from—

Adger, Carolyn, Donna Christian, and Orlando Taylor. 1999. Making the Connection: Language and Academic Achievement Among African American Students. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics: 1-29.

Language Diversity and Academic Achievement in the Education of African American Students—An Overview of the Issues[1]

John R. Rickford

Why consider this issue now? Why consider it at all? Despite the commendable generality and neutrality of its title, the driving force behind the conference whose proceedings are included in this volume is the furor that erupted in December 1996 when the Oakland (CA) School Board resolved to recognize Ebonics as the "primary language of African American students" and to take it into account in facilitating "their acquisition and mastery of English language skills."

The first question one might ask is why hold a conference on this issue one year after the furor erupted, and why publish a book on it two years afterward, when the issue has long since lost the attention of the media and the public? The reason for this is simply that the crisis that led Oakland to its radical resolution in 1996—the fact that (primarily working-class) African American students were performing more poorly in school than students from virtually every other ethnicity, particularly in the central areas of reading and writing—remains unchanged (see section 2 below). Moreover, the crisis is not confined to Oakland or California; it is evident in school districts across the United States. The teachers and parents of these students cannot give up on the issue simply because the television crews and reporters have packed up and gone away. They must continue to search for deeper understandings and solutions. There is evidence that the vernacular of African American students (called Ebonics or African American Vernacular English [AAVE]) can be used to help them improve their skills in reading and the language arts and do better in school more generally. Ebonics is by no means a panacea for *all* the problems that beset African American students in schools, but it is potentially part of the solution and from that perspective alone deserves consideration.

The second question some might ask is why hold a conference with this focus at all? At a point in history when so many people have

struggled to overcome differential opportunity and treatment by race (i.e., discrimination) in education, employment, housing, and other areas, do we really need to zero in on the problems facing African American students, as if they were somehow different from other students and as if the principles of good teaching somehow did not apply to them? This sentiment was widely echoed when the Ebonics firestorm erupted. For instance, the poet Maya Angelou, despite her own use of Ebonics in such poems as "The Thirteens" and "The Pusher,"[2] was quoted in *USA Today* (December 23, 1996) as saying that she was "incensed" by Oakland's Ebonics resolution and found it "very threatening, because it can encourage young men and women not to learn standard English." Similarly, Jim Boulet, executive director of the national organization English First, felt that the Oakland resolution was "saying in the most racist way that Black kids are stupid and they can't learn English, so let's not bother with that" (Diringer & Olszewski, 1996, p. A17).

The impression that Oakland was not interested in teaching Standard English (SE) was of course the most widespread misunderstanding throughout the Ebonics firestorm, the one that sent newspaper editorial and letter writers, TV commentators, radio callers, and talk show hosts into paroxysms of pontification about the importance of learning "proper" English. However, even those who recognized that Oakland was committed to teaching SE[3] objected to the suggestion that students' vernacular (Ebonics) had to be taken into account to help them learn SE. As an (African American) editor of a major U.S. trade book publisher wrote more recently:

> I find the whole notion of Ebonics counterproductive, condescending, and offensive. . . . The notion of using Ebonics to teach standard English implies that Black children aren't capable of learning standard English the way other children do. My parents were raised in the Jim Crow south by parents without high school degrees, and they managed to learn standard English without Ebonics even under those difficult conditions. (personal communication, December 5, 1997)[4]

In response to this, I would say that while I commend the successes of every individual African American (or other) student who masters Standard English and does well in school without special

intervention,[5] and while I agree that the very best principles of teaching and learning should be followed in the education of *all* students, the evidence that schools are failing massive numbers of African American students with existing methods is so overwhelming that it would be counterproductive and offensive to continue using them uncritically. To turn the powerful words of the Reverend Jesse Jackson on their head, to accept existing methods represents "an unconditional surrender, borderlining on disgrace"[6] (Lewis, 1996). Methods of teaching reading and writing that take the language diversity of African American students into account have shown greater promise than those that do not. Hence their relevance, and hence this conference and these proceedings.

In this overview, I address the following aspects of what I think we need to do in response to the crisis affecting African American students:

1. Recognize the scope of the problem.
2. Recognize the nature of the problem, including its several nonlinguistic components.
3. Improve teachers', students', and parents' attitudes and knowledge regarding Ebonics or AAVE.
4. Improve the teaching of Standard English.
5. Improve the teaching of writing and speaking more generally.
6. Improve the teaching of reading.

1. Recognize the scope of the problem—The devastating rate at which schools fail African American students.

Hutchison (1997), in a critique of the Oakland School Board and all "Ebonics advocates," points to statistics indicating that African Americans are not doing as badly in schools as some suggest:

> According to the National Urban League's State of Black America, 1995 report, nearly eighty percent of Blacks graduated from high school and nearly thirty-five percent were enrolled in college. (p. 37)

While it is important to recognize and applaud every achievement of this type, it is delusionary to pretend that a larger problem does not exist.

It was massive evidence of the problems facing African American students—the largest ethnic group in their school population—that led the Oakland School Board to create the Task Force on the Education of African American Students in 1996, and it was one of the recommendations of this task force that led the school board to its Ebonics resolution. The school board itself provided the relevant statistics as a supplement to the resolution, noting that although 53% of the 51, 706 students in its school district were African American, only 35% of the students in Gifted and Talented Education were African American. By contrast, 71% of all students enrolled in special education were African American; 80% of all suspended students were African American; African American students had the lowest grade point average (1.80 or a C-) of all students in the district; and 19% of African American students who made it to the 12th grade did not graduate. The converse of this last statistic, incidentally, is what Hutchison cites with pride ("nearly eighty percent . . . graduated from high school"). But the non-graduation of one out of every five students is surely no cause for elation.

In the comparison of Black rates of school success with White rates, particularly on standardized measures of reading and writing, the full scope of the problem becomes clear. Consider, for instance, the 1989-90 test performances of third and sixth graders in the Palo Alto, California, School District (predominantly White, middle and upper-middle class) and in the adjacent Ravenswood School District (predominantly Black, working and under class), both about one hour's drive south of Oakland. The Palo Alto kids scored high on both reading and writing in third grade (96th and 94th percentiles respectively) and improved to the very top of the scale (the 99th percentile) by sixth grade, showing that the schools are able to build on whatever abilities children bring to school and add value to them before they leave. By contrast, the Ravenswood kids scored low on tests of reading and writing in third grade—in the 16th and 21st percentiles respectively—and declined even further, to the 3rd percentile (meaning only 2% of sixth graders statewide did worse), by sixth grade. This coincides with the very general finding reported by Steele (1992) that the longer African American students remain in school, the worse they do relative to mainstream (and particularly White) norms.

Pointing in the same direction is Michael Casserly's testimony before the U.S. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on January 23, 1997, on the subject of Ebonics (*Ebonics*, 1997). Casserly, Executive Director of the Council of the Great City Schools (which includes 50 of the nation's largest urban public school districts), reported that in 1994, nine-year-old African American students were, on average, 29 points behind their White counterparts in reading proficiency (as measured on a 0 to 500-point scale). By the age of 13, the gap had increased to 31 points. By the age of 17, the gap was greater still, with African American students a full 37 points behind their White counterparts.[7] Casserly also reported that the 1992-93 scores of reading achievement by the 6 million inner-city children in Great City Schools indicate that while the percentage of White students scoring above the norm increased from 60.7% at the elementary level to 65.4% at the senior high level, the percentage of African American students scoring above the norm declined from 31.3% at the elementary level to 26.6% at the senior high level.[8]

2. Recognize the nature of the problem, including its several nonlinguistic components.

Linguists naturally concentrate on the linguistic aspects of such dramatic failure rates, including the differences between African American Vernacular English and the mainstream or Standard English that is expected and required in the schools. In this we are perfectly justified, but lest we forget the larger context of the problem and leave ourselves open to accusations of irrelevance or naïveté (Cose, 1997), we must recognize some of the other factors associated with the success or failure of schools in teaching and reaching African American students. Some of these factors may be more obvious than others, but all require increased study and understanding, as well as translation into teacher training, school funding, and policy making by school boards, counties, and state and federal legislative bodies. Some of these factors are described below.

School resources and facilities

The Reverend Jesse Jackson, discussing the Ebonics controversy on a visit to California at the end of December 1997, made the tell-

ing point that the average prison that houses primarily African Americans is better equipped than the average school that houses primarily African Americans. Freccia and Lau (1996) documented the disparity even more bleakly, noting, among other things, that

> in 1995, for the first time ever, California spent as much money on its prison system as it did on its universities. Since 1983, the California Department of Corrections has increased its staff by a huge 169%. . . . By contrast, California has decreased its higher education staff by 8.7%. The California Assembly Ways and Means Initial Review of the 1994/95 Budget states, "Corrections spending has grown more than twice as fast as total state spending. . . . This explosive growth has come at the expense of spending for other programs, primarily higher education."

Given that African Americans are significantly overrepresented in the jail and prison population—

> In 1991, African Americans constituted only 12.3% of the population nationwide, but 43.4% of the inmates in local jails, and 45.6% of the inmates in state prisons. (Rickford, 1997a, p. 173)

—they are undoubtedly the primary "beneficiaries" of the state's increased spending on prisons. But since spending on prisons comes at the expense of spending on schools, they are also the primary losers in this process. If one compares classrooms and school facilities in Palo Alto and East Palo Alto (Ravenswood), as I have, the latter are obviously far more poorly equipped in terms of buildings, books, computers, and other facilities than the former, and this difference alone must contribute to some of the differences in test scores between these school districts reported above.

Teacher pay, training, and collaboration

Teachers in highly successful school districts like Palo Alto tend to be better paid and to have received better training than teachers in less successful districts like East Palo Alto (Ravenswood). Interestingly enough, in the Evergreen Elementary School District in San Jose, California, which is only 17% White but "where schools consistently rack up academic awards and students outperform their peers across the county" (Suryaraman, 1997), teachers are paid an average of

$46,000 a year, among the highest in Santa Clara County. Additionally, Evergreen's teachers have high expectations for their students, are held and hold themselves to high standards of accountability, and spend Thursday afternoons attending training workshops and collaborating with each other on ways to teach better. This is surely a model worth emulating.

Outstanding (vs. mediocre) teachers

Apart from general factors like teacher training and pay, many school districts have one or more outstanding teachers. These include widely celebrated individuals like Pat Conroy (author of *The Water is Wide,* 1972, and the subject of the movie *Conrack*), Marva Collins (Collins & Tamarkin, 1982), Jaime Escalante (the real-life subject of the movie *Stand and Deliver*), and less well known figures like Oakland teacher Carrie Secret (see Miner, 1997) and East Palo Alto teacher Carl Daniels (see A. Rickford, 1998). Often, students who succeed against seemingly insurmountable odds have been influenced by star teachers like these. We need to study the strategies and philosophies that such teachers employ, while recognizing that we can never duplicate the whole package, and pass them on to other teachers. Actually, some of the factors listed below, like high expectations and the creation of challenging, engaging classrooms, are ones that almost invariably show up in the methodology of star teachers. Equally important is to identify and retrain or weed out the mediocre teachers who sometimes establish themselves securely in low-income, ethnic minority schools, where there is less competition for jobs. Based on recent classroom observations in California, I believe that poor teachers like these can have a stultifying effect on the educational and life opportunities of the children entrusted to their care.

Teacher expectations and pupils' performance

One of the factors that is well established in educational circles now is the powerful effect that teacher expectations can have on student performance (Tauber, 1997). Research studies indicate, however, that teachers tend to have lower expectations for African American students than for White students (Irvine, 1990). The effect can be particularly insidious for African American students who speak nonstandard or vernacular English because, as Williams (1976) showed, such students tend to be considered less promising or effective.

Stereotype vulnerability, self-esteem, and the need for challenge

A related factor is the "stereotype vulnerability" (Steele, 1992) that often develops among African American students, the low self-esteem, and the fear that they will inevitably succumb to the low expectations and prejudices of their teachers and fellow students. A common response to this on the part of African American students is "disidentification" with the academic enterprise and decreased effort (see Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). One solution to this stereotype vulnerability that Steele and others advocate is increased confidence building and challenge. For instance, Treisman's mathematics program for Black students at Berkeley (Treisman 1992) "recruits them to a challenging 'honors' workshop tied to their first calculus course. Building on their skills, the workshop gives difficult work" (Steele, 1992, p. 75). Students participating in this workshop quickly began to outperform their White and Asian counterparts. Similarly, Angela Rickford (1998) found that African American and other ethnic minority middle school students in East Palo Alto were more engaged and performed better when given a combination of ethnically congruent narratives and higher-order inferential and evaluative comprehension questions instead of the stultifying literal recall questions common in basal readers. Finally, Pollard and Ajirotutu (1997) showed that students at Martin Luther King Jr. elementary school in Milwaukee showed striking gains in reading, writing, and math after the school was designated an African immersion school in 1991. They argue that African-centered education might contribute more generally to increased cultural congruency and improved academic performance. At the same time, other factors like increased community and school district support were part of the success story at this elementary school.

Students' socioeconomic backgrounds

An obvious if little-understood factor in school success is the role of students' socioeconomic background. Students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds tend to do better than students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and because students of color are disproportionately represented among the latter,[9] the correlations between reading success and race discussed above must be partly attributed to

socioeconomics, or class. At the same time, we should not make the currently popular mistake (of the many who favor replacing race-based with class-based affirmative action) of attributing *all* the variance to socioeconomics. For one thing, as the Draft Report of the University of California Outreach Task Force (1997) reveals, among California high school graduates who took the SAT in 1995, Black students whose families earned above $60,000 (the highest income bracket considered) scored lower (average of 810) than Latinos (904), Whites (995), and Asians (1050) in the same income bracket and lower than Whites in all income brackets, including the lowest, those below $20,000 (average of 899).[10] For another, we do not fully understand the factors that lie behind the correlations with class or race and their relative importance. Nutrition, parental involvement and support (a key element of the successful Comer schools [Comer, 1993]), provision of books and academic guidance within the home, orientation to schooling, racism—these and other factors are relevant, but they need further study. Lest people interpret the UC Task Force statistics as an invitation to revert to long-discredited genetic arguments, it should be noted that the task force itself suggests a number of explanatory factors for the grim correlations between SAT scores and race—"students' lives outside of school, their sense of the value of education, their self-confidence and esteem, . . . family support" (University of California Outreach Task Force, 1997)—but genetics is not one of them.

These are only some of the relevant nonlinguistic factors in African American students' school failure and success. It is important that linguists get involved in understanding and influencing these nonlinguistic factors as well as the linguistic ones if we want to see maximum yield from our involvement in school issues. I would also contend that if these other factors are held constant, a program that takes the linguistic background of AAVE speakers into account in teaching reading and the language arts is likely to be more successful than one that does not. As I show in sections 4 and 6, there is good evidence of this effect.

3. Improve teachers', students', and parents' attitudes and knowledge regarding AAVE.

The first and most popular response of linguists to public controversies about the role of AAVE and other vernacular dialects in education is to try to dispel the negative attitudes and expand the information that the public generally has about such vernaculars and about language in general. This was the essential strategy of Labov (1969) in the classic "Logic of Nonstandard English" article that he wrote in response to the allegations of educational psychologists that Black children were verbally deprived. A decade later, in the wake of the "Black English" trial of 1979 (see *The Ann Arbor Decision,* n.d.; Whiteman, 1980), the Ann Arbor School Board was directed by Judge Joiner, who had been strongly influenced by the testimony of linguists, to provide inservice training to help teachers learn more about AAVE and its educational consequences (Bailey, 1983). In the Oakland Ebonics controversy of late 1996 and early 1997, the systematic and complex nature of AAVE was repeatedly stressed by linguists—for instance in the Linguistic Society of America's January 1997 resolution on the Ebonics issue[11]—to counter the widespread public misperception that Ebonics is merely slang or lazy talk that should be eradicated. More recently, Wolfram and his colleagues (Wolfram, Adger, & Christian, 1999; Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 1998) have emphasized the role that dialect awareness programs could play in increasing understanding of and appreciation for language variation in classrooms and communities. Their own dialect awareness programs in Baltimore, Maryland, and on Ocracoke Island, North Carolina—which reveal the grammatical and phonological regularity of local dialects as well as their distinctive lexicon and their historical origins—have been enthusiastically received by students, teachers, and community members and are widely regarded by sociolinguists as models for the field.

The deeper rationales for this educational response to public controversy (which we must be prepared to repeat over and over, as advertisers do—in the media, in classrooms, in public discussions, in private conversations) might include the following:

- Accurate diagnosis of a problem is essential to its adequate solution, and non-linguists' mistaken notions about what AAVE or other vernaculars are or what they reveal about children's cognitive abilities or scholarly potential are both unhelpful and harmful.

- Attitudes shape teacher expectations, which crucially affect student performance (Tauber, 1997), and negative attitudes rooted in ignorance of the rule-governed nature of vernaculars are likely to exacerbate the academic problems faced by their speakers.

- Students' self-esteem and interest in Standard English and the language arts tend to increase as they learn that their vernacular is a systematic and valid language form.[12]

But is it enough to attempt to improve public attitudes and information about AAVE, or should we also work to help AAVE speakers develop bidialectal competence in AAVE and SE? Kochman (1969) and Sledd (1972) both opposed the bidialectal program on various grounds, including the fact that it seemed hypocritical ("Your dialect is okay, but you need to learn SE"), that it placed the blame and responsibility for improvement on children rather than on the racism and ignorance of the larger society, that it wasted school time that could be used to develop children in more fundamental ways, and that it was ultimately likely to be unsuccessful either in developing solid competence in SE or in opening doors that were locked for reasons other than language. More recently, Lippi-Green (1997) has echoed similar sentiments about the "standard language myth" (she prefers the notion of "mainstream" U.S. English) and about the uncomfortable acceptance of language subordination and discrimination that the pursuit of teaching SE to vernacular speakers typically involves. But most linguists, while acknowledging these problems, still feel that for practical reasons (increased potential for success in schools and on the job) and because it is in line with the expressed self-interest of many African American students and parents, we need to improve access to SE or mainstream English even as we recognize the systematicity and complexity of the vernacular. Which brings us to the next point.

4. Improve the teaching of Standard English (SE).

Given that the goal of helping students master Standard English is shared by most detractors and aficionados of AAVE alike, it is evident that most of the media discussion about the Ebonics issue was about a non-issue. The real debate is, or should have been, about the *means* of teaching SE.

Immersion

For most commentators on the Ebonics issue, either implicitly or explicitly, the means of choice was and is immersion in the patterns, grammar, and spoken and written examples of SE without any reference to AAVE (considered either unnecessary, or likely to reinforce non-SE patterns, or both). One of the most explicit advocates of this approach is McWhorter (1997), who argues that

> we must make standard English a part of Black children's souls just as Black English is. This can only happen via immersion in standard English, to complement the immersion they have naturally had in Black English. (p. 4)

The most cogent rationale for advocating immersion as a means of improving the teaching of SE is evidence from second language teaching and learning that shows immersion to be one of the most effective ways of acquiring another language. But I have reservations about the effectiveness of this method for helping AAVE speakers acquire SE. For one thing, immersion seems to be more successful in the acquisition of a second language rather than a second dialect, where extensive overlaps in vocabulary, phonology, and grammar can cause speakers to miss subtle but significant differences between their own and the target variety. Secondly, where would SE immersion occur? The effect of exposure to SE via noninteractive media like radio and TV is apparently minimal. It is rather implausible to propose that SE be used exclusively in schools, including among AAVE-speaking friends. Immersion in SE in classrooms is already the method of choice in the overwhelming majority of U.S. schools. If it's so promising, why hasn't it produced better results?

Contrastive analysis

In a critique of the status quo with respect to English language instruction, Adger (1997) notes that "Programs to strengthen the

standard English skills that schools require do not consistently point out predictable contrasts between standard and vernacular dialect features" (p. 2). Pointing out such contrasts so that students can identify and negotiate the differences between the vernacular and the standard is precisely the goal of contrastive analysis programs, which have been advocated for dialect speakers for more than 30 years (See, e.g., Feigenbaum, 1970).

The basic rationale for contrastive analysis as a means of teaching SE is that students who speak vernacular varieties of English—and their teachers—are typically not aware of the systematic differences between them. Le Page (1968) made this point in relation to the Creole Englishes of the Caribbean:

> The teachers *are* in most cases aware of the fact that the vernacular of the lower-middle class and working-class homes is different from the language they are supposed to use in the classroom, but they are not able to formulate in any methodical way where the differences lie or what they are due to. (p. 487)

Feigenbaum (1970), referring to vernaculars in the United States, made a similar observation:

> By comparing the standard English structure to be taught and the equivalent or close nonstandard structure, the student can see how they differ. Many students have a partial knowledge of standard English, that is, they can recognize and produce it but without accurate control. (p. 91)

The second rationale for contrastive analysis is that this method allows for increased efficiency in the classroom, as teachers can concentrate on the systematic areas of contrast with SE that cause difficulties for vernacular speakers rather than taking on the more daunting task of teaching all of English grammar. The SE features of contrast and potential difficulty (for instance, possessive -s for speakers of AAVE, who may write, for example, "the mother name"[13] instead of "the mother's name") can then be brought under conscious control through identification, translation, and other drills. Feigenbaum (1970) provides several examples of such drills, and there are hundreds of examples in the substantial handbook of the Proficiency in Standard English for Speakers of Black Language program, an SEP

program that has been in use in California since the 1980s and is now in use in variant forms in over 300 schools, including several in Oakland. The 1996 Ebonics resolution was essentially a program to extend the SEP program within the Oakland Unified School District.

The third and perhaps most important rationale for using contrastive analysis to improve the teaching of SE is that where it has been systematically compared with other, more conventional methods, it has shown itself superior. Taylor (1989) reports, for instance, that African American students at Aurora University who were taught SE through an 11-week program of contrastive analysis showed a 59% decline in the intrusion of 10 Ebonics features in their SE writing, whereas a control group, taught by conventional methods over the same period, showed an 8.5% increase in the use of Ebonics features in their SE writing. Similarly, fifth and sixth graders in Kelli Harris-Wright's experimental program in DeKalb County, Georgia, who learn to switch consciously between "home language" and "school language" through contrastive analysis, show improved scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills each year, typically more so than the control groups of students who have been taught by other methods. (See chapter 3, this volume.)

One reservation that might be expressed about contrastive analysis programs for dialect speakers is that their potential or putative benefits are often extolled without the provision of empirical evidence. This is true, for instance, of Parker and Christ (1995), who report that they have used contrastive analysis successfully to help AAVE-speaking students in Tennessee and Chicago at the preschool, elementary, high school, and college levels develop competence in "Corporate English," but they provide no empirical evidence. This is also a problem with the SEP program in California, which has never been subjected to systematic, statewide evaluation (Yarborough & Flores, 1997), although such an evaluation is reportedly now being planned.

A second reservation is that the drills used in a contrastive analysis approach tend to be boring and repetitive, and if translation is not carried out in both directions, the message that can be conveyed is that the vernacular variety has no integrity or validity. In several contrastive analysis classrooms that I have observed in various parts of the country, translation is always from the vernacular to the standard, and

it is sometimes referred to as "correction." In one particularly egregious case in California, in what was billed as an SEP classroom, the teacher put phrases and sentences on the board that were ungrammatical in AAVE and all known American vernaculars (e.g., "us coach" for "our coach") and asked students to correct them. However, these are not intrinsic weaknesses of contrastive analysis, and programs like the Language Development Program for African American Students in Los Angeles (LDPAAS),[14] which minimizes drills and makes extensive use of African American literature, show that they can be avoided.

A third, theoretical reservation one might express about contrastive analysis as a strategy for teaching Standard English as a second dialect is that it needs theoretical updating. In the field of second language acquisition, contrastive analysis was sharply discredited in the 1970s and 1980s because of its behaviorist orientations and because of the overly strong claim in Lado's (1957) Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis that virtually all the errors that second language learners make are attributable to the influence of their first language. Later analyses of errors made by people learning a second language revealed that no more than half, sometimes fewer, could be attributed to interference from the learner's first language (Ellis, 1994). However, contrastive analysis has been making a comeback under the heading of "language transfer" (Odlin, 1989), and its relevance to second language acquisition and teaching, reconceptualized in cognitive rather than behaviorist terms and with fuller attention to sociolinguistic competence (Danesi & DiPietro, 1991; Ellis, 1994), is now better established. Its usefulness in sharpening students' metalinguistic or cognitive awareness of language differences is also clear (Kenji Hakuta, personal communication, January 15, 1997).

The extent to which criticisms of contrastive analysis with respect to second language learning and teaching are relevant to second dialect learning and teaching is not yet clear, but contrastive analysis for Ebonics speakers should undoubtedly be supplemented with error analysis and with the insights and approaches that second language acquisition theory has developed since the 1960s. For instance, as far as I know, we do not have systematic scientific analyses of the extent to which the errors that Ebonics speakers make in speaking and writ-

ing SE reflect interference or transfer from Ebonics (in terms of which features are affected and how often). We have lots of anecdotal evidence that Ebonics is somehow relevant to these errors. But Labov (1995a) reported that an African American legal transcriber in Chicago made many errors with SE plural *s*-marking and few with verbal (third person singular) *s*-marking. This pattern is the opposite of what we would have predicted from the frequency with which these features occur in spontaneous Ebonics speech. We need more studies like this to validate the use of contrastive analysis as a tool for teaching SE to speakers of other English dialects.

These reservations should not be construed as reasons to deemphasize contrastive analysis. Contrastive analysis shows promise, and it should be used more often in teaching SE to AAVE speakers than it is now. At the same time, more research is needed to establish the efficacy of this method.

5. Improve the teaching of writing and speaking more generally.

Helping students increase their mastery of SE, which is the primary focus of many linguists and educators who are concerned about the education of AAVE speakers, is not enough. Teachers must also teach their students—including those who already speak SE—to read and read well (section 6) and help them improve their skills in writing and speaking. Teachers steeped in the African American oral tradition—for instance, Carrie Secret in the Oakland School District (see Miner 1997)—already provide opportunities for choral recitation and rhetorical expression that draw on traditional practices within the African American church and oral tradition. Hoover (1991) has proposed that we draw on those traditions to teach composition as well. Ball (1995) has suggested that distinctive community structures are also evident in the expository writing of African American students.

Smitherman (1994) makes the important point that the narrative-imaginative essays of African American college freshmen that were rated most highly by teachers were not necessarily those with the most consistent SE, but those that included features of what she calls the "African American discourse style." Certainly many of the most distinguished African American novelists, playwrights, and poets—including Maya Angelou, Claude Brown, Langston Hughes, Sonia

Sanchez, Alice Walker, and August Wilson—draw creatively on the African American vernacular as well as on SE, and several of them explicitly praise the vernacular.[15] African American schoolchildren should be allowed to draw creatively on AAVE in their written and spoken work too, to avoid the result of a stultifying concentration on SE that Le Page (1968) found in the Caribbean 30 years ago: "Many children are inhibited from any kind of creative expression at all; and the prizes go to the best mimics rather than the most talented" (p. 438).

In general, linguistically informed work dealing with the teaching of writing to AAVE speakers is not as voluminous as work dealing with the teaching of reading, but relevant references, in addition to those listed above, include Farr and Daniels (1986) and Wolfram, Adger, and Christian (1999).

6. Improve the teaching of reading.

It may seem curious to consider reading last, since most of the evidence in the first section dealt with failures in the teaching and learning of reading, and this critical skill is at the root of many students' success or failure in school, particularly at the elementary level. But last is by no means least, for while much more remains to be done, there has already been considerable linguistic scholarship on AAVE and reading. I summarize three primary lines of work: (a) Piestrup's (1973) research on the effects of teaching styles; (b) Labov's (1995b) linguistically informed suggestions for reading teachers; and (c) dialect readers.

Piestrup's (1973) research on the effects of teaching styles

Piestrup's important but little-known study (1973) of 208 African American first-grade children in Oakland, California, showed the typical relationship in which children who used more AAVE features had lower reading scores than other children. More interesting, however, was the relationship she demonstrated between alternative teaching styles—the way teachers responded to their pupils' language—and children's success in reading. The two extreme styles of the six she identified were the *Interrupting* and *Black Artful* styles. The Interrupting teachers "asked children to repeat words pronounced in [the ver-

nacular] dialect many times and interpreted [vernacular] dialect pronunciations as reading errors" (p. iv). They had a chilling effect on the students' reading development, as reflected not only in reading scores lower than those of the Black Artful group, but also in the fact that some children "withdrew from participation in reading, speaking softly and as seldom as possible; others engaged in ritual insult and other forms of verbal play" (p. iv). By contrast, "teachers in the *Black Artful* group used rhythmic play in instruction and encouraged children to participate by listening to their responses. They attended to vocabulary differences of Black children and seemed to prevent structural conflict by teaching children to listen for standard English sound distinctions" (p. iv). Not only did children taught by this approach participate enthusiastically in reading, they also showed the highest reading scores, compared to children in the Interrupting and other groups. This study deserves replication by researchers and dissemination among teachers, to remind them that how they respond to vernacular-speaking students in the classroom crucially affects their students' success.

Labov's (1995b) linguistically informed suggestions for reading teachers

Labov (1995b), drawing on decades of research on AAVE, makes a number of linguistically informed suggestions for improving the teaching of reading to AAVE speakers. One of these is that teachers should "distinguish between mistakes in reading and differences in pronunciation." An AAVE speaker who reads aloud the words "I missed him" as "I miss him" has probably decoded the meaning of this Standard English sentence (i.e., "read" it) correctly, but he has reproduced it orally according to the pronunciation patterns of his vernacular, in which a consonant cluster like [st]—the final sounds in "missed"—is often simplified to [s]. Labov suggests that teachers give more attention to the ends of words, where AAVE pronunciation patterns have a greater modifying effect on SE words than they do at the beginnings. He also suggests that words be presented in contexts that preserve underlying forms: for instance, by using *testing* or *test of*, which favor retention of the final consonants, rather than *test* in isolation. These are sensible ideas, but as far as I know, no one has systematically implemented or evaluated them, so we have no empirical evidence of their effectiveness.

More recently, Labov and his colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania (Labov, Baker, Bullock, Ross, & Brown, 1998) have begun an empirical study of the kinds of decoding errors that AAVE speakers make in attempting to read the beginning, middle, and ending sounds of English words. The results so far are quite revealing and should prove especially useful to teachers.

Dialect readers

One approach that some have suggested (but note that neither Oakland nor Los Angeles is pursuing this approach) is that dialect speakers be introduced to reading with materials written in their native dialect and subsequently transitioned to reading in the standard or mainstream variety. Österberg (1961) and Bull (1990) reported striking successes in Sweden and Norway, respectively, showing in each case that dialect speakers taught by this method read better in the standard variety than dialect speakers taught through the standard variety alone.

The U.S. study most similar to these European studies was described by Simpkins and Simpkins (1981), who reported on an experiment involving the *Bridge* readers that they created in 1974 together with Grace Holt (Simpkins, Holt, & Simpkins, 1977). These readers, which were published by Houghton Mifflin in 1977, taught AAVE speakers to read by taking them through books written successively in AAVE, a transitional variety, and SE. The *Bridge* materials were tested over a 4-month period with 417 students in 21 classes throughout the United States (in Chicago, Illinois; Macon County, Alabama; Memphis, Tennessee; and Phoenix, Arizona). A control group of 123 students in six classes was taught using "regularly scheduled remedial reading" techniques. At the end of the 4-month period, students' scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills indicated that students taught by the *Bridge* method showed an average gain of "*6.2 months for four months of instruction*, compared to only an average gain *of 1.6 months* for students in their regularly scheduled classroom reading activities" (Simpkins & Simpkins, 1981, p. 238, emphasis in original). It should be noted, parenthetically, that the gain of only 1.6 months for 4 months of instruction that was evidenced by the con-

trol group is consistent with the evidence we saw in the first section that African American inner city children taught by regular methods tend to fall further and further behind mainstream norms each year they remain in school. It should also be noted, ruefully, that despite experimental demonstration of the success of the *Bridge* readers, some educators were so hostile to the presence of "dialect" in school materials that Houghton Mifflin halted publication, and this innovative and promising experiment ground to a halt. (See Rickford & Rickford, 1995, for further discussion.)

There have been other experiments with AAVE dialect readers in the United States, most of them successful, and there has been considerable discussion about the pros and cons of using them (see Baratz & Shuy, 1969; Fasold & Shuy, 1970; Laffey & Shuy, 1973; and Rickford & Rickford, 1995). The essential rationale for dialect readers is that they present AAVE speakers with the same initial task as that of SE speakers—learning to read (i.e., to extract meaning from print or writing)—without confronting them with the additional task of acquiring SE at the same time (Stewart, 1969). Dialect readers are almost invariably part of an overall program that includes a transition to reading and assessment in SE, so anxieties that SE will not be taught are unjustified. An additional point in favor of dialect readers is that they seem to work, both in increasing students' motivation and interest in reading and in improving their performance on comprehension and standardized reading tests.

One drawback to using dialect readers or teaching directly in the vernacular is that this tends to elicit knee-jerk negative reactions from parents and educators. Such a response can be minimized if those experimenting with dialect readers explain their rationale and display their commitment to parents and community members.[16] A second drawback is the fear that the use of dialect readers may involve (re)segregation of African American kids in special classes or special sections of classes. It is actually rather striking how many African American inner-city students are already in segregated classrooms. But even in integrated classrooms, it should be possible to introduce dialect readers to African American students as supplements to the regular reading materials and to SE speakers as part of a general consideration of language diversity in literature and real life.

A third and final reservation that was expressed in several studies in the early 1970s, including Melmed (1971) and Simons and Johnson (1974), is, as McWhorter (1997) put it: "Dialect readers were shown to have no effect whatsoever on African American students' reading scores" (p. 5). However, if one looks carefully at those studies, as I have, what is most striking is that they were all studies at one point in time of whether children decoded, discriminated, or comprehended better depending on whether the stimuli (words, sentences, short texts) were in AAVE or SE. The negative findings of these studies are certainly noteworthy and deserving of critical evaluation and replication, but one difference between these studies and the *Bridge* study (Simpkins & Simpkins, 1981) that I have already noted is that the *Bridge* study was conducted over a 4-month period, rather than at one point in time. That this may have been responsible for the differences in result is suggested by Simons and Johnson (1974),[17] one of the most substantive of the earlier studies reviewed by McWhorter:

> Another limitation of the present study concerns the length of the experiment and the number of reading texts employed. It may be the case that the treatment may have been too brief to show a difference in reading. (Simons & Johnson, 1974, p. 355)

Considerable work remains for linguists to do in re-examining, replicating and extending earlier research on the teaching of reading to AAVE speakers, whether our interest be in the study of decoding errors, the use of dialect readers, or the ways in which teachers should present material and respond to AAVE speakers in the classroom. As indicated in the second section, however, it is important for us to be aware of other aspects of the issue with which we have been less involved. In the case of reading, these include the use of phonics and phonemics versus whole language approaches (Chall, 1996), the importance of culturally relevant literature (Harris, 1995; Hornberger, 1985; A. Rickford, 1998), and the value of higher level inferential and evaluative comprehension questions rather than low-level recall questions (A. Rickford, 1998), particularly with students who have mastered the basic process of decoding. Linguists' research on reading has almost all been in the area of decoding, but the skill that all tests of

reading involve is comprehension. While this critically involves decoding, it also involves much more.

Conclusion

In this overview I have tried to indicate why a conference and published proceedings on the language diversity of African American youth are necessary—the essential rationale being the devastating rates at which schools fail African American students—and I have outlined a number of strategies for dealing with this educational crisis. Although my focus was on the areas in which linguists have attempted to make a difference, such as the use of contrastive analysis in the teaching of SE and the use of dialect readers in the teaching of reading, I have tried to consider too the nonlinguistic issues, such as school facilities and teacher training, that also make a difference. I hope that more of us linguists will use our expertise and training to solve this and other practical crises in American life, and that we will do so with the interests of the children foremost in mind rather than our own intellectual predilections, differences, or biases. The stakes are too high for us to do otherwise.

Notes

1. Thanks to Carolyn Adger, Donna Christian, and Orlando Taylor for inviting me to give the opening address at this conference, and to my wife and intellectual companion, Angela Rickford, for helpful discussion of many of the relevant issues. Some portions of this paper draw on remarks in Rickford (1997b).
2. For example, from Angelou (1986), here is the opening verse of "The Pusher":

    He bad
    O he bad,
    He make a honky
    poot. Make a honky's
    blue eyes squint
    anus tight, when
    my man look in
    the light blue eyes.

And here is the closing verse of "The Thirteens":

    And you, you make me sorry
    You out here by yourself,
    I'd call you something dirty,
    But there just ain't nothing left,
    cept
    the thirteens. Right on.

3. This was evident in the title of the Oakland school board's controversial resolution, No 9697-0063, both in its original (December 18, 1996) and its amended (January 15, 1997) versions: "RESOLUTION . . . TO DEVISE A PROGRAM TO IMPROVE THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND APPLICATION SKILLS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS."
4. Letter to Lukeman Literary Management, Ltd., New York.
5. Chances are that special interventions like extra encouragement, extra effort, extra time, and extra motivation on the part of parents, teachers, and students are involved in every success story.
6. Rev. Jackson subsequently visited the Oakland School District and reversed his position on the Ebonics issue, recognizing that "the teachers had not planned on teaching Ebonics but on using Ebonics to teach Standard English" (Watters, 1997, p. 1).
7. These data were drawn from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). NAEP data from earlier years, dating back to 1971, indicate similar trends.
8. Note that these standardized tests are normed so that 50% of all students taking them are expected to score above the 50th percentile. It should also be noted that Hispanic students also showed declines between the elementary and high school levels—from 32% to 24.2% scoring above the norm—whereas Asian and Pacific Islander students showed increases (from 40.3% to 42.9%), as did Alaskan/Native American/Other students (from 37.4% to 53%).
9. In 1993, "the percentage of all US households whose earnings placed them below the poverty level was 15.1%; for Whites . . . 12.2%; for Hispanics, 30.6%; and for Blacks, 33.1%" (Rickford, 1997a, p. 174).
10. I am grateful to Gil Garcia of the U.S. Department of Education for sharing these data with me.
11. For the full text, see http://www.lsadc.org/web2/ebonicsfr.htm.

12. Fischer (1992, cited in Adger, 1997, p. 13) notes that "students [in a language awareness program for Caribbean English Creole speakers at Evanstown Township High School, Illinois] who clearly distinguish English as a separate language from Creole develop the motivation to tackle English language acquisition."
13. This example, drawn from the English composition of an African American college freshman at the University of Akron, is from Palacas (1998).
14. The LDPAAS, directed by Noma LeMoine, involves more than 90,000 African American students in the Los Angeles Unified School District. This program serves more students than does Oakland's program.
15. For instance, Alice Walker, in an interview in the March 21, 1981, issue of *The New Republic,* said: "The worst of all possible things that could happen would be to lose that language. There are certain things I cannot say without recourse to my language. . . . I know the standard English. I want to use it to help restore the other language, the lingua franca" (p. 27). And James Baldwin described AAVE in the *New York Times* (July 29, 1979) as "this passion, this skill, . . . this incredible music."
16. As Fischer (1992, p. 110) notes: "Many parents harbor the same prejudices against Creole as do their children, one of which is that Creole, while it may be fine to use at home and with friends, has no place in school. However, CAP [the Caribbean Academic Program in Evanston, Illinois] has taken the approach of explaining clearly and directly what we do and why, and parents have turned out to be very supportive."
17. It may turn out that the critical variable in the success of the *Bridge* readers was not their language, but the fact that they featured stories involving African American characters, situations, and themes that boosted motivation and interest. One replication might involve comparing the SE versions of the *Bridge* materials, which still include an African American focus, with other materials that lack this. However, AAVE is such an intrinsic part of the authenticity of the *Bridge* materials that it is difficult to know what the results of any such replication might mean; certainly A. Rickford (1998) suggests that the dialect in the dialog of some of her Black reading materials is an important element in their success.

References

Adger, C. T. (1997). *Issues and implications of English dialects for teaching English as a second language* (TESOL Professional Papers No. 3). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Angelou, M. (1986). *Poems.* New York: Bantam.

The Ann Arbor decision: Memorandum opinion and order & the educational plan. (n.d.). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 140)

Bailey, R. W. (1983). Education and the law: The King case in Ann Arbor. In J. W. Chambers, Jr. (Ed.), *Black English: Educational equity and the law* (pp. 1-28). Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.

Ball, A. (1995). Text design patterns in the writing of urban African American students. *Urban Education, 30* (3), 253-289.

Baratz, J. C., & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). (1969). *Teaching Black children to read.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bull, T. (1990). Teaching school beginners to read and write in the vernacular. *Tromsø Linguistics in the Eighties, 11,* 69-84. Oslo, Norway: Novus.

Chall, J. S. (1996). *Learning to read : The great debate* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace.

Collins, M., & Tamarkin, C. (1982). *The Marva Collins way: Returning to excellence in education.* Los Angeles: Jeremy Tarcher.

Comer, J. P. (1993). *School power : Implications of an intervention project* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Conroy, P. (1972). *The water is wide.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cose, E. (1997, January 13). Why Ebonics is irrelevant. *Newsweek,* p. 80.

Danesi, M., & Di Pietro, R. J. (1991). *Contrastive analysis for the second language classroom.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Diringer, E., & Olszewski, L. (1996, December 21). Critics may not understand Oakland's plan: Goal is to teach black kids standard English. *San Francisco Chronicle,* p. A17.

Ebonics: Hearing before the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 105th Cong., 1st Sess. (1997) (testimony of Michael Casserly).

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farr, M., & Daniels, H. (1986). *Language diversity and writing instruction.* New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Fasold, R. W., & Shuy, R. W. (Eds.). (1970). *Teaching standard English in the inner city*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Feigenbaum, I. (1970). The use of nonstandard English in teaching standard: Contrast and comparison. In R. Fasold & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), *Teaching standard English in the inner city* (pp. 87-104). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fischer, K. (1992). Educating speakers of Caribbean English Creole in the United States. In J. Siegel (Ed.), *Pidgins, creoles, and nonstandard dialects in education* (Occasional Paper No. 12.) Canberra: Applied Linguistics Association of Australia.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the burden of "acting White." *The Urban Review 18*(3), 176-206.

Freccia, N., & Lau, L. (1996, February). Sending kids to jail: Progress in California education. *Lift*, 1.02. Available: http://www.lifted.com/1.02/caleducation.html

Harris, V. J. (1995). Using African American literature in the classroom. In V. L. Gadsden & D. A. Wagner (Eds.), *Literacy among African-American youth: Issues in learning, teaching, and schooling* (pp. 229-59). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Hoover, M. R. (1991). Using the ethnography of African-American communications in teaching composition to bidialectal students. In M. E. McGroarty & C. J. Faltis (Eds.), *Languages in schools and society: Policy and pedagogy* (pp. 465-85). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hornberger, J. (1985). Literacy and Black children. In C. K. Brooks (Ed.), *Tapping potential: English and language arts for the Black learner* (pp. 280-285). Champaign-Urbana, IL: Black Caucus of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Hutchison, E. O. (1997). The fallacy of Ebonics. *The Black Scholar, 27*(1), 36-37.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure: Policies, practices, and prescriptions.* New York: Greenwood.

Kochman, T. (1969). Social factors in the consideration of teaching standard English. *The Florida FL Reporter, 7*(1), 87-88, 157.

Labov, W. (1969). The logic of nonstandard English. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *20th annual round table: Linguistics and the teaching of standard English to speakers of other languages or dialects* (pp. 1-38). (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Labov, W. (1995a). Untitled paper presented at the Amherst Conference on African American English, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Labov, W. (1995b). Can reading failure be reversed: A linguistic approach to the question. In V. L. Gadsden & D. A. Wagner (Eds.) *Literacy among African-American youth: Issues in learning, teaching, and schooling* (pp. 39-68). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Labov, W., Baker, B., Bullock, S., Ross, L., & Brown, M. (1998). *A graphemic-phonemic analysis of the reading errors of inner city children* [Online]. Available: http://www.ling.upenn.edu/~labov/home.html

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Laffey, J. L., & Shuy, R. (Eds.) (1973). *Language differences: Do they interfere?* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Le Page, R. B. (1968). Problems to be faced in the use of English as a medium of education in four West Indian territories. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems of developing nations* (pp. 431-43). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Lewis, N. A. (1996, December 23). Black English isn't a second language, Jackson says. *New York Times*, p. B9.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States.* London and New York: Routledge.

McWhorter, J. H. (1997). Wasting energy on an illusion: Six months later. *The Black Scholar, 27*(2), 2-5.

Melmed, P. J. (1971). *Black English phonology: The question of reading interference* (Monographs of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory No. 1). Berkeley: University of California.

Miner, B. (1997). Embracing Ebonics and teaching standard English: An interview with Carrie Secret. *Rethinking Schools, 12*(1), 18-19, 34.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence on language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Österberg, T. (1961). *Bilingualism and the first school language—An educational problem illustrated by results from a Swedish language area.* Umeå, Sweden: Västernbottens Tryckeri AB.

Palacas, A. L. (1998, January). *Plurals in the English compositions of African American college freshmen.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York.

Parker, H. H., & Crist, M. I. (1995). *Teaching minorities to play the corporate language game.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the Freshman Year Experience and Students in Transition.

Piestrup, A. M. (1973). *Black dialect interference and accommodation of reading instruction in first grade* (Monographs of the Language Behavior Research Laboratory No. 4). Berkeley: University of California.

Pollard, D., & Ajirotutu, C. (1997). School restructuring in an African centered educational model. *Illinois Schools Journal, 75*(1) [Special issue: Focus on Afrocentricity and Afrocentric Education], 41-54.

Rickford, A. E. (1998). *I can fly: Teaching narratives and reading comprehension to African American and other ethnic minority students.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Rickford, J. R. (1997a). Unequal partnership: Sociolinguistics and the African American speech community. *Language in Society, 26*(2), 161-197.

Rickford, J. R. (1997b, January). Ebonics and education: Lessons from the Caribbean, Europe and the USA. In C. Crawford (Chair), *What is the relationship of Ebonics to the education of Black Americans?* Symposium conducted at Medgar Evers College, New York.

Rickford, J. R., & Rickford, A. E. (1995). Dialect readers revisited. *Linguistics and Education, 7*(2), 107-128.

Simons, H. D., & Johnson, K. R. (1974). Black English syntax and reading interference. *Research in the Teaching of English, 8,* 339-358.

Simpkins, G. A., Holt, G., & Simpkins, C. (1977). *Bridge : A cross-cultural reading program.* Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Simpkins, G. A., & Simpkins, C. (1981). Cross cultural approach to curriculum development. In G. Smitherman (Ed.), *Black English and the education of Black children and youth* (pp. 221-40). Detroit: Wayne State University, Center for Black Studies.

Sledd, J. (1972). Bidialectalism: The linguistics of White supremacy. In D.L. Shores (Ed.), *Contemporary English: Change and variation* (pp. 319-330). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

Smitherman, G. (1994). The blacker the berry, the sweeter the juice: African American student writers. In A. H. Dyson & C. Genishi (Eds.), *The need for story* (pp. 80-101). Champagne-Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Steele, C. (1992, April). Race and the schooling of black Americans. *The Atlantic Monthly, 269*(4), 68-78.

Stewart, W. A. (1969). On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In J. C. Baratz & R. W. Shuy (Eds.), *Teaching Black children to read* (pp. 156-219). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Suryaraman, M. (1997, January 10). School district achieves lots with little: Resourceful and focused, Evergreen shines despite "difficult" demographics. *San Jose Mercury News,* p. 1A.

Tauber, R. T. (1997). *Self-fulfilling prophecy: A practical guide to its use in education.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Taylor, H. U. (1989). *Standard English, Black English, and bidialectalism.* New York: Peter Lang.

Treisman, U. (1992). Studying students studying calculus: A look at the lives of minority mathematics students in college. *College Mathematics Journal, 23,* 362-72.

University of California Outreach Task Force. (1997, July). *New directions for outreach: Report from the University of California Outreach Task Force to the University of California Board of Regents.*

Watters, B. (1997, January 2). Jackson gains new insight on Ebonics. *Chatham-Southeast Citizen,* p. 1.

Whiteman, M. F. (Ed.). (1980). *Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and education.* Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 624)

Williams, F. (1976). *Explorations of the linguistic attitudes of teachers.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Wolfram, W., Adger, C. T., & Christian, D. (1999). *Dialects in schools and communities.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). *American English: Dialects and variation.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Yarborough, S., & Flores, L. (1997, January 19). Using Ebonics to teach standard English. *Long Beach Press-Telegram,* p. A1.