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ABSTRACT

The Michif technique is a method of language modification which encourages code-switching by introducing a third language as a cue. The method targets syntax modification and does not apply to phonetic modification.

The technique derives its name from the Michif Language which is the cue language used in the study. The learning of Michif is not a long-range goal of this study, but rather through the use of Michif code-switching can be fun and nonthreatening.

The Michif technique follows the bidialectical view which encourages the use of code-switching in formal environments and the use of the vernacular while in informal environments.

The Michif technique begins by whetting a children's natural interest in secret codes. Simple Michif phrases are gradually introduced into the classroom setting and the children readily learn them. A Michif cue phrase is then introduced and as the students are taught standard English concepts in class they are expected to apply this knowledge by code-switching in formal environments. The Michif cue phrase alerts the students that they are in a formal environment and have used a nonstandard form. The Michif technique would not be applied while the students are in an informal environment since the vernacular is encouraged.
during those times.

The students are encouraged to apply their code-switching ability, not only to their speech, but also to their written work.

Tests administered before and after the introduction of the Michif technique suggest that there was an improvement in the students' ability to code-switch in formal environments.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The intention of this thesis is to describe the use of a language modification method called the Michif technique. The Michif technique has two main goals. The first goal is to help speakers of nonstandard dialects feel more comfortable and competent while using Standard English in a variety of defined formal environments. The second goal is to encourage the speakers of nonstandard dialects to be proud of their vernacular and to recognize it as a highly communicative system which can be used while in a variety of defined informal environments. The ability to move from the vernacular to the standard language is called code-switching.

The subjects of this study were fifth grade students from a small Appalachian community in northwest Georgia.

The Michif technique is a nonconfrontational approach to language modification which initiates code-switching by introducing a third language into the classroom. Certain phrases from this third language act as a cue to alert the student that a nonstandard form has been used in a formal environment.
The technique draws its name from the Michif language,\(^1\) which is the cue language used in this study. The learning of Michif is not a long-range goal of this study, but through the use of Michif, language modification can be fun and nonthreatening to the students.

I will discuss the current views regarding nonstandard dialects held by linguists and sociolinguists. I will describe various methods that have been used by educators to promote code-switching. I will also describe the community where the research took place and the twelve nonstandard aspects of the dialect which became the target areas of the study.

I will also discuss the various tests which were developed to evaluate any progress in oral and written language modification resulting from exposure to the Michif technique.

I would like to note that this thesis is heavily narrative. Any conclusions drawn are a result of

\(^1\) The term 'Michif' is derived from the French Canadian word metis referring a 'a population neither clearly Indian nor European' (Laverdure 1983, p. vii). Michif is a language that combines elements of the French and Cree languages. It is spoken in areas of Canada and on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation in north central North Dakota.
observations on my part. In the future it would be beneficial to attempt this study again and to verify (or refute) my observations through the use of control groups and formal evaluations.

The Michif technique began by accident. At the beginning, at least, it was not a well thought-out plan to initiate code-switching among my students. It started at Davis Elementary/Middle School in 1985. Davis School is located in Sand Mountain in Dade County, Georgia, an Appalachian community with deep roots and traditions. The transition to my seventh grade class at Davis was quite a cultural shock since my prior teaching experiences were in religious schools located predominantly in the north where most of the students were from upper middle-class families.

Initially I had a difficult time understanding many of my students and several of my colleagues. With my basic linguistic background and the knowledge of my own vernacular I looked upon the vernacular spoken in Sand Mountain with some interest. I enjoyed hearing the difference between their syntax and phonological structure and mine.

What I found especially interesting about my new job was the reaction of my husband's friends and colleagues at a nearby private college. Many raised their eyebrows and said, 'You're teaching THERE?' I would hear stories about cross burnings and illegal cock fights, incest and
moonshine, and especially about a sign (since removed) on
the top of Sand Mountain which warned, in quite blunt
language, that black people should not let the sun fall
while they were on the mountain.

Unfortunately, my friends and I stereotyped the people
of Sand Mountain. This was similar to the stereotyping
that Richard Rodriguez talked about in his book, Hunger of
Memory. As a Mexicar-American that had been well-educated
he began to stereotype different groups of less educated
people. After working at a construction job when he
completed college, he came to some conclusions. 'The more
I remember about that summer the more I realize that there
was no single type of worker. I was embarrassed to say
I had not expected such diversity' (Rodriguez 1982, p.
133).

As far as Sand Mountain was concerned, there were some
stereotypical images conjured up whenever the name was
mentioned to an outsider. But what I saw in the county
itself was a close-knit community, on the whole concerned
about their children; anxious to retain tradition, but
wanting more for their children than they had for
themselves; friendly to those in the community; friendly,
but suspicious of those from outside the community. Close-
knit, it's true, but extremely diverse just the same.

After the initial shock I found that these 'culturally
deprived' children were just as curious and bright as the
'advantaged' children I had taught up north. I found their language full and highly communicative—a valued linguistic entity.

I also found, however, that the local vernacular spoken by the people of Sand Mountain and other rural areas in the region was stigmatized. An event at the end of my first year of teaching in the county further alerted me to this fact. On one occasion I saw one of my students preparing to order something to eat at Burger King. The Burger King was located in a mall on the outskirts of Chattanooga, Tennessee, which is the closest city to Sand Mountain and about twenty-five miles away. My student discussed her order with her friend and then placed it. When they left to find a table the two girls behind the counter giggled and one said softly, 'Hicks', and the other said softly, 'Rednecks'. My student and her friend were dressed like typical teenagers and there was nothing at all that I could see that would have distinguished them from other teenagers.

Now to me as a displaced Yankee the teenagers making these derogatory statements had southern accents just as thick as my student's accent, but somehow they could classify my student as 'different' solely on a brief conversation about hamburger toppings. I knew what the terms 'hick' and 'redneck' meant. I knew that they implied 'stupid', and 'backward', a kind of Gomer Pyle off the
streets of Mayberry. I also knew that the girl that had been classified in this way was one of the brightest students I had that year. She was reading well above her grade level, and a high achiever. In fact, she had been invited to take the P-SAT in seventh grade, which is quite an honor. Her goal was to be a medical doctor.

This scene bothered me, but I dismissed it saying to myself, 'Those girls at Burger King are ignorant and arrogant; they'll learn.'

For my second year at Davis School I had the opportunity to leave my seventh grade position as a reading teacher and move to a fifth grade self-contained class.

During my first year in the fifth grade (1986-1987) the Michif technique had its birth. I can't remember exactly how or when it began, but I believe it started when a student asked me, 'Can I go to the bathroom?' The may/can distinction had always brought back fond memories for me. I could remember when my own fifth grade teacher had responded to that question with, 'I don't know, CAN you?' I had always responded to my students in that same way, but this one time I didn't. Instead I said, No dinish do stan. No dinish do stan which translates 'I don't understand' was a phrase I knew from the summer I studied Michif for a Field Methods course. There had been many times I had had to say to my Michif language teacher, Rosie, no dinish do stan.
So, there in my fifth grade class, three years after taking Field Methods, I came out with that well-remembered Michif phrase. I can't remember the reaction of my students, but it must have been in the affirmative or the use of Michif would have never continued. I do remember beginning to apply the Michif technique to the parts of the vernacular that I found the most distracting: the various uses of ain't and the double negative.

As that year progressed the students wanted to learn other Michif words and phrases. I shared what I knew and they enjoyed playing with the language. I enjoyed seeing them touch the map around nor'-central North Dakota and talk about the people whose language they were learning. The exposure to the language made them curious, not suspicious, about the Michif people.

The most pleasing thing to me, however, was the overall shift that I saw in the speech of many of my students.

The following year (1987-1988) I again introduced Michif into the classroom environment but this time I linked its use loosely to the lessons in the Silver Burdett English series (Ragno 1985) which is part of our fifth grade curriculum. As we learned different aspects of Standard English we would apply the Michif technique to them. At this point I would say no dinish do stan whenever I heard a nonstandard utterance that had been covered in
our curriculum. It didn't matter if it was at lunch or while I was working one-to-one with a student.

This across-the-board application of the Michif technique stopped during the latter part of the school year. The change occurred when one of my student asked me why they always had to talk 'proper'. I thought about her question for a while. I thought about what I had learned about the importance of a person's mother tongue. This student was right, why should she have to switch her language at all times? Couldn't she learn Standard English without surrendering her vernacular? As a result of my conversation with that student the class began using their vernacular in more relaxed, informal environments without a concern about no disini do stan. Then they would switch to a more standard usage while in a formal environment.

That summer (1988) I had a chance to read various sociolinguistic books on dialect prejudice and code-switching. I was surprised to read that many linguists were antagonistic to code-switching because they felt that it degraded a linguistically adequate system. I also discovered that many attempts at teaching code-switching were unsuccessful. I tried to honestly look at what I had done with my students. I knew I had seen an improvement in their Standard English usage. I knew that they enjoyed playing with the Michif language. I knew it had them thinking through the Standard English process at different
times of the day, and I knew that they were learning to assess their surroundings in order to decide just when it would be appropriate to speak in their vernacular and when it would be appropriate to code-switch.

I continued to feel that code-switching was something beneficial for my students to know. I knew that language prejudice existed and to claim that it didn't exist was naive. Also, for me to attempt to try to eliminate that prejudice seemed impossible. Complete dialect tolerance seemed desirable but unreachable.

Lisa Delpit (1988) addresses this issue. She states that there are codes or rules that should be taught to allow students to function in a larger society. For example, there are linguistic forms and communication strategies which involve both speech and writing that should be taught to students of nonstandard dialects. She goes on to say: 'If you are not already a participant in the "culture of power", being told explicitly the rules of the culture makes acquiring power easier' (Delpit 1988, p. 282).

Delpit is not approving the system, but she realizes that the codes and rules can more readily be changed by people within the power structure.

Even though I felt that the students should be encouraged to learn these rules I also felt that they should be encouraged to retain their vernacular. I never
would have wanted the language at home affected by code-switching (even if I had that option available to me, which I did not). I didn't want my students to experience the feelings of abandonment that Richard Rodriguez (1982) felt when the nuns at his school told his parents to stop speaking Spanish in front of their children. I also didn't want my students to experience the diminished closeness that Rodriguez experienced because of being forced to always speak a language that was not his mother tongue. But even though Rodriguez mourned the loss of his 'private language' he still felt that it was his obligation to speak the 'public language'. I felt that my students could have the benefits of both their vernacular and the standard language without any of the negative side effects.

So, during the following school year (1988-1989) I applied the Michif technique and attempted to document, even curtly, the transition of my students' language as a result of code-switching. This thesis deals with that year.
CHAPTER 2

THE MICHIF TECHNIQUE: CODE-SWITCH CUE

The Michif technique was instituted because of the realization that human beings do not use language solely as a form of communication but also as a way to establish and maintain relationships. Through speech the speaker shows group loyalty and status and the interlocutor gathers relevant information about the speaker. For example, McDavid (1972, p. 263) reports:

In some of the most class-conscious Southern communities the use of ain't by educated speakers in informal situations is a signal to the stranger that he has been accepted as a social equal.

To show group loyalty and identification sometimes a community will even exaggerate its dialect, as has happened with long-time residents of Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts. In an effort to distinguish themselves from vacationers the residents of Martha's vineyard exaggerated a nonstandard aspect of their speech (Trudgill 1983a).

Trudgill (1983a) gives an example of how we gather information about others through their speech. If we were
standing in a train car or in a slow moving line we might be inclined to speak to the person in front of us. The weather would be a neutral topic to begin a conversation, but sharing or gaining knowledge about the weather would not be the real function of the conversation. Part of the reason we would speak would be to relieve the strain of silence which our society finds highly uncomfortable.

The main reason we would begin a conversation, however, would be to see where the other person would fit in the language hierarchy. From a brief conversation we can gather information about the origin, social status, and education of the speaker. So, in essence, it is not what we say that is important, but rather how we say it.

Our accent will often identify what part of the country we are from and also tell if we are native born. This is known as a regional dialect. Our grammatical usage and vocabulary can identify social group and educational background. This is appropriately called a social dialect.

It appears that people are more tolerant of regional dialect differences while less tolerant of social dialect differences. For example, an upper-class northerner would be more tolerant of an upper-class southerner's speech than a working-class northerner's speech.

It is unfortunate that our language can 'speak' so extensively about us, since it is our nature to stereotype others and to be suspicious of those that are different
from us.

Our culture has encouraged us to label some dialects as wrong, ugly, corrupt, ignorant, or due to laziness (Trudgill 1983a, p. 19). However, linguists do not find linguistic evidence for considering any dialect as wrong, ugly or corrupt. Hymes (1964, p. 391) states: 'Incorrect [nonstandard] form isn't the result of ignorance or carelessness for they are by no means haphazard but on the contrary, very stable.'

So, if different dialects are equally good and logical linguistic systems, why are some dialects considered nonstandard? Again the answer comes from our social framework. Trudgill (1983b, p. 203) states: '...judgments about right and wrong in language are not linguistic judgments at all, but social judgments.'

We are taught, though unintentionally in most situations, that people who speak a certain way stereotypically manifest certain related characteristics. The media also perpetuate this stereotypical relationship between speech and related characteristics by portraying certain characters with specific speech patterns. For instance, on the cartoon show Smurfs there are several Smurfs that have accents which help define their character. The Smurf known as Hefty Smurf has a heart shaped tattoo on his arm and a Brooklyn accent. Clumsy Smurf, whose mannerisms fit his name, has a rural Southern accent and
starts most of his sentences with, 'Well, golly.'

Numerous studies have been conducted to evaluate just how relevant the role of language is in classifying people. One such study conducted by Shuy (1973) involved sixteen employers in the Washington, D.C. area. The experiment was done to see how the employers would react to the voices of people from different socio-economic groups. Based solely on the voice they were to decide if they would hire the potential employee. The study showed that there was a direct relationship between speech and employability.

For example, one of the potential employers, a manager from a men's clothing store, decided that two of the four low-working class voices were unemployable. The other two speakers of low working-class speech were offered employment but only for manual jobs like porter or receiving room workers. The manager of the men's clothing store wanted to be sure these employees had no contact with the customers.

This study showed that Standard English speakers invariably received better jobs that those with nonstandard English, the latter being given manual jobs or judged unemployable. Shuy (1973, p. 307) makes an interesting comment about the employers:

Most of the employers in our study consciously denied that speech is a consideration, but they unconsciously reacted with amazing
uniformity in assigning jobs on the basis of very few linguistic clues... one might say that the employers seem better able to use linguistic clues as a criterion for employment than they are to talk about them. Delpit (1988, p. 282) states: 'Those with power are frequently least aware of—or least willing to acknowledge—its existence.'

After reading about the study done in Washington, D.C. we may argue that there might have been something else in the voice of the person rather than the dialect which caused the employers to reject or accept the potential employees. To accurately test to see if it was the voice quality or the dialect that people were evaluating, match-guise testing was developed (Fasold 1984).

In a match-guise test a person is asked to listen to a series of voices and then evaluate them in different areas, such as upbringing, intelligence, friendliness, education, trustworthiness, faith in God, and honesty. The trick comes when the listeners, who thought they were listening to a series of different speakers, were, in fact, listening to the same people speaking in different dialects. Consistently the listener would evaluate the same speaker differently based solely on the dialect, not on the voice quality.

This study raises serious questions about the power
of language usage and the power of societal labels on nonstandard dialects.

Dialect differences have an ancient history. Greek had its 'koine' and Latin its 'vulgar' dialect. Numerous references in the Bible appear to stereotype people by their speech. For example, in Matthew 26:73, the Apostle Peter is identified by his dialect: 'After all, the way you speak gives you away.' In Old Testament times it could be fatal if you had a pronunciation problem, as Judges 12:5b-6b shows:

When any Ephraimite who was trying to escape would ask permission to cross, the men of Gilead would ask, 'Are you an Ephraimite?' If he said 'No,' they would tell him to say 'Shibboleth.' But he would say 'Sibboleth,' because he could not pronounce it correctly. Then they would grab him and kill him there at one of the Jordan River crossings.

The Apostle Paul recognized that aspects of his language might hinder communicability and he talks about modifying his speech to make his content more easily understood: 'When I came to you, my brethren, I did not use eloquence and superior words as I proclaimed to you the testimony about God' (I Corinthians 2:1).

Sociolinguists universally agree that dialect
differences exist and that people are classified by their language usage. They do not, however, agree on how to prevent this classification from taking place nor even on its undesirability.

Sociolinguists divide into three main groups in this area: those that believe in eradication of the nonstandard dialect; those that believe in bidialectalism; and those that want acceptance of any nonstandard dialect.

I will discuss each of these approaches in some detail.

The first approach is known as the eradication approach. The eradication approach was historically accepted and encouraged by teachers and implied an accepted popular idea about 'correct grammar'. It stated that nonstandard speech socially stigmatized its speaker and should therefore be rejected in order to eliminate that stigma and allow the student to fully enter the mainstream of society. There was an often unspoken feeling that the nonstandard dialect was wrong, corrupt, and a result of laziness.

The eradication view has several weaknesses. To force a child to abandon his mother dialect can result in several problems. First, the system is psychologically wrong (Trudgill 1983a). Our speech is a symbol of our identity: our connection with family and community. When we are forced to abandon our mother-tongue or vernacular, guilt
can often result. Richard Rodriguez, in the book *Hunger of Memory*, discusses these feelings of guilt after he was forced to reject Spanish and learn English.

Second, it is socially wrong by implying that one social group is more valuable than another. And third, it is impractical; it just won't work. Peer pressure and group pressure are often strong enough to discourage students from learning the standard dialect to replace a system which is already meeting their immediate needs.

The eradication view is unpopular among sociolinguists and is losing popularity among educators.

The second approach to dialect differences is called bidialectalism. Unlike the eradication technique, bidialectalism overtly rejects the idea that nonstandard English is inherently inferior. Rather, those who take this view look upon the nonstandard dialect with interest and encourage students to take pride in their dialect. It is not the intent of the educator that upholds this view to have the students change their dialect, but rather that they learn how to use Standard English in certain situations while maintaining their vernacular for other situations.

The ability to change from nonstandard to standard dialect, depending on the situation, is called code-switching. Bidialectalism would encourage the use of the vernacular in informal, family, or community functions, but
code-switching in more formal settings, such as school, or eventually, the professional world. An example that might appeal to children is to compare their vernacular to a picnic where people are relaxed and allowed to use their fingers while eating. Standard English could then be compared to a dress-up party where certain forks must be used and manners must be followed. Both the picnic and the party can be fun, but you must follow the rules that each environment dictates (Delpit 1988).

This approach recognizes that the social stigmatism against certain dialects is inevitable. Shuy (1973, p. 304) states: 'It can't be denied that a man must adjust to the social needs of the environment.'

The bidialectalist doesn't condone this prejudice but acknowledges it and realizes that jobs and opportunities for social advancement will be denied to those who are not able to use Standard English. Delpit (1988, p. 296) states that it should be the goal of educators: '...to help students to establish their own voices, but to coach those voices to produce notes that will be heard clearly in the larger society.'

An excellent example of encouraging students to code-switch is shown by a Native Alaskan teacher who helped her students retain pride and value in their dialect while also allowing them to function within the standard format.

We listen to the way people talk, not
to judge them, but to tell what part of the river they come from. These other people are not like that. They think everybody needs to talk like them. Unlike us, they have a hard time hearing what people say if they don't talk exactly like them. Their way of talking and writing is called "Formal English."

We have to feel a little sorry for them because they have only one way to talk. We're going to learn two ways to say things. Isn't that better? One way will be our Heritage way. The other will be Formal English. Then, when we go to get jobs, we'll be able to talk like those people who only know and can only really listen one way. Maybe after we get the jobs we can help them to learn how it feels to have another language, like ours, that feels so good. We'll talk like them when we have to, but will always know our way is best (Delpit 1988, p. 293).

Most workers in applied linguistics feel the bidialectalist approach is the most realistic to the
dialect situation and many nonstandard communities see it as a possible way to have their children advance in society.

It would be a mistake to conclude that nonstandard English-speaking communities do not want Standard English taught. According to recent research most black parents profess to want their children to learn the standard dialect (Wolfram 1974, p. 182).

Lisa Delpit (1988), a black educator from the Baltimore City Schools, addresses this point in her article, 'The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children.' Delpit states that there are five 'aspects of power'.

The first 'aspect of power' is that enacted in the classroom. Curriculum, state compulsory schooling, and job preparation would all be 'aspects of power' included in the classroom.

Delpit's second 'aspect of power' states that there are codes and rules for participating in power. These relate to 'linguistic form, communication strategies, and presentation of self' (Delpit 1988, p. 282). These codes are called the 'culture of power'.

The third 'aspect of power' states: 'The rules of the culture are a reflection of the rules of the culture of those who have power' (Delpit 1988, p. 282).
The 'culture of power' is not how people's value should be appraised but that is how people are often evaluated.

In the fourth 'aspect of power' the author suggests that teachers should be honest with their students:

Tell [the students] that their language and culture style is unique and wonderful but that there is a political power game that is also being played, and if they want to be in the game there are certain games that they too must play (Delpit 1988, p. 292).

Finally, Delpit concludes that the 'culture of power' is often unaware of its existence, but those without power are most aware of its existence. This was evident in Shuy's study which was discussed earlier.

Many linguists question the effectiveness of the bidialectal type of language modification system. They feel that limited success can be obtained orally only if the child wants to associate with the social class which speaks the standard dialect.

Wolfram (1974b, p. 185) states:

A nonstandard English speaking individual, if he feels that he has a viable chance to become a member of a social group which uses Standard English, and if he desires to do so, will also fairly quickly and
largely unconsciously adapt Standard English and probably not before.

Most linguists agree that writing skills would probably show greater improvement than speaking skills, because compared to speaking, the writing process is more conscious and less automatic.

McDavid (1972, p. 270) summarizes that view of the bidialectalist by stating:

There is no substitution for respect for every mode of speaking as an adequate system, [and] for compassion towards students who must master other modalities from those habitual to them.

In Sand Mountain, where the local vernacular shows group loyalty and where the feeling of dialect maintenance seems strong, the bidialectical approach seems appropriate. With it the people can retain their community ties while also fitting into the larger society if that is their wish.

The third possible solution to nonstandard dialect prejudice is quite different from the first two alternatives because it attempts to change the attitude of the listener instead of the speech act itself. This solution states that we must reject the idea of language prejudice and attack negative language attitudes. It also teaches people an appreciation of dialect differences. The listener is taught to consider any speech acceptable. The
proponents of this view would feel that the bidialectalist 'buys into the system'.

This solution, on the surface at least, seems the most humane, but practically it has many problems. One problem is the division created within the nonstandard speaking community over this issue. Many feel that the encouragement of nonstandard speech within the nonstandard speaking community is a way to keep the poor in their place and prevent their advancement to better jobs. One black mother, in response to 'white liberals' introduction of dialect readers, states: 'My kids know how to be Black, you all teach them to be successful in the White men's world' (Delpit 1988, p. 285).

Others in the nonstandard speaking community feel that they are abandoning their identity to learn 'whitey's talk' (Sledd 1970, p. 363) when they are forced to modify their speech. Some voice concern over the psychological ramifications of the eradication or bidialectalist methods. They say that 'self mutilation' (Sledd 1970, p. 375) occurs because people are made to feel ashamed of their vernacular.

Proponents of this view feel that language attitudes must be changed instead of language itself and language stereotyping must be abandoned. I agree that it is wrong to stereotype people, and that this stereotyping is a result of the suspiciousness we feel towards those that are
different from us. However, I feel it is idealistic and naive to think that these prejudicial attitudes, which have existed throughout history, can be easily changed.

Another problem that arises with this nonstandard dialect view involves the absence of curriculum and books which could be used in teaching the nonstandard dialect. As a result of this shortage, some members of this group encourage the teaching of reading and writing in Standard English, while discouraging the use of standardized speech. The argument against this view is that this may create more confusion for the child.

Workers in applied sociolinguistics generally agree that a combination of bidialectical studies as well as appreciation of dialect differences is the most balanced approach to dialects.

Educators holding the eradicationist's view or the bidialectalist view must look for a methodology to assist in getting the desired results in language modification. Over a long period of time different strategies have been developed to modify nonstandard speech. Some of these educational techniques are quite direct while others use more indirect methods.

The most direct strategy for modifying nonstandard dialect usage would be an overt comment or question. This would be the technique which could potentially cause conflict within the child. For example, the child could
be badly hurt if an educator said the following, 'I can't believe that you just said, "I don't want nothin". How are you supposed to say it?'

All children, even the most resilient, cower under continual direct correction, and when this correction happens in front of a class of peers, the stress is even greater.

At one time, in an attempt to embarrass students into standard language usage, 'Tag Day' was instituted. '[On tag day, teachers] hung derisory tags on youngsters guilty of such indecencies as "I have got" and "It's me"' (Mencken 1936, p. 51).

Children ridiculed in such a way will often respond in one of two ways. Either they will avoid such verbal abuse by remaining silent, and only respond to the teacher's questioning with one or two word answers, or, perhaps to impress peers or to retain dialect loyalty, they may intentionally continue to use their vernacular as a way of gaining control over the teacher.

Some studies suggest (Piestrup 1973) that when a teacher continually reacts negatively to a child's nonstandard speech and repeatedly attempts to get the child to speak in a more standard dialect, the child's speech can actually become more varied as time progresses. If the teacher, conversely, doesn't react negatively to the child's speech but sets an example of Standard English,
then the dialect features in the child's speech become less marked by the end of the year. This passive modeling would produce more results than actively making speech a source of conflict.

Of all the techniques that will be discussed the overt comment method would be the one which could quite easily create that self-hatred or class-hatred which the opponents of bidialectalism speak of.

A less direct strategy, but one with some potential problems, is role mimicry. With role mimicry the teacher points out the error within the utterance, corrects it and then requires that the child repeat the now corrected phrase several times. So, for example, if the child said, 'I brung the car', the teacher would say, 'No, Johnnie, you brought the car, you brought the car, Now repeat after me, "I brought the car, I brought the car".'

As with the first strategy mentioned, this could be a very awkward situation for the child and the peer pressure would make it an even more stressful time.

The one aspect of this method which is an improvement over the previous method is that the student himself is not ridiculed, only his language is. But this is a very serious thing. As mentioned several times in this thesis, we draw our identity from our dialect, so any overt correction of our speech is construed to be a correction of ourselves.
A third possible strategy involves a response in which the teacher incorporates the corrected form in a question format. So, if the child says, 'I brung a doll', the teacher would reply, 'You brought a doll?' This system allows the child to respond in the affirmative without having to repeat the sentence with the corrected form. It is a less stressful situation for the child, and normally does not disrupt the flow of the class or draw attention to the child.

An even less threatening technique is the restating of the nonstandard form with a question format. So, if a child said, 'I brung a doll', the teacher would respond, 'You brung a doll'? The teacher would emphasize the nonstandard usage in the hopes of drawing it to the child's attention.

This method is so indirect that the students don't necessarily know that they are being corrected. If they are aware of the nonstandard form of their utterance they can self correct, if not the flow of the class is maintained and focus is not on them.

This method can be advantageous since it doesn't create an awkward situation between the child and her peers. However, it seems rather hit-or-miss as a way to make children feel more comfortable with the standard language. Also, many low or working-class grade-school children would miss the implicit nature of this questioning.
The Michif technique, which is the focus of this thesis, would differ from all of these methods of language modification, since it introduces a third language which acts as a cue to alert children that they are in an environment where code-switching is desirable. The Michif technique follows the bidialectalist view that code-switching is appropriate and vernacular retention is desirable.

The Michif technique is a non-confrontational approach to language modification which encourages a child to switch to the standard language format in given situations. It encourages cooperative learning, thus allowing the students to discuss what would be acceptable speech in a particular environment and then producing that response. The method targets syntax modification and does not apply to phonetic modification. The name of the technique comes from the Michif Indian Language which is spoken by the Michif Indians of north-central North Dakota.

The students are not expected to abandon their vernacular, but instead are encouraged to look upon it with pride. They are, however, made aware of certain situations where Standard English would be more acceptable. For example, they are encouraged to use their vernacular when, speaking informally to other students, in the lunchroom, at recess, attending community activities, and in informal
conversation with the teacher. This encouragement takes a passive role, meaning the Michif technique is not applied. However, the students are encouraged to switch when, speaking to other students within the classroom, in the formal class environment, on field trips, when guests come to the room, in the presence of the principal, and in formal conversation with the teacher.

The Michif technique begins by whetting a child's natural interest in puzzles, riddles, and secret codes. After a few weeks to allow my students and me to get acquainted I begin to introduce simple Michif phrases into our classroom environment. Initially these phrases create quite a stir. For example, if one student repeatedly talks out loud during a lesson I would turn and say la bush kay pa ha which means 'Shut your mouth'. Immediately I have the attention of all the students. They want to know what I said and they want me to repeat it so that they can learn the phrase. The learning of Michif is not a long-range goal of this program but when it is used as a cue it can enable language modification to be fun and nonthreatening.

The students enjoy 'knowing' some other language and especially knowing something that the fifth grade students in the other classes don't know. They also get the feeling of power when they can communicate, even slightly, in a rare language.

As the weeks progress they have additional phrases
added to their Michif repertoire. Such phrases as 'Who is it', 'Come in', 'Close the door', 'Sit down', 'Thank you', and 'Be quiet', are learned. So, if you were to knock on our classroom door any time after the middle of September you would hear a chorus of voices ask Wana key ya which means 'Who is it?'

The most important Michif phrase introduced to the students is the phrase No dinish do stan which means 'I don't understand'. This phrase is used to cue the students that something nonstandard has been said in a formal environment. As the students are taught Standard English concepts in our formal English class, they are expected to apply their knowledge in formal situations.

Thus, if the concept of subject-verb agreement has been taught and discussed in our English class and the child doesn't apply it to her speech, then I will get a puzzled look on my face and say No dinish do stan. The student may then self correct, but more often, especially at the beginning, there is cooperative learning involved, where other students assist in coming up with the correct response.

The students seem to enjoy the process and even use it on one another. There have even been occasions when they have had an opportunity to use it on their teacher, much to their delight.

If a student uses a nonstandard language form, but it
is one that we haven't dealt with in our English class, then the Michif technique is not applied. The Michif technique would not be applied while in informal situations since the vernacular is encouraged during those times. The technique would not be used if the student would experience undue embarrassment.

Thus, as the year progresses the list of learned language concepts increases and the list of concepts which can be applied to the Michif technique also increases.

It is amusing to see a child wildly wave her hand to answer a question and then stop to make sure that I won't catch her in a No dinish do stan. The students take great pride in thinking they've tricked me so that I don't get to say No dinish do stan.

The students are encouraged to apply their code-switching ability not only to their oral speech but also to their written work. As we do our weekly writing exercises the students apply their knowledge to target areas which have been covered in our formal English class. This is especially evident as they learn to proofread and edit their own work. Cooperative learning also comes into play as writing skills are improved. Students are encouraged to get suggestions from others on how to make their writing more concise and in a more standard format. They are allowed to take the advice given by the other students or stick to their own format.
Most of the success that I have seen as a result of the Michif technique can be attributed to the uniqueness of the program. It is the novelty of the system which appeals to the students. If all of the other classes in our school were following the same procedure I don't feel that the program would be a success.
A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENTS, THE TARGET AREAS, AND THE EVALUATIONS

The subjects of my study were 22 fifth grade students. At the beginning of the 1988/1989 school year they ranged in age from nine years and eleven months to twelve years and four months. There were twelve girls and ten boys in the study. All students were white. All of the students spoke the rural Appalachian vernacular.

The overall economic background of the students would be considered low by national standards. Over half (59.1%) participated in the free or subsidized lunch program set up by the Georgia Department of Human Services. Six students (27.3%) qualified for free lunch. To qualify for the free lunch program, the mean income for a family of four may not exceed $1,263 per month. Seven students (31.8%) qualified for subsidized lunch program. To qualify for the subsidized lunch program the mean income for a family of four may not exceed $1,797 per month. Most of the employed parents worked at blue collar jobs (90.9%).

According to nationally standardized tests the students ranged in total academic ability from 27%NPR to 99%NPR. Six qualified for and were serviced by the
Chapter One program in reading, and three qualified for and were serviced by the Chapter One program in math. To qualify for the Chapter One program the student had to be at least one grade level behind in the area of concentration according to the nationally standardized test administered. Two students qualified for and were serviced by the gifted program. To qualify for the gifted program the student had to score in the ninety-sixth percentile nationally or greater on the Test of Cognitive Skills, and could not fall below the eighty-fifth percentile nationally in any academic area on the nationally standardized test administered annually. Three of the subjects have repeated at least one grade.

Eight (36.4%) of the students had attended schools outside the Dade County/Sand Mountain community, and in over half of those cases they left the county for only a short time and then returned. Fourteen (63.3%) had never attended any school but Davis Elementary/Middle School. Nineteen (84.6%) of the subjects had at least one parent who attended this institution.

One extremely interesting aspect of my class was the high percentage of students that had some relative, other than sibling, either working or attending this school. Twenty (90.9%) had cousins or second cousins either attending or working at Davis School. Eighteen (81.8%) had either aunts/uncles or nieces/nephews attending or working
at Davis School. Four (18.2%) students had at least one parent working at Davis. Except for a few displaced 'foreigners', like myself, almost everyone was related to someone else at this school.

Sand Mountain in Dade County, Georgia, is located in the extreme northwest corner of Georgia, on the southern edge of the Appalachian Mountain range. The county includes approximately 228 square miles and is the smallest county in Georgia. Its population recorded for the 1980 census was approximately 12,550. Of these, approximately 1,600 reside in the Sand Mountain community.

The main industries in Dade County are a carpet mill, a wire mill, and a Lee Overall factory. Agriculturally, the residents produce apples, grapes, cotton, and corn. Sand Mountain is famous for its watermelon. The residents also maintain chicken and hog farms.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the Michif technique twelve target areas were chosen as indicators of the difference between local colloquial and Standard English. One of these twelve, not seen in any local sample of speech, was included because another sociolinguist (Wolfram 1974) considered it an important part of Appalachian dialect.

The following is a brief description of each of those twelve target areas (see Appendix A).
Target areas #1-#4

Target areas #1-#4 deal with different uses of the contraction ain't. Ain't is a common contraction in the south used by nonstandard speakers in most aspects of speech and by standard speakers to create an informal atmosphere or to show regional loyalty. Dr. Roy O'Donnell, the head of the English Education Department at the University of Georgia, argues that there is a reasonable use for ain't in the first person singular since there is no contraction available for am not while there is for the third person (is not to isn't) and all remaining forms (are not to aren't). Quirk (1986, p. 375) states:

...There is no universally accepted colloquial question form corresponding to the stiltedly formal Am I not beautiful. The contraction aren't is sometimes substituted (especially in British English), but with some feeling of awkwardness: Aren't I beautiful. In American English, ain't has considerable currency in both declarative and interrogative.

Ain't, however, is not limited to first person singular in Sand Mountain, but can be found in all persons and numbers.
Target area #1 deals with the use of ain't in place of the negated present tense linking verb be. In Standard English the contraction of the linking verb and the negative would produce He isn't nice. In Sand Mountain vernacular the contraction would produce He ain't nice.

Target area #2 deals with the use of ain't in place of the negated present tense auxiliary verb be. In Standard English the contraction of the auxiliary and the negative would produce We aren't reading the book. In Sand Mountain vernacular the contraction would produce We ain't reading the book.

Target area #3 deals with the use of ain't in place of the negated form of the verb have. In Standard English the contraction of have and the negative would produce I haven't seen the movie. In Sand Mountain vernacular the contraction would produce, I ain't seen the movie.

Target area #4 deals with the use of ain't in place of the negated form of the verb do. I have not observed ain't in this construction and only looked for it when I did my initial testing because of a reference to its use in Appalachian speech. In both Standard English and Sand Mountain vernacular the contraction of do and the negative would produce I don't eat peaches.

Target Area #5

Target area #5 deals with subject–verb agreement. The
basic concept of subject-verb agreement is that a verb must agree in number and person with the subject. In the dialect studied the past tense form of the verb be takes only the singular form was even when the subject is plural. This is by far the most common target area observed in the students, and the most resistant to code-switching. In Standard English subject-verb agreement would produce, The dogs were running down the street. In Sand Mountain vernacular it would produce The dogs was running down the street.

The students do follow subject-verb agreement with regular verbs that take the suffix -s when used with the third person singular. In Standard English and in Sand Mountain vernacular this would produce The boy jumps very high.

Agreement occurs in the verb do except in the negated contraction in the third person singular. Here, instead of progressing from This paint does not run to This paint doesn't run, the result is This paint don't run.

Target Area #6

Target area #6 deals with the use of the past participle. The past participle in southern dialects may be an example of hypercorrection or collapsing (Wolfram 1974).

The dialect which is the focus of this study tends to
place the past participle auxiliary have with the standard past tense verb while leaving the past participle verb form minus the auxiliary. For example, instead of hearing He has done it or He did it we would more likely hear He done it or He has did it. The example He done it may have arisen by contracting the He has to He's and then through a phonological process dropping the -s to arrive at He done it.

The past particle usage for the word went has been observed regionally across socio-economic lines. It is common to hear She has went to town. Since this has been observed across a wide range of socio-economic lines this particular verb has not been included in the target area.

Target Area #7

Target area #7 deals with the use of reflexives. Reflexives are commonly used in language to show a coreferential relationship between nominal elements in the sentence. I will briefly discuss three areas where the reflexive is used in Standard English and in Sand Mountain vernacular.

First, reflexives can be found in transitive sentences in both dialects when the subject and the direct object are coreferential. This would produce Tom cut himself.

Second, reflexives can be found in intransitive sentences in both dialects where the subject and the object
of the preposition are coreferential. This would produce
The girls went to school by themselves.

Third the reflexive can be found in transitive
sentences where the subject and the object of the
preposition are coreferential. This would produce Tom got
ice cream for himself.

This third environment for reflexives would rarely be
heard in Sand Mountain unless you posed a question 'Who did
Tom get the ice cream for?' to get the response (Tom got
the ice cream) for himself.

In Standard English the previous sentence could be
rephrased Tom got himself the ice cream. However, I have
not observed this use of the reflexive in Sand Mountain
vernacular. The common version for this vernacular would
produce Tom got him the ice cream.

This is an ambiguous sentence, it is unclear if Tom
got the ice cream for himself or for someone else.

It should be noted that it is possible that Sand
Mountain speech is a remnant of Late Middle English. In
Late Middle English (Jacobson, p. 109) the reflexive was
optionally attached to the pronoun. Brooks (1988, p. 5)
states: '...as frequently happens in colonial outposts,
original speech habits persisted; whereas, in the home
country, pronunciation continued to shift...'

Whatever the cause for this missing reflexive, this
target item showed the most change while the Michif
technique was being applied.

Target Area #8

Target area #8 deals with various types of irregular verbs. Sand Mountain vernacular follows the standard rules for those irregular verbs characterized by a change in the stressed vowel. For example, both Standard English and Sand Mountain vernacular change the stressed vowel in *find* to produce the past tense *found*. In Sand Mountain vernacular it would be unusual to hear *I finded a dollar*. For the verb *bring* Sand Mountain vernacular changes the stressed vowel but produces the nonstandard *brung* instead of the Standard English *brought*.

The most common type of irregular verb to be regularized in this dialect is the verb which shows no change in the base vowel and no addition of the past tense suffix. Commonly this type of verb is then regularized by adding the suffix and producing sentences such as *He shutted the door* and *She cutted the meat*.

Target Area #9

Target area #9 deals with comparatives and superlatives. In Standard English the comparative and superlative are usually formed by adding the inflectional suffixes *er/est* respectively to the adjective or adverb if the word contains one or two syllables. When there are
more than two syllables in the adjective or adverb more/most respectively occur and no inflection is used.

Sand Mountain vernacular consistently uses the inflectional suffixes to show comparatives. Occasionally more and most occur with the adjective or adverb which already has the inflectional suffix attached. This condition would produce phrases such as more beautifuller and most smartest. This is commonly done for emphasis. Irregular comparatives and superlatives stems, such as better/best and worse/worst are replaced by regular formations: gooder, goodest, badder, and baddest.

Target Area #10

Target area #10 deals with the double negative. In Standard English there are several rules which can be applied to negate a sentence. First, a negative sentence can be formed by placing not in the verb phrase.

He is old + not = He is not old

Second, to form a negative sentence where there is a main verb, an auxiliary must be added if it is not present then the not can be joined to the auxiliary by contraction.

Peter (does) eat figs + not =

Peter doesn't eat figs

Third, for special emphasis a negative form can be used for the first indefinite after the main verb phrase.

He knows everything + not = He knows nothing
While all of these methods can form the negative, no more than one is applied to any one phrase at the same time in Standard English. Sand Mountain vernacular often uses a negative form for the first indefinite but also inserts not into the verb phrase.

He doesn't (don't) know nothing

This usage can even be extended so that all indefinites after the main verb phrase become negated to produce sentences such as: We haven't (ain't) had no problem with none of us eating no bananas.

As an educator I have often heard other teachers say, 'Well, Johnnie, if you DON'T want NO candy, then I guess you mean you DO want SOME candy, because if you DON'T want NO then you DO want SOME.' Teachers using this line of reasoning assume that two negatives will equal a positive. This may be the case in formal logic but it is not the case in Sand Mountain English and in other languages such as Standard French and Spanish.

Originally double negatives were acceptable within certain environments in Middle English. 'Multiple negation...arises from the desire to make the negation emphatic and thus clear...' (Mustanoja 1960, p. 339).

The dialect I am studying, however, appears to have progressed to the place where the double negative is the norm and the notion of emphasis is no longer relevant. The
distinction between a normal negative response and the emphasized response has been lost.

Target Area #11

Target area #11 deals with the use of may/can. The distinction between may and can appears to be falling out of use in our culture. The main reason I included it in this study is the memory of my own experiences as a child when my fifth grade teacher made her own attempt at modifying our language.

Target Area #12

Target area #12 deals with the use of the nominative and accusative pronouns. This target area is not primarily limited to Sand Mountain or southern dialect. However, it was included in this study because it is a focus area in our curriculum and because it is a simple concept to convey to the students.

Students consistently choose correct pronouns when the noun phrase is not conjoined. But as soon as the conjoined subject occurs, accusative pronouns are used in place of nominatives. So when the sentences I hit him and She hit him are combined the typical result would be Me and her hit him instead of She and I hit him.

There is some evidence that, in English, the accusative case is treated as the unmarked or neutral case,
rather than the nominative. In relation to conjoined structures, it seems to be the general rule that as structural complexity increases, there is more of a tendency to pick the neutral or unmarked option.

Thus, in Sand Mountain vernacular the nominative case is used for subjects as long as it is not conjoined. When a conjunct occurs then accusative case is used.

After defining the twelve target areas for the study I then had to decide on a method of evaluation which would help me ascertain if the students showed any change in these twelve target areas after exposure to the Michif technique. I chose four types of evaluations which attempted to gauge the use of the twelve target areas in four different environments. The four environments evaluated were writing skills, speech used while in an informal atmosphere, speech used while in a formal atmosphere, and an individual oral test administered to each child.

I evaluated the students' writing skills three times during the school year (see Appendix F). They were evaluated in August before any exposure to the Michif technique; again in December after about two months of exposure to the Michif technique; and then finally in May after six months of exposure.

To evaluate writing skills in August I asked the students to write a one page story on the topic: The
Olympics of the year 2000. They were free to write a fantasy or a realistic projection of what the Olympics of the future might be like.

I collected and evaluated the stories in relationship to the 12 target areas. Many of the target areas did not appear on the written evaluation. For example, the may/can distinction (target area #11) did not appear on any of the written evaluations. I assumed that this is because those particular modalities would normally show up only in a dialogue format. As expected, the students' written expression largely reflected their local vernacular in relationship to the twelve selected characteristics.

I then returned the papers and allowed cooperative analysis of the stories. The students were placed in groups of three and four to evaluate each other's papers and provide suggestions. I observed that several students appeared uneasy with this process. All were told they did not have to take the suggestions which were given unless they felt that the suggestions would improve their story. There were some improvements in the overall structure of several papers, but only slight changes in the 12 target areas.

Writing skills were evaluated again in December, about six weeks after the students' initial exposure to the Michif technique. After reading newspaper accounts of the earthquake in Armenia, I asked the students to write a one
page story either acting as a newperson covering the story or a victim of the quake. The papers were evaluated before the editing process and then again after the cooperative editing process. There was some improvement in the overall writing skills compared with their writing skills evaluated in August. Many of the focus areas showed improvement and sentence structure appeared to be clearer and more concise.

Writing skills were again evaluated in May, about six months after the students' first exposure to the Michif technique. I asked the students to write a one page story choosing between a topic based on science fiction or a topic based on realistic fiction. After collecting these stories and checking them for the twelve target areas I returned them unmarked for cooperative analysis.

One of the students had a double negative within a dialogue format in her paper. Since the character that was speaking was supposed to be the student's mother, I did not count this as an error since the vernacular would be appropriate in that context.

There were fewer nonstandard forms evident in this series of papers compared to those gathered in August and December (see charts #1-3). There was a marked improvement in target area #5 which deals with subject-verb agreement.

The second type of evaluation involved an individual oral evaluation (see Appendix B) which was administered to the students in October and then again in May. In
preparation for the October test I told the students that they would be shown some pictures and then asked some questions. They were to answer the questions in sentence form. They were also told that this test would not affect their grade and that they would receive a candy bar at the end of the test as a reward.

A sociology student from a local college administered the test. Even though the sociology student and I attempted to create a relaxed atmosphere, some of the students were quite tense. The presence of the sociology student as an outsider may have affected the results. Because of these circumstances I question the accuracy of the data gathered. Because of the tension and excitement that existed during the testing I wonder if the Hawthorne Effect resulted. The Hawthorne Effect occurs when students, because of the excitement of being in an experiment, do better than anticipated in a testing situation (Fasold 1984).

For example, target area #1 was to test how many students would use *ain't* in place of *isn't/aren't*. Almost 90% of the students used the standard response while taking the test. This was a great deal higher than the 20% recorded when the class was observed in a formal teaching situation in September.

What was even more startling was that over 50% of the subjects didn't even form the contraction in their
response. So for example, when a picture of several animals was shown and the subjects were asked, 'Is there a monkey in this picture?' the predicted response was **No there ain't a/no monkey in the picture.** Instead, the most common response was the uncontracted form: **No, there IS NOT a/no monkey in the picture.** In my observation of speech recorded during a formal teaching situation, contractions would consistently be used and no uncontracted forms have been observed outside of this individual oral testing situation. These findings made me aware of the fact that the students had some knowledge of the standard forms even though they were rarely applying them.

At the end of the school year the students were again individually tested. These tests were compared to the tests taken at the beginning of the study (see chart #4). There was an overall improvement in all target areas and a much higher incidence of contractions which leads me to conclude that the students were more confident and comfortable in this testing situation compared to the one in October when there were many uncontracted forms observed (see Appendix C).

The third area of evaluation focused on the speech used by the students while in an informal environment. An informal speech environment would be defined as while at lunch, during physical education classes, during informal conversations with the teacher, at home, at church, and in
the Sand Mountain community. I evaluated the students in September, before the Michif technique was introduced, and then again in May after about six months of exposure to the technique.

Before the initial evaluation I made a list of the 12 target areas. Next to the list of target areas I labeled one column 'standard' and the next column 'nonstandard' (see Appendix D). Then while at the lunch table I took inventory of language usage relating to the 12 target areas. Each time I heard a student use a standard form in any target area I would tally it next to that target area in the column labeled standard. When I heard a student use a nonstandard form which related to one of the target areas I would tally it next to that target area in the column labeled nonstandard.

At times two nonstandard usages were heard within one sentence. For example, if I heard a sentence like *I ain't eating none of that stuff* I would tally it in the nonstandard column of target area #2 which deals with *ain't* used in place of the auxiliary *be*. I would also tally it in the nonstandard column for focus area #10 since this area deals with the double negative.

Some sentences would receive a tally in both the standard and nonstandard column. For example, if I heard a sentence like, *Me and her were late because we missed the bus*, I would tally one in the nonstandard column for target
area #12, which deals with the nominative/accusative pronoun usage, but I would tally one in the standard column for target area #5 which deals with subject-verb agreement using was.

For target areas #2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 only the first ten usages of each target area were counted. This is because these forms were not as prevalent as some of the other target areas, and our twenty-five minute lunch period forced certain time constraints upon me.

For target area #1, which deals with ain't in place of the linking verb be, and target area #10, which deals with the double negative, the first thirty usages were counted. For focus area #5, which deals with subject-verb agreement using was the first forty usages were counted. A larger sampling was taken for target areas #1, 5, and 10 because these are prevalent segments of speech and therefore more than ten instances were necessary for evaluation.

In nine of the target areas (#1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12) at least 50% of the speech recorded was nonstandard. In eight of the target areas (#1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 12) at least 70% of the speech recorded was nonstandard. The only item that had no standard usages recorded was focus area #7 which deals with reflexives. The only area that had only standard usages recorded was focus area #4 which uses ain't instead of don't and didn't.
I had never heard this usage and only placed it in my test because of a reference to it in an article about Appalachian speech (Wolfram 1974).

I attempted to evaluate the students' speech in an informal environment again in April but ran into some difficulty. Our class went on a field trip to Colossal Fossils, a traveling exhibit of near life-sized mechanized dinosaurs. My plan was to evaluate my students' informal speech while riding on the bus. This would have constituted the informal evaluation where the use of vernacular would be predicted.

This plan was unsuccessful. First of all, the bus which transported us to Colossal Fossils had the loudest motor of any bus I've been on in all of my years of teaching. Second, the other fifth grade teacher permitted her students to bring radios. The combination of rock music and grinding gears prevented me from gathering any relevant data on the bus.

I was finally able to evaluate the students' informal speech in May. This observation took place after six months of exposure to the Michif technique. This time we were again on a bus. Again I made a tally sheet and followed the same procedure that I had followed in September.

In seven of the target areas (#1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 12) at least 50% of the speech recorded was nonstandard.
In six of the target areas (#1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 10) at least 70% of the speech recorded was nonstandard. The data showed that there was some difference between the language usage in the informal environment observed in September and of that observed in May but that the students used their vernacular at both the September and the May observations.

Five target areas (#2, 3, 7, 11, and 12) showed at least a 10% improvement over the September results. The four areas that showed the most improvement were: target area #2, which showed an improvement of 30% in the area of ain't as an auxiliary; target area #7, which dealt with the reflexive and had no standard responses recorded in September, had 30% of the responses standard in May; target area #11, which showed a 30% increase in the may/can usage; and target area #12, which showed a 30% increase in standard usage of nominative/accusative pronouns. Two target areas (#3 and #9) showed fewer standard usages in May compared to September.

The fourth environment to be evaluated was that of the students' speech while in a formal atmosphere (see Appendix E). Sample formal atmospheres were while in formal class, in the presence of the principal, while on field trips, or while having a formal conversation with a teacher. The students were observed in September, before the Michif technique was begun, and then again in May after about six months of exposure to the Michif technique.
To gather this data I made a tally sheet identical to the one used for evaluating the informal speech. In September I taped the students' language while they were participating in a formal science class. I then replayed the tape and tallied the results in the same way I did for the informal speech evaluation.

In ten of the target areas (#1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12) at least 50% of the speech recorded was nonstandard. In six of the target areas (#1, 3, 5, 7, 10, and 12) at least 70% of the speech recorded was nonstandard.

There was some difference among the formal language observed in September and the informal language observed in September and May, but in spite of these differences the vernacular was evident in both of the informal environments and in the formal environment observed in September.

The students' formal speech was then observed in May while at the Nature Center. None of the target areas were recorded as having more than 50% nonstandard usage. In only one of the target areas did the students split at 50% standard and 50% nonstandard (target area #6 which deals with the past participle). Each target area, however, did have some nonstandard usage (except #4 which doesn't appear to be nonstandard in this vernacular). This showed a marked change in the use of Standard English compared to the formal environment observation of September.
These observations showed that there was some change among the two informal language evaluations and the earlier formal language evaluation done in September, but that there was a significant change in formal speech patterns at the May observations.

This leads me to conclude that the Michif technique had encouraged code-switching and as a result code-switching was indeed happening in the formal environment while the vernacular was being maintained in the informal environment (see chart #5).

In March both fifth grade classes at our school took the California Achievement Test. Several observations can be made about the results of these tests. The overall results for the section on Language Expression were almost identical for both classes, but there was a noticeable difference in the scores for the target areas that were evaluated on the test. In target area #5 which deals with subject-verb agreement my students scored about 7% higher than the other class. In target area #7 which deals with reflexives my students scored about 6% higher than the other fifth grade class. In target area #12 which deals with nominative/accusative pronoun usage my class scored about 5% higher than the other class. These results could indicate that the Michif technique improved my students' ability to choose the standard form.

The other fifth grade scored about 8% higher in target
area #9 which deals with comparatives and superlatives. I had introduced this target area only about two weeks prior to the standardized test and it may not have had enough exposure to the Michif technique to show an improvement.

On the section in overall Language Expression my class scored about 72% correct responses. In the five target areas that were tested my class scored about 90% correct responses. In overall Language Expression my class scored about 1% lower than the national reference group. In the five target areas which were tested my class scored about 2% higher than the national reference group.

These results may suggest that my fifth grade students were more able to apply their knowledge in those target areas than the other fifth grade students.
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CHART 3
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CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

Before explaining the process of the Michif technique I feel it is fitting to briefly reiterate its two main goals. The first goal is to encourage the students to look upon their vernacular with pride and wonder, and to see it as a unique and highly communicative system. The second goal is to encourage the students to grow comfortable in the use of the standard language system so that they can function within that system. The Michif technique does not have to expose the students to the standard language system since they are already exposed through radio and television. It does, however, encourage the students to use the standard language system themselves and become comfortable and proficient in its use.

The Michif technique is not the first and will not be the last method to prompt code-switching. However, it takes an innovative approach to language modification by introducing a third language into the classroom environment. This third language acts as a cue which alerts students that they are in an environment where code-switching is desirable.

I begin implementing the Michif technique in the third
or fourth week of school. By then a daily routine has been established and I am aware of the various personalities present in the class.

The first Michif phrase I introduce is La bush kay pa ha which translates 'Close your mouth'. I usually introduce this phrase when one of the students won't stop talking out in class. This is an enjoyable moment for me because the students react with such enthusiasm, and that enthusiasm is a vital ingredient to the success of this technique. Without that enthusiasm the Michif technique would become just another classroom lesson.

One reason that that enthusiasm exists is because the Michif technique is approached from a student-oriented learning environment, not a teacher-oriented learning environment.

For example, if I want to introduce the second Michif phrase Wana key ya which translates 'Who is it' I would not go up in front of the class and say, 'Today, class, we are going to learn a new Michif phrase. That phrase is Wana key ya and it means "Who is it?" Now everyone repeat after me, Wa...na...key...ya..., Wa...na...key...ya. Good, now who can tell me what Wana key ya means?' If I were to approach the Michif technique that way I feel it would be unsuccessful, since that is a teacher-oriented learning environment. For the Michif technique to succeed it must be student-oriented and student-initiated. In a student-
oriented learning environment the student is in control of what is learned and retained.

So, when I introduce a new phrase into the classroom environment, I merely introduce it in a casual way and then let the students take over.

To help show the distinction between these two approaches to teaching compare the previous example, which introduced *Wana key ya* in a teacher-oriented learning environment and the following example which will introduce the same phrase in a student-oriented learning environment.

When I introduce the phrase *Wana key ya* I usually wait until the students are quietly working at their desks. When someone knocks at the door, instead of the common response 'Who is it' I say *Wana key ya*? This phrase is not even addressed to the students but they're curious about its meaning and also if it's related to the phrase they've learned during the previous week. After the introduction to the phrase it is the students, not I, who initiate the learning. I don't have to ask them if they want to know what the phrase means, they'll ask me. I don't have to tell them to repeat it, they ask me if they're saying it correctly, and they ask me to repeat it to them so that they get the pronunciation correct. Their curiosity is the impetus, not grades or a desire to impress the teacher.

It is vital to see this distinction between a teacher-oriented learning environment and a student-initiated and
oriented learning environment before you can understand how this technique works.

After the first two Michif phrases are introduced I usually introduce one or two new phrases a week. When I introduce new phrases into the classroom environment I want to do it in such a way that it will shock the students so that they will take the initiative in learning. I choose phrases that I feel the students can use in various situations and that are also in my Michif vocabulary.

The third Michif phrase we learn is Pay peesti kway which translates 'Come in.' This phrase would be introduced a few days after the phrase for 'Who is it?' Again, the students initiate the learning and I act only as a source of the information they want.

As the weeks progress new phrases are added to the students' Michif vocabulary. As new phrases are learned we review previously learned phrases. This is not a formal review, but rather as the occasion arises the appropriate phrase is used.

The fourth phrase added is La port kay pa ha which translates 'Close the door'. This is an important phrase because several students usually see the relationship between La bush kay pa ha 'shut your mouth' and La port kay pa ha 'shut the door'. They learn to cut morphemes without even being taught how to do it.

For several of the students I think that the learning
of this phrase is the first time that they realize that Michif is a real language and not just some gibberish that I created.

As the weeks progress the Michif phrases for 'Sit down', 'Be quiet', and 'Help' are learned. All of these phrases are learned before any attempt is made to use Michif as a cue to code-switching.

We also begin to learn some of the twelve target areas while we are in our formal English class. Our curriculum for English is Silver Burdett (Ragno 1985) and I loosely follow their ordering as I introduce the twelve target areas.

On the latter part of October the phrase which acts as a cue to code-switching is introduced. Again, I introduce this phrase in such a way that a student-oriented learning environment is created. I normally wait until one of our twelve target areas has been introduced and taught in the formal English class.

We had learned about subject-verb agreement (target area #5) in our English class and as a result, an opportunity arose for me to introduce the cue phrase. We were having a discussion in Social Studies when a student made the following statement: We was in Massachusetts two summers ago. He was one of my better students, had a good self-image, and was one of the leaders of the class. He was also one of the most enthusiastic Michif learners.
Because he had all of these qualities I felt that he would be a good candidate to help me introduce the cue phrase.

Since he had violated the subject-verb agreement rule that we had reviewed that morning I got a confused look on my face and said *No dinish do stan*. By now the class had grown accustomed to hearing a new Michif phrase every week or so, thus they wanted to know what this new phrase meant. When I told them that it meant 'I don't understand' most of them seemed confused. Why had I said that I didn't understand when the boy had communicated his thoughts quite clearly? He repeated the same phrase a little louder, thinking that I hadn't heard him. Again I said *No dinish do stan*. But, this time I picked up the English book and began to leaf through it. Suddenly, a big grin came over his face and he self-corrected by saying *We were in Massachusetts two summers ago*. When he self-corrected he stresses the word *were*.

At that point we all put aside our Social Studies for a few minutes while I explained to the class under what circumstances I would be using *No dinish do stan*. We discussed that the times we would use *No dinish do stan* would be when we were in formal class, in the presence of the principal, while on field trips, or while having a formal conversation with a teacher. *No dinish do stan* would not be used while at lunch, during physical education classes, or during informal conversation with the teacher.
The class overwhelmingly reacted with enthusiasm. Here was a new way to play with their special language.

Along with the discussion about the use of Standard English I encouraged the students to be proud of their vernacular. We discussed how certain aspects of their vernacular were actually more communicative than Standard English. An example we discussed was the use of you'all in place of you in the second person plural. (This is not one of the twelve target areas and is not a candidate for code-switching since it is used over broad socio-economic lines in the south and is therefore not stigmatized).

As the weeks progress we apply the Michif technique to the twelve target areas as they are taught in our formal English class.

In the beginning of November we begin working on the replacement of ain't through code-switching. After a review of subject-verb agreement we begin discussing the use of contractions. The students understand that even when a subject and verb are contracted they would still want to be in agreement and that the verb wouldn't change when negated. I will usually draw a silly cartoon picture on the board. One character will have the word 'verb' written on him and the other character will have the word 'subject' on her. Then I'll have them shaking hands and smiling. This makes the students laugh, but it also helps them to retain what has been taught.
We begin by looking at sentences where ain't is often used in place of isn't/aren't. This corresponds to target item #1. We begin with the simple sentence You are a boy. We then form the negative by adding not and get You are not a boy. We then contract the verb and not to get You aren't a boy.

As the week progresses we discuss sentences where the ain't is often used in place of the auxiliary. This lesson corresponds to target area #2. We begin with sentences like The girl is running down the street. We then form the negative by adding not and get The girl is not running down the street. We then contract the verb and not to get The girl isn't running down the street. This concept is not new to the children but it hadn't been applied to their speech.

We continue to discuss the use of subject-verb agreement when asking questions. We progress from You are hungry then reverse the subject and auxiliary to form the question Are you hungry? We then negate the original sentence to get You are not hungry and then contract the auxiliary and negative to arrive at You aren't hungry. Finally we reverse the subject and the contracted form to arrive at the negative question, Aren't you hungry? After these lessons these two concepts (target area #1 and 2) are added to our list of items that could have the Michif technique applied to them.
In the latter part of November our lessons on ain't continue. We review the use of subject-verb agreement and the replacing of ain't where it is used as a linking verb and when it is used as an auxiliary. I introduce the use of haven't and hasn't instead of ain't. Again we progress from a declarative sentence, to the insertion of not to the contraction of the verb and not.

So by the end of November four of our target areas have been addressed. The students show an eagerness to code-switch in these target areas and even code-switch in aspects of their nonstandard speech that we haven't discussed in class.

In early December we concentrate on regular and irregular verbs. As December progresses we continue focusing on irregular verbs and begin including the study of the past participle.

This concept is quite difficult for the children. In several cases their vernacular uses the past tense verb form in place of the past participle verb form to produce I have ate lunch. The past participle form is then used without the auxiliary to produce I done it or He run the whole way yesterday.

As we use the Michif technique more often it becomes increasingly important to sense when the student would be embarrassed or in a stressful situation. For example, if a child gives the answer, 'The pilgrims was from
California', I would not draw attention to the violation of subject-verb agreement, I would instead concentrate on the incorrect answer. If, however, the student said, 'The pilgrims was from England', then I would say No dinish do stan.

When we return to school in January we concentrate on what our text fondly calls 'troublesome verb pairs', referring to may/can and sit/set. When may and can are added to the list of terms that can be applied to the Michif technique, the children begin getting caught quite often.

The students continually ask permission to do various things, such as to use the rest room, borrow markers or scissors, and go to the library. These are common requests but now the students suddenly find that they get my blank stare and No dinish do stan. The students seem to enjoy this new area because they have to be extra careful or they'll be aught.

It doesn't take them long to learn that May I is expected. After these lessons they approach my desk, get a big smile on their faces, and emphasize the word may. One student, after using the May I form, said with a triumphant smile, 'Well, I cheated you out of that no dinish do stan.'

For the Michif technique to be successful it is vital to know the personalities of your students. At no time
should the program allow a student to feel awkward or cornered. It must remain non-confrontational to be supported by the students. For example, there was one week in January when we didn't use the Michif technique at all. Many of the students were just returning to school after having the flu. To add to that we were all shocked by the death of an eighth grade student who died from a flu related secondary infection. At this time I felt that the students needed the comfort of their vernacular.

Another vital aspect of this technique is that the students come to think of Michif as their special class language. For example, if I accidentally use a Michif phrase in my math class, which has some students from the other fifth grade, I am quickly reminded by my regular students that not everyone knows 'our' special language and they don't want everyone to know it. The class comes to think of the language as their special secret. This makes it even easier to encourage code-switching since no 'outsider' would know what we're saying. This private quality also prevents our class from offending nonstandard speakers who are not acquainted with our technique.

As we move into the winter months I see an improvement in the overall Standard English used within the class. I see students pause in mid-sentence, get big smiles on their faces, and then produce the end of the sentence in the standard form.
In early February I introduce the target area #12 which relates to nominative-accusative pronoun usage. All students will have been able to see clearly which pronoun would correctly fit in the subject and object slot as long as the subject and object are not conjoined. However, as soon as a conjoined subject occurs then the students consistently inserted an object pronoun. There is evidence that this may result because the accusative case is treated as the unmarked or neutral case and thus as the structural complexity increases there is more of a tendency to pick the neutral form. So, for example, students correctly insert the first person singular subject pronoun in the following sentence, I ate tomatoes. But if the subject becomes compound they insert me and get John and me ate tomatoes.

We practice covering up the additional subject and then choosing the correct pronoun. Most students understand this concept and attempt to apply it. Some overcorrection results in sentences such as Mary hit Jill and I.

I introduce reflexives and comparatives in mid February. Reflexives are an interesting lesson for me to teach because they showed up as one of the most nonstandard target areas.

We start off by looking at the ambiguity of the sentence John got him a coke. The students agree that
without knowledge of the referent they can't tell if him is referring to John or to another boy. We then review the previous lesson on subject and object pronouns and discuss how there is a way to tell if the object pronoun is referring to the subject or not. At this point in the lesson I first draw a silly picture of a boy getting a coke out of the machine and then a picture of a boy getting a coke out of a machine and giving it to another boy. We then discuss how we'd use the sentence John got himself a coke to go with the first picture but use John got him a coke to go with the other picture.

As the week progresses we learn the different reflexives. A few students attempt to combine possessive pronouns and self to create words like hisself.

When I introduce comparatives and superlatives we discuss the inflectional endings -er and -est and when they would be used. We then discuss when the periphrastic is used. I usually demonstrate this concept by bringing in items that the students can compare themselves. I'll provide the root then they must determine which method is appropriate to form the comparative or superlative. The hands-on experience often helps retention.

As we approach the middle of February I notice that many of the target areas are rarely being caught anymore. The most persistent target areas appear to be #5 which involves subject-verb agreement, #12 which concentrates on
subject/object pronoun usage, and to a lesser extent #1 and 2 which concentrate on ain't.

As the weeks progress I hear several of the Michif phrases incorporated into English. For example, a student may ask me, 'May we pay peesta kway (Come in) and pe jee pa ta pee (sit down)?' Or among themselves I might hear one say to another, 'You'd better la bush kay pa ha (shut your mouth) and pe jee pa ta pee (sit down) if you know what is good for you.'

Around this time of year I have to tell the students to be sure to use our language only among the students in our class. There have been times when teachers that occasionally use the Sand Mountain vernacular have been upset because my students have used the Michif technique on them in an effort to make them code-switch to Standard English. Even though I don't want my students to offend anyone, it pleases me that they have become more aware of the distinction between their vernacular and Standard English. They are not snobby about their knowledge, they just don't understand why everyone isn't learning how to code-switch.

I introduce double negatives during the first part of April. We discuss the rule about having only one negative word per phrase. We also review ain't at this time since ain't and double negatives often occur together.

Throughout the year the Michif language seems to hold
a degree of magic for the students. They enjoy using it among themselves, they enjoy looking at pictures of North Dakota, and they always seem curious about the people who have shared their language. The students seem ever alert in formal situations, so as not to be caught in a no dinish do stan. But then they seem to effortlessly switch back to their vernacular the moment class is over and we are casually talking in the hallway.

As the year progresses I also apply the Michif technique to written language skills. When a paper is unclear I'll sometimes write the phrase kay kwi o ma which translates 'What is this?' There are also times when the students write wich i in 'help' in the margin to show where they are having difficulty.

As in the case of oral communication, I see an improvement in the students' written communication as well. Each week we have a writing exercise, sometimes fused with another subject, other times purely to work on writing skills. At times I have received papers that have had conversations between someone talking in the vernacular and someone talking in Standard English.

As the year draws to a close I feel that the two goals of the Michif technique have been met. The students have continued to proudly use their vernacular and they have come to recognize it as a unique and highly communicative system. They also have learned to feel more comfortable
and competent in the standard language format.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

The Michif technique succeeded in creating an open atmosphere for code-switching and increased the students' awareness of the differences between Standard English and their vernacular.

I feel that this was possible because of the Michif technique's innovative approach to language modification. The students thrived on the Michif technique because it was a student-oriented and initiated learning environment. Its main appeal to the students was that it was different from what other fifth grade students were doing.

So, it is because of this uniqueness that the Michif technique worked and it is because of this uniqueness that I feel it could not be successfully implemented on a large scale. It would, however, be an interesting study to see what would result if other classes had different 'secret' languages. In other words, perhaps the Michif technique could be generalized to a 'third-code technique'. I do feel, however, that if it were to become a part of an official curriculum it would become a teacher-oriented and initiated learning environment and the charm of the system would be lost.
As I look at the future of my former students I wonder how much retention there will be of the twelve target areas. I have no way of judging that at this time, but it would be interesting to do a follow-up study on them at the end of sixth grade. I am confident that my students will more easily perceive formal and informal environments and adapt their language to those environments. I also feel that they will have enough respect and pride in their vernacular that, if they choose to function within the larger society as adults, they will not feel they have to abandon their vernacular.

To any other teachers who embrace the bidialecticalist view, my advice would be to try innovative techniques to promote code-switching. Instill in your students a sense of pride and wonder for their vernacular. Don't make your students think that you are trying to change something wrong about them but rather that you are helping them to have fun with words. Let your students initiate the learning so it will become a part of them. If you let your students enjoy playing with language, then they will retain and apply what they have learned.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

A LIST OF THE TWELVE TARGET AREAS

#1. The use of ain't in place of the linking verb be
#2. The use of ain't in place of the auxiliary be
#3. The use of ain't in place of the verb have
#4. The use of ain't in place of the verb do
#5. Subject-verb agreement (was)
#6. Past participle
#7. Reflexives
#8. Irregular verbs
#9. Comparatives and superlatives
#10. Double negatives
#11. May/car. distinction
#12. Subject/object pronoun ordering
APPENDIX B

INDIVIDUAL ORAL EVALUATION

Test Item #1: Ain't in place of the verb be

Show a picture of several animals, not including a monkey or turtle, but including a colt.
Ask: 'Is there a monkey in this picture?'
Answer: 'No, there isn't/ is not/ ain't a/ no monkey in the picture.'
Ask: 'Are there any turtles in this picture?'
Answer: 'No, there aren't/ are not/ ain't any/ no turtles in the picture.'
Ask: 'Is there a colt in the picture?' (Filler question)
Answer: 'Yes, there is a colt in the picture.'
Ask: 'Are you in the picture?'
Answer: 'No, I am not/ I'm not/ ain't in the picture.'

Test Item #2: Ain't in place of the auxiliary be

Show a picture of three sitting owls.
Ask: 'Are the owls walking?'
Answer: 'No, the owls aren't/ are not/ ain't walking.'
Ask: 'Are you running in the street?'
Answer: 'No I am not/ I'm not/ ain't running in the street.'
Show a picture of a woman standing.
Ask: 'Is the woman eating chicken?'
Answer: 'No, she isn't/ is not/ ain't eating chicken.'
Show a picture of a crying woman.
Ask: 'Is the woman crying?' (Filler question)
Answer: 'Yes, the woman is crying.'

Test Item #3: Ain't in place of haven't and hasn't
Ask: 'Have you ever seen a real live dinosaur?'
Answer: 'No I have never/ haven't ever/ ain't seen a real live dinosaur.'
Ask: 'Have you ever eaten a hamburger?' (Filler question)
Answer: 'Yes, I have eaten/ ate a hamburger.'
Ask: 'Has your mother ever been to the moon?'
Answer: 'No, my mother hasn't/ has not/ ain't ever/never been to the moon.'

Test Item #4: 'Ain't in place of 'don't/didn't'
Show a picture of a boy gently holding a bird, then put the picture away.
Ask: 'Did the boy hurt the bird?'
Answer: 'No, he didn't/ did not/ ain't hurt the bird.'
Ask: 'Do you eat worms?'
Answer: 'No, I don't/ do not/ ain't eat worms.'
Test Item #5: Noun-Verb Agreement

Show a picture of three men playing basketball, then put the picture away.
Ask: 'What were the three men doing in the picture?'
Answer: 'They were/ was playing basketball.'
Show a picture of two women running.
Ask: 'What are the two women doing in this picture?'
Answer: 'They are/ is running.'
Show a picture of witches, then put the pictures away.
Ask: 'Were the witches ugly?'
Answer: 'Yes, they were/ was ugly.'
Ask: 'Were people in this class in the fourth grade last year?'
Answer: 'Yes, they were/ was in the fourth grade last year.'
Ask: 'Was I alive yesterday?'
Answer: 'Yes, you were/ was alive yesterday.'
Ask: 'Are the cooks going to give us lunch today?'
Answer: 'Yes, they are/ is going to give us lunch today.'
Ask: 'Am I going to give you a treat soon?'
Answer: 'Yes, you are/ is going to give me a treat soon.'
Show a picture of a boy with a cat.
Ask: 'Does the boy have a cat?'
Answer: 'Yes, the boy has/ does have/ do have a cat.'
Show a picture of a swan.
Ask: 'Does this swan eat elephants?'
Answer: 'No, this swan doesn't/ don't/ eat elephants.'

Test Item #6: Past participle usage
Ask: 'Have you seen Mrs. Smart today?'
Answer: 'Yes, I have seen/ saw/ seen/ have saw Mrs. Smart today.'
Show a picture of scribbling. Then show a picture of a baby and a man.
Ask: 'Who do you think has done the scribbling?'
Answer: 'He has done/ did/ done it.'
Show a picture of a bird flying to his nest.
Ask: 'Where has the bird gone?'
Answer: 'He has gone/ went/ has went/ goed to his nest.'
Ask: 'If your brother decided to go to his friend's house and your mom asked where he was, what would you say?'
Answer: 'He has gone/ went/ has went/ goed to his friend's house.'

Test Item #7: Reflexives
Ask: 'What would you like more than anything else in the whole world?' When you have a response use the item to fill in the blank below. Ask: 'If you saved
up all of your money and got a ________ how would you
tell your friends about it?'
Answer: 'I got myself/ me a ________.'
Ask: 'If your brother got into a fight and got a
black eye how would you tell your friends about it?'
Answer: 'He got himself/ him a black eye.'

Test Item #8: Regularizing irregular verbs
Say: 'I will leave a word out of a sentence and I
would like you to fill it in. For example, I will
say, 'Today I will paint a picture, yesterday I
________ a picture.' What would you fill in the
blank?'
Answer: 'Painted.'
Say: 'Good, now we will do some more.'
Ask: 'Tomorrow I will run around the gym, yesterday
I ______.'
Answer: 'Ran/ runned/ run'
Ask: 'Today I will jump over the wall, yesterday I
_____.' (Filler question)
Answer: 'Jumped'
Ask: 'Tonight I will give a penny to the boy,
yesterday I ______.'
Answer: 'Gave/ gived/ give'
Ask: 'Tomorrow I will know the answer, yesterday I
______.'
Answer: 'Knew, knowed'
Test Item #9: Comparatives

Show a picture of two old men.
Ask: 'If this man is old, then this man is ______.'
Answer: 'Older/ more old/ more older'

Show a picture of two women, one beautiful and one plain. Point to the plain woman.
Ask: 'If this woman is beautiful then this woman is ______.'
Answer: 'More beautiful/ beautifuller/ more beautifuller'

Test Item #10: Double negatives

Show a picture of a girl with many friends.
Say: 'This girl has lots of friends.'

Show a picture of a boy with no friends.
Say: 'What can you tell me about this boy?'
Answer: 'He doesn't/ does not/ don't/ ain't have/got any/ none/ no friends.'

Show student a candy bar.
Ask: 'I have a candy bar. Do you have any candy?'
Answer: 'No, I don't/ ain't have/ got any/ none/ no candy.'

Hand candy to the student.
Ask: 'Now, do I have any candy?'
Answer: 'No, you don't/ do not/ ain't have/got any/ none/no candy.'

Test Item #11: May/Can
Test Item #12: Ordering of Subject and Object Pronouns

Ask: 'If you and a friend wanted to go to the library how would you ask Mrs. Wildeman?'

Answer: 'Can/ May me and _____/ _____and me/ I a _____/ _____and I go to the library?'
APPENDIX C
RESULTS OF INDIVIDUAL PRE/POST ORAL EVALUATION

Pretest results based on twenty-two students.
Post test results based on twenty-one students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target area #1: Ain't in place of linking be</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Nonstandard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is not</td>
<td>Are not</td>
<td>Isn't/Aren't</td>
<td>Ain't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>16/21</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Filler question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am not</td>
<td>I'm not</td>
<td>Ain't</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/2</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>57/61</td>
<td>86.4/96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>13.6/3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uncontracted Form</td>
<td>36/2</td>
<td>54.5/3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Form</td>
<td>30/61</td>
<td>45.5/96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Target area #2 - Ain't in place of auxiliary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are not</td>
<td>Aren't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>11/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am not</td>
<td>I'm not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/2</td>
<td>2/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is not</td>
<td>Isn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>15/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>58/62</td>
<td>87.9/98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>12.1/1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uncontracted Form</td>
<td>28/2</td>
<td>42.4/3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Form</td>
<td>38/61</td>
<td>57.6/96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target area #3 - Ain't in place of the verb have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have not</td>
<td>Haven’t</td>
<td>Hadn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>15/14</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has not</td>
<td>Hasn’t</td>
<td>Hadn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>13/19</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>32/33</td>
<td>72.7/78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>4/3</td>
<td>9.1/7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>8/6</td>
<td>18.2/14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Valid Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>88.9/91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard</td>
<td>11.1/8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>44/42</td>
<td>100/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uncontracted Form</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>4.5/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Form</td>
<td>42/42</td>
<td>95.5/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Nonstandard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were</td>
<td>Were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15/21</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21/20</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16/21</td>
<td>6/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was</td>
<td>Were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were</td>
<td>Was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13/21</td>
<td>9/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18/21</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target area #5 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has</td>
<td>Does Have</td>
<td>Do have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15/21</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn't</td>
<td>Don't</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13/19</td>
<td>9/1</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>179/207</td>
<td>81.4/98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>34/1</td>
<td>15.5/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Forms</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>3.1/0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Valid Responses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>84/99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>16/0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>Actual count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>46/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>19/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Forms</td>
<td>23/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Valid Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target area #7 - Reflexives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myself</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/20</td>
<td>16/0</td>
<td>6/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Himself</td>
<td>Him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/14</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>10/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>0/34</td>
<td>0/81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>28/3</td>
<td>63.6/7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>16/5</td>
<td>36.4/11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Valid Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>0/91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>100/8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Filler question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target area #8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>57/63</td>
<td>86.4/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>7.6/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>6.0/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Valid Responses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>91.9/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>8.1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest.</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>20/42</td>
<td>45.5/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>17/0</td>
<td>38.6/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>15.9/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percent of Valid Responses**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>54.1/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>45.9/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Target area #10 - Double Negative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>8/0</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/20</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>44/55</td>
<td>66.7/97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>16/0</td>
<td>24.2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Forms</td>
<td>6/8</td>
<td>9.1/12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Valid Responses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>73.3/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>26.7/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target area #11 - May/Can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/21</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>50/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>45.5/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>4.5/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Valid Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>52.4/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>66.7/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target area #12 - Subject/Object Pronoun Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quest.</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Nonstandard</th>
<th>Invalid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_ and I</td>
<td>_ and me</td>
<td>Me and _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>13/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Standard Form</td>
<td>7/21</td>
<td>31.8/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>14/0</td>
<td>63.7/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Invalid Form</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>4.5/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent of Valid Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Form</td>
<td>33.3/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstandard Form</td>
<td>66.7/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET AREA</td>
<td>STANDARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1 Ain't - Linking Verb</td>
<td>8/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Ain't - Auxiliary</td>
<td>4/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Ain't - Haven't/Hadn't</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Ain't - Don't/Didn't</td>
<td>10/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Subject-Verb Agreement</td>
<td>7/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Past Participle</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Reflexives</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Irregular Verbs</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Comparatives</td>
<td>6/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 Double Negatives</td>
<td>7/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 May/Can</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 Nominative/Accusative Pronoun usage</td>
<td>1/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E

**PRE/POST TEST OF LANGUAGE FOUND IN A FORMAL SPEECH ENVIRONMENT - SEPTEMBER 7, 1988/MAY 12, 1989**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET AREA</th>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>NONSTANDARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Ain't - Linking Verb</td>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>24/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Ain't - Auxiliary</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Ain't - Haven't/ Hadn't</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>8/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Ain't - Don't/ Didn't</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Subject-Verb Agreement</td>
<td>9/29</td>
<td>31/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Past Participle</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>7/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Reflexives</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>10/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Irregular Verbs</td>
<td>4/8</td>
<td>6/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Comparatives</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>5/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 Double Negatives</td>
<td>5/24</td>
<td>25/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 May/Can</td>
<td>3/9</td>
<td>7/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 Nominative/ Accusative Pronoun usage</td>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>8/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F.

#### PRE/MID/POST TEST TALLY OF NONSTANDARD USAGES IN WRITING: August/DECEMBER/MAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET AREA</th>
<th>ORIGINAL</th>
<th>EDITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 Ain't - Linking Verb</td>
<td>11/3/1</td>
<td>4/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 Ain't - Auxiliary</td>
<td>6/6/2</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 Ain't - Haven't/ Hadn't</td>
<td>7/5/1</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 Ain't - Don't/ Didn't</td>
<td>0/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 Subject-Verb Agreement</td>
<td>48/18/6</td>
<td>23/9/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6 Past Participle</td>
<td>17/7/3</td>
<td>4/1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7 Reflexives</td>
<td>1/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8 Irregular Verbs</td>
<td>9/3/1</td>
<td>3/0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9 Comparatives</td>
<td>3/0/1</td>
<td>1/0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10 Double Negatives</td>
<td>9/4/2</td>
<td>2/0/1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11 May/Can</td>
<td>0/0/0</td>
<td>0/0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12 Nominative/ Accusative Pronoun usage</td>
<td>4/2/0</td>
<td>2/0/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Double negative used in a dialogue format.
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