DIALECT COLLISION AND STUDENT TRAUMA

MIDGE ROOF

My first encounter with college level basic writers as their composition teacher has led me, as it has many other teachers before me, to spend anxious nights questioning what I always thought were the "givens" of teaching composition: the unquestionable worth and desirability of Standard English and Standard Written English; the ease with which any native speaker should be able to acquire facility in both; the apparently simple correlation between writing and speaking (the notion that anyone who can talk can write). But my basic writing students have led me to reassess those formerly easy assumptions. When I began to consider their language and its relation to writing (particularly to writing in college composition courses), the first thing I discovered was that neither they nor I actually spoke Standard English as I had always conceived it: grammatically precise, lexically accurate, syntactically coherent. Standard English, it occurred to me, like beauty, is a relative thing. Next I pondered the fact that we none of us write the way we talk, nor is it probably desirable to do so. Standard Written English is considerably different from speech, even from Standard English. Finally, as I read the compositions of my basic writing students, I discovered that while we could converse with little or no regard for dialect interference, the students could not write as fluently as they spoke, even when they were encouraged to write out their thoughts in informal (and ungraded) journals. Somewhere in their academic pasts they had been traumatized by the act of writing, especially by writing for an audience. Behind their expressions of trauma were hints that they felt their language was inadequate for writing. Not for speaking, but certainly for writing. For that reason it seemed to me that as their teacher, I should investigate the roots of their trauma. Underlying my investigation is my assumption that student writing is composed of care-

ful language aimed to please as well as to express, inform, or persuade.

That basic writing students are traumatized about their writing seems unarguable. Both their writing and their talk about writing amply demonstrate the pain. Many feel that their language is somehow inadequate to the task of writing, although they are often fluent speakers who use few stigmatized forms in conversation.

Linda Comerford, an associate faculty member in IUPUI's Writing Program, conducted a survey of approximately five hundred basic writing students in the fall of 1982. One question she asked the students was what element they thought was responsible for their placement into IUPUI's non-credit remedial course. The responses fell roughly into the following categories:

143 — The placement tests were faulty (80), graded too hard (20), test anxiety (30), too little time was allowed for the tests (13)
86 — Too long away from school (33), didn't work in high school (16), high school failed (27), not enough coursework in high school (10)
150 — My writing
121 — Mechanical problems: paragraphs (13), can't write decent sentences (20), don't know grammar (66), punctuation (13), spelling (9)

These answers are diffuse, but their very diffuseness is suggestive: (1) the students are confused about what is wrong with their writing; (2) they are defensive and resentful; (3) they have taken one criticism of their past writing (grammar, punctuation) and made it the focus of their writing problems. The fact is, of course, that basic writing students have problems with all three major areas a teacher is most likely to be interested in — invention, arrangement, and expression.

The students know, because they have been told and their remedial placement confirms it, that something is wrong with their writing. For lack of a solution to their writing problems, they retreat behind defenses familiar to composition teachers: they deny the importance of writing in their career plans (and one wonders whether some of them have changed their career plans *because* they have writing problems); they write very little, and what they do write is often vapid, incoherent, and disorganized; those who have

not yet given up trying to write academic prose can be identified, as Wolfram has noted, by inflated diction, hypercorrection, and malapropisms.[1] In short, basic writers practice avoidance (which often worked in the past) and dissociation of their writing from themselves (vapidity, "themewriting").[2] A parallel logic is operative in William Labov's description of an interview between a Black child and a white linguistic investigator; the child's monosyllabic, apparently dull behavior was his only defense "in an assymetrical situation where anything he says can literally be held against him."[3] If this is true of speech, it is doubly true of writing, which produces an artifact of some permanence.

It was also Labov who formulated the "Observer's Paradox": speech that is being professionally observed is altered by the presence of an observer.[4] Perhaps it is belaboring the obvious, but it is nonetheless important to recall that in student writing, the observer's paradox cannot be sidestepped: student writing is public expression aimed at and altered by an observer, no matter whether the observer is critical or sympathetic. Mina Shaughnessy has said that, to basic writers, "academic writing is a trap, . . . a line that moves haltingly across the page, exposing as it goes all that the writer doesn't know, then passing into the hands of a stranger who reads it with a lawyer's eyes, searching for flaws."[5] Students who speak fluently, often with few stigmatized features, are paralyzed at the thought of committing themselves in writing for a teacher. Their trauma finds abundant expression when they discuss their writing:[6]

Gregory: For me one of the hardest part is comming up with a topic thats not just interesting to me but also interesting to the reader.

Elizabeth: I try to think of something important and interesting for the other person who will be reading the paper.

Mark G.: Another problem is I have trouble spelling. by the time I look a word up in the dictionary I sometimes loss my thought.

Andy: My grammar is the worst in the world. My writting looks like chicken scratch.

Charlene: The reason I have trouble getting words on paper is because I know what to say but do not know how to write. The main reason for this is

grammer. Grammer is very difficult for me. I forget where to put commas, semi colons & other mechanics. I always change the tense.

Smoke: Instead of just saying what I think, I try to make it sound really good by adding a bunch of junk. I am also a little scared that it's not going to be very good, so I am very subconscious about what and how I write.

Jeff: My voc. is very little. When I go to think, I only think of simple meanings. Another reason is my spelling. I can't spell worth a dime. My spelling is only simple words. This limits me in many way. I do have one more problem. I also have a lack of English grammar useage. This means when I write, I use simple sentences with simple spellings with simple little words.

What interferes with their writing, these comments suggest, is the students' attempts to please a critical reader by conforming to the alien dialect of Standard Written English (SWE), particularly the surface features of the written dialect. Also implicit in the remarks are the kinds of criticisms their writing has received in the past.

Educators' attempts to help basic writers often produce further trauma. Mina Shaughnessy noticed that "medical metaphors dominate the pedagogy" of basic writing: students are "diagnosed" and placed in "remedial" or "developmental" classes; they go for additional help to writing "clinics" and "labs."[7] Basic writing students cannot help absorbing the notion that their writing is sick, and by extension, so is their language and so are they. They have often been made to feel like an expensive disease in the academic body which must be cured at all costs.

Jim Quinn, in an entertaining and perceptive book that skewers prescriptive and "pop" grammarians, allows that "there is really no argument about teaching children to read and write Standard English."[8] Nevertheless, a few pages later he implies that academic standard prose is different from SWE, and gives the following example of academic writing: "It is not for me to determinate whom was right; however, it is neither the individual's decision."[9] My own understanding is that good academic writing is SWE, the only major difference being that lexical choices will differ ac-

cording to audience and purpose, not that academic writing demands different (more Latinate) language than SWE.

I am not concerned here with an extensive apology for Standard Written English. It is the "lingua franca" of educated Americans, the language of academic, scientific, government, and business communication. Students aspiring to those fields need to master the written forms those fields demand. But before they can master Standard Written English, they need to recognize the ways in which it differs from speech, even from Standard English to which it is closer than it is to other dialects.

An intriguing question is whether writing differs from speech in kind or in degree. Janet Emig argues that writing demands different, more complex cognitive operations than speaking.[10] Donald Murray has said that meaning evolves through and during writing and that a text has its own integrity and autonomy.[11] Linda Flower, following Vygotsky and Piaget, believes that writing differs from speech in degree rather than in kind; that it evolves in a series of stages, transformed from inner or egocentric speech through "writer-based prose" to "reader-based prose" or SWE.[12] Regardless of whether SWE is a new dialect to master or simply a demanding extension of speech, basic writing students know that competence in oral communication does not ensure competence in written communication:

Kathleen: The reason I have trouble getting words down on paper is because. I have a hard time trying to think of things to say or write down. Alot of times my mind is wondering off on things that upset me at that time or just things that I have on my mind. It is hard to buckle down on one topic and be able to write down all the things. you are thinking. I begin to think about so many different things at once sometimes I can't decide what I want to write down first. It is like a big puzzle in my mind and I'm not sure which should or should not be written down.

Larry: The reason I have trouble getting words down on paper is. I often find myself when I get the words on the paper, they don't make sense, so I hesitate a little.

John: I don't have a very good vocabulary, and so I don't know what I want to say . . . I don't think

about what I'm saying either, and sometimes things don't make sense.

Andy: The reason why I have trouble getting words down on paper are because, when I'm writting I'm thinking about 4 different thing. Like what am I doing, how boring it is to write, so on. I just can't keep my mind on one thing. I can give a speech on a subject but on that same subject I cant write. I worry about my grammer.

Randy: The reason I have trouble getting words down on paper is my thought get all mix up. I know what I would like to say. But it never seems to come out that way on paper. My Words get mix up, and then when I write it seems to be a mess so I never write that much. But I would like to be able to write where my words can flow. My thoughts be organized.

Gregory: I can be writting a papper and doing pretty good win all of a sudden my mined hets a wall. I have diffeculty breaking threw this wall . . . When i say or think something it sounds right but when i go to write it it dosn't look right.

Smoke: I can't turn my imagination into a good paragraph. I usually don't have trouble thinking of what I want to say; but how I word it on paper.

Brad: I have a tendancy to start writing the way I talk but I don't use the slang I use when I talk.

Tonya: I have trouble putting my thoughts down on paper. I know what I want to say, but not how to say it. It seems to me that every time that happens, the words I wrote do not mean the same thing.

Elizabeth: Usually when I try to think of a subject to write about my mind will go blank. It like I can see a dark empty room and there are not any flashing lights that have the subject title written on them.

Mark: Sometimes at a sper of the moment thing I can write very good. Often I don't get this charge of energy and so I fight with the pen and paper. It

> rally is like a private war. Sometimes I win and most often I lose.

The recurrent theme in these comments from my W001 students is the struggle between meaning and the demands of organization and expression. Basic writers either lose their thoughts or are unable to develop them because of this premature stress on framing their ideas in the best public language at the first attempt.

Walter J. Ong, S.J., has discussed some differences between orality and literacy which apply as well to the distinctions between speech and Standard Written English. Orality, or speech, he says, is episodic, anecdotal, circular, formulary, and aphoristic.[13] To that it can be added that lacunae and ellipses are frequent in speech, depending on the social context. Speech or, more precisely, conversation helps generate ideas in the interplay between two minds. And finally, some grammaticality is negotiable (or at least forgivable); even among careful speakers of Standard English, subject-verb agreement, pronoun reference, syntax, word choice, and usage are often subordinated to meaning, lost in the tangled expression of a complex unfolding idea.

Writing, particularly SWE, is far more demanding than speech. Ong characterizes writing as linear, sequential, and analytic. The absence of immediate response and clarification from an audience requires, in extended written discourse, careful planning, filling in gaps, making connections explicit, anticipating objections and misunderstandings. Students whose experience with print is not extensive (and they are no longer a small minority) are often unacquainted with the linear logic of writing, as Marshall McLuhan described it some years ago, or perhaps they find it inadequate compared to global experiences like television and film. Further, SWE insists on conformity to rules about grammaticality, word usage, spelling, and punctuation; mistakes in these areas are glaring in print, hindering a reader and drawing attention to themselves. That writing offers an opportunity for self-correction and revision is a mixed blessing: it provides the leisure in which to "tinker" with one's work, but it also places an added burden on the writer to take responsibility for precision of meaning, coherence of form, and clarity of expression. Obviously, basic writers know something that English teachers may have forgotten: anyone who can talk can probably write, but even the most

fluent conversationalists cannot necessarily produce Standard Written English. Not to help students see and bridge the gap between speech and writing is to increase their trauma.

But composition teachers are not the sole source of student trauma. They, as well as their students, suffer from the ancient Chinese curse, "May you live in interesting times." The genesis of much ferment about composition can be laid at the door of sociolinguistics and the application (or misapplication) of sociolinguistic theories. In the last two decades, at the time when many of today's college students were beginning their educations and many of their teachers were taking professional education courses, sociolinguistics came into its own in the United States. Sociolinguistics is interested in language in its social settings, and a major social setting with which sociolinguistics have concerned themselves is education. The impact of sociolinguistic theory on education has been great. While students and their teachers were forming critical attitudes about language, sociolinguists were engaged in a debate that has interesting implications for students' traumas about their language.[14]

In the 1950's the British sociologist Basil Bernstein, drawing on Benjamin Lee Whorf's theory of linguistic relativity, posited the hypothesis that social structures condition linguistic behavior, and linguistic behavior reinforces and reproduces social structure. More specifically, lower class language lacks features found in middle class (Standard) speech. Followers of Bernstein concluded that lower class children are deficient in verbal skills because of their deprived environments, and consequently they are impaired in intellectual capacity at an early age. Although there are serious flaws in these studies, their impact was sufficient to establish compensatory programs, a major example being Headstart, whose practice was to intervene and "enrich" children's environments. When Headstart did not yield the improvements in school performance it had promised, Arthur Jensen called into question the Headstart clientele's innate mental capacities with his controversial and much-publicized assertion that Blacks and lower class whites are genetically inferior, incapable of certain cognitive (abstract) operations.[15]

William Labov fired one of the earliest volleys at the deficit hypothesis in general and at Jensen in particular with

his publication of "The Logic of Non-Standard English." Linguistic competence, say Labov and the variability theorists, is a function of contexts, and all native speakers are linguistically competent in certain situations. Using terms like "formal" and "informal,"[16] "appropriate" and "inappropriate,"[17] or "Standard" and "non-Standard," they try (without succeeding, I think) to remove the old value-ridden labels imposed by the traditionalists and the prescriptive grammarians ("correct" and "incorrect").

Refuting the deficit hypothesis that non-Standard dialects lack some features of middle class (Standard) English, Walt Wolfram has demonstrated that our perception of Standard speech is created largely by the absence of certain stigmatized features.[18]

Complicating the theoretical debates are the government's role and stance vis-à-vis sociolinguistics and education. Dittmar has observed that "every single sociolinguistic inquiry in the USA after 1964 has been financed by the Ministry (sic) for Health, Education and Welfare."[19] Thus the deficit theory gave birth to the federally financed Headstart and compensatory programs. With the loss of confidence in Headstart, William Labov and the Center for Applied Linguistics have been searching for other methods of mainstreaming minorities into our current educational systems. One proposal was the adoption of dialect texts to teach reading to dialect speakers, gradually moving from those to texts written in Standard English, a controversial proposal that was not unanimously approved by parents of dialect-speaking children[20] nor by some ethnic minorities who had "made it" without such assistance.[21]

A further development in education during this time was the open admissions policy begun by City University of New York in 1970, when CUNY scrapped its quota systems and competitive requirements to accept any New York City resident with a high school diploma.[22] This was in response to the equality of opportunity laws passed in the 1960's and 1970's; the result was to bring into colleges many students unprepared by traditional standards to do traditional college-level work. Their presence was particularly problematic for English composition programs, because many of the new students were non-Standard speakers and writers. English composition was forced to turn to linguistics to understand such students; twelve previous years of schooling under traditional grammarians had failed to produce

speakers and writers of Standard English. Mina Shaughnessy's sensitive work on the logic of students' language errors, *Errors and Expectations,* would seem to be an outgrowth of the partnership between linguistics and composition theory.

Norbert Dittmar provides an outsider's (German, Marxist) perspective on the interrelatedness of sociolinguistics, education, and government in this country. Dittmar claims that even the variability theorists aim to mainstream and colonize non-Standard speakers and minorities into "the system" through education.[23] The rhetoric of "emancipation of the lower class"[24] is only a disguise, he asserts, for both the deficit and variability theorists' intention "to adapt the Blacks and other ethnic minorities to the social conditions that repress them with the bait of 'upward social mobility,' and to integrate them into capitalist society."[25] In an equally irate tone, James Sledd has suggested that teaching Blacks Standard English can only be viewed as "formal initiation into the linguistic prejudices of the middle class," who should rather be educated to rid themselves of their prejudices against non-Standard dialects.[26] These latter two views — Dittmar's and Sledd's — lordly, liberal, and accurate though they may be, ignore the realities students and teachers need to face at the moment. This is not yet the best of all possible worlds; for teachers to sit and wait for its coming is to shortchange our students and indulge in inexcusable quietism.

Students in today's college writing classes were in grade school when the deficit theorists were in the ascendancy; it is interesting to speculate what effects the linguistic theories of the time had on their teachers, on their milieu, and on their writing performance. Mina Shaughnessy's "medical metaphors" for basic writing programs would appear to be a remnant of the deficit hypothesis, a carry-over of the philosophy that something is wrong with the students but not with the educational system through which they have passed.

In its practical educational applications, the variability theory has given rise to a debate with far-reaching implications for the teaching of composition.[27] The debate centers on whether to ignore the "grammar" (spelling, punctuation, syntax) of a non-Standard speaker's writing in favor of content, meaning, and creativity. Wolfram noted that "there has been increasing resistance on socio-political grounds to the

methodical teaching of spoken Standard English to Black English speakers," although "few deny the advantage of knowing how to read and write the standard language."[28] The result was a reluctance to impose SWE, along with spoken Standard, on non-Standard speakers in composition courses as a way of validating the integrity of non-Standard dialects. Edward Finnegan has provided us with the background of the arguments between linguists and composition teachers in his book, *Attitudes Toward English Usage: The History of a War of Words.*[29] Meanwhile, the temper of the times has swung in a decidedly conservative direction, with a concomitant Back to Basics movement on the part of the government and of the general public, a movement which, in its popular manifestations, often seeks to return education to the nostalgic simplicities of the one-room schoolhouse.

The current reality faced by teachers and students of composition, then, can be characterized as a denial of the "either-or" mentality of the recent past, as a search for a middle road between the rigid prescriptivism that denies linguistic pluralism (and that does not seem to help students write SWE) and an "anything goes" approach that does not yield competent writers of SWE either. Another reality, one not much discussed by sociolinguists but with important implications for adult college students, is the students' desire for upward mobility into the capitalist middle class that Dittmar disparages, with its linguistic prejudices that Sledd finds contemptible.

The trauma of basic writers is real. It has its roots in the students' experiences with educators — probably most often with English teachers — who have not helped them bridge the gap between speaking and writing, and who have made them feel that style or expression supercedes meaning. Linguistics has contributed to the trauma by viewing dialect speakers as deficient and inferior, or by alienating composition teachers with what appears to be a condemnation of Standard English and SWE. And non-Standard students' rising expectations in a tightly competitive job market that demands comformity to SWE promises to produce further trauma.

"The buck stops here," Harry Truman was fond of saying; the motto applies as well to college composition programs as to the presidency. In the composition class, more than anywhere else in the curriculum, two powerful

realities clash: non-Standard dialects that have served as more than adequate tools for communication during the students' first eighteen years come up against the brick wall of SWE through which students must break if they hope to achieve the goals they have set for themselves. The ability to succeed in middle class circles, like it or not, is often related to the ability to use SWE. What, then, is a teacher to do?

The process approach to teaching composition affords a unique opportunity for reducing our students' trauma about writing while simultaneously offering them powerful strategies for shaping their thoughts into a product that conforms to SWE. It does this in two important ways: by stressing the evolutionary nature of translating meaning into written language and by putting language in its proper place.

The process approach restores meaning to its primary place in composition. Prewriting, invention, and discovery techniques afford a way into a topic the meaning and implications of which are not yet crystallized in the writer's mind. Despite their protestations that they know what they want to say but not how to say it, student writers need this opportunity to explore their topics systematically without the added burden of struggling with unfamiliar stylistic conventions that hinder or completely inhibit thought.

In the drafting or writing stage students begin to select, organize, and translate their private visions into written discourse. Linda Flower's distinction between "writer-" and "reader-based prose" is helpful here: early drafts are often narratives of the writer's thinking, narratives which need to be transformed to communicate the writer's purpose to a reader.[30] Basic writers apparently put a higher premium on organization and expression at an earlier stage than experienced writers do. Consequently, they lose their meaning in the search for what Flower terms "the perfect draft."[31] My own guess is that these students have a lower tolerance for the messy, evolutionary nature of writing — for adapting, reformulating, and rewriting until an idea comes out clearly. Unfortunately, these students do not realize that even the most gifted writers share the struggle between meaning and expression. Writing often *is* a "private war." Better writers are simply more accomplished strategists and experienced campaigners, with a longer string of successful battles behind them. To share this news with our students in discus-

sions of the writing process will alleviate the trauma incurred by their "perfect draft syndrome."

Taking the reader's needs into consideration can also introduce the revision stage of the composing process. Here the writer reviews the composition as objectively as possible to see if the intended meaning has been expressed satisfactorily. Only now, after revising for meaning, is the student ready to worry about the language. Now is the moment to decide if SWE is appropriate to the context of this composition and, if so, to make the necessary translations from a personal dialect into SWE.

Peter Elbow has the most practical approach to this final step in revision of which I am aware.[32] After reasoning with the writer about why it is necessary to adhere to the conventions of SWE, Elbow offers short-term remedies (use a handbook; enlist three friends to proofread; hire a competent typist) and long-term goals, the most promising of which is for the student to start a personal error inventory against which will all subsequent work can be checked. His techniques help the student writer take charge rather than waiting helplessly for the red pen to perform a search and destroy mission on the composition.

Walt Wolfram's conclusion that Standard English is marked by the absence of stigmatized features has important pedagogical implications. There are a limited number of these stigmatized features; it is likely that no student uses all of them. Drawing our students' attention to Wolfram's features by including them as needed on the personal error inventories enhances the students' ability to revise their writing so it conforms more nearly to SWE.

Using the process approach, therefore, has several important benefits for the student who is already traumatized about his or her writing, and should prevent inducing trauma in students now free from it. The process approach restores meaning to its rightful primary place. It equips students with strategies for making and sharing meaning through writing, and this is in the best tradition of the humanities to which composition programs rightly belong. The process approach views language as a context-specific transaction and does not perpetuate the elitist attitudes and middle class prejudices which have made SWE a test of moral rectitude rather than a dialect appropriate for some highly specific contexts. Helping student writers acquire

SWE as a context-specific dialect while recognizing non-Standard speech as equally appropriate to other contexts will broaden the students' linguistic *and* social options and prevent teachers from playing Henry Higgins to their students' Eliza Doolittle.

To teach composition in this way entails recognizing the integrity of students' dialects and, by extension, the students' worth as persons; accepting that education in a democratic society is not the prerogative of a linguistic elite; and teaching writing as a tool for personal revolution and success. To neglect to teach SWE is to shut our aspiring students out of the world they want to join, while to intimidate them about their language, spoken and written, is to traumatize them so badly they cannot begin to acquire the tools they need. From their teachers they expect and deserve much more.

Midge Roof has taught writing both at IUPUI and Indiana University. She is currently working on a Ph.D. in English and Language at I.U. where she is an Associate Instructor.

NOTES

[1]Walt Wolfram and Marcia Whiteman, "The Role of Dialect Interference in Composition," *The Florida F. L. Reporter,* Spring/Fall 1971, 37 ff.

[2]It is probably too early to generalize about the effect of personal computers on writing skills and attitudes about writing, but I do have one basic writing student who is exploring the available software to eliminate misspellings and errors in usage, thus, he hopes, bypassing the problem by mechanizing it.

[3]William Labov, "The Logic of Non-Standard English," *The Florida F. L. Reporter,* Spring/Summer 1969, 62.

[4]William Labov, "Sociolinguistic Patterns," *Conduct and Communication* 4. Quoted in Dittmar, p. 193.

[5]Mina Shaughnessy, *Errors and Expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 7.

[6]These quotes come from students in my developmental W001 class at IUPUI in response to a question about why they have trouble putting words on paper.

[7]Mina Shaughnessy, "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing," *College Composition and Communication,* 27 (October 1976), 234-239. Reprinted in *The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook,* ed. Gary Tate and Edward P. J. Corbett (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 62 ff.

[8]Jim Quinn, *American Tongue and Cheek: A Populist Guide to Our Language* (New York: Penguin Books, 1980), p. 161.

[9]Quinn, p. 171.

[10]Janet Emig, "Writing as a Mode of Learning," *College Composition and Communication,* 28 (May, 1977), 122-128. Reprinted in Tate and Corbett, pp. 69-78.

[11]Donald M. Murray, "Writing as Process: How Writing Finds its own Meaning," in *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition,* ed. Timothy R. Donovan and Ben W. McClelland (Urbana Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1980), pp. 3-20.

[12]Linda Flower, "Writer-Based Prose: A Cognitive Basis for Problems in Writing," *College English,* 41 (September 1979), 19-37. Reprinted in Tate and Corbett, pp. 268-297.

[13]Walter J. Ong, S.J., "Literacy and Orality in Our Times," *ADE Bulletin,* No. 58 (September 1978), 1-7. Reprinted in Tate and Corbett, pp. 36-48.

[14]This is a necessarily reductive sketch of the work done in sociolinguistics in the last twenty years. The conception of a bifurcation in the discipline between deficit and variability theorists and much of the material contained in this section came from Norbert Dittmar, *A Critical Survey of Sociolinguistics: Theory and Application,* trans. Peter Sand, Pieter A. M. Seuren, and Kevin Whiteley (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976), p. 128.

[15]Arthur Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review,* 39 No. 1, 1969.

[16]Walt Wolfram, "Varieties of American English," in *Language in the USA,* ed. Charles A. Ferguson and Shirley Brice Heath (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 59.

[17]Edward Finnegan, *Attitudes Toward English Usage: The History of a War of Words* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1980), p. 161.

[18]Walt Wolfram and Ralph W. Fasold, *The Study of Social Dialects in American English* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974).

[19]Dittmar, p. 129

[20]Courtney B. Cazden and David K. Dickinson, "Language in Education: Standardization versus Cultural Pluralism," in Ferguson and Heath, pp. 459-60.

[21]Quinn, p. 150

[22]Shaughnessy, *Errors and Expectations,* p. 1

[23]Dittmar, p. 247.

[24]Dittmar, p. 99.

[25]Dittmar, p. 248.

[26]James Sledd, "Bi-Dialectalism: The Linguistics of White Supremacy," *English Journal* '59 (December 1969), 1307-1329.

[27]See, for example, "Students' Right to their own Language," *College Composition and Communication* Special Issue, 25 (Fall 1974).

[28]Wolfram, "Dialect Interference," p. 34.

[29]Finnegan; see especially his "Epilogue," p. 158 ff.

[30]Flower, "Writer-Based Prose."

[31]Linda Flower, *Problem-Solving Strategies for Writing* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1981), p. 38.

[32]Peter Elbow, *Writing With Power: Techniques for Mastering The Writing Process* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). See especially Chapter 15, "The Last Step: Getting Rid of Mistakes in Grammar," p. 167 ff.