DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 707 AL 002 055

By-Stewart, William A., Ed.
Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English. Language Information Series, 2.
Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 64
Note-37p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.95
Descriptors-Creoles, Language Instruction, Negro Dialects, *Nonstandard Dialects, Pidgins, *Standard Spoken Usage, Teacher Attitudes, *Teaching Methods, *Tenl

This document brings together three papers dealing with the teaching of standard English to speakers of substandard varieties of the language, as well as of English-based pidgins or creoles. The first two papers are by linguists. The essay "Foreign Language Teaching Methods in Quasi-Foreign Language Situations" by William A. Stewart is intended to serve as a general introduction to the problem. "Non-Standard Negro Speech in Chicago" by Lee A. Pederson is a summary of a partial study in depth of the Chicago situation and supplies a more detailed illustration of one specific case. The last paper, "Some Approaches to Teaching English as a Second Language," is by an English teacher, Charlotte K. Brooks. Her practical concern with the teacher's attitudes toward non-standard speech and its users becomes especially meaningful once the linguistic aspects of the situation are understood. What is especially noteworthy, however, is that all three papers express the same basic conclusion as to what should be done. Number 1 of the Language Information Series, "Second Language Learning as a Factor in National Development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America," dates from 1961 and is available from the Publications Section of the Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D. C. 20036, for $0.50. (Editor/DO)

LANGUAGE INFORMATION SERIES • 2



# NON-STANDARD SPEECH AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Edited by William A. Stewart

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS • 1964

LANGUAGE INFORMATION SERIES • 2

# NON-STANDARD SPEECH AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Edited by William A. Stewart

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS • 1964

LANGUAGE INFORMATION SERIES

1. Second Language Learning as a Factor in National Development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (1961, 50 cents)

2. Non-Standard Speech and the Teaching of English, Edited by William A. Stewart (1964, 50 cents)

Published by the Center for Applied Linguistics
of the Modern Language Association of America
1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 36, D.C.

Price 50 cents

Out of print

# INTRODUCTORY NOTE

In this second number of its Language Information Series, the Center for Applied Linguistics brings together three papers dealing with the teaching of standard English to speakers of substandard varieties of the language, as well as of English-based pidgins or creoles.

The first two papers are by linguists. The essay by Stewart is intended to serve as a general introduction to the problem, while Pederson's summary of a partial study in depth of the Chicago situation supplies a more detailed illustration of one specific case. The last paper is by an English teacher. Her practical concern with the teacher's attitudes toward non-standard speech and its users becomes especially meaningful once the linguistic aspects of the situation are understood. What is especially noteworthy, however, is that all three papers express the same basic conclusion as to what should be done.

Readers who are not fully familiar with the phonetic symbols used throughout the linguists' papers, or with the distinction made between phonetic and phonemic transcription, will find most of the relevant information in Bronstein's Pronunciation of American English [cited in full in the bibliography to the first paper].

The papers by Stewart and Pederson were originally given at the 16th Annual Conference of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (Minneapolis, April 1964). Mrs. Brooks' paper was originally given at the 53rd Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (San Francisco, November 1963).

W.A.S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODS IN QUASI-FOREIGN LANGUAGE SITUATIONS

William A. Stewart, Center for Applied Linguistics

If I were asked to indicate what I felt to be the most fundamental change which has taken place in the orientation of language teaching in the United States during the past fifteen or twenty years, I would point to the marked increase in realism evident in both the expressed purpose and the methodology of language teaching. Of course, what I mean by "realism" here is simply the view of language as it is rather than as it ought to be, and of the learner's need for it as a personally useful tool of social interaction rather than as a rotely learned device of principally esthetic value. Yet this increase in realism has not been at the cost of a firm basis in language teaching theory. On the contrary, language teaching theory has been refined and enriched, not only through its own considerable experience, but also by drawing more or less heavily from the knowledge which has been accumulating in linguistics, psychology, sociology, and other behavioral sciences.

It is especially the first two of these -- linguistics and psychology -- which have contributed most to the development of a number of basic theoretical assumptions about the nature of language, the way it is learned, and the most suitable methods for teaching it. One of these I would like to focus on in particular, for it underlies the language teaching theme of this paper; I am referring to the theoretical distinction between "native" or "first" language teaching on the one hand, and "foreign" or "second" language teaching on the other.

Insofar as language teaching in the school is concerned -- and I would like to restrict the scope of this paper to that specific situation -- it is important to note that by school age, that is by the age of six or seven, the average, mentally normal child will already have internalized most of the basic phonological and grammatical patterns of at least one linguistic system (and indeed perhaps more, if the child has been raised bilingually). The child will also have a fairly ready command of a large number of lexical terms (less, however, than an average adult) together with a surprising amount of skill in their use or avoidance in terms of specific semantic or social contexts.

Now, if the language being taught at school is essentially the same as that already largely internalized by the child during the preschool language learning period, then it is clear that language teaching in

the school will be primarily concerned with giving the child a command of such supplemental refinements as additional vocabulary, more complex or stylistically restricted syntactical patterns, and of course reading and writing skills. This, then, is "native" or "first" language teaching.

If, however, the language being taught at school is other than the one in which the child has already acquired preschool fluency (such as would be the case, say, in teaching Spanish to a child previously monolingual in English, or English to a Navaho monolingual -- or a Navaho-Spanish bilingual, for that matter), then the teaching methods must of necessity be quite different; the major task would be to impart a command of precisely those kinds of basic linguistic patterns which were already known in the native language teaching situation. Furthermore, the fact that the new-language learner has already internalized the basic behavioral patterns of another language -- patterns which differ from those to be learnt -- means that the language teaching techniques should take special account of the ways in which the differences between the native and the new languages are liable to produce interference problems for the learner. Language teaching of this type is, of course, "foreign" or "second" language teaching.

This distinction between the two kinds of language teaching is fairly well known and accepted these days, but I have felt it worth while to review it here, since for the remainder of this paper I will be concentrating on extensions and modifications of the methodological differences which it implies.

In the process of finding out about language behavior, it sometimes happens that what has been generally accepted as a more or less uniform whole turns out -- upon closer examination -- to be in reality a conglomerate of related but empirically distinguishable linguistic systems. As is to be expected, linguists are generally more aware of such divisions than are language teachers, partly because linguists have a more refined technique for dealing with minute differences in language behavior, but also because the methodology of linguistic description is to start with discrete individual forms of speech, and to build up from them generalizations about the over-all pattern. Language teachers, on the other hand, have been part of a tradition which has started with the assumption of a more or less uniform whole, embodied, for example, in the goal of teaching "the English language" or "the French language", and which takes only exceptional note of subvarieties of speech. However, as I hope to illustrate, even for language teaching this generalized view of language as a uniform whole is better left as a goal than taken as a starting assumption. Yet even linguists have on more than one occasion found that the data, once collected, have necessitated a revision of previously held views about a particular language. An example of this would be the rev-

ised ideas about American dialects which have resulted from the research carried out in connection with the Linguistic Atlases of the United States.[1] Perhaps a more striking example is furnished by the pidgins and creoles spoken in various parts of the world, which were once thought to be nothing more than "corrupted" forms of certain European languages, but which subsequent analyses have shown to represent fairly independent linguistic developments, and to constitute separate languages in their own right.[2]

At this point, I am ready to illustrate how the linguistic characteristics of intra-language variation can have a direct bearing on the language teaching methodology distinction I mentioned earlier. Let me begin with two cases which are not really typical of the kind of situation usually found in the United States, but which have the advantage of being relatively well-defined from a linguistic point of view.

In Jamaica, standard English (based largely upon the Southern British norm) is the official language of the island, and the sole language of education. There is also a widely used, unstandardized folk speech, referred to locally as "the dialect". This designation is a purely sociolinguistic one, in that it refers to the substandard nature of the folk speech, rather than to its structural relation to standard English. For the fact is that Jamaican "dialect" is popularly regarded as nothing more than English badly spoken. Consequently, it has been traditional in Jamaican schools to teach English to country children much as it is taught to children in England -- in fact importing from there their textbooks and teaching methods. These, needless to say, are with few exceptions oriented toward first-language teaching, since most English children are native speakers of the language.

Yet even the most energetic efforts at English teaching in Jamaica characteristically meet with a general lack of success which would be most unusual in England. The Jamaican language teaching difficulties have been attributed to many causes. Some, such as the low functional literacy level of the island's population, probably are contributing factors. However, it is now apparent to linguists that a major source of the problem may lie in the fact that the Jamaican language situation is different enough from that of England to require a radically different approach. For Jamaican "dialect" is, in its rural form at least, not linguistically a variety of English at all, but is rather an English-based creole. That is, it is an independent language with a large part of its vocabulary derived historically from English, but with a grammar which is strikingly aberrant in many

ways.[3] For example, Jamaican Creole words like dem 'they, their, them', mi 'I, my, me', fren 'friend', etc., sound quite like English, though obviously substandard, as in:

| | |
|---|---|
| dem a mi fren | 'they are my friends' |
| mi a dem fren | 'I am their friend' |
| mi a go si dem | 'I am going to see them' |

From the translations of fren occurring in the preceding sentences, it will be noted that Jamaican Creole does not indicate the pluralization of nouns where the number is apparent from the context (as it is, in the above cases, from the number distinction implied in the subject pronouns dem and mi). However, noun pluralization may be marked in cases where the context leaves number ambiguous, and dem following the noun is used for this purpose:

| | |
|---|---|
| mi a go si mi fren | 'I am going to see my friend' |
| mi a go si mi fren dem | 'I am going to see my friends' |

Thus it is apparent that there are several differences in both the form and usage of pluralization in Jamaican Creole and standard English; for the former, the marking of noun pluralization is optional, but in the latter it is with few exceptions, obligatory. Where the plural is marked in Creole, it is done by the regular device of a free morpheme (structurally the same as the third person plural pronoun) following the noun. In English, pluralization is structurally much more complex and often quite irregular. In addition, the relation of Creole and English noun pluralization is further complicated by the fact that the Creole uses a morphological plural for a purpose achieved in English by the use of circumlocutions, e.g.:

| | |
|---|---|
| mi fren-op Jien dem | 'I made friends with Jane and her crowd' |

A rural Jamaican, even after mastering all the complex structural correlations between Creole and English noun pluralization, would probably render the above Creole sentence as "I made friends with Janes", which of course would mean rather "I made friends with several girls named Jane" to the native speaker of standard English.

I think these examples -- and they could be duplicated from almost all areas of Jamaican Creole and English structure -- furnish convincing evidence that the teaching of standard English in rural Jamaica would benefit by a very positive shift from a native language to a foreign language teaching approach.

In Liberia, where English is also the official language (in this case, based largely upon American norms), children are taught the standard language by traditional, native language methods, with heavy reliance upon texts imported from the United States. Yet, even by the time they first enter school, most Liberian children have acquired a fairly fluent command of Liberian Pidgin English, which is widely spoken in the streets of Monrovia, along the main communication routes of the interior, by soldiers, and in inter-tribal villages and markets.[4]

There are a large number of structural differences between Liberian Pidgin English and standard English, and it is interesting to note that for tribal Liberians the Pidgin patterns seem to cause more interference problems in their English than do the patterns of the African vernaculars which they speak at home and actually learn first. A few examples will serve to illustrate this kind of interference. Liberian Pidgin English marks the present tense of verbs by adding -in to the verb stem, e.g.:

ah ronin[5] 'I am running'

The verb stem used alone indicates the past tense in the Pidgin, e.g.:

ah ron 'I ran'

Because of this, Liberian children, when attempting to refer in English to an event in the past, will often use the verb stem alone, though of course this is actually the simple present in English. The possibility of this latter function for the verb stem in English does not occur to the Liberian child, since the meaning of the English simple present is expressed in Pidgin with le (pronounced [lɛ́]), e.g.:

ah le ron 'I run'

General predication also causes problems, since Liberian Pidgin English has three separate constructions where standard English always uses the verb to be:

zero in noun adjective clauses:
dey smoh 'they are little'

biy in noun-noun clauses:
i biy teybu 'it is a table'

and dey to indicate presence or position:
shiy dey deh 'she is there'

These Pidgin patterns can often be seen to underlie mistakes Liberian school children make in attempting to produce English equivalents. Although one would expect the Liberian language situation to make it more appropriate to teach English as a foreign language than as a native language, it may come as a surprise to many that the language most likely to constitute the major source of interference is Liberian Pidgin English rather than any of the vernaculars.

Language situations similar to the Jamaican and Liberian ones in that they involve pidgins and creoles which are related to the official standard exist in other parts of the Caribbean and West Africa, as well as in certain parts of Asia.[6]

Here in the United States, the only language teaching situation involving an English-based creole that I am aware of is that of teaching English to speakers of Gullah. But the point of my Jamaican and Liberian examples was not solely that English-based creole or pidgin speakers need to be taught standard English as a foreign language (although I do maintain that this is the case). Rather, I intended it as an illustration of the more general fact that there may be cases where the structural relationship between standard English and varieties of speech which are sociologically accepted as mere substandard variants of it are in fact reminiscent of foreign language relationships. An example which comes immediately to mind concerns Mexican-American English.[7] Structurally, it is more like Spanish than English in its phonology, but more like English in its grammar and vocabulary, and in certain ways it is also syncretic and innovating. For example, since final consonant clusters of the type /-nt/, /-nd/ do not normally occur in the dialect, the standard colloquial English contrast between can and can't is handled by a consistent stress difference; compare:

/xì kàŋ gó#/ 'he can go'
with
/xì káŋ gô#/ 'he can't go'

Note that a stress differentiation of this type for verbs is not a normal Spanish phenomenon, nor are some of the stress sequences particularly English. A certain amount of the basic structure of this dialect is clearly deviant from that of standard English, and foreign language teaching methods accordingly seem appropriate

to some degree in English teaching involving speakers of this dialect.

For my last illustration, I will turn to English teaching in another American dialect situation. Although it clearly has less of a real foreign language element than the preceding one, it nevertheless involves enough structural mismatch to warrant, if not a full foreign language teaching approach, then at least one which still takes sufficient account of the fact that conflicts between different linguistic structures underlie many of the learner's difficulties. This particular linguistic situation -- itself a by-product of fundamental changes which are taking place in the American social and economic order -- offers the teaching profession one of its greatest current challenges.

I am referring to the teaching of English in many of our large northern and west coast urban communities to speakers of various substandard dialects of English which have come there primarily through migration from the southern Atlantic and Gulf states. The fact that in most such communities the majority of these dialect speakers are Negroes means that the English teaching situation -- complex enough in terms of the linguistics alone -- is further complicated by the intrusion of social, cultural, economic, and even political factors.

In their native region, dialects of this type evolved within an over-all sociolinguistic framework in which they stood in a structurally close and socially well-defined relationship to local varieties of standard English. However, migration to the North and the West Coast has taken the dialects out of that setting and brought them into direct contact with varieties of English -- both standard and substandard -- which are often structurally very different, and into a new sociological environment where the intruding dialects are regarded with much less general indulgence than they were at home. The nongradient nature of the structural relationship between the immigrant dialects and the traditional ones in the northern communities tends to emphasize the substandard nature of the imported speech forms and, in cases where they are brought in and used primarily by Negroes, dialectal traits often acquire associations with racial identity. This can happen even though such traits may have been shared by white and Negro alike in their home territory, and in spite of the fact that in the northern communities there may be Negroes in whose speech such traits are totally absent.[8] No doubt in part because of this racial association of imported dialect features in the new community, Negro immigrants and their descendents may show a tendency to retain some of them. In fact, a fairly uniform in-group dia-

lect may come into existence which, due to dialect mixing and innovation, may come to be unique to that community, even though other communities may be made up of essentially the same immigrant composition. In most such communities, there may be a further linguistic differentiation between immigrant Negro and native-born Negro, with the latter's speech being typically closer to the northern standard. But this is by no means universal, since extremely heavy migration may cause linguistic swamping, with the result that even native-born persons may come to have the same type of speech as the immigrants.[9]

Although the actual linguistic details of such immigrant dialect situations are currently being analyzed and described in some communities, many others still remain unstudied, and comparisons between the main characteristics of the dialect situations in various communities have yet to be made.[10] However, I can give a few examples of this type of language teaching problem based on personal observations in Washington, D.C. These examples may seem simple or obvious, but it is precisely for that reason that I have chosen them as isolated illustrations of what is really a vast complex of interrelated linguistic and sociolinguistic problems.

Let me begin with a case of phonological mismatch. Among the consonants used in virtually all varieties of standard English, there is a paired series of consonants which can be diagrammatically organized according to place and manner of articulation as follows:

| | Bilabial fricative | Apico-dental fricative | Apico-alveolar stop |
|---|---|---|---|
| Voiced | /v/ | /ð/ | /d/ |
| Voiceless | /f/ | /θ/ | /t/ |

These all occur word initially, e.g.:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /vot/ vote | /ðɪs/ this | /du/ do |
| /fʊt/ foot | /θɪŋ/ thing | /tu/ two |

medially, e.g.:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /nɛvə/ never | /mʌðə/ mother | /lædə/ ladder |
| /sʌfə/ suffer | /nʌθɪŋ/ nothing | /mætə/ matter |

and finally, e.g.:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /lʌv/ love | /brið/ breathe | /nid/ need |
| /tʌf/ tough | /brɛθ/ breath | /nit/ neat |

In contrast, a diagram of the consonant phonemes covering essentially the same articulatory area for a common type of substandard

Washington English would be:

| | Bilabial fricative | Apico-älveolar stop |
|---|---|---|
| Voiced | /v/ | /d̈/ |
| Voiceless | /f/ | /t/ |

Note that in this dialect there are no apico-dental fricatives, standard English /ð/ and/θ/ showing up as /d/ and /t/ in initial positions, and usually as /v/ and /f/ elsewhere. Thus the middle column of the word list previously cited would appear, for this type of English, as follows:

/dɪs/ this
/tɪŋ/ thing

/mʌvə/ mother
/nʌfṭn/ nothing

/brɪv/ breathe
/brɛf/ breath

Here, there are two teaching problems. First, the new phonemes /ð/ and /θ/ must be taught, i.e. their articulation as well as the recognition of their contrast both with /d/ and /t/ and with /v/ and /f/. Second, their occurrence in specific words must be taught, so that /d/, /t/, /v/ and /f/ are replaced in the appropriate ones, but in no others. For the first of these, the English teacher could profit from foreign language teaching techniques devised for teaching phonemic contrasts which are not in the native language of the learners.[11]

In standard English, both the definite and indefinite articles have two different pronunciations in unstressed position, depending upon whether the following word begins with a consonant phoneme (e.g. /bʊk/ book) or a vowel phoneme (e.g. /ok/ oak). The variants are:

| | Definite article | Indefinite article |
|---|---|---|
| Before a consonant phoneme | /ðə/ | /ə/ |
| Before a vowel phoneme | /ði/ | /ən/ |

Thus most speakers of standard English say /ðə búk/ and /ə búk/, but /ði ók/ and /ən ók/.

This kind of automatic alternation in the pronunciation of the

articles is incorporated into the orthography of the indefinite article, where /ə/ is written as a and /ən/ as an, e.g. a book, an oak, but it is not recognized for the definite article, both pronunciations of which are written the, e.g. the book, the oak.

In Washington substandard English, the articles are commonly pronounced /ðə/ and /ə/ both before words beginning with consonant phonemes, and those beginning with vowel phonemes. The only difference is that in the latter case the vowel of the article and the initial vowel of the following word are separated by a juncture phenomenon, usually a glottal stop, e.g. [ðə ʔ ok], [ə ʔ ok].

Now, for the standard English speaker, the spelling difference a vs. an presents no problem, since he simply writes what he says, while he can ignore his pronunciation differences for the definite article, since it has no orthographic variation. For the non-standard speaker, however, the correct selection of a or an in spelling the indefinite article may cause problems, because the variation matches nothing in his linguistic behavior.

In teaching the non-standard speaker the correct use of a and an, acquainting him with the abstract phonological rules (from a dialect which the learner does not speak) underlying the spelling variation would hardly seem to be either a realistic or an enduring solution to the problem. Nor would instruction based on purely orthographic rules, like "write a before consonant letters and an before vowel letters", since, even if understood, it could produce such unacceptable results as a honor and an use. Some purely orthographic differences can easily be handled by the simple device of memorizing word lists, representing this or that spelling. Such a solution is not feasible in this case, however, because the word lists dividing a from an would ultimately include every noun and adjective in the English language. It seems to me that the most direct and enduring solution to this particular spelling problem is simply to get the non-standard speaker to internalize the relevant phonological behavior of the standard dialect, upon which the spelling rules are based. This could be done using much the same kind of pattern drills that are used for teaching English-speaking learners of French such variations as /la/ vs. /l/.

A more complex problem of essentially the same sort is encountered in the teaching of standard English verb usage to non-standard speakers in the same dialect situation. Perhaps the most immediately apparent case of mismatch in this area involves the absence with many speakers of the third person singular marker -s on the

present tense form of standard English verbs, e.g. substandard he know for standard he knows.[12] Technically more serious, however, are cases where mechanisms of predication and even the over-all organization of the verbal systems may be different in the two types of speech. For example, certain kinds of predication without a verb exist in substandard speech where standard English uses the linking verb to be, e.g. substandard they tired and she my sister beside standard they are tired and she is my sister. An example of more general verbal system differences is to be found in the dialect usage of some speakers who apparently have no inflectional contrast to match the preterite vs. simple present of standard English. Thus a form like he go will be used by such speakers where standard English would use he went as well as where it would use he goes. For this type of substandard dialect, the main distinction is aspectual, being between non-durative (cf. the he go construction) and durative, e.g. he goin', this last construction being roughly equivalent to standard he is going or, in some cases, he was going.[13]

I think that the foregoing examples are sufficient to demonstrate that, for this dialect situation, verbal usage is sometimes different from that of standard English. Furthermore, since the individual cases of mismatch may derive from more general deviations in the over-all organization of the two verbal systems themselves, it seems clear that isolated "mistakes" will not necessarily be amendable to patchwork correction. On the contrary, it would appear that the most satisfactory approach to the teaching of standard verbal usage would be of a type similar to one now being used in many of the newer foreign language teaching materials. In these, the corrective exercises are based upon a preliminary comparison of the way in which the learner's verbal system agrees with or differs from that of the language being taught.

In the four preceding English teaching case histories which I have selected to illustrate the suitability of foreign language teaching methods in what I have termed "quasi-foreign" language situations, the actual structural distance between the non-standard, English-like, pre-school speech of the learner and the standard English being taught has varied from case to case. In the Jamaican and Liberian situations, the non-standard varieties were different enough from standard English to have prompted linguists to classify them as independent languages. In the American situations the difference was less marked, although a certain amount of structural deviation from standard English was still evident. From the language teaching point of view, what was

common to all of these cases was the fact that, in spite of striking structural similarities in certain areas (such as in vocabulary), structural dissimilarities in other areas (such as in the grammars) have given rise to language learning problems of a type which are similar to foreign language learning problems, and hence render desirable the use of foreign language methods in English teaching.

With this conclusion established, it will be apparent that the development of more suitable language teaching materials for situations like the foregoing ones has to depend heavily upon the availibility of good linguistic descriptions of those non-standard varieties of speech which are normally used by the learners of the language to be taught. Of course, the linguist will want such forms of speech described anyway -- as additional samples of human language behavior, if for no other reason.[14] However, the educator or language teacher, who may be tempted to look down on non-standard varieties of speech, should bear in mind that linguistic descriptions of them, far from being mere scholastic curiosities, can serve as a very useful basis for more effective teaching of the kind of language which he or she is deeply interested in getting the learner to use.

NOTES

1. See Allen, "The Linguistic Atlases: Our New Resource". Also compare the three dialect maps of the United States given as figures 3, 4, and 5 in Bronstein, The Pronunciation of American English, which represent major revisions in linguists' interpretations of the dialectal subdivisions of American English. Incidentally, there has recently appeared an admirable interpretation for English teachers of the newer dialect data. This is Malmstrom and Ashley's Dialects -- U.S.A.

2. For an exemplary case history of one such pidgin language, see Hall, Hands off Pidgin English!

3. By "grammar", I obviously mean the patterns of language structure rather than a set of rules in a book. This distinction between linguistic grammar and formal grammar is now widely known and accepted in the United States, but it is much less familiar to Jamaican language teachers. To most of them, Jamaican Creole "has no grammar", simply because its structural patterns have never been formally codified within the culture. For a linguistic description of Jamaican Creole, see Bailey's dissertation, Jamaican Creole Syntax.

4. As is the case with Creole in Jamaica, Pidgin English has no independent sociolinguistic status in Liberia, and indeed is known by no specific name. Where it is referred to at all, it tends to be called "colloquial English", "bad English", or, in Monrovia, "Water Street English". An important difference between the Jamaican and Liberian situations is that while Creole is the native -- and only -- language of most Jamaicans, Liberian Pidgin English is usually a second language for tribal Liberians who are native speakers of an African vernacular such as Bassa or Kpelle. Incidentally, Liberian Pidgin English is structurally quite different from the Nigerian and Cameroun varieties of English-based Pidgin, which are closely related to Sierra Leone Krio.

5. This -in, pronounced [ɣ], is historically related to the standard English morpheme written -ing. The Liberian Pidgin English examples are given here in a tentative, quasi-phonemic spelling based on preliminary linguistic investigations which I carried out in Liberia under the auspices of Educational Services, Inc. and the Center for Applied Linguistics.

6. I am currently preparing, for the use of Educational Services, Inc. in West Africa, a language manual for primary school teachers in countries where instruction is given in English, but where an English-based pidgin or creole is widely used outside the classroom. Its main purpose is to inform the teacher about likely language interference problems, and techniques for avoiding or correcting them. The manual is intended primarily for mathematics teachers in Liberia and Sierra Leone, but it is being written so as to also make it useful for teachers of other subjects and in other areas with a similar language situation, such as Nigeria, the Cameroun, and the British Caribbean.

7. Here I do not refer to the kind of English which a monolingual Spanish speaker in Mexico may end up with after having taken English in school. Rather, I refer to a special dialect of American English spoken in the Southwest by a considerable number of Americans of Mexican descent, who are usually bilingual in it and some variety of Mexican or Southwestern Spanish.

8. See Raven McDavid's articles, "Some Social Differences in Pronunciation" and "The Relationship of the Speech of American Negroes to the Speech of Whites".

9. This phenomenon is certainly common in Washington, D.C., where it is easy to find cases involving second or third generation Washington Negro families in which the parents are speakers of

a quite standard variety of English, but where the children's speech is much closer to that of the newer immigrants. The explanation seems to be that heavy post-war immigration has dialectally swamped much of the younger generation of native Washingtonians. This phenomenon, incidentally, seems to support the theory that children learn more language behavior from members of their own peer group than from their parents, and suggests that educator concern over the quality of "language in the home" may be misplaced.

10. Research projects for studying the sociolinguistic situation -- including urban Negro speech -- are presently being carried out in Chicago, under the direction of Raven I. McDavid, Jr., and in New York City by William Labov of Columbia University. In Washington, D.C., a program for the study of the speech of school-age children, involving the cooperation of the Center for Applied Linguistics and the District of Columbia Public Schools, is currently in the proposal stage.

11. Many Washington speakers have /ð/ and /θ/ word-initially, with the standard distribution, but generally have /v/ and /f/ medially and finally. For them, the teaching problem is essentially one of bringing about sound substitutions in the appropriate places.

12. As far as the communication of meaning is concerned, this absence of verbal -s in substandard speech causes no ambiguity, since the relevant information is usually supplied by the noun or pronoun. Socially, however, its use is quite important, because the presence of verbal -s in the appropriate places appears to serve as one of the criteria distinguishing "educated" from "uneducated" speech. This is one of those many cases where, in content, substandard English is just as expressive as standard English -- the two differing primarily in form. Yet it is on the basis of just such differences in linguistic form that social judgements regarding the speaker are often made.

13. Either fortuitously or because of a historical connection of some sort, this same dominance of aspect over tense is found in certain Caribbean creole languages.

14. For an outstanding example of the kind of scientific description which can be made of substandard and socially deprecated varieties of speech, even where these may be subjugated to the norms of a closely related but standardized dialect of high prestige, see Sievertsen's Cockney Phonology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Allen, Harold B. "The Linguistic Atlases: Our New Resource", The English Journal 45.188-194 (1956). Also reprinted in the following item, pp. 212-219.

-----,ed. Readings in Applied English Linguistics. 2nd ed. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1964.

Bailey, Beryl L. Jamaican Creole Syntax. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.

Bronstein, Arthur J. The Pronunciation of American English: An Introduction to Phonetics. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960.

Hall, Robert A., Jr. Hands off Pidgin English! Sydney, Australia, Pacific Publications Pty., Ltd., 1955.

Malmstrom, Jean and Annabel Ashley. Dialects -- U.S.A. Champaign, Illinois, National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. "Some Social Differences in Pronunciation", Language Learning 4.102-116 (1952-3). Also reprinted in Harold B. Allen, ed., Readings in Applied English Linguistics, pp. 251-261.

----- and Virginia Glenn McDavid. "The Relationship of the Speech of American Negroes to the Speech of Whites", American Speech 26.3-17 (1951).

Sievertsen, Eva. Cockney Phonology. Oslo, Norway, Oslo University Press, 1960.

# NON-STANDARD NEGRO SPEECH IN CHICAGO

Lee A. Pederson, University of Minnesota

Ninety-nine years after the legal abolition of the segregated school system in Chicago, Negro children in that city remain scarcely more integrated than they are in most parts of the South. Thus as of November of 1962, only eight percent (i.e. 36) of Chicago's 450 elementary schools had really integrated enrollment. Of the remaining 414, sixty-seven percent (or 301) were 90-100 percent white, while twenty-five percent (or 113) were predominantly Negro to the same extent.

This de facto school segregation closely parallels a well-established segregation in Chicago's residential patterns. Although the notorious "Black Belt" has existed for a long time, its boundaries seem formerly to have been less rigid and its population much smaller. In contrast, the present-day Chicago Negro lives in a community that is gradually spreading over more and more of the city, with the white residents selling and retreating before him as he moves north, south, and west. This rapid expansion of the Black Belt represents a tremendous increase in the urban Negro population which -- due largely to migration -- almost doubled during the decade ending in 1960.

Racism on the part of many elements in the white community has undoubtedly been an important factor in the maintenance of low social mobility and a segregated living environment for the Chicago Negro. Non-racist rejection based on his generally low economic status has probably also played a part. However, there is much evidence to suggest that there has been a great deal of deliberate pressure-group manipulation to keep up a close correspondence between neighborhood school boundaries and the racial boundaries of Chicago's segregated real estate.[1]

The Negro school children -- the real victims of the situation -- suffer in many ways from their physical, social, economic, and cultural segregation from white middle-class Kultur. In the schools, where social interrelations would be most productive, the young Negro is most thoroughly deprived. Perhaps the most unfortunate aspect of the situation is its perpetuation of an

immobile social class. The young Negro comes into the school system from an immigrant background, in which non-standard American English is the primary (if not only) means of verbal communication, and then he is denied the opportunity to acquire the socially approved dialect through adequate contact with indigenous white speakers of it.

On various occasions, America's most experienced dialect geographer, Raven I. McDavid, Jr., has termed such persons as the Chicago Negro the "linguistically crippled". Their handicap is a lack of knowledge of the all-important standard speech. Without it, the road to higher education and to better employment opportunities is barred. In fact Professor McDavid has expressed the view that, in speaking only a dialect which is sharply different from the speech of the local white middle class, many American Negroes are little better off than the non-English speaking members of other minority groups. He suggests, however, that the immediate solution to the problem of non-indigenous regional dialects and non-standard social dialects would seem to lie, not in their elimination, as some have proposed, but rather in the teaching of the local white middle class dialect as a second language for those linguistic minority groups.

In suggesting this approach, Professor McDavid is translating into the language of applied pedagogy some of the findings of a large-scale, social sciences research project currently in progress in Metropolitan Chicago. This project, entitled the Cognitive Environment Study, was undertaken in late 1962 as a cooperative effort by resident faculty members of the University of Chicago and the Illinois Institute of Technology. Participating linguists, anthropologists, and educators began to investigate the problems of basic education for the socially underprivileged.[2] Although the Cognitive Environment Study is limited neither to Negroes nor to linguistic problems, the phonology of Negro speech has been a part of the first phase of the investigation, and some tentative findings concerning pronunciation can be summarized here.

So far, the investigation of racially-marked speech differences in Chicago has been completed only in terms of segmental phonology, but even within this restricted scope there appear to be sufficient data to allow interesting comparisons of Negro and white speech in Chicago. The comparisons presented here derive from two sources. The first is a recently completed dissertation which establishes the segmental phonemes of the dominant dialect, as well as the phonetic alternation and phonemic incidence among sub-dialect groups.[3] The second source is from preliminary re-

search carried out for the Cognitive Environment Study, which includes the speech of Negro residents of the city regardless of birthplace. These materials include 35 records of mothers, friends, and teachers of young Negro children. Each of the informants responded to a 67-item questionnaire which was prepared after the extensive field work had been completed and which comprised only potentially critical aspects of pronunciation.

From a comparison of the material in these sources, it is possible, first, to establish certain differences between white and Negro speech in the city and, second, to note a broad distinction between the speech of native-born Chicago Negroes and that of Southern or Midland-born immigrant Negroes. There are, of course, several secondary conditioning factors within each; these include age, education, and parents' place of birth.

Taking the speech of natives of northeastern Illinois as a norm, certain differences are found to occur in the speech of white natives of Chicago, and these seem to characterize urban speech (especially of the lower social classes) as distinct from that of the surrounding region. Some of these are:

1. General phonemic differences:

   /d/ for /ð/ as in either, father, mother
   /ʊ̈/ for /θ/ as in moth, threshed, with
   /w/ for /hw/ as in wheat, wheelbarrow, whip

2. Phonemic differences in specific words:

   /i/ for /ɪ/ in creek
   /ʊ ~ ɯ/ for /ɔ/ in whore
   /ʊ/ for /u/ in broom, room
   /n/ for /ŋ/ in precinct

Although some of these differences may be important in terms of their social connotation (i.e., identifying the speaker as a city man or as a suburbanite, as well-educated or less well-educated, etc.), it is still evident that, in terms of over-all linguistic shape, urban speech is not strikingly different from that of the greater Metropolitan area, the six counties of northeastern Illinois. However, when one compares the samples of urban Negro speech with either urban or Metropolitan speech, a number of

distinctive features of pronunciation are apparent. Some of these are:

1. Phonetic differences:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [ɑ>] | for [ɑ] | as in ma, pa |
| [ɑ·ɪ ~ aɪ] | for [ɑɪ] | as in nice, nine, twice |
| [aʊ] | for [ɑʊ] | as in fountain, how, mountain |
| [jɯ] | for [ju] | as in beautiful, music |
| [ə] | for [ɚ] | as in father, mother, water |
| [ᵊ] | for [ɚ] | as in door, four, morning |
| [ɾ] | for [ɹ] | as in three |
| [t] | for [t̬ ~ ɾ] | as in beautiful, kettle |
| [t] | for [ʔt ~ tʔ] | as in fountain, mountain |

2. Phonemic differences in specific words:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| /ɑ/ | for /æ/ | in aunt |
| /ɔ/ | for /ɑ/ | in borrow, crop, God, on, palm, tomorrow, want, Washington, wasp, watch, water |
| /æ/ | for /ɛ/ | in married |
| /æ ~ ɑ/ | for /ɛ/ | in wheelbarrow |
| /ɪ/ | for /ɛ/ | in genuine, Pennsylvania, ten |
| /ɪ/ | for /ə/ | in (the second syllable of) beautiful, faucet, kettle, mountain |
| /ɛ/ | for /ɪ/ | in chimney, rinses, since |
| /ɜ/ | for /ɪ/ | in syrup |
| /i/ | for /ɪ/ | in beard, ear, pier |
| /ə/ | for /ɪ/ | in jaundice, vomit |
| /ɑ/ | for /ɔ/ | in Chicago, fog, frost, hog, jaundice, log, moth, sausage |
| /o/ | for /ɔ/ | in hoarse, mourning |
| /ʌ/ | for /ʊ/ | in soot |
| /u/ | for /ʊ/ | in poor, roof, root |
| /i/ | for /ji/ | in yeast |

/n/ for /m/ in (final consonant of) mushroom
/z/ for /s/ in grease, greasy

It is worth mentioning at this point that in almost every case the incidence of these features is lowest among the highly educated, somewhat higher among the uneducated, and highest among the high-school students interviewed. This suggests something about the way certain social factors are influencing Negro speech in Chicago. First, the older Negro had much greater social mobility than do the young residents of the Black Belt today. Incidentally, the fact that in this survey all native Negro informants over age 50 had at least one white ancestor also seems to support this conclusion. Second, teachers in the present-day Black Belt are predominantly Negro, and many of these are natives of the South and south Midland. In addition, the steady flow of poor migrants from the South serves to reinforce the incidence of non-standard Southern dialect features in the Negro community.[4] In fact, a comparison of the features of Chicago urban Negro pronunciation given above with the features which characterize Southern and Midland dialects will make it clear that the former's distinctive character derives largely from these sources.[5] For example, one of the features mentioned was the frequent occurrence of /z/ rather than /s/ in the Negro pronunciation of grease (verb) and greasy. Since this /z/ is actually a hallmark of Southern and Midland speech, the following additional facts about its incidence in the speech of resident Chicago Negroes might prove informative.[6]

First, on the basis of place of birth:

| | /z/ | /s/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Chicago-born | 24 | 3 |
| 2. Midland-born | 5 | 5 |
| 3. Southern-born | 20 | 10 |

Second, on the basis of age:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Over age 38 | 14 | 4 |
| 2. Over age 30 | 14 | 8 |
| 3. Over age 20 | 15 | 5 |
| 4. Under age 20 | 17 | 7 |

Third, on the basis of education:

| | /z/ | /s/ |
|---|---|---|
| 1. College Graduates | | |
| Chicago-born | 8 | 1 |
| Midland-born | 2 | 4 |
| Southern-born | 6 | 4 |
| 2. High-School Graduates | | |
| Chicago-born | 10 | 0 |
| Midland-born | 2 | 0 |
| Southern-born | 7 | 7 |
| 3. Elementary-School Graduates (or less) | | |
| Chicago-born | 7 | 1 |
| Midland-born | 1 | 1 |
| Southern-born | 5 | 1 |
| 4. Chicago-born High-School Students | 17 | 7 |

In conclusion, it is evident that the average Chicago Negro, native or immigrant, speaks a variety of English different in many ways from that of the rest of the population. Where differences of the phonological type discussed in this paper are matched by others in grammar and vocabulary, they may create a real barrier to the acquisition of a fluent command of the standard English so necessary to social advancement within the world of the white majority. But even phonological differences alone can be injurious when the Chicago Negro communicates with his often not very receptive white neighbors, for his non-standard allophones may have the effect of a foreign brogue which serves to identify him as a suspicious one, if not an outright invader.

The Cognitive Environment Study plan is to promote a preschool program which would provide concentrated doses of language information and practice for the mother and the four-year-old child. This kind of preparation will have the effect of bringing the child of the "Black Ghetto" closer to the level of linguistic awareness enjoyed by the average white student. If Professor Hauser's proposal to break down the neighborhood school plan is realized, these preschool Negro children will need more language skills if they are to compete sucessfully with the socially

and linguistically more privileged whites. If the Hauser Report is ignored, as the tireless labors of the Urban League have been, then at least the Negro pupil in his segregated school will be helped to understand that although his native dialect may be quite suitable in certain social situations, it is liable to be less useful in others. For if he is going to communicate effectively with that part of Chicago which holds the power, he must learn a second language -- the language of The Man, the language of Miss Ann.

NOTES

1. This situation is clearly documented in the 114-page sociological study which was carried out at the University of Chicago in 1964, and which is known locally as the "Hauser Report", after its director, Professor Philip M. Hauser of the Department of Sociology.

2. The directors of this research program are Raven I. McDavid, Jr. of the Department of English, Robert D. Hess of the Department of Human Development, and Sol Tax of the Department of Anthropology, all at the University of Chicago, as well as William M. Austin and Alva Lee Davis, both of the Department of English, Illinois Institute of Technology.

3. Lee A. Pederson, The Pronunciation of English in Metropolitan Chicago: Vowels and Consonants. The field records analyzed in this dissertation include the speech of 136 natives of northeastern Illinois, thirty-three of whom are Negroes. Fifty-five of these informants responded to a questionnaire of approximately 700 items; the remaining eighty-one responded to the sixty-seven item short phonological checklist.

4. The characteristics of non-indigenous Negro speech of this type include such features as the vocalization of /r/ and diphthongization of /ɔ/ in words like [flɔɪədə] Florida and [ɔɪndʒəz], the loss of dental stops after final /l/ as in /æsfɔl/ (or /æʃfɔl, æsfɛl, æʃfɛl, ɑsfɔl, ɑʃfɛl/) asphalt and /fil/ field, the loss of /ð/ before final /z/ as in /mɔz, mauz/ moths, and the substitution of /ʃ/ for one of the /s/'s (but never both) in the word sausage, i.e. /ʃɔsɪdʒ, ʃasɪdʒ, sɔʃɪdʒ, saʃɪdʒ/.

5. See in particular the essay by Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "The Dialects of American English", appearing as Chapter 9 in Francis' The Structure of American English, especially pp. 521-526.

6. See Map 171 in Kurath and McDavid, The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States, and the comments to it on pp. 176 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Francis, W. Nelson. The Structure of American English. New York, The Ronald Press, 1958.

Kurath, Hans, and Raven I. McDavid, Jr. The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States. Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1961.

Pederson, Lee A. The Pronunciation of English in Metropolitan Chicago: Vowels and Consonants. Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

# SOME APPROACHES TO TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Charlotte K. Brooks, District of Columbia Public Schools

Linguists say that all languages and dialects are really of equal merit, and that "good" language is simply language which gets the desired effect with the least trouble for the user. Yet, there exist in our schools two kinds of children who have language or dialect problems and whose language, from this point of view, is not "good". I would like to discuss their problem at this time.

Of course, I am still interested in the eager, relatively untroubled youngsters who study the language arts with enthusiasm. I am always happy to see, hear, and read about the excellent teaching they are getting. I am glad to know that they share experiences readily -- both orally and in writing -- and that they learn to read with little difficulty. As a teacher I enjoy working with such youngsters and now I find great pleasure in visiting them and observing their growth in reading power, their skill in writing, their articulate and perceptive discussions, their joy in literature, and their creativity. But these youngsters are not my major concern at this moment.

Like many others, I have taught -- and now watch with a troubled mind -- the two other kinds of pupils: the culturally different and the culturally deprived. I am concerned because I think that in spite of a growing awareness of the long-neglected problems of these children, educators have not yet learned the best ways of dealing with them. And unless teachers of the language arts salvage the youngsters -- and do so very early in their school lives -- these potentially useful citizens will be lost forever to all education and will become our problems, our drop-outs, our hangers-on, our failures. I say "our", because if this happens, the loss will be ours as much as theirs, for in our rapidly changing, automation-geared land we can no longer afford such losses.

Earlier, I said "two kinds of children" quite purposely, because I want to differentiate sharply between the culturally different and the culturally deprived. Many people, even those who have made careful studies of the needs of children who perform below par, tend to lump the two groups together. In my own city of

Washington, D.C., where we have attempted to help normal children who are retarded in school, basic classes sometimes include not only these children but also the mentally subnormal and the emotionally maladjusted. A cursory reading of newspapers and magazines and attendance at professional meetings has elicited for me the not too surprising information that all over this land totally unlike kinds of culturally different and culturally deprived children are thus grouped together. Too often there is little consideration given to the great differences among them or to the best approaches to teaching them.

Limitations of space and time will prevent my exploring more fully the variations among these children and all of the approaches that can be used in teaching them. Therefore, I shall concern myself with the users of non-standard English among the culturally different and culturally deprived, and with some approaches to teaching them standard English as though it were a second language. However, it must be mentioned that among the culturally different should be included those perfectly intelligent (or even superior) children who are immigrants from foreign lands, and many of whom are non-English-speaking. Still others are pupils with physical or emotional problems, or pupils from other English speaking countries. In short, they include all who differ from the average child of middle or upper level American city or suburb. No teacher must make the brutal error of considering these different children as necessarily deprived. They have rich cultural heritages and can offer much to their fellow pupils and teachers if properly approached.

What, then, is the culturally deprived child? Of course, there can be some overlapping, because the culturally deprived child may also be culturally different. However, he is essentially the child who has been isolated from those rich experiences that should be his. This isolation may have been brought about by poverty, by meagerness of intellectual resources in his home and surroundings, by the incapacity, illiteracy, or indifference of his elders or of the entire community. He may have come to school without ever having had his mother sing him the traditional lullabies, and with no knowledge of nursery rhymes, fairy stories, or the folklore of his country. He may have taken few trips -- perhaps his only one the cramped, uncomfortable trip from the lonely shack on the tenant farm to the teeming, filthy slum dwelling -- and he probably knows nothing of poetry, music, painting, or even indoor plumbing. He may live in the slums; he may reside in the suburbs. He may fool the observer with his quiet and cleanliness or he may disgust with his dirty appearance and

crude manners. He may disturb because of his loud, vulgar ways or frustrate because of his sullen silence; he may well be the child of a minority group, a product of inferior schools staffed by inadequate, poorly prepared, or -- to him, at least -- culturally different (or indifferent) teachers. Such a child, though potentially of average or above average ability, often comes to school for the first time able to speak only some non-standard variety of English.

Since being relatively happy and successful in the middle and upper reaches of the English speaking world requires the ability to use standard English, and since the old ways of attempting to teach its use have not been notably successful, other ways must be tried. In order to prepare for experimentation in this area, I have visited schools in which English is being taught as a foreign language, have watched speech and language arts teachers at work on elementary and secondary levels, and have talked with and observed the work of teachers of the culturally different and the culturally deprived. At least one teacher of English in Washington is now working on the design for a research project in which she will teach standard English as a second language to culturally deprived as well as culturally different pupils. Others are interested.

This is my first assumption: that standard English should and can be taught successfully as though it were a second language to children who speak non-standard English as a result of cultural differences and/or cultural deprivation. Why do I assume that this should be and can be done? Many teachers of the language arts -- themselves the products of the so-called middle classes -- teach as though a modern linguistic science did not exist and as though standard English speech and usage were historically and geographically fixed and immutable, with certain well-known laws that always have been and always must be obeyed. Textbooks, those "best of all authorities" to many such teachers, have blandly stated these laws and the teachers have inexorably taught them. Middle class little girls and boys have easily learned and practiced the "correct" forms simply because this is the kind of usage that they have always heard and seen. The basal readers have always pictured their milk-cum-vitamin way of life. Later, these children have identified with the characters of stories in school and in the stories their parents and teachers have encouraged them to borrow from the libraries. Their parents and teachers have talked in identical socially acceptable ways, lived in the same kinds of worlds. With few problems in the language arts, these children have moved from elementary to secondary school,

then usually to college and on to professional careers.

The other type of children? On entering school they learn very quickly how unlike the socially accepted pattern they are. Dress, manners, speech -- so much of their behavior is strikingly different from the established norms. The stories -- even the pictures in the books -- are certainly not about their lives, and the language spoken by the teachers and prescribed by the grammar books is not like theirs. The situation may be worsened if the teacher attempts to remodel the child without adequate scientific knowledge about the reasons for and the nature of the differences between the child's behavior and the established norm. One linguist maintains that this kind of teacher is a quack and should be just as liable to prosecution as the medical fraud. The non-standard speaker, meeting this snobbery in school, is puzzled and discouraged. Some teachers can be heard to say, for example, "A person's speech reflects his personality traits", or "Careless, sloppy speech reveals a careless, sloppy person". And the non-standard speaking pupils have often believed this, and have shrunk from or resisted learning.

Let us now consider some examples of the kinds of pupils whom I am discussing. Carlos is culturally different. His parents, born in New York City, are the children of parents born in Puerto Rico. Because one grandparent lives in the home, Spanish is often spoken there, although his parents are able to speak English. They have little money, but Carlos and his family love music and dancing and often attend free concerts or go to art galleries. The grandfather has shared his store of tales and poetry with the boy, and sometimes takes him on long rides into the country, or to beaches and parks. Carlos has even visited Puerto Rico, where other relatives live. But the boy does not say much in school because he is shy, and is not sure that he always has the right English word. As a result, his teachers in primary school, harassed with overcrowded classes, few materials, and little training in dealing with the culturally different, lumped him with other Puerto Rican children in a slow class.

Fortunately, the program described in the October 18th Christian Science Monitor came to the rescue before it was too late. A trained volunteer now works with Carlos, often in this way. The boy picks up an interesting picture.

> "I hab a tree, with leebs", says Carlos.
> "Yes, you have a tree, with leaves", replies the teacher. "Say have-leaves".

"Have-leaves", replies Carlos, learning the /v/ sound in English. Because this boy already knows some English, he needs mainly to have someone take an interest in him to draw out what he knows, to involve him in the life around him, to help him share with others -- orally and in writing -- his valuable contributions, and to correct some speech difficulties.

Mary, on the other hand, is a culturally deprived child -- a small brown girl, whose mother moved North with her non-working husband and six children. Mary's mother is too tired at the end of a long working day to do much more than a minimum of housework. She says little except to reprimand; the father, seldom present, says nothing unless he is cursing in a drunken fury. The rooms are small, noisy, and unclean. Loud parties are given constantly next door, cars and trucks clash by, sirens, dogs, radios, and television assault the ear, and Mary long ago learned to "turn herself off". Mary seldom opens her mouth in her first grade classroom deep in the slums of a big city. Conditioned inattention, they call it, when Mary cannot "turn herself on" in school. Apathetic, vacant, she seems stupid. She is not, really -- not yet, anyway.

A special language arts program, like those that are a part of the Great Cities Project, may save Mary. In Washington and in other cities with such programs trained teachers work with pupils like this girl. Such children can become interested in fascinating objects like bells with many different sounds, and can learn to listen, to talk, and to write about them. They are given new experiences -- something new to talk and write about. Perhaps, unlike Carlos, Mary must be taught about fire stations, museums, concerts, art galleries, the zoo and the country. Like Carlos, though, she must be taught standard English as a second language.

Mary may say, "Dis here a leaf".

The teacher could then reply, "This is a leaf, Mary. Put your tongue between your teeth and say 'th'." The teacher should surely not say, "You have a lazy tongue". That kind of value judgement would defeat her purpose, and would simply vanquish, in the time-honored way, the already nearly defeated child.

Mary, enjoying this special attention, and not told she is wrong at every word, will try. And she will learn to say this, teeth, that, and other standard English sounds and words. I know, for I have seen this done.

My second assumption is based upon the first: If standard English

is taught as a second language it is not necessary to insist that the child reject entirely the other or "first" language.

With Carlos, this poses no problems. Most people realize that non-English or minimally-English speaking persons must retain the first language for use in the home and sometimes in the community. They even accept with equanimity those errors in English usage that come obviously from primary use of the other language: "leebs" for "leaves"; "I no want to go", and such interesting dialects as Pennsylvania Dutch and 'Cajun'. How many teachers, though, are able to accept Mary's non-standard "dis" and "dat"? For Mary will use incorrect English. She will be affected by her community and her peers more than she will be affected by her teachers. She will say:

"You done it".
"Dis is mines".
"I ain't got none".

This language will get the desired effect in Mary's community with the least difficulty for its user, while,

"You did it".
"This is mine".
"I haven't got any" or "I don't have any",

from Mary might cause an embarrassing sensation in the home and among her friends.

Perhaps Mary can use both kinds of language, each at its appropriate time, if her teacher will show her the way. Must the teacher reject the non-standard English as wrong -- and with it reject Mary's family, friends, and her values? Many teachers feel that they must change the language of children like these. They have tried, but how successful have they been?

Certain questions are well worth asking at this point. For example, what right has a person to impose his cultural pattern upon another? How does a teacher know that his is the right way? What does the teacher know about the history of English? Does he or she know the linguistic facts about shall and will, and the double negative (perfectly right, by the way, in Spanish), the possessive, or forms like ain't I? Who made the rules, and who changes them? Who decides upon standard American English? Is it different from standard British English? Does it differ regionally within the United States?

After a year spent teaching English in Birmingham, England, I revised many of my own attitudes about pronunciation (Birmingham, Alabama; Birming'm, England), as spelling, usage, pronunciation, and meaning. I learned to spell labor as labour, to say contróversy and A to Zed, to put a comma after the salutation of a business letter and to use Esquire and Yours faithfully. I learned to say "The team are ready", and to know that napkins are diapers after my husband brought some home for use at my first grand English high tea! I met men and women from Wales, many of whom speak their own Celtic tongue among their countrymen. At my school there were six who spoke English well -- though almost always with a musical lilt -- but kept Welsh as a "first" language. They had no trouble shifting from one to the other at will, or from formal to informal (and sometimes non-standard) British English. Most of us move from formal to informal American English quite as readily. Will not our pupils, if their own first language is not rejected, be just as able to shift into standard English when such a shift is required by circumstances?

Before briefly summarizing some of the suggested approaches in a final statement, may I reiterate my reasons for feeling that these rather tentatively suggested and not yet completely tried suggestions are needed?

Constant admonition has not, we know, taught correct usage to those who habitually use non-standard English. Red pencils have seldom changed the way of resistant pupils. Why, then, should teachers not exploit the tremendous psychological uplift implicit in the idea of acceptance by saying in effect to Carlos and Mary, "I accept you and your language; use it when you need it for communication with your family and friends. But, if you really want to be a free and successful participant in other areas of American life, why not learn the kind of language accepted and used there".

The teacher must, of course, fit this little speech to the age and mental ability of the pupil, but with it he or she may be able to destroy the barrier to communication built up by the usual, unknowingly insensitive rejection. Perhaps by the same device he can build a foundation for the kind of teaching he must do. This initial acceptance can lead to some of the approaches I shall mention.

Incidentally, if language laboratories are used in this program as they are for foreign languages, we in the language arts should be in an excellent position to request some of the NDEA funds now going into those other languages. Furthermore, if linguistic science is truly a science -- and I believe it is -- we have a

second reason for requesting participation in the NDEA grants.

What, then, should we do?

1. We should not reject outright the first language of any child, but should accept the view that we leave his language alone, and teach him a second language as though it were a foreign tongue.

2. We should point out as early as possible in the child's school career that there are certain advantages in learning and using standard English. Specific examples should be pointed out.

3. Culturally deprived children might be started earlier in school -- perhaps in a pre-kindergarten or nursery school -- so that they can be given some of the rich experiences that are not now being provided by the home or the community.

4. The same media used for teaching foreign languages should be used for teaching standard English as a second language: interesting objects and pictures, tape recorders, records, television programs, language laboratories, films, and new textbooks based upon the findings of linguistic science.

5. Teachers and pupils must learn the history of language, and must understand the nature of standard English.

6. Books, especially basal readers and grammar books, must be revised to include more material directed toward the culturally different and the culturally deprived.

In terms of this approach, concern with matters like ending sentences with prepositions becomes sadly antiquated and trivial. Does this mean that the more traditional teacher will no longer be needed? She needn't worry; there will be plenty for her to do. Pupils will still have to be taught to read well and critically, to speak clearly, to write correctly and accurately, and to avoid those mechanical errors in the use of English which interfere with communication. But these errors are found everywhere, not just among the different and deprived. Indeed, Dr. Edwin Sauer says in English in the Secondary School, "...the really serious language faults of our time are more likely to be heard in high places than in low. The gardener who says to his employer, 'I ain't hardly got no room for them tulip bulbs' will be understood...But what can a reader do with a statement like this from a top industrial executive? 'Gentlemen: In re your communication as to the expediency of our continued controls of merchandisable materials, may we state

that, pursuant to many requests..."'

If, Miss Fidditch, our traditional teacher, can help eliminate jargon, gobbledygook, tautology, euphemisms, and clichés in addition to what has been suggested already, she will have a more than full-time job.

Culturally different and culturally deprived pupils like Carlos and Mary may well be happier and more successful "sayin' what comes natur'lly" where this is perfectly acceptable, but learning to use standard English in the appropriate situations. And if the "natur'l" talk is not rejected completely, and the standard English taught from the beginning with the very best approaches used in teaching a foreign language, Miss Fidditch and teachers of the language arts may be happier and more successful too.

At least, it's worth trying.