



The Australian Journal of **INDIGENOUS EDUCATION**

This article was originally published in printed form. The journal began in 1973 and was titled *The Aboriginal Child at School*. In 1996 the journal was transformed to an internationally peer-reviewed publication and renamed *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*.

In 2022 *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* transitioned to fully Open Access and this article is available for use under the license conditions below.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

THE SCHOOL AND THE ABORIGINAL CHILD

J. Dwyer,*
Department of Education,
Brisbane, Qld.

"Uffela bin pinkin in a girl toilet!" The speaker was Norman, a somewhat crestfallen seven year old Aboriginal boy who had been sent to my office by a teacher on playground duty. Norman knows no Aboriginal language, and if asked, would state that he speaks English. His parents and friends would make a similar claim. I had been at the school long enough to know that Norman was guilty of throwing stones into the girls' toilet. His defence was that Deidre had thrown a stone at him first.

"Was it bigger or smaller than the one you threw?" Blank looks! Try again. "How big was Deidre's stone?"

"Oh!" with wide eyes and gesturing hands, "It a bi-i-i-g one!"

Norman uses a restricted linguistic code; a code that is perfectly adequate for his face-to-face social communication, but one which severely limits his considerable potential when he comes into the school room and is confronted by a teacher who uses "school talk", and by books which are written in Standard English. Norman's mode of speaking is clearly different from that which is found in a middle class suburb. It is English, yet it is sufficiently different to label it "Aboriginal English". I stress that it is different - not inferior, not second-rate! And therein lies one of the real problems of teaching Aboriginal children - white middle-class teachers use different words and quite different

.....

**Mr. Dwyer was formerly principal of Cherbourg State School, Qld. and has recently been appointed as Inspector of Schools (Education of Indigenous Children) with the Queensland State Department of Education.*

language structures from those to which many Aboriginal children are accustomed. In effect white teachers are talking to many of these children in what is, for them, almost a foreign language. Consequently, learning problems are basically communication problems, and language is of critical importance in the education of Aboriginal children.

At some time in your professional reading you must have come across a technical section dealing with a complex concept, expressed in bewildering phraseology. You didn't understand it. You read it again but the meaning was still vague. It was written in a different type of English - one to which you were not accustomed. Your language background was such that you just could not interpret the material. It would have done little good for someone to read it to you again in a loud voice, or to shake you violently and call you "stupid". Yet this is the very thing which often happens to Aboriginal children. Not aware that they use a different form of language, the teacher may regard them, and may label them, as lazy, or dumb, or stubborn, because they fail to comprehend. And let us not forget that communication is a two-way process. The child fails to understand the teacher, and the teacher also often fails to understand the child and may as a result develop, or perpetuate, inadequate stereotypes of Aboriginal children.

For instance, what is the teacher's reaction to this situation?

Norman is asked, "Is $6 + 2$ bigger than 8, or smaller than 8, or equal to 8?"

Answer, "Yes!" - Stupid kid?? No! A perfectly logical answer, $6 + 2$ *is* one of those things. The teacher is using a sophisticated form of language not familiar to the child. He is aware of a language convention that indicates alternatives. The child is not.

What if the teacher rephrases the question? "Is $6 + 2$ bigger than 8?" Again blank looks. And again understandable. You'll recall that Norman had described Deidre's stone as a "bi-i-i-g" one. He does not use the comparative form "bigger".

Let's try again. "Is $6 + 2$ equal to 8?" Again blank looks. "Oh, for goodness sake, get your counters! Make a row of 8 counters. Now make a row of 6 counters and a row of two counters. Put the 6 and the 2 together. Look at the two rows you have now. What do you see?"

A flash of recognition and understanding from the child - "They tie!"

Was the child "hopeless" at mathematics, as perhaps his teacher thought, or was it perhaps another example of a language problem?

"Oh, rubbish!" the teacher says. "Surely every child of seven know what 'equals' means. This just goes to show that Aboriginal kids can't do maths. Seven years old and he still has no idea of what 'equals' means!"

But the teacher is wrong. The child does have a concept of equality. He merely uses a different label for it, (one which his teacher would accept unhesitatingly in a different situation - when discussing the result of a race, for instance).

"but", says the teacher, "don't the tests prove that I'm right? Don't they show that Aboriginal children are less intelligent than white children?"

Perhaps before we accept this proposition, we ought to look more closely at the tests themselves. Here is a fairly common type of example. "Conductor is to orchestra, as teacher is to..."

Such a analogy type question involves not only a complex mental operation. It involves also a vocabulary component (conductor to orchestra) which is likely to be unknown to Aboriginal children, and further it is couched in a language form which is quite foreign to these children who generally don't make use of the verb 'to be'. It is not surprising that they score badly on such tests.

The verb 'to be' can create a problem for the child in this completion item. "During the day we're at school; at night we're" We hear and recognize "we're" as a contracted form of "we are", but the Aboriginal child may not use this verb form. He may therefore hear the "we're" as "wear" and so respond, "During the day we're at school; at night (*wear*) pyjama." -

Again, in the framework of his language usage, a perfectly logical answer, in spite of the fact that he probably omits the plurals!

What if we present the child with a sentence which tells that Mary ran to the fence while Jean hopped and Bill crawled? In a test of reading comprehension we ask what Mary did, and get the answer, "'e run". "Wrong!" we say, because the answer is not stated in Standard English. Yet, in fact, it is correct. The comprehension is there.

What of the completion type item? "The roof is made of (glass, grass, tiles)." The contextual clues indicate the 'correct' answer is 'tiles'. But the Aboriginal child knows that all the roofs he's seen are made of galvanised iron. So he ignores the alternatives presented and puts down 'iron' - and we put him down as stupid!

But is this mis-match between the child's language and that of the school really all that important? Let's consider one final example. Suppose I ask Norman what he will do after school today. His response might be, "Uffela go town". I would probably get the same response if I asked what he did yesterday or what he intends doing next week. The language structure he uses shows no tense differentiation. The precise meaning will depend upon the context or on voice inflection or facial expression or gesture. But you can't write inflections and expressions and gestures into reading books. Norman may learn to read the words, "I shall go to town tomorrow", but he may not equate their meaning with his, "Uffela go town". It is possible, therefore, that although he may learn to read words he may have considerable difficulty in assigning meaning to the printed page.

What I have been describing is one aspect of the cultural difference that exists between the Aboriginal child and his white teacher. But it is important that teachers see it for what it is - cultural difference and not cultural deficit. For me the test of language is its adequacy for the situation. We all speak a variety of languages. The way we'd chat to a friend at a barbeque or yell abuse at a referee of a football match is quite different from the way we would speak to a prospective employer in a job interview. Yet none of these styles of speech is inferior to the other; each is quite adequate in its own particular setting. Similarly we need to realize and accept that the

Aboriginal child is not speaking a 'wrong' or 'bad' or 'careless' form of language. It is merely different and, within his own social environment, it is perfectly adequate.

But we must be realistic too. If the Aboriginal child, a member of a minority group, is to take his rightful place in the majority world, he will need the skills the school can give him. To develop these skills fully he will need to become proficient and secure in two forms of English: 'home talk' and 'school talk', each being used by him in its appropriate place.

A major breakthrough in the education of Aboriginal children has been the language development program, devised and developed by the Queensland Department of Education with the assistance of a grant from the Bernard Van Leer Foundation. (1) Radio microphones fitted into special jackets were used to collect extensive samples of children's speech in a variety of natural situations. These language samples were coded and computer analysed in order to identify and compare the language structures most commonly used by Aboriginal children from two large Aboriginal communities and by children living in a middle-class suburban area and speaking Standard English. Information concerning other aspects of language competence of young Aboriginal children was obtained from the application of a series of tests. The language analyses and test results were subsequently used in the compilation of a language development program for school starters. The program extends through the first three years of schooling by which time it is hoped that its major aim will have been realized:

"to help the children to develop facility in the use of language structures of Standard English. It is hoped that they will eventually make automatic use of such English in school and in comparable settings. This accomplishment should facilitate their cognitive development and their learning of reading and writing skills and should so ensure a more successful and satisfying school career." (2)

At the same time the program makes no attempt to derogate Aboriginal English. In fact a second aim is to develop in each child a favourable self-concept and this may be damaged if his 'home' language is ridiculed or scorned. Thus the program places

considerable emphasis on the importance of a warm, encouraging, supportive classroom atmosphere and on positive forms of language modification. The child who, at news time, says, "Me go town today", finds his contribution warmly received by the teacher. "Oh! That's good. I'm going to town today. You tell me your story again." - and the child, encouraged by this response will probably say, "I'm going to town today".

In the words of the Van Leer Handbook:

"Under no circumstances should the teacher convey to the child a suggestion that his spontaneous language forms are not acceptable. The continuing aim is the encouragement, not the inhibition, of the child's desire to talk."

(3)

The teacher will have most success in a classroom characterized by child talk rather than teacher talk. The children's contributions will then become the starting point for many activities. Teachers may be surprised at how much they learn about the children in their care if they are prepared to listen to them and to accept their ideas as worthwhile.

The Van Leer language development program is integrated around language units such as "I am", "I can", "look at", "I'm going to", and so on. These units are introduced sequentially, the sequence having emerged from the computer analyses of the children's speech samples. Children readily become involved in the program because it draws heavily on their own ideas and suggestions. As their own language contributions form the basis of the language modification program the children see the various activities as highly relevant.

How can we modify Norman's "Me big", to the standard form, "I am big"? How does any child learn his language? He listens first to new patterns and then attempts to repeat them orally, haltingly at first, but more confidently after he receives patterned support. Only much later does he learn to read and write. Herein is the key to modifying language behaviour. We learn to speak by speaking. Reading and writing may help to reinforce patterns already acquired or practiced orally but they will not modify language behaviour unless adequate opportunities for prior oral practice have been provided.

Before he can use it, Norman will first need to hear and become aware of the language unit, "I am". His teacher will take every opportunity to use it in every curriculum area she explores with him and his group. She'll recite poems that stress this unit. She'll sing songs that contain it. She'll read stories which use it and she may begin to provide practice in the supported use of the structure by encouraging the children to repeat key phrases or refrains that contain the unit. "I'm the gingerbread man, I am, I am!" Gradually she'll introduce games and activities which will provide opportunities for Norman to use this new structure as he develops all sorts of other skills and concepts. Looking in a mirror, he makes discoveries about his size and says proudly, "I am big". Comparison of his reflection with that of his mate leads him to observe, "I am bigger than Bill". His frequent non-standard attempts are accepted by his teacher who soon becomes very skilful at creating a supportive atmosphere in which he'll cheerfully, and at first almost unconsciously, modify them to the standard form.

After he's had a considerable amount of oral practice his teacher may encourage him to 'write' his story by sequencing specially prepared magnetized cards. The cards will feature units, not words - "I am" not "I" and "am" - for she wants him to see that he can 'write down talk'. The physical manipulation in placing the cards (a much simpler manipulation than attempting to write with a probably unfamiliar pencil) and the subsequent 'reading' of the story he has made, help to reinforce both the standard language pattern and the realization that what is written and read has meaning. As his physical dexterity develops and his new oral language patterns become more secure, he'll learn to write (always in a meaningful context) and he'll be shown how to decipher the written word, but for the present, and indeed for quite some time, it is enough that he is aware that he can 'read' and 'write' the things that he talks. Experience reading of this type has great relevance for him. With the teacher's help he and his mates can 'write' their own class books which feature the doings and sayings of the children themselves, skilfully converted to Standard English by the teacher. Thus one page has a sketch of Norman in action, captioned, "I am jumping". The next page features a mate with the caption, "I am hopping". Perhaps the language unit gets extra reinforcement by being repeated in a speech balloon which emerges comic-like from the character's mouth. Soon everything the child does is being labelled verbally or in writing, using the child's own

ideas and utterances modified into Standard English in such a way as to reinforce whatever language unit is currently being developed. Class-made reading books proliferate. Books dealing with maths and other concepts also reinforce language units and vice versa. News sheets become reading books. Concepts of colour, number, size, space, position, and so on emerge as the teacher and children create sketches to illustrate the Standard English news items. A Birthday Book stresses language units, "I am Norman. I am seven", and also develops maths concepts such as seven candles, with seven flames which are drawn on a cake which is also decorated with seven, big, green triangles.

"Reading is fun because it's all about the things we say and the ideas we have and the games we play."

Gradually the teacher begins to introduce 'real' books - not only books to read to the children, but books to be read by the children; books that use the same sort of language structures that the children have been developing orally; books that contain familiar vocabulary (much of which can be guessed, in the early stages, by using picture clues); books that feature familiar situations and that are suitably illustrated - ideally, with pictures of Aboriginal children (the class photo books are extremely popular on this score) or with pictures which are multi-ethnic. Soon the pile in the book corner grows as these commercially prepared books are added to the class-made ones. And still there is no 'class reader' as such. Children browse where they will in the growing pile, all the books having been placed there because they provide practice in language patterns already developed orally. As the children acquire more competence there will be a place for a series of reading books but these are always seen as only one thread of a multi-strand reading program.

But do the children *really* learn to read in this way? Of course they do, provided they also receive help in developing their perceptual skills, particularly the auditory and visual skills which will ultimately help them to decipher the written word. And these needn't be dull, boring activities. "Susie Seasnake's sound" is much more fun than the letter 's' and Susie's sound is more likely to develop a firm sound-symbol association than are discussions about the letter 's'. Susie is soon one of the class, along with Henry, Tottie, Googa, and all the rest of the phonic puppet characters. In fact, when the roll is called, they're usually included and the child who is Susie's voice

answering, "I am here", has yet another chance to practise a standard language pattern. Perhaps this child, benefitting from activities which provide frequent, spaced, and varied repetition say "I'm am here". But the teacher accepts this example of overlearning happily, recognizing it for what it is; an indication of progress towards the acquiring of the standard form. Soon the children want to write a book for Susie and for Henry and for all the rest. Later they'll enjoy suggesting lists of words that each puppet would like. Susie likes sand and sausages and sandals and such. Written on charts and displayed around the room, they become a relevant class word list and are freely used by the children in creative writing sessions.

Phonic puppet activities often take the children out of doors. On a 'Henry walk' we find hair, a hat, a half a marble. We are amazed at the children's knowledge of, and interest in, their environment. Why, then, don't we make more use of it? Why should number work always be done with coloured rods or plastic counters? Why not use sticks or stones or leaves or shells? What exciting seriation exercises we can develop from these! What interesting counting exercises involving concepts or more, less, bigger, smaller and so on we can develop by using leaves! What interesting multiplying and dividing exercises we can devise by using wildflowers that all have the same number of petals! What books we can write, reinforcing language patterns as we record these meaningful activities!

What discoveries the children can make and what discoveries we can make! Perhaps we'll come to realize that Aboriginal children don't necessarily lead dull and uninteresting lives after all. They may be poor in material possessions but they have a real treasure box in their environment. But we may also realize that although these children have had similar types of experiences to those of their middle class white age mates, they may not have verbalized these experiences in the same way. Whereas the Aboriginal child will probably spend most of his pre-school time with children of his own age, the middle-class child will probably have more interaction with adults. This latter child, pouring water from a jug into a bucket will probably be encouraged to discuss what is happening. "How many jugs of water have you used? Is the bucket full? Will you have enough water, or too much?" The danger for the Aboriginal child is that the school may expect him to have verbalized his experiences in the same way and so it may assume that he will

understand these concepts. The teacher must be aware of this problem and cater for it by providing plenty of opportunities for the child to manipulate concrete materials of all kinds and to discuss what he is doing and discovering.

By taking the child outside to use environmental materials, we may make yet another discovery. We may discover that such materials have more relevance for him than do the commercially prepared ones inside which so obviously belong to the school and which are so remote from his *real* life outside it. Perhaps he may continue to play with these environmental materials after school is finished for the day. He may even inspire his pre-school brother to join in and, who knows, they may even discuss their activities in terms which will make subsequent school experiences more meaningful. Can we occasionally take our writing lesson out in the sand pit or in the dirt using a stick for a pen? The child who has no paper and pencil at home may thus see a way to practise this new and exciting skill outside the school situation. And once again his young brother may join him.

THE MIDDLE AND UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOL

I wonder if we can agree that the sort of approach I have been describing is also valid for the older children in the primary school. I'm sure that it is. Such an approach places a continuing stress on the importance of oral language development. Perhaps we need to learn to listen more carefully to what our Aboriginal pupils say and to study more carefully what they write, hearing and seeing not merely a maze of 'errors' but guide posts showing us the direction we should take to provide them with the sort of program which will cater for their needs and which will, at the same time, have relevance for them.

Table 1 shows many of the Aboriginal English structures revealed by the computer analyses carried out as part of the Van Leer Foundation language development program. How many of these non-standard structures do your pupils use? Can this list (or one you develop for yourself from the speech and writing of your own pupils) provide you with the framework for a relevant oral language development program for your older pupils? For instance, what sorts of activities could you devise to develop

the use of a standard question form? Could your children make up simple riddles or quizzes? Would they enjoy reading these if they were later written in a class book? Would such reading material, as well as reinforcing oral language patterns, be more meaningful for your virtual non-reading thirteen year old Aboriginal boy than would Book 1 or 2 of a reading series which features, at an infantile level, middle-class white children in middle-class white situations? Might you not encourage him and some of his better achieving mates to read more if you let them write their own reading books, about things that interest them? They could start perhaps from a folded foolscap sheet on which they drew a sequence of four pictures which they (or you) captioned and to which were added comic-like speech balloons containing statements reinforcing particular language structures. They love to draw and they're usually quite good at it. Why not build on this strength?

Is it possible to develop word attack skills through games? Might there be value in extending the class 'spelling lists' developed by the younger pupils?

Perhaps functional writing such as filling out forms writing shopping lists, and composing telegrams could be developed through keeping material records of what's happening in the community - the number of fish being caught, or the number of cattle being mustered for the weekly sales.

What could be more functional, and yet creative at the same time, than letter writing? Letters that you really send. It's easy for the teacher to arrange for an exchange of letters with another school. Such an exchange could be the basis of an exciting project in which not only letters but also photographs, colour slides, and tape recordings are exchanged. Think of the social studies concepts that could be extended, the research skills that could be developed, the oral discussions that could emerge, the writing and reading of reports that could be practised, the captions for colour slides that could be composed, the!!

What I'm saying is that Aboriginal children may be more motivated towards school learning if the program presented is relevant and if the strategies used capitalize on their strengths. Let's make use of their tendency towards cooperation rather than competition by establishing cooperative groups in which problems

can be discussed and solved by mutual aid rather than by competitive individual effort. As an added bonus, group work provides the audience necessary for the development of language skills. Let's continue to use concrete aids, visual materials, and action-oriented approaches. Let's use flexible organizational formats that encourage independence and initiative and that ensure success through programs based on the concept of continuous progress. Let's remember that individual differences exist among Aboriginal children too. Let's accept that Aboriginal children are often person-oriented rather than achievement-oriented. They are likely to be greatly influenced by the peer group. Can we devise ways of using this influence? Can we, for example, develop peer group approval of reading by building a reading component into a *really* exciting activity or game which *really* interests the group? If it is true that Aboriginal children are more likely to work for the teacher because they like him as a person rather than because he represents the pathway to achievement, then let us, as teachers, while being as firm as is necessary, be warm and supportive, respectful of the child and his culture, flexible in our approach, but consistent in our demands and our attitudes. If he achieves for us because he likes us, he may continue to achieve for himself because he comes to value achievement.

HOME AND SCHOOL

In the past a significant barrier to the educational progress of Aboriginal children has been a lack of real and effective communication between the home and the school. On the one hand the school has often failed to appreciate, accept, and build on the values, expectations, and life style of its Aboriginal pupils. On the other hand, the home has been unaware of the aims and expectations of the school. Research evidence shows that, where such a conflict exists, the home and neighbourhood exert a greater influence than the school on the child's academic progress. This is a powerful argument for increased dialogue between school and home. Unless such a dialogue can be established by bringing the parents to the school, or the school to the parents, or by arranging contact on 'neutral ground', the educational program being developed in the school is likely to have little lasting effect.

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

Can we pause for a moment to look at ourselves? What do we expect of our Aboriginal pupils? Considerable recent research indicates that the expectations of teachers do fix the academic goals of both students and teachers. If we believe that Aboriginal children are lazy, or that they can't achieve beyond a certain level, or that they can't be trusted to work on their own, then they'll live up (or down) to our expectations. The self fulfilling prophecy operates in all realms of education. Perhaps we would all do well to ponder Carl Rogers' statement:

"If I accept the other person as something fixed, already diagnosed and classified, already shaped by his past, then I am doing my part to confirm this limited hypothesis. If I accept him as a process of becoming, then I am doing what I can to conform or make real his potentialities." (4)

I would like to finish where, perhaps, I should have started. As a teacher of Aboriginal pupils I am often asked, "What are you really educating them for? What is the school aiming to do?" There is no quick or easy reply to these questions. Perhaps part of the answer is that the school should give the child the chance to make a choice. He may choose to reject the majority culture. That is his right. Many of our own youth have made the same decision, choosing to opt out of a system they see as too materialistic. On the other hand, he may decide that he wants a place within the mainstream culture, or a more satisfying place within the minority culture. The school alone can't guarantee him this, but without the skills that the school can give, he has no chance to make a choice.

Do our schools give the Aboriginal child that chance?

.....

References

1. Department of Education, Queensland; Bernard Van Leer Foundation Project Publications. See *The Aboriginal Child at School* Vol. 1, No. 3, p.15.

2. Department of Education, Queensland, Bernard Van Leer Foundation Project.
Handbook for first year Experimental Language Development Program; Book One, Brisbane, July, 1971, p.iv.
3. Ibid p.vii.
4. Rogers, Carl : *On Becoming a Person*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1961, p.55.

TABLE 1

Source: Department of Education, Queensland, Bernard Van Leer Foundation Project (Language Development Program)

LANGUAGE STRUCTURE OF ABORIGINAL ENGLISH (*Ab.E.*)
EXAMPLES OF PATTERNS WHICH DIFFER FROM STANDARD
AUSTRALIAN ENGLISH (*S.E.*)

Ab.E	S.E.
1. <i>Omission of the verb 'to be'</i> That a big one. 'e going now. Uffela making sausage. That not a square. They wild When he going? You can dive where the deep water.	That's a big one. That is a big one. He's going now. He is going now. She's going now. She is going now. We are making sausage(s). That is not a square. They are wild. When is he going? You can dive where the deep water is. You can dive where the water is deep.

2. *Use of uninflected verb 'to be' (minority of Ab. E. speakers)*
I be cold. I am cold.
They be at the back. They are at the back.
3. *Uninverted question forms*
They can get it? Can they get it?
They can get it, eh?
You like it? Do you like it?
It heavy? Is it heavy?
Daddy going too? Is Daddy going too?
4. *Omission of plural 's'*
Some plum over there. Some plums are over there.
Two crab la! two crabs - there!
(no exact S.E. equivalent)
5. *Omission of possessive 's'*
That my Daddy car. That's my Daddy's car.
Look at John boat. Look at John's boat.
6. *Omission of 's' verb ending*
This go on top. This goes on top.
He run fast. He runs fast.
7. *Substitution of indefinite for definite article*
All a boy playing football. All the boys are playing
football.
Clivie in a water. Clivie is in the water.
8. *Use of masculine for feminine gender.*
He a big girl. She's a big girl.
She is a big girl.
That he dress. That's her dress.
That is her dress.
Give it to him. Give it to her.

9. *Nonstandard possessive pronouns*

He put he arm up.	He put his arm up.
That youfla pant?	Are these your pants?
They bin go with your Daddy.	They went with your Daddy.
Uffela chair got a cushion.	Our chair (has) got a cushion.
Plenty ripe mango at Moofla* place.	(There are) plenty of ripe mangoes at my place.

10. *Other nonstandard usages of pronouns.*

Uffela going Back Beach.	We are going to Back Beach.
You coming with Uffela?	Are you coming with us?

11. *Omission of prepositions*

He home.	He's/He is at home. She's/She is at home.
They goin' town.	They are going to town.

12. *Nonstandard past tense*

He hook him.	He hooked him.
He bin hook him.	
I bin eat it.)	(I ate it.
I eat it.)	(I have eaten it.
He a baby then.	He was a baby then.

13. *Nonstandard future tense (standard form is also frequently used)*

I eat it.	I will eat it.
John going** to catch you.	John is going to catch you.

.....

*"Moofla is uncommon in many communities but occurs with high frequency at Yarrabah.

**"going to" is often used to indicate future action by speakers of Ab.E. and S.E. alike.

14. *Use of singular nouns for irregular S.E. plurals*
Two man in a jeep. Two men are in the jeep.
15. *Omission of the verb 'to do'*
Nail not float. Nails do not/don't float.
A/The nail does not float.
You like banana? Do you like bananas?
16. *Nonstandard contractions*
I'na wear it on. I want to wear it.
They'n see it. They saw it.
(They bin see it.)
17. *Lack of inflection for comparatives and superlatives*
(length of vowel indicates relationship)
This big. This is big.
This biiig. This is bigger.
This biiiii one. This is the biggest.
18. *Nonstandard adverbs*
You can easy do it. You can easily do it.
19. *Restrictions in ordering within sentences*
 - a. *Avoidance of passive voice**
A bee sting him. A bee stung him.
He was stung by a bee.
 - b. *Preference for animate-inanimate progression**
He got it in the hand. He has it in his hand.
It is in his hand.

5 0 0 1 1 3 0 0

**Speakers of S.E., particularly immature speakers, also exhibit preference for the forms indicated above. In the case of Ab.E. speakers, the alternative form may be used much less frequently or not at all.*

00000000