SELECTED WRITTEN SYNTACTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF A PAPAGO COLLEGE DIALECT OF ENGLISH AND A STANDARD ENGLISH WRITING PROGRAM FOR PAPAGO COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Natalie Brostoff Kuhlman

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

COMMITTEE ON LINGUISTICS (GRADUATE)

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my direction by Natalie Brostoff Kuhlman

entitled **Selected Written Syntactic Characteristics of a Papago College Dialect of English and a Standard English Writing Program for Papago College Students**

be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**

Laurence Thomas Mentis — Oct. 21, 1974
Dissertation Director — Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in its approval and recommend its acceptance:*

Robert D. Hubbell	Oct 21, 1974
Paul R. Turner	oct 21, 1974
Mary Jane Cook	October 21, 1974

*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory performance at the final examination.

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Natalie Brostoff Kuldna

This dissertation is dedicated to Daniel Matson who was the first person to introduce me to the Papago people and their language, and to Bernard Fontana who is responsible for the initial direction of my research regarding American Indian usage of English.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Patricia Van Metre who was of great assistance in all stages of this dissertation; Dr. Robert Hubbell who made valuable suggestions throughout the development of the dissertation; and to other major committee members Drs. Mary Jane Cook and Paul Turner for their support throughout. I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of the minor committee members Drs. Cecil Rogers and Robert M. Harnish. Many Papago students also deserve recognition for their contributions of writing samples for the present study. Special thanks goes to Robert Longoni for his constant suggestions and help in the development of the writing program. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my husband David, whose continuous support and suggestions have always been especially valuable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

ABSTRACT

The present study (1) described the characteristics of written English used by selected Papago college freshmen and (2) proposed program procedures to teach written American Standard English to Papago college freshmen.

One of the difficulties involved in changing or adding to an existing language pattern is the interference caused by the similarities and differences between existing and target language patterns. In the present study the existing writing style is that used by selected Papago students and the target writing style is American Standard English. A combination of traditional, descriptive, and transformational approaches was used to describe American Standard English, while a tagmemic approach provided categories and sub-categories to identify the non-standard characteristics of the writing form of the Papago students.

The investigator did not find any divergencies from American Standard English at the sentence or clause levels in the Papago students' writing samples; however, twenty sub-categories of divergencies did exist in the samples at the phrase and word levels. The most frequent non-standard structural occurrences at the phrase level were repetition of superlatives in the noun phrase and non-standard subject-verb agreement and omission of the copula "be" in the verb

phrase. At the word level, the most frequent non-standard divergencies from ASE were the omission of the plural and possessive markers for nouns, and the omission of the third person singular present tense marker for verbs. The usage of prepositions was the most frequent non-standard semantic characteristic of the students' writing. Non-standard spelling and inconsistent usage of capitals occurred frequently in the students' writing samples.

The findings are similar to findings of other studies of non-standard written English, especially to those findings of Mary Jane Cook's study of 1500 essays of Southwestern Indian students in grades 4-12.

The writing program procedures suggested in the present study use a contrastive approach and were developed to teach ASE to Papago college freshmen. The procedures combine oral and written explanations of grammatical forms, with practice exercises.

Recommendations for further related study included the investigation of the writing of American Indian students who reside outside of the Southwestern United States, and the development of additional writing programs for Indian students who use non-standard English dialects. The importance of respect for the students' writing form as well as an understanding of the motivational factors necessary to the successful acquisition of the target language form by the students was noted.

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the present study was to explore Papago Indian usage of written English as it relates to both Standard English and non-standard dialects of English. In addition suggested program procedures to teach written Standard English to Papago college freshmen were developed.

The Rationale

Linguists differ in how they define the word "dialect"; however, most agree that it is a variant of a language. Francis (1958, p. 48) claims that a dialect exists when a single homogenous speech community is formed. Dialect users adopt unique characteristics of their language in phonology, grammar, and lexicon. Laird (1967) enlarges upon Francis' definition when he states:

> if two sets of people speaking basically the same language are thrust into two sets of places, apparently they'll originate language variations and in time they will be speaking noticeably differently. . . . Placing people in separate areas creates what we call dialect, i.e., when languages change enough so that people can't understand each other (p. 6).

A "pidgin," as opposed to a dialect, is a simplified language used for communication between peoples speaking two unintelligible languages (McDavid 1972, p. 355). This

variation becomes a dialect of one of the languages, according to Stewart (1964, p. 12), when it has become standardized and there exists a sizable number of native speakers of that dialect, as was the case with Black American usage of English in the United States.

In the United States, new dialects have taken several forms, the best known of which is the geographical or "regional" dialect. As people have settled throughout the United States, their language has changed along with their new life styles. ". . . an alteration in the culture will inevitably produce a variation in the language" (Past 1970, p. 17). Three major regional dialect patterns are now recognized: Eastern, General American, and Southern (Shuy 1972, p. 345). Regional dialects share a social acceptance both within their own communities and with the larger population which surround them. "No geographical dialect is recognized as superior to any other . . ." (Past 1970, p. 269).

Another dialect form, however, is associated with specific ethnic groups. This form has frequently been referred to as "non-standard" or "sub-standard" (Kenyon 1972, p. 387; Labov 1972, p. 395), and is not as acceptable to the larger population (C. Fries 1972, p. 351). Black English (BE) is one of the better researched of this form of dialect (Fraser 1973, p. 2). BE originated with the slaves who arrived in the New World from Africa

approximately 250 years ago. The slaves were not allowed to associate with members of their own tribe and consequently came to the United States with no one to communicate with in their native language. The slaves learned a variety of English, either upon arrival in the United States or upon being captured by the slave traders in Africa; however, the language was neither British English nor the American Standard dialect of English. They acquired a language of use, now known as Black English (Stewart 1972, p. 408). BE is generally understandable to speakers of American Standard English (ASE), but it is used predominantly by Blacks in the ghetto (Hanners 1972, p. 2). BE has several syntactical features which are peculiar to it (such as the non-standard usage of "be"), as well as a distinctiveness in its phonological structure (Fraser 1973). Recently, linguists have pointed out that ASE is now adopting several of these features, making ASE more informal (Hanners 1972, p. 29; Zale 1972, p. 1).

A second ethnic dialect which has recently been acknowledged is that used by the Mexican-Americans (Stewart 1964, p. 12; Johnson 1970, p. 170; Metcalf 1974, p. 97). This dialect is strongly influenced by Mexican Spanish. Present claims are that there are actually several Mexican-American English dialects. Some of these dialects are quite similar to Mexican Spanish, while others are closer to ASE in nature (Elerick 1973, p. 1). However, most studies speak

of Mexican-American usage of English only in relation to the bilingualism of the Mexican-American (Elerick 1973, Oldstad 1973, Carnejo 1973). Much more investigation will be necessary before a precise definition of the English used by Mexican-Americans will be available.

The focus of the present paper is with a third ethnic group, the American Indians, and the dialects of English that they use. The dialects used by American Indians are similar in background to those of the Mexican-Americans, in that each of the dialects originates from and is still influenced by a second language. With regard to Indians, the second language influence will vary from tribe to tribe. It is not presently known how many spoken and written tribal forms of English exist; therefore, in the present paper, "Indian English" will refer to all such forms in general, except where otherwise stated. The rationale for referring to Indian English as a dialect follows from the definition offered by Stewart (1964, p. 12). Although at one time Indian English would have been considered a "pidgin," it has existed over time, and for many Indians who are now native English speakers, it is their only language (John 1970). The majority of research on American Indian usage of English has taken the focus of "problems Indians have learning English" (Cook 1973, Clemons 1962). A few researchers, however, do mention that American Indians have acquired a non-standard variety of English

(Clemons 1962, Shuy 1964, John 1970, Leap 1974, Willink 1970). The present investigator has found no studies into the nature of that variety before 1973 except for the extensive work of Cook (1973) on common errors in writing English made by American Indians. In 1973, several graduate students, under the guidance of Bernard Fontana at The University of Arizona, began researching the usage of English by several specified tribes, such as Papago, Yaqui, and Cocopah. In addition, a recent federal grant proposal, submitted by the four tribes of the Colorado River Reservation in Northern Arizona, suggested similar research. As well, Leap (1974) has studied the spoken English of the Isletan Tiwa. At present, however, little is actually known about the features of Indian English. It is known that there are both native English speakers and English as a second language speakers among the American Indians; however, whether both groups, within one tribe, use the same form of spoken English has not yet been investigated.

What do educators and linguists see as their obligation, after recognizing the existence of ethnic dialects? Should non-standard dialects, such as Indian English, be changed or left alone? Eric Lenneberg (in Spolsky 1970) sums up this problem: "Society assumes that its members will be able to function effectively in a variety of SE. Speakers of other languages and dialects will be penalized in being denied access to education,

employment and the general culture" (pp. 6-7). This mobility is perhaps the most common reason cited by linguists and educators for encouraging students to acquire skills in ASE. Charlotte Brooks (in Hoffman 1971) says to users of BE: "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 successful participant in other areas of American life, why not learn the kind of language accepted and used there" (p. 95).

Another reason cited for acquiring ASE skills occurs at the college level. If the non-standard dialect user does succeed in gaining admission to a college or university, he may find that without skills in ASE he is unable to cope with college level requirements. Richards (1970, p. 1) has found that when students fail to achieve, they drop out. With specific regard to American Indian students, Toelken (1971, p. 29) has reported on a study at the University of Oregon which found that out of forty to fifty Indian students who enrolled each fall, roughly six remained the entire term. Those students interviewed cited difficulty in their English composition course as their primary reason for leaving school. In summary, American Standard English is required for mobility, both social and economic, and for the education needed to acquire that mobility.

Another subject for consideration is the rationale for teaching both ASE speech and ASE writing patterns. What are the arguments for and against instruction in ASE speech? The two arguments cited in favor of teaching ASE speech are first, that without ASE speech skills mobility will not exist (Lenneberg, in Spolsky 1970, pp. 6-7), and second, that without ASE speech, one cannot write ASE (Clemons 1962, p. 47).

The answers given in opposition to these two arguments take two focuses. First, several linguists claim that non-standard English is understood by ASE speakers, and non-standard speakers understand ASE. Hanners (1972), in referring to students who speak BE, states "My students' speech is perfectly understandable and the dialect peculiarities which cause so much interference in their writing are not serious handicaps to their speech" (p. 2). Joan Baratz (in Fasold 1971, p. 85) has shown in her research that children understand spoken ASE although they do not use it. Instantaneous translations from ASE to the non-standard dialect by the BE speaking student is posited by Troike (1968).

An answer to the second argument, that speaking a dialect is a prerequisite to writing it, is that individuals do not write in the way that they speak (Past 1970, p. 288). "No competent linguist would suggest that the teacher of written English would accept in student writing

all of the conventions and the same characteristics of style as are customary in speech, even that of the most cultivated" (Ives 1958, p. 360). Ives (1958) distinguishes two types of writing, one which is a "graphic representation of a linguistic expression . . . and, [second], writing as a special kind of communicative activity (which differs in style and purpose from speech)" (p. 360).

The researchers just cited argue against teaching ASE speech while arguing for teaching ASE writing. Additional arguments are offered specifically in favor of teaching ASE writing. Schotta (1970) contends that "the acquisition of SE through writing involves less emotional stress than when approached through speech and requires less skill on the part of the instructors" (p. 261). Wolfram and Whiteman (1971) claim as well that there is ". . . Resistence on socio-political grounds to the methodological teaching of spoken SE to BE speakers." They add that "few deny the advantages of knowing how to read and write the standard language" (pp. 2-3). Finally, Hanners (1972) contends that "It is desirable that all college students have a command of standard written English, be his spoken dialect whatever it will" (p. 2).

The present investigator has found in the literature only two writing programs geared for non-standard dialect users (Schotta 1970, Hanners 1972). Hanners, at the time of her research, was unable to find any other such program

after a search of many sources. Consequently, the potential for teaching ASE writing to non-standard dialect users, without teaching them to first speak ASE, has not yet been fully explored. If, as Past (1970, p. 288) and Ives (1958, p. 360) contend, written English does have its own grammar, style, and purpose, and thus is a form distinct from spoken English, then perhaps one should further investigate the possibilities of teaching written ASE to writers of non-standard English without regard to their spoken dialect. As well, if many linguists are justified in their belief that non-standard dialect speakers can understand ASE and can be understood by speakers of ASE, as Hanners (1972) and Fasold (1971) contend, then again it is the formal writing situation which ought to take precedence over speech.

If one accepts that (1) ASE writing is a necessary tool for success in higher education and for mobility in the larger society, (2) ASE speech may not be as necessary a tool as is writing for mobility, and (3) thus it would be worthwhile to further experiment with writing programs geared for non-standard dialect users, still another question needs to be asked: Is it possible to successfully teach a writer of non-standard English to write ASE? In order to investigate this question the first language acquisition of children will be discussed and then the process required to learn to write that first language will also be reviewed. These forms of language acquisition will

then be discussed in relation to the process of learning to write in a second language.

The first acquisition of language by a child is a natural process (McQuown 1958, p. 352). There are several theories which attempt to explain this phenomenon. Some psycholinguists claim that by ages three to five, a child will have internalized structures and hypothesized rules for the language through an innate ability. The child will then be able to generate sentences which he may never have heard before (Slobin 1969, Ch. 3). The argument set forth by many social behaviorists states that language acquisition is a socially based behavior learned primarily from observing models (Bandura 1969). A third explanation, offered by Skinner (1957), relies heavily on an imitation model of acquisition. Each of these approaches accepts that the normal acquisition of language by the child is not consciously taught to the child.

In contrast, with regard to learning the written language, the child is consciously taught (McQuown 1958, p. 352). Regardless of the method used, the child must learn to translate spoken language into written language, i.e., to equate sounds with letters (Past 1970, p. 281). As has been stated above, to assume that this knowledge is a verbatim transcription of spoken language is unrealistic (Ives 1958, p. 360). As McQuown (1958) states:

> teaching the child to represent by letters on paper what he says--is greatly complicated in English, by the fact that there is no general, one-to-one correspondence between the sounds which the child already carefully distinguishes and the conventional choice of letters with which they are represented. We do not, unfortunately, write as we speak (p. 353).

Learning to write in English, then, is not a simple task.

In summary, the acquisition of speech by the child is a natural informal process which is accomplished in unrefined form between the ages of three and five. The acquisition of writing skill in that language, however, is a much more complicated procedure which requires the aid of an instructor.

Learning to write in a second language, however, does not entail the same difficult process that was encountered in learning to write in the first language. The methods used in teaching writing to second language learners, as summarized by Mullen (1971), generally assume literacy in the first language. The programs assume that one has gone through a process of learning to write already, which includes the mastering of the concept of the relationship between letters and sounds. Teaching methods, as summarized by Mullen, build on the knowledge already acquired through learning to write the first language.

Many second dialect learners also have some skills in writing available when attempting to learn to write the standard language. What other factors then, would affect

the acquisition of ASE by the student who uses a non-standard dialect? Motivation is perhaps the strongest influence in acquiring a new dialect. Scoon (1971) claims that two types of motivation may cause a student to learn a new dialect. "Instrumental" motivation occurs when the student desires to learn the new language or dialect in order to make some particular use of it. Many researchers appeal to students on this basis (Brooks 1964). "Integrative" motivation, on the other hand, occurs when the student has a desire to learn more about those who use that language or dialect, and to grow closer to them. Scoon (1971) claims that it is the latter which is the more successful of the two. It is not enough to desire mobility--one must also be willing to learn about the people and the language of those who can provide the variety of opportunities one desires. One can postulate that proper student motivation is needed to change or add to one's native dialect.

Why is it necessary then to study the non-standard variations of English used by American Indians? An influence on the acquisition of ASE by the non-standard dialect user, is the amount of knowledge known by both the educator and the student about the language variation used by the student. The rationale for educators and linguists to study any ethnic dialect is summarized by Labov (1972):

> First, we can observe that automatic adjustment does <u>not</u> take place in all cases. . . .

> Second, knowledge of the underlying structure of the non-standard vernacular will allow the most efficient teaching. . . . Third, the vernacular must be understood because ignorance of it leads to serious conflict between student and teacher (pp. 393-394).

In addition, McDavid (1965, p. 258) contends that in order to understand the language situation, although the languages for some are already well documented, for others one must search more deeply into the special features of the particular language community. McDavid then claims that the researcher should "establish comparisons of the data, to see which features of speech seem to be identified with ethnic or social groups . . . set up teaching programs based on these features most strongly disapproved by the dominant culture" (p. 258).

This type of analysis has led to the development of educational programs for Black Americans, based on a knowledge of the language variations used by Black people. Hanners (1972) and Schotta (1970) have identified the particular language variations used by their students before developing their writing programs. Hoffman (1971) has summarized several of the discussions regarding whether or not bi-dialectal or mono-dialectal approaches are more effective for integrating the BE user into the Standard English world. However, no conclusions were reached in Hoffman's study, and this is an on-going argument in the field. In all the above studies, however, BE is being used

as the foundation for moving toward ASE usage, while maintaining BE.

A few analyses and educational programs have also been formulated for Mexican-Americans (Metcalf 1974, Johnson 1970); however, educational programs on this basis have not yet been developed for American Indians. Shuy (1964, pp. 52-53) suggested an investigation be made of the usage of English by Indians, but the present investigator has found no such studies in the literature. Cook (1973), as previously mentioned, has outlined the difficulties most frequently encountered in writing by Indians in grades 4-12; however, her study centers on Indians learning English as a second language.

Two groups of Indian speakers of English can be identified, based on the problems encountered in English by them. The first group includes those whose writing already has been studied by Cook; these are non-native English speakers. The second group includes those who are native speakers of English, but not of ASE. When this division is made, investigations can be broadened to include the second group in programs designed for Indians who are encountering difficulty with English. These native speakers have often not been included in previous programs. As well, the methods which are now being experimented with for teaching Blacks to use ASE, may be examined for adaptation for use with American Indians in both the first and second groups.

When an attempt to meet the cultural needs of American Indians in English courses was made at the University of Oregon (Toelken 1971, p. 29), although the courses were not directly related to non-standard English, the drop-out rate for Indians decreased to nearly zero. Perhaps similar success would be found for Indians who use non-standard English if researchers are able to identify the variations of English used by Indians and implement programs based upon that knowledge.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present research was to investigate written English usage of one group of American Indians. The following questions were explored:

1. What are the syntactic characteristics of the written non-standard form of American Standard English used by Papago college freshmen?
2. How does this written form compare and contrast
   a. with American Standard English;
   b. with other American Indian tribes' usage of written English; and
   c. with Black and Mexican-American usage of written English?
3. Taking into consideration the syntactic characteristics of the written English used by Papago college freshmen, how can a college level writing

course be developed to teach these students written Standard English?

In Chapter 2, relevant literature in the following areas will be explored: (1) American Standard English and its relationship to non-standard dialects, (2) the altering of non-standard dialects, and (3) non-standard writing programs. A model for the design of the present study will be presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 will provide the findings of the analysis. Chapter 5 will be devoted to the methodology for developing writing program procedures to teach American Standard English to Papago college freshmen. Chapter 6 will include a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, research methods used to describe American Standard English (ASE), its relationship to non-standard English (NSE), and studies directly related to Papago will be reviewed. Programs which have been developed to teach students of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Second Dialect (ESD) to write ASE also will be presented. Finally, assumptions underlying current ESL and ESD programs will be discussed.

American Standard English

> We do have in the United States a set of language habits, broadly conceived, in which the major matters of the political, social, economic, educational, religious life of this country are carried on. . . . 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 United States (C. Fries 1972, p. 351).

The above quotation is indicative of the way in which ASE is frequently defined. Grammarians differ, however, in how they describe ASE. Three fairly distinct approaches have been taken: prescriptive, descriptive, and theoretical. The traditional grammarian prescribed correct usage based on written English. "The emphasis was on

sentence analysis in which the sentences were parsed through the identification of parts of speech or were diagrammed according to an elaborate system developed by Alonzo Reed and Brainerd Kellogg" (Martin and Rulon 1973, p. 43). The assumptions that underlay traditional grammar were that "(a) language should be logical; (b) change is a sign of decay; (c) language can be legislated; (d) speech should imitate writing; (e) a standard exists which can be defined; finally, (f) the ability to label parts of the sentence enables the speaker to use 'better' English" (Martin and Rulon 1973, p. 43). Grammars in this field are typified by Lowth's (1762) Short Introduction to English Grammar and Sheridan's (1780) General Dictionary of the English Language.

Critics of the traditionalists claim that these grammarians were not scientific in their study of the language. Additionally, the parts of speech identified by the traditionalists overlapped, making their methods unsystematic and inconsistent. Postman and Weingartner (1966, p. 50) cite the noun as an example. "A person, place or thing" does not include enough information to identify a noun from other parts of speech. A third criticism was that traditionalists failed to distinguish between objective inquiry and personal preference (Postman and Weingartner 1966, p. 50). Finally, Martin and Rulon

(1973, p. 44) claim that traditional grammar was unable to deal with ambiguity.

In the second quarter of the twentieth century a new method for studying grammar was introduced. This was the era of the descriptivists, or the "structuralists." Bloomfield (1933) is considered the founder of this method of grammatical study, and his book Language introduced the idea of immediate constituent analysis. In describing the binary cuts of immediate constituent analysis, Martin and Rulon (1973) state that ". . . levels of structure are separated into units, each having its key word and modifiers" (p. 47). Structuralists segmented language into three layers: phonology, morphology and syntax. Hockett (1948, p. 269) stated that structural analysis could be scientific without being semantic. In 1952, Fries published The Structure of English, and defined grammar as "the study of linguistic forms that 'signal' structural meaning" (Postman and Weingartner 1966, p. 59). Meaning, then, was the outcome and not the method of the structuralists (Langacker 1968, p. 10).

As opposed to the traditionalists, the structuralists recognize four general categories at the morphological level: noun, verb, adjective, and adverb. The remaining are designated as function words, which include auxiliaries, prepositions, and articles. Other designations identified by Charles Fries (in Postman and

Weingartner 1966, p. 59) are inflections, derivational contrasts, and intonation.

The structuralists, then, are concerned primarily with language as it does exist in speech: with the ordering of words, with the classification of words and with immediate constituent analysis. Structural grammar is criticized by Martin and Rulon (1973) because its analysis is limited to "language already spoken or written and is unable to describe fully all of the possible utterances in a language . . ." (p. 48). As well, they claim that structural grammar deals only superficially with ambiguity, analyzing it in terms of stress.

Tagmemics, a descriptive analysis similar to structural analysis, was developed primarily by Kenneth Pike in the 1950's. This method stresses the relationship between function and form, in other words between formula slots and the fillers of those slots (Elson and Pickett 1962). As opposed to the structuralists, tagmemicists use a multi-constituent analysis which they claim allows for more flexibility. Multi-constituent analysis allows for three or more cuts, whereas immediate constituent analysis allows only two. As well, tagmemics divides syntax into several levels: the paragraph level is filled by sentences; the sentence level is filled by clauses; the clause level is filled by phrases; the phrase level is filled by words; the word level is filled by morphemes; and the morpheme level

is filled by phonemes (Cook 1969). Used particularly for gaining basic information about previously unknown languages, tagmemics allows the linguist to abstract elements of a language which can result in simple and immediate understanding of that language. One of its original functions was to enable missionaries connected with the Summer Institute of Linguistics readily to translate the Bible into any language. It is now used widely for describing previously unstudied languages (P. Fries 1972).

Although descriptivism in these forms still flourishes, some grammarians have taken another focus on grammar, the beginnings of which were in the late 1950's. A theoretical approach to grammar, known as transformational grammar analysis, was introduced by Chomsky (1957) in his Syntactic Structures. (In 1959, a Frenchman, Tèsniere, introduced a similar idea in Eléments.) It was Chomsky's (1965) idea that through transformational analysis the linguist could ". . . determine from the data of performance the underlying system of rules that has been mastered by the speaker-hearer and that he puts to use in actual performance" (p. 4). Chomsky (in Roberts 1964, p. ix) claimed that an adequate grammar of English must generate all well-formed sentences for each phonetically possible utterance. The idea of generating sentences is a major feature of transformational grammar, distinguishing it from other

grammars. Martin and Rulon (1973) sum up the transformationalists' viewpoint about language as consisting of three items: "the language system as a whole; the description of that system; plus a theory about how to describe the system" (p. 51). They claim its strength is in several areas. For example, they state its use of deep and surface structure (which among other things explains ambiguity), "adds greatly to its explanatory and descriptive powers" (p. 55). That tied with transformational grammar's formulas for generating a sentence adds to its "explicitness and its precision." Finally, Martin and Rulon (1973, p. 55) claim that transformational grammar makes an attempt through the study of competence and performance to obtain information about an individual's own knowledge of the language, rather than relying on observable data. Thus, generative grammar goes beyond the latitudes of traditional and structural grammars by theorizing about how the language is produced, and by projecting possible utterances in order to account for novel sentences. In addition, meaning is an integral part of generative grammar analysis, while traditional and structural grammars treat meaning only as a final result.

Chomsky, in his introduction to Roberts' (1964) English Syntax, criticized traditional grammar as relying too heavily on intuition and unexplained phenomena, rather than on known utterances. However, much has been borrowed

from traditionalist views and one linguist has even defined transformational grammar as "rigorous, systematic and explicit traditional grammar" (Goldstein 1966, pp. 92-93).

Similarities also exist between descriptivism and transformationalism. As Postman and Weingartner (1966, p. 61) point out, both grammars make a careful distinction between speech and writing, which the traditionalists did not do. Postman and Weingartner also claim that both disciplines are concerned with clarity of definitions and with the distinctions drawn between prescriptive and descriptive statements. However, transformationalists theorize as to why these distinctions occur, and the descriptivists do not.

In summary, three grammatical approaches have been taken to language analysis: traditional views, which have focused on prescriptive goals, i.e., what should exist; structural and tagmemic views, which have been concerned with describing what does exist; and finally transformational views, which have been concerned with theorizing about what does exist, and predicting what possible utterances can be generated. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, the present study borrows from all of these disciplines in developing a method for analyzing the non-standard written English used by Papago college freshmen.

ASE Contrasted to Non-Standard Dialects

Although one way of accounting for ASE is through describing and analyzing it, other attempts have been made to account for it by contrasting ASE with non-standard dialects of English. Bloomfield did this as early as 1927, when he claimed that the popular distinction between "good" and "bad" language was that the former was the "standard version" while the latter included dialectical versions. He also said that some claim that "good language" is the literary or written form while "bad language" corresponds to the deviations which occur in speech, as the traditionalists would claim. However, Bloomfield pointed out that the good-bad distinction seems to also exist where there is no written form for the language.

Contrasts between specific non-standard dialects and ASE have also been made by many researchers. Labov et al.'s (1968) discussion of Black English in two volumes has been used as the basis for many of these contrastive studies. Fraser (1973), for example, has taken Labov et al.'s Black English data and made a contrastive transformational analysis with ASE. Politzer and Bartley (1969) have listed and described systematically the major features of English phonology and morphology and compared those data to the data found in published studies, including Labov et al.'s. Carroll and Feigenbaum (1967) report on contrasts in the spoken language between ASE and Black English in

Washington, D. C. Williams (1971) has edited a series of articles dealing with the Puerto-Rican English dialect; one article compares not only Puerto-Rican English to ASE, but to Puerto-Rican Spanish as well.

A few studies have also begun in the area of Mexican-American usage of English. Johnson (1970) claims that whether the Mexican-American child is a native English speaker or a native Spanish speaker, he will still have interference in his English speech resulting from living in an environment where the English spoken is influenced by Spanish. Johnson suggests that teachers should be made aware of the non-standard features of the Mexican-American child's language and should develop programs to teach the child ASE usage, in order to combat the under-achievement of many Mexican-American children.

Metcalf (1974) reports on several studies carried out in the Riverside, California area which have attempted to determine if "Chicano English" is characterized by vocabulary choices which have Spanish cognates. Metcalf cites such examples as "couch" and "sofa." He and his researchers found that the Mexican-American more frequently chose "sofa," a Spanish cognate, and the Anglo-American more frequently chose "couch." The same preference was shown for "dish" (Anglo) and "plate" (Mexican-American), where the latter is a Spanish cognate. Metcalf's findings,

at present, support the thesis that Mexican-American usage of English is characterized by usage of Spanish cognates.

Comparisons of ASE with American Indian usage of spoken English occur only recently in the literature. Some studies exist which indicate difficulties encountered by American Indians with English, and comparisons have been made between these difficulties and ASE (Cook 1973, Clemons 1962). The majority of research regarding Indian language usage compares ASE to native Indian languages.

Leap (1974) has studied the forms of English used by the Isleta Indians, a Pueblo group in the Albuquerque, New Mexico area. He found characteristics in their spoken language to be similar in several ways to other non-standard dialects of English, such as the non-standard usage of "be" by Black Americans. Some syntactic structures also appeared to be peculiar to Isletan usage of English. Furthermore, "The sentences are pronounced using the segmental and intonational details of the Tiwa language spoken within the Isletan community" (Leap 1974, p. 178).

The variety of English used by Navajos, including both native English speakers and bilingual speakers, is discussed by Harvey (1974). She refers to the dialect as "Dormitory English" although the dialect is not limited to those Indians who have lived in a dormitory. She found that students using Dormitory English could usually recognize and understand ASE structures, such as the plural marker

"-s," while they did not use the structures in their own speech. Harvey concludes that studies of the type she made may aid in changing teacher attitudes and the understanding teachers have of their students' language.

Although the studies by Leap (1974) and Harvey (1974) were the only ones found by the present researcher, other indications that Indian English is recognized appear in the literature. Willink (1970) recognizes the acquisition of non-standard speech patterns by non-native English speakers when she states:

> Most of these English speaking [Indian] children however, are bilingual, in the sense that they use the language of their tribe as well as English. It is not known how well they speak their tribe's language, but their English is usually a non-standard dialect and their command of it is usually extremely limited (pp. 5-6).

Clemons (1962), while addressing herself to the Indian's problems with English at the college level, claims that "His problems are often those of the foreign student. . . . But unlike many foreign students, the Indian may be quite fluent in a rather slangy brand of English, so fluent in fact that his proficiency in a sub-standard brand of English is a real barrier for him to overcome in speaking or writing at the college level" (p. 42).

As mentioned in Chapter 1, a series of studies on the English used by Indians of the Southwest is now beginning at The University of Arizona, under the guidance of Bernard

Fontana. Many of the Indians being studied are native English speakers, while others are bilingual speakers.

The Papago Language

Many studies of American Indian languages are available and a few relate specifically to Papago. Each study has placed emphasis on the phonology, morphology and syntax of the native language and some have compared the structure of the native language to ASE, as Mathiot (1973b) has done for Papago. She found several items of syntax and phonology which are similar to ASE, as well as many others which differ from ASE. For example, Mathiot found seven English consonants which do not occur in Papago (v, θ, ð, z, ʒ, ŋ, and w), while Papago exhibits three consonants not found in English (ḍ, ʔ, and ñ). All other English consonants are found in Papago, at least in some approximation. Syntactically, Mathiot found that Papago is a much freer language with regard to word order than is English. For example, in English there is a rigid ordering of Subject-Predicate-Object, whereas in Papago that order may be followed, or it may be reversed (Object-Predicate-Subject), or it may be infused (Predicate-Object-Subject). Another difference between Papago and English, as cited by Mathiot, is that in English there are pre-positions and in Papago, frequently, there are post-positions.

In addition to her comparison of Papago and ASE, Mathiot (1973a) has recently completed a very extensive dictionary and grammar of Papago, making use of complex linguistic terminology and techniques. Her dictionary is limited to placing Papago words and phrases into English; however, it has been a major addition to knowledge of the Papago language.

Other studies of Papago include one by Saxton and Saxton (1969) which contains a grammar that details Papago structure and a dictionary (Papago-English; English-Papago). The Saxtons make less effort than does Mathiot to compare Papago to English, but rather they attempt to explain Papago by using English language terminology.

Finally, Alvarez (1969a, 1969b) has written, in Papago, a phonology and syntax of Papago which was summarized in English by Kenneth Hale at MIT, and which was later literally translated by Kuhlman (1972). Alvarez approaches the language from an intuitive viewpoint and his work may be one of the few grammars of an Indian language written in the native language by a native. Alvarez discusses each of the sounds found in Papago and provides examples. He also discusses several of the types of sentence structure found in the language. While writing the phonology and grammar, Alvarez found that he had to invent new terms, as Papago did not have a way of talking about such concepts as a "sentence," "word," or "nasal." These new terms are

perfected. Hatch (1971) comments that it would be possible for a student to remain at one step all semester.

Hatch (1971) criticizes all of these programs, however, when stating that "decomposition exercises are not 'building blocks'" (p. 50). A student can do the exercises and still not be able to write well because the problems are presented to him--the student need not make an original effort. Hatch further comments that students in these programs do not develop an awareness of judgment about their own writing. The exercises teach the student that one should write whether or not he has anything worthwhile to say. Finally, Hatch suggests that imagination must be worked into any successful writing program or unimaginative writers will be produced.

Mullen (1971) reviews several other ESL programs, which were designed specifically for adult Indians. Mullen's own program for adult Indians in Northern Canada is "especially intended for adults who are not literate in their own language and [the program] realizes that the students must speak English before they can learn to read it" (p. 1). Another program discussed by Mullen is that of Bernardo and Pantell (1966), English: Your New Language, which is an audio-lingual approach for adults to develop skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. Mullen claims that this program requires a great deal of motivation since it emphasizes drill and dialogues rather than

activities. The topics, however, are appropriate for adults and the reading materials (interviews and resumes) are practical.

Mullen (1971) refers briefly to a few other programs designed for adults. These include NCTE's (1965) English for Today and Martin's (1967) An Introduction to Canadian English. English for Today provides instruction in oral English for those who have already begun learning the language, as well as material for geography, social studies, social science, and literature. Martin's (1967) program is based on a standard oral approach of drills and conversation, but begins immediately, as well, with reading and writing. Another program mentioned briefly by Mullen (1971) is that of Mitchell (n.d.) called Help Through Learning English. It is comprised of a series of sixteen lessons designed for adult literacy classes. Mullen (1971) felt that this program relies too heavily on the student's ability to memorize.

In review, programs are available for both the literate and the non-literate to learn English as a Second Language. Program methods vary, but there are many available.

Writing programs aimed at Standard English development for the non-standard dialect user, however, were found by the present researcher only twice in the literature and in both cases the programs were designed for Black students.

In 1970, Schotta reported on a program she developed for Prince Edward County, Virginia. Schotta's approach was geared for schools where ESL personnel were not available and ESD programs were needed. She claimed that Black English (BE) is not the same throughout the country and each program should define exactly what is needed for each group of students. Using a corpus of 500 papers, Schotta began by describing the formal and informal language written by the students involved. After identifying these characteristics, Schotta developed a contrastive approach to the writing program based on her analysis. She concluded that more sampling of data is required and called for eventually enlarging her study to include other non-standard dialects of the area. Schotta states that "A proper long-range objective of ESD instruction is to educate members of our society about bidialectalism so that individuals who are native speakers of a dialect not shared by members of the dominant culture will be able to participate in both professional and social roles" (p. 275).

A writing program for Black college students at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, was developed in 1972 by Hanners. All students involved were enrolled in a remedial English workshop. Hanners used one class as an experimental group and another as a control group. Those in the control group were taught writing using the Macmillan Handbook (Kierzek and Gibson 1965) and those in the

experimental group used linguistically oriented methods developed by Hanners (1972). She focused on ten areas she found peculiar to the population of the college. These included omission of inflections from the past tense, past participle, third person singular present tense, and plural and genitive nouns. Hanners' emphasis was on understanding language changes and simplifications. In addition, she was concerned with phonological and morphological reasons for specific deviations from the norm. She concluded that, although some improvement was achieved in the experimental group, the two-unit class did not allow enough time for greater improvement to occur. She felt that in a course designed to meet the specific needs of students, more success might be achieved in the students' writing if more class time was provided.

Problems Related to Changing Dialects

Several programs which aim at changing or adding to the specific language of the student have been reviewed. However, there is some concern by linguists and educators regarding whether change is possible. A few researchers have addressed themselves specifically to the problems encountered in making such changes. Labov (1964) offers a progression for the normal acquisition of ASE and one can see from it the relationship between ASE and non-standard dialect acquisition. His six steps are:

> 1. The mastery of the main body of grammatical rules and lexicon of spoken English sufficient for a child to communicate his needs; 2. acquisition of local dialect consistent with that of his friends and associates; 3. acquisition of social perception in early adolescence; 4. development of ability to modify his speech in the direction of 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 (pp. 91-92).

In the case of the non-standard dialect user, problems may arise. Bruce (1969) suggested that some of the problems result from the linguistic and cultural implications which are drawn from the incongruity of participating in the Anglo culture but living in a Black one. He proposed that a curriculum in the educational system be developed specifically for Blacks so that this incongruity will not exist. He is specifically concerned with teaching the standard language.

"Anomie," as defined by Lambert (1963) is "experiencing feelings of chagrin or regret as one loses ties in one group, mixed with the fearful anticipation of entering a relatively new group" (p. 114). Lambert postulates that this affects the success of the person when trying to learn a new language or dialect.

Several studies related to motivational factors and language change can be found in the literature. Scoon (1971) as cited earlier, discusses the results of a study

at the Albuquerque Indian School which found a desire by students to move closer to another dialect or language world as a strong motivational factor in learning a new dialect or language. Brooks (1969) claims that motivation of students must begin with the instructor respecting the language used by the student and at the same time expecting that the student will be successful in learning the new dialect. This belief is held by many other educators and linguists (Harvey 1974, Johnson 1971).

Johnson (1970) states that some of the most common problems encountered in trying to make individuals bi-dialectical in BE and ASE are teacher attitude, failure to recognize BE as a distinct linguistic system, motivation, and the surface similarity between BE and ASE.

Summary

In this review of the literature, various methods for discussing and describing ASE have been offered. In addition, review of literature in which ASE has been used as a comparative vehicle to describe and define non-standard variations of it has been presented. Also, programs have been reviewed which deal with teaching ESL, and which deal with teaching written ASE to non-standard dialect users. Finally, literature concerned with causes of difficulty in the acquisition of ASE have been reviewed.

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURES

The present study required the collecting of samples of written English from Papago college students and the designing of a systematic analysis of the data to determine how the writing varied from ASE usage.

Collection of the Data

Approximately twenty-five essays were collected as samples of written English from Papago college students at The University of Arizona and at Pima Community College (PCC) in Tucson, Arizona. All of the students were enrolled in freshman composition courses.

The collected papers had been written in a variety of forms, representing both formal and informal writing. Many of the papers were written as classroom assignments and were only later solicited for the present study. Free writing on a variety of topics was predominant; however, several of The University of Arizona papers were written in a persuasive style. A few papers were revisions of earlier writings, in which case both the original and the revision were submitted. Comparisons of the original to the revision were made when appropriate.

Other data collected for the present study included approximately twenty essays written by Indians representing tribes from different parts of the country, who were attending the Desert Willow Training Center of the Indian Health Service, located in Tucson, Arizona. These papers were assigned as part of the trainees' regular English classroom work and were descriptive in nature. These data were analyzed separately from the writing samples of the Papago college students, but the same methods were used.

Method of Analysis

A comparative analysis was made between the writing samples of the Papago college students and ASE. The analysis of the writing samples was based on a combination of tagmemic and transformational methodology. Tagmemic levels offered ease in approaching the data, particularly at the clause, phrase, and word levels. Through phrase structure rules and transformations, transformational grammar analysis aided in understanding how some of the variations from ASE may have occurred in the students' writing. The ASE data which were used to compare ASE to the Papago students' writing samples came from a variety of sources. The sources included Williams' (1973) Style and Grammar; Wardhaugh's (1972) Introduction to Linguistics; Jacobs and Rosenbaum's (1968) English Transformational Grammar; Roberts' (1964) English Syntax; Elson and Pickett's

(1962) An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax; Legget, Mead, and Charvat's (1974) Prentice-Hall Handbook for Writers; and Crews's (1974) The Random House Handbook.

The analysis was made in a hierarchical format. The students' writing samples were first divided into three major analyses: structure, semantics, and spelling. Each of these three analyses was then sub-divided further into tagmemic levels of sentence, clause, phrase, and word. Categories within the levels were comprised of phrases, words, or morphemes which shared similar characteristics which might differ from ASE, such as non-standard subject-verb agreement or the presence or absence of the noun plural marker. In addition, several categories were divided into sub-categories. For example, the category of word order at the phrase level was sub-categorized into word order in the noun phrase and in the verb phrase.

An arbitrary decision was made that three examples in any particular category or sub-category, would be considered relevant and would be included (1) in the accounting of the variations from ASE found in the student's writing, and (2) in the suggested writing program procedures to be developed. An intent of the present study was to give direction for the suggested writing program. Judging from her own classroom teaching experience, the present investigator believed that three variations, in essays of different students, sufficiently indicated that similar performance

differences might occur for other Indian students and constituted an indication that the categories of differences should be included in the writing program.

Structure

In the structural analysis, several possible categories were investigated, the first of which was word order. At the clause level (filled by phrases) a determination was made as to whether ASE sentence patterns were followed, e.g., $S_{Declarative} \rightarrow NP + VP$. Word order was also examined at the phrase level (filled by words) to determine whether within a phrase, such as the verb phrase, ASE word order was maintained. Whether the auxiliary preceded or followed the main verb is an example of word ordering investigated at the phrase level, e.g., "could run," versus "run could." Another example of word order analysis at the phrase level is that of prepositional phrases. Papago uses post-positions more frequently than the prepositions found in ASE. For example, the Papago "g ki: wui" is literally translated to "the house of." The analysis investigated whether the post-position word order of Papago was applied to the written English usage in the students' papers.

A second group of structural categories was investigated at the phrase level. Noun and verb phrases were analyzed at this level to determine whether agreement

occurred within the phrase. For example, subject-verb agreement was studied at this level to determine whether the verb choice was appropriate to the subject, e.g., "I am" versus "I are." Another category investigated at the phrase level was the usage of adjectives and adverbs within the noun phrase. The analysis investigated whether a lexical choice was made so that a noun was modified by an adjective or determiner, rather than an adverb. The latter does not occur in ASE. In addition, the corpus was examined at the phrase level for the presence or absence of determiners which would be found in ASE usage.

Inflections at the word level were the focus of the last structural category of analysis. At the word level, inflections were examined in the writing samples and compared to ASE usage. Subject-verb agreement was examined since this agreement frequently is indicated only by inflectional endings, e.g., "He says" vs. "I say." Other inflectional endings, such as the noun plural marker "-s," were also examined, since they appear to be significant in several non-standard dialects of English (see pp. 43 to 48 of the present chapter).

Semantics

The second section of analysis dealt with meaning and lexical choices. All data which were grammatically standard, but semantically distinctive from formal ASE,

were isolated into categories. Included in the investigation were prepositions which were not consistent with ASE usage, e.g., "I went at the bridge" rather than the ASE version "I went to the bridge." Also included in the investigation were idiomatic expressions in which a word was used inappropriately, e.g., "I worked my skin to the bone" rather than the ASE expression "I worked my fingers to the bone." Colloquialisms such as "This one man" and "The movie was real good," also were identified, since a goal of the research was to distinguish in the writing divergences from formal Standard English.

Spelling

Spelling was the focus of the third section of analysis. All spellings which were not consistent with standard spellings were identified. Cook (1973) suggested in her research that spelling errors may be phonologically determined, i.e., if a sound does not occur in the native language it will frequently not be used in writing or speech in the new language. The native language sound closest to the new sound will be substituted. For example, the sounds graphemically represented "th" in ASE, do not occur in Papago. Consequently, a Papago learning English may find it difficult to represent those sounds. He may not hear the sounds represented by "th" when pronouncing a word containing them and consequently may not write "th"

when the sounds should be written in ASE. "That" may become "dat." The present data were examined for non-standard spelling which might have resulted from phonological differences between Papago and English.

According to Hanners (1972) similarly pronounced sounds also may cause spelling problems, e.g., "suddenly" may be spelled "suttonly." Spelling variations of this type were also examined.

Comparison of Findings to Other Sources

After the analysis was made, the findings were compared to several other investigators' findings.

American Indian English

Cook's (1973) study was a major source of comparison. Cook's subjects were below college age, and although many of her examples came from Papago students, her data went beyond just the Papago population. She identified, from 1500 essays, predictable errors in the writing of children in grades 4-12. Cook noted that both phonological and syntactical explanations could be given for these errors. The syntactical categories investigated by Cook showed the following characteristics:

1. Nouns: Omission of final -(e)s of the regular noun plural, e.g., "They only had three piece of corn bread." (Papago)

2. Verbs:
   a. Omission of final -(e)d in past tense, e.g., "I got up out of bed, wash my face . . . ." (Papago)
   b. Omission of final -(e)d in the regular past participle, e.g., "I was puzzle." (Navajo)
   c. Omission of -(e)s in the third person singular present tense, e.g., "It take place at Fort Defiance." (Paiute)
   d. Final nasal difficulty resulting in faulty verb forms, such as the omission of -ing in spelling, e.g., "He was enjoy the movie." (Tiwa)
   e. Subject-verb agreement errors, e.g., am, is, are; was, were; have, has; do, does; go, goes. Cook states such errors are predictable for all learners of inflected languages.
3. Adjectives: Use of double comparatives, e.g., "more nicer," and superlatives, e.g., "most nicest." Cook states that these are indicative of young native speakers and English as a second language learners also.
4. Adverbs: Use of adjective for adverb form, and misuse of particle (two-word verb), e.g., "get at," "get up," and "get to."

5. Pronouns: Confusion in gender distinction between third person masculine and feminine. This was much more prevalent among the younger children, states Cook.

6. Determiners:
   a. Omission of articles (a, an, the), e.g., "White man came and built house." (Papago)
   b. Confusion between "this" and "these"; "that" and "those"; "close" and "far"; e.g., "I have seen one of this games." (Papago)

7. Prepositions: Generally difficult because
   a. When both the first and second language contain prepositions there is rarely a reliable one to one semantic correspondence between them.
   b. In English, prepositions are normally unstressed so that in spoken English they may not be accurately heard, e.g., "After lunch we walked on the garden." (Papago) and "We asked to the storekeeper." (Navajo)

8. Word Order: No usual arrangement problems; however, some misplacement of adverbs, e.g., "always," "never," "usually."

It was also valuable to compare the present findings with the findings of the Desert Willow analysis as the trainees of this Indian Health facility were in an age group

roughly equivalent to those in the present study, but from a variety of tribal groups. The writing samples collected from the trainees showed all of the characteristics identified by Cook (1973), with the exception of the confusion in usage of singular and plural demonstrative pronouns, e.g., "this" and "these." In addition, several idioms were used by the Desert Willow trainees differently than would be found in ASE, such as was shown earlier in the example "I worked my skin to the bone."

Black English

The present findings were also compared to other ethnic groups' usage of written English. Hanners (1972) identified ten categories which caused difficulty for Black students in their writing at the college level:

1. Nouns:
    a. Omission of the inflection on plural and genitive nouns, e.g., "One of the girl was sick."
    b. Use of double plural and double negative, e.g., "The mens are working."
2. Verbs:
    a. Omission of the inflection for the past tense and past participle, e.g., "He ask me to dance."
    b. Omission of the "-s" inflection on the third person, singular, present tense, indicative

verb. Hanners claims this is indicative of language economy.

c. Use of "have" for every form of the verb "to have," e.g., "He have a new car."

d. Omission of the copula, e.g., "Mary this serious. Why you laugh."

e. Use of "be" as a predicting verb, e.g., "Insects be in all the food."

3. Spelling:

a. Confusion of sets of phonemes: /d/ and /t/; /n/ and /ŋ/; /w/ and /hw/; e.g., "Suttonly the door slam"; and "I hate to stay along at night."

b. Intrusion of "r," e.g., "The jurdge sentence him to death."

4. Use of an embedded question, e.g., "I asked him where was he."

Mexican-American English

Findings of a similar nature for the written usage of English by Mexican-Americans were not found in the literature by the present researcher. Johnson (1970), however, has analyzed the spoken English of Mexican-Americans, and the characteristics he identified may be reflected in their writing. The pertinent categories were:

1. Nouns:
   a. Use of double subject, e.g., "That man he lives next door."
   b. Use of double plural, e.g., "mens."
2. Verbs:
   a. Final consonant clusters dropped.
   b. Syllable "-ed" added for preterit ending, e.g., "jumpted."
   c. Reversal of past tense form of verbs and past participle form of irregular verbs, e.g., "He should have went."
   d. End agreement sound not pronounced for third person singular present tense, e.g., "He run all the time."
3. Use of the double negative.
4. Difficulty with English sounds contained in the following words: "miss--mees"; "brother--brouther"; "chair--share"; "very--bery"; "cap--cahp"; "rice--rize."

Papago

In addition to the comparisons made to the findings of Cook (1973), Hanners (1972), and Johnson (1970), a few comparisons, where applicable, were also made to the spoken English of Papago children, ages eight to thirteen (Kuhlman in preparation). Finally, the language characteristics

identified in the present study were explained, when appropriate, in terms of the Papago language to which they might be related.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings from the analysis of the writing samples of Papago college freshmen are presented in this chapter. The findings are organized in accord with three major analyses: structure, semantics, and spelling. Each of these analyses is discussed, when appropriate, under the tagmemic levels: sentence, clause, phrase, and word. When several examples of divergence from ASE were found within any one tagmemic level, and these examples had common characteristics, the examples are discussed as a single category. The findings are then compared to the analyses contained in several other studies of non-standard usage of English.

Structural Analysis

The sentence and clause levels were investigated for word order; however, the distinguishing categories of structural analysis in the students' writing samples were found at the phrase and word levels.

Sentence Level

Clauses which filled the sentence level were ordered in accordance with ASE structure. No examples of

distinctive differences from ASE were found at this level. For example, relative clauses did not occur before the phrase that they modified: "Who is twelve years older than I am, John lives nearby."

Clause Level

Phrases which filled the clause level were ordered in accordance with ASE structure. The students' writing samples did not reveal any structures at this level which diverged from ASE. For example, in a declarative sentence the verb phrase did not precede the noun phrase: "Are going home we."

Phrase Level

Three categories of differences were identified as distinguishing the students' writing samples from ASE at the phrase level: word order, modifiers, and verbs.

Word Order. Three examples, from different writing samples, contained word order at variance with ASE. In one example, the object of the preposition was placed at the beginning of the sentence while the preposition concluded the sentence: "Concerts we get to see different kinds of."[1]

---

1. Examples from students' writing are retained in original form. Non-standard forms under discussion are underlined. Changes in the examples to show ASE usage only pertain to those portions of the sentence or phrase under discussion.

A transformation occurred, placing perhaps the most meaningful word at the beginning of the sentence. In ASE, the sentence would read: "We get to see different kinds of concerts."

In the second example, noun modifiers occurred in an order differing from ASE: "My best friend just bought a beautiful gold with two carrots, diamond ring." The student's sentence included a prepositional phrase within a noun phrase. An ASE speaker might either remove the preposition, making the sentence read: "My best friend just bought a beautiful two-carrots [sic] gold diamond ring." Or the ASE speaker might move the phrase, placing it after the noun as an attributive prepositional phrase (Williams 1973, p. 132). The sentence would then read: "My best friend just bought a beautiful gold diamond ring of two carrots [sic]."

In the third example, a one word modifier was inverted from ASE noun-modifier word order: "There is a large mahogany new desk in my room." In ASE the ordering would be: "There is a large new mahogany desk in my room."

Modifiers. Modifiers in noun and verb phrases were frequently in contrast with ASE. Several sub-categories were formed: omitted and added articles, modifier repetition, and use of adjectives for adverbs.

1. Omitted articles. Articles not appearing when required in ASE formed one sub-category of

modifiers: "But as years went by the teachers in my classes started saying . . . ." An ASE speaker would include a "the" before "years" making the expression read: "But as the years went by . . . ." A similar situation exists in the phrase: "All uniformity of television has had an effect on us." An ASE speaker would include "the" to make the phrase read: "All the uniformity of television . . . ."

2. Added articles. Articles also appeared in the students' writing samples at variance with ASE: ". . . ride in the train up to the High Chapparel." Here, an article is added to the proper noun, but the place name is already specific. Another example of the added article is: ". . . at the Community Center where the big stars come to." In context, "stars" referred to non-specific movie stars; consequently, the word "stars" does not require the specific article "the."
3. Modifier repetition. Another type of non-standard modifier usage in the students' writing consisted of modifiers which were repetitious in a single noun phrase. Examples from the students' writing include "alot of many different kinds," in which the amount modifier is repeated, and "the most largest effect," in which the superlative is repeated. Repetition of

superlatives occurred frequently in the writing samples.

4. Adjectives for adverbs. Adjectives were sometimes used in verb phrases in place of adverbs. ". . . 'good' and 'bad' used as adverbs are non-standard. Standard English requires 'He talks well but writes badly'" (Crews 1974, p. 46). Examples from the students' writing include: ". . . but maybe not as bad as he did . . .," and "He will probable find this the most difficult of all." An ASE speaker would employ "badly" and "probably" in place of the adjectives "bad" and "probable," because each modifies a verb and not a noun.

Verbs. At the phrase level, many verbs in the students' writing exhibited non-standard patterns of usage. Subject-verb agreement, tense changes, omitted modals, and omitted and added parts of "to be" were all revealed in the writing samples. The most common non-standard verb pattern was the lack of ASE subject-verb agreement.

1. Subject-verb agreement. In several instances plural subjects were used with singular verbs and singular subjects were used with plural verbs. "Some reasons I don't think I'd protest is . . ." may be explained by the fact that the verb is not positioned next to the subject of the sentence, "reasons." However, in

the example "Tucson have alot of parks," the verb is positioned directly next to the subject. Apparently, other factors affect subject-verb agreement.

2. Tense changes. Some writing samples showed a change in tense: "The way we spent Christmas is by staying up . . . ." If the action had taken place each year, then in ASE the progressive tense "spend" might be used rather than the simple past tense "spent." If the action had only taken place in the past, "spent" would be appropriate ASE usage, and "is" would be changed to "was" to be consistent with the simple past (Crews 1974, p. 145).
3. Omitted modals. Non-standard omissions of the modal were also found in the students' writing: "The ones I seen would be the museums." The writer might have expressed that portion of the sentence in ASE as "The ones I have seen . . . ." Another standard form is "The ones I saw . . . ." Since more transformations are required in the remainder of the sentence in order to obtain the latter construction, the writer may have intended the former construction; or, as in Black English, the form "seen" may even have had a special meaning for the writer, although no more examples of this sort were found in the students' writing.

4. Omitted "be." The copula "be" was frequently omitted in the students' writing where the copula would occur in ASE: "He ready to go on his own . . .," and "About all I can say is I glad it finally happened." Another example is "It a larger lot."

5. Added "be." In a few instances in the students' writing samples, the copula was added at places where it would be omitted in ASE: "Its still looks warm," and ". . . rain clouds are often forced to be change direction." In Papago the words " o wud" are equivalent to "be"; however, "ʔo wud" is not used as consistently in Papago as "be" is in ASE. Williams (1973) offers the following explanation of the copula in ASE: ". . . be is primarily a linking device. . . . Semantically, since be does not imply action or change, it enables us to assert that two concepts represented by noun phrases are identical" (p. 25). This concept of a verb that has only a functional meaning may be difficult to master for someone unfamiliar with ASE.

Word Level

At the word level examples of almost all inflectional endings occurring with nouns and verbs were identified as non-standard. Other word level distinctions from

ASE, such as non-standard prefixes, were not found in the students' writing samples.

Nouns. Only in relation to inflections did noun structure in the writing samples form a category by differing from ASE at the word level.

1. Omitted plural inflection. Nouns frequently occurred without the ASE plural inflection "-(e)s," as in the examples: "Festival are usually . . .," and "Many people think of Christmas as pretty decoration in their homes . . . ." Frequently, the plural marker was omitted from the word "Indian." The students' writing exhibited such examples as: ". . . no longer can Indian be pushed around," and "It only applies to some Indian." In Papago, the word for "Indian" and "Papago" is the same, "ʔoʔ odham" and is used for both the singular and the plural.
2. Added plural inflection. Use of the plural inflection in situations where it is not required in ASE, also was found in the students' writing samples. A revised student paper contained the following example (although the student's original paper did not): "with lots of rooms for playing baseball." The plural inflection on "room" may have occurred because of the two possible meanings of "room" in

this context. The word "room" could have referred to a room in a house, in which case "room" can be pluralized in ASE. However, in the present context "rooms" referred to open space out of doors, in which case "room" cannot be pluralized in ASE. Another non-standard usage of the plural marker occurred in the example: "I have a sister four years youngers than me." As in ASE, "year" is pluralized in the student's sentence by the "-s" inflection; however, the modifier in the student's sentence is also pluralized with the "-s" inflection to create "youngers," which does not occur in ASE.

3. Omitted possessive inflection. The possessive marker "-'s" was frequently omitted in the students' writing samples where it would appear in ASE. An example of this omission from the writing samples is in the sentence: "Finding suitable shelter is important in a person life." When the possessive marker was present in the students' writing, the apostrophe was generally omitted: ". . . the usual way people learn lessons is through other peoples mistakes . . . ."

Verbs. Verbs formed a category of differences from ASE with regard to only one inflectional ending, although

many other non-standard dialect studies have evidenced various non-standard usages.

1. Omitted third person, singular, present tense inflection. There were many examples of the third person, singular, present tense inflection "-(e)s" being omitted in the students' writing: "It show real good actors," and "But its not only the husband who make an effort . . . ." In ASE usage, the "-s" would occur with "show" and "make" to form "shows" and "makes" (Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968, p. 133).
2. Omitted past tense inflection. The non-standard omission of the past tense inflection "-ed" did not appear in the students' writing samples. Many non-standard dialects, however, are characterized by this omission. For instance, Hanners (1972) found many examples of omitted past tense markers in the writing of her Black American students.

Semantic Analysis

Four categories of meaning distinctions from ASE were found in the Papago students' writing samples. These categories were all at the phrase level. Two of the categories related to specific word classes: prepositions and "is." The remaining related to idiomatic English and colloquialisms, two more generalized classes of usage.

Prepositions

Although prepositions were properly placed before their object (except in the case cited earlier), the meanings of many prepositions were frequently not consistent with ASE within the context of the sentence or phrase: "But if I had to choose on being for or against . . . ." An ASE speaker would probably state: ". . . between being for or against," since two items are contrasted in the phrase. Another usage of "on" is found in a second example: ". . . such as the protesting by the Indians on the BIA building . . . ." To show location, an ASE speaker might use "at." In another writing sample, "of" was used in a non-standard form actually to mean the opposite of its ASE usage: ". . . getting away from the security of home and the dependency of his parents." The context of the phrase implied that the child was dependent on the parents, not that the parents were dependent on the child. "Dependency on his parents" is appropriate in ASE.

"Is"

In the students' writing samples the third person singular verb "is" was used in place of more specific verbs: ". . . you will see a row of Oleanders that is a type of privacy." An ASE speaker would specify that the oleanders "give" or "offer" a type of privacy. Another example occurs in the sentence: "This is essential to a

government that is a free nation." A more specific term for "is" would be "represents," making that portion of the sentence read: ". . . a government that represents a free nation."

Idiomatic Usage

The students' writing samples contained examples of non-idiomatic usage of English. Typically, in these instances, a sentence was grammatically consistent with ASE, but some part of the sentence was semantically awkward: "The result could be an under nourishment in the person." In ASE "under" is used frequently as a preposition in such idiomatic phrases as "taken under advisement," and "under observation"; however, an ASE speaker would not use it in the present example. The phrase would be "under-nourished." The sentence would then read: "The result could be an under-nourished person," or "The result could be a person who is under-nourished."

"It is surrounded by different shapes of mountains," is an example of a sentence which would be understood by an ASE speaker. However, the ASE speaker would probably use the more idiomatic phrasing: "It is surrounded by mountains of different shapes," placing the emphasis on mountains, rather than on shapes.

Colloquialisms

The students' writing samples provided many instances of colloquial expressions, even though idioms which differed from ASE were not found in the samples. An example of colloquial usage in the students' writing is: "It show real good actors." An ASE speaker might write: ". . . very fine actors," or ". . . really good actors." Other examples of colloquial usage in the students' writing usually included the word "this," such as "this one man." Colloquial usage, in general, is not unique to Papago written English and is found in many freshmen compositions, from all types of students.

Spelling Analysis

At the word level, two categories of non-standard graphemic representations were found in the students' writing samples: non-standard spellings and capitalization.

Non-Standard Spellings

As Cook (1973) has stated, non-standard spellings may indicate that a person does not hear certain sounds in the way that those sounds are pronounced by an ASE speaker. Interference may occur from the person's first language or dialect. This may result in the assimilation of sounds or the changing of the graphemic representations of the sounds.

Assimilation. In some instances in the students' writing, an ASE sound apparently was assimilated to another closely related but distinct Papago sound. The following are examples of student non-standard spellings which may be accounted for by the student not hearing some ASE sounds: "aprisiate" (appreciate), "jesters" (gestures), and "neighter" (neither).

Graphemic Changes. Several ASE sounds do not occur in Papago; however, these ASE sounds were not given new graphemic representations when used in the students' writing: "that" was not written as "dat."

Repetition. Doubling of medial consonants in a two-syllable word occurred frequently in the students' writing: "durring" and "arround."

Capitalization

Capitalization was frequently inconsistent with ASE usage in the students' writing samples. In ASE, specific names, such as those for persons, places, nationalities, and holidays, are capitalized (Legget et al. 1974, p. 145). However, one student wrote: "Its the american thing to do." There is an inconsistent use of capitals in: "The Way we spent christmas is by staying up on Christmas eve and Watching all . . . ." Such usage reflects an individual's

divergencies; however, many of the writing samples exhibited various forms of inconsistent capitalization.

Comparison of the Present Findings to Other Non-Standard English Studies

American Indian English

The present findings were compared to Cook's (1973) analysis of Indian students' writing in grades 4-12, and to the present investigator's analysis of the Desert Willow data. The majority of the present findings were in accord with both of these analyses. For example, at the phrase level all three studies found omissions of articles which would occur in ASE. The present investigator found articles used in the students' writing where articles would not occur in ASE, while Cook (1973) did not find any such usage. Demonstrative pronouns, such as "this" and "these" were distinctive in Cook's findings. She found singular forms used when the noun referent was a plural: "this horses." The findings of the present study did not reveal such a distinction from ASE.

Difficulty in making ASE pronoun gender distinctions ("he" versus "she" versus "it") is expected in Indian usage of English since many Indian languages, Papago included, make no pronoun gender distinction. Only the younger subjects of Cook's (1973) study, however, made non-standard English gender distinctions in their writing. The

Desert Willow investigation and the present study did not reveal non-standard usage of pronoun gender.

Repetition of noun modifiers, particularly of the superlative, was found both in Cook's (1973) and the present study. In addition, Cook noted use of adjectives for adverbs as did the present investigator.

Several examples of non-standard subject-verb agreement at the phrase level were found in all three studies: "they is" instead of "they are." At the word level, non-standard subject-verb agreement was found in inflectional endings. Cook (1973) has stated that subject-verb agreement could cause predictable errors for all learners of inflected languages such as ASE. The existence of such predictable errors is evidenced in all three studies.

Also, at the word level, omissions of the plural marker, "-(e)s," and of the possessive marker "-'s," were non-standard in all three studies. However, regarding verbs, the present findings did not show any examples of ASE past tense marker ("-ed") omissions, whereas both Cook's (1973) and the Desert Willow studies had examples of the omission of "-ed."

The meanings of many prepositions were at variance with ASE in all three studies. Cook (1973) has suggested that prepositions are generally difficult, and there are

many examples of non-standard usage from each of the three studies.

Some non-standard spellings in the writing of Indian students may be caused by the phonological differences between their native language and ASE (Cook 1973). Each of the three studies contained many examples in which this explanation may apply, since spellings were distinctive from ASE.

Black English

Many similarities were found between Hanners' (1972) description of Black American students' written English and the present findings. Structurally, in both studies there were examples of non-standard omissions of the copula at the phrase level. The Black students' writing also exhibited "be" as a predicating verb, but that was not found in the present findings. A study is now beginning under the guidance of Leap (in preparation), however, to compare the usage of "be" by the Isletan Tiwa of New Mexico, with the usage of "be" by Blacks in Washington, D. C.

When discussing verb structure at the word level, Hanners (1972) noted non-standard omissions of the past tense inflection, "-ed," in her students' writing as did Cook (1973), while the present findings did not evidence such examples. Examples of non-standard omissions of the third person, singular, present tense verb marker "-(e)s,"

were found by Hanners (1972) and such omissions were also found in the present study. Cook (1973) has stated that these omissions represent a phonological problem.

Hanners (1972) also found non-standard omissions of the plural marker, "-(e)s," in her students' writing as did the present investigator. In addition, Hanners found the usage of double plurals: "the mens are working." But there were not any such examples in the present study.

Spellings which differed from ASE were also found by Hanners (1972) in her students' writing. She observed that confusion sometimes existed between similar phonemes such as between /t/ and /d/. This assimilation of sounds was also found in the present study.

Mexican-American English

Inflectional endings, such as "-(e)s" for the third person, singular, present tense, were the only distinctive items appearing in both Johnson's (1970) analysis of Mexican-American usage of English and the present findings. Johnson's other findings appeared to be peculiar to the population he studied.

Papago

Specific comparisons between Papago and the written English of Papago college freshmen were difficult to make, since Papago is not a written language for most native speakers. Many items, however, were similar in both the

analysis of spoken English of Papago children (Kuhlman in preparation) and in the analysis of the writing samples of the Papago students in the present study. Of particular note was the almost total absence in the children's speech of final consonants, which may explain the absence of noun and verb inflections in the students' writing.

Summary

The findings of the present study revealed several areas in which the writing of Papago college freshmen differed from ASE. These areas were in structure, semantics and spelling. Structural categories included the non-standard use of nouns and verbs at the phrase and word levels. Omissions of inflectional endings for both nouns and verbs were the most frequent structural distinctions from ASE found in the students' writing. Subject-verb agreement was also frequently non-standard in the students' writing samples, at both the phrase and word levels. The most frequent semantic differences with ASE were in usage of prepositions. In addition, some differences were found between idiomatic ASE usage and the students' writing. Evidence was also found of colloquial usage of English, but that is common to the writing of many freshmen students. Spellings of certain words in the writing samples differed from standard spellings, especially where assimilation of

sounds might have occurred: /g/ became /j/ and /sh/ became /s/.

When the findings of the present study were compared with the findings of other studies of non-standard usage of English, the greatest similarity was found with Cook's (1973) analysis of Indian children's writing in grades 4-12. Non-standard inflectional endings were found in the present study as well as in all of the studies to which it was compared. Non-standard omissions of such items as the copula and the article were also found in all of the studies except that of Johnson (1970).

CHAPTER 5

SUGGESTED ASE WRITING PROGRAM PROCEDURES FOR PAPAGO INDIAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

A suggested writing program was devised to meet the needs of those Papago college students at Pima Community College (PCC) in Tucson, Arizona, who expressed a desire to change their writing styles toward formal ASE usage.

The program took a contrastive approach using ASE and the findings presented in Chapter 4 as the media for comparison. Explaining to the students the new writing style (ASE) in terms of how it differs from the existing one (that used by Papago college students, as indicated in the present study) was the basis of the program. Stewart (1964) has stated that this method is a very effective approach to teaching a second language, saying the contrastive approach:

> . . . involves, as a prerequisite to actual language teaching, the analysis and plotting out of the linguistic structures of both the native language of the learner and the foreign language to be learned. After this is done the resultant points of divergence between the two linguistic systems can be taken as indications of where the learner is most likely to experience difficulty in assimilating the patterns of the new language (p. 10).

In the present program, written ASE was the "foreign language" and the writing of the Papago college freshmen,

as identified in the present study was the "native language." The points of divergence between these two "languages," as identified in Chapter 4, were the "resultant points" which were to be taught. Hanners (1972) used a similar methodology in developing her program for Black American students and found the methodology successful.

The Pilot Program

The writing program was first offered for Papago college students at PCC on a pilot basis in the fall semester of 1973. Materials for the course were developed in the summer of 1973 under a faculty development grant at PCC. The findings of the present study were used as a basis for the program.

The pilot program was intended to be five weeks in length and to be taken either without credit, or substituted for a five week module of the student's regular writing class. However, it soon became apparent that a major reason for the students' difficulty in writing ASE was that ASE had been thrust on the students too suddenly during previous education. Since many of the students in the pilot class spoke a form of English as their native language, or had acquired some spoken English before beginning school, it appeared that teachers at previous schools had assumed the students understood more about ASE than the students actually did. Consequently, in order to present ASE

materials more gradually, and at the students' request, the pilot program was extended over the whole semester, but was not offered for credit.

Of the fifteen Papago students who originally showed interest in the pilot course, ten committed themselves to attending and six remained the entire semester. The attrition rate was 40%, slightly less than the overall school attrition rate.

The Present Suggested Program

An informal evaluation of the pilot course showed some student progress; however, the results of the pilot program also indicated several areas in which improvement could be made in the classroom procedures. Consequently, the program was revised in the summer of 1974 as part of another faculty grant at PCC. The syllabus was expanded to include language categories suggested by the students, and to make the class procedures more flexible by allowing the instructor to lengthen or shorten items on the syllabus to meet the needs of the majority of a particular class.

The revised classroom procedures suggested in this study, which emerged from the experience of the pilot class, consists of three parts. The first two parts are in written form; the third part is in oral form and is dependent on the exercises written by the students. The three parts are described below.

1. A written and oral explanation of the ASE forms is made based on the non-standard form. This explanation is given in informal ASE to make the explanation more readily understandable to the students. Difficult terminology is eliminated or simplified whenever possible.
2. Exercises for practical application follow the explanation in Part 1. The exercises may be fill-in or multiple choice. Fill-in exercises allow students to respond to each item with a variety of answers. Multiple-choice exercises require students to make a choice between the standard and non-standard forms. In some cases, a third type of exercise is included: the writing of an essay or paragraph. These three types of exercises will demonstrate receptive and expressive abilities of the students.
3. When the students have completed an exercise in Part 2, an item-by-item review of the exercise is made in class. If students have used a non-standard form in an exercise where an ASE form is required, an explanation of the differences between the standard and non-standard forms again is made by the instructor. At times, students will have been instructed to do an exercise twice--once using standard and once using non-standard English. In

those cases, a comparison of the two forms is made in the review following the students' completion of the exercise.

Sample Classroom Activities

Below are six examples of how the suggested methodology and procedures may be applied to the language categories which were identified in the students' writing samples in this study as being particularly at variance with ASE. The six selected categories are: (1) non-standard omission of the plural marker "s," (2) non-standard usage of articles or determiners, (3) non-standard omission of the third person singular present tense marker "s," (4) non-standard omission of the copula "be," (5) non-idiomatic usage of prepositions, and (6) assimilation of language sounds. The explanations and exercises in the six examples presuppose that the students have already been made aware of some differences between ASE and their own form of writing. Their own form is referred to either as colloquial or informal writing. ASE and formal writing are used synonymously except where otherwise indicated.

Example 1: Non-Standard Omission of the Plural Marker "s."

Part 1: Written and oral explanation:

The most common way that nouns are pluralized in ASE is by adding an "s" to the noun. For example, "dog" becomes

"dogs." That is all there is to it. Many of you in your writing do not put the "s" on the noun when the noun refers to more than one thing, although you sometimes indicate plurals in another way, such as "three dog." That sometimes is appropriate when writing for reasons other than, say, for school or business. Actually, it is redundant to put the "s" on the noun if you have already shown that the noun represents more than one item in another way, perhaps by preceding the noun with an amount modifier, such as "three" or "many." When you do not precede the noun by some sort of modifier in colloquial usage, you need the "s" in order to get across the idea that the noun represents more than one thing. However, when you write in ASE, the "s" must occur whenever the noun represents more than one, regardless of whether or not a modifier occurs. The exception is when an irregular noun occurs, but we will go into that later. Right now, take Exercise #1 and put in plural or singular nouns as you would if you were writing ASE. Then go through the exercise again and check (✓) the number of the items which only require a plural noun marker because you are writing ASE, ones that you would otherwise know were plural. After you finish, we will go over the exercise together to make sure that you all understand the difference between pluralizing in ASE, and what you need to pluralize if you are writing more colloquially.

Part 2: Written exercise. Exercise #1:

Instruction: Fill in the blank with an appropriate singular or plural noun.

1. We have three _____ and four _____ in the backyard.
2. There are at least a dozen _____ in the refrigerator.
3. You will need to use a _____ for this assignment.
4. We have some _____ in stock already.
5. Many _____ have already said that they would come.
6. Several _____ said they wanted to buy the book.
7. We recommend six _____ for this course.
8. The movie showed five different _____ in ten _____.
9. _____ are fun.
10. _____ isn't any fun.
11. We go to _____ with the intention of learning.
12. Jumping _____ aren't meant to eat.
13. _____ cost 50¢ a pound now.
14. They found _____ in the pond.
15. Most students prefer to take a full load of 12-15 _____ if they can.
16. The _____ in the sky may not produce rain.
17. A _____ is worth quite a bit these days.
18. There are twenty-four _____ in a day.
19. Twelve _____ worked on the house.
20. We have seen many beautiful _____ on our vacation.

Part 3: Oral review:

Review of singular and plural noun usage for standard and colloquial English, using the completed Exercise #1 as basis of discussion.

Example 2: Non-Standard Usage of Articles or Determiners.

Part 1: Written and oral explanation:

In English, we have something called "determiners" or "articles." The word "article" does not really tell you anything, does it? Well, "determiner" probably does not right away either. What a determiner, or article, is, or what it does, is to determine or specify how you are using a noun. For example, the most common determiners are "the," "a," and "an." When "the" is used before a noun, that determines that a specific thing is being referred to, such as "the book." We are not speaking of just any book, but a specific one. However, when a noun is prefaced with "a" or "an," we are being more vague, more general. We are speaking of just one book, but it can be any one book. So determiners (or articles) help to determine, quite literally, whether we want to be specific (use "the"), or be general (use "a" or "an").

In colloquial writing the above determiners frequently do not appear. Often, the determiner is dropped before a singular noun that can be counted. However, in

written ASE, a determiner is required before a singular count noun. For example, if "dog" is the noun, some sort of determiner must precede it in a sentence to make clear whether you are referring to a specific dog ("the dog . . .") or to any dog ("a dog . . ."). "A dog walks" makes a general statement. "This dog . . ." or "The dog . . ." makes a more specific statement about the dog. Before a plural noun, for example, "dogs," the determiner in ASE is optional, depending on whether or not you wish to be specific: "Dogs walk" is general; "The dogs walk" is more specific.

There are many other determiners that can be substituted for "a" or "the" when a determiner is required. For "a," these include "any" or "one." "This" or "that" can be substituted for "the" to be more specific about the noun in question. Remember, though, that in ASE, as opposed to less formal writing, "this" only is used to distinguish that the item is right here, not over there. "This" is not synonymous in ASE with "the." For example, "the dog is over there" is quite acceptable in ASE; however, "this dog is over there" would be contradictory in ASE, although acceptable in some colloquial writing.

We have discussed a few of the words that can be used as determiners or articles to make a noun general or specific. We have concentrated on the singular noun, because it must have some sort of determiner in ASE, while

plural nouns have optional determiners. Exercise #2 will give you some practice on the use of determiners. First respond with the appropriate answers for ASE. Then fill in words you would use if you were writing to a good friend, informally. After you are all finished, we will go through each of the items in the exercise and compare the two answers you have given. Sometimes you may not want to put anything into the blank space, so don't. But if you leave it blank, try and figure out why you did.

Part 2: Written Exercise. Exercise #2:

Instructions: Fill in the blank with a determiner.

1. _____ man was working hard.
2. _____ dogs are hunting for rabbits over there.
3. _____ cats are lapping the milk; the rest are asleep.
4. John has _____ dogs.
5. We got _____ dog last week.
6. _____ book is on the third shelf over there.
7. The horse jumped _____ fence.
8. _____ sky is a very bright blue today.
9. There are _____ different kinds of cars on the lot.
10. Fill _____ boxes with this; fill _____ rest with that.
11. We have _____ cat, _____ dogs, and _____ horse.
12. He spoke to _____ daughter quietly.
13. He spoke to _____ girl as if she were his own.

14. I have half _____ dozen eggs in _____ refrigerator.
15. _____ herd of cattle were grazing in _____ pasture.
16. Phillip was riding _____ bright blue bicycle.
17. Feel free to ask all _____ questions you need to.
18. We have _____ pens in stock, but we'll have _____ tomorrow.
19. _____ price of eggs has increased greatly _____ week.
20. Pick up _____ newspaper while you're out.

Part 3: Oral review:

Review usage of determiners with nouns, using Exercise #2 when completed as the basis of discussion.

Example 3: Non-Standard Omission of the Third Person Singular Present Tense Marker "s."

Part 1: Written and oral explanation of present tense verbs:

Just as with other forms of grammar, there is in ASE a less formal way to use verbs. In colloquial writing, quite frequently the past tense marker is left off of verbs, especially when the time is indicated elsewhere, such as in "We work yesterday." It is clear when we worked, even though the "ed" to indicate past tense in the verb is not there. But the present tense is another case. How is it formed in ASE? Simply, the present tense is formed by dropping what we call the infinitive marker "to" from the infinitive. For example, the infinitive "to walk" becomes

"I walk" in the first person, present tense. This is true for all persons (I, you, we, they) except the third person singular (he, she, it, or a substitute). For some reason, one does not say or write in ASE "He walk." The ASE form is "He walks." An "s" is added to the basic verb form. Frequently, in informal writing, that "s" is dropped from the third person (he, she, it) and all of the persons are alike: "I walk, she walk, and John walk." The reader can easily understand what is meant. But, when you are writing at school, on the job, or in any other more formal situation, you need to put an "s" on the verb, just for the singular form of the third person. A third person noun is one which you can replace with he, she, or it. Such nouns include "dog," "man," "victory," "job," "Sue," and "PCC."

Exercises #3 and #4 will help you remember when to use the final "s" on the verb. Exercise #3 gives the infinitive for several verbs. Using whatever subject you wish, write the third person singular verb form in ASE for the present tense. For example, if the infinitive is "to find," then you might use "John finds," or "the dog finds." Remember that a singular count noun such as "dog" must have a determiner.

In Exercise #4 use the ASE verb form. This exercise will provide several different situations which require the singular form for the third person, and a few situations

which require the singular or plural forms for the other persons (I, we, you, they).

When you have completed the two exercises we will review them in class to make sure you understand in what situations the "s" must be added to the present tense verb.

Part 2: Written Exercise. Exercise #3:

Instructions: Fill in the blanks with the present tense third person verb form and a subject of your choosing.

	Infinitive	Present Tense Third Person
1.	To walk	He walks
2.	To talk	_____
3.	To skip	_____
4.	To jump	_____
5.	To flip	_____
6.	To slip	_____
7.	To cook	_____
8.	To rope	_____
9.	To call	_____
10.	To crawl	_____
11.	To discover	_____
12.	To recover	_____
13.	To rip	_____
14.	To study	_____
15.	To count	_____
16.	To guess	_____

	Infinitive	Present Tense Third Person
17.	To limp	_____
18.	To climb	_____
19.	To want	_____
20.	To desire	_____

These are all regular, but some of them require changing a letter, or adding a letter, e.g., "study" becomes "studies" and "studied"; "to skip" becomes "skipped" in the past tense. The reasons for these changes will be explained in the spelling unit.

Part 2: Exercise #4:

Fill in the correct verb form for the present tense.

1. Miguel _____ to work tomorrow.
2. Andrew _____ to fix the stove today.
3. The birds _____ south for the winter.
4. In the morning, the paperboy _____ the newspaper.
5. The whole family _____ when John is in trouble.
6. My grandparents _____ to our house for dinner on Sundays.
7. Maria _____ to school early everyday.
8. It _____ the fence very easily.
9. He _____ very handsome.
10. Some of the students _____ to school in Sells.
11. The nurse's aide _____ at PCC.
12. The movie house only _____ old films.

Part 3: Oral review:

Review present tense verbs with particular attention to the third person singular, using Exercises #3 and #4 as the basis of discussion.

Example 4: Non-Standard Omission of the Copula "be."

Part 1: Written and oral explanation:

The verb "be" is one which causes difficulty in ASE and is frequently omitted in informal or colloquial writing. It is called a linking verb because it connects two things, usually nouns and pronouns, or a noun or pronoun and an adjective. For example, a pronoun and a noun are connected in "He is a professor." A noun and an adjective are connected in "The girl is beautiful." "Be" has no meaning of its own in most cases, just a function. Since all sentences in ASE must have a verb of some sort, "be" functions as that verb when all that occurs in the sentence is that two items are linked, such as in the examples above. What follows "be" identifies the first noun or pronoun in some more specific manner, whether by identifying a quality about the noun, as in "Freedom is wonderful," or the occupation of the noun, as in "John is a doctor."

Another reason why "be" is difficult in ASE, and perhaps why it is often omitted in colloquial usage, is because "be" is so irregular. In the present tense, "be"

has the forms: I am; he, she, it is; we, you, they are. Three different forms are used, whereas a regular verb has only two, for example "make" and "makes." The past tense is also irregular for "be": I was; he, she, it was; we, you, they were. Sometimes, in colloquial usage of English, one form of "be" will be used in all cases: I is, you is, he is.

In summary, "be" is needed in ASE when a sentence calls for a linking verb, something that functions to link up items and has no meaning of its own. It also fills the requirement that in ASE every sentence must have some sort of verb. That is not a requirement for informal or colloquial speech or writing. "I glad" is colloquial; "I is glad" is also colloquial. But "I am glad" is ASE. Colloquial forms are appropriate, even necessary, for use in many informal situations. ASE is necessary in more formal situations, such as on the job or at school.

The following two exercises will help you remember what has been discussed here. In Exercise #5 you will fill in what follows the verb "be" in situations like those we have been discussing. This will give you a good opportunity to see how many different kinds of things can follow "be" when it is used as a linking device. Use as many different kinds of things as you can: nouns, pronouns, proper nouns, adjectives, and prepositional phrases. You cannot use verbs or adverbs, such as "He was running," or "He is really," for this exercise.

In Exercise #6 you will need to fill in the appropriate ASE verb form. Fill in just the ASE forms, that is the ones that you would use when writing a composition in college, or on your job.

Part 2: Written exercise. Exercise #5:

Instruction: Fill in the blanks with nouns, pronouns, proper nouns, adjectives, or prepositional phrases. Be sure to use determiners with nouns when necessary.

1. He was _____.
2. She was _____.
3. He was like _____.
4. She is like _____.
5. The cats are like _____.
6. John is similar to _____.
7. The truck is like _____.
8. The school is similar to _____.
9. In the sixth grade Mary was _____.
10. The New Year's Parade is like _____.
11. That book is _____.
12. The movie is similar to _____.
13. She is as sweet as _____.
14. The nurse was as kind as _____.
15. Many boys are like _____ when in high school.
16. The class is _____.
17. Those clouds are like _____.

18. A rose is _____.

19. A brick wall is similar to _____.

20. A football team is _____.

Part 2: Exercise #6:

Fill in the correct ASE verb form of "be."

1. Many people _____ at the picnic today.

2. It _____ wise to decide on a career early.

3. We _____ all students.

4. His family _____ farmers.

5. The doctors in the village _____ new to us.

6. You _____ a hard worker.

7. The movie _____ at Old Tucson.

8. The young girl _____ cute in her playsuit.

9. The beating of the drums _____ loud.

10. You _____ a kind person.

11. John _____ tall, dark, and handsome.

12. Strawberries _____ big and red this year.

Part 3: Oral review:

Review ASE usage of the linking verb "be" using Exercises #5 and #6 as the basis of discussion.

Example 5: Non-Idiomatic Usage of Prepositions.

Part 1: Written and oral explanation:

There are many prepositions in English and several have similar and even over-lapping meanings. Among these

are "in," "at," "to," and "of." One type of colloquial usage of prepositions is to take one or two of the above and use them in all situations, or as many as possible. ASE usage of prepositions, however, is quite varied and frequently confusing. In order to make you more aware of the many different uses of prepositions in ASE, we will go through the attached list and try and figure out when each can be used, and how it is used. After we go through those in class, Exercises #7 and #8 will provide you with situations in which you will need to choose the appropriate preposition, or prepositional phrase. Exercise #7 is multiple-choice while #8 is a fill-in exercise. You must decide in each situation what is the most appropriate preposition for ASE usage. After you have completed the exercises, we will compile a list of prepositions and prepositional phrases from all of your work and distribute them so that everyone will see the huge number of possibilities there are for the ASE usage of prepositions.

Remember that prepositions (and their phrases) usually answer the following questions: when? where? and how? For example, "at 4:00 p.m." tells you when; "from San Francisco" tells you where; and "through the fence" tells you how. In addition, the object of a preposition must be some form of a noun or noun phrase. This will become clearer as we go through the following list.

Prepositions:

about
above
across
after
against
along
among
as
as for
as to
at
before
behind
below
beneath
beside
besides
between
beyond
but (except)
by
by way of
concerning
down
during
except
for
from
in
in addition to
in place of
in spite of
into
of
on
on account of
over
since
through
throughout
to
toward
under
underneath
upon
with
within
without

Prepositional phrases:

about time
above your head
across the field
after the storm
against the wall
along the path
among the people
between the devil and the deep blue sea
but Fred
concerning your father
to the house
without help
for you
in place
during the night
as for your question
at night
before sunrise
behind the shed
below the deck
beneath the starry sky
beside the lovely lady
by way of introduction
to the movies
to bed
through the window
from the post office
from him
except Snodgrass
down the drain

Part 2: Written exercise. Exercise #7:

Instructions: Choose the most appropriate preposition for ASE usage.

1. Think (on, about, over) that for a while.
2. He takes great pleasure (in, for, with) his studies.
3. He bought the book (by, with, for) five dollars.

4. This test is (similar with, similar to, resembling) the last one I took.
5. He studied (for, by, during) an hour.
6. I will walk with you (as far as, as far to, so far as) the bridge.
7. We read (in, on, through) the newspaper that it will rain today.
8. The dogs jumped (through, around, over) the fence after the cat.
9. We will go to the movies (after, under, by) dinner.
10. The planes raced (under, through, over) the sky.
11. The coyotes howled (in, on, by) the moonlight.
12. You promised to have the work done (on, by, through) noon.
13. The counsel met (in, on, near) the clubhouse.
14. (In, On, For) the evening, we will walk in the woods.
15. He is hiding (in, on, behind) the rock.
16. Jump (in, over, above) the car.
17. We will run (over, through, into) the rock if we aren't careful.
18. Let's straighten (up, over, into) this room.
19. He gave (over, through, up) his position on the newspaper.
20. We are (on, under, in) the process of fixing the television.

Part 2: Exercise #8:

Instruction: Fill in blanks with prepositional phrases, or one prepositional phrase and one adverb.

1. Fragments _____ cause confusion _____.
2. His team _____ works _____.
3. The trainmen _____ went _____.
4. _____ several deer came out _____.
5. Late _____ rain began to fall _____.
6. My brother-in-law, who is _____, came home _____ last week.
7. Frogs _____ make a lot of noise _____.
8. You three men _____ are to go _____.
9. We were __(somewhere)__ __(when?)__.
10. _____ jack rabbits jump _____.
11. The potato _____ was rotten _____.
12. Everyone _____ kept talking _____.
13. The dog _____ was chasing rabbits _____.
14. We went _____ to see the James Bond movie _____.
15. They were in the process _____ when we arrived.
16. It is _____ that you got here.
17. The sailor was down _____ when his captain asked him _____.
18. The letter was _____.

19. She received twelve red roses _____.

20. Mary was really _____ as to what to do.

Part 3: Oral review:

Review of ASE usage of prepositions using Exercises #7 and #8 as the basis of discussion.

Example 6: Assimilation of Language Sounds.

Part 1: Written and oral explanation:

Probably the most common reasons for not using ASE grammatical forms in written form are that either in your first language they are formed quite differently; or, just as with many people who have spelling trouble, one doesn't hear, say, the past tense ending "-d," when speaking. For example, can you hear the final "d" when I say "I'm supposed to go to the store now."? Probably you just heard "suppose to." So, why would you necessarily remember to write a "d" that you don't hear? (Incidentally, in English, don't rely on being able to hear many of the sounds that occur in the written word.) As well, with this example, you have two sounds, one ending the word "supposed" and the other beginning the word "to," which are in any case difficult to enunciate together. If you say these two sounds over to yourself, "t" and "d," you'll find that they are very similar; as a matter of fact the only difference is what we call "voicing." If you hold your hand on your throat and say the two sounds out loud, you'll feel the difference.

Now try "z" and "s." Notice any similarities? When saying the "s" and the "t" your vocal chords, what you are feeling there, don't vibrate against your fingers, right? That is what voicing is about. Now try saying "The plump banana." Something similar will happen with the 2nd "p" of "plump" and the "b" of "banana," as with "supposed to." "P" and "b" are also similar pairs--and difficult to differentiate one after another. This is another reason why, for someone learning Papago for example, it is nearly impossible to differentiate between the Papago "k" and "g" sounds. In Papago, they are generally both voiceless--i.e., you don't feel them against your vocal chords. We do make the voiced-voiceless distinction in English, though, and that is where your spelling will get you into trouble.

Okay, so now you know about voicing in sounds. These sounds will cause you trouble because when you are trying to write down a word, even if you have learned to spell using phonics--and twice as much if you haven't--you won't necessarily hear those two sounds. You'll probably just hear one or the other--and most likely it will be the first sound of the second word, rather than the last sound of the first. Here are some words to practice on. Look at how they are spelled--then see how you say them.

1. a plump banana
2. supposed to, used to
3. trot down
4. kick goal
12. judge chap
13. trot to town
14. live van
15. life fan

5. log king
6. jazz singer
7. last sip
8. mass zip
9. life van
10. live fan
11. match jump
16. log goal
17. kick king
18. last zip
19. mass sip
20. plump plum
21. could have
22. could've

See what happens? Aside from getting tongue-tied, you will find that a lot of those words are hard to say together--unless you pause in between. When you run them together, generally only one of the two sounds (first or last) is heard clearly.

Now take the following list of words and look at them carefully. These are pairs of words that frequently are not spelled in the standard way, perhaps because they sound so much alike. Say them out loud, one after the other. Then look up the words in the dictionary to see how they differ in meaning. We will then go through the list together and try and discover what sounds are different, if any, in each pair. Also, we will clarify the meanings of the words from your dictionary definitions.

Part 2: Oral and written exercise:

Speak and then define the attached list of easily confused words. Try and use the words in a brief sentence.

Easily confused:

accept	except
access	excess
advice	advise
affect	effect
aisle	isle
all ready	already

allusion	illusion
altar	alter
angel	angle
ascent	assent, accent
berth	birth
boarder	border
breath	breathe
capital	capitol
choose	chose
coarse	course
confidently	confidentially
conscious	conscience
corps	corpse
council	counsel
decent	descent
desert	dessert
device	devise
dual	duel
forth	fourth
here	hear
ingenious	ingenuous
its	it's
later	latter
latter	former
lead	led
loose	lose
no	know
pair	pear, pare
peace	piece
personal	personnel
principal	principle
shone	shown
son	sun
stationary	stationery
their	there, they're
than	then
to, too	two
weather	whether
who's	whose
your	you're

Part 3: Oral review:

Review list of confused words as related to discussion of sound assimilation, and standard and non-standard spelling.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study described the characteristics of written English used by selected Papago college freshmen and proposed program procedures for teaching written ASE to Papago college freshmen.

Summary

American English dialects are of several types: in addition to those dialects defined by geographical location, such as those of the Southern and New England areas, there are non-standard dialects that are used by native English speaking ethnic groups, such as Black Americans. Some linguists also recognize non-standard dialects of English which are used by ethnic groups who are predominantly non-native speakers of English, for example the English dialects used by many American Indians. The writing of Papago college freshmen, as a part of the latter dialectal group, was the focus of the present study.

Many educators have stated that teachers have a responsibility to teach ASE to students who use a non-standard dialect in the classroom. These educators believe that ASE is a necessary tool for students to succeed in education and business and feel obligated to teach their

students ASE; however, some educators and linguists argue that in Anglo American society, written ASE is a more critical tool for success than is ASE speech. In addition, learning to write ASE may be a simpler task than learning to speak ASE because the learner has already had experience with the mechanics of writing what he says aloud.

The interference caused by the similarities and differences which exist between a target language or dialect and an existing language or dialect is a potential area of difficulty in changing language patterns. These similarities and differences need to be identified before language patterns can be changed.

The target writing style in the present study was ASE. Historically, grammatical analyses of ASE have taken three formats: traditional, descriptive, and transformational. The description of ASE used in the present study was adopted from a combination of these forms of analyses.

The existing writing style investigated in the present study was that used by Papago college freshmen. A tagmemic approach was used to identify the non-standard characteristics of the students' writing samples. After the characteristics were identified, a transformational approach was employed: transformations provided an understanding of how the distinguishing characteristics may have occurred.

Also in the present study procedures based on knowledge of the existing writing style and that of the target writing style were developed to teach written ASE (the target style). Techniques which were employed in writing programs developed by other educators to teach ESL and English as a Second Dialect were investigated for use in the present project. The techniques used in the programs of Schotta (1970) and Hanners (1972) for teaching Black Americans to write ASE were particularly appropriate for application to the project.

A contrastive approach is used in the suggested ASE writing program for Papago college freshmen: the target writing style is explained in terms of the existing one (that of Papago college freshmen as identified in the present study). The program procedures combine oral and written explanations of grammatical forms, with practice exercises and weekly writing assignments. All work, whether in written or oral form, is discussed in class to aid students in understanding the material.

The pilot class offered in the fall semester of 1973, which was the basis for the present revised program suggestions, met with several difficulties: no credit was allowed and there was insufficient time (five weeks) for the course. In its revised form the writing program for Papago college freshmen was designed to last a full semester and to be a part of a credited, modularized writing class. In

addition, the program procedures include grammatical categories not identified in the data analysis, but requested by students who participated in the pilot class.

Summary of Categories and Findings

The tagmemic approach to analyzing a new language by looking at levels of structure is particularly appropriate to the identification of the characteristics of a non-standard writing style. Reducing writing samples into sentence, clause, phrase, and word levels allows the identification of differences from ASE in such areas as word order, subject-verb agreement, and inflectional endings. In addition, this breakdown provides a way to identify differences from ASE in semantic structure and spelling. The following outline summarizes the categories and findings of the present study, in which this methodology was applied to the writing samples of approximately twenty-five Papago college freshmen:

I. Structural Categories
   - A. Sentence Level: No divergencies from ASE were identified.
   - B. Clause Level: No divergencies from ASE were identified.
   - C. Phrase Level:
     1. Noun Phrase

a. Modifiers occurred in non-standard word order.

b. Non-standard omission and addition of determiners occurred, e.g., omission of articles.

c. Repetition of modifiers occurred frequently, e.g., "alot of many."

2. Verb Phrase

a. Non-standard subject-verb agreement occurred frequently, e.g., "Tucson have . . . ."

b. Non-standard addition and omission of the copula occurred, e.g., "I glad . . . ."

c. Non-standard omission of modals occurred, e.g., "The ones I seen . . . ."

d. Usage of adjectives for adverbs occurred, e.g., "bad" for "badly."

D. Word Level:

1. Noun

a. Non-standard omission and addition of the plural marker "-(e)s" occurred frequently.

b. Non-standard omission of the possessive marker "-'s" occurred frequently.

2. Verb

a. Non-standard omission of past tense and past participle marker "-ed" did not occur.

b. Non-standard omission of third person singular present tense marker "-s" occurred frequently.

II. Semantic Categories (all at the phrase level)

A. Prepositions with meanings distinctive from ASE were used, e.g., "I had to choose on being for or against."

B. Non-specific usage of "is" occurred, e.g., "It is a type of privacy."

C. Non-idiomatic usage of English occurred, e.g., "The result was under nourishment in the person."

D. Non-standard idiomatic usage of English did not occur, while colloquial usage of English did occur, e.g., "this one man."

III. Spelling Categories (all at the word level)

A. Non-standard spellings

1. Language sounds not heard due to native language interference resulted in non-standard spellings, e.g., "jesters" for "gestures."

2. Doubling of consonants occurred, e.g., "durring."

B. Inconsistent usage of capitalization occurred.

In summary, divergencies from ASE did not exist in the Papago students' writing samples at the sentence or clause levels; however, divergencies did exist in the samples at the phrase and word levels. The most frequent non-standard structural occurrences at the phrase level were repetition of superlatives in the noun phrase, non-standard subject-verb agreement in the verb phrase, and omission of the copula "be" in the verb phrase. At the word level, the most frequent non-standard divergencies from ASE were the omissions of the plural and possessive markers for nouns, and the omission of the third person singular present tense for verbs. The usage of prepositions was the most frequent non-standard semantic characteristic of the students' writing. Non-standard spelling and inconsistent usage of capitals occurred frequently in the students' writing samples.

Conclusions

1. In the students' writing samples divergencies from ASE in twenty different sub-categories were noted. It was the researcher's judgment that these were a sufficient number of divergencies to indicate a need for the development and testing of an ASE writing

program specifically designed for Papago college freshmen.

2. The characteristics of written English of Papago college freshmen as found in the present study, are similar to Cook's (1973) analysis of the writing of students in the Phoenix Indian School in grades 4-12, and with the present investigator's analysis of writing samples of trainees at the Desert Willow Indian Health Service Training Center in Tucson, Arizona.
3. A writing program to teach Papago college freshmen to write ASE can be developed using a contrastive approach.

Recommendations

1. The written English of college level Indian students from outside of the Southwestern United States should be studied to discover if the present findings and those of Cook (1973) are in accord with those of researchers in other parts of the country, and whether or not it is valuable to refer to native language structure while teaching written ASE.
2. Additional writing programs designed to provide the American Indian student with an efficient means of acquiring the skills necessary to write in ASE

should be developed. A composite program then might be developed for use across the country.

3. Programs for speakers of American Indian dialects of English should begin with the acknowledgment that the form of English used by many American Indians is a viable dialect, or group of dialects of English, used both within and outside of the Indian community and that these dialects have a written form.
4. Educators should recognize and respect the forms of English used by their American Indian students before attempting to add to or make any changes in the form of speech or writing that the students use.
5. Motivation of the student should be recognized as an important consideration for the success of a program devised to teach ASE to non-standard dialect users.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, Albert. 1969a. The Sounds of Papago, manuscript. Boston: MIT. (With translation by Kenneth Hale.)

_____. 1969b. The Expressions of Papago, manuscript. Boston: MIT. (With translation by Kenneth Hale.)

Bandura, Albert. 1969. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bernardo, Leo, and Pantell, Dora. 1966. English: Your New Language. New Jersey: Silver Burdett Co. for General Learning Corporation.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1927. "Literate and Illiterate Speech," American Speech. Vol. 2, No. 10, pp. 432-439.

_____. 1933. Language. New York: Henry Holt.

Brooks, Charlotte. 1964. "Opportunities for Research in Urban Social Dialects in Washington D. C." in Roger Shuy (ed.), Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill: NCTE.

_____. 1969. "Motivating Students for Second Language and Second Dialect Learning." ERIC Document #ED 030 091.

Bruce, Beverlee. 1969. "The Social and Psychological Implications of Language Changing," American Behavioral Science. Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 34-37.

Carnejo, Ricardo. 1973. "The Acquisition of Lexicon in the Speech of Bilingual Children." in Paul Turner (ed.), Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Carroll, William, and Feigenbaum, Irving. 1967. "Teaching a Second Dialect and Some Implications for TESOL," TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 31-39.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic Structures. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Mass.: MIT Press.

Clemons, Elinor. 1962. "The Linguistic Approach in Teaching Grammar and Composition." Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Co-ordinating Council for Research in Indian Education. Phoenix: Arizona State Department of Public Instruction.

Cook, Mary Jane. 1973. "Problems of Southwestern Indian Speakers in Learning English." in Paul Turner (ed.), Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cook, W. A. 1969. Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Crews, Frederick. 1974. The Random House Handbook. New York: Random House.

Dykstra, Gerald, Port, Richard, and Port, Antonette. 1968. Ananse Tales and Ananse Tales Workbook. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Elerick, Charles. 1973. "An Instructional Model for Teaching 'University' English to Mexican American Bilinguals." ERIC Document #ED 078 714.

Elson, Benjamin, and Pickett, Velma. 1962. An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax. Santa Ana, Calif.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Fasold, Ralph. 1971. "What Can an English Teacher Do About Non-standard Dialects?" English Record. Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 82-91.

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

Fraser, Bruce. 1973. "A Summary of Some Linguistic Features Characterizing Black English." Unpublished monograph. Boston University.

Fries, Charles. 1952. The Structure of English, New York: Harcourt Brace.

Fries, Charles. 1972. "Standard English," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fries, Peter. 1972. "Tagmemics," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Goldstein, Miriam. 1966. The Teaching of Language in Our Schools. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Hanners, LaVerne. 1972. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Linguistic Oriented Teaching Methods in Correcting Dialectally Derived Errors in the Writing of Black College Students." ERIC Document #ED 067 701.

Harvey, Gina. 1974. "Dormitory English: Implications for the Teacher," in Garland Bills (ed.), Southwest Areal Linguistics. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Hatch, Evelyn. 1971. "Composition: Controlled Communication," in Clifford Prator (ed.), Workpapers Vol. V. Los Angeles: Dept. of English, U.C.L.A.

Hockett, Charles. 1948. "A Note on Structure," IJAL. Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 269-271.

Hoffman, Melvin J. 1971. "Bi-Dialectalism is Not the Linguistics of White Supremacy: Sense vs. Sensibilities." ERIC Document #ED 054 148.

Ives, Sumner. 1958. "Linguistics in the Classroom," in Harold Allen (ed.), Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Jacobs, Roderick, and Rosenbaum, Paul. 1968. English Transformational Grammar. Mass.: Blaisdell Publ. Co.

John, Vera. 1970. "The Development of Communicate Competence: American-Indian Needs and Priorities for the Education of American Indians." ERIC Document #ED 057 956.

Johnson, Kenneth. 1970. Teaching the Culturally Disadvantaged. Palo Alto: Science Association.

_____. 1971. "The Influence of Non-standard Negro Dialect on Reading Achievement," English Record. Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 148-155.

Kenyon, John. 1972. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kierzek, John, and Gibson, Walter. 1965. Macmillan Handbook, 5th Edition. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Kuhlman, Natalie. 1972. "English Translation of 'The Sounds of Papago' and 'The Expressions of Papago' by Albert Alvarez." The University of Arizona, unpublished manuscript.

_____. In preparation. "The Spoken English of Papago Children." The University of Arizona.

Labov, William. 1964. "Stages in the Acquisition of Standard English," in Roger Shuy (ed.), Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE.

_____. 1972. "The Study of Non-Standard English," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Labov, William, Cohen, Paul, Robins, Clarence, and Lewis, John. 1968. "A Study of Non-standard English of Negro and Puerto-Rican Speakers in NYC." 2 volumes. ERIC Document #ED 028 423/424.

Laird, Charlton. 1967. "Linguistic Applications to the Study of the American Language," Baltimore Bulletin of Education. Vol. 43, pp. 1-80.

Lambert, W. E. 1963. "Psychological Approaches to the Study of Language. Part II: On Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," The Modern Language Journal. Vol. 47, pp. 114-121.

Langacker, Ronald. 1968. Language and Its Structure. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.

Leap, William. 1974. "Grammatical Structures in Native American English: The Evidence from Isletan," in Garland Bills (ed.), Southwest Areal Linguistics. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

_____. In preparation. "A Comparison of the Isletan usage of 'be' with the 'be' usage of Blacks in Washington, D. C." American University, Washington.

Legget, Glenn, Mead, C. David, and Charvat, William. 1974. Prentice-Hall Handbook for Writers. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Lowth, Robert. 1762. Short Introduction to English Grammar. London: G. Miller and R. J. Dodsby. Facsimile edition: Yorkshire: Scholar Press (1967).

Martin, C. W. 1967. An Introduction to Canadian English. Toronto, Ont.: Department of Provincial Secretary and Citizenship.

Martin, Charles, and Rulon, Curt. 1973. The English Language Yesterday and Today. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc.

Mathiot, Madeleine. 1973a. Papago Dictionary, Volume I. Bloomington: Indiana University Research Center.

_____. 1973b. "English and Papago Compared," in Paul Turner (ed.), Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

McDavid, Raven. 1965. "American Social Dialects." ERIC Document #ED 042 792.

_____. 1972. "Sense and Nonsense about American Dialects," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

McQuown, Norman. 1958. "Language Learning from an Anthropological Point of View," in Harold Allen (ed.), Applied English Linguistics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Metcalf, Alan. 1974. "The Study (Or, Non-Study) of California Chicano English," in Garland Bills (ed.), Southwest Areal Linguistics. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Mitchell, Elizabeth. n.d. Help Through Learning English. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Dept. of HEW.

Mullen, Dana. 1971. "A Plan for Fluency First." ERIC Document #ED 056 565.

NCTE. 1965. English for Today. Rev. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oldstad, Charles. 1973. "The Local Colloquial in the Classroom," in Paul Turner (ed.), Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Past, Ray. 1970. Language as a Lively Art. Dubuque, Iowa: W. C. Brown Co.

Pike, Kenneth. 1954-1960. Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of Human Behavior. Volumes I-III. Glendale, Calif.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Politzer, Robert, and Bartley, D. E. 1969. "Standard English and Non-Standard Dialects: Phonology and Morphology." ERIC Document #ED 030 869.

Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. 1966. Linguistics: A Revolution in Teaching. New York: Dell Publ. Co.

Richards, D. R. 1970. "An Evaluation of Supplementary Techniques for Correction Idioms and Vocabulary Problems of Bilingual Students." ERIC Document #ED 050 882.

Roberts, Paul. 1964. English Syntax, Alt. Ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Saxton, Dean, and Saxton, Lucille. 1969. Papago and Pima to English; English to Papago and Pima Dictionary. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Schotta, Saritta. 1970. "Toward Standard English Through Writing," TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 261-276.

Scoon, Annabelle. 1971. "American Indian Ethnic Attitudes in Relation to School Improvement." ERIC Document #ED 047 858.

Sheridan, Thomas. 1780. General Dictionary of the English Language. London: J. Dodsley, C. Dilly, and J. Wilkie. Facsimile edition: Yorkshire: Scholar Press (1967).

Shuy, Roger. 1964. "The Problem of American Indian English," in Roger Shuy (ed.), Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE.

_____. 1972. "The Reasons for Dialect Differences," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Skinner, B. F. 1957. Verbal Behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Slobin, Dan. 1969. Psycholinguistics. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1970. "Evaluation of Research on Bilingual Education for American Indians." ERIC Document #ED 057 953.

Stewart, William. 1964. "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching," in Roger Shuy (ed.), Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE.

_____. 1972. "Sociolinguistic Factors in the History of American Negro Dialects," in Virginia Clark, Paul Eschholz, and Alfred Rosa (eds.), Language: Introductory Readings. New York: St. Martin's Press.

SWRL. 1970. "Controlled Communication Program." Inglewood, Calif.: Southwestern Research Laboratory.

Tèsniere, Lucien. 1959. Eléments. Paris: Klincksieck.

Toelken, Barre. 1971. "Cultural Bi-lingual and Composition," in W. E. Slager (ed.), English for American Indians: A Newsletter of the OE Programs. Washington, D. C.: BIA.

Troike, Rudolph. 1968. "Social Dialects and Language Learning: Implications for TESOL," TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 176-180.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1972. Introduction to Linguistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Williams, George (ed.). 1971. "Puerto-Rican English: A Discussion of Eight Major Works Relevant to Its Linguistic Description." ERIC Document #ED 051 709.

Williams, John B. 1973. Style and Grammar. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Willink, Elizabeth. 1970. "Needed Research as a Contribution to the Problem of Teaching English to American Indians." ERIC Document #ED 057 955.

Wolfram, Walter, and Whiteman, Marcia. 1971. "The Role of Dialect Interference in Composition." ERIC Document #ED 045 971.

Zale, ERic. 1972. "The Case Against Bidialectalism." ERIC Document #ED 071 465.