially and economically disadvantaged status, penalized because their life styles and languages differ from the establishment norm. Teachers of English as a Second Language and Teachers of English as a Second Dialect should seek to broaden the linguistic versatility of their students, giving them greater social acceptance and mobility, a broader range of options, and greater ability to compete on an equal footing with other members of the mainstream society. He then goes on to show how role playing can be used to provide a link between the classroom drill and the real life situation.

The emphasis in the article is on the interaction of language and its social context. Saville discusses several types of interference: linguistic, psychological, cultural, and educational. Under educational interference Saville includes unsuitable instructional materials, bad teaching methods, educational segregation of minority groups, and negative attitudes held by teachers. A comprehensive bibliography is included at the end of the article.


This handbook is intended for use by teachers and administrators involved in bilingual education. The first chapter contains historical background on bilingualism and discussion of some of the controversies which exist in the field. The second chapter discusses the linguistic, psychological, social, and cultural factors which must be considered in bilingual education. The third chapter includes a brief contrastive description on English and Spanish and Navaho phonology and illustrates some common teaching problems which result from the differences. The fifth chapter offers some practical teaching suggestions based on the principles of bilingualism. The last chapter discusses evaluation.


An analogy is drawn between Bonnie and Clyde and those who want to eradicate nonstandard dialect. Shuy presents three currently popular approaches to the problem of nonstandard English (1) eradication (2) biloquialism—which he suggests is a more neutral term than bi-dialectal, and (3) teaching nonstandard to standard speakers. He presents social and intellectual goals which can be achieved by learning a standard English. In discussing materials currently being used to teach a standard English, Shuy voices concern that the majority of the materials rest on the uneasy assumption that TESOL methods will work with speakers of nonstandard dialects, and that most current materials deal with pronunciation while the evidence seems to point out that the grammatical features are the most important. Shuy then gives five questions he feels all English teachers should answer as they attempt to teach a standard English to nonstandard speakers.

This book is easily understandable by teachers and students alike. Shuy provides a thorough discussion of dialectology including what a dialect is, how regional and social dialects differ in grammar, lexicon and pronunciation, how these dialect differences came to be. He also discusses current American dialects, the influence of foreign languages on American dialects and the use of dialects in literature. Especially helpful is Chapter Six which lists field research projects for teachers to conduct with their classes as well as word lists, interview forms, dialect maps, and illustration of speech sounds. The book also contains a lengthy bibliography.


The authors describe the methodology used by the Detroit dialect study staff in their survey of Detroit speech in 1966-67. They attempt to provide a practical basis for large scale urban language study. To do so, the authors first present general principles of fieldwork, including details from their work which they feel would be useful in similar projects. The main chapters deal with general aims, sampling procedures and research design, fieldwork design, fieldworker orientation, the questionnaire, the actual fieldwork, and fieldwork evaluation.


In this frequently quoted article, Sledd attacks bidialectalism, offering arguments as to why teaching nonstandard speakers a standard English is immoral and racist and should not be tolerated even if it could succeed. He gives several reasons why teaching standard English is doomed to failure and how teacher's time might be better spent.


This study, done by the Center for Applied Linguistics, is of value to teachers of English to Mexican-American students. It is not a methods book, but rather a book about the problems of interference resulting from structural differences between the native language of the student and English.

This text presents an analysis of the structural differences between English and Spanish. The focus is on the nature of the conflicts between the structure of a language which has already been learned (English) and the structure of one which is still to be learned (Spanish). Included in the text are chapters on (1) introduction to grammatical analysis, (2) basic sentence patterns, (3) word classes and morphological characteristics, (4) the noun phrase and its constituents, (5) verb forms, (6) the auxiliary constituents of the verb phrase, (7) other constituents of the verb phrase, (8) simple sentence transformations, (9) complex and compound sentence transformations, (10) lexical differences, and (11) hierarchy of difficulty. The appendix contains a section on pedagogy as well as references, abbreviations, and symbols.


Wolfram examines and evaluates eleven ERIC documents dealing with the deficiency theory and the difference theory. He illustrates how the deficit model violates some of the basic assumptions about language held to be true by linguists. The articles examined were by Deutsch, John, Osser, Cazden, Baratz, Baratz and Povich, and Skinner. A bibliography is included.


Wolfram deals with the attitudinal problems associated with nonstandard dialects. He discusses some of the basic premises of sociolinguistics and shows how many currently held views about nonstandard dialects violate these basic premises. He also points out that a knowledge of the systematic differences between the various nonstandard dialects and standard English can serve as a basis for effectively teaching a standard English to speakers of these nonstandard dialects.


This book is the result of two years of research at Abbott House, an institution for dependent New York City children, many of whom speak Harlem English. The oral language program presented in the book would also be applicable to pidgin English, creole English, nonstandard forms of Appalachian English, and other varieties of nonstandard dialect used throughout the United States. The introductory sections of the book stress the importance of attitudes toward language variety and the additive approach to learning a standard English. A variety of exercises and activities are suggested to meet the needs of these young nonstandard speaking children. These activities were carried out in a program that also emphasized children's social, affective, and aesthetic development.
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GLOSSARY

DIALECT: A dialect is a variety of language which consists of characteristic lexical, phonological, and grammatical patterns common to a group of speakers. (See functional variety of usage, prestige dialect, regional dialect, social dialect).

FUNCTIONAL VARIETY OF USAGE: Linguistic observation indicates that speakers of English, both standard and nonstandard, move from one variety of language to another according to the context of the speech situation and the speaker's purpose. Five such varieties have been identified for standard English. These are (ranged from most formal to least formal): literary, formal, informal, casual, and intimate. (For an informative discussion of this concept see The Five Clocks by Joos).

GRAMMAR: Grammar refers to: (1) The scientific analysis or (2) systematic description of the structures used in a language, or (3) the body of rules accounting for such structures. Grammar must be differentiated from mechanics and usage.

IDIOLECT: The individual's unique way of speaking—the variety of language resulting from the complex interaction of such variables as the speaker's age, sex, education, occupation, avocation, social class, and regional and ethnic background—is called his idiolect.

LANGUAGE: A language is normally composed of a set of dialects incorporating the major features of the language but differing in some aspects of phonology, grammar, and lexicon.

"Language is a dynamic system of learned, conventional, oral symbols held in common by members of some community, used by individual members of the society for the conduct of relatively precise patterns of human interaction." (University of Minnesota Project English Center).

LEXICON: The lexicon of a language is its word stock, i.e., the words comprising the vocabulary of the language. The dictionary is a compilation of the basic word stock.

LINGUISTICS: Linguistics refers to the scientific study of language or to the descriptive information derived from this study.

MORPHOLOGY: Morphology refers to that subdivision of grammar which deals with the structure of words, i.e., the rules for the addition of prefixes and suffixes to word roots.
NONSTANDARD ENGLISH: Nonstandard English refers to dialects which differ from the regional standard in pronunciation, and/or grammar. Nonstandard dialects are, most frequently, regionally variant types of speech spoken by in-migrant groups. Such dialects may contain features characteristic of less prestigious social and economic levels in a community, and are often maintained as dialects by ghetto circumstances.

PHONOLOGY: Phonology refers to the study of the sounds of a language or a dialect.

PRESTIGE DIALECT: Prestige dialects are the dialects preferred and used by educated and influential persons in a given region. For social and economic reasons, prestige dialects are normally the standard dialects in a particular region.

REGIONAL DIALECT: A regional dialect refers to the variety of language spoken in one part of a geographic area.

SOCIAL DIALECT: Social dialects, sometimes called class dialects, are those dialects spoken by members of different socio-economic groups within a given geographic area (or regional dialect area).

SYNTAX: Syntax refers to that subdivision of grammar which deals with the structure of word groups, i.e., rules for sentence structure.

STANDARD ENGLISH: The phonological, lexical, and grammatical patterns which are accepted and used by the majority of the educated English speaking people in the United States form a series of regionally standard American English dialects.

According to C. C. Fries, standard English is "The particular type of English which is used in the conduct of the important affairs of our people. It is also the type of English used by the socially acceptable of most of our communities and, insofar as that is true, it has become a social or class dialect in the U.S.

USAGE: Usage refers to the effects of nonlinguistic factors on the language used, i.e., words, sounds, and grammatical forms employed.

Robert Pooley defines usage as "the application of external social values to language in specific situations...subject to the varieties and changes to be expected in human value situations."

An individual's usage is extremely complex because it is affected by numerous factors including: The speaker's age, sex, economic status, cultural background, education, and purpose; the size and characteristics of his audience; and the occasion for speaking. (See idiolect).
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INTRODUCTION

To provide instruction in a regionally standard dialect to speakers of nonstandard dialects, suitable instructional materials for students are a necessity. As minimum requirements, the materials should be feature-specific and should be at a difficulty level appropriate to the students' educational backgrounds. To determine the availability of such material, ninety-seven commercially available textbooks were analyzed.

METHODOLOGY

Members of the English Inservice Staff and one teacher each from an elementary, junior high, and senior high school in the Metropolitan Twin Cities area categorized exercise materials in textbooks according to (1) the type of exercise: blank-fill or multiple choice, pattern practice and substitution drill, rewriting sentences, creating sentences, games, literature study, and discrimination between standard and nonstandard forms; (2) the appropriate grade range; and (3) the particular type of nonstandard feature dealt with. This information was recorded in the following format on a 5 X 8 index card.
On the top line of the card the specific nonstandard feature covered by the exercise was recorded. On the second line a brief description of the material or activity was recorded. If the material was an exercise in a book, the title, author and/or publisher was indicated. The appropriate grade level, page number, and whether it was for individual or group work was also indicated. The type of exercise was checked in the column on the right. The answers to any fill-in-the-blank or multiple choice items were written on the back of the card.
RESULTS

Table 1 presents the number of textbooks from the total that deal with the twenty-nine most critical features from the UMREL Usage Survey.*

Category I in the table lists in rank order the fifteen nonstandard features that received the strongest negative reaction, Category II in the table lists in rank order the fourteen nonstandard features that received a mild negative reaction. It is important to note in Table 1 that a majority of the textbooks provided exercises dealing with only two of the features that received the strongest negative reaction: $v_{\rightarrow-v}$ and $Pn_{\rightarrow-Pn}$.

* Rank ordering for the criticality of features is adapted from a survey of acceptability of features in five dialect regions. The combined ratings are presented in Barbara Long's UMREL Usage Survey, February, 1971: Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Since it was impossible to analyze exercises with the exact precision employed in the Long study (1971), certain categories such as $v_{\leftarrow\rightarrow v}$ and $aux_{\leftarrow\rightarrow aux}$ represent a combined average of all features of this type employed in the Long study (1971).
TABLE 1
TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS
OF TYPES OF USAGE FEATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category I (Strongest negative reaction)</th>
<th>No. of Textbooks Covering Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. + aux</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(She <em>been</em> hit the ball over the fence.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. aux → aux</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(He <em>done</em> been in the hospital for two weeks.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. + ed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(She <em>putted</em> the candle too close to the tree.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. + gots</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(He <em>gots</em> a '68 Charger.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ø ing</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(He was <em>try</em> to stop the fire.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. v → v</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I <em>seen</em> a good movie./Bill <em>come</em> down the hill.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. + comp</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jim is the <em>most smartest</em> boy.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. be → v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(He <em>be</em> hoping to get a scholarship to go to college.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pn → Pn</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Him and <em>her</em> went to the store.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. + N</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I <em>don't</em> have no shoes.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. + s pl</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(There were ten <em>childrens</em> in our family.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. t/Ø</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I <em>tink</em> the voting age is eighteen.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. + s ve.b</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(They all <em>rides</em> to school on the bus.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. &quot;it/there&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(It <em>wasn't</em> anybody on the street last night.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Category II (Mildly negative reaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Ø s verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(He ride to school with me every morning.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>+ here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(This here microphone seems to be stuck.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>d/Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(My parents are watching dis program.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>irreg. verb: don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(It don't matter what I do.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>+ Pn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(My brother he lets me use his car.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ø be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(She ____ a good teacher.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Ø prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(My mother flew ____ Washington to.accept a medal.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>ain't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(There ain't anything Jim doesn't know.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ø final d (Ø final con.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(We're getting new re' and blue jerseys.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ø poss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(I went to a girl_ school before coming here.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ø art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(We all go to ____ circus every year.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ø -ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Last night I work_ four hours.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>a ~ an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(He brought a apple for the teacher.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Øs pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(He made fifty cent_ an hour.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>+ prep (at)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(I asked the librarian where it was at.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the types of exercises that were found in the textbooks. It is important to note that over two-thirds of the exercise materials were blank-fill exercises or blank-fill with a slight modification. It should also be noted that approximately three-fourths of the exercise material was classified as either blank-fill or pattern practice.

### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exercise</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blank Fill</td>
<td>16,506</td>
<td>68.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern Practice</td>
<td>3,790 + 33 exercises with adaptive patterns</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrite</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Sentences</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Study</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Discriminatory</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other such as Role Playing, Dramatization, Interpretation, Puzzles, and Drawing</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accepting the position that for a majority of students, dialect differences are surface structure differences, the pedagogical approach would be to provide instruction dealing with particular nonstandard features. This approach necessitates exercise material for features that are socially and economically stigmatizing. Although standard textbook materials cover a few of the critical features, there are a large number of critical features that are not covered as was summarized in Table 1. If existing textbook series are to have greater utility for students with minor dialect differences, a greater number of critical features will need to be covered in the texts.

With adaptation and addition, current textbooks could be made more useful for the teacher who has students with numerous nonstandard dialect features. However, special programs with special texts will probably be required for this group. This special material would involve more than the adaption of existing texts and would have to be designed for the dialect involved.

Current textbook series concentrate on materials for teaching a written standard English, with only minor discussion of the spoken language and dialect differences. The written exercises found in textbooks as summarized in Table 2 may be workable for teaching a written standard English but are questionable in terms of their utility for teaching a spoken standard English.

Linguists such as Feigenbaum (1969), San-su C. Lin (1965), William Slager (1967), William Stewart (1964), and others suggest that use of an oral/aural approach is a worthy, if not a more effective, alternative for teaching a standard spoken dialect.
SUMMARY

Current textbooks can be adapted for nonstandard speakers with minor dialect differences by (1) employing exercises dealing with more of the critical nonstandard oral usage features and (2) employing a wider variety of exercise format which would be adapted specifically to oral usage. However, special programs with special texts need to be designed for students with wide dialect differences.


Textbooks Analyzed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addison-Wesley</td>
<td>English 7</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 8</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 9</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Book Co.</td>
<td>Our Language Today, 7</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Grammar &amp; Composition 9</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Grammar &amp; Composition, 10</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Grammar &amp; Composition, 11</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource for Modern Grammar &amp; Composition, 12</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Public Schools</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Language Program, 1-3, 4-6</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Foresman &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Language &amp; How to Use It, 4-6</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide to Modern English, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide to Modern English, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide to Modern English, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide to Modern English, 10</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginn</td>
<td>Ginn Elementary English, 1-2</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ginn Elementary English, 3</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ginn Elementary English, 4</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spectrum: Literature, Language &amp; Composition, 9</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voices in Literature, Language &amp; Composition, 10</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Harcourt, Brace & World    | English: Target 1-
                           |      |
|                            | The Space Visitors, 7                           |      |
|                            | English Grammar & Composition, 7               | 1969 |
|                            | English: Target 2-
<p>| |
|      |
|                            | The time Capsule, 8                            |      |
|                            | English Grammar &amp; Composition, 8               | 1969 |
|                            | Language for Daily Use, 8                      | 1969 |
|                            | English Grammar &amp; Composition, 9               | 1969 |
|                            | Language for Daily Use, 3                      | 1968 |
|                            | Language for Daily Use, 4                      | 1968 |
|                            | English 2600, 10                               | 1960 |
|                            | English Grammar &amp; Composition, 10              | 1968 |
|                            | The English Language, 10                       |      |
|                            | The English Language, 11                       |      |
|                            | English Grammar &amp; Composition, 11              | 1965 |
|                            | Competence in English A Programmed Handbook, 10-12 | 1967 |
| Harper &amp; Row               | New Directions in English, 4                   | 1969 |
|                            | New Directions in English, 5                   | 1969 |
| Hayden Book Co.            | Language in Society, 10-12                     | 1969 |
| D.C. Heath                 | English Is Our Language, 6                     | 1968 |
|                            | Modern English in Action                       | 1968 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holt, Rinehart &amp; Winston</td>
<td>Language/Rhetoric, I, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/Rhetoric, II, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good English Through Practice, 7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language/Rhetoric, III, 7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin Co.</td>
<td>English for Meaning 3 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English for Meaning, 3 (Workbook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English for Meaning 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English for Meaning, 4 (Workbook)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laidlaw</td>
<td>English 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice for English, 3 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice for English, 4 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Approaches To Language &amp; Composition, 7 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Approaches To Language &amp; Composition, 8 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Lippincott Co.</td>
<td>The New American Speech, 10-12 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, Workbook 3,2 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 3 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, Workbook 3 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 4 1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, Workbook 4</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 11</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 6</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 7</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macmillan English Series, 8</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick-Mathers</td>
<td>Building With Your Language, 1-3</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicating With Your Language</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>About Your Language, 1-3</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploring Language, 7-9</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaining Ideas in Language, 7-9</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Dimensions in English, 10-12</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Dimensions in English 1, 10-12</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding Out About Language, 10-12</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>Mastering Spoken English, 7-9</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American English Today, 9</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher/Material</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Grade(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>Advanced English Exercises, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern English Workbook, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Conversation Practice, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>English Now, (not indicated but appropriate for grades 4-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTE</td>
<td>Discovering American Dialects, 7-9, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Public Schools</td>
<td>Speech Improvement-Middle Schools, 7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech Improvement-Upper Schools, 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prentice-Hall</td>
<td>New Ways In English, 7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>Enjoying English, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying English, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying English, 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying English, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying English, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoying English, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Unit I: Teaching Standard English Features, 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit II: Teaching the Singular Copula/Plural Marker, 1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Standard English Exercises for Urban Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster/McGraw Hill</td>
<td>American English Today, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American English Today, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American English Today, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>